

THE REAL MUHAMMAD AND THE FALSE QURAN

**Refutation of all the heresies of Islam
and how the jews wrote the Quran**

**Father Gabriel Théry O.P
(Hanna Zakarias)**



DEUS VULT

LEONIDAS • NANVS • VITALIS

ANNO DOMINI MMXXIV

WARNING FROM THE EDITORS

For once, here is something really new!

When we read the Quran, we are actually reading something else. What we call it is to the true Quran what 'The Acts of the Apostles' are to the Gospel. And this Quran, which is not one, should be called the Acts of Islam. As for the true Quran, it is lost.

Fortunately, the Acts of Islam restore some passages to us. By studying them carefully, we arrive at an extraordinary discovery, which indeed obliges us to consider as null everything that has been professed so far about Islam.

How will those who have specialized in the study and practice of this pseudo-religion react? The author does not hesitate to name a few 'doctors'. Because of these confrontations, although they are not offensive to individuals, we hesitated for a long time to publish the work. What matters, after all, is not what this or that person may think of Muhammad and Islam; what matters is what a thorough study reveals without any prejudice in the sole aim of finding the truth.

If the author were still in this world, we would have exposed this point of view to him. He himself acknowledges that his work will violently shock Muslims. 'We fraternally invite them,' he writes, 'to rethink the religious problem in total objectivity... to judge as reasonable men... in order to find the true meaning of their religion.' But he was dead when the manuscript was handed to us, and his heirs did not believe they were authorized to modify anything in the form or tone, any more than in the thesis itself.

So here is this book, as it is, which in Hanna Zakarias' projects, was intended to give the general public the arguments and conclusions that a previous work of historical criticism had only offered to specialists. It gives a glimpse of a very beautiful figure of a missionary, that of the Rabbi of Mecca who, in order to overthrow the idols and bring Arabia to the God of the Bible, knew how to indoctrinate Muhammad and whose zeal thus carried him high above the efforts of the Christians of Mecca. Above all, it gives a glimpse, for the Mediterranean world and even for the entire world, of the possibilities of a future quite different from what is believed to be determined.

And finally, Hanna Zakarias' thesis seemed to us so solidly founded, so plausible and of such importance that we decided to publish this work. May all men of good will find in it something to work effectively for Peace!

THE EDITORS.

INTRODUCTION

We are not writing a novel about Mohammed. We also dismiss all the nonsense that has been spouted for centuries about the origins and historical developments of Islam. We stick to the conclusions, which have been described as “rigorous and precise”, which are those of our previous work entitled *From Moses to Mohammed*, conclusions which can be summarized in a few extremely clear points.

1. — Islam is nothing more than Judaism explained to the Arabs by a rabbi.
2. — Mohammed was never inspired by God. He is neither a Prophet, nor the revealer of a new religion. All that can be conceded to him is that he converted to Judaism under the pressure of his wife Khadidja, a Jew by birth, and helped his instructor, the rabbi, in his plan to Judaize Arabia by preaching the religion of Moses to his compatriots.
3. — If Mohammed was in no way a prophet, he was no more a writer, nor the depository of a new thought of the Sovereign Creator. The Quran was neither revealed by Allah, who has never been a specific god of the Arabs, nor written by Mohammed. It was composed and written by a Jew, the same one who instructed his student Mohammed in the religion of Mount Sinai.
4. — This primitive Quran, an Arabic duplicate of Moses’ Hebrew Quran, was written by a Jew who was truly the creator of the Arabic religious language. It really existed at the time of Mohammed and the great Meccan quarrels of the early 7th century, but it is now lost. What Muslims present to us as their Quran is not a Quran, that is to say a prayer book, in accordance with the Quran of Moses - the only religious Quran according to the Jews - intended to be read and commented on in mosques, sisters of synagogues, but a book of anecdotes, stories, a kind of report established by the rabbi instructor of Mohammed and editor of the Arabic Quran. Therefore, all the covers of this book should be pulped, and a first page should be recomposed with the title: *The Acts of Islam*.

These Acts written by a Jew constitute the only authentic source that allows us to know the origins of Islam, in other words, the origins of the Judaization of Arabia, of which the rabbi of Mecca, Khadidja and her husband Mohammed were the first workers. We will use only this single source, categorically refusing to reproduce any of the fantasies of Muslim traditions contained in the *Sīrah*, which P. Lammens has definitively banished from the field of history, and which even Muslims a little trained in the exact sciences no longer take seriously. It is with Muslim traditions as with caravans in the desert. The traveler who would be at the end of this caravan, seeing the endless line of camels advancing slowly and heavily,

would have the impression of a safe convoy. But if ever the idea comes to him to go up this caravan, he will find himself facing a donkey-driver. We can advise Muslims to go back through the centuries to the origins of their traditions. "The entirety of the Sīrah," writes P. Lammens, "is nothing but embroidery and imagination.

Only a critical study of the Acts of Islam, falsely called the Quran, can provide us with a solid basis for a reconstruction of the origins of Islam, or conversion of Arabia to Judaism.

5. — If the Acts of Islam were composed, drafted and written in Arabic by a Jew, it is unimaginable that one could find Christian ties in this book. In fact, this book is fundamentally anti-Christian. Any attempt at direct rapprochement between Muslims and Christians can only be a rapprochement on stilts, doomed sooner or later to a catastrophic crack. Islam does not exist as a specific religion. There is only one original revelation in the Mediterranean basin: the Revelation made by Yahweh to Moses on Mount Sinai, Jewish land par excellence; Mosaic revelation which constitutes the original nucleus of Judaism. This worn-out Judaism, which had failed almost two thousand years ago in a lifeless Pharisaism, itself resulting from the Mosaic codification, was invigorated, revived, transformed by the Revelation of Jesus, son of the Virgin Mary, God himself equal to the Creator. Judaism grew out of this Christian Revelation, which blossomed into Christianity. If Christianity is in continuation of Mosaic Judaism, it nevertheless contains something new. It is a new light thrown on the world. But in Islamism, there is nothing original; it's an old flame passed on to a new lamp. It's the old Sinaitic law transported to Mecca. In the Mediterranean basin, the religious question is to be debated between Jews and Christians. Muslims, who are only Arabs transformed into Jews since the beginning of the 7th century, can have no part in this dialogue. The only interested parties are the holders of the original Mediterranean Revelations: Jews from the Revelation of Moses, and Christians from the Revelation of Christ-Jesus. In other words, there was divine communication made by Yahweh on Mount Sinai; God gave his last message twenty centuries ago in Palestine; but God never spoke to the Arabs, neither directly nor through a prophet. Mohammed is an invention of a Jewess, Khadidja, and a rabbi from Mecca. He is neither a prophet nor a revealer nor a composer of the Quran. He never founded a religion. If he were questioned as a witness to the religious problem of Arabia, he could only repeat the stories learned from the rabbi.

FIRST CHAPTER

MECCA

In the past, in the time of Isaiah, that is to say in the 8th century before Jesus Christ, merchants who exported their goods from Persia or India reached the Mediterranean by following the tracks of the Syrian desert. It is by this northern route that the princes of Dedan, Arabia and Cedar, that the merchants of Sheba and Rahma received from the east horse blankets, lambs, rams, goats, precious stones, gold and spices.

Long after, the war and political quarrels between the Romans and these tribes of the Middle East, introducing insecurity into the regions once traversed by Abraham leaving the land of Hiran, forced merchants to change their route. The merchant has no country; more precisely, he has no soul. He takes no account of the noblest and deepest human feelings. He has no nation, so no enemy. He has only one goal; wealth, wealth to enjoy in total and fierce selfishness.

A merchant wants to sell. He will sell to anyone. He will even sell goods that, sooner or later, could be used against his country and his own family members. The paths of the Syrian desert having become uncertain, the merchants of the 6th century AD, who do not want to give up exporting their products, will turn south, create depots on the shores of the Red Sea, in the Sinai Peninsula. Thus, one day Mecca became a commercial necessity, born from a political scramble in the north, and the will to survive among eastern traffickers. From Mecca, the merchants, now avoiding Sassanid territories, go back south to find their traditional outlet. Syria then offers them, as in the past, all security to reach the Mediterranean.

Twice a year, in summer and winter, the wealthy Meccans organize caravans that will carry all the eastern riches to the north, the grapes of Taif, the incense and perfumes of southern Arabia; the ivories and gold powders of Africa. These two caravans have, so to speak, become part of Meccan customs. The Acts of Islam, in Surah 106, verses 1-2, recommend to “pray” for the union of the Qurayshites, so that they “unite for the caravans of winter and summer”.

Mecca is now one of the largest centers of Eastern trade, with all that entails any junction point of primitive tribes. Then, as today, slaves are sold there. Prostitutes abound. In his deepest instincts, the Arab of this time is a primitive. Left to himself, to his personal excesses, the Arab does not have a sense of construction. He is destructive by nature. Whatever country he inhabits, this country is doomed sooner or later to

extinction and death. But this savage is religious. He is unintelligently religious. In Mecca there is a center called “the Ka’ba”. Already reported in the 2nd century, it is a kind of box 12 m long, 10 m wide, and 15 m high, placed on a marble base 25 cm high, covered with a black carpet changed every year, and supplied by the Egyptians who consider this gift as a distinguished privilege.

In this Ka’ba, a black stone had been placed a long time ago, similar to those found in several Syrian sanctuaries. Even today, a stone of the same color is shown in the Meccan Ka’ba, the date and placement of which are unknown. It is a set of three fragments, with a total diameter of about 50 cm, set in a large silver setting 1 m from the ground, in the East corner near the gold door inlaid with silver that gives access to the interior of the temple.

It is the Muslims, inventors of so many senseless legends, who tell that this stone was brought from heaven by the archangel Gabriel, in this kind of box, or Ka’ba, whose foundations Abraham and even Adam would have laid in the past!

In the 6th century, the Ka’ba had become a jumble of stones, mostly unsculpted, picked up on the desert roads of Arabia. There were very few statues in this sanctuary. The stones were supposed to represent deities. There were as many gods or goddesses as there were days in the year. There was something for everyone, for all situations, for all tribes, for semi-sedentary people and Bedouins. They were given gifts, sacrifices were offered to them, they were conjured with sticks, and people also danced and stamped around the Ka’ba.

The Acts of Islam have preserved the names of three goddesses who seem to have been the object of a particular cult: Allât, al-'Uzza, and Manât, to which can be added the god Wadd, or god of Love. This is pretty much all we know about the old Semitic background of the Meccan pantheon. The Acts of Islam also speak of a recent contribution of deities: Souwâ, Yagoût, Ia’ouk, and Nasr; but the birth date and place of origin of these new deities of the Ka’ba are unknown.

In Mecca at the end of the 6th century, the vast majority of the population consisted of polytheistic Arabs who worshiped these stones gathered in the Ka’ba next to the black stone. One of Mohammed’s relatives is said to have been one of the last known guardians of this sanctuary, a kind of sexton.

There is also a Jewish community led by a high-class rabbi, a remarkable man, extraordinarily cultured, a fine connoisseur of the Hebrew Bible, the Midrashim, the Talmud, possessing Hebrew, Aramaic, probably Syriac. This pious, zealous rabbi, noting the intellectual and religious poverty of the Arabs, will conceive the immense project of converting these primitive beings to the religion of Moses. To achieve this goal, he will latch onto a crafty Arab, Mohammed, married to a Jewess, Khadija. This is

the whole story of the origins of Islam, which is nothing other than the conversion of Arab polytheists to the One God of Israel.

Finally, there is a third religious group in Mecca. The Christians indeed form a community, but a not very shining one. They live in the slums of the Meccan agglomeration; small craftsmen with no future, they scrape by day to day. Their priest or bishop has certainly heard about the rabbi's enterprises, but without paying much attention to them. He is pious, classically pious. He knows the gospels, but, as has happened several times in the history of the Catholic Church, his zeal remains drowsy in the face of danger that he has not been able to appreciate at its true value. When he intervenes to stop the conversion of Arabs to Judaism, it will be too late.

CHAPTER II

BIRTH, ADOLESCENCE, AND MARRIAGE OF MOHAMMED

No document informs us about the exact date of Mohammed's birth. We do not want to repeat once again all the wild hypotheses that circulate in all Muslim books and Eastern scholars on this point. Any connection between Mohammed's birth, the Year of the Elephant, and Surah 105 is pure nonsense. This Surah 105 contains five verses:

1. Have you not seen how your Lord dealt with the Men of the Elephant?
2. Did He not make their plan go astray?
3. And He sent against them birds in flocks,
4. Striking them with stones of hard clay,
5. And He made them like eaten straw?

How can the men of the Elephant, the little birds, the clay stones inform us about a child's birth date? One must have a truly fertile and disoriented imagination to create such ramblings. According to the more serious conjectures of P. Lammens, let's admit that Mohammed was born around 580, and, if we do not want to sin by presumption, let's simply admit that we know nothing. However, it can be admitted that, in the last quarter of the 6th century of our era, a little Arab was born in Mecca who will later marry a Jewess, who will make him leave his idols of the Ka'ba to adopt the religion of Israel.

Was this little boy named Mohammed? It's possible. What is certain is that sooner or later he was called by this name.

His own family was poor, according to the Jewish author of the Acts of Islam, sura xviii, 8: "He found you poor and enriched you". Having become an orphan at a young age, Mohammed would have been taken in by one of his uncles, Abu Talib, who was trying to make a living by combining the functions of a sexton of the Ka'ba and a caravan driver. It was in this environment of fetishes and camel drivers that Mohammed lived. Naturally, he was not taught any trade. At eight years old, he is practically on the street. He has many rich relatives, but they do not want to take care of a rascal of that age, who begins to loiter in the alleys of Mecca. The child appears intelligent and sharp. Abu Talib then conceives the idea of taking him with him in the caravans he leads to Gaza: a good opportunity for him to earn some money. This clever little Mohammed must be wriggling with joy at the thought of going so far and seeing the country. He will be able to perch on a camel, squeeze between the goods, and squawk like a big one. Very quickly, he gains a reputation as a resourceful person. It is already sensed that he will go far. In fact, people are happy with his services. People talk about him in the huts. He's a very astute boy. The years pass... Why doesn't he get married? He's twenty

years old, and still no women. Where does this anomaly come from in this tall young Arab? In fact, is there an anomaly?

Later, it will be seen that Mohammed had such a sensual temperament, that his own compatriots will be scandalized. We will never know how Mohammed spent his youth without women, which must not have been devoid of adventures. The opposite would be inconceivable.

Today, Mecca is celebrating. Mohammed is getting married at the age of twenty-five. We are at the beginning of the 7th century, let's say in 605, if Mohammed was born in 580, as Lammens wants. He is undoubtedly marrying a young girl from a good family, a rich family of merchants, a young girl of about fifteen years old, as is the custom among these primitive peoples where the senses are always ahead of the spirit. It is also customary for a young man who is getting married for the first time to marry a virgin of whom he will be the first to take possession. There are many people at this wedding. The groom's family is so large! In the crowd, there is his guardian Abu Talib who, not liking Jews, is unhappy with his nephew's marriage. There is also Uncle Hamza; Uncle Abu Lahab, greasy and self-sufficient, he too anti-Jewish; Uncle Abbas and aunts galore, and cousins of all kinds. In this dizzying crowd, one can easily imagine the couple strolling through the streets of Mecca, to the sound of drums and ululations.

Let's try to approach and catch a glimpse of the bride, this pretty girl who is going to make her husband happy. Where is she? Dressed in brightly colored clothes, yellow, red and green, here she comes.

From the smiles of the crowd, we guess that she is the victor of the day. She is Mohammed's wife. But... But... she's an old woman! She's 40 years old. She walks, pompous and triumphant. It's not given to all old women to land such a handsome young man. She, Khadija, has pulled off this extraordinary feat. The procession is comical. Perhaps one had never seen in Mecca a couple so mismatched. One can easily imagine the taunts thrown by this sensual crowd at the young groom. Some must have said: "Don't worry, the old woman is rich, you won't have any more worries". Others whispered in his ear: "Young girls are not lacking around the Ka'ba or among the nomads, to replace your old woman on occasion". But all counted without Khadija's character. She was old, certainly, for such a youth; but she had temperament and she knew men. She was a headstrong woman, reputed as one of the best merchants in Mecca. She succeeded in all her ventures and she was rich. But with her, one had to walk straight. She was cut out to command. She is even credited with initiating her marriage to Mohammed. In any case, she holds him firmly. She will always keep him in check, she will force his fidelity. Married once before to a speculator, she will no doubt balance her second husband because he was not doing his job. She did not like useless and cumbersome men. That's when she set her sights on Mohammed.

What a strange woman this Khadija was! She undoubtedly needed a businessman, but a man who was a man; and she took possession of a young man without fortune. She knew that her iron authority would be more easily exercised over him. However, he was young, with a fiery temperament. To keep him all to herself, did she still have the necessary charms? She wanted children of her own; she may have had some. In the end, Khadija became a permanent chain for Mohammed. Only her death will give freedom to her “faithful husband”. We are not there yet. Mrs. Mohammed is not dead. She reigns over a husband who is always afraid of losing his position. This Khadija was an ambitious woman. She showed it on her wedding day; she braved the mockery of the Meccans by marrying a dashing young boy. During her years of marriage, she managed to maintain him in apparent marital fidelity despite himself. In the end, who was this woman? A Jewess, a merchant. Mohammed had married a Jewess (1), which explains his entire religious evolution that we are going to witness and which will unfold in an implacable way. Mrs. Mohammed will demand of her husband the abandonment of the idols of the Ka’ba and his conversion to the God of Israel.

The Khadija-Mohammed household did not always go smoothly. We can at least suspect this from reading sura cxi, in which we see Mohammed curse his uncle Abu Lahab, anti-Jewish as we have said:

1. May the hands of Abu Lahab perish, may he perish!
2. His wealth and his gains will not avail him.
3. He will be exposed to a blazing fire,
4. while his wife, carrying wood,
5. will have a rope of palm fibers around her neck.

What nonsense historians have not spouted in the analysis of this surah! Mohammed, they say, would have violently attacked his uncle because the latter refused to recognize the new religion announced by his nephew! Abou Lahab is presented to us at this time as the worst enemy of Islam, revealed by Allah! Let’s not let ourselves be manipulated by these novelist scholars. Let’s see! What is it about? This surah cxi, dates from a time when Mohammed is not yet publicly monopolized by the Jews. Indeed, there is no trace of Judaism in it. Mohammed appears to us here as he is, resentful and violent. If he curses his uncle, it is certainly not because the latter refuses to admit the new religion. At that time, there was no question of Islam, an exact copy of Judaism, which the rabbi of Mecca will only teach much later to Mohammed and the Meccans. The discussion in this surah cxi does not concern the religious problem. It would be wrong to talk here about a social revolution inaugurated by the “Prophet”! For what reason do our famous Quranists absolutely want to make Mohammed a precursor of political socialism! Mohammed is just a quarreler. It is resentment

that we find in these snippets of sentences. The armchair exegetes talk about preaching, social plan, even revelation! There is none of this in Mohammed's words. Let's not lend to this man our 20th century mentality. For us, Mohammed is, at this time, a bitter, aggressive man. This is how he appears to us in the first texts of the Acts of Islam. So where does this acidic and violently excited character come from? Wouldn't it be due to his wife? We would then have to imagine many domestic scenes! Would Mohammed have shown some desire to leave his dear wife? Would she have reproached him for his conduct, reminding him bitterly that he was poor when she welcomed him into her home? She had done everything for him. And his parents, what had they done? They had left him in misery. These reproaches from the old woman were known. They had crossed the threshold of the conjugal hovel. Later, in surah xciii, the rabbi will take up exactly the same argument: "Your Lord found you poor and enriched you". The rabbi thus fully justified Mohammed's shrewish wife. - Ah yes, your parents are beautiful. You, Mohammed, are my husband. I share my fortune with you. Go shout at all this rabble incapable of a gesture of benevolence, shout at them all our contempt! Go tell your parents what we think of them: "May your uncle Abou Lahab die! and may his wife be cursed!" This is the only text in the Acts of Islam where a particular woman is mentioned, to curse and insult her. It is not customary for an Arab to curse and insult a known woman in public. There is no doubt that in these invectives we find the influence of another woman: Khadidja. In cursing his aunt, it is his own wife that Mohammed defends. In these domestic quarrels, we are far from a social plan conceived by Mohammed, far also from divine revelations, even further from a contemplative Mohammed, withdrawn on Mount Hira, all panting under the shock of Allah's revelations, and coming back to be revived by his wife trembling with emotion and sufficiency.

How can we still believe today in such nonsense that rests only on a pruritus of imagination, when we have texts, in the Acts, which allow us to glimpse some traits of reality, a reality much more prosaic, it is true, than all the chimeras invented by some Arab bluffers and repeated with admiration by the great Western scholars? In all this, where is Islam? Mohammed could not think of it at this time. Islam is not his creation, and the rabbi of Mecca has not yet officially intervened in his life. Only the shadow of Khadidja is projected on the actions and gestures of her husband.

CHAPTER III

CONVERSION OF MOHAMMED TO JUDAISM

The idol worship is in full swing in Mecca. Sedentary and nomadic people gather around the Ka'ba at the departure and return of each caravan. There is dancing; they conjure up fate; sacrifices are offered; there are big Arab and Jewish traders, those from India and those from Africa; wretched people who swarm and stretch out their hands attached to the end of long, emaciated arms; blind people with eyes oozing with grime. But now a voice rises in the midst of this motley crowd. Such language had never been heard before. The poor wretches, greasy and scrofulous, grouped around the Ka'ba, hear well, but understand nothing. They turn away, shrugging their shoulders. The speaker, for his part, has drawn the terms of his speech from the secular meditations of his ancestors. "I swear by Yahweh who created male and female. He who gives alms and fears God will be rewarded. As for the one who is miserly, full of self-sufficiency, he will be cast into the abyss. What will his fortune serve him?" I warn you now of a fire that blazes, reserved for him who does not fear! (sour. xciii). Wouldn't one think they were hearing the author of Proverbs, xv, 16: "Better is little with the fear of Yahweh than great treasure with trouble"; and didn't David sing in Ps. xxxvii, 16 "Better is little of the righteous, than abundant fortune of the wicked"?

How well this speaker from Mecca knows the Bible, who from the beginning of his preaching divides humanity into two categories: those who fear God and believe in the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, Paradise and Hell; and the Infidels, the miserly and the proud. In these stories, we find only stories from the Old Testament, biblical theology, Talmudic reminiscences! Everything is Jewish in the sermon of this public preacher:

I swear by the fig tree and the olive tree

I swear by Mount Sinai

Those who believe and do good

will receive a reward (sour. xcv).

No one will escape Judgment. As the author of Ecclesiasticus proclaimed, each individual will be weighed on their own scale. Everything is written in a Book of Life, as the Psalmist sings repeatedly.

Who is this preacher who ridicules the idols of the Ka'ba; who announces the existence of a Unique God, the resurrection of bodies, eternal reward and punishment; who swears by Mount Sinai, the olive tree and the fig tree, the two trees of happiness in the Old Testament? This preacher only knows the religion of Israel. As an honest critic, we are obliged to conclude that this preacher is Jewish.

This conclusion, he himself offers it to us. Everything I announce to you, he says, is contained in revered leaves (sour. lxxx, 13-16), the leaves of Moses and Aaron (sour. xxxvii, 114-120). Idolatrous Meccans, who worship inert and powerless stones, do you not know that the Creator God has spoken? Yes, he spoke here, on the nearby Western Mountain, on Mount Sinai, to Moses in the midst of lightning! He revealed to him the principles of the right path, in the Night that taught the world the Destiny of Man. It is Yahweh who, in this famous Night, revealed to Moses the Hebrew Quran, the only Quran that has ever existed, the glorious Quran of Mount Sinai (sour. lxxxv, 21-22), Meccans who listen to me, do you know it, this Quran of Moses that you can see in our synagogue?

It is this book of Moses that a Jewish preacher announces in Mecca. By what madness, by what aberration, by what bluff have we come to speak of a revelation of Allah to Mohammed on Mount Hira? Of a revelation of 6,226 verses that Mohammed would have forgotten, and that compassionate Allah would have recited to him again, bit by bit? Of a religious investigation by Mohammed in Jewish and Christian taverns? Of an army of typists who would have transcribed, no doubt after lunch, the words of Mohammed in trance, on sheep ribs or broken dishes? We are in full ridicule. Never has religious history been told with so much stupefaction!

However, everything is so simple. The speeches contained in the Acts of Islam contain absolutely nothing that is not specifically Jewish.

In other words, all the speeches contained in the Acts are essentially and exclusively biblical. They can therefore only have been authored by a Jew, a Jew who knows the Bible, the Talmud, and all Jewish literature. This educated Jew can only be the rabbi of Mecca, the head of the synagogue. All of this is irrefutably clear.

The rich Meccans who only think about their trade are annoyed by the preaching of this rabbi. They do not want to be towed by the Jews.

The rich Meccans who only think about their trade are annoyed by the preaching of this rabbi. They do not want to be towed by the Jews. Woe to the bitter slanderer who has amassed a fortune and counted it over and over! He

thinks his fortune has made him immortal! (sour. civ, 1-3) May the hands of Abou Lahab perish. May he perish! His wealth and his fortune will be of no use to him. (sour.cxi, 1-2)

For now, the rabbi's audience is still made up of rich merchants from Mecca, who do not want to renounce their ancestral idols, to rally to the God of Israel. To renounce their idols would be equivalent to giving up their pleasures and curbing their need for enjoyment. The rich, because they are rich, only think about getting richer and richer, and they are deaf to words of kindness and charity.

For the moment, the rabbi's audience is still composed of wealthy merchants from Mecca, who do not wish to renounce their ancestral idols to rally to the God of Israel. Renouncing their idols would be equivalent to giving up their pleasures and curbing their need for enjoyment. The rich, because they are rich, only think about getting richer and richer, and they are deaf to words of kindness and charity.

O (you) wrapped in a cloak! Rise at night for a while, Half or less than half of the night or a little more, — and chant carefully the Preaching We are going to communicate to you a serious word; Indeed, the (chanting) at night (marks) a deeper impression... During the day, you have vast occupations. (sour. Lxxiii, 1-7).

Thus, Mohammed learns that there is only one God, that this Unique God has spoken to men, that His words addressed to Moses on Mount Sinai have been recorded in a Book, a Quran. - You cannot read this Hebrew Quran, but I will tell you its beautiful stories, the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses. You will repeat them with me until you know them by heart. "We will teach you to recite and you will not forget" (sour. lxxxvii, 6). Mohammed is a good student. He is even enthusiastic. He would like to move even faster, his tongue gets tangled, and the rabbi has to moderate his student to make him repeat the master's words correctly, which he will then explain clearly: Do not stir your tongue, in saying it, to hasten its expression! When We preach it, follow its preaching, then its exposition is up to Us! (sour. lxxv, 16-19)

When he comes home, he receives nothing but compliments from his wife, dear Mohammed! Khadidja, the Jew, is very happy when one fine day, her little husband proudly recites his new profession of faith dictated by the rabbi:

1. Say: He is Unique, Yahweh;
2. Yahweh, he is alone.
3. He has not begotten and has not been begotten.

4. No one is equal to Him (sour. cxii).

What a beautiful Jewish profession of faith! Yahweh is unique. He had no beginning and will have no end. No one can be likened to Him. No one is God, except Him.

Mohammed has just abandoned the fetishes of his ancestors, his parents, his uncle Abou Lahâb, his uncle Abou Talib, the sexton of the Ka'ba. He only has his wife's religion in mind now! By his profession of faith, Mohammed ceases to be a member of an Arab tribe. He now enters the Jewish community.

Mohammed did not convert for himself alone. He made his conversion public. Solemnly, he broke all religious ties with the idolaters of Mecca. In the Arab city, this conversion caused a scandal, stirred up turmoil. This madman, married to a Jewess, was he not going to risk ruining the old Pantheon of Mecca, the pride of the sedentary and the nomads, by adopting his wife's God? There was nothing like it in all of Arabia! It was near the Ka'ba that the caravaners met. For a long time, it had been the rallying point of the nomads, the center where oaths were exchanged, where business contracts were sealed. — Mohammed, you are mad to want to ruin a sanctuary that has made our fathers' wealth and now constitutes the glory of our country! You are ruining us, and you are ruining us for the benefit of the Jews!

But the rabbi watches over his disciple:

1. Say: (-them, Mohammed): O Unbelievers!
2. I will not worship what you worship.
3. And you, you do not worship what I worship.
4. And I, I will not worship what you worship.
5. And you do not worship what I worship.
6. To you, your religion. Me, I have mine (sour. cix).

Like the rabbi, Mohammed now speaks of the One God, creator of heaven and earth; of Adam, the Demon, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Job, Joseph, David and Solomon. He knows that Yahweh appeared to Moses to dictate his Law.

With Mohammed, there has never been a revealing Allah, but simply a Jew. And it is this Jew who tells him and teaches him the great stories of the Hebrew Bible.

Without scruple, we must sweep from our books and our minds the insane ramblings about Mohammed's contemplative temperament, about the auditory

character of his revelations, about the sweats and trances of the “Prophet” after each whisper of Allah. All this secular erudition constitutes a veritable Summa of all the nonsense that human folly and malice can invent. One fact is certain, which emerges clearly from the reading and study of the Acts of Islam: an Arab, Mohammed, husband of Khadidja, after having followed the lessons of a rabbi, converted to Judaism among the Arabs. He could only do that. In Mecca, we will never see him assume the slightest apostolic initiative. Mohammed will be nothing more than the spokesman for a Jew, the pupil of a rabbi, for a strictly and absolutely Jewish enterprise.

As for the rabbi, what was his goal in converting Mohammed to Judaism? To count one more recruit for the synagogue? Certainly, there is that. But there is even more. Indeed, the rabbi was already preaching in public, before setting his sights on Khadidja’s husband. At that time, he had already defined his ideal. He sought to Judaize, not a man, but a race. It is to achieve this goal that the rabbi joins a man, a man of Arab race. Mohammed, after his conversion, will put himself totally at the service of the Jew for the realization of this audacious project.

In all this, was Mohammed sincere? Did he convert wholeheartedly to the Jewish religion? No text of the Acts, no Muslim tradition makes the slightest allusion to Khadidja in this matter. But to understand Mohammed’s attitude, let’s put ourselves for a few moments, in a normal and real way, in his family environment. Here is a man who frequents Jewish circles, who learns and recites by heart important passages from the Bible. His wife knew it well. The comings and goings, especially in the evening, of Mohammed at the rabbi’s house, could not escape Khadidja. And if Mohammed continued his relations with the Jews, if he repeated in public the words taught to him by the head of the synagogue, he could only do so with his wife’s consent. Otherwise, Mohammed would never have been able to make the slightest gesture of dissent: divorce was looming and, with divorce, ruin. The least that can be said is that Mohammed’s conversion to the religion of Israel was done with Khadidja’s consent. The truth is undoubtedly more categorical. It was pushed by his wife, herself “nagged” by the rabbi, that Mohammed — the little boy of the household — abandoned the national idols to adopt the God of the Jews and shout it out loud.

Let’s suppose for a moment that Khadidja was an idolater and an Arab. How would she have tolerated a renegade husband, who would have openly rejected ancestral traditions to pray in the Jewish way, to prostrate himself with the Jews upon hearing the name of Yahweh, to now devote his leisure time to learning by heart the biblical stories of creation, Noah, Abraham, Moses, to tell them to his bewildered and mocking compatriots, making fun of this big fool, unable to speak without the help of a Jew who did not let go of an inch and who dictated the answers to give to the mockers who overwhelmed him with their sarcasm? Without his

wife's consent, Mohammed would never have been able to desert the Arab Pantheon, risk his honor by becoming the apostle of a foreign and cursed religion, and offer himself, knowingly, to the ridicule and contempt of all those who knew him. To defy all hatreds, Mohammed had to feel strongly supported by his wife; not only supported, but undoubtedly pushed by her. It is possible, even probable, that she put this deal in his hand: either conversion to Judaism or divorce. Mohammed, who was always timid in front of his wife, was trapped. On one side, the Meccans, members of his family faithful to their gods, did not understand that an Arab, their nephew, their cousin, could adopt a foreign religion (these parents will only understand after receiving some small gifts from the lucky Mohammed! The rich will remain idolaters; but the poor, gratified with a few dirhams, will convert to Judaism. Islam at its beginnings is only a small family affair, well organized by Mrs. Mohammed). On the other side, Khadidja and the rabbi seeking to make Abu Talib's nephew the apostle of the Jewish religion. The attacks of the Meccans were triggered with such violence that on several occasions poor Mohammed, greatly shaken, thought about returning to his native religion. But in the end, between the Meccans and Khadidja, Mohammed chose his wife, who was undoubtedly an excellent auxiliary for the rabbi of Mecca. One may wonder why she waited so long - ten and fifteen years perhaps - to decide her husband to turn towards the God of the Jews. But nothing indicates that she waited so long to talk about Yahweh to Mohammed, an idolater as stupid as all his relatives, friends and acquaintances. However, for a decisive step to be taken, an extraordinary circumstance was needed. We have seen that union was not perfect between Mohammed and some members of his family. Khadidja had succeeded in "setting up" her husband against them. Never before had an Arab been seen publicly cursing a woman, yet this is what Mohammed did for one of his aunts. Vengeance from Khadidja no doubt! Khadidja, by pushing her husband into the rabbi's hovel, did she think she was playing a dirty trick on her in-laws? Didn't she see in this gesture a way to perfect her own revenge?

CHAPTER IV

RELIGIOUS FORMATION OF MOHHAMED AND THE DIRECTION OF HIS APOSTOLATE

Mohammed now attends the rabbi's school. He learns the essential elements of Holy History. He now knows that idols are inert and lifeless; they are powerless, unable to do either good or evil. There is only one God, and because God is Unique, He is necessarily All-Powerful. The signs of All-Powerfulness burst forth in all of nature. It is this God who created heaven and earth, the sun and the moon, day and night, the sea and the springs, all pairs of living beings, man and woman. All of nature is a praise to the All-Powerful Creator. What are idols in comparison to this God so merciful to humanity? There is even more. Idols are mute and God has spoken to men. Oh! What a solemn night that night of Revelation was! (sour. lxxx, 11-15; xcvi, lxxxvii, lxxviii, 15, 52; lvi, 76-77). It was on Mount Sinai. Moses was camping with all his people at the foot of the mountain; a voice called him: "Moses, Moses!" Moses followed the call and, through an angel, God told him wonderful things; He gave him a code (2) which would henceforth be the true direction for men. This God named Himself: "I am Yahweh, the one who is", Yahweh, God Unique and All-Powerful. He is not the first among the gods, for there is no hierarchy in All-Powerfulness: Yahweh is alone. Apart from Him, everything is falsehood or error. — Listen again, my son. Do you know to whom Yahweh entrusted His secrets? To Moses; to him alone. Israel is the confidant of the Eternal. No people have been chosen by Yahweh to receive His message, except Israel. There is only one God, Yahweh; there is only one people of truth and righteousness: the people of Israel; Outside of it, there can be no salvation.

Jewish racism is based on a pivotal event: a unique Revelation, made by a Unique God, to a unique man, and intended for a unique people. — Israel, go back into yourself and become aware of your mission: you are now charged with leading all of humanity towards the God of Truth. Your mission will be tough, but Yahweh's hand will guide your arm. You will then have to guard yourself from the idolatrous peoples who surround you. But courage, Israel, victory is yours! Your enemies will fall one after the other; in the afterlife, they will know the eternal abyss. — Under different names of heroes chosen by Yahweh, it is the history of Israel that has been repeating itself for centuries, identical and victorious. Abraham and Lot, Moses and Aaron, David and Solomon, great servants of the Unique God, are also the great victors of idolatry. Mohammed, you too will be among these servants... Say and repeat to your compatriots: you have your gods and I have mine. I believe in the One God, the God of Israel, Creator of Heaven and Earth. Your Allah that you worship in the Ka'ba, is powerless, not being all-powerful.

Your idols can do nothing, neither help nor harm. My God is the only one who can do everything, who sees everything, who hears everything, who knows everything. Yahweh, the God of Moses, is now my God. My heart and my life belong to Him. I know the Truth about the creation of Adam and Eve, the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Job, Elisha, Jonah, David, Solomon, the Queen of Sheba. I know the signs of the Almighty, the One God. I now know the Truth.

The rabbi is jubilant. He has just won his first victory. It is he, and not Allah, who made Mohammed aware of the Revelation of Moses as well as the stories of the Bible. What would this Allah be, who would only know Jewish stories, Talmudic interpretations? This Allah would have a predilection only for Jews, and it is really a pity that the historian is really forced to renounce his services in the case of Mohammed. The rabbi of Mecca is sufficient for the task. He has fulfilled his function as a teacher and instructor wonderfully. Mohammed has carved himself to the God of the Jews, Khadidja must have sighed with pleasure. In this story, there is also no place for Mount Hira, which we wanted to present as a reduced Sinai, a substitute for Sinai: everything is fake in the Islamic novel. The Medinans have only been able to elaborate a poor copy of their Mosaic model: Mount Sinai has become for them Mount Hira; Allah makes himself heard there as Yahweh once did on the Sacred Mountain, and Mohammed appears there as a new Prophet, surpassing Moses now outdated! In the end, all this is in very bad taste. The historian is often more sensitive to nuances than the poet or novelist. Here, however much the historian looks, he perceives neither Mount Hira nor the cave where Mohammed would have come to meditate to hear Allah's prayers. Mohammed is not contemplative, solitary or inspired for the historian. He is quite prosaically the husband of a Jewess and the pupil of a rabbi, a fine connoisseur of the Bible and the Talmud. For centuries we have been bluffed in all problems concerning Islam.

We are bluffed even in everyday and current life. Have we not seen, recently, the ex-king Farouk charged a complaisant genealogist to manufacture "authentic" pieces for him to declare to the world that he descended directly from Mohammed, with the ulterior motive of making a piece to the sultan of Morocco, descendant only of Ali (?). This was undoubtedly only a means of electoral propaganda, a "trick" to open the door giving access to the caliphate; but it is pitiful to see poor ignorant Muslims - when they are not Western scholars - rushing into all these follies which denote in their authors a real abuse of trust and a sovereign contempt for their co-religionists. - Have we not seen, in 1949, the University of El-Azhar in Cairo, gathered in Supreme Committee of Fetouahs, solemnly declare in the name of the most eminent jurists and theologians (!), in response to a consultation of Tunisian Muslims, that it was permissible for a Muslim to resort to a non-Muslim doctor and even, in case of emergency and gravity, to also accept a transfusion of Christian blood! - Has not a

group of Muslim politicians taken as their motto: “Allah is our Master. The Koran is our constitution. Mohammed is our leader. The holy war for the cause of God”. All “holy wars” have started with these principles. All mahdis have used religion for their political ends. Perhaps one day we will be able to make Muslims understand that Allah is a myth, that the Koran is lost, that the Acts of Islam were composed by a Jew, that Mohammed was in Mecca only the servant of Judaism, and that the holy war was declared by a rabbi with biblical texts!

Very recently, didn't the Association of Ulemas (that is, a small group of elementary school teachers) declare that the beach of Sali, near Rabat, would now be reserved for the exclusive use of women? The Koran, they affirm (or, more exactly, they invent), does not forbid women to bathe as long as it does not take place in front of men. All of this is completely grotesque in its ridiculousness and presumption.

Mohammed, my son, listen, listen well: Abraham, it's you... Moses, it's you... Like them, you are now charged with triumphing the Truth, in the midst of your idolatrous people. Sweep away the false gods of the Ka'ba. Fear nothing. They are incapable of doing the slightest harm. And Mohammed obeys... He sees the shadow of Khadidja looming before his steps. And the rabbi's refrains make him dizzy. Mohammed obeys... He repeats everything his master tells him. This Arab now speaks like a Jew. He knows only one religion, the religion of Israel. He has become the apostle of Yahweh, like Abraham and like Moses. All his entourage mocks him: if you are like Moses, then do miracles! Mohammed had never thought about this impotence: they are right, the idolaters; if I were like Moses, I would perform wonders similar to his! Mohammed wavers. He realizes that he is just a crier at the service of the Synagogue, that he is playing into the hands of the Jews. But the rabbi is there - look, Mohammed, you let yourself be troubled by such an objection that wants to be a mockery, and which is only thoughtlessness? Miracles are not necessary to confirm your mission!

Even if they saw you perform miracles, they would not believe. Better than wonders, you have the word of Yahweh, and Yahweh keeps his promises. Those who fear Him will enjoy unparalleled happiness. They will eat succulent dishes, absorb fragrant drinks; for the pleasures of love, they will have young men, beautiful women with round and firm breasts, more beautiful than the breasts that hang on the chest of withered and worn women, even more beautiful than Khadidja's breasts! With these promises, perhaps your opponents will believe! As you know, your compatriots are fond of all these sensual pleasures. Entice them with these treats. Perhaps they will come to you. If they refuse, they will be burned by a fire that will never go out. They will drink boiling pus. They will have neither young men nor houris... Mohammed obeys. He announces to the Arabs the pleasures promised to believers, the dreadful torments reserved for idolaters. Even without a miracle, I will

have the final victory. — Shut up, fool and idiot, retort the polytheists. Have you seen a dead body come back to life? Stop telling us all these ridiculous stories. Come back to common sense. We are much happier with the religion of our fathers who knew neither Abraham nor Moses. How do you expect us to accept your fables, your old tales, reported by a Jew who claims to learn them himself in a Jewish collection of revelations from God?

The God that the rabbi preaches is indeed the God of Moses. It is Yahweh, the rewarder of the just and the punisher of the wicked. To be just is to fear Yahweh and do good. Those who prefer idols to Yahweh, Multiplicity to Unity, all men who do not want to believe in the God of Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David and Solomon are considered wicked. There is salvation only in the Almighty, the God of the sons of Israel, the Unique Protector of the Jewish people.

In the religious teaching given to Mohammed, everything, absolutely everything is Jewish. The teacher of such a teaching can only be a Jew. Everything that Mohammed now knows about religion, he learned from the rabbi of Mecca. He is only the reflection of this unique master. Our Quranic scholars did not understand this, who evoke Zoroaster, the Syrian Church, Manichaeism... as if poor Mohammed had his head stuffed with all these doctrines! He knows only one thing: what the rabbi teaches him. This rabbi is the only agent in this whole religious adventure. It is he who conceived the project to Judaize Arabia and who, for this purpose, tells the Arabs biblical stories, speaks to them of the Book of Yahweh of which Israel has been constituted the depository; it is this same rabbi who fights foot by foot against the idols of the Ka'ba and who, to succeed more surely, imagined to join an Arab whom he will have made his disciple, whose words and gestures he will guide carefully, and whom he will defend against the sarcasm of his compatriots. At the origin of Islam, there is only one man, and this man is not an Arab: he is a Jew. What more do you want to recognize in all loyalty and frankness that this Jew has become the apostle of the Arabs?

If we understand this origin well, we will have understood the very essence of Islam. At its root, Islam is only the extension of Judaism among the Arabs, conceived and traced by the rabbi of Mecca, who was assisted in the realization by a converted Arab, Mohammed, whom his wife, Khadidja, pushed towards Judaism. Mohammed, in the building of Islam, is not the architect. He is only the first mason. He repeats aloud what he hears in a low voice. He is only a receiver, an authentic 'pipe' through which rabbinical teachings pass. According to Muslims, everything in the Acts of Islam - which they call the Quran, out of ignorance - everything is absolutely divine - Just as Yahweh revealed himself to Moses on Mount Sinai, for the glory of Israel, so Allah - they think - revealed himself to Mohammed, thus manifesting his predilection for the Arab people. Is there a greater privilege for a nation than to be the confidante of the Almighty, creator of heaven and earth? The

Arabs would be this exceptional nation: the Jews having failed in their mission, the Arabs would have inherited their legacy declaring themselves then the only race of Truth, the chosen race of Allah! Let one travel through the lands of Islam, and one will feel everywhere this instinctive pride of ignorant and stagnant men, who reject far from them all those who do not recognize the favor granted by Allah to all Arabia.

This idea of Arab supremacy dominates in all Muslim countries. It is at the root of all current events in North Africa, Egypt and the Middle East. A few years ago, Saint E. Salah Hark Pacha, addressing the youth of Egypt, declared that Sudan had been the victim of Christian missionaries. Only the 'Arab Empire' brought into the conquered country ideas of justice, truth and tolerance; that's why - concludes Saint E. - 'The East must guide the West and save humanity again' (3). One cannot be more grotesque. What has Islam given to humanity? Let's travel through Muslim lands. If these lands are uncultivated, unproductive, stirred with the most primitive instruments, you are certainly in a land of Islam. If the country is sordid, if the population lives in slums, in the midst of secular filth, you are certainly in a land of Islam. If you are gripped at every step by children who cling to you to extort a batchich from you, you are in a land of Islam. If the sidewalks are crowded with all kinds of miseries, often organized; if Moorish cafes are filled with hookah smokers getting drunk on hashish; if at every moment you hear the eternal 'malech' (I don't care...), you are certainly in a land of Islam. Batchich, Hatchich, Malech, are the three stars of the Muslim flag. The Islam that is proposed to us as a guide for the West has given to the world only filth, dirt, ignorance and misery, and it is still Islam that maintains slavery. The woman, covered with an elegant veil or wrapped in her rags, is only a poor creature for reproduction. Islam is only an immoral harem. From a religious point of view, it is based on a lie and a scam. From a human point of view, it constitutes a stagnation of the spirit, and the most harmful element to the development of thought.

One could object that the nature of the soil, rocky, arid and desert-like, is the insurmountable cause of all these physical, moral and intellectual miseries. We do not accept these excuses. Let's enter the State of Israel. It's the same land, the same soil; despite this fundamental similarity, when crossing the border we discover an absolutely new world. The fields are everywhere watered; trees grow in abundance; we walk on a carpet of greenery; the roads are maintained; the shanties have disappeared. No more batchich, hashish, or malech. The youth there is clear and ardent. It is said that during the Israeli-Arab war of 1948, Jews from Yemen arrived en masse in the State of Israel. They arrived with their customs acquired over centuries lived among the Arabs. They did not know how to use a towel, having never washed themselves. They ate soap, not knowing its use. After four years, they

learned cleanliness and teamwork from the Jews. Never has such a transformation been seen, and never will it be seen in Muslim lands.

In the intellectual field, where are the Arab productions? We are waiting for someone to tell us; we are waiting for someone to list their inventions, their discoveries, the human progress that could be credited to them. The Arabs are strangers to the golden age of Islam. By acquired movement, Christians converted to Islam brought with them all their civilization; but, once these first generations disappeared, Islam fell back into its ignorance and sordid state. Does this total and universal stagnation stem from the Arab character? One could not affirm it. Don't Christian Arabs in the Near East have a different behavior than Muslim Arabs? They know how to house themselves, wash themselves, eat cleanly, they have learned to work; in a thousand details, one can without effort in the streets of Beirut, Damascus and Palestine surely distinguish the Christian Arab from the Muslim Arab; and we are obliged to conclude that Islam, as Islam, is at the last degree of human civilization, and that Muslims are perfectly ridiculous when they claim to serve as a model for humanity. In the Near East, one cannot help but think that there was a natural selection between Jews and Arabs; that the Arabs were left behind, and that Muslims perpetuate among the nations of the world the image of Job on his dung heap; that Islam tarnishes, vilifies, 'ignorifies' everything it touches. The Arab is destructive by nature. Ibn Khaldoun in his Prolegomena (4), has provided numerous and obvious proofs, easy to verify in all Muslim countries, in Byblos and Palmyra, in Constantinople, as in Tlemcen. 'The disaster of Baalbek is the work of Arabs', writes Barrès in his 'Inquiry into the countries of Levant t. I, p. 186. One will never exaggerate the disasters much more extensive than that of Baalbek - caused by Islam in humanity. The Quranists who have only touched on the Islamic problem readily speak of the traditional morals of Islam, Here again, they are mistaken. Tradition is not stagnation. One must not confuse the blood flowing in the veins of a living being with coagulated blood that kills the organism. Despite its millions of adherents, Islam only carries germs of death. The Arabs killed Islam itself. Before Islam there was no intellectual culture in Arabia. The famous poems that we amuse ourselves by designating with an Arabic name to give them more weight, and on which we rave for lack of better, are undoubtedly posterior to the Arabic Koran written by the rabbi of Mecca. The Jews, on the other hand, had behind them centuries of religious and intellectual vitality. They were really at the forefront of human culture for hundreds of years. At the beginning of the 7th century, one of them, the great rabbi of Mecca, tries to get the Arabs out of their ruts, their gangue of error and ignorance, their idolatry; he tries to divert them from worshipping lifeless and powerless stones, to lead them to God Unique and Almighty, the God who spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai. This rabbi wants to teach Arabs that God spoke to Israel and through Israel to all humanity: He gave it a Direction, and this code of Direction written on Tables by Moses was the first Koran that every man should know and practice to be eternally

saved. There has never been any other Koran than that of Moses, and it is this one that Mohammed repeated to the Arabs, on orders from his Master.

CHAPTER V

CATASTROPHIC FAILURE OF KORANIC EXEGESIS

Based on our well-established conclusions, it seems useful to us, before continuing our brief history of Islam, to search for the causes of the stinging failure of traditional Quranic exegesis.

Among Muslims, there is obviously no question of a rabbi, instructor of Mohammed. Among them, historical criticism is still unsuspected. Even those least encrusted in their secular routine cannot imagine for a second that a human intelligence could engage in an exegetical study of the Acts of Islam which, for lack of reflection, they persist in naming the Quran. For Muslims, historical criticism, totally non-existent, is replaced by a blissful fideism, absolutely uncontrolled, without any infrastructure, resting on emptiness and nothingness. They simply affirm, without any proof, that Mohammed was inspired by Allah. Who is Mohammed, they know nothing about it. I have often asked them the question; invariably I received the same answer: I do not know, but my father and grandfather knew it well.

Ask them who Allah is, they will give you exactly the same answer. The people of the countryside, as well as the 'famous' ulemas who boast of their Quranic knowledge, live, from a religious point of view, in the deepest ignorance. What is the personality of Allah? What idea led him to lean one day on Arabia, to choose Mohammed as he had once chosen Moses and more recently Jesus - not the Christ, but Jesus son of Mary - and to make the Arabs the new depositories of his thought? Who is this Allah? Is he identical to Yahweh of Moses? Somewhat thoughtful spirits would conclude in the affirmative, since Yahweh and Allah speak the same language, give the same directives. But Muslims do not reflect on their religion. They do not have the right to do so, and they have no notion of these fundamental problems. It is on this immeasurable void that they have, over the ages, piled up tons of nonsense.

These Arabs from Arabia were, before the term existed, great and authentic Bergsonian. They did not conceive of a static Allah. For them, Allah did not know exactly what he was doing. He wavered in his resolutions! A decree he had signed the day before, he abolished the next day. Although indecisive, Allah was good and indulgent, especially in the sensual domain, and first for Mohammed his faithful servant. He granted him all sorts of liberties with women, after the death of Khadidja. He was not only good, but also very learned! In terms of languages, he spoke Arabic, Hebrew, Aramaic perfectly, no doubt Syriac. He knew all the Jewish

stories. In his secret revelations to Mohammed indeed, he liked to tell purely Jewish stories: the creation of Adam, the story of Noah, the great characters of the Old Testament: Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Job, Jonas, Elijah, Elisha, David, Solomon, the Queen of Sheba. He knew all these stories by heart. He told them so well, mixing in explanations from the Talmud and Midrashim! How well he knew the Bible, this Allah of the Arabs and Mohammed! But one cannot help but observe an absolutely curious fact about this God so fond of Judaism: in terms of religion, he only knew that of Abraham and Moses. He did not like Christ or at least denied him as his son. Christ in his mind was a good Jew but no more; an announcer of good news that Christians had distorted by presenting him to the world as the son of God. How could he be the son of God since Allah had no wife!

Why invent an Allah who had nothing else to reveal than the religion of Israel, who had nothing else to say to the Arabs than what he had already said to the Hebrews? This Allah of the Arabs is in all respects identical to the Yahweh of the Jews; what is more serious is that Allah has absolutely nothing to tell. What he whispers in Mohammed's ears is purely and simply the religion of Israel, the unique model of religions.

Sadly, we must say a final goodbye to this myth of Allah, to pay a big tribute to Yahweh, the God of the Jews. At the same time, the revelations made to Mohammed also disappear! It would be difficult for us to conceive of an inspired person without an inspirer. However, Mohammed did not need an inspirer to learn the stories contained in the Bible, which all Jews have known for centuries. If, in Islam, there is no inspired person because there is no inspirer, there is also no revelation. A revelation presupposes a new dogma, the object of this revelation. So where is this new dogma necessary for the "construction" of a new religion in Islam? One would search for it in vain; it does not exist. Allah the inspirer and Mohammed the inspired are to be rejected in the realm of fable. There is no longer any basis for Arab racism: one does not take pride in nothingness. Never has any God ever leaned towards Arabia to confide his secrets to it. Never has Arabia been, in the history of religions, a privileged land. When Yahweh visited it, it was only to bring it to Judaism and tell it the story of his chosen people, the people of Israel.

Western Quranic scholars reason quite differently. For them, there is no Allah the revealer. They affirm it, at least, without giving any reason for their opinion. All the glory of the foundation of Islam goes back to Mohammed. This poor camel driver would have been a soul anxious for spirituality; he found himself in front of three kinds of religions: Judaism, Christianity, and idolatry. He knew idolatry, having practiced it until his marriage.

Mohammed was then just a polytheist like the others. Sorry! Not like the others, because according to our Quranic scholars, Mohammed was eager for religious

truth! He wanted God; deliberately, he sought him methodically, through surveys and polls. The Gallup Institute should take him as an honorary founder! But how to conduct surveys? Mohammed could neither read nor write. Fortunately, he had a tongue and ears. He listened and discussed. Our most serious Quranic scholars present Mohammed going through all the hovels of Mecca to inquire and learn. Great scholars affirm without flinching that all the biblical stories inserted in the Quran (that is to say, for us, in the Acts of Islam), are due to verbal communications received by Mohammed in Jewish or Christian taverns. This is really a scholarly idea. We can clearly see Khadija's husband leaving his hovel to go from tavern to tavern ordering "a glass on the zinc" or sitting at the corner of a table, calling the boss or the café boy, or approaching consumers. He immediately engages in conversation, so eager is he for religious information. Given the abundance of his documentation - more than 2,000 biblical verses in the Meccan period - we must conclude that Mohammed was a pillar of coffee; and as this documentation of the Acts is essentially Hebrew, it is therefore Jewish taverns that Mohammed frequented, rather than the miserable shops of the poor Christians of Mecca. He only frequented "cafés" of great luxury, on the Champs-Élysées of the city. For famous Quranic scholars, these "cafés" were in a way fashionable salons. There they evoked great theological questions; they talked about creation, Adam, Abraham, Moses, Joseph, Lot, Jonah, David, Solomon. They discussed the Resurrection of bodies, Sheol (5) and Paradise. We are forced to admire the Quranic scholars who arrive at such perfect conclusions. But how did these men so perspicacious and of such deep erudition not manage to find signs for these great Jewish "cabarets"? It is probable that there was the café "At Midrash Tanhuma"; "At Midrash Genesis-Rahab"; "To Moses"; "To Noah, king of drinkers"; "To Potiphar and Zuleikha"; "To chaste Joseph"; "To Eve's Temptation"; "Panorama of Israel's history"; "To Babel Tower"; "To Queen Sheba"; "Entrance to Paradise", a tavern easily recognizable by its red lantern, reserved for boys over 12 years old and men; one could contemplate in full nature the enticing houris. We are not joking. All our Quranic scholars reason as if one fine day Khadija's husband had decided to go through all the Jewish taverns in Mecca to learn about Israel's religion. It's simply mind-boggling.

What an incorrigible husband! However, one cannot say that Mohammed was a bad boy! When he went to the Jews, it was naturally with his wife's permission, and always for a commendable reason. Moreover, his behavior was perfect! Mohammed was indeed very attentive to what the Jews were telling him. He listened so well that he immediately memorized the multiple biblical stories he heard. He was a wonderful man, according to our Quranic masters. He had heard, for example, the story of Moses; this story, he retained; returned to his hovel and after being comforted by his dear wife, he called his secretaries who hurried to gather around them the old pottery, the ribs of sheep and camels, and transcribed with skill and fidelity everything that came out of Mohammed's mouth, delighted himself with so

much science. The next day, Mohammed returned to the taverns to perfect his knowledge.

This whole novel, developed in the most technical works, by respectable men who present Mohammed as a specialist in religious inquiries, inquiries that were to determine his final choice, is supremely ridiculous. For scholars of this ilk, Mohammed is indeed the greatest religious investigator the earth has ever known. He is indeed the conscious, thoughtful founder of a new religion called Islam. But at the same time, these scholars present Mohammed as an inspired one, inspired by Allah, his words are words of revelation. However, one must choose: either Mohammed was educated in Jewish taverns, and his book is only a fixation, by scribblers who understood nothing, of what the Jews told Mohammed; or Mohammed is an inspired one, and the book attributed to him is a collection of divine revelations. Inspired? or educated by the Jews? Revealed book, or collection of heard stories? The “Quran” cannot be both at once. One must choose. Western Quranic scholars have frankly failed in their endeavors for lack of having known how to choose. Jostled at the very threshold of their studies between two conceptions, planted in a beatific wonderment before a Mohammed they did not understand, these Quranic scholars were - perhaps even unbeknownst to them - all prepared to swallow wholeheartedly the enormous nonsense elaborated by Muslim commentators; and God knows if there are any! “I have noticed,” writes Riza Tewfik, “that most historians in the East lack critical sense, and history - until the beginning of the 19th century - has retained its primitive character with us: that of being flatly anecdotal! As for commentators, they have accumulated - in the name of traditions that they consider as self-evident truths - a heap of superstitions invented by popular imagination... They have so abused it that the commentaries are full of these stupid anecdotes which, far from illuminating the meaning of the text, rather tarnish it; this embarrasses the intelligence of simple people and shakes their faith.”

(6)

To be free in Quranic matters, the first duty of the true scholar is to rid himself of all this clutter of dreams, insane imaginations accumulated over centuries by men devoid of any critical sense and even any common sense, dreams and imaginations that still form today, the essential basis of Muslim teaching in small medersas, or in what we call Universities, a completely incorrect name, since Quranic history is totally excluded from it. Our Quranists have failed because of their credulity, and these are the same men who allow themselves to trample booted lords on the much more delicate fields of Jewish and Christian exegesis.

To engage in a field as encrusted as the Quranic field, one must examine one’s conscience, shake the foundations of the so-called acquired data that lingers in the so-called scientific treaties, test their real solidity, and realize their supportive value. It is for not having chased the donkey that is at the origin of Muslim traditions, that

the works of our Quranic scholars are cluttered with traditional, fanciful, unreal annotations, without any utility for understanding the origins of Islam.

Our great Quranic scholars have failed for a third reason, perhaps more serious than the other two. They wanted to understand Mohammed by doing linguistics and bibliography, thus stifling his true history. To be a historian, one must respect the vital movement of a text. Every text is dynamic. On the other hand, scholarship is too often a maneuvering work, which hides the unintelligence of essential and primordial questions (7). It's a cheater's game that only gives the illusion of knowledge. Muslim commentaries, as long as they confine themselves to philology, remain powerless to reconstruct reality. These are two different sciences. Again, one must choose when approaching the study of Islam. Do you want to do philology? Do you want to do linguistics? Do you want to do history? The misfortune is that most of our Quranic scholars have mixed all these sciences, without having known how to subordinate them to each other. To draw the portrait of Mohammed, they do not hesitate to throw and knead on the same palette, and with the same brush, pieces of suras from Mecca and Medina, "making waltz" in a fantastic sarabande verses torn from their frame, drawn from any chapter, at any time. It's bad work, presented in a spirit of sufficiency so unpleasant that it rears up the spirits however most indulgent for human follies. The works of our Quranic scholars give the impression of immense erudition, coupled with incalculable naivety, which even manages to corrupt the simplest historical data.

Under the pretext that they know more or less Arabic, Quranic scholars believe they are qualified to write about Islam! However, knowing Arabic and being a historian are two different things. In the specific field that concerns us, we are not even afraid to affirm that true Arabists are unfit to do history. Experience is there to attest to this fact. The attention of man and his perspicacity are necessarily limited. The scholar who is absorbed by linguistic concern, the origin and significant evolution of words, ends up neglecting - sometimes even completely - the meaning of the text, the atmosphere that gives terms their exact value, and that's why it's extremely common to meet Quranic scholars, good Arabists, absolutely lost in the historical problems posed by the Quran itself.

After experiencing Muslim commentaries and the learned works of specialists, we have deliberately and deliberately tried, in our work on Moses and Mohammed, to be simply natural, normal, to sit comfortably in solid common sense, and to read the texts, to reread them, to analyze them without preconceived ideas. We did not erect a thesis. Our conclusions spring from the text itself. Through this assiduous and repeated reading of the suras, we were led to make a multitude of remarks. Countless problems of detail have arisen in our minds. Each verse, one might say, brings a new subject for meditation, a new slice of life. We could not say everything in a simple orientation work. Moreover, the details do not interest us. It also doesn't

matter that we were mistaken in this or that absolutely secondary exegesis. Even when we felt that there could be a different interpretation from ours - in accidental matters - we did not seek to justify our opinion, thinking of the joy of scholars too happy to be able to polish some fragments of a building they were unable to build. But what we ask these scholars is to be careful, under the pretext that a simple roof tile seems insufficiently adjusted, not to attack the building itself. You don't demolish a fortress with a hammer blow. It is the bases themselves, the infrastructure that must be reached.

Neglecting secondary and truly uninteresting details, we have therefore applied ourselves to clear from this mass of verses contained in the Meccan suras, great avenues of orientation. But there is still a lot of work to be done for the road workers. To each his own trade. While avoiding lengths, however, there will be repetitions in our study. They are certainly not as numerous as in the Meccan suras! They will suffice, however, to dismiss the idea of a thesis, and to keep our readers in the movement of religious struggles of which Mecca was a witness in the 7th century of our era. Our work is strictly limited to the Meccan period. We will subsequently deal with the Medinan period, which offers us totally different suras and which, to be understood, requires a completely different state of mind.

As often happens when we approach a subject of study in complete freedom, we have arrived at absolutely revolutionary conclusions, in Quranic matters:

1. — Islam is only Judaism explained by a rabbi to the Arabs.
2. — The Quran was written by a Jew, not an Arab. Mohammed has absolutely nothing to do with it; there can be no question of any revelation made to the Arabs.
3. — The primitive Quran is lost: all we have left is a book of stories falsely called the Quran and also written by a Jew. Islam is the greatest bluff in Mediterranean history.
4. — The doctrinal contacts between Islam and Christianity are necessarily the same as between Christianity and Judaism. They are only that, and nothing more.
5. — These luminous and soothing conclusions constitute the best response to all Muslim detractors and frightfully ignorant bluffers, of all castes and from all countries.

These conclusions will violently shock Muslims. We fraternally invite them to rethink their religious problem, objectively, without getting upset, and calmly. They should learn to read texts healthily, to judge as reasonable men. It is in this mentality, in this spirit of docility to the texts, that they will find

the true meaning of their religion that the Jews have taught and revealed to them. In their origins, Muslims are only Arabs converted to Judaism. If Jews and Arabs have developed in such a contradictory way on the national, commercial, psychological and intellectual fields (8), they have however met one day on the religious field. Islam is the great triumph of Israel. No one can do anything about it, Muslims less than anyone. We are, moreover, convinced that our study, of brutal objectivity, will bring them complete peace which many of them feel confusedly the need and necessity.

As for our Quranic scholars, after the initial moments of surprise, we hope that, shaking off their past, they will manage to pull themselves together to resolutely walk in the new avenues that we have tried to trace for them for the good and success of their future investigations. Among the Quranic scholars, some already, the least encrusted and the least bewitched, had felt that there was at the origins of Islam a “something” that left them in uncertainty, in a certain intellectual discomfort that no study could heal. We hope that our work will bring all these worried and dissatisfied men a normal breath, a balance of mind, a great calm of intelligence.

One might object that it is inappropriate to deliver these conclusions to the public; that the most certain result of our work will be to sow confusion in Muslim consciences. All of this may be true and will still be true in twenty years, in a hundred years, and even more so. In the time of Jesus Christ, the same problems arose with regard to Judaism. Jesus did not hesitate. In the human order, truth always has a beginning, often marked by upheavals, scandals, and even murders. Jesus, God, died to attest his truth. Under the pretext of kindness, indulgence, even under the pretext of saving the future of some religious establishments scattered in Muslim countries, it is not up to Western Christians - Protestants, Catholics - nor to Orthodox of different rites, to become defenders of an Islam that has no autonomy, which is, in its origins, only the expansion of Judaism in Arab countries, and a colossal bluff in its historical development.

CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT TEACHINGS OF THE RABBI TO MOHAMMED

Mohammed converted to Judaism after his marriage to the Jewish woman Khadidja, who by virtue of this conversion, became the Mother of the God-Fearing, that is to say, converts to Judaism. But the rabbi's work does not stop there. This conversion was only a preliminary step for the leader of the Meccan synagogue. The rabbi's ultimate goal is to use Mohammed for the expansion of the Jewish religion in Arabia. Perhaps the marriage between Khadidja and Mohammed was orchestrated by the rabbi himself? This could even be his first success. The second achievement would be Mohammed's conversion to Judaism. Now it remains to shape the mind of the neophyte, to instruct him seriously, deeply, in the history of Israel, to teach him to pray like the Jews, to prostrate towards the East, to invoke the name of Yahweh. To be a true apostle, to effectively fight against the idols and fetishes of the Ka'ba, Mohammed must become a faithful follower of the Synagogue.

The rabbi teaches him the history of the great figures of Israel. All these stories are told at the same pace. Once upon a time, there was a man who believed in the One and Almighty God. He had received the mission to announce to his idolatrous and polytheistic surroundings the existence of this One God. Those who believed in his message were assured of their salvation; as for those who refused to believe, they were doomed to destruction. Israel has always triumphed over its enemies. Yahweh, the God of the Chosen People, the Jewish people, has everywhere annihilated those who resisted him. Jewish history is only the long series of triumphs of Yahweh's apostles over idolaters. And now here you are, you too, Mohammed, the apostle of God, of the true God, of the One God, the God of Israel. Mohammed, courage! You too will triumph over your enemies!

In this almost personal apologetic framework, the rabbi told Mohammed, supporting his stories with the Bible, the Midrashim, and the Talmud, the stories of the great men of the Old Testament. Mohammed heard them for the first time. He was amazed. Little by little, the rabbi transformed him. Listen, Mohammed, you are like Abraham; you are like Moses. Jacob, it's you... David, it's you. Like them, you are chosen to announce to your ignorant people the existence of the Great God, Unique and Living. Listen, Mohammed, the history of Israel. Announce to your people the God of Israel and be sure of the final triumph. There is no example that Israel has been defeated by its enemies in its faithfulness. In this struggle that you will lead,

helped by your wife, against the idols of the Ka'ba, you will be the great victor.

In the field of religious knowledge, the Pseudo-Quran or more precisely the Acts of Islam bring absolutely nothing new; no story, no detail, that does not refer to the Bible and Jewish literature. There is no religious originality in Islam, no innovation, neither dogmatic, nor moral, nor legal. Islam is a myth. It has no existence of its own. Remove the Old Testament and the entire construction of the Acts collapses. They are right, the Muslims who claim that the Pseudo-Quran has no sources. Indeed, it does not. According to Muslims, the Pseudo-Quran would have been revealed by Allah himself. This is correct, provided we add that Allah never said anything to the Arabs. The Pseudo-Quran does indeed represent the words of God, but they were spoken to Moses on Mount Sinai, and in no way to Mohammed on Mount Hira.

Islam was born from a very simple fact. A very educated and zealous Jew governed the synagogue of Mecca, the great commercial center of Arabia, at the beginning of the 7th century. This Jew had dreamed of converting the Arabs to the religion of Israel, of overthrowing the pantheon of the Ka'ba. Who says pantheon, says multiplicity. However, Israel rejects any multiplicity in divinity. The rabbi wants to replace the multitude of idols with his One God, Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth, who revealed himself to Moses on Mount Sinai on a blessed night.

What are your idols, idolatrous Meccans? They are lifeless and powerless stones. They see nothing, hear nothing, can do nothing! Come all to Yahweh: It is He who created the heavens and the earth, with seriousness. How much more august He is than what the Infidels associate with Him. He created Man from a drop of sperm, and behold, Man contests Him. He created for you camels that give you clothing, utilities, and food that you eat. He created the horse, the mule, and the donkey to serve you as a mount and as an ornament. It is He who made water descend from the sky from which you draw something to drink and from which shrubs live. He has subjected for you the night, the day, the sun, moon, and the stars are subject to His order. It is He who has disseminated different colors on earth. It is He who has subjected the sea so that you eat fresh flesh (issued) from it and draw jewels that you wear, so that you see the ship and that you seek (a little) of His favor in it. Well! Is the one who creates like those who do not create? (sura xvi, 3-16).

The God of the rabbi is the Creator God, and all creatures celebrate the existence and greatness of the One God. The very first step of a reasonable

being is to look. “Ah! If you were to count the blessings of your Lord, you would not be able to enumerate them. Truly, God is a forgiving and merciful God.” (sura xvi, 18). You will not find more proof of the existence of God in the Acts of Islam than in the Bible. In Israel, Yahweh’s existence is not proven. Yahweh IS. He is the One who is. His existence is a fact; it invades everything, it is perceptible everywhere and in everything. For us, Westerners steeped in Greek wisdom and molded by logic, nature is proof of the existence of God. But in the Bible, and therefore in the Pseudo-Quran, nature is only a sign, a report, a power of evocation. You must know how to look in order to remember. The believer is the man who looks and who, meditating before nature, extends his gaze towards the All-Powerful and Merciful Creator.

“Lift up your eyes on high And see who has created all these trees!
... Don’t you know? Haven’t you learned? Yahweh is an eternal God Creator of the ends of the earth. He does not get tired, nor does he get weary.” (Isaiah, xli, 21-28).

The mission of the rabbi to Mohammed and the idolatrous Meccans is precisely to teach them to look, to see the signs of the Power of Yahweh, creator of the Universe. It is exactly the same movement of soul that we find in the Hebrew Bible and in its Arabic adaptation. The opposite would be incomprehensible. Mohammed, come to me and take your place next to the men who reflect: I am going to teach you to read the signs, as our great Patriarchs and our Prophets did to the idolatrous peoples. (sura xlv, 2-4; xxx, 20, 21 22, 23, 24).

In thinking of Yahweh, the All-Powerful, Merciful, Provident, also think, Mohammed, my son, of the afterlife. If Yahweh gives life, he also causes death (sura xxiii, 82; xxvii, 63; xl, 4; xxxix, 7; xxx, 28; xxxv, 14; vii, 52). Our holy books and our Quran have long taught this truth (Deuteronomy, xxx, i, 39; i Samuel, ii, 6).

After creation, the resurrection of the dead is one of the main manifestations of divine Providence: Do you not know (Mohammed), that everything returns to your Lord! That it is He who makes laugh and who makes cry? That it is He who gives life and who gives death? That He created the couple, male and female, from an ejaculated drop of sperm? That the second birth will be incumbent upon Him?

(sour. liii)

Don't you see, Mohammed, that Yahweh created the heavens and the earth? If He wills, He can make you disappear and bring about a new creation. This is not difficult for Yahweh (sura xiv, 22-23). All men will one day return to their Creator. "Yahweh brings out the Living from the Dead and brings out the Dead from the Living. He revives the earth after its death; this is how you will come out of your graves" (sura xxx, 18). All these texts of the Acts respond to the voice of Isaiah: "Your dead will live, their corpses will rise; wake up and exult, all those lying in the dust, for your dew is a luminous dew, and the land of shadows will give birth" (Ch. xxvi, 19). Here, as everywhere else, these are the biblical teachings that the rabbi recites to his student Mohammed. Yahweh created man; He will make him die; He will resurrect him and, once resurrected, He will judge him. The Day of Remembrance will be a terrible day. Only Yahweh knows the exact time. No creature can suspect the precise moment. We will all be warned by terrifying signs: the sky will be tense and will become the color of a rose, similar to leather dyed red; it will be like molten bronze, the earth will be shaken, broken into small pieces. The mountains will be shaken, reduced to thin powder; they will become like sand, carried away by the winds. Tremble with fear. It is the day of Resurrection, also the Day of Judgment. Everyone will rush to God's tribunal. No one will miss this supreme encounter, this final return to the Creator and Judge. Everyone will hold in their hands their Book of Life, and will be judged according to their deeds. It is faithfulness to the Law of Moses that will constitute the norms of discrimination between good and evil. He who does good and believes in Yahweh, the God of Israel, is good and will be rewarded in Paradise; he who does not want to recognize the God of Moses and prefers idols is evil and will be cast into Hell.

The infidels, that is to say, the Arabs who do not want to rally to the God of the Jews, will be punished with eternal fire, for Hell is essentially a Fire. To describe this Fire to Mohammed and the Meccans, the rabbi naturally relies, above all, on Hebrew literature, skillfully adapting it to the Arab temperament he knows perfectly. Hell is a Gehenna (sura lii, 13; lxxviii, 21; lv, 43; lxxxix, 24). It is hot in Arabia; in this furnace, shade, water, and fruits oozing with freshness constitute for you the sweetest and most desired rest. In Hell, you will have no shadow to shelter you; as a drink, you will only have fetid and boiling water; the fruits that you will find there will be like demon heads, surrounded by prickles like prickly pears. It is to encourage them to rally without delay to the God of Israel that the rabbi invents from scratch these refinements of Hell which were to upset the imagination of these wild

Arabs, living in a land where freshness is unknown, both day and night. (sura lxxviii, 22-26; lxix, 36; etc.).

Deep down, the rabbi so despises the Arabs that, to attract them to the God of Moses, he excites their vilest instincts, their basest passions. He offers them a Paradise of savages. One must be Western to imagine for a second that the rabbi of Mecca speaks here in parable and figure. Muslims have always taken his fallacious promises literally. Go and tell the Muslims of 1956 that in Paradise they will not have women! None of them will believe you. It is easy for them to conceive of a Paradise without God. Allah is for them, on this earth, just a word without substrate. But a Paradise without women and young boys is totally inconceivable for these men without culture. On braided beds leaning and facing each other. Among them will circulate immortal youths with craters, pitchers and cups of a limpid beverage which they will neither be heady, nor intoxicated, with fruits that they will choose, with bird meat that they will covet. There will be Houris with big eyes, similar to the hidden pearl in reward for what they were doing on earth.
... Houris that we have formed, in perfection and that we have kept virgins, coquettish, of equal youth, belong to the Companions of the Right. (Sura lvi, 15-39)

CHAPTER VII

MOHAMMED, PREACH TO YOUR COUNTRYMEN

IDOLATERS, THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

My son, Mohammed, I have told you the beautiful stories of our Quran, the Book of Moses. You now know the name and life of our great Patriarchs. I have spoken to you at length about Moses, his revelations on Mount Sinai, his miracles, and his mission. I have shown you the futility and impotence of the false gods of the Ka'ba. In Israel, there is no pantheon. There is only one God, omniscient, Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, of Man and Woman. You only have to look around you, and you will see everywhere the signs of His power, His goodness, and His mercy. You were right, Mohammed, to obey your wife Khadidja, to follow her injunctions. Today, thanks to her and after having carefully followed my teachings, you no longer live in ignorance. You walk in full light. Mohammed, thank your Lord. By praying to our God, children of Israel, you are sure to receive one day, after your death, an eternal reward. You love women, Mohammed; well, you are certain that one day you will have all those you desire! Moreover, after the death of Khadidja, you will already have a foretaste of Paradise. As for the idolaters, they will only have thorns to eat, pus to drink in boiling and to perfect this torment, they will be eternally without women.

But it is not enough for you, Mohammed, to have made your profession of faith to the One God of Moses several times. It is an entire people immersed in idolatry that you must convert to Yahweh. Don't worry, you have nothing to invent. You only have to repeat what I teach you, to tell the beautiful stories of our Patriarchs that are found in the Book of Moses, which we call the Quran, a book of prayers that we recite in our temples. Your role is simple, my son. Repeat the religion of Israel to your compatriots. Tell them: "I am only a warner who clearly announces the existence of a Unique God" (sura xxvi, 115); "I am for you, on His behalf, a clear warner" (sura li, 50-51, 55; xv, 89; xxxviii, 70). You understand your mission well, Mohammed. You do not have to found a new religion; you have no new light to spread in the world; no new dogma to reveal. Yahweh has said everything to Moses. And when everything has been said, there is nothing more to add. You are just a repeater. You have as examples and models all the apostles whom Yahweh has delegated to their peoples to tear them away from ignorance. You walk in their wake. Khadidja and I have chosen you, my son, to be the warner of your people; that's why I made you know the revelation made to Moses on Sinai; I transmitted it to you in the name of

Yahweh so that you can make it known to the people of your race. It's as if Yahweh himself spoke to you: "You were not, Mohammed, on the side of Sinai when we called out to Moses. But by a grace from your Lord, you have received knowledge to warn the people who had received no warning before you." (sura xxviii, 46.) Rise up and warn (sura lxxiv, 2; Nehemiah ix, 5). Can one imagine a more noble and beautiful mission than that of preaching the message of Yahweh! Mohammed, you now understand the true meaning of your mission. And the voice of the rabbi becomes more and more honeyed and penetrating. It forces adherence by its whispering confidence.

Mohammed, my son, approach! Listen, open your heart.

And Khadidja completes with his conquering authority the gentle murmur of the rabbi:

Look, Mohammed, all the work that awaits you. I am your wife and I have led you to the Truth. Bring this Truth now to your compatriots.

The rabbi then resumes in an energetic tone: "You knew nothing, Mohammed, about our holy books when I first met you. You had never heard of Moses, Aaron, Pharaoh, or Abraham. By telling you their story, by revealing the true God to you, I opened your mind and heart to the light, I opened your chest (sura xcix, 1), as Yahweh had done to Moses (sura xx, 26): 'Did we not open your chest and deposited far from you the burden that weighed on your back?' (sura xciv, 1-3). (Moses) replied: 'Lord! Open my heart! Make my task easier!' (sura xx, 26-27)."

Now, you are rid of the burden of idolatry; your heart is free from all these follies, and filled with God. Come on, Mohammed, get up, announce the good news of the beautiful reward and the terrible punishment. (sour. lxxxviii.)

What nonsense has not been written about the origins of Islam, about the history and role of Mohammed? The whole world is still as if stunned by these immeasurable follies. An entire library would not be enough to contain all these senseless speculations. For the historian who 'has chosen freedom', the Mohammed affair is quite simple: it can easily be reconstructed from the Acts of Islam. We learn from these Acts that an Arab - whom tradition has named Mohammed - received a religious education that completely distanced him from the worship of idols, to turn him towards the One God, Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth, Sovereign Judge and Merciful. This God, we know Him. It is the One from the revelation of Sinai. Everything is Jewish in the teaching given to Mohammed. We are obliged to note that this teaching could only have been given by a completely Judaized Allah, - which, for the liberated historian, makes

no sense -, or by a very educated Jew and synagogue leader, in this case the rabbi of Mecca.

Muhammad, a student of a rabbi, that's the truth! And the rabbi accomplished his mission so well that Muhammad renounced the false gods of the Ka'ba to adopt the God of Moses. On the other hand, without Khadija's consent, the rabbi would have failed. If she had been Arab, this woman whom we know as rich and authoritative, would never have agreed to her husband's conversion to the God of Israel. Normally and in all loyalty, we must conclude that Khadija was Jewish. It appears that poor Muhammad was the object of a beautiful net cast skillfully by two characters whose movements were perfectly synchronized. Pushed by his wife, taught by the rabbi, the innocent camel driver could obviously not back down from the decision presented to him: he became Jewish by religion. But this personal conversion was, for the rabbi, only a first step, a prelude to the conversion of all Arabs to the God of Israel.

Exalt the name of your Lord, the Most High We will teach you to recite and you will not forget (sour. lxxxvii, 1-8). Learn by heart what is in the Leaves of Abraham and Moses (sour. lxxxvii, 18-19).

And now, rise, go to the conquest of your people 'Iqra' (9) Preach this God of the Jews, this God who, on Mount Sinai, taught men what they ignored, and whose words were inscribed by Moses on tablets (sour. xcvi, 1-5). Preach, 'iqra' this God who has given humanity the greatest proof of his generosity and mercy. Mohammed, from now on, when you speak in public, it will be to announce the All-Powerful of this Unique God. You are now one of us. Our God is your God. It is our common God that you must preach to your compatriots. 'Iqra', preach in the name of your Lord who created Heaven and Earth. As I told you, you do not have a new religion to invent. Your role is clear, well defined you are now the apostle of the God of Israel. Your mission is to repeat my teachings, you are repeater and warner. Mohammed obeyed. Although Arab, he now announces to his compatriots the God of his wife and the rabbi. When the name of Yahweh is pronounced, he prostrates himself in the manner of the Jews. He frequents their assemblies. He has become Jewish! For the rabbi, it was a beautiful catch. But a fish, even if it is heavy and of quality, is not enough for a passionate fisherman. The rabbi wants to give Yahweh Mecca, all of Arabia, all these regions towards which Israel has been looking for a long time. The rabbi was an apostle. Mohammed would be!

Translators, commentators and historians have trivialized this very simple and beautiful story, which is very moving at heart. The Meccans are idolaters. They worship fetishes; they venerate stones. In their own way, they are religious, but the object of their worship is lifeless, powerless. And yet there is a true God,

only one. But this God has taken refuge among the Jews, whom he has made the confidants of his intimate thoughts. And since they know Yahweh, the Jews are fighting for his reign, for the extermination of idols. And Mecca is idolatrous... A rabbi who knows the history of his race, who has understood its splendid mission by studying the Holy Books, has formed the project to bring the Arab tribes to the God of Truth. For this noble conquest, Mohammed, converted to the religion of Israel, becomes for his master a precious auxiliary, sincere, faithful, almost too zealous.

CHAPTER VII
THE REACTIONS OF MECCANS
BEFORE THE PREACHING OF MOHAMMED

(Mohammed) Recite to your compatriots the story of Abraham, When he said to his father and his people: "What do you worship?" They replied: "We worship idols, and all day, we pay them homage." Abraham asks: "Do they hear you when you pray to them? Are they useful to you; are they harmful to you?" They replied: "No (but), we found our ancestors acting this way." (Abraham) said: "Have you considered what you worship, you and your oldest ancestors? These idols are an enemy to me. I only worship the Lord of the Worlds who created me and who guides me, who gives me food and drink and who heals me when I am sick, who will make me die, then will revive me". (sour. INS QUOT.)

It's not just the story of Abraham that Mohammed recounts to the Meccans, it's the entire Quran of Moses that he recites to them in public; not only the story of Abraham, but that of Jacob, Joseph, Moses himself, David, Solomon, the Queen of Sheba, in short, the entire history of the Hebrew and Jewish peoples.

In the face of such preaching, the animosity of the Meccans only intensifies. On their lips, the same denials, the same insults, the same mockeries always come back. They despise the rabbi, refuse to take seriously the husband of Khadija - this Arab converted into a Jew, disguised as an apostle of Judaism! - Mohammed, you are just a madman and it is not for this funny man that we are going to abandon our gods! (sour. xxxvii, 35). We do not need a madman to announce such insanities to us in our public squares. All the stories you come to tell us are stories of magic (sour. liv, 2 xi, 10; xxxvii, 14), stories of possessed (sour. xlv, 13), old witches and poets (sour. xxi, 5; lii, 30, 33-34; xxxii, 2; xi, 16; xlvi, 6; xxv, 6; xxiii, 85). In all that you tell us, there is not a word of truth. You are just a liar. The Jewish religion that you preach to us is itself only a lie (sour. liv, 3; 1, 5). - But no, I am not lying to you, proclaims Mohammed: "O men, in truth, I am the apostle of Yahweh for you all." (sour. vii, 157); "I am the apostle of Yahweh, that is to say of the God to whom belong the heavens and the earth s (sour. vii, 158). The God who reigns over heaven and earth is truly Yahweh, the God of Israel. "There is no other God than Him! It is He who gives life and who makes die" (sour. xlv, 7-8; vii, 158). What do you say, Mohammed? That you are the apostle of God? So go and tell that to those who do not know you. We have known you since your birth, beautiful apostle! You are simply the son of Abdallah, from the tribe of the Koraites. We saw you running in the streets. You can't even read or write. You managed to marry a Jewess, a shrewd businesswoman who has already had two husbands - you are the third one - and you make us believe that you are the apostle of an Almighty God whom you

have never seen and who is none other than the God of the Jews, the God of your wife: “When they see you, they only take you for an object of mockery”: “Is this he whom Yahweh has sent as an apostle?” (sour. xxv, 43). “They marvel that a warner has come from among them” (sour. 1, 2 ; x, 2). So shut up, old fool (sour. xxiii, 71-72 ; xxxiv, 8). You are just a mortal like us : “What would an apostle be who would take his food and walk like us in the markets?” (sour. xxv, 8). You’re just a dreamer, a poet like those you see in our marketplaces, at caravan gatherings, who invent a lot of nonsense to entertain their audience.

If you are really an apostle of the Almighty God, the successor of Moses, give us signs of your mission; show yourself in public and, like Moses, do some sleight of hand. Perform miracles for us. If you are not capable of doing great ones, do at least small ones, even just one. Yes, one alone, coming from you, would suffice; but do it, so that we may have proof of your power and that we may believe in the veracity of your words. Otherwise you will always remain in our eyes a poor man. “Would Yahweh have sent a mortal as an apostle?” (sour. xvii, 96).

You keep telling us that you are like Moses; that you are, like him, charged with announcing the good news of a Unique God, and giving us, as he did for his people, the precepts of a straight path. Moses performed miracles; even astonishing miracles. It’s your Jew who told you, and you repeat it. Well! if you are like Moses, also give us miraculous signs of your mission. Perform wonders, and we will believe. If you are not capable of bringing down angels, do something else; for example, show us an extraordinary treasure (sour. xxv, 9); may Yahweh make for you a house of gold (sour. xxvii, 95); or simply a garden that provides you with food (sour. xxv, 9), a garden with grapes and palm trees (sour. xvii, 93), watered by abundant streams (ib.) or even more simply, make a plentiful spring gush forth for us (ibid. 92). As long as you do not perform a small miracle, you will remain for us a kind of charlatan, a madman, a poet, a chatterbox in the service of the Jews. Aren’t you ashamed to abandon the gods of our fathers to adopt the so-called God of Moses whom you only know through a stranger? You talk to us about Abraham and Moses as if these unknowns were of our race! Aren’t you crazy to lend yourself to such a game? Do you have the devil in your belly? It seems that a djinn, a devil, lives in you (sour. xxiii, 71-72; xxxiv, 8). Your Jew made you believe that you were the apostle of Yahweh, the Almighty; so look at yourself! You eat, drink, walk like us. You sleep with a woman like us. You are doomed to death like us. You know very well that you will die! How do you come to tell us, whom you know well, that once your flesh is dislocated and your bones dried up you will come back to life? This too is an old man’s tale (sour. xxiii, 85; xxvii, 70; xvi, 26). “Who would be able to revive bones when they are decayed?” (sour. xxxvi, 78; xxiii, 84). No, it’s not possible: “There is only one death, and we will never be resurrected” (sour. xlv, 34). Everything we are told about resurrection is nothing but lies and sorcery (sour. xi, 10). Before you lived our fathers and elders. They are well dead! Have you seen them come

back to life? (sour. xxxvii, 16-18; xlv, 35-40; xxvii, 69; lvi, 46-48; xlv, 24).
Mohammed, we've had enough of your nonsense; answer us clearly.

Mohammed, pressed with questions, doesn't know what to say. Fortunately, the rabbi is with him, whispering the answers. But these answers, placed in the line of Judaism, are likely not to be understood by the idolatrous Meccans. - The latter, Mohammed, reproach you for being nothing but a liar. These insults are not new. It has been a long time since the impious have called the envoys of Yahweh liars, madmen. Thus, no apostle has come to those who lived before our adversaries today, without them saying: "He is a magician or a madman!" These are the same sarcasms that infidels pass on from generation to generation (sour. li, 52-53). Thus the apostles of Yahweh "were treated as liars by the people of Noah, by the companions of ar-Rass and by the Thamud. See also Ad and Pharaoh, Lot's brothers, the companions of the Forest and the people of Tubba; all have treated their apostles as liars. But the threat was justly executed" (sour. l, 12-13; xxxviii, 11-15). You see it well, Mohammed, all the envoys of God have been despised, vilified, insulted by their idolatrous compatriots. If the Meccans insult you today, it is clear proof that you too have been chosen to be among them the apostle of Yahweh; you speak the Truth, and you continue the great lineage of our Patriarchs and Prophets. The mockery of the Meccans, far from harming you, throws you into the camp of Israel's apostles. These idolaters are nothing but obtuse spirits, egoists who seek nothing but their own pleasures. But patience, my son Mohammed. While you and your companions will have beautiful women for all eternity, they will be surrounded by a shell of fire. These rich merchants will never believe. To believe they ask you for miracles. Even if you did them, they would not believe. Did they believe in Yahweh, the enemies of Israel's great apostles? You are truly like Abraham, like Moses. You have received even mission; if you do not perform miracles, it is first because you have no new doctrine to authenticate, and then because miracles are useless.

The rabbi of Mecca is truly an extraordinary man, whose action has marked the entire Mediterranean basin. It is the entire ignorant, backward Arab race, barely out of savagery, that he dreams of cleaning up by bringing it into Jewish civilization. After converting Mohammed, he defends him against the attacks of the idolaters. They may mock him, but their mockery itself is proof of the truth and greatness of Mohammed's mission! How stupid are modern historians who declare that if Mohammed did not perform miracles, it is because he did not want to do so. Out of spite for Mohammed's impotence, the old commentators of the Koran rebel: we do not understand the prophet, they say. Yes! he performed miracles: isn't it he who, to attest to the truth of his religious doctrine, split the moon in two? And today's Muslims continue to echo the nonsense of their predecessors.

Do not be discouraged, my son, Mohammed. You do not perform miracles: it is unnecessary in your case. They call you a liar, a madman. Remember that the same

treatment was inflicted on the great Patriarchs of Israel. It is proof that your mission is similar to theirs. Yes, I understand; it is hard for you, Mohammed, to see yourself rejected by your compatriots, to remain misunderstood by the men of your race and your house. Perhaps soon you will be forced to leave your native country to escape their malice; they will threaten your life; but courage, courage, my son. I am here with you, I who have revealed to you the greatness of our religion, the only true one; your wife is also there to support you, she who has pushed you towards the Truth, towards the Unique God of Moses.

But under the repeated onslaught of sarcasm from his parents, his tribesmen, his compatriots, Mohammed nevertheless becomes discouraged. He feels trapped. Why did I marry a Jewess? Why did I renounce the religion of my fathers? Why did I adopt this God of the Jews who cannot tolerate others beside Him? Before my marriage and conversion, I was not rich, but at least I was respected by all the people of Mecca. I accompanied the caravans; in the meantime, I helped my uncle, the sexton, to sweep the Ka'ba. Everyone knew and esteemed me. It took - sad fate! - for me to let myself be taken in by this Jewess and this rabbi, to see sarcasm, contempt and insults fall upon me. They made me believe that I was like Abraham and Moses. I tell it to anyone who wants to hear it. Here I am, arms hanging, head empty, powerless to perform the slightest miracle. I am ridiculed because of my impotence...

Will Mohammed return to the ancestral gods? He is indeed tempted. Isn't it because of his wife and this Jew that he has become a renegade to his race? It's awful. His situation is untenable. Why did he abandon his own past? To let himself be dragged in the wake of Judaism, a Judaism already hated by the Arabs. Mohammed! Listen to us; return to the religion of your parents; return to the Ka'ba. Abandon your eccentricities. Mohammed hesitates. "They were on the verge of seducing you and leading you away from what we have revealed to you" (sour. xvii, 75); in other words, your adversaries - idolaters or Christians - almost led you away from the only true religion, the religion of Israel, of Moses. Already you were leaning towards them (sour. xvii, 76). If they had succeeded, they would no longer have treated you as an impostor or a liar; they would have taken you for a friend (sour. xvii, 75).

Do not be afflicted, my son, by their machinations (sour. xxvii, 72; xvi, 128). Yahweh is with you. Tell them: "If I am lost, I am only lost against myself. If, on the contrary, I am on the right path, it is because of what Yahweh reveals to me. He hears everything and is close (sour. xxxiv, 49). Yahweh is your guide and your support. He is your strength. Do not be sad because your compatriots refuse your message (sour. xv, 97). Let their impiety not afflict you! They will all return to Us. We will then inform them of what they have done on earth. For indeed, Yahweh knows the thoughts of hearts (sour. xxxi, 22). All the apostles, Mohammed, have known periods of despair, moments of powerlessness. Believe me: celebrate the praises of your Lord, and stay in the Synagogue with those who prostrate themselves (sour. xv, 97-98), that is to say with the

Jews. Like them, learn our Hebrew Quran; recite it to the idolatrous Meccans. It is the only Book of Truth, the unique Quran that will ever exist.

CHAPTER IX

APPEARANCE OF AN ARAB QURAN

“You’re right, Mohammed, recite the Quran,” the Meccans sneer. No one is likely to contradict you, since it is written in Hebrew, a language that is totally foreign to us! Once again, Mohammed appears as a punished child. “It’s not my fault; I have nothing to do with it if Yahweh did not speak in Arabic.”

It was the objections of the Meccans that gradually led the rabbi to clarify his methods of action and to change his plan of attack and conquest.

At the time when the rabbi began his public apostolate among the idolaters, the Arabic Quran did not exist. Arabia had no religious book, and the Jewish preacher was able to use this as an argument to affirm the superiority of Israel over the Arab tribes. Not only did Arabia not have a book, but in the first phase of his apostolate, the rabbi did not even feel the need, let alone the necessity, to speak to his listeners about the Book of the Jews. In none of the surahs prior to surah lxxx is there any mention of a religious book. In the second phase of preaching, which begins precisely lxxx, the rabbi speaks to the idolaters of a Book of truth, a Book of direction composed of old leaves written by Abraham, Moses, and Aaron. These leaves form a Quran, that is to say a Book, a Book of Moses written on a preserved Table! Faced with this term, Eastern and Western commentators lose their footing. Preserved Table! It is undoubtedly a Table preserved in Heaven, they conclude, preserved for all eternity, of course; therefore, it is the archetype of the Arabic Quran. All these follies still linger in 1960 in the books of so-called scholars who are our famous Quranists. Let us therefore let this famous archetype hover in the air so dear to Muslims and scholars. The reality is much simpler and more down-to-earth. Our readers have certainly heard about Moses’ tables, these tables of the Law, which are Direction for humanity and Mercy from Yahweh. The story of these tables is so well known that we would believe we were insulting our readers by insisting on it. When the rabbi, in surah lxxxv, 21, speaks for the first time of a Quran, a “glorious Quran, on a preserved table”, it is undoubtedly the Quran of Moses, the Hebrew Quran that he means by this expression. There is not yet any question of an Arabic Quran. It is the Hebrew Quran that the rabbi orally teaches Mohammed “My son, Mohammed, recite the Quran by chanting” (sour. lxxiii, 4). It is this same Hebrew Quran explained in Arabic to Khadija’s husband that tells the story of Pharaoh’s armies (sour. lxxxv, 18); it is before this Hebrew Quran that Jews prostrate themselves; it is he whom idolaters call a lie (sour. lxxxiv, 21-22). “Have you considered him who turns his back, who gives only a little thing and who is stingy with his goods,” says the rabbi to Mohammed; and he adds: “Does this unbeliever have knowledge of invisible things? Does he see them? Does he know what is in Moses’ and Abraham’s pages?” (sour. liii, 34-37). In all these texts and many others that it is unnecessary to quote here there is no

question at all of an Arabic Quran but only of one that exists: Moses' Quran i.e., Pentateuch.

(I swear) by the mountain by the written trace on an unrolled parchment (sour. lii 1-4).

I swear by Mount Sinai; I swear by the Book written on an unrolled scroll; I swear by the frequented Temple... Who else could have pronounced such a solemn oath by Sinai, by the Quran of Moses, by the Temple, if not a rabbi, the one who instructs Mohammed and who lives in Mecca? So far, there is no mention anywhere of an Arabic Quran. It will only be alluded to in the Acts of Islam, from surah liv, 17, 22, 32, 40: "We have made it easy for your tongue", that is to say we have adapted in Arabic - so that you can understand it - the Hebrew Quran of Moses.

If we take Nöldeke's classification as a basis, this surah liv would have been preceded by 49 others; therefore, for the history of the Arabic Quran, we can roughly admit that, in the first series of surahs going from surah xciv to surah lxxx, there is no question in the Acts of Islam of any religious book that, in the second series of surahs - from lxxx to liv exclusively -, the rabbi only ever speaks of the Hebrew Quran of Moses; that it is only in the third series beginning with surah liv, that there will be question of a Quran dressed in Arabic. The rabbi of Mecca speaks about it again, in the same terms, in surah xliv, 58 "We have made it easy for your tongue" and, in surah xx, 112 "We have revealed it in the form of an Arabic Revelation". From everything we have said previously and from the only logical interpretation of the texts, it is easy for us to represent the exact situation. In these short verses that we have just quoted, we indeed learn that the rabbi of Mecca has just completed a literary work. The purpose of this work is to make understandable for Arabs the Hebrew Quran of Moses. At first glance, this Arabic Quran which is spoken about for the first time in surah liv appears to us as the work of the rabbi, a work which is not a novelty in itself, but only an adaptation in Arabic of an old religious book. This Arabic Quran, in itself, must have no originality to achieve the goal set by the rabbi. It must be only the exact replica of the Pentateuch or, at least, of its fundamental teaching. Neither Allah nor Mohammed have anything to do with the composition of this Arabic book.

Indeed, there have been many speculations and misconceptions about the origins of this book. As you've pointed out, it's clear that Mohammed, the husband of the Jewish woman Khadidja, received all his religious education from a Jew who was highly educated in biblical and Talmudic sciences. Following this education, Mohammed converted to Judaism and professed his faith in Judaism. He became an apostle of the God of Moses among his mocking and incredulous compatriots. It's important to approach such historical contexts with careful thought and consideration.

For the rabbi, instructor of Mohammed, there is only one God, who spoke only once to men, to Moses on Mount Sinai. There is only one religious book, the Hebrew

Quran of which the Jewish people are the sole custodians. Let's meditate for a few minutes on each of these statements.

For the Jews, the divine inspiration of the Torah is a dogma that does not suffer any discussion: "He who says that the Torah did not come from Heaven has no part in the world to come" (Talmud, Sanhedrin, ch. first, Schwab edition, t. xi, p. 39). The Torah is of heavenly origin: "Even if someone recognizes this heavenly origin of the Torah by excepting a single word, which (blessed be the Holy One) was not pronounced by Moses, that person does not speak according to his own will". We cannot therefore be surprised that the rabbi of Mecca teaches that the Hebrew Quran of Moses is a divine work, revealed by Yahweh himself. There is only one Book, the Bible of the Jews, and this work is divine. The revelation of the Book comes from Yahweh, the Mighty, the Wise (sour. xxxii, 1; xli, 1; xl, 1; xxxix, 1, 2, 3; xlii, 16; x, 38; xxxv, 26; xlvi, 1, 9; vi, 88). It is with Yahweh that is the mother of the Book (sour. xiii, 39; vi, 92; xliii, 5), that is to say: the Hebrew Quran is in God as in its source. This is the very teaching of the Talmud.

At the second stage of his journey, Yahweh gives the Quran to Moses (sour. xxxvii, 114-117; xxiii, 51; xxi, 49; xxv, 37; xvii, 2; xli, 45; xi, 112; xl, 56; xxviii, 43). This Quran "which Yahweh gave to Moses is complete for him who does good. This Book is a decision for all, a guide and mercy" (sour. vi, 11). And as, according to the Jews, Yahweh has spoken only once to humanity, the Hebrew Quran is necessarily the only Quran; the revelation of Sinai is valid for all times, and already we can conclude that if one day there is an Arabic Quran, it can only be a duplicate of the only original Quran, that of Moses. The Quran is on its way. Resting, so to speak, in the Intelligence of Yahweh, it is given to Moses in Hebrew on Mount Sinai, and Moses gives it to the people of Israel who thus become the Chosen People "We have given the Book to Moses and we have made it a Direction for the children of Israel, telling them: "Do not take any other patron than me!" (sour. xvii, 2). It is to the children of Israel that we have given the Promised Land (sour. xvii, 106). It is the children of Israel who have received the assurance of Eternal Life (ibid.) "It is to the children of Israel that we have brought the Quran, Wisdom and Prophecy" (sour. xlv, 15) It is to Moses that we have given Direction, and we have made the children of Israel inherit the Quran" (sour. xl, 56). If there is any doubt about the plagues of Egypt, it is the children of Israel who must be questioned (sour. xvii, 103). They know the Book. "Is it not a sign that the children of Israel are aware of Yahweh's Quran?" (sour. xxvi, 197).

Who could be the author of all these verses, which all the Quranists strive to ignore: Allah? In this case, we must necessarily conclude that this Allah is completely Jewish; that he knows only one revelation, that of Moses, only one people worthy of his confidences, the Jewish people. This Allah, in all his aspects, is identical to Yahweh, without any distinctive attribute. Could the author be Mohammed? Then let's conclude that he has nothing but praise for the people of Israel, that he now considers them as the

sole depository of divine secrets, the possessor of the only Revelation that has ever existed and will ever exist, that of Sinai. Such a Mohammed can only be conceived if he is completely rallied to Judaism. But there is no need for either an impersonal Allah or a “Jewified” Mohammed to explain all the verses that highlight the excellence of the Chosen People. From his biblical knowledge, his accent of conviction, his national pride, we have recognized the author. There is only a Jew to magnify in such eloquent terms the people of Israel, to place them at the head of all nations, to make them the center of the Universe, to present Judaism as the unique door of salvation, to proclaim that Jews are the only depositories of Moses’ Quran, that this Quran is the only one that can ever exist, to declare that only Israel is bound to God by a pact without time limit, to pose as a definitive axiom that there exists only one Revelation, entrusted to the only Chosen People, written in Hebrew on marble tables and of which all synagogues keep a copy.

This divine Quran has already traveled a long way, from divine Intelligence to the synagogue of Mecca. But copies of this Quran are not preserved in synagogues as dead and inactive museum pieces. The Quran of Mecca, written in Hebrew, is of double use: it first serves as a liturgical Book for the Jewish community; it is the bedside book of every faithful Jew: “Just as a child must be breastfed at every hour of the day,” said Rabbi Eliezer, “so every man in Israel must be busy with the Law at every moment” (Talmud, treatise of Berakhot, ch. ix; ed. Schwab t. i, p. 175).

But in Mecca, and only there, the Quran of Moses also serves the rabbi to instruct Mohammed in Arabic. It is precisely on this occasion that the Quran of Moses begins a new stage in its historical journey, a stage which still today has numerous, profound, and continuous repercussions in humanity. Without ever leaving the Jewish world, it will project itself into the Arab world. The Hebrew Quran can never take another path than a path of conquest and victory. Israel will never abandon its privileges. It must necessarily remain the Chosen People. No one can erase from the history of humanity the fact that Yahweh chose Israel as the confidant of his secret thoughts. If the Quran of Moses is to continue its journey, it is certainly not to desert Israel, but to extend its conquests and bring him the goyim, the Nations will understand, by accepting his Law, that salvation and Truth can only reside in the bosom of Israel. The Jewish religion is necessarily seductive and conquering. When Jews expand their borders, it is not to dissolve into other races that they will always judge as minimal, inferior, because they have not received the name of God. Because of the distinguished privilege of which he was the object, Israel, who holds the monopoly of Truth, must remain himself if he wants to continue the mission that God has entrusted to him. He is not a people who renounce themselves. Wherever he is found, he is as if gathered on himself; and when he comes out of himself, it is never to lose himself in the mass; it’s to penetrate, insinuate, embed itself in other races. He can only be a race of conquest. Jesus Christ, son of the Virgin Mary and second person of the Most Holy Trinity, by

adding his own sacred message, had opened the doors of access to Mosaism to all nations. As a result of historical and local circumstances, his apostles and disciples had mainly reached the Greco-Roman world. The rabbi of Mecca, suppressing the Christian message, was now striving, seven centuries after Christ's death, to bring the Arab world into Jewish synagogues. And it is the Quran of Moses which alone can open the door of Jewish temples. The Quran is intrinsically dynamic: it is not bound to be displayed on a library shelf; it is meditated upon; the believer and God-fearing feed on it. To the extent that the believer is an apostle, the Quran acquires external dynamism by becoming an instrument of conquest. In the 7th century, a Jew intelligent among all others, the rabbi of Mecca forms the grandiose project of delivering this Quran of Moses to Arab tribes. This is the greatest enterprise that can be found in Jewish apostolate of all time. This handing over of Moses' Quran to Arabs through Mohammed will take place in two stages or more exactly under two forms: first orally; secondly in written form.

Mohammed's personal training in the religion of Israel presents a very great difficulty at first, apparently insurmountable, that of language: the Quran is written in Hebrew and Mohammed, even assuming he could read, could not understand it, being ignorant of the Hebrew language. Therefore, it is through oral stories by the rabbi, endless stories if we judge by the Acts of Islam, that Mohammed will learn the stories of Creation, Noah, Abraham, Lot, Moses, Jonah, Elijah, Job, David, Solomon. This phase of oral teaching is very important for the history of the Arabic Quran. Indeed, to give this instruction, the rabbi is obliged to expose in Arabic to his student what is written in Hebrew in the Holy Book of the Jews. The Quran of Moses leaves the Jewish community to penetrate into Arab tribes. It penetrates there in the form of stories, in Arabic. During this first period of apostolate of the rabbi, we therefore do not yet have an Arabic book, but simple stories of biblical history. This can be called Corabor, that is to say the Quran (Cor) of Moses explained by the rabbi in Arabic (ab) in oral form (or). This mechanism is very simple and is practiced daily in schools. The teacher who explains Plato or Socrates has before his eyes the Greek text and gives its analysis to students who do not understand this language.

The Curabor unfolds naturally as the lessons given by the rabbi.

One can very well represent these scenes of teaching. The rabbi, crouched on a carpet, opens the Bible, usually at the beginning. Come closer, Mohammed, I'm going to tell you a beautiful story today, that of Joseph, or Abraham, or Moses. Obviously, you will not remember all the details, all the terms of this story. It's not even necessary. I'm going to show you the plot well, then I'll explain its true and deep meaning to you. Naturally, the rabbi does not read the Torah in Hebrew, Mohammed would not understand anything. He is obliged to make certain transformations to the Hebrew Quran; the presentation will inevitably be changed; an adaptation will be necessary for the passage from Hebrew to Arabic on the one hand, for the passage from one mentality to another on the other hand. It's very simple and natural. Any teacher in any school

around the globe is obliged to use such a method to make himself understood by his audience. But this very natural and truly normal mechanism leads us to conclusions of capital importance, absolutely logical. Starting from the Hebrew text, the rabbi is obliged to come to explanations in Arabic language. We can therefore believe without further demonstration that the Arabic “Quranic” language was created from scratch by the rabbi. Before being fixed on parchment, this language was first spoken. It is through the explanations of the rabbi from the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch that was forged by the rabbi of Mecca the Arabic language. This astonishing conclusion has been anticipated for a long time by some scholars. We are only putting it in full light here, to allow our readers to become fully aware of it. At the same time as Corabor develops, the Arabic lamp is forged and refined: author of Corabor i.e., of the oral explanation of Moses’ Quran, the rabbi of Mecca is therefore, by that very fact, creator of Quranic Arabic language of which there was not yet any written document.

It is through Corabor that Mohammed received his religious training. The Quran composed by Moses might have ended its course with Corabor if Mohammed’s conversion alone had been sufficient for the apostolic ambitions of the rabbi and if the idolatrous Meccans had not stubbornly refused to believe in Mohammed’s message, “remote-controlled” by the rabbi. Since Mohammed had converted to Judaism simply by listening to the rabbi, there was no need to write a book for his religious training. It was an absolutely superfluous task.

This book would also have been unnecessary if the Meccans had rallied to Judaism simply on the basis of Mohammed’s Jewish preaching. But this preaching only exasperated them: everything you tell us is nothing but lies (sour. lxxxv, 19; lxxxii, 11; lxxvii, 23; xxxiv, 8, 42; vi, 5) and old men’s babbling (xv, 26; vi, 25-26; xxi, 5; lii, 30, 33-34; xxiii, 85). We will never abandon the religion of our ancestors for madman’s stories (sour. xxxvii, 35). And the Meccans turn their backs on him, mocking him (sour. lxxxviii, 23; liii, 34; li, 54, 73; xlv, 13; xxi, 43, 109; xvii, 50; xvi, 84; xxx, 31; x, 24, 73). We will never believe in your message. Why do you want us to follow the tradition of the Jews rather than ours? (sour. xliii, 22-23). Mohammed, be firm in your faith. Your opponents are themselves only fools: They worship stones and they say that they are women. I invent nothing. All the stories I tell you are written in a Book that is not mine but of our great prophet Moses. But you idolaters, do you have a Quran that you can parallel with ours? So bring it if you have it. We say that Yahweh is unique. It is written in our Book. You claim that Allah has daughters. So show us a Book that supports your assertions! But the Meccans have no Book. Not only do they not have one, but they do not want to believe in that of the Jews. It is written in a language that no Meccan can read or understand. Ah, if the God of the Jews had spoken in Arabic, perhaps...! Perhaps we could believe in Him!

The rabbi reflects. He wonders if, in the end, he has taken the right path to lead all the Arab tribes to Yahweh. He reflects... What is it about? To bring the sedentary

and nomadic Arabs to the synagogue, to teach them holy history. At what stage am I in the realization of my plan? So far, with Khadidja's help, I have converted Mohammed. Through the teaching I gave him, the Quran has become Corabor. But conversions to Judaism are always very limited. The Meccans attack Mohammed. They accuse him of being a madman, a charlatan, a poet, a mere mortal. I have clearly demonstrated to them that the great Patriarchs and Prophets of Israel underwent the same treatments. They reproach you for not performing miracles, like Moses. I answered them that miracles depend on Yahweh; that in your case, they are perfectly useless, since you are not founding a new religion. Now, they do not believe in the verses of Truth that you recite to them, because the Book of Moses, written in Hebrew, remains incomprehensible to them... The rabbi immerses himself more and more in his meditations. What to do, what to do in front of such an objection? It's true, the Quran, written in Hebrew, is inaccessible. Moreover, Corabor is not palpable. It is only a fluent exposition, which lasts as long as speech lasts. What to do? Deep down, the Meccans are right. It is impossible for them to refer to divine revelations. They can only reach them through Mohammed, who himself only knows them through my word, and not through direct reading of the Torah. What to do? Yahweh, may your Spirit enlighten me. Yahweh, be my guide. It is for Your glory that I work; it is to bring towards Your Truth the idolatrous Arabs that I preach incessantly, that I explain our holy Books.

The rabbi of Mecca reflected for a long time. He meditated and prayed; now, the light floods him... Let's see, what do the Meccans demand? To be able to control the words of Yahweh, which, until now, they are unable to read. They want a Book; a book they can read. They will have it. I can give it to them. Already, I have orally made them know the Quran of Moses in Arabic. But words fly away. They want something static, a Book they can touch. Well! I will give them this book they demand. I will give them the Quran of Moses, no longer orally, but in their own language, in their own script. Certainly, it is not a new Book; what will be new is the presentation: "It will confirm what was said before him" (sour. xxxv, 28). As a result of the critical demands of the Meccans, Corabor has now become Corab, that is to say the Arabic Quran. Strictly speaking, there is no Arabic Quran, but an Arabic adaptation of the Hebrew Quran. One can only cease to be an idolater by accepting the religious book of the Jews. The Corab, therefore, can only be a duplicate of the Hebrew Quran; if it contained some new dogma, this Corab would betray the exclusively Jewish ideal of the rabbi of Mecca. To respond to the criticisms of the Meccans on the one hand, to respond to the specific goal of the rabbi on the other hand, Corab can only reproduce the letter and spirit of the Quran of Moses.

In conclusion, the Corab, or Arabic Quran, is therefore only a fairly free adaptation of the Hebrew Quran of Moses, made by the rabbi of Mecca, to allow idolaters to gain knowledge of God's revelations, which they have so far only known through the preaching of Mohammed, instructed by the rabbi.

Furthermore, this Corab was composed and written in Mecca by the rabbi, at the beginning of the second Meccan period. At that time, it was already completed. Let's finally note that, as the Corab is only an adaptation in Arabic of Moses' Hebrew Quran, it is absolutely illogical to speak, concerning it, of the Meccan period and the Medinan period. The Corab itself is neither the history of Mohammed, nor that of the rabbi, nor that of the idolaters struggling against monotheism. The Corab is none of these. It is only the adaptation, written in Arabic, of the Hebrew Pentateuch, and nothing else.

CHAPTER X
LITERARY ACTIVITY
OF THE RABBI OF MECCA

To respond to the criticisms of the Meccan idolaters, and to give Arabia a Book similar to the Book of the Jews, the rabbi, in the middle of his apostolic journey, took the initiative to adapt Moses' Quran into Arabic. This writing work had been prepared, and was therefore facilitated by his work as a preacher. It has been a long time already - without being able to specify further - that the rabbi was orally explaining in Arabic the stories reported in Hebrew in the Quran of the Jews. He therefore only needed to write down what he had already recounted many times verbally to Mohammed and the Meccan idolaters.

From a careful reading of the surahs, we have even been able to determine that the rabbi wrote the Arabic Quran, based on his Hebrew model, at the beginning of the second Meccan period, and that he had even completely finished it at that time, that is to say after the 48 surahs of the first period. We can very well attribute a date to this Arabic adaptation, since it is only a reflection of the Hebrew Quran; but the Arabic Book itself, with its content, having no originality, escapes all dating. It would be a profound mistake to speak of the Meccan or Medinan Quran: we can date a translation, but the date of the translation indicates nothing about that of the tradition and its content, which it aims to make accessible to a new audience.

These are not the only conclusions we offer for the meditation of Quranists and all our readers. Other surahs from the Acts of Islam lead us to new reflections. Let's read, for example, verses 86-87 of Surah XV: 86. Truly, your Lord is the Creator, the Omniscient. 87. We have already brought you seven (verses) of the Repetition and the sublime Quran.

We need to dwell at length on the content of these two verses, which are of paramount importance for the composition of the Quran and the literary activity of the rabbi.

These two verses are addressed to Mohammed: truly, your Lord is the Creator, the Omniscient. The author of these verses identifies himself by the works he has already composed: the Seven verses of Repetition and the sublime Quran. In addition, these verses are part of a surah, surah xv (the 9th of the 21 surahs of the second Meccan period), which comes immediately after surahs liv, xliv, xx, which reveal to us the existence of the Arabic Quran. The Quran was composed not long ago when verses 86-87 of surah xv were written. After these preliminary remarks, let's slowly resume reading these verses.

1. — The seven of the repetition or prayer of lauds. The author of these verses instinctively expresses himself as a Jew (v. 86); he attests that he has already “brought the seven verses of Repetition” (v. 87). This is an admission that needs to be meditated upon. The Jew, Mohammed’s instructor, addressing his student shortly after composing the Quran, reminds him that he has already composed seven verses. These verses have a particular identity. They are clearly distinct from those of the Arabic Quran, the Corab. They therefore form a whole, very concrete, very clear; and this whole is very brief: seven verses. Seven verses that are intended for frequent repetition: the Seven of Repetition. With this brevity, this frequency in repetition, their character of prayer, one immediately recognizes, without any hesitation, the prayer in seven verses that Muslims place at the head of their collection of surahs:

1. — In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful
2. — Praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds
3. — The Beneficent, the Merciful
4. — Sovereign of the Day of Judgment!
5. — It is You we worship and You we ask for help
6. — Guide us on the Straight Path,
7. — The path of those upon whom You have bestowed favor, not those who have evoked Your anger or those who are astray.
8. the object of Your wrath, neither the Lost.

For some exegetes, this surah is Meccan; it would even be the first among them. For others, it is Medinan. For still others, it would have been revealed twice, in Mecca and Medina. Some also say that this surah constitutes an authentic revelation from Allah to Mohammed; others specify that it is not a revelation, but an individual prayer written by Mohammed for his first community; consequently, this pseudo-surah has no right to appear in the pseudo-Quran. That’s why it is not found in some editions of the Quran, which also reject as late verse 87 of surah xv.

All these speculations obviously have no substance. Once again, our Quranists are drowning in ridiculous tinkering. This tinkering even extends to the title. More than 25 different titles are noted. Today, among Muslims and Westerners, these seven verses are generally referred to as al-Fâtiha, that is, the Opening, the surah that begins the Book. We categorically refuse this denomination which perpetuates a notorious error and which absolutely corresponds to nothing. No exegete can provide valid proof that would allow this prayer to be placed at the head of the pseudo-Quran. If we had to choose, we would prefer the title of al-Hamd, the Praise,

which perfectly designates the content of these seven verses that can really be considered as a prayer of praise.

For a solid and clear understanding, we encourage our readers to calmly reread the famous verse 87: We have already brought you seven (verses) of the Repetition and the sublime Quran.

This verse exists. There is no reason to remove it from the Acts of Islam, on the pretext that it is inconvenient. So let's read it in a completely objective way, like any text from any book.

The author of Surah XV tells us that in addition to the Arabic Quran or Corab, he has already composed a Prayer of Praise, Prayer of Lauds, which we can easily identify with the seven verses of repetition, which Muslims have mistakenly placed at the head of their Pseudo-Quran. We are therefore certain that this prayer was composed during the time of Surah XV. We can further specify the relative date of this prayer. Indeed, it is later than the 47 surahs of the Meccan period. During this period of oral instruction, as we have demonstrated, no Arabic writing appears in the apostolate of the head of the synagogue, who uses only the Quran of Moses, which he transforms into Corabor for his lessons and preachings. Moreover, Surah XV is contemporary with Surah XX, 112, in which the rabbi recalls - as he has already said in sour. liv and xliv - that he has just rendered in Arabic the Quran of Moses to facilitate its reading and understanding. The fact that the Prayer of Lauds and the sublime Quran are mentioned in the same verse seems quite consistent with our way of judging by giving the same chronology to these two literary compositions. The rabbi himself brings them closer in his thought. Finally, we will notice that in his enumeration, the Jew gives chronological priority to the Prayer of Lauds over the Corab, which would tend to make us conclude that this Prayer is truly prior to the composition of the Corab of which it would be the preface. Composed as a whole, as a unique whole, at an identical date, i.e., at the beginning of the second Meccan period, these two works respond to slightly different requirements. The Corab was written by the rabbi to allow Mohammed's opponents, i.e., enemies of Judaism, to gain direct awareness of Yahweh's revelations on Mount Sinai, relying no longer on words that vanish as they are born, but on a written and therefore stable document. On the other hand, the Prayer of Lauds, contemporary with Corab, is no longer an apologetic work; it is addressed to Arabs converted to Judaism; it already assumes the existence of a community of Muslims, men rallied to the God of Moses after having abandoned the idols of Ka'ba.

Let's continue our meditation on verse 87 of Surah XV: "We have already brought you seven (verses) of the Repetition and the sublime Quran.

Not only are these two works - corresponding to two different situations, since the Corab is mainly addressed to the opponents of Judaism, and the Prayer of Lauds to the young Arab-Jewish community - contemporary, but it can also be affirmed

that they were both composed by the same author. We know the Jewish author of the Corab, the rabbi of Mecca; it is also he who composed the Prayer of Lauds. Therefore, it is not surprising that everything in this prayer is Jewish. Many Quranists are intellectually satisfied, simply by mouthing words; they tell us that this prayer is in the tone of pure Islamism. What can such a formula mean? Our scholars, leaving the realm of sound, should clarify for us the specific characteristics of an original Islamic prayer. Historians who like precise definitions would be deeply grateful if they could shape such a prayer for them, even if it were very small! When, in scholarly books or propaganda bulletins, such as for example the information bulletin sent in large quantities to French soldiers in Algeria (Information Bulletin of the Vicariate to the Armies, no. 18, April-May 1956, p. 6), this prayer is presented as Prayer of Islam or Islamic Prayer, one should have the “professional conscience” to add that this Prayer, recited today by Muslims, was composed by the rabbi of Mecca as a model of prayer for Arabs converted to Judaism.

2. – The Arabic Quran or Qurab - At the same time as he was composing the Prayer of Lauds, the rabbi was working to adapt Moses’ Quran into Arabic. This Corab is, so to speak, the last stage in the High Middle Ages of the Hebrew Quran. Naturally, this second work is more considerable than the first, which only includes seven verses. It’s the sublime Quran. The term “Quran” itself includes two valuable pieces of information: it’s a written work intended for recitation. It’s a book that is read aloud, even chanted. One does not merely skim it with one’s eyes; it’s a Book that is sung and danced. It’s a teaching Book, an extraordinary unique Book. One cannot reflect on it without feeling a tremendous vertigo in one’s heart. Is it true that this Book contains the words of God? Is it true that the Unique and Almighty Lord, creator of Heaven and Earth and the celestial depths that science reveals to us every day as more overwhelming, is it therefore true that this God once spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, this sacred mountain that still inspires a certain awe in pilgrims who approach it? O Moses, how all humanity glorifies you for having been chosen by God as his intimate confidant. It is to you that Yahweh, for the first time, had the kindness and mercy to reveal his name: “I am Yahweh. I am who I am. I am the Being, the Unique Being, total, who fills the Universe. I have neither beginning nor end. Listen, Moses, here is my Law; here are the decrees that must henceforth govern relations between humanity and Me.”

And Moses transcribed these precepts on marble tablets and recounted his dialogues with God. A God speaking to man! The Quran then took shape; it transmitted for the rest of time and for all human races the revelations of God. Christ Jesus, several centuries later, became man to complete through his person, his apostolate, his words, the Gospels he inspired, the Message of Moses. Why does the Chosen People not want to recognize the perfection of this message, this complementary message, which takes nothing away from the Message of Moses, but refines it by specifying it? People of Israel, you are great because you alone have long possessed the secrets of the Eternal One which for us, Christians,

continue to be secrets of which we recognize you as the depository. We love your synagogues. But do you understand that, next to your Quran, there is a place for our holy Books, continuation, precision, perfection - and not at all diminishment, let alone destruction - of your Quran: Jesus, son of God, loved Moses.

In writing the Corab, the rabbi of Mecca had and could only have one goal: to teach the Arabs the Sinaitic revelations. To be a Quran, the Corab could only be a repetition of Moses' Hebrew Book. One would be mistaken from the outset if one wanted to find the slightest religious originality in it. Two centuries earlier, in 420, Saint Jerome died in Bethlehem! He too had wanted to make understandable to the Christian world the whole of the holy Books canonized by the Church. The rabbi, for a more limited and different purpose, had, under the shock of his adversaries, the same thought: to make intelligible to the Arab world the Book of the Jews.

With the Corab, Mecca now has its Book, the first Book written in Arabic, a Book that cannot be divided into Meccan and Medinan, because it has no connection with these localities in itself: it has absolutely nothing to do with Arabia; it is only a Quran and nothing more, that is to say an Arabic translation-adaptation of the Hebrew Pentateuch, the Book of revelations, or in a broader sense, a history of the main characters of the Hebrew Bible. With the Corab, composed at the beginning of the second period of apostolate, begins in Mecca a new stage in the religious revolution triggered by the Jews. Until then, the person of the rabbi was, so to speak, the rallying center for Arabs converted to Israel. The rabbi taught, preached, had recited, and it was through this oral teaching that the Arabs, abandoning their idols, returned to Yahweh. To this period of apostolate limited to speech - a period which lasted until around Surah liv - now follows the period of the Book. From now on, the believer, the God-fearing one is he who believes in the Book. We have arrived at the dictatorship of the Book, the Arabic Book which will make known to Arabia, in an authentic and permanent way, the revelations of Yahweh, Lord of the Worlds and God of Israel. Never had such a wonder been seen! The first Arabic book was born. Embryo of a library that will grow considerably over the ages, this book is the work of a Jew!

By its fidelity to its model, the rabbi's Corab has the same attributes as Moses' Hebrew Quran. Any translation, insofar as it is faithful to the original, retains the same quality. It is the same breath in Arabic as in Hebrew: "The Book of Moses is a model (a guide) of Divine Mercy" (sour. xi, 20). This Quran (Arabic) was not invented by another than "Yahweh", that is to say: God is the author of the truths it contains, since these truths are only a repetition of the teachings received from Yahweh by Moses: "It is the confirmation of what was before him. It is only the explanation of the Book of the Lord of the Worlds. There is no doubt about this point" (sour. x, 38). And so that Mohammed and the Meccans are well convinced, the rabbi repeats again: "What we have revealed to you from the Book is the truth, it confirms what was said before him" (sour. xxxv, 28); "Before this one (the Arabic

Quran), there was the Book of Moses model and proof of Divine Mercy. And it's a book confirming the other, in Arabic language" « sour. xlvi, 11).

3. – The Acts of the Islam - Nous connaissons maintenant la Prière des Laudes, l'existence d'un Coran en langue arabe, la date relative de sa composition et de sa parution, son contenu général, l'auteur de ces deux œuvres.

Moreover, everyone today is talking about an Arabic book called the Quran. It is the book of Muslims, comprising 114 chapters or suras, and 6,226 verses. All the covers of this book bear the title "Quran".

The first question that comes to our mind can therefore be formulated in these terms: is there an identity between the Corab composed by the rabbi at the beginning of the second Meccan period and the official Quran of 114 suras? Our answer is absolutely categorical: No, there is no identity between these two works; The current Quran is not the original Quran, composed by the rabbi for the first group of Arabs converted to Judaism. First group of Arabs converted to Judaism. To start our discussion, let's read once again verses 86-87 of sura xv: In truth, your Lord is the Creator, the Omniscient. We have already brought you seven (verses) of the Repetition and the sublime Quran.

Let's think slowly about these verses again to get a very clear understanding. We are currently reading sura xv. The author of this sura tells Mohammed that he has already composed two works: a leaflet, or Prayer of Lauds, and the sublime Quran. But at the same time, by the very fact that the two verses we are reading are part of a sura, we see that the rabbi, author of the two aforementioned works, is also the author of a third work in which sura xv is included. So we have in the end:

1. — Prayer of Lauds.
2. — The Corab.
3. — A third writing which includes sura xv, whose verses 86-87 teach us about the existence of the two previous works.

From a simple reading of these verses 86-87, we can objectively conclude that the work to which they belong, commonly called the Quran, is clearly different from the Corab, mentioned by the suras immediately preceding sura xv. Put back in their context, these verses appear to us as a triumphant song, the expression of intense joy. The rabbi, addressing his disciple Mohammed, and as if to summarize his apostolate, says to him in a way: "See, my son, I have already composed in Arabic the Prayer of Lauds and the sublime Quran".

Not only does he say it, but he writes it in a work that includes sura xv, which fits into a context already counting 47 suras (first Meccan period), and eight others (beginning of the second period) in which we find the first allusions to the Corab.

A few moments of reflection will quickly confirm the clear distinction between the Corab and the Book that contains sura xv. These differences are of three kinds: chronological difference; difference in purpose; literary differences.

Chronologic differences - At the time of sura xv, the Corab is completely finished: "We have already brought you the sublime Quran". It is also finished in sura xx (see v. 112), in sura xliv (see v. 58), in sura liv (see v. 17, 22, 32, 40). We can therefore affirm that the Corab is composed at the beginning of the second Meccan period: "We have brought you the sublime Quran"; "we have made easy for your Arabic tongue, the Quran of Moses". The Arabic adaptation of the Hebrew Quran is finished. The rabbi will not return to it. He does not have to return to it. His Hebrew-Arabic translation is definitive.

At that time, all idolaters who wish can consult this book; it is at their disposal. It is not the same for the book to which sura xv belongs. This book is not finished at the time of sura xv. Started with the apostolate of the rabbi, it tells its adventures; it is a book in the making; it will only be finished with the apostolate itself. In this sura xv, the rabbi notes that now his apostolate is in full bloom, that he has already composed two Arabic works. He has already written 55 suras for the past. He will compose 33 more for the events of Mecca. He will later tell the whole story of Medina. But this is something he cannot do in advance! This work presents itself to us as a report of sessions, discussions, biblical sermons, a kind of road book, similar to what the Acts of the Apostles are for Christianity. For this reason, we call the work that contains sura xv: The Acts of Islam. The Corab is therefore finished *ne varietur* at the beginning of the second Meccan period, while, started in Mecca, The Acts of Islam will only be finished in Medina. Here is a first difference.

Differences of purposes – The Corab is essentially:

a) A book of Jewish prayers, intended to make the Meccans aware of God's Providence, to lead them to abandon polytheism and anchor them in the religion of the Unique Yahweh, to teach them to pray to the God of Mount Sinai. b) It is a liturgical book, parts of which must be regularly recited or sung. Just as the Hebrew Quran is recited in Hebrew in synagogues, so too the Judeo-Arabs, who are already called Muslims - that is, submitted to Yahweh, God of Israel - will have to recite the Arabic Quran in Arabic in their assemblies.

The Acts of Islam, on the other hand, do not constitute in themselves either a Book of Prayer or a Book of Recitation. It is quite evident that the suras cxi (against Abû Lahâb); cxvi (Union of the Quraysh for the winter and summer caravans); cviii (We have given you abundance); civ (Woe to the bitter slanderer); cii (Rivalry distracts you until you visit the necropolises); cv (The Elephant), have no prayer character and have no title to appear in a liturgical office. It can be affirmed that such suras are not part of the Corab, Arabic explanation of the Mosaic Quran.

When the rabbi asks Mohammed to recite the Corab (sou, x, 94), it means that Mohammed, converted to Judaism, must recite to his compatriots the Quran of Moses adapted in Arabic, and not the local stories, the small gossip of the city recalled by the suras that we have just indicated. The Corab, for its part, tells beneficial stories proving that the God of Israel is the Unique God of the Universe, All-Powerful and Merciful, God of justice rewarding those who fear and punishing idolaters. It is in this Book that the young Arab community, rallied to Judaism, will learn and learn to pray. It is not the Acts, unfinished at the time of sura xv, that the neo-converts must recite while bowing before the Most High!

Literary differences — The Corab and the Acts of Islam are two absolutely different literary genres. The Corab is essentially a Book of dogma, of objective teaching, valid for all times, therefore static and unchangeable, abstract from the local contingencies of the 7th century. It is essentially the revelation of Mosaic monotheism.

The Book of the Acts of Islam, on the other hand, tells us about the thousand adventures of the establishment of the Jewish religion in Mecca, and the energetic struggles of the Medinan period - which will be the subject of our next volume. We are in the presence of a real chronicle that moves in daily concrete: reactions of the Meccans who do not want to renounce their idols to adopt the Unique God of the Jews; deeds and actions of Mohammed at the instigation of his wife and the rabbi; refusal of the big Arab merchants to imitate Mohammed; their attachment to ancestral faith; rebukes from the rabbi, threats of punishment, promises of reward, encouragements to Mohammed... etc. This is what we can read in The Acts of Islam.

In short, the Book of Acts - which everyone today calls “the Quran” - is not the Arabic Quran or Corab, or the Arabic adaptation of the Quran of Moses.

Of the three works composed in Arabic by Mohammed’s instructing rabbi, the Prayer of Lauds and the Acts of Islam have been preserved until now.

So, a huge question mark is inscribed in these thirteen centuries of deception that separate us from the foundation of Arab Islam. What has become of the second work of the rabbi of Mecca? What has become of the Arabic Quran? Where has the Corab gone?

CHAPTER VI

THE GOAL OF THE ARABIC QURAN

The Arabic Quran is lost. — Everyone has heard of, and many have seen, perhaps leafed through, a book that generally bears a large title: the Quran. This book has a great reputation. It is generally said to contain revelations made by Allah to Mohammed, husband of a Jewess, Khadija. We now know that this title is false, that it only designates a Pseudo-Quran, and we advise publishers — in order not to appear as laggards — to pulp all the covers of this work, and to replace the old title with this more accurate one: The Acts of Islam.

But if this work is widely distributed, who knows the Arabic Quran, composed by the same rabbi based on the Old Testament? This Arabic Quran seems lost; at least, no one has identified it yet. Was it destroyed in Medina by Othman or Abu Bakr? Is it definitively lost? We would need to search, in the mass of Arabic manuscripts, if there is an Arabic version of the Old Testament. Once this version is found, it would remain to compare it with the stories of the Corab that the Acts of Islam have preserved for us, and which we will soon discuss.

We have here a field of research and study that is absolutely new, and even unsuspected. One fact is certain: the true Arabic Quran, which we call Corab, is lost. Every scholar, every historian who will let himself be guided by his common sense, will come to the same astonishing conclusion. We live in total error regarding Islam; even more, we are in the most complete bluff. The Arabic Quran was only the explanation of the main stories written in Hebrew in the Old Testament. That was all it was. But today, no one knows this book: not even the Muslims or others. The contemporary Muslims of the rabbi and Mohammed possessed the Corab; modern Muslims do not even suspect its existence. Between the Meccan Muslims during Mohammed's lifetime and the Muslims of today, there is a deep break. The Muslims of the 20th century no longer read their fundamental book, the book that led the Arabs of Mecca to the Unique God, the God of Moses and Israel. To connect the Muslims of the 20th century to those of the 7th century, there is only the Prayer of Lauds, the only literary memory that links modern and ancient mosques and leads Muslims of all ages to synagogues. Today as in the past in Mecca, Muslims recite every day, and several times a day, the prayer that a rabbi composed for them, according to the Psalms of David. Of the original Arabic Quran, they only possess the Preface, composed and written by a Jew!

Let's open a parenthesis here. We are told in all tones that the Quran is incomparable! that it is sacred, that it constitutes the great book of Direction for the present and future humanity! All of this is true, but with one caveat: it is true without any restriction of the Hebrew Quran, which contains the great revelations of Yahweh to Moses on Mount Sinai. We can also say that it is true for the Arabic Quran, only insofar as it is intrinsically faithful to the Quran of Moses, the first

analogue. The Arabic Quran, in its content, has no age; it is just a tracing, it only has the qualities of its model. Its expression is naturally Arabic. At first glance, it therefore seems that some Arabic writer should benefit from it. Well, no! No Arab - neither Mohammed nor anyone else - has ever written this book that we like to qualify as unique, extraordinary, a masterpiece. The Arabic Quran may be a masterpiece, but this masterpiece was authored by a Jew, a rabbi, the rabbi of Mecca, author of the Prayer of Lauds and the Acts of Islam. And to top it all off, this masterpiece over which all Arabists swoon is lost! Arabists and Quranists swoon over a myth. More precisely, they are mistaken about the object. They imagine glorifying the Quran; but this one is lost. They have no idea about it, but since they absolutely need to admire something Arabic - we would not understand an Arabist who does not admire - they admire a book that has nothing of the Quran but the title; in reality, this book is simply the Book of Acts. That's not all. Our good Quranists - I say good because deep down they are not mean - would like us to believe that this famous book is the work of an Arab. Again they are mistaken. We now know that the author is a Jew. Ultimately, our good Quranists have given themselves an attitude of psychological admiration. The Quranist is essentially a credulous man, a man who marvels, who is amazed. Never, ever has he seen such a splendid book, so inimitable as the Quran. Everyone is master of their feelings; we would not want to take away this right to ecstasy from our dear Quranists! We simply point out to them that they themselves are more wonderful than the Quran because they admire what they have no idea or suspicion about since the Quran is lost and they have never detected its existence. They are even more extraordinary than one generally thinks these good old Quranists since they swoon before this book which they call Quran and which is not the Quran which they attribute to an Arab and which is in reality the work... of a Jew. They simply mistake content and authorship. But let's reassure ourselves: their case is not so serious. To put everything back in order in this kingdom of admirations, all it takes is a change of address. For centuries, in an automatic and unthinking este, all Muslims, all Western historians, all Quranists send their missives full of hyperbolic praise to Mr Mohammed, husband of Khadija, Prophet of Islam. That's very good; unfortunately despite all intelligence of celestial messengers letter will never arrive since Mohammed has nothing to do with writing of Quran absolutely nothing at all and letter will return to sender Let our great Quranists now address their correspondence to Mr Rabbi of Synagogue of Mecca They can be sure that Yahweh will communicate their letters to him and make him aware of tons of compliments that so many unknowns send him without knowing it Simple change of address and everything will return to order.

But if the author now has a chance to receive correspondence from his admirers, his initial work remains nonetheless untraceable. Untraceable, unfound... However, we still preserve from this primitive Quran or Corab large extracts that a good little scholar - while waiting to find the original book - could put end to end to give us a first idea of the rabbi's work. These large extracts are preserved in the Acts of Islam, a historically most precious book, since it alone provides us with the most

authentic data on the origins of Islam. Not only has it revealed to us the existence, date, author, of the Corab, but on the content of this Corab now lost it gives us valuable indications. The rabbi makes extensive use of the Corab he himself composed for the writing of his Acts. If the Corab was only completed at the beginning of the second Meccan period, no quotation should be found in the 47 suras of the first period. In fact, no trace is found in these suras; everything, absolutely everything, is Jewish; but of a Judaism so to speak diluted, although very authentic. The rabbi is content to draw his listeners' attention to the existence of a Unique God, His Goodness towards humanity, the certainty of resurrection. The anecdotal stories found in these suras of the first period relate mainly to local circumstances, to Mohammed himself, stories that have no future value, no flavor of spiritual life and are not intended for prayer or public recitation. In this period, the rabbi only touches on biblical stories; he does recall the memory of some characters from the Old Testament, especially Moses and Pharaoh, Abraham and Noah, but these are only reminders, not stories. The texts are not quoted there. Similarly in the descriptions of Paradise and Hell, the rabbi still proceeds only by allusions or brief affirmations.

It is enough to reflect a little to take on the spot, concretely, the very special literary process used by the rabbi in the first suras of the Acts of Islam. The Corab is not written. The rabbi cannot refer to the book he is writing, this book does not yet exist! All Quranists have noticed that, during this Meccan period, the rabbi generally begins the writing of his suras with solemn oaths that are often cited as small masterpieces of Arabic eloquence, and which are actually part of beautiful Jewish literature. These oaths will disappear in the second Meccan period, at the very moment when the Corab will appear. There is a certain evolution in the preaching of the rabbi - the great Quranists say: in Allah's revelation: oaths, and no Corab; Corab, and disappearance of oaths. But what is essential to underline here is that, before the composition of the Corab, there is no proper biblical narrative in the Acts of Islam, which leads us to two essential conclusions:

- The Acts of Islam were composed by the same author as the Corab;
- The Corab was composed after the 47 suras that form in the Acts what can be called the first Meccan period.

We can also conclude that the Surahs of the Acts represent a real roadmap of the Jewish apostolate in Mecca, written as events unfold.

After the composition of the Corab, at the beginning of the second Meccan period, the Acts of Islam completely change in aspect. The relative calm of the first 47 surahs is followed by an increasingly noisy and irritating charivari. The insults from the Meccans multiply, becoming more and more coarse. Mohammed is stunned. Khadidja may well encourage him in his Jewish proselytism, the poor camel driver is losing his mind. He has not yet sufficiently identified with Judaism to be able to cope on his own with his adversaries. Fortunately, the rabbi is there!

He does not leave him an inch. Mohammed, say this! Mohammed, say that! In the second and third Meccan periods, these formulas come back more than a hundred times. It is the rabbi who masters all this Arab-Jewish drama whose theater is Mecca, and the stake is the complete Judaization of the second half of the Semitic world, the disinherited half, the Arab world. Mohammed, say this; Mohammed, say that! Tell your idolatrous compatriots the story of Moses, Abraham, Noah, Lot. In surahs xx and xxvi, all close to the composition of the Corab, we find 215 biblical verses; and the verses follow one another, forming a kind of summary of the holy history of the Jews; and these verses, as demonstrated in Hanna Zakarias' work, *From Moses to Mohammed*, vol. II, p. 119-131, are in the Acts of Islam only true extracts from the Corab.

This Corab is lost, the conclusion is certain. But should we consider this loss as a catastrophe? Let's think a little:

1. From a religious point of view, this loss is certainly very regrettable. The Muslims, indeed, a) no longer have a prayer book. The real prayer book was the Corab, containing the revelations of Yahweh to Moses on Sinai. This is the book that the first Muslims recited, right at the beginning of the second Meccan period. They recited it, prostrated before the Eternal. These Arabs converted to Judaism were good Jews. They applied themselves to recite from memory the biblical stories translated from Hebrew by the great Jewish leader of the new Judeo-Arab community. b) As a primitive and authentic prayer formula, all that remains for Muslims of the 20th century is the Prayer of Lauds, placed at the head of the Pseudo-Quran, and which, for this reason, is called the Fatiha. It is the only direct link that connects them to Islam of the 7th century.
2. From a historical point of view, this loss of the Corab is also to be deplored, since it deprives us of the first Arab book that ever existed.

The seriousness of this loss is nevertheless mitigated by the Acts of Islam, whose author is the same as that of the Corab. From the second Meccan period, it is entire sections of his Corab that the rabbi inserts into his Acts. It is through his own quotations that a part of the Corab has been saved and has reached us. If, as we have already wished, some scholar could, in the near future, reconstruct a part of the Corab from the extracts of the Acts, such a reconstruction would be magnificent from a religious, historical, linguistic and literary point of view, since it would allow us to judge from the texts the apostolic effort of the rabbi among the idolatrous Arabs. A magnificent work not only for scholarship, but also for religious value thanks to this now possible reconstruction, the only current remedy capable of somewhat compensating for the loss of the Arabic Quran, Muslims could find their original prayer book, which they sorely lack, and also find their authentic legal code - excerpt and adaptation from Deuteronomy - of which we only have quotations inserted in the book of Acts. Through this work of

reconstruction, today's Muslims will be able to join the Muslims of the seventh century who, after abandoning the inert idols of the Ka'ba, finally recognized the truth of Moses, and prostrated themselves before Yahweh, the God of Israel.

CHAPTER XII

THE FIRST JUDAIC-ARAB COMMUNITY

THE FIRST MUSLIMS

The first Meccan period is, so to speak, a period of kneading, of setting up. Only the rabbi is on stage. He is preparing his batteries for a huge battle, the result of which must be the abandonment by the Arabs of the idols of the Ka'ba and the complete Judaization of the Arab tribes. In this first period, the most sensational event is Mohammed's conversion to Judaism. This was already a beautiful result. Mohammed was not just anyone! As a young man, he had roamed around the Ka'ba, one of his uncles being the last sexton. Later, he had accompanied distant caravans. Like all Arabs, he certainly had a lot of chatter. He would have made a very good salesman in our day. This was his vocation and he succeeded fully, so much so that he was asked in marriage by a woman who was about forty years old, when he was twenty-five. He was then in full virile strength. But he was poor and Khadidja, his wife, was rich. He was Arab and she was Jewish. He frequented the Ka'ba and worshipped idols; as for her, she performed her devotions at the synagogue and invoked Yahweh, the God of Moses and Israel. No, really, the household was too mismatched for a lasting agreement. How to solidly seal this union? Have children? Yes, that was a solution, and it is possible that Mohammed, to avoid repudiation, used this normal means. Succeed in business? This was also an excellent solution, and we know from a surah of the Acts of Islam that during the day, Khadidja's husband had to seriously slog: "In the day, you have vast occupations" (sour. lxxiii, 7). But neither children nor work would have been enough to keep such a poorly matched household together. The religious question really constituted a big deal. Mohammed continued to pray to his idols; he would throw his darts to ward off fate. He invoked the gods Allât, Muât, al-Ouzza, the god of Love, Wadd. Khadidja remained faithful to the synagogue. Between her and her poor husband, there was no possibility of agreement. Then the rabbi intervened. In agreement with Khadidja, he clandestinely catechized Mohammed. He taught him Holy History. Mohammed had a good memory and behaved like a perfect student, an oriental student: a lot of memory and little intelligence. And one fine day, this model student made his abjuration. It was a great celebration that day among the Meccans

- Christians, always nonchalant and always living in anticipation, smiled. Soon they will repent of their inertia;
- Jews triumphed; for Khadidja it was a great victory; the rabbi foresaw all the use he would be able to make of this fool who already bit his fingers at the gesture that had just been imposed on him;
- As for the Meccans, sometimes they were furious with their compatriot who had let them down, sometimes they mocked this fool who was afraid of his wife and who let himself be led by her by the nose to the synagogue of Jews. This

braggart with endless chatter collapsed before the altar with seven branches; he prostrated himself before Yahweh. They, idolaters invoked gods they saw; him Mohammed now bowed his back before emptiness; nothing could be seen of god he prayed!

Anger and mockery didn't matter! Khadidja and the rabbi didn't care. The essential thing for them was not the conversion of Mohammed? That alone counted. The second Meccan period was starting on solid and definitive bases: not only is the husband of the Jewish Khadidja converted, but he is completely ready for his apostolate. He now has a Book. This Book, he will never be able to read it, but he will use it as a support for his preaching. Thanks to the rabbi, his schoolmaster, he now knows by heart the main stories of this Book, at least those likely to remind him of his own history. If he does not always manage to cope in the midst of these religious battles, it does not matter. The rabbi is by his side, dictating the answers that will silence his detractors. Don't worry about anything, Mohammed; everything will work out: recite the Corab, recite it without getting tired; recite it even if you don't understand it. To understand it well, you would have had to be born Jewish, to have been rocked by the story of our beautiful stories. You are now a Jew by religion; but from a racial point of view, you can only be a Jew by adoption. Be an apostle of Judaism; recite the Quran. Come with us, pray with us, come and pray with your wife. You have children now. These are real Jews, this time, that you have begotten and that your wife has given birth to. I have raised you well above the Arabs, sons of ignorance and idolatry; I have made you a Jew. Oh! Mohammed, "put your trust in the Mighty and Merciful One, who sees you during your vigils and who sees your gestures among those who prostrate themselves" (sour. xxvi, 217-219).

The prostrated ones, in rabbinic literature, are the worshipers of Yahweh, the Jews. Mohammed! Pray with the Jews and in their way! And Mohammed obeys. He now frequents the synagogue. He now gathers his compatriots to talk to them about Moses, the great patriarchs of Israel; he parallels the idols that do not see, that do not hear, that do not walk, with the Almighty God, Unique, Creator of Heaven and Earth. Worship all the God of Israel! It is He who gives life and who causes death! It is He who will reward and punish. Submit to His teachings, to His will, to the directives He gives you every day in the manifestation of His goodness, in all the signs of His Mercy. Become like Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon! Become like all the saints of our great history! Their inner history can be summed up in one word! Listen to this word, dear readers! Engrave it in your memory and you will understand, for the first time no doubt, the deep meaning of Islam. There is only one word to characterize this attitude of the great saints of Israel: they were Submissive to the will of God: "I ask you no retribution," said Noah to his contemporaries. "My salary is incumbent only on Yahweh; He has ordered me to be part of those who submit, that is to say, as the Arabic term expresses it, to be part of the muslimina, the Muslims. Muslimin (oun), which makes in plural muslimin (ouna) and muslim (ina), according to its function in the

sentence, is the active participle of the verb *aslama*, to resign oneself, to submit to the will of God.

The great patriarchs of Israel were all Submissive, Muslims. Let's always reflect, dear readers. At the time of Mohammed, the terms Islam, Muslims, do not designate a new religion, a new religious formula, but on the contrary a religion of the past, a very ancient religion, very characterized, the religion of the Jews opposed to idolatry. Noah was a Muslim (sour. x, 73). Abraham and Isaac were eminently submissive and are therefore among the great Muslims of Judaism. Do you understand, dear readers, that it is absolutely stupid to put, in reading the Acts of Islam, an opposition between Jews and Muslims? Not only is there no opposition, but it must be affirmed with precision that the great Muslims are first and foremost the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Testament. Lot is also one of the main Muslims of Holy History: "We are," say the two messengers who came to warn him of the divine message, "sent to a criminal people to throw stones at him... We have found only one house of resigned, submissive, muslimina" (sour. li, 36). Noah, Abraham, Lot and his family are the three authentic muslimina that the rabbi presents in his Acts of Islam up to surah li.

They are obviously not the only ones in the history of Israel: the last word that the rabbi puts on Joseph's lips is a wish: "Make me die a Muslim, muslim" (sour. xii, 102), that is to say, make me submit to You, O Yahweh, and thus join the saints. For the rabbi, instructor of Mohammed, Joseph is also a true Muslim. The Muslims par excellence are the Jews. Judeo-Arab converts only become Muslims by reference to the Hebrew Patriarchs, fully submitted to the will of God.

In the history of the Hebrew people, the perfect type of Muslim is Moses, who gave the most complete example of submission to God, and who implored his people to follow his example: "Moses said: O my people, if you believe in Yahweh lean on Him, if you are submitted to Him, if you are muslimina" (sour. x, 84). Pharaoh himself, according to midrashic legends, would have ended up converting to the God of Israel, would have become a Submissive, a Muslim: "We made the Red Sea pass to the children of Israel, and Pharaoh and his troops pursued them with determination and speed, until finally submerged by the waves where he perished, Pharaoh said: "I believe that there is no God but He in whom the children of Israel believe. And I am among the Submissive among the muslimina, the Muslims)", (sour. x, 90-91). Still Muslims: Solomon and the Queen of Sheba (sour. xvii, 38-45).

After enumerating all these texts (and many more could be added), we can now try to concretely define the Muslim. First observation: in the rabbi's language, Muslims and Submissive are two synonymous terms. — Second striking observation, the notable and only authentic Submissive or Muslims, models for all others, are the Patriarchs and Great Men of Israel. The concept of submission is realized first and foremost, directly and completely, in Judaism alone. It is a specifically religious concept that contains as its main elements: belief in Yahweh

Unique, Almighty, Creator of Worlds, Sovereign Judge, and submission to His Will. This concept of the Muslim overflows intelligence to invade man's will. In the concrete history of the Jewish people, this concept has undergone many evolutions. It is not the same before and after Moses. Before Moses, this submission of man to God came from an inner inspiration from God, indicating himself his great servants the Direction to follow. Abraham, for example was an authentic Muslim: he perceived in his conscience the commandments of God and conformed to them with faith. The adventure of the sacrifice of Isaac constitutes one of the most striking examples of pre-Mosaic Islamism. Before Moses, we were already muslimina (sour. xxviii, 52-53). With Moses, this submission is based, this time, not only on purely internal and personal inspirations, but on the revelations of Mount Sinai, concretized in a Book that everyone can read, which has universal and perpetual value. From now on, submission becomes obedience to leaders, to divine commandments, to the precepts of the Book, the Quran of Moses.

Let's take another step, dear readers, and we will realize that the concept of "Muslim" does not contain any Arab element. Identifying Arab and Muslim is absolutely inept. The Muslim is first and foremost the Jew, the good Jew. He is a Muslim by nature. Converts to the God of Israel, they become Muslims by abandoning their idols, by accepting Yahweh, by their submission to Him. Among the Arabs, Mohammed can be considered as the first Muslim in that he is the first convert to the God of Israel.

The religion of Israel, in its true characteristic, also carries a specific name. It is called Islam, that is to say, the religion of Muslims. "Have you not seen," says the rabbi to Mohammed, "that Yahweh has brought down from heaven a water that He leads to (sources) gushing forth in the earth? He brings out, by (this water) grasses of various species which then fade and yellow at your sight and which, finally, (Yahweh) makes dried up twigs. Truly, in this is certainly a warning for those who are endowed with intelligence. Is it he whose heart Yahweh has expanded for Islam, and who is in the light of his Lord..." etc. (sour. xxxix, 22-23). "He whom Yahweh wishes to keep, He extends his heart to Islam" (sour. vi, 125), that is to say, until complete submission to His will.

What a turmoil we have been living in for centuries! I would have been amply rewarded for my efforts if I could - even after hundreds of years - rectify our religious conceptions. We live in ignorance and bluff. Therefore, let's have the courage and energy to reform our ideas and our language. For now, dear readers, retain only two or three very simple notions:

1. The Muslim is the Jew who submits his will to the will of God; there is only one race of original and complete Muslims, it is the Jewish race, the Chosen People whom Yahweh has guided from within by the great characters of the Old Testament.

2. Islam is the religion of the Jews. Among the nations of the world, the Jewish nation alone was chosen as the depository of its thought; first, it knew the name of the Eternal and received His Commandments. Despite the jostling of the impious, it preserves its faith in Yahweh and remains submissive, through the centuries, to the precepts of its God. It bears a name Islam or Submission.
3. Islam has no radical attachment with Arabs. It is pure ineptitude to identify Arabs and Muslims. At the time of Mohammed, we must distinguish a) The Arabs faithful to the Ka'ba: these are the idolaters who do not want to accept the religious ideal that the rabbi announces to them, either directly or through Mohammed. b) The Arabs converted to the God of Israel. These are Muslims by adoption, conversion; more exactly muslimized. They are called Muslims only by analogy. There were first, and especially since Moses, Jewish Muslims; there will be Arab Muslims only after their conversion, in Mecca, in the 7th century.
4. Arab Islam does not constitute a new religion. Without Judaism, it would never have existed. On the other hand, Mosaic Islam could very well do without Arab Islam without being diminished. Arab Islam has brought nothing to it, but has everything from it. There was not yet any Arab-Muslim community while Jews were Muslims for twenty centuries.

A time will come when the Arabs, wanting to forget their Jewish origins in the religious field, will declare themselves the only and authentic Muslims, the only representatives of Islam. This will be the beginning of the great religious bluff of the Mediterranean basin. The Arabs have always been the poor relatives of the Semitic race. Unable to invent in any field, they have shamelessly raided. Their supreme trick has always been to seize the property of others. What we observe in 1956 has nothing that should surprise us. Unable to dig the canal, they steal it. In a few years, they will proclaim that they were the pioneers and builders. Arab history, as Ibn Khaldoun repeated in his Prolegomena, is made only of thefts and qualified thefts.

Everyone knows that there is no Arab philosophy. The Arabs have never been able to understand - let alone develop - a doctrinal system. At the two poles of their vast empire, in the East and West, anti-Arab, Syriac and Berber dynasties reigned. What is called Arab philosophy has absolutely nothing in common with the Arab race. It is the composition of Syriac or Persian philosophy expressed in Arabic with al-Ghazzali, al-Khindi, for example; and it is also Berber philosophy expressed in Arabic by Ibn Tofail, Ibn Badjdja, Ibn Rushd, who have absolutely nothing in common with the Arab race. Racially Arab philosophy is a myth; a myth also the art derived from the Arabs. Even less is there an Islam that would have originated among the Arabs.

By converting to Jewish Islam, Mohammed became, after the millions and millions of Jewish Muslims, the first Arab Muslim: "Indeed, I have been ordered to be the first Muslim" (sour. xxxix, 14). The rabbi commands him to say: "I have been ordered to be the first to submit" (sour. vi, 14, 163). What the rabbi could not do, Mohammed, Judaized, will take charge of doing. Announce the good news to your compatriots. As the first Muslim, you have the power and authority. Bring them to the religion of Israel

and ask them if they are Muslims or if they intend to become so: “Tell them: It is only revealed to me that your divinity is a unique divinity. Are you Muslims? (sour. xxi, 108)”. Who then utters a more beautiful word than he who invokes Yahweh, who does good and who says: “I am among the muslimina, those who submit to God” (sour. xli, 33). And the rabbi says again: “It is to you, Mohammed, that we have revealed the Scripture, clarification of all things, Direction, Mercy, and good news for Muslims” (sour. xvi, 91). You will only go to Paradise to find the eternal houris if you are Muslims (sour. xliv, 54; xxxvii, 47; xxxviii, 52; iv, 60).

Arab Islam is on the move. The conversion of Mohammed was certainly a great success, but this individual success had its full value only in the hopes it carried within itself. Mohammed must also become an apostle to the idolatrous Meccan crowd. He is already praying at the synagogue: “Put your trust, Mohammed, in the Mighty and Merciful who sees you during your vigils and your gestures among the prostrated” (sour. xxvi, 217-219). At this time of sour. xxvi, very shortly after the composition of the Corab, there is a Judeo-Arab community under the orders of Mohammed. The rabbi recommends him to watch over it carefully: “Lower your wings over those of the believers who follow you” (sour. xxvi, 215; xv, 88; xvii, 25). By this pretty comparison that he likes and that he borrows from the Bible (Ps. xvi, 8; xxxv, 8; lvi, 2; lx, 5; lxii, 8), the rabbi obviously does not recommend Mohammed to lower his wings over the Jews, as Yahweh had once done over the people of Israel (Deut. xxxii, 11: Yahweh has spread his wings; he has taken Israel and carried it on his feathers). The believers that the rabbi recommends to Mohammed can only be Arabs converted to Judaism, and historically we can conclude that at the time of sourate xxvi, Mohammed had already managed to subtract from the cult of idols some of his compatriots, designated under the name of believers. Grouped around him, they pray exactly like Jews. The surah xlvi, which should probably be placed after the composition of the Corab, resounds like a victory song

1.
 - Indeed, we have granted you a resounding success,
2.
 - so that Yahweh may forgive your first and last sins, and also that He may complete His blessing upon you and guide you in a straight path.
3.
 - Yahweh lends you a powerful help.
4.
 - It is He who has brought down the divine Presence (the Shekinah of the Jews) into the heart of believers so that they may add faith to their faith. To Yahweh are the legions of heaven and earth. Yahweh is omniscient and wise. To Yahweh is the legion of heaven and earth. Yahweh is powerful and wise.
- 8.

- We have sent you as a Witness (Mohammed), Announcer, and Warner,
- 9.
- so that you may believe in Yahweh and in His Apostle (so that) you may assist him, honor him, and glorify him at dawn and dusk.
- 10.
- Those who swear allegiance to you only swear allegiance to Yahweh, with Yahweh's hand placed on their hands. Whoever is perjured is only perjured against himself. Whoever (on the contrary) is faithful to the commitment made to Yahweh will receive from Him a huge reward (sour. xlvi, 1-10).

These Arabs who are now entering, thanks to the preaching of Mohammed, into the religion of Moses, are called believers, in opposition to the unbelievers or idolaters. They are characterized by the knowledge of the one and only true religion, by faith in the Unique God of Sinai, while the idolaters of the Ka'ba remain locked in the senseless worship of stones. Before having their particular temple, it is extremely likely that these Arabs converted to Judaism now frequent the synagogue. They are led there by their leader, Mohammed. They do not wear phylacteries, reserved for Muslims by race, but they pray by prostrating themselves before Yahweh, like all Israelites. It is evident that the Arabs converted to Judaism committed themselves to live according to the Mosaic rule. A whole internal restructuring was imposed on these Arabs, yesterday polytheists; today monotheists and having to live, externally and internally, in the manner of Jews!

If we look at Mecca in the aftermath of the drafting of the Corab, we can clearly distinguish several religious groups, believers and unbelievers.

1. The unbelievers constitute the mass of Arabs - sedentary and nomadic - who venerate the stones of the Ka'ba. Let us note in passing that, after their conversion to Islam, these Arabs will always remain fundamentally true fetishists. Jewish Islam will not succeed in converting them seriously. Every Muslim, whether in the Near East or North Africa, is essentially fetishistic, which largely explains the success of Islam in Black Africa. Moreover, a religion that has as its law to deify, to eternalize man's most perverse instincts, is assured of spatial success.
2. The believers, who need to be well catalogued, following the very indications of the Acts of Islam. a) First, the believers by birth, the Jews. For the rabbi of Mecca, the Jew is the great original believer who has Yahweh's trust and who collects from father to son, since Moses, the secrets of the Unique God, Creator and Master of the Universe. b) Then, among the believers, a group of infidels whom we will soon talk about. They were believers originally. But they split from the Israelite branch to form a separate sect. These are Christians: renegade

Jews, they broke the divine Unity revealed by Moses by deifying a child born of a woman. The descendants of these renegade Jews are now Arabs. They do not frequent the Ka'ba; they do not go to the synagogue. They have their own temple, their community or church, and they only worship Yahweh's son. We will see them at work. c) Fortunately for the rabbi, a new community is rising. It does not yet have a temple. Led by its leader, it goes to pray at the synagogue. These are Arabs converted to Judaism. They worship Yahweh; they pray by prostrating themselves. There were already Jewish Muslims, now there are Arab Muslims. At the end of the Meccan period, shortly before their flight from Mecca, they are not yet very numerous: "Among them (Arabs)," says the rabbi, "there are those who believe and among them there are those who do not believe" (sour. x, 41). A short time before, in preaching (sour. xxix, 46, also from the third period), the rabbi, addressing a group of Arabs and reaching out to them, had said: "And of these there are those who believe", "but those who deny our signs", i.e., verses from our Quran," those are unbelievers".

CHAPTER XIII

THE FIRST REACTIONS

OF THE FIRST MECCANS

Mohammed, an Arab, converted to Judaism, became the leader of a group of Arab Muslims, attending the synagogue, should not have expected a very favorable reception from his compatriots. In fact, the fury of the fetishists reached its peak at the time when Mohammed presented them with the Corab, composed by the rabbi. These fetishists reject its authority (sour. xli, 2-4; vi, 116). They deny everything (sour. xvii, 101). They argue about the verses that are recited to them (sour. xli, 6; xl, 4; vi, 67). They even argue at night (sour. xxiii, 69). They reject as false the word of Yahweh (sour. xxiii, 107). When they are recited the verses of the Corab, they invariably turn their backs (sour. xlv, 13; xxvi, 4; xxiii, 68; xxi, 109; xvii, 49; xli, 3; xvi, 84), as they used to do when the rabbi orally explained biblical stories to them (sour. liii, 30-34). Noah's opponents acted no differently by calling God's envoy a liar (sour. x, 73). Before the composition of the Corab, the idolaters mainly attacked Mohammed himself; now it is the rabbi's work that is the target of their fury. They ridicule the Corab (sour. xlv, 6-8; xxiii, 112). The rabbi replies to them: "Woe to every slanderer full of sins who hears Yahweh's verses communicated to him and then stubbornly persists in his pride as if he had not heard them! Announce to him a cruel torment! Woe to those who know some of our verses and ridicule them. For these people is reserved a ignominious punishment (sour. xlv, 6-8; xxiii, 112). You are nothing but dogs! When a dog is pursued, it growls; when left alone, it still barks (sour. vii, 175). Do today's Muslims know that this supreme insult Kelb that they so willingly throw at Christians was first hurled at the Arabs of Mecca by a Jew? Race of dogs! If you do not want to believe in the Book of Moses which I have adapted in Arabic to hasten your conversion to the God of Israel, bring therefore the reasons and proofs for your refusal. — Proofs? retort the idolaters, we have as many as you want. Here is one absolutely peremptory: (But to understand it, one must remember that there is no more arrogant than fools. Let's listen to them talk): you come, Mohammed, tell us that your book, the Corab is a blessed scripture, which was first given to Moses and communicated by Moses to Jews. And it is this book that you have the audacity to preach us! Big smart! If this book was really a good book it would not have been given by God to Jews but to Arabs! (sour. xlvi, 10). We would have made better use of it than Jews and Christians (sour. vi, 158). Your stories of revelation make no sense. God has never revealed anything to men: no more to Moses than to others. What you present us as a revealed book is after all just a roll of paper (sour. vi, 91). Why should we prostrate ourselves before such a roll? Even more: you come and tell us poor fool that there would have existed a first Hebrew roll given to Moses by God himself. We don't believe it! You are now telling us about a second roll written in Arabic! We don't believe it any more either. — Of the Hebrew Quran and the Corab they say: "These are two works of sorcery. We believe neither in one nor in the other" (sour. xxviii, 48). Your Hebrew Quran is just a myth a fool's tale (sour. xli, 5; xxi, 5; vi, 25). As for the Arabic Quran it would also have been revealed by God! With

your stories don't waste any more time! We know what we're up against it's you Mohammed who invent all this! (sour. xxi, 5; xxxii, 2; xi, 16-37).

The rabbi is there; he listens, and he jumps: but no, but no; Khadidja's husband didn't invent anything! Think a little! How could Mohammed invent the stories of Moses himself? How could he know by himself the story of the great revelation of Yahweh on Sinai? Was Mohammed there, on Sinai, next to the liberator of the Hebrew people? 43. — We gave the book to Moses, after having annihilated the previous generations... 44. — You were not on the western slope (of Sinai) when we issued the order to Moses. You were not among the witnesses. 45. — You did not live among the Midianites, communicating Our signs to them. 46. — You were not on the side of Mount Sinai, when We called out to Moses.

No, this Arabic Quran was not fabricated by Mohammed, who saw nothing of the scene of Sinai, who heard nothing of the colloquies of Yahweh and Moses "The Arabic Quran was not invented by anyone other than Yahweh. It is only the confirmation of what was written before him, that is to say the book of Moses whose unique and true author is the Lord of the Worlds" (sour. x, 38). — Mohammed, still, think a little! You are Arab like us. Until your marriage to the Jewish Khadidja, you frequented the Ka'ba, like us. How you have changed! Do you want to know our thought? You are only a bewitched, bewitched by the Jews, in the hands of the Jews. This statement is reported to us by the rabbi himself in surah xlv, of the Acts of Islam that the great Ulemas, buried in their secular ignorance. have the naivety to present us as the Quran.

The scene, as always in the second Meccan period, is very lively. The rabbi rants about the disbelief of the Meccans "I swear, he says, by the obvious Book, the Quran of Moses. There is no God but Yahweh. He is your Lord and the Lord of your fathers". As always, the fetishist Meccans mock the Jew. The latter turns to Mohammed and tells him with assurance, — the assurance of a man who has for him the strength of God —: Patience, Mohammed, they will not always laugh; "Watch for the day when the sky will bring a visible smoke that will cover men! It will be a dreadful torment". At that moment, they will no longer laugh: "Lord, they will moan, remove from us the punishment! We believe, now!" But how would they believe in the divine reminder of the ultimate test, when during their life they had before them an apostle, an apostle of God himself, and they turned away from him?

On the square of the Ka'ba, the noise grows; the meeting becomes more and more tumultuous. The fetishists shout: no, Mohammed! we do not believe that you are the envoy of God. We do not believe in the divinity of your mission. We do not believe in the divinity of the Arabic book that you persist in telling us (sour. xlv, 1-13). Nothing is true of what you tell us. Before you, we lived peacefully in our city; you have managed to sow discord among our tribes, with your stories of inspiration, your stories of Noah, Lot, Abraham and Moses.

As often happens in violent discussions, the fetishists now come to say the opposite of what they affirmed at the beginning of their palaver. They had started by mocking the Arabic Quran. You want us to believe that Yahweh is the author. The author, it's you! And now, these idolaters have lost, in heating up, the thread of their reasoning. Or simply, attacks are coming from all sides, clashing with each other, each shouting what comes to mind, without worrying about the clamor of the neighbor: but no, Mohammed, you are not the author of the Quran; it is not Allah either! You, inspired by Allah? Go tell these old wives' tales to those who don't know you. As for us, we know very well who you are; you won't fool us like that! We saw you as a kid, hanging around in the paths of Mecca, we saw you at the Ka'ba, strutting around with your uncle the sexton! We laughed a lot at your marriage to this old Jewess! We saw you run off to the synagogue on your wife's arm! And you have the audacity to tell us that you are inspired by Yahweh? So shut up, we know everything! The stories that you told us as inspired, we know perfectly well who teaches them to you: you are nothing more than a student, a Jewish mu'allamum (sour. xliv, 13). We do not want to believe in your book. Nothing proves that it is true. What is certain, you renegade, is that you work for a Jew, you are at his orders. Everything you know about religion is a Jew who teaches it to you, and this Jew, we know him!

Faced with such a direct attack, Mohammed and the rabbi lose their footing. Unable to deny that he was Mohammed's only instructor, the rabbi, to parry the blow, takes refuge in general and ineffective considerations: you are the enemies of Yahweh and you know — we have said it enough — that Yahweh always crushes his enemies and punishes them eternally. He should annihilate you on the spot. Patience! A day will come when the supreme punishment will fall upon you: "The day we strike the supreme blow, we will take revenge (sour. xiv, 15).

The afterlife? That's news that doesn't disturb our sleep, Mohammed. We are on earth, retort the idolaters; let's enjoy the present life; after, we'll see! You bet us about the afterlife as if you were in God's secret. Look at him, this husband of Khadidja; my faith, he really looks like a madman. Your revealing God, we're going to tell you who it is: it's the grand master of the Synagogue. That's who tells you what you come to us to spout afterwards. We all know his "tricks" now. —The idolaters talk incessantly and their heads spin. You have to be a charlatan, they say to Mohammed, to invent such nonsense. You really are a poor man, to agree to make yourself an accomplice of a liar like the rabbi.

It's a lost cause! You will not be able to deceive us. Your famous book, in the end, where does it come from? It has nothing to do with Allah! You lie to us when you come to preach that God is the author of this "book". It's you who made it; but you're not clever enough to have done it all by yourself. Others have had a hand in it. "It's nothing but a hoax and other people have helped him. They thus bring an iniquity and a falsehood" (sour. xxv, 5). And these others who wrote the book for you, they are not far away; they live in our city; they walk in our streets. They address their God by prostrating themselves, and you imitate them. Ah, really, you make a beautiful apostle,

Mohammed! And to think that this disciple of the rabbi almost turned us away from our deities! It's an abomination. (sour. xxv, 44-46). If your book had really come down from Above, we would believe in it (sour. xxix, 49), but it comes from a Jew. Yes, it's a Jew who composed it, a Jew who gave it to you, and it's this work of a Jew that you come to offer us, Arabs? Ah, if this book had been sent to a great man of Mecca, perhaps we would follow him (sour. xliii, 28-30).

The rabbi listens again and, at the moment chosen by him, he jumps again. You are scorned by your own, Mohammed, but you are blessed by Yahweh. Do not believe in the false logic of your fetishist compatriots. It is to us, Jews, that the future belongs. Israel will always be a victorious people! The truth, we alone possess it. The Book is Unique, and it is our property, it was revealed to us on Sinai by Yahweh on a famous night. "Falsehood will never reach it, from whatever side it comes. The Quran, the Hebrew Book, is a revelation of the Wise, the Worthy of Praise!" (sour. xli, 41-42). You have absolutely no understanding, Meccan idolaters. It is not Mohammed who received the revelations from God; it is not he who invented the Corab! Many centuries before Mohammed, the Quran existed! It was revealed to Moses. As for the Corab, it is I, rabbi of Mecca, who have just written it recently. Poor Mohammed whom you accuse has absolutely nothing to do with it. Strictly speaking however, I am not its author. The Corab does not have a personal soul. Its soul comes from the depths of the centuries of Mount Sinai; it is on this summit that connects earth to heaven that Moses directly received the Quran in Hebrew, of which the Corab is only an echo in Arabic language. The soul of the Corab comes from God through Moses; but the echo is my work. I am its unique craftsman and I claim it as my fabrication. Mohammed has nothing to invent. He only has to listen and repeat!

Mohammed is the phonograph and the brayer of Judaism among the Arab tribes. No, Meccan idolaters, "his word is not the word of a poet. How little faith you have! It is not the word of a soothsayer. How short your memory is! It is a revelation from the Lord of the Worlds" (sour. lxix, 41-43). The Corab he recites to you is a reminder of our Scriptures, (sour. xxxvi, 69). Mohammed is not a braggart, a charlatan, like those fairground poets who come to distract and amuse you by spouting their nonsense. Your Mohammed, whom you treat as a madman, a liar, a poet, bewitched, is a wise man who has understood the message of Yahweh to Moses and who, on my order and the order of his wife, comes to warn you of this heavenly message. All this astonishes you! Well yes, I certify it to you, Mohammed invents nothing; he recites. What he recites is the Corab, which is only the reverse of Moses' Quran. You still doubt it? It's simple: you have among you a witness among the sons of Israel who knows Hebrew and Arabic. So ask him! He will be able to affirm with authority the truth of what I am telling you (sour. xliv, 9). You know very well, moreover, that the Doctors of Israel know Moses' Quran (sour. xv, 197) and are capable of comparing with this original the Corab that I have just written for your benefit.

Mohammed is truly the creature of the rabbi, the most authentic fruit of Judaism. Just as the bugle is capable of expressing through its sounds the feelings of the one who

plays it, so Mohammed, led by the energetic voice of his wife and by the precise, nuanced and sweet teachings of the rabbi, echoes the Jewish law around the Meccan synagogue.

In the Near East, in the 7th century as today, one can be sure that a thunderous voice will arouse the braying of the ignorant masses who, moreover, will applaud tomorrow what they have scorned the day before. There is nothing more mobile than an Arab mass. The all-powerful bugle or tom-tom is the all-powerful master of movements. Sound is the great guide of thoughtless spaces. Mohammed, spurred on by Khadidja and the rabbi, gave himself great shouts and, among the great fools who listen to him, some applauded, without really knowing what they were doing, the God of Israel. Thus was born, despite the mockery and shrieks of the Meccan fetishists, Arab Islam, a copy of Jewish Islam, the only authentic Islam.

CHAPTER XIV

DISPUTES BETWEEN

THE PRIEST OF MECCA AND THE RABBI

The Meccan Christians had shown themselves to be very amorphous at the beginning of the rabbi's apostolate. But now they are starting to worry about the progress of Judaism. Mohammed converted to the God of Israel, bringing with him some of his compatriots. The rabbi redoubles his activity: he has just adapted the biblical stories into Arabic. These solid and fundamental successes shake the torpor of the Christians. Why didn't their eyes open at the beginning of the rabbi's preaching? The history of Arabia and that of the religious world in the Mediterranean basin would have been changed. Is it really too late to divert the course of events? The Christians of Mecca certainly knew Mohammed by reputation: he made enough noise by serving the Jews! He went directly from idol worship to the worship of Yahweh. Never had he looked towards the Christian Church before his conversion, and even less so after his allegiance to the God of Israel. But was all hope lost to attract him to the religion of Christ? Couldn't we make up for lost time? Mohammed has already made his Mosaic profession of faith, the Corab is already composed, when the Christians, after having made their mea culpa, decide to intervene publicly in the debate. One of their priests, undoubtedly the most learned, either the priest of Mecca or the bishop of the Christian community, takes the initiative. Just as the rabbi had revealed to the Meccans the great characters of the Old Testament, this priest begins to preach about Saint John the Baptist, about the Virgin Mary, about Christ, son of God. This preaching is a direct response to the rabbinic message and constitutes an eleventh-hour effort to wrest Mohammed from Israel's grip.

We do not have the text of the sermons of the Priest of Mecca. But, from the responses given by the Rabbi, we can easily conjecture their content. The priest does not reject the revelations of Mount Sinai. Like all Christians, he teaches and preaches the Old Testament. However, the faith of Christians is attached to the person of Christ. Moses, undoubtedly, cleared the ground by driving out idols, destroying any pantheon, whatever its nature, proclaiming the Uniqueness of God. But Jesus came. He taught the world extraordinary things that completed and crowned, without destroying it, the great message of Moses. By presenting himself as the Son of God, Jesus, son of Mary, was already announcing by this very fact the existence of the Father. Later, to comfort his disciples, he had predicted the sending of the Holy Spirit. Father, Son and Holy Spirit, they were however only one and the same God, Unique in his nature. Christians had meditated at length on this mystery. Armed with a powerful philosophy, which the priest of Mecca must have known perfectly well, they concluded, after many debates and explanations, that God is alone, unique in nature, but in a trinity of persons.

Meccans, listen well, yes, God is unique. This great revelation, He made it Himself to Moses; but His unity of nature does not exclude the trinity of persons: we

Christians, we believe in Jesus Christ, Son of the Father, equal to the Father, God like the Father, and we believe in the Holy Spirit, third person within the Unique God. Moses is completed in Christ! The Torah is clarified in the Gospel: Judaism ends in Christianity. Jesus, son of Mary and second person of the Holy Trinity, is our Master and should also be yours, sons of Israel! It is your prophets who announced His coming; it is they again who predicted His birth from a virgin; it is John the Baptist, one of yours who, finally, preached the good news of Jesus-God!

The priest of Mecca undoubtedly took years to understand the danger of Mohammed's conversion to Judaism. He finally understood that the trio - (the rabbi, Khadidja and Mohammed, the Arab married to a Jew and converted to Jewish Islam) - could be a destructive force for Arab Christianity, which had already experienced hours of success and splendor! Was it too late to put a stop to this Jewish enterprise led by a Jew and trumpeted by an Arab? Through their mockery, the fetishists almost brought him back into their ranks. Could we not, as Christians, try to remove Mohammed from the synagogue and invite him into our church?

According to the Acts of Islam, the priest of Mecca would have centered his preaching around three main themes: John the Baptist, Mary, and Jesus. These are precisely the three themes that the rabbi takes up in the counter-attack he conducts with cunning and vigor to preserve all its rigidity to Jewish monotheism. Indeed, shortly after the composition of the Corab, we note that its Jewish author mixes with his usual stories about the Patriarchs of the Old Testament new stories about the New Testament. As we will see incessantly, these stories, in the mouth of the rabbi, lose all Christian flavor. He even gives them a frankly anti-Christian direction. Decently, one could not expect anything else from a rabbi fighting against a priest, right in the middle of an Arab environment! But here it is! Our famous scholars did not see that these stories about John the Baptist, Mary and Jesus were only a response to Christian preachings, and that these responses had only one goal: to refute Christianity to make way for the only Jewish religion.

Not understanding anything about this insertion of Christian stories into the Pseudo-Quran, our great Quran scholars have launched into a host of hypotheses that make us doubt human common sense. My dear readers, I make you judges, and you will also judge the dissertation that follows. For now, follow the reasoning of the great leaders who occupy the high chairs of the State. Sit comfortably to avoid losing balance. So, having understood nothing neither about the historical origins of Arab Islam — an extension of Jewish Islam — nor about the composition of the Arabic Quran, a transposition of the Hebrew Quran, our good old Quran scholars tell us without any hesitation — (it would be a sin, for a good old Quran scholar, to hesitate or even to appear simply hesitant) — that Mohammed, whom they have never seen the role of a bugle, composed the Quran. Naturally, they do not believe a single word of these stories of divine revelation in a cave on Mount Hira! When they talk about it, pretending to believe in it a little, it is to please Muslims. But let's not lose the thread of our thought. So Mohammed, according to these good old Quran scholars, composed the

Arabic Quran himself. But how could this Arab who, by definition is as ignorant as his compatriots, have composed this masterpiece? It's very simple; it only took the subtle intelligence of a Quran scholar to think about it. As far as I am concerned, I could never have imagined such a solution on my own. As for you, dear readers, realize this hypothesis well; Mohammed could neither read nor write; so it is not in books that he learned the Jewish and Christian stories that he dictated to his army of secretaries. Since he did not read these stories, he therefore heard them. This is high philosophy man can furnish his intelligence with fables or foreign stories only by means of two senses sight or hearing. Mohammed could have used sight: he was not blind, although he was probably bleary-eyed, like many of his compatriots who stubbornly refuse to wear a cap to protect themselves from the sun. If Mohammed did not use sight to learn about these stories, it is simply because he could not read. And even if he could read, he would have had to know Hebrew to learn Jewish stories, since the Hebrew Quran, at the time of his conversion, had not yet been translated into Arabic or adapted in this language; he would also have had to know Latin and the Vulgate since the Christian Gospels had not yet been translated into Arabic either. So without being blind sight is certainly forbidden to Mohammed as a means of information. But fortunately he still had hearing left. All this as we can see is sound logic! So it is by oral means that this famous Mohammed was able to learn about the stories of Adam Noah Abraham Lot Jacob Joseph Jonah Tobit Moses Aaron Pharaoh David Solomon Queen Sheba and Talmudic commentaries and Midrashim and stories about John the Baptist Mary virgin mother of Jesus Jesus Christ Christians. Think dear readers if Mohammed needed a trained memory! Arrived at this point in their demonstration our good old Quran scholars feel an irresistible need: to pour out absolutely everything they know about Semitic memory. The sincere historian still has good moments in life! because all this is really very amusing... or rather would be very amusing if it were not so pitiful.

So, it was through contacts with Jews and Christians that Mohammed learned Jewish and Christian stories. The question remains as to where these contacts were made! You don't see it, dear readers? But it's quite simple: while leading his caravans, the camel driver Mohammed had to sleep somewhere. No doubt, he often slept under the stars; but sometimes, he fancied asking for hospitality at some Christian monasteries along the roads of Palestine. Mohammed was invited to "break bread", after which, he "had a good chat with the monks, delighted to answer all the questions of a host so curious about religious issues. That's where he learned so well about John the Baptist, the Virgin Mary and her son Jesus! Between us, how many nights our camel driver must have spent, during his caravans, at his friend Bahira's, a Christian monk, to come back with so many documents in mind!

Obviously, all of this doesn't "stand up", you realize that, dear readers. Allow me a small digression, a digression not of erudition, but a simple reflection of human experience. Here, naturally, it is about my own experience, which is as follows: during my existence, I have learned to be wary, a priori and consciously, of two categories of people: politicians and Islamists. As soon as I see a politician on the shield, my first reaction is this: "what "bad and nasty" actions could he have committed to reach such a

high position? Then, as soon as an Islamist publishes a new volume, instantly, my intelligence rears up: what nonsense will I read in this lucubration? Despite saying and strongly repeating that France is a great Muslim power, protector of Islam, we are not obliged to marry the naiveties of our Quran scholars!

And Mohammed's Jewish documentation? According to our scholars, it was in Mecca itself that he would have found it. For once, our Quran scholars are imprecise. The Jews have so often and so long told Mohammed the stories of Noah, Abraham, Lot, Joseph, Jonah, Tobit, Moses, Aaron, Pharaoh, David, Solomon, and the Queen of Sheba, that it is permissible to wonder if Mohammed invited the Meccan Jews to his table, or if he went to them himself. From what we have just guessed, our Quran scholars would opt for this second solution, since they repeat - this is one of their great discoveries - that Mohammed was getting information by going from tavern to tavern. We believe that, here again, by delving a little into the subject, our scholars could have distinguished two periods: before Mohammed's marriage, and after. - Before his marriage, we could very well admit with our great scholars that Mohammed, having no money, frequented only taverns like those found in all the "black villages" of Euro-African cities. But after his marriage, he had his wife's cash box. Muslims, who do not always have a very chaste language, would say that he had money! And we do not see why, under these conditions, the husband of the rich Khadidja would have been continually a client of taverns instead of treating himself to the chic restaurants of Mecca.

Dear readers, pause for a moment: do all these stories from our great scholars really seem normal and serious to you? Do you see Mohammed spending entire evenings in Jewish shops, with or without his wife, to listen to all the grand and beautiful adventures of Abraham, Joseph and Moses? Do you see him returning "to his huts" after his hikes in the North, gathering all his comrades and having them write on pieces of crockery or sheep bones the precious information collected from his friend Bahira and the Christian monks?

Above all, don't believe that I am inventing all these stories myself to amuse you. No, no, no. All of this is written by the great Arabico-Quranic scholars, professors of the Sorbonne or the Collège de France, old, recent or still living. One would think that these men, as soon as they approach the problems of the Quran and Islam, are struck by "judicial paralysis"! They also imagine, in their vanity, that the world is in admiration of them as soon as they utter the slightest word. Times have changed. We now demand full health in Islamic studies. It's high time to purify the atmosphere and detoxify ourselves.

Let's get back to reality: Mohammed is therefore not at all involved in the composition of the Corab, nor in the composition of the Lauds Prayer, nor in the composition of the Acts of Islam, works of the rabbi of Mecca. This rabbi, quite naturally, has given as a pivot to the events he recounts, the Old Testament. That's why you will find in the Book of Acts the main stories contained in the Bible, with

interpretations and commentaries circulating in Jewish schools. So far, our mind is perfectly at rest.

Let's now examine the case of Christian stories. My dear readers, would you understand a rabbi who would start preaching in his synagogue, recommending Christian truths as we understand them? This rabbi would soon perceive disturbances in the assembly of his faithful. Be certain that the Jews of the 7th century behaved no differently than the Jews of the 20th century on this chapter. If the rabbi of Mecca told the stories of John the Baptist, the Virgin Mary, Jesus, it was certainly not to propose them as an object of faith to his Arab Muslims! If he talks about it, it is on the contrary to refute them, to empty them of their Christian substance. As we will see in detail, these stories inserted by the rabbi into his Corab have lost all Christian significance. They are opposed to Christianity. Let's continue our reasoning which is based on the authentic texts of the Acts of Islam: if the rabbi counterattacks, it is to respond to the attacks of Christians who superimpose the purest figures of Christianity on the great patriarchs of Judaism. The presence of these Christian texts in the Corab thus takes on its true meaning. They do not represent pro-Christian proposals coming from poor Mohammed, but anti-Christian responses from the rabbi, responses made necessary by the preaching of the priest of Mecca, whose main themes we now know.

1. — John the Baptist - You always talk about Moses, but we have Christ, announced by Saint John the Baptist, whom the Church rightly calls the Precursor, the Prophet who precedes Christ and reveals his presence. You know the Gospels "And you, little child," proclaims Zechariah addressing his son, "you will be called Prophet of the Most High, for you will precede the Lord to prepare his ways, to give his people knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of sins... You will enlighten those who stand in the darkness of shadow and death (Luke 1, 76, 77, 79). I, John, am nothing; I am just a voice crying in the wilderness. I am only the herald of a new message: "Prepare the way of the Lord, as Isaiah predicted (xl, 3-5). He comes — he is here — "the one who is more powerful than me, and whose shoes I am not worthy to untie. He holds the winnowing fork to clean his threshing floor and gather the grain into his barn; as for the chaff (straw), he will consume them in a fire that does not go out" (Luke iii, 16). It is through Jesus, my brothers, that the history of Israel will end; it is through Jesus and with Jesus that Yahweh's millennial mercy towards his people will find its total perfection. John the Baptist is Israel's past; but John has been given a mission to announce a new future bathing — like this past in which he plunges his roots — in God's Mercy.

John the Baptist can only be understood historically in relation to Jesus; he is the precursor. John's mission is to announce a dizzying future to the people of Israel. He came to prepare the Jews for a long-anticipated leap forward, but unsuspected in its dimensions. He is the hinge that connects the ancient times of Abraham and Moses to the new times of Jesus. My brothers, Saint John the Baptist calls you to Christ-Jesus. Through his preaching, he surpasses Abraham and Moses, without denying them at all. The path traced by Moses for all humanity can only end in Christ, the God of

Christians. Jews are only unfinished believers. Through his revelations from Sinai, Moses had placed them on the right path, but they stopped before they had finished their normal course. Mohammed, do not act like them. The rabbi and your wife are obstacles to your full development. You have abandoned the Ka'ba to go and pray in the synagogue. That's good! But you still have a big step to take: leave the synagogue and come to our church; there you will find the Son of God, God like his Father, on an equal footing with his Powerful and Creator Father. Moses can only be fully understood through Christ announced by John the Baptist.

Will Mohammed let himself be taken by the Christians? Will the priest of Mecca prevail over the rabbi? The problem of John the Baptist is now posed in Mecca, publicly and officially. He risks thwarting the apostolate of the head of the synagogue. It is necessary to react. This reaction of the rabbi against Christian preaching, we find it in surah xix, named surah of Mary, from the second Meccan period, roughly contemporary with the composition of the Arabic Quran:

1. — Story of your Lord's Mercy towards his servant Zechariah.
2. — When (Zechariah) secretly invoked his Lord,
3. — he said "Lord! my bones, in me, are weakened, and my head has been enlightened by old age.
4. — In my prayer to You, Lord, I was never unhappy.
5. — But I fear my relatives, after me. Although my wife is sterile, grant me a descendant from You,
6. — so that he may inherit from the family of Jacob, and make him pleasing to You, Lord! »
7. — "O Zechariah! We announce to you the good news of a son, whose name will be John.
8. — Never before have we given this name.
9. — Zechariah said: "How could I have a son? My wife is sterile and I am already advanced in age.
10. — (God) said: "Thus speaks your Lord: this is easy for Me, since I created you previously, when you were nothing.
11. — (Zechariah) said "Lord, grant me a sign". God said: "Your sign is that you will not speak to men for three whole days."
12. — (Zechariah) came out of the sanctuary towards his people and he signaled them to celebrate God's praises, morning and evening.
13. — "O John! Take the Book with strength." And we gave him Wisdom in his childhood
14. — as well as tenderness and purity. (John) was pious, good to his father and mother. He was neither violent nor disobedient.
15. — May peace be upon him on the day he was born. (May it be upon him) on the day he dies and on the day of his resurrection.

These verses, as you can see, summarize the generally known and accepted facts about the birth of John the Baptist, son of Zechariah and Elizabeth: the old age of the couple, the sterility of the household, the unpleasant allusions of the people and priests towards Zechariah, unworthy to be high priest since he had no children, Zechariah's prayer to the Lord; the announcement of a son despite the advanced age of Zechariah and his wife, Zechariah's doubt, his punishment; the birth of the son, named John; the recognition of the people.

For this counter-attack, the rabbi undoubtedly used the Gospel of Childhood, written in Syriac and already translated into Arabic. However, there is no indication that the rabbi was inspired by Saint Luke. It cannot be asserted with certainty that the canonical Gospels were translated into Arabic at that time. And even if the rabbi had knowledge of the text of Saint Luke, it must be strongly maintained that he fundamentally disagreed with this text. The main idea of the Gospel is to highlight Yahweh's mercy towards the people of Israel by presenting as a miracle the birth of Saint John the Baptist, and by making him the precursor and announcer of Jesus. The entire Gospel narrative is dominated by this messianic view. At the birth of his son, it is towards Yahweh, the God of Israel, that Zechariah turns to give thanks: "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, because he has visited and redeemed his people". But the history of Israel does not only concern the past. The future projects itself before it: a new future, awaited for centuries. Until now, despite the unique prerogatives it enjoyed, the Chosen People had only completed the first stage of its journey. Before John the Baptist, Jewish piety rested on the Law and the Prophets (Saint Luke, xvi, 16). But Law and Prophets are only a door ajar towards the abyss of divine mercy. Law and Prophets were not the true light. John was the precursor who was going to open wide the door to the divine message that was going to prepare the way for a new future much brighter for the history of Israel than all the past had been since Abraham and Moses.

There is no question of these future prospects and this Messianic message of John — the center of the Gospel narrative — in the Acts of Islam. The John the Baptist of the Acts is a John the Baptist split from his message, split from his new future of Israel, totally split from Jesus. John the Baptist is, in the Acts, a Prophet, but a Prophet without a message. In the Acts, John is nothing more than a sign, among so many others, of Yahweh's mercy towards the Chosen People, without any link with the Christian future: he announces nothing, he is the precursor of nothing and no one without a link with Jesus, he does not belong to the Christian world.

In summary, the rabbi of Mecca found himself one day obliged to counter-attack the priest of the Meccan parish who, in an attempt to reconnect Mohammed and the few recruits grouped around him, ardently presented Christian doctrines. The rabbi obviously responded to him using the same terms: you talk about John the Baptist, but this holy man belongs to us; he is part of our history. Certainly Mohammed, you can believe it. John the Baptist is not contrary to Moses, nor to any of our Prophets. He continues their lineage. In short, according to the rabbi, John is "a good person", but he has nothing to do with Christianity.

From this dissertation, it is especially important to remember that “the little verse about John the Baptist” found in the Acts of Islam was not invented or written by Mohammed, nor whispered in his ear by the great Allah. Mohammed and Allah are absolutely innocent. The rabbi remains in contention: he undoubtedly did not insert this story into his Acts to please Christians. He was obliged to do so to defend his own cause with Mohammed and his small group of converts to Judaism. It is absurd to look at these lines on John the Baptist as a reminder of Christianity, as our too naive Quranists do. On the contrary, it is a clearly anti-Christian position that we find in the Acts of Islam.

2. — The Virgin Mary - This is exactly the same case as for Saint John the Baptist. Everything that is said in the Acts of Islam on this Marian theme: is only a response from the rabbi, to the preaching of the priest of Mecca, in a naturally anti-Christian sense.

Let’s first read the texts from Surah XIX: 16. — And mention in the Book Mary, when she withdrew from her parents to the East. 17. — She separated from them. And we sent her Our Spirit and he presented himself to her in the form of a perfect man. 18. — “I take refuge in the Merciful because of you,” said (Mary). May you fear God! 19. — “I am,” he replied, “only the Messenger of your Lord to give you a pure son. 20. — “How can I have a son,” she asked, “when no man has touched me and I am not a prostitute.” 21. — “So it will be,” he said. “This is how your Lord spoke, this is easy for Me and We will certainly make him a sign for men and (a) proof of Mercy from Us: it is a decreed affair.”

These verses 16-21 of Surah XIX constitute the large Marian block of the Pseudo-Quran! How many Christians eager for syncretism have not swooned over this text? Providence is still very good to have revealed to us the Marian piety of Mohammed! — I would not want for anything in the world to harm anyone, or to darken the serenity of our dear Quranists; but it would still be good, before concluding, to carefully reread the texts of the Pseudo-Quran and to group together the concrete and positive data that emerge from it. To not forget any, let’s take good care to catalog them.

a) Mary’s Retreat to the Temple (xix, 16-17). — This retreat is recounted in more detail in the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew (ed. Michel Peeters, apocryphal gospels, vol. I, 1911, p. 73): “Now, after nine months had passed: Anne gave birth to a daughter and named her Mary. And when she had weaned her in the third year, Joachim and his wife Anne went together to the Lord’s temple and, while offering sacrifices to the Lord, they presented their little daughter Mary so that she might live with the virgins who spent day and night praising God. When she had been placed before the Lord’s temple, she climbed the fifteen steps running, without looking back and without asking for her parents, as children usually do. And this fact struck everyone with astonishment, to the point that the priests of the Temple themselves were in admiration.”

b) The Annunciation (xix, 17-21). The Annunciation can be broken down, so to speak, into several scenes: first, the appearance of a spirit in the form of a perfect man; then, Mary's fear in front of this man; finally, the dialogue between Mary and God's emissary. When reading the Pseudo-Quran, we still think of the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew: "A young man appeared whose beauty could not be described. Mary, seeing him, was seized with fear and began to tremble. He said to her: "Fear not, Mary, you have found favor with Me" (ibid. ch. ix, ed. cit. p. 89). "And Mary became pregnant without the help of a man and generations will know her as the Virgin Mary" (ibid. ch. ix, ed. cit. p. 87-89).

Your conclusion is clear: the rabbi, when he was writing the 19th surah in Mecca, had a copy of the Bible in Hebrew in his library; he had already composed the Corab. The priest of Mecca, faced with the danger of Judaization of the Arabs, which he had just become aware of, began with his preaching a movement of grand style: knowing the Gospels as the rabbi knew the Old Testament, he preached the reign of Jesus Christ, son of Mary and Son of God, announced by the Prophets, preceded by John the Baptist, who demonstrated to his listeners that Moses and the Law had only been a beginning, but that Christ-God marked the point of completion of God's great mercy towards humanity.

To respond to the priest, the rabbi does not take the Gospels; he rereads the Apocrypha: the Gospel of Childhood, written in Arabic; the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, in Hebrew; and probably also, the Proto-Gospel of James, in its Hebrew form. Moreover, he transforms his sources of information in order to break any link between the Virgin Mary and the "Christ of Christians". In the Pseudo-Quran, the Virgin Mary has absolutely nothing to do with Christ. Of Mary, Mother of God, nothing remains. As he had done for John the Baptist, the rabbi rejects in Israel's past the Mother of Jesus, and deliberately ignores any Christian perspective.

Let's resume reading the Pseudo-Quran, to grasp its exact meaning and uncover the intention of its author. First of all, let's note that there is no identity between Mary, daughter of Anne and Joachim, and the Mary of the Acts of Islam. According to the rabbi, Mary would be the sister of Aaron and Moses: "O sister of Aaron, your father was not an unworthy father, nor your mother a prostitute." (sour. xix, 29.) This astonishing text has naturally tormented our dear Quranists. Let's see! This is not possible! Mohammed was too intelligent to have made such a confusion! He had too good a memory! Moreover, if it is Allah who inspired the great Arab Prophet, how could this great God have made such a blunder? Could we be in the presence of a bad transcription of the revelations dictated by Mohammed, under the fire of inspiration, to his army of secretaries? How annoying this little text is! It is from confessions of this kind that examining magistrates demolish all the argumentation of their clients.

Well, no! There is no transcription error. There is no error or simple slip of the tongue by the rabbi. For him, Mary, mother of Jesus, is really the sister of Moses and Aaron; at least he pretends to believe it; He was quite certain that no one could

contradict him. One could not mock his audience in a more cynical way. The rabbi's contempt for the Arabs is indeed manifested many times in the Pseudo-Quran. To rally them to Judaism, had he not promised them as supreme happiness the love of women and little boys! Now, sure of "impunity", he tells them that Mary is Moses' sister.

This statement says a lot about the rabbi's opinion of the Arabs. It is hard to be more contemptuous. The Jews were not only the custodians of the Truth, but they were "civilized". God, the One, Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth, had chosen them as confidants. Behind them, they had a whole past of military glory, territorial conquests. They had stable administrative and political organizations. They had "civility". They knew how to wash themselves! (Malachi iii, 2; Mark ix, 3). The Jews could also boast of a whole secular literature which, even today, is the glory of their civilization! Is there a people who have composed prayers as beautiful, as moving as those of the Psalmist? Who has expressed feelings as delicate as the author of the Song of Songs? Who has opened up perspectives as grandiose as Isaiah and Jeremiah? It is the entire Old Testament that tells the glory of Israel! And next to the revealed Books, one should also mention all the work of commentators and exegetes.

In the face of this past greatness, what did the idolatrous Arabs represent for a Jew, if not a Semitic waste? And the rabbi of Mecca does not deprive himself of telling them his contempt, assured that they would not even understand it! The priest talks to you about Mary, Mother of Jesus, whom some Jews have made a new religion. Come on, gentlemen! All this is false; Mary belongs to Judaism; she was not born yesterday, nor even seven centuries ago. She is the sister of Moses..., and the Meccan idolaters "swallow" these nonsense. It is no coincidence that the rabbi tells the idolaters this enormity. His senseless genealogy did not exist in any of the sources he could consult. This genealogy of Mary is a pure invention of the rabbi instructor of Mohammed: a wanted and premeditated invention.

In the Bible, Moses' father is called Imram or Amran, son of Kohath, from the family of Levi (Exodus vi, 18-19). Amran married Jochebed, his aunt, and they had three children: Miriam, Aaron, Moses. In Surah xix, 29, by identifying Mary, mother of Jesus, with Aaron's sister, the rabbi therefore intended to make Mary the daughter of Amran and the sister of Moses: "O sister of Aaron! Your father was not a wicked man, nor was your mother a prostitute." (Surah xix, 29.) According to some exegetes, the expression "Mary, sister of Aaron," would have no historical value in the rabbi's mouth. It would only represent an oratorical formula, as one says "Mary, daughter of David". But this interpretation, imagined by commentators to remove from Mohammed a too glaring folly, does not stand up to the texts.

The proof that the text xix, 29, is neither symbolic nor fortuitous, is that it is not unique in the Pseudo-Quran. The expression "sister of Aaron" is found there as a synonym for the daughter of Amran, father of Moses and Aaron. Mary is really presented to the idolatrous, ignorant and uncultured Arabs, not as the daughter of Joachim, - as the rabbi could read in the Gospel of Childhood - but as the daughter of

Amran: 30. — Yahweh chose Adam, Noah, your family of Abraham and the family of 'Imran over all the world as descendants of each other. Yahweh hears and knows everything. 31. — (Remember) when 'Imran's wife said: "Lord! I dedicate to you what is in my womb. Accept it from me! Truly, You hear and You know everything! When she gave birth (the wife of 'Imran) she cried out: "Lord, I have given birth to a daughter." 32. — ... Zechariah took charge of her. Now, every time he entered her presence in the sanctuary, he found with her a necessary subsistence. "O Mary," he asked one day, "how do you have this?" (sour. iii).

In this text, it is noticeable that Mary is truly designated as the daughter of 'Imran's wife. Anne is no longer mentioned. As for Zechariah, he is no longer the father of Mary as named in the Apocrypha, but rather her protector in some way. It is also unclear where he comes from. The rabbi cites him without introducing him.

It is still as the daughter of 'Imrân that the mother of Jesus is designated in surah lxvi, 12: 'He thus proposed the example of Mary, daughter of 'Imrân who remained a virgin.'

The identification of the Virgin Mary and Aaron's sister is therefore not an isolated fact in surah xix. It belongs to a genealogical system deliberately invented by the rabbi. P. Abd el Jalil is naturally very embarrassed by all these texts: "Whatever the Quran may be, we must refrain from accusing Islam of making such a confusion (between Mary the Virgin Mother of Christ, and Mary sister of Aaron); we must renounce easy and vain argumentation and ineffective and unpleasant insinuations." (*Aspects intérieurs de l'islam*, p. 13). This text, for an objective historian, calls for serious reservations: why should we refrain from accusing Islam? We do not have to accuse, but simply to note that Mary is presented in several texts as the sister of Aaron... mother of Jesus! (sour. xix, 29; lxvi, 12; iii, 30-31). It is not a question of joking or mocking: the situation is such, and not otherwise. Obviously, it's very embarrassing. But to console P. Abd el Jalil, let's point out to him right away that Islam, the religion of the Arabs, is not a game. We also know that Arab Islam has no identity of its own. Islam is first and foremost Judaism. In this mad assimilation of the two Marys (Mary mother of Jesus, and Mary daughter of 'Imrân), neither Jewish Islam, nor consequently Arab Islam are at issue. Islam is only an attitude of submission to the Law, and by the Law, to Yahweh; it is not in this attitude that we find the identification of the two Marys. It's in a book. If this book was written by Mohammed, on his own initiative, we must squarely conclude that he was quite ignorant. He would even have failed his patent. If this book was inspired by Allah, we must still conclude that Allah needs to revise his history, since he has forgotten many basic notions. But let's reassure ourselves, we now know in a peremptory way that neither Allah nor Mohammed have anything to do with the Acts of Islam or Pseudo-Quran referred to by P. Abd el Jalil; they have nothing to do with the Coran written earlier by the rabbi, Quran in Arabic language today lost. May our great Quranists regain some of their calm: in the court of history, the case of the confusion of the two Marys ends with a dismissal for Allah as well as for Mohammed. The only responsible for these damages - if there are any - can

only be the rabbi, author of the Acts. Forced to address the Christian problem, he will have only one goal: to break all relations of the characters he opposes with Christianity. John the Baptist is a holy man, but has no role as a precursor; he only belongs to Jewish history. Likewise Mary, mother of Jesus. She is a virgin: had not Isaiah said: "The Lord himself will give you a sign: behold, the Virgin has conceived and she will bear a son, and she will give him the name Emmanuel." (vii, 13-14). But to separate the Virgin Mary from Christianity, the rabbi confuses all chronological data without shame, certain that not a single Arab will rise to contradict him: Mary mother and virgin announced by Isaiah raised by Zacharias daughter of 'Imrân and sister of Moses and Aaron! We touch with our finger so to speak what Jews in the 7th century thought about Arabs from Mecca. In front of this Marian cocktail how can we judge the attitude of Christians who come to sing us at every turn and out of place Muslim worship for Virgin Mary!

3 — Jesus, son of Mary. - After having spoken of John the Baptist by completely concealing his messianic role, then of Mary by making her unrecognizable through the fanciful genealogy that he fabricates for her, the rabbi necessarily addresses the question of Jesus. It could not be otherwise in the face of Christian preaching. Even before reading the texts, we can be certain that the author of the Pseudo-Quran will strive to break the personality of Jesus, to deny him divine nature, to reject him in the past of Israel to take him away from Christians. Indeed we read in Acts that Jesus is only a Prophet, similar to hundreds of Jewish Prophets; it would be a monstrous blasphemy to present him as God, Son of God. That said, we leave our dear Quranists such as Tor Andræ, Massignon, Abd el Jalil, and their little friends, such as Y. Moubarac, full freedom to make their stew (10) by mixing Christianity and Islamism in the same pot to reduce them to the state of porridge at once emollient and unifying, for toothless intellectuals. It is needless to add, I think, that Muslims do not put their hand to all this cooking, culinary masterpiece of Arabic-Quranists, believers or unbelievers, and Western apologists some of whom are already stunted before their growth! Let's go back to our text. Let's read on from Surah xix:

3. — And (Mary) conceived and she withdrew with him into a remote bond.
4. — The pains surprised her near a palm tree trunk: "May it please God", she exclaimed, "that I had died before this moment and that I was totally forgotten!"
5. — The one who was at her feet cried out "Do not grieve! Your Lord has put a stream at your feet.
6. — Shake towards you the trunk of the palm tree; you will drop towards you fresh and ripe dates.
7. — Eat and drink and let your eye dry! and if you see someone, tell him:
8. — "I have vowed to fast for the Most Merciful and I will not speak today to anyone."
9. — She went (carrying the child) to her own people. "O Mary", they said, "you have done a monstrous thing.
10. — O sister of Aaron! your father was not a wicked man, nor your mother a prostitute!"

11. — (Mary) signaled towards the child. “How”, they said, “would we speak to a child who is still in the cradle.”
12. — But (the child) said: "I am servant of Yahweh. He gave me Scripture and made me a prophet!
13. — He blessed me wherever I am. He recommended me prayer and alms as long as I remain alive,
14. — and piety towards my mother. He did not make me miserable and proud.
15. — And peace was upon me the day I was born; (may it be) upon me the day I die and the day I will be resurrected."
16. — This is Jesus, son of Mary, according to the word of truth, about which they discuss.
17. — It could not be possible that Yahweh takes any child. Praise be to Him (Yahweh). When he has decided something, he says: “Be”, and it is.

Verses 22-26 report the episode of the palm tree, according to the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, which, moreover, places this scene during the flight to Egypt.

Regarding verses 28-30, which relate to Mary’s entry among her own people, we find no trace in the sources that the rabbi could have consulted.

Verses 31-32 seem to recall the text of the Gospel of Infancy: “I am Jesus, the Son of God, the Word, whom you have given birth to, as the angel Gabriel announced to you, and my Father sent me to save the world.” (Op. cit., ch. i; ed. cit., p. 1). Between the two documents, there is indeed a certain resemblance: in both documents, Jesus speaks in the cradle; moreover, the child’s words present certain common points that lead us to believe that the rabbi really had the Gospel of Infancy before his eyes. But here, dear readers, I want to put the two texts in parallel for you, so that you can grasp for yourself the deep intentions of the rabbi, author of Corab and Acts of Islam, or Pseudo-Quran:

Gospel of Infancy Jesus speaks... and says to his mother I am Jesus, the Son of God The Word Whom you have given birth to And my father sent me to save the world.

Pseudo-Quran XIX, 31 (Addressing Mary), he says: I am The servant of Yahweh He gave me Scripture and made me a Prophet.

As it is clear, the Gospel of Infancy presents Jesus as the son of the Virgin Mary and at the same time as the Son of God. He is the Word, which Christians will later call the second person of the Holy Trinity. On the other hand, in the Pseudo-Quran, Jesus is no longer in any way the Son of God. Such an assertion is a scandal for a Jew raised in the most rigorous Mosaic monotheism! How would you expect a Jew to dare to call Jesus the Son of God? This would be to deny all

of Israel's history, the reason for the existence of the Hebrew and Jewish people. The only torture inflicted on the Gospel of Infancy by the author of the Acts of Islam is, in itself, conclusive proof that the author of this latter work is an authentic Jew. Once again, let's notice how amusing it is to see the traditional and irrational veneration of Arabs for a book they believe was revealed by Allah and which is, in reality, only the work of a rabbi from Mecca. If one day, Arab Muslims become aware of this historical observation, they will never be able to rise from their prostrations again and will all disappear into the sand. The time is near for this disappearance.

Not only does the rabbi not want a Jesus who is Christ, Son of God, but he also categorically refuses to see the son of the Virgin as the savior of the world. The divine personality and the saving mission of Jesus are rigorously excluded from the Pseudo-Quran, an exclusive work of the rabbi, as they were necessarily from the true Arabic Quran, a simple echo of the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, how could one say that Jesus, in his cradle, had received the Book of Gospels? Let's not forget, the Mother of Jesus was presented to ignorant Arabs as the sister of Moses. It is then logical, in this line of thought, to have Jesus say that Yahweh had given him Scripture (that is, the Pentateuch), and had made him a Prophet.

Jesus, son of Mary, and not the Son of God; Jesus, servant of Yahweh, and not the Savior of the world; Jesus ranked among the Hebrew Prophets, is no longer in any way the Jesus of the Christians. By thus transforming the Gospel of Infancy, which he nevertheless knew the exact content of, the author of Surah xix reveals once again who he is, and what his intentions are.

Conclusion - As can be seen in both an easy and technical way, these evangelical stories were not introduced by the rabbi into the Pseudo-Quran to bring Arab Islam closer to Christianity. On the contrary, they are precisely there to block the way for Christians, to break the influence of the priest of Mecca who, after a period of nonchalance, sought to regain success from Judaism, which he understood a little late the danger.

Let's put ourselves well in the mentality of our Meccan rabbi. According to him, there is only one chosen people: it is Israel. There is only one Law, that of Moses, the Torah. There is only one God, Yahweh. This trilogy forms a block against which any attempt at dissidence necessarily breaks. Everything that is not written in the Book that relates the revelations of Yahweh to Moses on Sinai during a famous night, is nothing but a lie: Praise be to Yahweh who brought down on his servant (Moses) the Scripture (the Pentateuch) where he did not put any detour. (It's a Book) straight to give warning of a severe calamity coming

from Him, and announce to Believers who do good (the Hebrews) that they will receive a beautiful reward (sour. xviii, 1-2).

For the rabbi, it is from this Hebrew Quran that one must judge the value of all religions. Any religion that does not conform to it is a false and deceitful religion. From this perspective, Christianity is presented as the greatest danger that Jews have ever known: (Yahweh brought down the Scripture on Moses) to warn those who say: “God has taken a Son for Himself.” (Neither these people) nor their fathers have any knowledge of Yahweh. Monstrous is the word that comes out of their mouths. They only tell a lie. (xviii, 3-4).

Since Moses, Israel was the “owner” of the Unique God. Israel was the only Chosen People, the only dispenser of Truth and morality. There is no racism more deeply rooted than the racism of this small, so privileged people. And here are men, Jews too, who came to dispossess them of their most beautiful titles, to burst the barriers of Jewish nationalism, by making Jesus, son of Mary, a new God, a God for all. These Jews have the audacity, in the name of religion itself, to want to perfect the religion of Moses! Jesus would have come to complete Moses and save humanity! What a monstrosity! (sour. xix, 91). So reflect, Christians, if you are capable. Reflect, idolaters, if you have some intelligence. Arab Muslims who have heard the voice of Mohammed calling you to the synagogue, listen well that Mary is Virgin, we can admit it. Isaiah had predicted it; Hebrew books, like the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew and the Protoevangelium of James also affirm it. What is turpitude, cries out the rabbi, is not that Mary is a virgin; it’s not that she’s Jesus’ mother while remaining a virgin. This miracle, announced by Isaiah, is all to Israel’s honor. What is turpitude is to proclaim that Mary is a virgin and mother of a God. To realize such blasphemy that shakes at its very roots the Mosaic dogma, one would have to say that then Mary is the wife of God. But since she is a virgin, she can be no one’s wife, much less God’s wife! No, Jesus is not the son of God since Yahweh has no wife: “Truly, Yahweh — may His Majesty be exalted — has taken neither companion nor son for Himself” (sour. lxxii, 3). “He who formed the heavens and the earth! How could he have a son when he has no companion!” (sour. vi, 101). To admit a son next to Yahweh or place associates next to Him or give Him a wife is to ruin the very idea of divinity, of Yahweh Almighty: God needs no one. Multiplicity is a consequence of weakness and insufficiency. The Almighty can only be unique: “Yahweh has never had a son and there is no other divinity with Him. (If it were otherwise) each divinity would claim what it had created, and some might be superior to others” (sour. xxiii, 43; xxi, 22). “All these gods would be decomposing!” (sour. xxi, 22). No, Yahweh has not taken a son (sour. xxv, 2). Mohammed, say and repeat well with me: “Glory to Yahweh who has not taken a son for Himself and who has no associate in his kingdom... Magnify him

greatly” (sour. xvii, 111; xxi, 22-26). The rabbi is tired of the priest’s preaching on the divinity of Jesus. So stop blaspheming! Israel is complete. After the revelation of Sinai there is nothing more to say. We can no longer bear such an outrage against Moses. No, no and no, the son of Mary is not son of God! He is only servant of Yahweh (sour. xix, 31), He is a prophet, a great prophet from the lineage of Noah, Isaac, Jacob, Moses Aaron David Solomon Zechariah John also from Elijah’s lineage, Ishmael Elisha and Lot (sour vi 84-86 xlii 11). Isn’t that a beautiful company?

As you understand, dear readers, Mohammed is completely outside of this religious discussion. The poor man, pushed towards Judaism by his wife, did not know so much about all these problems. The only characters involved are the priest of Mecca, who threw himself across the apostolate of the rabbi, and this same rabbi, composer of the Corab and the Prayer of Lauds, now busy writing, day by day, the Acts of Islam, witnesses of his struggles for the Judaization of Arabia.

The temperature is rising in Mecca. Minds are heating up and tongues are wagging.

The obstinate polytheists redouble their mocking attacks, their taunts, at Mohammed; they sometimes go so far as to disturb, “boycott”, we would say, the meetings of the first Judeo-Arabs. And now the Christians are joining in! But the rabbi wants to safeguard the work undertaken and push his advantage. No, he will not let the results of so much effort be destroyed by anyone. Always on the breach, his dialectic will never be caught out. He will give as good as he gets. He is sure of victory. Isn’t he fighting the good fight in the way of Yahweh?

APPENDICE

THE MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN JOKES

SMALTALK OUT OF HUMILITY

We wanted to dedicate an appendix to Christian-Muslim jests. Some will still accuse us of being polemical and lacking serenity in our criticism. We understand them very well, but we cannot let ourselves be stopped by such a grievance. We have already explained ourselves on this point, in the preface of our first volume on “Islam, Jewish Enterprise”; our readers, overall, have given us the testimony of their approvals and encouragements. We have published a part of these testimonies in the collective letter written especially for them under the title of “Islam and Historical Criticism” (11).

No, we don’t hold a grudge against anyone. We simply show, based on the solid conclusions, scientifically established, which our historical criticism work has led us to, the futility, the ridicule, and sometimes the harmfulness of certain initiatives specific to our time and, alas! to the men of our country, to doctrinally bring Catholicism and Islam closer together.

These clumsy maneuvers, always naive, come from the fact that their promoters have never deeply reflected on these problems. They simply took for sympathy towards Christianity the texts that constitute its most profound refutation.

CHAPTER I

CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM REAPPROCHMENT

A – interferences of politics and religion

The day after the conquest of Algeria, our politicians — it is extremely important to note this — immediately curbed the Catholic ambitions of the Church, to the detriment of the true France, where party issues too often take precedence over national future, much to the surprise of Algerian Muslims themselves. In a report on *The Separation of Muslim Worship and the State*, established by the Social Secretariat of Algiers, p. 7, it is rightly noted that “Muslims in Algeria, at the time of the conquest, wondered what would become of them; position of dhimmi (that is to say humiliated) by a kind of backlash — before the conquest, it was Jewish and Christian communities that were seen as inferior — or obligation to convert to Catholicism, purely and simply. It is known (and perhaps it has not been said loudly enough) that a good number of them resigned themselves in advance to the latter solution”.

The French government immediately stiffened and, to put an end to Catholic proselytism, imagined this famous respect for Islam and inaugurated, in opposition to the Christian religion, this senseless policy that the rulers would like today to reject on other parties the responsibility. This is an anti-clerical formula that this convention of July 5, 1830, which proclaims: “The exercise of the Mohammedan religion will remain free. The freedom of the inhabitants of all classes, their religion, their properties, their trade and their industry will not receive any attack.” Let our good apostles meditate on this letter sent by Father de Foucauld to the Duke of Fitz-James in 1912.

This prophetic letter is written by a man who had a genuine and deep experience of the Muslim world. It could still serve today as a guiding thread to bring some order to the confusion created by the false and often absurd ideas of the great directors of French politics.

"My thought is that if, little by little, gently, the Muslims of our colonial empire in Africa do not convert, there will be a nationalist movement similar to that of Turkey.

"An intellectual elite will form in the big cities, educated in the French way, an elite that will have lost all Islamic faith, but which will keep the label to be able to influence the masses through it.

"On the other hand, the mass of nomads and country people will remain ignorant, distant from us, firmly Muslim, driven by hatred and contempt for the French by their religion, their marabouts, by the contacts they have with the French (representatives of authority, settlers, traders), contacts which too often are not suitable to make us loved by them.

"The national or barbaric sentiment will therefore exalt itself in the educated elite when it finds the opportunity. For example, during difficulties in France at home or abroad, it will use Islam as a lever to lift up the ignorant mass and will seek to create an independent African Muslim empire.

"The North-West African empire of France, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, French West Africa, has 30 million inhabitants; it will have double that in fifty years thanks to peace.

"It will then be in full material progress, rich, crisscrossed by railways, and populated by inhabitants trained in handling our weapons, whose elite will have received instruction in our schools.

"If we have not been able to make these peoples French, they will drive us out. The only way for them to become French is for them to become Christians." (12)

Unfortunately, our politicians, often Freemasons (13), atheists and fundamentally anti-clerical, in order to undermine Catholicism — the fundamental goal of their action — not only stopped the conversion movement that everyone was waiting for and which, if it had taken place, would have avoided today the Algerian-Egyptian collusion or, more generally, Algerian-Arab collusion, but gave Islam direct or indirect encouragement. They encouraged the pilgrimage to Mecca, and this until after the Second World War; they favored the daily festivities of Ramadan, invented official and hollow language with these ridiculous formulas: respect for Islam, our Muslim brothers. The result is that they developed, by favoring Islam, the Arabization of Algeria. Catholic missionaries were forced to stop their activities or their apostolic initiatives. The White Fathers themselves came to judge as hasty and imprudent the generous steps of Cardinal Lavignerie. In order not to upset our politicians, the Catholic hierarchy recommended extreme slowness in dealings with Muslims, called prudence. It was no longer a question of conversion, but of distant preparation for this conversion of Islam. This preparation was concretized by some concrete reports, moreover confined to the three traditional cups of mint tea; also reports of good neighborliness, sometimes reports of example. But on the specifically religious and doctrinal ground, the two communities, Muslim and Christian, learned to live separately. The White Fathers gradually lost in North Africa their

ideal of true missionaries. They simply became parish administrators like all European clergy and if occasionally some erudite priests devoted themselves to the study of Islam, they only chose the folkloric, historical aspect without ever touching the doctrinal aspect; things went in such a way that today the ideal has become peaceful coexistence... when one does not think of finding in Islam religious beauties that Christianity might well envy (!!!). The gap was therefore dug between the two communities, Christian and Muslim, by the very fault of our politicians, by their lack of judgment since they did not expect the logical development of the situation. Muslims lost all confidence in these faithless politicians and began to see Catholics as their only true friends. Muslims no longer trust French politics. This is an undeniable fact that only our rulers deny in private and who judge Algeria only from files often fabricated for their own use by their own creatures.

It was then that the Catholics, who were noticing on the ground the lack of our politicians, resumed their initiatives, supporting them, moreover, on another springboard. Not working for a political party, nor to create a situation for themselves, nor for the pleasure of wearing a nice cap, these Catholics, while seeking to make known the truth of Christ, to establish relations with Muslims, emerged from the European mass of Algeria as the most authentic French. This was both their strength and their weakness. Their strength, in that Muslims respect only men of faith and consider them as their allies, as opposed to politicians. Their weakness also, because these Catholics, in order not to diminish in any way the radiance of France, sought to level the gap existing between Islam and Christianity. This new apologetics began with silence on the differences that constituted an insurmountable doctrinal barrier between the religion of Christ and the pseudo-religion attributed to Mohammed; this apologetics of silence quickly transformed into apologetics of similarities and leveling. We endeavored to highlight what we considered as common traits between the two religions. Without knowing it and surely without wanting it, we were thus playing into the hands of our anti-Christian politicians. Let us note that these two kinds of apologetics are recent and strictly French. Recent, because never in the Middle Ages, which knew much better than we do the doctrines of Islam, would we have imagined such a method. Moreover, these apologetics are strictly French. It is the French who have imagined themselves transformed into protectors of Islam. Did not Mr. Lacoste proclaim himself brother of Algerian Muslims? And therefore brother of Nasser, as Muslim as Ferhat Abbas! England, which welcomes several million Muslims into its Commonwealth, has never had the idea of proclaiming itself protector of Mohammed's disciples. American Protestant missionaries also take care not to pursue a policy of rapprochement with Islam. Such a policy dating from 1830 seems quickly to be the prerogative of French Catholics who

naively associate themselves with anti-clerical politicians who favor Islam in order to more effectively repel the Catholic Church from Muslim lands.

We do not want to follow in this wake. We have no reason, as Catholics, to minimize the Muslim error in any way. While remaining superiorly French, not only do we have no reason to spare Islam, this revealed pseudo-religion, but we consider it an absolute duty to fight against this historical scam, a cancer of the Mediterranean basin and a direct cause of the underdevelopment of so many poor wretches. We have no respect to profess towards Islam. For us, Catholics, the Quran is a human book that must be subjected to the requirements and laws of sound criticism. We do not have to play the game of our ephemeral politicians. How is it that these men who, by the game of parties, are brought to govern our country in a temporary way, rely on anti-Catholic principles, while in France the majority of inhabitants are Catholic, and that these same men transported to Algeria — an Algeria they only know from yesterday — start preaching in favor of the Muslim religion? Where does this sudden tenderness for “our Muslim brothers”, for “the Franco-Arab community” (!), for “the little Muslim children”, as Mr. Guy Mollet, President of the Council, used to say? Let us acknowledge in passing that, unlike Mr. Ramadier, Mr. Guy Mollet is not rebellious to any intellectual formation. One might even say that since the beginning of 1956 when he courageously left for Algeria with a large file under his arm to settle the serious problems of North Africa in a few days, he has lost his naivety. He has learned to distinguish Arabs and Berbers, to judge at its true value what fanatical Muslims pompously call holy war. Perhaps today he would no longer propose a truce for Christmas holidays, which bandit assassins care very little about. We hope that at each Christmas or Easter holiday, until our affairs in North Africa are put back in order, the government will not renew such blandnesses, and that our Catholic apologists will not sing the same refrain.

B. — Christiano-Muslim rapprochement on the sentimental level

A number of Catholics, even at the top of the hierarchy, are happy to talk about a friendship between Christians and Muslims. For example, Monsignor Paul Méouchi, Maronite Patriarch, stated some time ago (see *La Croix*, December 18, 1956) that Lebanon was increasingly moving “towards a coexistence marked by friendship between Christians and Muslims”. This speech was given at the 10th annual general assembly of the International Movement of Catholic Intellectuals of Pax Romana, held in Beirut. The speech of Mgr Meouchi is obviously a speech of circumstance inspired by the presence of Mr. Jamil Mekkaoui, Minister of Public Works of Beirut. Therefore, one should not give more value to the words of Mgr than they contain in the circumstance. Let’s talk about Christian-Muslim friendship, fine! Provided that this friendship

remains confined to good neighborly relations and does not engage in any way the dogma and thought of the Church. I would also allow myself to doubt this Christian-Muslim friendship in Lebanon. The Maronites who are fervent in this country precisely fear to wake up one day suffocated by Islam. Just take a look at a geographical map to realize the dramatic situation of this Christian country. Syria surrounds it to the South, North and East. Inside, Muslims are becoming more and more active, to such an extent that, for some years now, efforts have been made in Lebanon to give voting rights to expatriate Lebanese who are very numerous, and whose ballots could counterbalance the vote of Muslims living in their country where they are nevertheless foreigners. Moreover, every Lebanese will explain to you in Lebanon itself that it is constrained by the political situation and despite its Western culture, that it has opted for the Arab League, for which it feels only antipathy.

In the sentimental field, curious initiatives are also noted in France, which are not condemnable in themselves, but rather touching in their naivety; some slightly worried people will not hesitate to talk about a total lack of common sense. Naturally, it is always the same and inevitable characters that we find in these initiatives: Messrs. François Mauriac, Louis Massignon, etc. Here is what it is about: A group of Christians took the initiative to pray together on November 2, 1956, believers of all religions, and published the following appeal: "The situation has suddenly worsened in North Africa. Faced with growing hatreds and the threat of a generalized conflict where there is a risk of disappearing forever any possibility of friendship between the French people and the peoples of the Maghreb, the undersigned Christians launch an urgent appeal to believers (Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, Jews) and men of good will to make November 2 - All Souls' Day - a day of recollection and, if possible, private fasting, in a spirit of deep fraternal friendship. May their prayers rise that day to ask the Almighty for the advent of a just peace." Signed: Messrs. François Mauriac, Louis Massignon. Maurice Vaussard, Pierre Emmanuel, Lanza del Vasto, Jean Lacroix, Robert Barrat, André Mandouze, P. Chombart de Lauwe, G. Suffert, J. Chatagner, J. Scelles, J.-M. Domenach, Dr Louis-Paul Aujoulat.

Other Christians lament that Muslims do not understand them, and do not respond to their calls for collaboration. The newspaper *La Croix*, dated October 31, 1956, reports that: *La Vie Nouvelle*, a movement "of personalist and community inspiration bringing together activists who work in the social, political and religious order", after having organized very interesting meetings between Christians and Muslims this summer, has just held a national council which brought together 200 delegates. The declaration adopted by them regrets that the events of last week have harmed the friendship between French and Maghreb people, asks the Muslims of *La Vie Nouvelle* to "continue to believe in

its attachment and, despite the painful circumstances, not to despair of the future and the true face of France”.

At the time of the bloody repressions of the Russians in Hungary, “Christian personalities” thought it was an opportune moment to ask the French government to inaugurate a new policy in the Middle East and Algeria. Among these personalities, we inevitably find Mr. Massignon. These gentlemen believe that it is time for France “to break with the methods and habits of an outdated colonialism and contrary to the honor of our country”, and they adjure the government to inaugurate a new policy in the Middle East and Algeria.

Among the signatories of the appeal, the names of Pierre Emmanuel, Louis Massignon, Ph. Chombart de Lauwe, Robert Barrat, Jacques Madaule, P.-A. Lesort, J. Chatagner, André Cruizat are noted (La Croix, November 11 and 12, 1956).

We would not want to lack charity, nor justice. But we simply admit that we are part of these bad Christians who understand nothing of this apologetics which seems to us to lack simple common sense. This generosity, in our opinion, has no consistency; it rests only on troubled concepts, without vigor, without defined contours. To succeed in its enterprise, this “sentimental” group would have needed an audience of the same caliber. Fortunately, there is none among us. This apologetics has, in essence, no value. It is always the same politico-religious errors that form the basis of these more nervous than intelligent jolts: respect for Islam; fake and beatific admiration of the Muslim faith, distribution of postcards representing an Arab in prostration in the sand next to his camel, etc...

C. – Doctrinal rapprochement

This movement of rapprochement is even more recent than the sentimental rapprochement. One of the promoters of this movement was undoubtedly Asin Palacios. In works that caused a sensation about thirty years ago, this Spanish scholar noted that there was a Muslim mysticism, that between this mysticism and Christian mysticism there were many contacts, parallel points and that, consequently, one could very well pass quietly from one mysticism to another; Christians and Muslims speaking the same language, they could very well understand each other. At the time these works appeared, it was imagined to explain this parallel the use of the same sources: Muslims would have known works of spirituality composed by their “brother” Christians. This was the origin of a whole literature of justification, now quite outdated. Other writers, abandoning the field of literary criticism, sought in psychology the reason for this apparent parallelism between Christian mysticism and so-called Muslim

mysticism. Before belonging to a religion, man is man. Whether he is Buddhist, fetishist, Catholic or Muslim, he has fundamentally identical tendencies, and one of these tendencies is precisely the search for a being superior to us. It can therefore be explained that Muslims and Christians have common feelings and find identical formulas to express this identity of tendencies.

Let us note in passing that this Christian-Muslim parallelism does not exist as such, that the parallelism is exactly between Christian spirituality and spirituality as expressed in the Pseudo-Quran. The Pseudo-Quran having been composed by a Jew, we will obviously find there the religious conceptions of the Old Testament, insofar as Christianity takes up in its teaching the very spirituality of the Old Testament; to this same extent, there is an identity between Christian spirituality and the spirituality of the Pseudo-Quran.

Once the idea was launched (by Asin Palacios), French Catholics, always guided by a more or less conscious nationalism and by their fundamentally and authentically apostolic spirit, endeavored to monetize this policy of doctrinal rapprochement. This led to singular extravagances. The most easily exploitable theme is undoubtedly the Marian domain. See how good Providence is! We, Catholics, love the Holy Virgin Mary with all filial tenderness, and Muhammad, too, wrote such beautiful pages in the Quran about Jesus' mother! It's wonderful! One would have to be completely blind not to see that Providence has established Mary as a bridge between the Catholic bloc and the Muslim bloc. Well, consciously - we would like to say "scientifically" - we rejoice to be among these blind; we energetically reject any conception tending to make the Holy Virgin a historical bridge between Islam and Christianity. Let's first listen to the engineers of this bridge! It is a Catholic, Philippe de Zara, in a booklet entitled: *Marie and Islam*, published by the Canadian Marian Center, No. 45, January 1954, booklet published with the Nihil obstat of Bishop Robert Charland, and the Imprimi potest of Bishop Robert Martin who declares: "There is indeed an infidel people who, long before the solemn promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, believed in Mary's birth outside Satan's grasp. This Faith will certainly weigh in the divine balance on the supreme day of reckoning. This people is the people of Islam" (p. 10). And the author continues: "Now, Mary prayed incessantly, was constantly in intimate union with the Trinity, by the Father, her Creator, by the Word, her Son, by the Holy Spirit, her Spouse. And her prayer can only be universal. So Mary prays for Islam, for this source of silence, for this domain of peace - which are not however the total Truth" (p. 11).

We suppose in all charity that it is not these ramblings that led Bishop Rodhain to the plan to build a pavilion for Muslims in Lourdes! Perhaps we will soon see, in 1961, on the esplanade of Lourdes, a statue of Muhammad, one of

the first “promoters of the Immaculate Conception”. Perhaps we will also see in the near future “our Muslim brothers” set up some huts in Mecca to welcome our supporters of rapprochement and they, with the Marian banner at the head, will go on pilgrimage to recite the “Angelus” around the Ka’ba. Father Paul Catrice, who signs “former advisor to the French Union”, is very severe for the work of Philippe de Zara approved by two “Monseigneur”, which he lightly qualifies as a “duckling booklet” (see *L’âme populaire*, monthly organ of the Catholic Furrow, 14, boulevard Carnot, December 1956) (14). Unfortunately this booklet is not isolated in contemporary second-rate Catholic literature. For example in *Ecclesia* directed by Daniel Rops, isn’t it said: “Do you know that Muslims also believe in the Holy Virgin”, that “Marian worship is surely one of the aspects of Islam by which the Muslim soul can be approached”! In its October 1956 issue, the magazine *Travaillons*, organ of the French Catholic Women’s Action, also contains an article on Mary and Islam, signed Jeanne Danemarie: “The current events in Algeria”, it is said, “pose many questions about Islam. It is interesting to look for everything that could allow us to understand Muslims from a religious point of view. Now, a great link joins us to them, devotion to Mary”. And naturally all texts that can make believe in a veneration by Muslims of the Very Holy Virgin Mary are reproduced. Conscientiously, the author of this article declares that “all details given in these pages are taken from a brochure written by a converted Muslim, J.-M. Abd-el-Jalil who became a Franciscan religious. It bears the *Nihil obstat* and *Imprimatur* of the Diocese of Paris” (*Ibid.*, p. 7). It is still Father Abd-el-Jalil who is invoked in an article from *La France Catholique* dated August 10, 1956, entitled *Is not the Virgin Mary preparing for the reunion of God’s children?* “This Marian piety”, it is said, “comes as an echo of Catholic piety, and also of Muslim piety”! The same Franciscan Father explains again in the first volume of *Maria* (15) how Muslims venerate “Myriam”, Jesus’ mother considered as one of the prophets prior to Muhammad, and what deep devotion they have for her. There would even be a certain dogmatic adherence which, in many ways, brings them closer to Catholics, in their belief in the Immaculate Conception for example.

This worship “constitutes a sort of inner preparation for the total and pure truth”! Father Abd-el-Jalil had already published a pamphlet on Mary and Islam. He tried to demonstrate that certain texts of the Quran suggested a sort of *Imitatio Mariæ*. It’s really astonishing; in the name of sound exegesis and historical criticism, we vehemently protest against such distortion of facts and texts. If one desires a rapprochement between Islam and Christianity, it could be understood, provided that nothing of the Church’s dogma is sacrificed: this rapprochement, moreover, is conceivable only by the total disappearance of Islam which is not a

religion. But a Catholic does not have the right to seek at all costs such a connection, nor to mislead the triad of Christians on paths that lead nowhere. It's almost a breach of trust. It is astonishing to see members of the Catholic clergy, who must have done however a minimum of theological studies, historical studies, vouch for Arab Islam which they undoubtedly know, - let it be said to excuse them -, than by certain newspapers, by postcards or at most by conversations, unless they are Arabic Quranic specialists, which makes them even more excusable. On this meager luggage or on their erudition, they have forged theories either anti-colonialist or pro-Muslim; from the political ground, they have slipped towards apostolic projects tending no more and no less than to a certain unification between Islam and Catholicism, based on the lucubrations that we have just pointed out or on others similar. But all those who have read the PseudoKoran with a little attention know pertinently that on the Marian ground, Muslims and Catholics do not speak the same language! It is enough to realize it by putting in parallel the main schemes of the two beliefs.

Here is the comparison you provided:

Catholics

- Mary
- Virgin
- Daughter of Anne and Joachim
- Mother of Jesus Christ, God

Arab-Jews or Muslims

- Mary
- Virgin
- Daughter of 'Imrân, sister of Moses and Aaron.
- Mother of Jesus, a simple prophet.

It is enough to look at this table, as accurate as it is uncomplicated, to bring out the pure truth. Let's first note that in the authentic Arabic Quran, the rabbi did not have to mention Mary, for the simple reason that the authentic Quran was only an adaptation in Arabic of the Hebrew Quran. As in this Hebrew Quran, there is never any question of the Virgin Mary, so the rabbi did not have to talk about her in his summary in Arabic. The mention of Mary

is particular to the Pseudo-Quran, or more exactly to the Acts of Islam, stories established by the same rabbi, author of the authentic Arabic Quran. It was his controversy with the priest of Mecca that forced the rabbi to talk about Mary in his Acts. He spoke of her as a Jew should speak of her, stripping her of her true identity and divine maternity. She is not in line with the evangelical texts; the Mary of the Quran is not a progression towards Mary co-redeemer of mankind, mother of a God, second person of the Most Holy Trinity. It is a deliberate counterfeit, a voluntary diversion. From the Mary of the Gospels, there remains only the name of virginity in the Acts of Islam. By speaking thoughtlessly, as is commonly done in certain Catholic circles, of Mary as a link between Christianity and Islam, one goes against the truth of the texts, one manufactures wind-filled wineskins. We do not need this verbiage apologetics. Why, moreover, want to absolutely find common points between Christians and Muslims? Why want at all costs to create common ground between Christianity and Islam? Islam is not what we would like it to be. It is what it is, that is to say it has no specific identity. Islam is Judaism, and the real problems of religious agreement in the Mediterranean basin arise only between Jews and Christians. Islam is only a derivative of Judaism, a side issue in the development of Israel's religion. The routine thinkers who are so well seated in secular traditions will certainly not fail to accuse us of upsetting the history of Mediterranean religions.

Well, yes, we are overturning this history, and quite naturally. We wanted to apply the historical method to the Arabic Quran or more precisely to the Acts of Islam; we simply scrutinized the texts as an honest man. We did not have to take into account the powers reigning here or there. Instinctively, we could not, under the pretext of prudence, seek the assent of scholars, politicians, or timid wait-and-see people when writing. We refused this collaboration so frequent between pure thought, true history, and the ephemeral steps of men of action. If we overturn the history of religions by refusing any place to Islam, it is only because the texts have led us to these conclusions so little "scholarly", so little "diplomatic", so much common sense, that they appear to "collaborators" as the worst of revolutions.

For example, some want to make Mary a bridge between Islam and Christianity. We first respond that we do not need this bridge; we have no reason to seek a priori points of attachment between the two religions, under the pretext of bringing them closer and demonstrating that France is truly protective of Islam. Before bringing two terms closer, they should first be clearly defined. However, I notice that all the propagandists of this collage apologetics generally ignore Islam. This is perfectly noticeable in the Marian problem. We have said a few words about it in the preceding pages, in the

chapter on disputes between the priest of Mecca and the rabbi. But let's reread the texts which, according to Father Abd-el-Jalil, would constitute an anthology that could be called *Imitatio Mariæ*, as we say the *Imitation of Jesus Christ*, and group our texts by analyzing them:

1— Mary. This name appears in the Acts of Islam in the following passages:

sour. xix, 16: And in Scripture, mention Mary when she withdrew from her family to an eastern place (16); see also *ibid.*, 28: "So she came to her own carrying the child. "O Mary!" they said, you have done something monstrous!"; *ibid.* 30, 35; sour. xxiii, 52: "From the son of Mary and his mother, we have made a sign and we have given them refuge on a quiet and watered hill"; see also iii, 31, 32, 37, 38-40. The name Mary, or Myriam, is indeed mentioned in the Acts of Islam, as you've pointed out. The references are found in Surahs xix, xxiii, xxi (Meccan Surahs), and in the Medinan Surahs iii, iv, lxvi, v. It's indeed intriguing that a Jewish author writing a religious work found it necessary to mention the Virgin Mary and outline her story on a religious level. However, upon close reading of the texts, it becomes clear that these texts do not represent a positive religious teaching about the Virgin Mary. Instead, they serve as a warning against the Christian doctrine concerning the mother of Christ. This highlights the complex interplay of religious beliefs and interpretations across different faith traditions.

2 – The Mary of the Acts of Islam is the sister of Mosiah and Aaron

Let's start by rereading Surah xix, whose verses related to Mary have already been partially analyzed in our chapter on Judeo-Christian disputes in Mecca: 28. — (Mary) therefore came to her own carrying the child: "O Mary!" they said, "you have done something monstrous!" 29. — O sister of Aaron! Your father was not an unworthy father, nor your mother a prostitute!

According to this text, the rabbi refers to Mary, mother of Jesus, as the sister of Aaron. Should we take this qualifier literally? At first glance, we might lean towards a text error. The scribe of the Acts could have made this confusion himself, and the rabbi would be absolved of this historical error. We could also imagine, as we have mentioned, that the expression "sister of Aaron" has only a typological meaning. The rabbi would have said "Sister of Aaron" as we say today "Daughter of David".

Perhaps we will find the solution to this problem by continuing to read the Acts of Islam. It is in Surah iii, unquestionably Medinan, that we find mention of Mary: 30. — Yahweh has chosen Adam, Noah, the family of Abraham and the

family of 'Imrân, over the world, as descendants of each other. Yahweh hears (everything) and knows everything.

It is evident that in this verse, it is a good Jew who broadly outlines the history of the world up to Moses. He only needs to cite a few great names among the greatest: Adam, Noah, Abraham, 'Imrân. Everyone knows the first three names. But 'Imrân is, so to speak, less known to the public. One must already know the Old Testament well to speak about it with ease. But, as we know, the rabbi knew his Hebrew Bible very well, as well as the Midrashic and Talmudic commentaries; indeed, in the Pentateuch, there is precisely a question of 'Imrân, son of Kohath (Exodus vi, 18-19); 'Imrân marries Jochebed, his aunt (ibid., 23) daughter of Levi (Numbers xxvi, 59). From the marriage of 'Imrân and Jochebed, three children were born: a daughter named Miriam, then Aaron, finally Moses. Everyone agrees on this biblical generation. We only have to read the texts of the Pentateuch. Therefore, when the rabbi speaks in the Acts of Islam, iii, 31, of the family of 'Imrân, we know exactly which characters he is referring to. 31. — (Remember) when the wife of 'Imrân said "Lord! I dedicate to you what is in my womb. Accept it from me! Truly, you hear and you know everything! When she had given birth (the wife of 'Imrân) cried out: "Lord, I have given birth to a girl; but Yahweh knew well what she had given birth to — a male child is not like a girl. I name her Mary. I place her under your protection, as well as her offspring, against the stoned Demon."

The wife of 'Imrân is called Jochebed in Exodus. The rabbi, who knows his Bible so well, is not unaware of this. Here is Jochebed realizing that she is pregnant; even before giving birth to her child, she dedicates it to the Lord. It turns out that this child was a girl. Jochebed named her Mary; as we will learn later, this Mary became the Mother of Jesus! This time, we are indeed obliged to abandon the hypotheses we had imagined about the expression: Mary, O sister of Aaron! There is no transcription error in the text of Surah xix, 29; in the rabbi's mouth, this expression claims to have historical value. We do not see how to save the rabbi, and Surah xix is perfectly explained by the Medinan Surah iii. Between Medina and Mecca, there is truly an identity of intention. Can we guess this intention? Yes, without a doubt. In this Surah iii as in Surah xix, the rabbi intends to speak about Mary, mother of Jesus. What did he have to inform himself? If he finds himself led to speak about Mary, mother of Jesus, we know that it is because of the preaching of the priest of Mecca, late preaching, but effective, since it almost tore Mohammed away from Judaism to bring him into the Christian camp. This preaching, coupled with the hostility of fetishist idolaters, forced the rabbi, Mohammed, and the first community of Muslims, to flee Mecca to seek in Medina a more hospitable and generally Jewish environment. If the rabbi, who has already begun to react in Mecca against the priest's preaching,

continues to speak about Mary in Medina, it is certainly not to relax his attacks against Christians. We can even say - and we will see this from the texts - that the Mary of Medina is even more un-Christian or better anti-Christian than the Mary of Mecca. In Medina, there is in the rabbi at least on one point - we will see later if we need to generalize - a redoubling of violence and determination against Christian positions.

In addition to the priest's preaching, the rabbi could learn from Christian works translated into Arabic. We know that he had before his eyes and used the apocryphal Gospel of Infancy translated into Arabic at that time, as well as the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, probably in its original Hebrew version. In short, the rabbi had two sources to learn about Christian origins; the oral preaching of the priest of Mecca who opposed the rigid Jewish monotheism to the divinity of Christ; and a written source, the apocryphal accounts that we have just mentioned. However, it is certainly not the priest of Mecca who would have told his faithful and the Arabs who listened to him that the Virgin Mary was the daughter of 'Imrân, sister of Aaron and Moses. We believe that all our readers can accept this conclusion which is all too obvious. Nor are the apocryphal accounts that taught him this strange story. If the father of the Holy Virgin is not named in the canonical Gospels, on the other hand, he has a name in the Gospel of Infancy: he is called Joachim. Let's not rush; let's think carefully about the concrete situation. The rabbi, pressed by the Christian priest's preaching, is obliged to explain himself in Mecca about Christian origins, and naturally about the Holy Virgin. The Judeo-Christian struggles continue in Medina. To respond to this Christian offensive, the rabbi once and for all accepted a policy that he will follow in Medina as in Mecca. He knows full well that Mary is Joachim's daughter. Even assuming that the priest, sticking only to the canonical Gospels, did not mention Joachim's name, he could not deny this genealogy. While the rabbi, who used the Gospel of Infancy, positively read Joachim's name attributed to Mary's father, Jesus' mother. If he did not mention it, if he sought another genealogy, he therefore did so voluntarily, with a very specific purpose. What purpose? The texts are clear in answering this question: it is solely to place Mary in the Mosaic cycle and lock her in it. By asserting that she was Moses' sister, he removed at once any desire, wherever it came from, to make Mary the future mother of a God. One cannot put Mary in contradiction with her brother: Sinai's monotheism becomes a family affair! Mary had to be completely in agreement with her younger brother on this point; she could not give him a categorical denial or such a great affront by giving birth to a God, son of God! It was for a Jew - and our rabbi repeats it several times in the Acts of Islam - to utter a monstrous thing by giving divinity to Jesus. To rivet Mary to Moses' family was to remove from renegade Jews, represented by Christians, any temptation to utter

the greatest religious blasphemy that can exist for a Jew: to make Jesus another Yahweh!

The rabbi's general system in this matter is therefore conscious and deliberate: by first proposing this genealogy orally in his arguments against the priest of Mecca and against the Christians of Medina, and then transcribing it, not in the Arabic Quran — a duplicate of the Hebrew Quran —, but in his Acts of Islam, he could not display greater contempt for the idolaters and for the Arabs converted to Judaism. Rightly, the rabbi saw himself as absolutely superior to all these people, who had no civilization behind them, who represented for a Jew the last degree of civilization. Instinctively, we think of Herodotus, and we cannot help but transcribe here for the amusement of our readers his appreciation of the Egyptians of his time. Let's not forget that Herodotus was writing in the 5th century BC: "The Egyptians do everything contrary to other men; they urinate squatting; they are circumcised; they write from right to left; for nothing in the world would they use a Greek knife or pot, nor would they touch meat cut by a Greek knife; pork is an impure animal for them". Analogously, the rabbi must have held his Arab listeners in similar contempt. He knows full well that if their arms flail in exaggerated gestures, if their lips are voluble, their attitude bold and inflated, their poor heads are empty. He knows full well that he can fill this void at will. He will never find listeners both prouder and more foolish. And he takes advantage of it. He is a Jew, and he knows it too: behind him, there are centuries of light, poetry, and faith. He knows that Adam, Noah, Abraham the great, Jacob who embodies his race so well, Joseph who presents the image of Providence, Moses, this strong man, man of genius, savior of a race, confidant of God belong to Israel. Arabs, you are Semites, but poor Semites. Do you have an Abraham, a Moses and a David in your lineage? And you Christians, what do you have to present to me in front of this gallery of our ancestors? Nothing! For John the Baptist, Jesus, Mary, whom you constantly talk about to us, are not out of series with our patriarchs and our prophets: they are in the lineage; Mary is Moses' sister.

Once again, in one of the last Surahs of Medina, the rabbi returns to the Mosaic genealogy of Mary. This is in Surah lxvi; this proves to us that Christian reactions against the formidable resurgence provoked by the rabbi of Mecca had not slowed down: 10. — Yahweh has proposed an example to those who are unfaithful: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot. They were under (the authority of) two of Our holy servants; they betrayed them and (this) served them nothing against Yahweh and it was cried out to them: "Enter into the Fire with those who must enter!" 11. — Yahweh has also proposed an example to those who believe: the wife of Pharaoh, when she cried out: "Lord! Build me, near You, a dwelling

in the Garden! Save me from Pharaoh and his works! Save me from the people of the Unjust!”

The rabbi here mentions the example of several women. In verse 10, it is about two women who would have transgressed the laws of Yahweh by disobeying their husband. The Torah is not yet revealed to Moses, and God’s will is signified to humans by natural events. The rabbi first cites the wife of Noah, punished and condemned to Fire for having disobeyed her husband’s orders. Note that the Bible does not report this act of disobedience by Mrs. Noah, and it is thought that the rabbi knew this fact from some Midrash.

As for Mrs Lot, she was punished for disobeying the orders of the angels sent to her husband (Genesis xix, 17-26).

As an example of female fidelity to the Most High, the rabbi also cites two women; first, that of Pharaoh: 11. — Yahweh also proposed as an example to those who believe, the wife of Pharaoh, when she cried out: “Lord, build me a dwelling near You, in the Garden! Save me from Pharaoh and his works! Save me from the people of the Unjust!”

According to the rabbi himself, it is necessary to distinguish several phases in the story of Pharaoh’s wife: the phase of temptation told in Genesis xxxix, 7-20, which everyone knows (told by the rabbi in the Meccan surah xii, 21-34, supplemented by midrashic comments) (17). This story ends with Pharaoh’s wife in a phase of repentance unknown to the Bible, but which the rabbi reports here probably according to some midrash, as he is used to doing: sur. xii : 51. — (The king) asked (the guilty women): “What was your intention when you tempted Joseph with your charms?” — “God forbid!” they replied. “We do not know him for any bad action.” And the wife of the powerful (Pharaoh) added: “Now the truth comes out. It was I who tempted (Joseph) with my charms, and he is among the truthful. 52. — (I say) this so that (the king) knows that I do not deceive him out of his sight, and that Yahweh does not direct the artifice of the deceiver. 53. — I do not absolve myself. Indeed, the soul is certainly an instigator of evil! (I desire) only the mercy of my Lord. My Lord forgives and He is merciful.”

If, in the Bible, there is no ending to the story of Pharaoh’s wife, in the Acts of Islam, xii, 51-53, the rabbi, drawing on Jewish legends, gives this woman an edifying faith, which can be cited as an example to the infidels, as a model of repentance and salvation. It is this same idea that the rabbi takes up in Medina in surah lxvi, 11, of which we have reproduced the text above (18). Let’s not forget the thread of our reasoning. We are currently reading the Medinan surah lxvi, 10-12. The rabbi proposes four examples of women, two who were punished for

their infidelity, and two who were rewarded for their faith and good deeds: I. — The two women punished for disobedience and infidelity:

1. — Noah's wife. There is no mention in Genesis of this woman's rebellion, either towards the Lord or towards her husband and master.
2. — Lot's wife: this essentially biblical theme was often evoked by the rabbi in the Acts of Islam relating to the 2nd Meccan period; sur. xxxvii, 133: with the exception of a woman left behind; xxvi, 170: except an old woman who remained among the stragglers; xv, 60 except his wife, for the Lord had decreed that she would certainly be among those left behind; xxvii, 55: We saved him and his family, except his wife, for We had decreed that she would be among those left behind.

3rd period, surah xi, 83: "Leave with your family at the end of the night, and let none of you turn back, except your wife who will be struck by what will strike the Impious"; xxix, 31-32: "We will certainly save him (Lot) and his family, except his wife who will be among those left behind..." "We are going to save you and your family, except your wife who will be among those left behind"; vii, 81-82: "We saved him and his family, except his wife who was among those left behind. On them, We brought down a rain (malefic). So consider what was the end of the guilty!" — The v. 10 of surah lxvi, composed in Medina and which is the subject of our current reading, is in line with all the Meccan texts of the Acts of Islam that we have just quoted.

II. — The faithful and rewarded women: In parallel with the two unfaithful women, Noah's wife and Lot's wife, the rabbi cites as examples two faithful women, and consequently rewarded by Yahweh.

1. — Pharaoh's wife. This is not about the Pharaoh reigning over Egypt at the time of Moses, as Blachère's already mentioned annotation would seem to suggest, but about the Pharaoh who figures in the story of Joseph. The wife of this Pharaoh, — whom the rabbi mentions so often in the Meccan surahs —, after trying to lead Joseph into evil, repented of her fault and received forgiveness from Pharaoh and the Lord of the Worlds. This story of repentance does not appear either in the biblical account; it is normal to think that the rabbi learned it from some midrash.
2. — The second woman cited by the rabbi as an example of fidelity. This woman, the rabbi will find her in the cycle of the Pentateuch, as he had found in the same cycle Noah's wife and Pharaoh's wife. This time, it is in the Mosaic milieu that he will find her. It is none other than the Virgin Mary, whom the rabbi presents again to his naive listeners as the daughter

of 'Imrân, as he had already done in the Meccan surah xix, 29 (sister of Aaron) and the Medinan surah iii, 31 (daughter of 'Imrân).

Once again, we see the rabbi's firm intention to remove the Virgin Mary from the Christian cycle and "plaster" her, against all likelihood and to the contempt of his listeners and readers, to the time of Moses, thus making Sinai monotheism, as desired by Yahweh, a family affair, with the sister confirming the divine confidences made to her brother Moses. The consequences of this historical turmoil are obvious: Mary will never contradict her brother Moses by allowing herself to be taken for the mother of a God, son of Yahweh. This would be a complete falling out with her younger brother. One can read and reread the texts indefinitely, one will always arrive at the same conclusions according to Christians, the Virgin Mary is mother of Jesus, son of God. For a Jew, this is the most scandalous of blasphemies. Yet this blasphemy is constantly preached by the priest of Mecca, with some success, since Mohammed himself, well cornered by the Jews, by his wife, and by the rabbi, almost let himself be caught and change clans. These Judeo-Christian struggles, which are largely responsible for the hasty departure from Mecca, continue in Medina. We find their echo in surahs iii, 31 and lxvi, which we have just read without rushing.

After a careful reading of the Meccan and Medinan surahs on the Marian genealogy, will we still have the audacity or naivety, or even foolishness, to want to make the Virgin Mary a point of convergence between Islam and Christianity? As for us, we do not want to enter such a system that we denounce as a kind of scam at any cost. We know Muslims very well. We do not want to deny that the little Muslim girls entrusted to Catholic nuns pray to the Virgin Mary with all their heart and with great piety. Some Muslims have even shown us in their wallets images of the Virgin Mary that Christian friends had given them. Can we base on this sporadic and sentimental devotion a Christian-Muslim doctrinal rapprochement? We absolutely do not believe so. We even think that such an attempt is not only doomed to failure, but that it is dangerous because of all the inaccuracies and illusions it contains. Let us first note that, as long as Islam remains in the obstinacy we know, we will never make these Muslims devoted to Mary understand that the Virgin Mary is the mother of a God. This God, for them, would be other than Allah, and never a Muslim from the mass, even if he has some devotion towards Mary will consent to such a concession. You have to be "very intelligent" to understand Christological mysteries, the mystery of the Trinity, of Incarnation, of Redemption; we mean that such faith presupposes not only a perfect knowledge of the Gospel, but centuries of philosophical and theological traditions. We are not there with Muslims, whatever class they belong to, and I do not see the time coming when these Muslims will be able to distinguish nature and person, speak fluently of a unique God in three persons,

and of a unique Christ in his person, but with duality of nature, divine and human. To open metaphysical horizons to Muslims, we would have to start by de-Islamizing them! And as long as they have not understood that the Virgin Mary gave birth to a child-God, the Mary of Islam and the Mary of Christianity will never be able to adjust. We will be able to find points of contact between these two Marys, as we will see, but on the essentials, there will always be a void that no one can fill. Catholics must get an exact account of this situation in order “to avoid the worst disappointments”. Let’s even suppose that one day perfectly evangelized Muslims start praying to the same Virgin Mary as Christians; this would be equivalent for them to converting to Christianity, i.e., renouncing Islam because, as we have seen in previous analyses, the Virgin Mary of the rabbi is precisely the opposite of the priest’s Virgin; or rather, it is to repel the “Christian” virgin that the rabbi proposes “the Mosaic virgin”, which is his invention. There is no possible rapprochement between the two, even if we notice some personal or accidental resemblances.

The mere thought that one might consider Mary of the Acts of Islam as a progression towards the Mary of the Christians makes me doubt the psychological health of my contemporaries. Aaron’s sister has nothing in common with the mother of Christ. One can praise her virginity, affirm that she is the mother of Jesus, but she is neither the mother of the Redeemer nor our mother. She is a privileged woman who is admired from the outside, she is not the co-redeemer whom we love tenderly, whom we cherish with love, and without whom we cannot conceive of Christian life. The Mary of the Acts of Islam is an outsider, like Pharaoh’s wife; she is not the mother that every Christian carries in his heart. Has Mary of the Acts ever inspired a Muslim literature comparable to Christian religious literature? Where is the Saint Bernard of Islam? I have before my eyes an album of Persian paintings and miniatures representing Mohammed, Paradise and the Houris. I do not find a single miniature representing the Virgin, mother of Jesus. How could Mary, daughter of 'Imrân, sister of Moses and Aaron, inflame our hearts, nourish our inner life, inspire poets and artists? Do you see a Péguy crying over Aaron’s sister as he did over the Virgin Mary in his Passion of Christ? In founding Islam, the rabbi denied the mother of Christ.

After these analyses, one remains stunned, as if stunned, to see so many Catholics, perhaps well-intentioned, but certainly poorly informed, rushing into perspectives of Christian-Muslim rapprochement at the expense of the mother of the Divine Redeemer. These Catholics infiltrate everywhere; they distribute everywhere the product of their imaginations, sometimes in reference works in conferences, sometimes and often in small Catholic information magazines, missionary magazines, all magazines and books that lie around and pile up on the

tables of religious institutions of women and men and which contribute to stopping the great and solid Christian formation. Mary and Islam! it is discussed in Maria, Studies on the Virgin Mary, under the direction of Hubert du Manoir, S. J., vol. i, Beauchesne 1949, in an article by J.-M. Abd-el-Jalil, The Life of Mary according to the Koran, p. 183-211. The author is obviously embarrassed by the texts of the Koran or more exactly the texts of the Acts of Islam from the Meccan and Medinan periods “Imrân, Mary’s father,” he says, “seems ‘blocked’ with Amrane, father of Moses, Aaron, and their sister Mary. The Koran indeed addresses Jesus’ mother with this apostrophe: ‘O sister of Aaron!’ Whatever may be of the Koran (!) one must refrain from accusing Islam of making such a confusion; one must renounce an easy and vain argumentation and ineffective and unpleasant insinuations. Just as it would not be legitimate to interpret the Bible without taking into account believers who meditate on it and live it, so one should not rush to lend meanings to Koranic terms elaborated independently of the prodigious effort of thought (sic!) deployed by Muslims in order to overcome the difficulties that their sacred texts may present”. Father Abd-el-Jalil will further expose his point of view in a booklet published by Beauchesne in Paris in 1950 and he repeats it again in a Moroccan magazine entitled Facts and Ideas (see no. 51, May 5, 1956, p. 13-22). This article, The Virgin Mary in the Koran begins with an overview of all the stories that we hope to see disappear forever in the very near future “It is known” (19), says the author, “that Islam was founded in Arabia by Mohammed (certainly not) at the beginning of the 7th century AD. It quickly took on the role of arbitrator between Jews and Christians (pure legend that does not stand up to criticism); and this in the name of God, as a textual dictation of various messages (sic) brought by Archangel Gabriel”. “God”, says the author referring to the Acts of Islam, “chooses Adam, Noah, Abraham’s family and Imrân’s family above all worlds as descendants from each other”. This is how the Koran (iii, 33) introduces Mary’s genealogy. Imrân is her Father. Her mother is not named, she is always referred to as the wife of Imrân; but “Muslims know her real name (Anne = Hanna), as well as Joachim”. (Art. cit. p. 15.) — Let’s not rush; let’s think slowly about our texts. Father Abd-el-Jalil is obliged to recognize that in the “Koran”, the Virgin Mary is presented as the daughter of Imrân, sister of Aaron, therefore of Moses. We can’t do anything about it. The texts are formal. The author tells us that, faced with this absurdity, Muslim tradition has reacted. Among these Muslim commentators, there are those who give these texts of the Pseudo-Koran on the Mosaic genealogy of Mary a symbolic meaning; for others, Aaron would not be Moses’ brother, but a character related to Mary. Obviously, for men devoid of any critical sense, these texts of the acts of Islam are very embarrassing, and there is no way to intervene here the law of the abrogating and the abrogated which we have pierced the trick (20). Other commentators propose to replace the genealogy of the Acts of Islam

simply by that of Christian tradition Mary's mother would be named Anne and her father Joachim. All this is perfect, but we note that between the commentators and the Acts, there is a split. The comments are not in the logical development of the Acts; they erase them; a correction, or worse: a disavowal, is something other than a development! We readily concede that, without admitting Christian data on divine maternity and the role of co-redeemer of Mary, mother of Christ, Muslim writers informed by Christians have reacted to the chronological absurdities of the Acts of Islam, but their commendable effort which places them in contradiction with the text — considered by them as sacred — does not save in any way these absurdities themselves, consciously taught and written by the rabbi of Mecca, founder of Islam, to remove Mary from Christians and reject her in the camp of Jews. Far from being a link between two “religions”, Mary of the Acts marks the absolute separation that the rabbi naturally intends to maintain between Judaism and Christianity. His “genealogical tricks” are crude, but hey! Arabs are so ignorant! (21). Could we not say as much about certain good contemporary apostles who follow their sensitivity and a false nationalism anchored deep within themselves, much more than their head? This Marian theme, indeed, is not reserved in France for distinguished scholars, lost from the beginning of their approach by their a priori and a lack of intellectual domination. These same scholars persist in a mad popular propaganda. It must be, according to their apostolic ambitions, that Christians accustomed to reading *Le Pèlerin* — it is not in our thought to throw any discredit on this venerable magazine; we simply take it as a measure of the intellectual level of Christians whose religious formation we want to ensure — also know that there are not so many differences between Islam and Christianity, and that with a little goodwill on both sides we could come to an understanding (on the back of the Virgin Mary, obviously). Let me just recall, without wasting time mentioning their articles, *Ecclesia*, several Action Catholic magazines, missionary magazines, Christian propaganda magazines, all realities that stop male and solid intellectual development that those responsible must by state and under their responsibility ensure for laymen or clerks who will each have in their place an obligation to spread in the Church the truth of Christ.

Philippe de Zara, whom we have already had the opportunity to quote several times, perfectly summarizes the foolish opinion of certain Catholic circles when he writes for his own account: “Much will undoubtedly be forgiven of his errors to Muhammad for having paid homage to Mary that the Protestant Reformers refused him. While he reduced the Lord to the role of a simple prophet, a prophet inferior to him, he recognized in Mary all the prerogatives that Christian faith recognizes in her. So that, by a mysterious humility of spirit on the part of the founder of Islam, Jesus' mother receives infinitely more honors than his own

mother” (22). “There is an unfaithful people who, long before the solemn proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, believed in Mary’s birth outside Satan’s grasp... This people is the people of Islam.” (23). Mary and Jesus were both preserved from all satanic contact from their birth. This is the Immaculate Conception (24). All this is said with assurance and repeated by so many authors that we must reread all the texts of the Acts of Islam on this theme. A priori, however, we are very surprised that in the 7th century, Christian tradition, while venerating the Virgin Mary, did not yet have absolutely explicit ideas about the intimate privileges of Jesus Christ’s mother. It took centuries of Christian life to allow believers to first understand with their hearts their mother’s astonishing purity. Saint Thomas himself, for fear of harming the universality of Redemption, did not dare to declare that the Virgin Mary, exempt from all actual sin, had been kept from original sin from her conception. This idea was clearly brought out only after centuries of Marian love. In the early Middle Ages, in the Greek and Syriac Church, there was first talk of Saint Anne’s miraculous conception; there was also talk of Jesus’ miraculous, extraordinary birth. But the real problem was not there. That Mary remains pure from all defilement for the birth of her son Jesus, all Christians have admitted since the origins. However, it is not in Jesus’ conception that Mary was exempt from sin; it is in her very nature, in her “making” that Mary, destined to be mother of a God, was preserved from the very root of all evil, that is to say from original sin with which every man is essentially kneaded. If Muhammad has made himself an apostle, as it is said at every moment, of the Immaculate Conception, where and how did he become aware of this extraordinary fact which will not be defined until twelve centuries later? Or it is Allah who revealed it to him since according to Muslims all the “Koran” comes directly from Allah. In this case I urgently ask those fervent in Christian-Muslim rapprochement to henceforth devote a chapter in their learned dissertations on the Immaculate Conception to divine revelations made by Allah to Muhammad on this theme. I even ask for more. Why not erect a statue to Muhammad on the esplanade at Lourdes as I have already said? The National Relief is just right to take the lead in this beautiful and intelligent initiative.

Or perhaps, Mohammed, who would have received no revelation from Allah, but who would have gathered his information alone from the Jews and Christians, would have known from the latter the extraordinary privilege of Myriam, daughter of 'Imrân and mother of Jesus. Yes, but to affirm this dependence, one would have to be quite sure that the Christians of the 7th century, and in particular the Arab Christians of Mecca, had clearly become aware of this dogma so dear to the Christians of the 20th century: the Immaculate Conception. I would be very grateful to anyone who could demonstrate this to us.

Moreover, for us, the problem is not there. It is about knowing well what a rabbi, an educated Jew, could think of the Virgin Mary. We already know his way of eliminating, denying, the divine maternity of Mary; we have noted his audacious chronology. Now, the apologists - I mean the apologists who work in rubber at the reconciliation of contradictions - would like this rabbi, Mohammed's monitor, to have taught the Arabs something approaching the Immaculate Conception. To be able to judge in all competence the value of this strange affirmation, we have only one thing to do: read carefully what the rabbi himself wrote on this subject.

First of all, let's note that in the Meccan Acts, and in particular in Surah xix called Surah of Mary, there is no allusion, even the slightest, to this privilege of Jesus' mother; nor in Surahs xxiii, 52 and xxi, 91. We can perfectly conclude that in the discussions with the Christians of Mecca, the rabbi's mind was not awakened on this point, which leads me to think that these Christians themselves must not have insisted on a Marian privilege that they probably did not know. It is in the Medinan Surahs that the Quranists think they find their weapons in favor of the Quranic affirmation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Here is a first text, sour. iii, 37: "The angels said: 'O Mary Yahweh has chosen and purified you. He has chosen you over (all) the women of this world.'"

This formula has already been used a few verses earlier in the same Surah iii, about Adam and other Hebrew patriarchs: "Yahweh has chosen Adam, Noah, the family of Abraham and the family of 'Imrân, over all the world, as descendants of each other. Yahweh is hearing and omniscient" (v. 30).

The great Hebrew patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, had also been elected and purified, without the rabbi ever thinking of exempting them from original sin! "And mention our servants: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, full of works and foresight. We have purified them by a pure (thought): the memory of the (eternal) stay. Truly, they are certainly cut off from Us, among the best of the Elect!" (sour.

Myriam's brother, Moses, was also chosen, of course: "I have chosen you. Listen to what will be revealed to you! Truly, I am Yahweh. No divinity except Me!" (sour. xx, 13-14.)

Eli: Jonah had also been: "His Lord had chosen him and placed him among the saints." (sour. lxviii, 50.) For the rabbi, therefore, every being chosen by Yahweh to give the world a new sign of divine mercy is elected and purified, and there is no question of establishing the slightest link between this election and this Judaic purification on the one hand, and the preservation of original sin in

Mary on the other hand. Historians of religions, who often reason on sets or approximations, or on the contrary on minutiae outside reality, would do well to refrain from publishing new novels on this Marian theme in the Acts of Islam.

Let's not abandon this Surah iii. Another text delights our Quranists "When she gave birth to (her daughter) (the wife of 'Imrân) cried out: 'Lord! I have given birth to a girl.' But Yahweh knew well what she had given birth to. 'The male is not like the female. I name her Mary. I put her and her offspring under Your protection against Satan the stoned.'"

This time, no doubt, we are there! It's the Immaculate Conception! From her birth, Myriam is completely sheltered from the enterprises of the demon; it may not yet be the dogma of the Immaculate as it will be defined by Pius IX in 1854, but it is a solid Christian start launched by the 'Prophet' Mohammed towards Marian worship. One would have to be in bad faith not to bite at this hook, which is like a call for the union of the two great religions, Christian and Muslim! At least that's what many historians of religions think, who would probably be more skilled at writing in the collection *The Saint*, Detective Magazine, where their imagination could run free, than at bending their intelligence to solid text analyses. So let's take a good hold of the text of Surah iii, 34. Let's read it calmly, simply, as an honest man. What is it about?

In general, this passage is a reiteration of the Marian theme presented in Surah xix, which allows us to conclude that the discussions between Christians and Jews continue in Medina. In the specific text we are reading, iii, 31-32, the rabbi once again talks about the origins and birth of Myriam. The wife of 'Imrân, he recounts, discovering herself pregnant, turned to the Lord and said: "Lord, I vow and consecrate to you what is in my womb. Accept it from me. You hear everything and you know everything."

So far everything is clear. The wife of 'Imrân, whom Exodus calls Jochebed, but whom the rabbi never names in the Acts of Islam, is very pious. She dedicates to God the child she carries in her womb, as many Christian women still do today. Naturally, this has nothing to do with the Immaculate Conception, or preservation from original sin. The rabbi continues: "When the wife of 'Imrân gave birth, she cried out: 'Lord, I have given birth to a girl.' She was not teaching anything to God" (who knows everything, as stated in the previous verse). "The male is indeed not like the female." "This girl, I name her Mary" (= the pious) "and I put her and her offspring under Your protection against Satan the stoned."

One would have to lack total objectivity and the most basic theological knowledge to have the audacity not only to establish, but even to sketch the

slightest connection between this text and the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception. The preservation from original sin presupposes a creation outside the series, a creation outside the general law and, like any creation, this preservation falls solely under the All-Powerful divine. Absolutely nothing of the sort is found in Surah iii of Medina: it is not Yahweh who intervenes in the consecration of Myriam, it is the wife of 'Imrân. Our Quranists, even if they are not theologians, might however think, before writing, that the wife of 'Imrân, even if she is to become one day the mother of one of the greatest men of humanity (Moses), perhaps did not have the power to preserve her daughter from original sin! Her gesture is much simpler. She consecrates her daughter to the Most High, hoping thus to protect her against the enterprises of the cursed (râjim), stoned Demon. The idea and even the expression are not new in this Surah iii. Already, the rabbi has expressed himself in identical terms about heaven and the signs of the zodiac, Surah xv, 17 of the second Meccan period: "Indeed, we have placed constellations in heaven, We have adorned it for those who look and We have protected it against every cursed Demon, every stoned Demon."

In an earlier surah, he also wrote: "Indeed, We have adorned the nearest heaven with an ornament, the others, in protection against any rebellious demon" (25). The demon is the enemy of the God-fearing, tempter of Adam, and tempter of man. Demonology holds a considerable place in the Old Testament. It is therefore not surprising that the rabbi insists, in his teaching, on this harmful role of Iblis, the cursed, the stoned (26). Iblis is an enemy of light. That's why, my son, Mohammed, when you recite the Corab that I have written and taught you, seek refuge in Yahweh, against the cursed demon (râjim). This one has no power against those who believe and rely on their Lord (27). It is continuously that the rabbi, in the Acts of Islam, recommends to man, as a good rabbi that he is, to seek refuge in God to defend himself against the demons who roam around him (28); it is not surprising that the wife of 'Imrân asks for her daughter Myriam from the Almighty Lord, protection against the enterprises of the demon: "I put (my daughter) Myriam under Your protection as well as her offspring against the Cursed Demon" (29). We have in this text a gesture and a prayer specifically Jewish; I urgently ask our Quranists what relationship there can be or they see between these Jewish texts of the Acts of Islam and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception? I would be very curious, as well as my readers, so faithfully and deeply attached to my thought, to know their lucubrations on this point. Let us recognize once again that these lucubrations are without historical or exegetical foundation; they simply poison the atmosphere of Quranic studies.

b) Mary, Virgin. - The virginity of Mary is affirmed both in Medina and Mecca. It is Mary who claims this quality when the Lord's messenger comes to

announce that she will be the mother of a “pure boy”. - "How will I have a boy “when no mortal has touched me and I am not a prostitute” (sour. Meccan xix, 20); “and (mention) the one who remained a virgin” (sour. Meccan xxi, 91); “how will I have a child, when no mortal has touched me” (iii, 42); “Yahweh also proposed Mary, daughter of 'Imrân, who remained a virgin” (lxvi, 12).

The concept of virginity, that is, for a woman, the intact preservation of her secret parts for virtuous reasons, is almost unknown in the Old Testament. Virginity is one thing, virtue is another; but the Jews did not have the idea of establishing any relationship between a woman’s integrity and virtue. It is necessary to arrive at the teaching of Christ to see this connection born in spirituality which will soon take on the value of an ecclesiastical institution. What could a rabbi of the 7th century therefore think of the virginity of a mother-woman? He undoubtedly knew the text of Isaiah, vi, 13-14: “Listen then, house of David: is it not enough for you to weary men, that you come to weary my God? So it is the Lord himself who will give you a sign. Behold: the young girl is pregnant and will give birth to a son whom she will call Emmanuel.”

Where is the center of this sign? That a young girl or a young bride gives birth to a child? This is the common story of humanity. One can say that Isaiah announces here the birth of Hezekiah: this is probably correct. One can also affirm that, beyond this royal birth, he foresaw a new era, which would be the messianic reign. In any case, Isaiah proposes a sign, and it is this sign that it is important to understand. How could a Jew interpret the prophetic vision: “a young girl is pregnant and will give birth to a son whom she will call Emmanuel”? The first evangelist, Saint Matthew, - whether he wrote his gospel in Hebrew or Greek, it doesn’t matter - gives of the text of Isaiah an interpretation that Christian theology and liturgy have accepted without restriction. According to Saint Matthew, the sign given by Isaiah for an upcoming realization (birth of Hezekiah) or for a distant event (the messianic reign) consists precisely in the opposition between virginity and maternity: “Behold, the Virgin will conceive and bear a son, to whom will be given the name Emmanuel” (Saint Matth. i, 23). Let us note that Saint Matthew reproduces Isaiah textually and that among the evangelists, he is the only one to do so. If we think that he could have written his gospel in Hebrew, and that he has before his eyes the text of Isaiah, his interpretation of the “virginal sign” takes on value as an echo of authentic Jewish tradition. We can already suspect, in reading it, that his Jewish contemporaries had already interpreted this prophecy in a very precise sense. The advent predicted by Isaiah will be guaranteed by an extraordinary sign, never seen before: a virgin, not a young girl, but a virgin ante and post partum, virgin before and after conception, will become mother of a son who will be called Emmanuel. Reading the text of Saint Matthew is already understanding

Jewish tradition. In fact, nothing opposed, in Judaism, that Yahweh, to attest to a fact of great importance, gave an extraordinary sign, particularly extraordinary for a Jew: the simultaneity in a woman of virginity and maternity.

By citing the text of Isaiah in his Hebrew gospel, Saint Matthew undoubtedly consolidated his assertion by relying on an earlier tradition, as we have just said, a tradition that we find explicitly among other Jews in the 3rd century BC. For my lay readers who may not have very accurate notions, let's recall that in the 3rd century BC, Jews gathered in Alexandria undertook a gigantic task: to translate all the Hebrew books of the Old Testament into Greek. These Jews numbered 70, which is why even great scholars give their translation the name Septuagint. Now, in this Septuagint translation, the Hebrew term *almah*, which we find in Isaiah and which literally means young girl or recently married young woman, is rendered by *parthenos*, literally: untouched virgin woman. The scholarly translators of the so-called Jerusalem Bible are therefore fully justified when they write, in their annotation of v. 14 of ch. vii of Isaiah, that "the text of the LXX is a precious witness to the ancient Jewish interpretation that Matthew i, 23 consecrated by reading here the announcement of Jesus' virginal conception". When the rabbi of Mecca speaks of Mary's virginity, there is therefore no need to imagine any intrusion of Christianity into Islam. The rabbi, very well versed in biblical and Talmudic sciences, could very well know this virginity of Mary through a Jewish tradition that dates back at least to the 3rd century BC, a tradition still alive in Jewish circles of the 1st century that we find in the gospel of Saint Matthew. Apologists so eager to find points of contact between Islam and Christianity would do well to meditate on this fact, which we have just explained to them as clearly as possible: in affirming Mary's virginity, the rabbi did not have to sketch the slightest step towards Christianity; he made no concessions to his adversary, the priest of Mecca; he simply remained faithful to pure Jewish tradition.

Finally, let's note that the term *almah*, used six times in the Old Testament, always has the meaning of an unmarried woman, that is, a virgin: Rebecca (Genesis xxiv, 43; see also *ibid.* v. 16: the young girl was very beautiful, she was a virgin, no man had approached her); the virgins of the Song of Songs, the *alamoth* (i, 3; vi, 8, where the text distinguishes the *alamoth* from queens and concubines); Ps. lxxviii, 26; Prov. xxx, 19. We will also note that Mary, sister of Moses and Aaron is entitled, in the sacred text, to the title of *almah*, Exodus ii, 8, that is to say virgin: "The *almah* went to fetch the mother of the little one."

So far, what remains of Mary, a point of rapprochement between Muslims and Christians?

Once upon a time, according to the Acts of Islam, there was a young girl named Myriam. "The form of this name is, in Arabic, identical to that used in Syriac and Greek in the Bible. The most reasonable commentators simply say that this name is of Hebrew origin and means 'the pious' 'the devout'. Whatever its meaning, this name had nothing to displease a good Jew. It is important to note, for the context of the Acts of Islam, that this name of Myriam is applied, in the Old Testament, only to the sister of Aaron and Moses, daughter of 'Imrân (Numbers xii, i, 15; xx, 42; Micah vi, 4), qualified as a virgin at the birth of Moses, by Exodus. The rabbi therefore continues as a Jew could do it was a virgin named Myriam, sister of Moses and Aaron; this virgin was to become a sign for Israel. This sign is that by keeping her virginity, she would become a mother. Isaiah announced it. In all this, there is nothing specifically Christian. On the contrary, one can see the cunning of the rabbi who hooks Mary to Jewish history with the help of biblical data; we have already seen, and we will see again from the following texts, that this Mary is absolutely anti-Christian. The Jews of Mecca, like those of Medina, must have laughed under their breath at the stupidity of the Arabs when they heard these speeches built on audacious confusion.

c) Mary's retreat to the temple. - This fact is reported in the Meccan surah xix, 16-47: "Mention Mary when she withdrew from her family to a secluded place and she set up a veil beyond them". It is through the apocryphal that the rabbi knew this detail which is not found in the canonical gospels. We have already quoted the texts in the last chapter of the first part of this book (31).

d) The Annunciation - It is recounted in Surah xix, 17: "We sent Our Spirit to her and it appeared to her (in the form of) a perfect mortal." At the sight of this beautiful apparition, Myriam becomes afraid: "I take refuge with the Benefactor against you," she says, "May you fear God." Instinctively, Mary, who has never known a man, seeks to protect her purity. She takes refuge in the Lord. He will keep her from this young man who dares to stand before her; these are bad manners! But Myriam, raised in the temple of Jerusalem, who has heard the priests pray, knows that Yahweh is the refuge for those who fear Him: "Yahweh is my rock and my fortress, and my deliverer is my God. I take shelter in Him, my rock, my shield and my horn of salvation, my citadel and my refuge" (ii Samuel, xxii, 3). "He is the shield of anyone who takes refuge in Him" (ibid., 31). With such a shield, Mary is safe. Be careful, young man! Yahweh is my strength. May you too take refuge in Him, be among those who fear God, otherwise you will be punished! - So far, Myriam is still a good little Jewess, who only knows the Scriptures of her ancestors, the Scriptures of the Patriarchs and Prophets. The reflexes we perceive in her are solely and can only be the

reflexes of a pure child, raised according to the spirit of the holy Scriptures by the priests of the Temple.

Seeing the emotion and disturbance of the young virgin, the young man finally introduces himself: "I am," he says, "only the emissary of your Lord, (come) to give you a pure boy" (sour. xix, 19). Myriam is even more troubled. She doesn't even hear the last word of the conversation "pure". She doesn't pay attention to it. She has retained only one thing, a thing dreadful for her, a monstrous thing that she will never accomplish: this young man testifies to an audacity that puts her beside herself. She resists, she who is very young, who can only be shy; looking squarely at the stranger, she declares to him: "How would I have a boy, when no mortal has touched me and I am not a prostitute?" Poor little Myriam! Proudly, she declares to the emissary I am not who you think I am. You can withdraw. I am not a prostitute, and I do not give myself to the first comer whose identity I don't even know.

The celestial messenger cuts short this conversation: I am leaving, Myriam, but you will realize that what I have just announced to you will happen. It is easy for Yahweh, the Almighty. For Him, a decreed thing is an accomplished thing. It is Yahweh himself who gave this sign of an incredible alliance between virginity and maternity. Our great prophet Isaiah said it (Isaiah vii, 14). And the rabbi of Mecca only repeats what was part of the Jewish tradition: "We will certainly make him (your son) a sign for the people and a grace from us (sour. xix, 21). We made her and her son a sign for the world" (sour. xxi, 91).

This text from Surah xix, 19, which we have just read, is obviously not inspired by the Gospel of Saint Luke i, 26-38, although the theme is fundamentally identical. It is the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew that the rabbi refers to: "A young man appears to her whose beauty could not be described. Mary, seeing him, was seized with fear and began to tremble. He said to her, 'Fear not, Mary, you have found favor with Me' (32)."

In Surah iii, 37-40 of Medina, the rabbi once again recounts this scene of the Annunciation. Let's read this text with a lot of attention and without any haste. In this passage, it is no longer an emissary of the Lord, appearing as a handsome young man, who presents himself to the sister of Moses and Aaron. It is Angels who come to bring Myriam this extraordinary message: The Angels said: "O Mary! Allah has chosen and purified you. He has chosen you over all the women of this world". - It is not every woman who can have such an adventure, to become a mother without the help of a man. Yahweh, Mary, has purified you for this extraordinary mission, preserving your virginity. The Immaculate Conception has absolutely nothing to do with this declaration by the rabbi. Those

who assert the contrary write novels of the worst taste, even if they are eminent professors.

To support this incredible message, the angels strongly recommend Mary to remain a good Jew. She should not dream of impossible things. Already the rabbi alludes to the impossibility for Mary to give birth to a God, for who can fathom the female imagination? Your inviolable virginity and the miraculous conception of your son will not make him an extraordinary being among mortals! Be careful, Myriam. The Lord will give you a sign for Israel, but continue to pray to the God of your brother Moses! Remain “in prayer before your Lord. Prostrate yourself and bow down with those who bow down!” Those who bow down and prostrate themselves are not Muslims. Muslims as such originally had no identity. We now know with certainty that they are only Arabs converted to Judaism. When they prostrate themselves, it is because the Jews - their fathers in religion - have imposed on them to adopt this reverential gesture before Yahweh. The Old Testament and the Talmud, as well as the teaching of the rabbi to Mohammed, are unanimous on this point: those who prostrate themselves before Yahweh are Jews (33). The brother of Myriam, Moses, bows down to the earth and prostrates himself saying: “If I have found favor in your eyes...” (34). Myriam, say the Angels, do as your brother does. Bow down; prostrate yourself before Yahweh. And, addressing his associate Mohammed, the rabbi adds listen well to what I am going to tell you (35). I am going to reveal things that you are totally ignorant of. You ignore them because you were not present in person at the time of the events: “You were not among them when they cast their reeds (to know) who among them would take care of Mary; you were not among them when they were disputing” (36). We do not know exactly what fact the rabbi is referring to; but Arab Muslims know it: “According to Muslim legend, the priests who were arguing about who would take care of Mary settled the question by each throwing his reed into the Jordan. Since Zachariah’s was the only one that came back up to the surface, it was Zachariah who was designated to take care of Mary” (37). Father Abd-el-Jalil also points out some Muslim comments, which obviously have no foundation “The recourse to lots did not take place until later, following a famine during which Zachariah, too old, no longer had the strength to overcome material difficulties and provide for Mary’s needs. Someone had to take care of her. The lot designated a carpenter named Jourayj. An ancient text declares that this Jourayj was a monk (râhib) at the same time as a carpenter, an old indication that insinuates the purity of morals of Mary’s new guardian, and that no one seems to have retained. Jourayj practiced his trade and provided for Mary’s needs; he brought what he could find in these difficult times; but what little he brought was miraculously increased and improved to Zachariah’s great astonishment” (38).

It seems much simpler to admit that we are unaware of the event to which the rabbi is alluding. You were not there either, my son, when the angels said to Myriam: “Yahweh announces (the good news) of a word from Him and (the name of) this word is Messiah, son of Mary, who will be illustrious in this life and in the other and among the closest (to the Lord).” Many syncretists swoon over this text. You can clearly see, it’s undeniable: Jesus, son of Mary, is the Word. Christians do not speak differently. For them too, Jesus is the Word and will be illustrious in the other world, just as he will be illustrious in this life, for his fame will be great among men who are closest to God, that is to say undoubtedly among Christians, disciples of Jesus! One would have to be really mean-spirited not to see that Islam here extends a hand to Christianity and that Mohammed, if he did not recognize the divinity of Christ, was at least extremely sympathetic to him.

Why are there troublemakers like us who insist on not reading diagonally, or almost, and who, being late, prefer to walk rather than in a supersonic plane, and still try to understand the texts by meditating on them? O Myriam! Yahweh announces to you the good news of a word from Him, word: kalimatin (sour. iii, 40; see also same expression v. 34). Blachère translates: “O Mary! Allah announces a Word emanating from Him”. For today’s Christians, such a translation obviously recalls the prologue of the Gospel of Saint John and can only greatly promote Christian-Muslim rapprochement. Yes, but unfortunately there is a fundamental difference between the Acts of Islam and the Gospel of Saint John: for Saint John, “in the beginning was the Word and the Word was God”. When we know - from the texts - with what determination the rabbi of Mecca fights the divinity of Jesus, any rapprochement between the Acts and Saint John becomes absolutely impossible. Under these conditions, why, in a translation, choose precisely terms that can be misleading? Why identify Jesus, son of Mary, herself sister of Moses, with God, which constitutes for Jews stabilized in Judaism the most monstrous of blasphemies?

This translation of Kalimatin by “Word” is all the more surprising as Blachère himself (39) notes that “the context allows to translate here by Word (why?), a meaning that the word has only exceptionally in the Quran”.

This term of Word of God - (we are sorry to make this observation again to our Catholic apologists) - has nothing, in itself, specifically Arabic. We can even affirm that it is specifically Hebrew and Jewish. Word and Wisdom are often identified in the Old Testament. They preexist in Yahweh (40); they were there at the time of creation “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth”. Already, His Word existed, since “God said: ‘Let there be light...’” (41). “God of the Fathers, Lord of mercy, you who, by your word, made the universe” (42). In

the Old Testament, the Word is an attribute of the Almighty. It will take until the New Testament for this attribute to be clearly personified (43). But for a Jew, such a release is impossible. The Word of God, or more exactly, the word of God will never constitute a divine person. The Word of God, for a Jew, is an attribute by which God acts outside of Himself. It is obviously not a question of making it the second person of a Trinity. This interpretation is rigorously unthinkable. According to the rabbi, the Angels would have said to the daughter of 'Imrân “We have come to bring you a word from Yahweh. You will have a son whose name will be Messiah. He will also be called Jesus, son of Mary; he will be illustrious here below, in the other world, and among those close to the Lord”; not certainly among Christians whom the rabbi has so much fought in Mecca and whom he fights even more in Medina, but among Jews. It is the Jews, and they alone, who are the “close ones to the Lord”.

At the announcement made by the Angels, Myriam responds by addressing the Lord directly: “Lord, how could I have a child, when no mortal has touched me?” The Angels respond (44): “Yahweh creates what he wants (45). When he decrees a thing, He only says his purpose: ‘Be!’ and it is” (46). You see it for yourselves, dear readers, these Angels really speak like good Jews, like excellent connoisseurs of the Old Testament.

Let us gather once more before these texts and the concrete situation they reveal to us. This time, we are in Medina. The discussions between the rabbi and the Christians, inaugurated in Mecca, continue more beautifully, and even more bitterly in Yatrib. On many occasions, the author of the Acts of Islam is obliged, by the acerbic tone of these discussions, to criticize Christian themes. He did not have to talk about Mary and Jesus to his community of neo-converts to Judaism. He only talks about it because the Christians have awakened from their torpor and are now violently attacking Judaism. It would be ridiculous to believe, as our good Quranists do, that Christians are attacking Mohammed founder of a new religion. Mohammed does not found anything at all, and this is what his fetishist co-tribesmen sometimes reproach him for, in a mocking tone: you are only a student; you only repeat what your monitor instills in you; you only tell us old stories! As for the Christians who until the rabbi’s nice coup, coexisted peacefully with the Jews, they suddenly feel invaded by the apostolic flame. And it is Judaism that they contradict; it is against Jewish religious expansion that Arab Christians stand up: Moses, that’s very good. It is not us, Christians, who will seek to erase him from religious history. But Moses - our Christian faith teaches us - is incomplete. He threw into idolatrous humanity a weighty announcement, a massive proclamation that broke the reign of idols, ruined ineffective fetishism and inaugurated the worship of the Unique, Living and Almighty God. But Yahweh preserved for other times the subtleties of his Word

revealing and creating a new world. For Christians, Mary inaugurated this new divine plan.

Christian preaching was such a success among the polytheistic Arabs that Mohammed himself, after professing faith in the God of Israel, almost abandoned the synagogue to take the path of the Church. The rabbi reproaches him for this hesitation. There were also contrary upheavals, and Christians were seen abandoning the Church to return to Jewish prayer. The rabbi had taken the lead in Jewish resistance to Christianity. To Moses, they want to oppose the religion of Christ. Well! Let's see objectively what it is. Jesus was born of Mary. Very good! Who is Mary?.. and the rabbi forges the argument that we have related from the Acts of Islam. If the rabbi knows the canonical gospels, he never refers to them. He reads Pseudo-Matthew; we can affirm this with certainty. But he reads as a Jew rooted in traditional Judaism can read a Christian book, that is, with circumspection, and by bringing all the characters back into the Jewish zone. He admits everything, except what can cause the slightest harm to the religion of Israel. He could read in Christian works that Mary's father was Joachim; but he will make sure to divert his Arab listeners from the true track: daughter of 'Imrân, sister of Moses and Aaron, virgin, sign given to Israel, privileged young girl, mother of Jesus, here we are tossed from Moses to Isaiah, from Isaiah to Jesus, from Jesus to 'Imrân by his mother. A real mess. All this has no logic. The rabbi has the consummate art of confusing the clearest situations; he can tell the Arab idolaters the most absurd stories, he is calm, they will not check. In his story, the appearance of Jesus is just a miscellaneous fact in the history of Israel, and without any connection with the redemption of mankind. Myriam thus appears as a Virgin expurgated and deformed by a Jew. This is the famous bridge that some Christians, as ill-informed as they are well-intentioned, offer us to link Islam and Christianity. It's simply absurd and ridiculous (47).

e) Myriam becomes pregnant. - The spirit of God (48), the emissary of the Lord (49), descended in the form of a beautiful young man (50), or even the angels announcing good news (51), disappear after having announced the decree of Yahweh, a decree always followed by realization; Myriam became "pregnant with the child" (52). Nothing here contradicts the religion of Israel.

f) The miraculous birth of Jesus Christ. - If the rabbi of Mecca totally ignored what could approach, even from afar, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, a dogma that had not yet clearly emerged in Christian consciousness, on the other hand, in accordance with the text of Isaiah vii, 14, he could not hesitate for a single moment about the miraculous birth of Myriam's child, a child named Jesus, and whom the rabbi presents as the nephew of Moses and Aaron, the grandson of 'Imrân.

This miraculous birth, admitted by Jewish tradition, is affirmed many times in the Acts of Islam. But between the words of Yahweh's envoy and the fact that Myriam is pregnant, nothing happens, absolutely nothing. The conception immediately follows the annunciation: "Your Lord said: This is easy for Me... it's a decreed matter, and she became pregnant with the child" (53). To make her pregnant, it was enough for us to breathe our Spirit into her (54). Truly, Myriam daughter of 'Imrân remained a virgin, and we breathed Our Spirit into her (55). Myriam was a saint (56); she was among those who prayed (57).

g) The period of pregnancy. - Having become pregnant immediately after the announcement of the divine envoy, the Virgin Myriam entered her period of pregnancy. She left her parents and withdrew to a secluded place: "She became pregnant with the child and withdrew with him to a remote place". Pseudo-Matthew provided the rabbi of Mecca with this detail that we find in the Protoevangelium of Saint James and in the Armenian recension of the Gospel of Infancy (58). This secluded place was located "on a quiet and watered hill" (59).

h) The delivery. - It is in the desert that Mary gives birth to her son: "The pains surprised her near the trunk of the palm tree (60). She was alone, in the middle of the desert. We understand her distress: "Would to heaven," she exclaimed, "that I had died before this moment and that I had been totally forgotten!" (61). This is where the miracle reported in the Hebrew gospel of Pseudo-Matthew is fulfilled: "The child, looking up at his mother, said to her: "Do not be sad. Your Lord has put a stream at your feet" (62) and you will therefore not be thirsty. You will not be hungry either. "Shake towards you the slip of the palm tree: you will thus drop fresh and ripe dates on you. Eat, drink and let your tears stop flowing. If you see a human being, do not engage in conversation with him. Simply tell him: today, I am fasting and I offer my fast to the Lord" (63). This anecdote of the palm tree is still borrowed by the rabbi from Pseudo-Matthew who places it, moreover, not at the date of birth, but at the time of the flight to Egypt. As can be seen from our justifying references, this account of Myriam's pregnancy and her delivery is only mentioned in Meccan sura xix: it is not found in any Medinan sura.

i) Myriam's return to her own. - It is easy for us to represent the exact situation: Myriam, absent from her family for several months, decides to return home. She is no longer alone. She carries with her a child. She knows, she, Myriam, that her conduct is irreproachable; she has committed no fault; she has received a visit from an emissary of Yahweh; Yahweh himself deposited the seed of her conception, without the intervention of a man; she knows, she, Myriam, that her virginity has not been violated by her maternity. She knows all this, but her own do not know it. She may have told her mystery; but is this incredible

story told by a young girl, even if she is the best, believable? Myriam feels enveloped in suspicion. She has no support. The Christian Gospels do not leave Myriam alone in the face of her “trial”. Joseph is at her side, his support, his confidant, also a confidant of Yahweh “Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary, your wife, into your home, for what has been begotten in her comes from the Holy Spirit” (64). But the rabbi, who ignores our canonical Gospels, also ignores Joseph. Myriam is alone with her son, alone with her shame. She knows what awaits her when she returns home: aren’t you ashamed, Myriam, of what you have done? We are however an honorable family, so far without reproach. Look at your brother Aaron. He’s a boy, but he’s very serious. The rabbi does not speak of Moses at the birth of Jesus. According to Exodus, Moses is the youngest of 'Imrân’s children; he is probably not yet born. As soon as Myriam entered her own home, her parents addressed her with the sharpest reproaches: ah, Myriam! here you are... and with a fatherless child! “O sister of Aaron, your father was not after all an unworthy man, nor your mother a prostitute” (65).

j) Jesus, son of Mary. - In the thought of the rabbi of Mecca, Jesus, nephew of Moses and Aaron, was to be like his two uncles and like his mother Myriam a sign for humanity: “We will make him a sign for people and a grace from Us” (66). “We made her and her son a sign for the world” (67). “From the son of Myriam and his mother, We have made a sign” (68), according to the prophecy of Isaiah: “So it is the Lord himself who will give you a sign” (69). The signs given by Yahweh to Israel are signs for the world, because Israel has been placed in the midst of nations to be the witness of the All Power and Mercy of Yahweh.

CHAPTER I

FUNNY... BLODY

1. — Christmas Truce. - Christmas is a very big celebration in France. Catholics and Protestants celebrate the memory of the birth of Jesus, Redeemer of the world, son of God and son of Mary. For non-believers and strong spirits, Christmas remains an occasion for festivities. The “réveillon” is almost a national institution. The most anticlerical, secular and mandatory Minister of Public Instruction will never have the idea to abolish Christmas holidays on the pretext that this clerical institution violates the conscience of teachers and non-believing students. Strikes of this style - continuing classes during Christmas holidays, in public education establishments, to protest against the existence of private education establishments - are unheard of. But if religious holidays are so important in France itself, let the French people in the metropolis get it into their heads, once and for all, that our great Christian anniversaries have absolutely no echo in the Islamized world. The Islamized people of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, for the most part, ignore what Mohammed himself represents; many times I have asked them this question - (who was Mohammed?) - and invariably I have obtained the same answer: my father knew; I don't know; I believe that Mohammed has been dead for a long time; I don't know well! - All the more reason, if you happen to talk to them about Christmas, it will be the most complete bewilderment.

Indeed, there exists a Christian Committee for France-Islam Understanding (what does this terrible juxtaposition mean?), which we believe is headquartered at 21, rue Monsieur, Paris 6th, and which is chaired - if our information is correct, by Mr. Professor Massignon - who took the generous and overly naive initiative in 1956 to propose a truce to the Fellaghas operating in Algeria that would last from December 22 to 25. The same Committee invited the “believers” of France and Algeria (i.e., Christians and Islamized individuals) to impose a preparatory prayer in order to obtain a “ceasefire” and establish Algerian harmony in justice and mutual respect! I am not a torturer; I am not an unbeliever either. I would simply like to have a little common sense in all these problems, to speak a language that men who do not wage war, but murder, loot, set fires, commit the most atrocious cruelties can understand. Concretely, what kind of repercussion could such a proposal have on the uncultured brains of the Islamized, even if they were the most honest in the world? What does Christmas mean to them? What element of harmony, justice, appeasement, kindness,

gentleness does this name evoke for them? No, really, they are not yet tuned into this wavelength.

Let's note that Christians do not have a monopoly on these naiveties. At the end of December 1956, not wanting to be outdone by "France-Islam", the Civic and Social Union also addressed an appeal to Mr. Guy Mollet for a Christmas truce to be established in Algeria! This is really supremely comical. This appeal is worth reading:

Women and mothers of France and Algeria, Europeans and Maghrebis! Christmas unites us all in peace and hope (go see why!). We ardently wish that this day be marked by a truce in spirits and in acts.

For this truce to be possible and effective, this desire for peace must be active in everyone's heart. It is certainly in the hearts of women, mothers.

Let's unite our efforts to obtain from the leaders a Christmas truce, a harbinger full of hope for a true peace based on justice, equity and fraternity.

I would really like to know who these mothers from Algeria and the Maghreb are, united with the mothers of France and Europe during the Christmas holidays, in peace and hope! We still don't have the right to write such nonsense and such foolishness on such serious subjects!

The response did not take long, all the newspapers noted an increase in attacks in Algeria during the Christmas holidays themselves.

2 — Measures of clemency on the occasion of Ramadan. - Ramadan, as everyone knows, is the Lent of those who have embraced Islam. It officially consists of abstaining from consuming anything, neither liquid nor solid, and not smoking between sunrise and sunset. Seen from a Minister's office and through French traditions imbued with Christianity, this sacred time is undoubtedly marked by the return of souls to a better life, by repentance; a magnanimous government, which wants to manifest its infinite respect for the faith of the Muslims it protects, must therefore make a gesture of goodwill.

The sunset is announced in large cities with a Muslim population by a cannon shot. At this precise moment, the Moorish cafes fill up and immediately another kind of sport begins that only those who have really attended or who are obliged to support can understand. These noisy festivities, which often last until the middle of the night, accompanied by drumming and shouting, provided the French Government with an opportunity to show that France was truly the

protector of Islam :(O Charles Martel! O Saint Louis.) — Favor licenses were already granted to those who had embraced Islam; the opening of Moorish cafes was extended. Mr. Lacoste, resident minister, wanted, in 1957, to renew these gestures of goodwill towards his “Muslim brothers”.

Algiers, March 31. — On the occasion of Ramadan, Mr. Robert Lacoste took the following measures of clemency: — 700 people assigned to residence in accommodation centers will be released in the coming days. — From March 15, sanctions taken against civil servants who, under pressure from the rebellion, had taken part in the strike movement at the end of January, will be lifted, except for the appreciation of responsible authorities. — The prefects have been ordered to reopen shops and stores closed during the attempted insurrectional strike at the end of January, except in cases of particular gravity that responsible authorities will have to appreciate.

As expected, the “protégés of France” were quick to respond to their brother, Mr. Lacoste. The newspapers have communicated to us the meaning and extent of this response: “Several attacks marked the beginning of Ramadan. — Algiers, April 2: two series of events have been drawing attention since yesterday in Algeria. On one hand, the coincidence of a new series of attacks in Algiers with the beginning of the ritual fast of the month of Ramadan”

Will our great politicians ever understand that they are the laughing stock of the Islamized people of Algeria, that there is no common measure in their way of thinking, speaking and acting with this objective reality; that this objective reality is not grasped in office reports, but in concrete life; that it is absurd for metropolitan politicians to want to solve Algerian problems without taking into account the men who are daily engaged in these problems, know them from the inside, through long experience, outside of any political party ideology?

I was expecting to see the Resident Minister, Mr. Lacoste, support the pilgrimage to Mecca, as his predecessors did, during which the slave market is organized and anti-Western policy is forged! To those who would like to have some good moments of hilarity, I would advise them to revisit the Algerian newspapers from before 1950, and reread the moving and pious words that “our dear governors address to the dear pilgrims”. It’s enough to make you cry... with laughter and sadness. When representatives of an officially atheist government go to give sermons to the “believers”, it rings false. Their grimaces do not deceive Muslims, who respond with machine guns.

CHAPTER III

BOOGEYMAN FUN

On August 24, 1956, Sheikh el-Bakhouri, ministers of cults in Egypt, launched a call for holy war in a sermon delivered at the El-Azhar mosque, which is considered to be the main university in the Arab world, if one can speak of a university in the land of Islam. This term, holy war, has a mysterious power. It transforms Muslims into trembling and frenzied dervishes, while it plunges Westerners into a fear very close to terror. These two words, which evoke notions that are contradictory at first glance, awaken images of bloody and merciless battles excited by the most primitive religious fanaticism. At the sound of these few syllables, the poor fellows of Islam are completely disoriented and the Christian world, which has long been accustomed to fighting - but in a completely different way - to uphold holy things and sacred rights, is as if struck by paralysis or hemiplegia. To keep our cool, let's start by remembering that it is not impossible to reason with all these madmen who lose all control at the simple word of Jihad, holy war. Recent history provides us with a memorable example during the Israeli-Arab war, despite their famous Jihad, the Egyptians, having left and abandoned their shoes to run better, would have ended up in Cape Town if the English, whose policy is decidedly inconsistent when it comes to the Middle East, had not imprudently forbidden Jewish armies from entering Cairo! One can say that the holy war would have led them far!

But the bluff of the Jihad will be even better deflated by a bit of "Quranic" exegesis. Indeed, it is in a few verses of the Pseudo-Quran that this idea of holy war originated. So let's take these verses firmly in hand, remembering that the Pseudo-Quran, or more exactly the Acts of Islam, are written by a Jew. It is in surah xxv, 54, that we encounter for the first time the word djâhada which our great Arabico-Quranists interpret in the sense of a war, not just any war, but a holy war: "Do not obey the unbelievers, but fight them vigorously in a battle full of ardor."

Montet needed no more to evoke the horrific specter of a fierce war between Muslims and non-believers. At the end of the second Meccan period, the Arab-Jews or Muslims would therefore be at daggers drawn with the Arabs who remained polytheists; and as the powder rifle is not yet invented, these two groups slaughter each other around the Ka'ba. Mohammed, terrible, his eyes bulging and bloodshot, the tuft of hair bristling on his skull, a dagger clenched between his white teeth, stands upright in the middle of his troops. Here he is now emerging from the faithful group and rushing through the alleys of Mecca,

in search of idolaters to smite. It is divine justice that passes in a whirlwind, annihilating everything in its path... !

It's really very amusing, at the same time as pitiful, to observe how legends have been created in Islam, even in view of the clearest texts, to fabricate a carnival Mohammed for us.

“Do not obey the unbelievers, but fight them vigorously in a battle full of ardor”. What does this war communicate, this order of the day No. 1 mean? Let's sit comfortably; before we take our counter-offensive measures, let's reflect a bit on the adversary's aims. Naturally, it is not Mohammed who is speaking. We are less afraid, aren't we? Let's look closely at the preacher, it's always the rabbi of Mecca. He knows from daily experience the difficulties of Jewish apostolate among the Meccans. It was a relatively easy task for him to decide Mohammed to abandon the idols. Khadija was there, Mohammed only had to obey promptly. He had nothing to say, the poor man. But converting the Arab tribes was much more difficult. The idolaters mocked Mohammed, increasingly shaken and jostled by the taunts of his compatriots. The rabbi gives him his advice to keep him in the camp of monotheists: above all I beg you, my son, do not return to the idols of the Ka'ba, which are only lifeless and powerless stones; preach loudly and incessantly the unique God of Israel. Do not let yourself be saddened by the mockery of your compatriots. Now you are strong, you are certain of victory. Yahweh guides you, he supports you, he protects you with his all-powerful arm. Fight with ardor, with unwavering energy. You know, you, the revelation of Yahweh, made to Moses on Mount Sinai. You know the Truth descended from Heaven. Fight your idolatrous compatriots by throwing in their face the Quran of Moses. Remember what is written in this Book “You shall have no other gods before my face. You shall not make any graven image or any likeness of what is in heaven above or what is on earth below or what is in the waters beneath the earth. You shall not bow down before them and you shall not serve them. For I, Yahweh, your God, am a jealous God” (Exodus xx, 3-4). “Do not turn to idols and do not make for yourselves molten gods. I am Yahweh, your God” (Leviticus xix, 48). These words of Yahweh are your weapons of combat.

Blachère, for this time, has understood the text of the Acts of Islam (xxv, 54), and it is with frankness that he translates this famous verse: “Do not submit to the Infidels and wage a great battle against them by means of Preaching” (Blachère, op. cit., t. ii, p. 130), that is to say, taking into account the incredible transpositions of Blachère, by means of the Quran. The idolaters accuse you of lies; fight, fight against them, my Mohammed! You have a weapon to protect yourself and to attack; you have spear and shield: it is the Quran that God revealed to Moses in Hebrew and that I have just made intelligible for your

language! So breathe, friends! Mohammed does not have a rifle. His bombs are the verses of the Pentateuch. The blood does not flow, but the tongues are unleashed. It's a lawyers' fight. The holy war as we conceive it today is at the end of an evolution that originated in a logomachy. The term holy war will soon disappear from Muslim jokes.

The term "djâhada" is found in verse 5 of Surah xxix. Naturally, the ineffable Montet hastens to declare "that we are in the period of the battles that followed the Hegira" (Montet, Quran, p. 535, n. 9). Fortunately, we find more peaceful comments, for example here again the paraphrase of Blachère: that the term "djâhada" "does not mean here to wage an armed battle against the polytheists; it is about the battle against passions, battle by word or threat" (Blachère, op. cit. t ii, p. 524). As we can see, one should not expect in this kind of war the clatter of weapons, the brandishing of sabers, the cutting of jugular veins! Mohammed is not in shirt sleeves, sleeves rolled up, seroual held by a belt adorned with pistols! What a pity for cinematographic shots!

The holy war, the djâhada, after all, is not a terrible thing. Let's look closely at the scene, as the Acts of Islam make us glimpse it. Mohammed, an Arab son of Arabs, married a Jew. Naturally, he had to convert to Judaism, preach the Unique God of Israel, tell his compatriots about the victorious adventures of Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, against the idolaters of their time. But he finds before him determined adversaries: the rich Meccan merchants and the worshipers of the lithic fetishes of the Ka'ba. They mock him, insult him, repeat to him that he is nothing more than a man like the others. Sometimes they call him crazy, sometimes a liar, sometimes a fool, sometimes a traitor, in tow of the Jews. Under this avalanche Mohammed is about to falter: "they were about to seduce you and take you away from what we have revealed to you" (sour. xvii, 75). If they had succeeded, "they would have taken him for a friend" (ibid.). And this would have happened if I had not strengthened you in your vocation, for already you were leaning towards them: "If we had not confirmed you, you would certainly have inclined towards them somewhat" (ibid. 76). Courage, my son, you will conquer! Everywhere and always, the apostles of Yahweh have been victorious over their detractors: Your enemies, fight them with courage, my son, march against them with ardor. To their mockery, oppose the texts of the Quran of Moses that I have revealed to you. The holy war... Instead of a Mohammed with a bulging chest and stiff biceps brandishing on both sides a cut-choux already all tinged with blood, we have a Mohammed who is very annoyed at having let himself be subjugated by a Jewess, his dear rich and authoritative wife; we have a Mohammed who sees himself in a f...u mess at the thought of having to preach under the direction of a rabbi the religion of Israel to his compatriots! Come on Mohammed courage! Preach the Quran of Moses. You have nothing to

fear. Speak loudly and respond to your detractors by reciting what I have taught you.

Good health in exegesis is enough to deflate the balloon of holy war. There are still, in the Acts of Islam, other belligerent texts: and always the same foolish and stupid interpretations (70). No, Mohammed is not a formidable warrior. The rabbi himself, if he is tenacious in his apostolate, never thought of giving a beating to his disciple when he was seriously considering returning to the Ka'ba. Khadija probably did not have a good character. We have proof of this in Surah cxi against Abu Lahab and his wife, where Mohammed, out of fear of his wife, utters invectives against his uncle and aunt. But if he had to walk straight in front of Khadija, nothing indicates that the mistress of the house beat her husband when he hesitated in his Jewish faith. This story of holy war still originally means that the rabbi of Mecca and Khadija constituted for the too adventurous Mohammed as a straitjacket that encircled him and forced him to hold firm in the path of Yahweh!

Periodically, we see the emergence in Islam of Mahdis, that is to say, adventurers who seek to stir up the masses in the name of the Quran, to launch them into a war they call holy, and which is fundamentally just a political camouflage. If these turbulent individuals had the fancy to rely on the Meccan surahs to make noise, one could invite them to change their tune. The holy war in Mecca is defined in a few words: Courage, Mohammed! Your opponents insult you. But fear nothing. Above all, walk straight! Your wife is there, by your side, who does not let you go. The rabbi is there who instructs you and supports you. Deal a few good blows of the Quran on the heads of your opponents, and you will emerge victorious from this battle of tongues!

The Jihad, the holy war is a myth.

LEONIDAS • NANVS • VITALIS