

«مقاله پژوهشی»

## نقد و بررسی دیدگاه خورشید و فون اشتوش در خصوص روایت قرآن کریم از تصلیب عیسی (ع)

سید علی مرکبی<sup>۱\*</sup>، عباس اسماعیلی زاده<sup>۲</sup>

### چکیده

مُهَنْد خورشید و کلاوس فون اشتوش در بخشی از کتاب «پیامبر دیگر: عیسی در قرآن»، به بررسی دلالت آیه ۱۵۷ سوره نساء پرداخته‌اند. این دو پژوهشگر معتقدند قرآن کریم به صراحت موضوع تصلیب حضرت عیسی (ع) را رد نکرده است. از دیدگاه آنان، آیه محل بحث را می‌توان به گونه‌ای تفسیر کرد که با روایت اناجیل درباره به صلیب رفتن عیسی (ع) سازگاری داشته باشد و حال آنکه مفسران مسلمان در طول تاریخ به نادرست این آیه را در تقابل با آموزه های اناجیل قرار داده‌اند. در این نوشتار ضمن دسته‌بندی ادله مطرح‌شده توسط این دو محقق، دیدگاه آنان در تفسیر آیه مذکور مورد نقد و بررسی قرار خواهد گرفت و با استفاده از روش تفسیر قرآن به قرآن و نیز تحلیل تطبیقی با متون عهد جدید، تبیین می‌شود که چگونه تفسیر پیشنهادی خورشید و فون اشتوش از این آیه با آنچه آیه بر آن دلالت دارد، بیگانه می‌باشد.

### واژه‌های کلیدی

قرآن کریم، کتاب مقدس، انجیل، عیسی، تصلیب.

۱. دانشجوی دکتری علوم قرآن و حدیث دانشگاه فردوسی مشهد، ایران.  
۲. دانشیار گروه علوم قرآن و حدیث دانشگاه فردوسی مشهد، ایران.

نویسنده مسئول:

سید علی مرکبی

رایانامه: [sa.morakkabi@mail.um.ac.ir](mailto:sa.morakkabi@mail.um.ac.ir)

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۳/۱۲/۱۲

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۴/۰۵/۱۴

### استناد به این مقاله:

مرکبی، سیدعلی و اسماعیلی‌زاده، عباس (۱۴۰۴).  
نقد و بررسی دیدگاه خورشید و فون اشتوش در  
خصوص روایت قرآن کریم از تصلیب عیسی (ع).  
فصلنامه قرآن و روشنگری دینی، ۶(۱)، ۹۱-۱۰۲.  
(DOI: 10.30473/quran.2025.73875.1304)

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# A Critique on Khorchide and Von Stosch's Theory Regarding the Crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'an

Sayed Ali Morakkabi<sup>1\*</sup> , Abbas Ismailizadeh<sup>2</sup> 

1. Ph.D Student , Department of Qur'an and Hadith Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.

2. Associate Professor of Quran and Hadith studies in Ferdowsi university. Iran.

Correspondence

Sayed Ali Morakkabi

Email: [sa.morakkabi@mail.um.ac.ir](mailto:sa.morakkabi@mail.um.ac.ir)

Received: 02 Mar 2025

Accepted: 05 Aug 2025

### How to cite

Morakkabi, S.A. & Ismailizadeh, A. (2025). A Critique on Khorchide and Von Stosch's Theory Regarding the Crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'an. Quran and Religious Enlightenment, 6(1), 91-102. (DOI: [10.30473/quran.2025.73875.1304](https://doi.org/10.30473/quran.2025.73875.1304))

### ABSTRACT

In their book, "The Other Prophet: Jesus in the Qur'an," Mouhanad Khorchide and Klaus von Stosch examine Qur'an 4:157, offering a perspective that challenges conventional Islamic interpretations of the verse. The central argument of Khorchide and Von Stosch is that the Qur'an does not explicitly reject the crucifixion of Jesus. Instead, they propose an alternative interpretation that aligns the verse with Gospel narratives. They contend that traditional Muslim exegetes have historically misconstrued this verse, presenting it as contradictory to Gospel accounts rather than acknowledging its potential consonance with them. This article systematically categorizes and then critically examines Khorchide and Von Stosch's interpretation of Qur'an 4:157. Employing the method of *Tafsir al-Qur'an Bi'l Qur'an* (interpreting the Qur'an by the Qur'an) alongside a comparative analysis with the New Testament, the study demonstrates how Khorchide and Von Stosch's reading of Qur'an 4:157 diverges from the verse's explicit textual and contextual meaning.

### KEYWORDS

Qur'an, Bible, Gospel, Jesus, Crucifixion.



## Introduction

The scriptures of Christians and Muslims have long been subjects of scholarly inquiry, leading to diverse interpretations of certain verses throughout history. Among these, Qur'an 4:157 is particularly notable:

"And because of their saying: We slew the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, Allah's messenger - they slew him not nor crucified him, but it appeared so unto them; and lo! Those who disagree concerning it are in doubt thereof; they have no knowledge thereof save pursuit of a conjecture; they slew him not for certain."

This verse asserts that Jesus was neither slain nor crucified, and that the belief in his crucifixion stems from a misunderstanding of what actually occurred. Consequently, this misunderstanding led to the event being recorded in Christian history and sacred texts, even though Jesus was not truly crucified. The biblical narrative of Jesus' crucifixion, supported by the doctrine of biblical inerrancy, has led Christian theologians and Orientalists to reinterpret the Qur'anic account in an effort to reconcile perceived discrepancies between the two texts. Nevertheless, Muslim exegetes throughout history have consistently rejected the biblical account, asserting that Jesus could not have been crucified and advancing multiple theories to explain how he was spared.

Although Qur'an 4:157 has been examined by commentators from various perspectives—including the ultimate fate of Jesus, the identity of the individual crucified in his place, and the interpretation of the phrase "*Shubbiha Lahum*" (it was made to appear to them)—this article focuses solely on the arguments presented by Mouhanad Khorchide and Klaus

von Stosch in their work, "The Other Prophet: Jesus in the Qur'an." Their analysis attempts to demonstrate that the Qur'anic account aligns with the Biblical narrative of Jesus' crucifixion.

Mouhanad Khorchide was born into a Muslim family in Beirut, raised in Saudi Arabia, and later immigrated to Austria. He is currently the director of the "Documentation Center for Political Islam" in Austria. His notable publications include "Islam is Mercy, Sharia, and God Believes in Humans." Klaus von Stosch, the co-author, is a German academic and professor specializing in comparative theology and Christian-Muslim relations. He taught at the University of Paderborn from 2008 to 2021 before taking his current position in Bonn, Germany. His key works include "Challenges of Islamic Theology and Trinity."

Although Khorchide and Von Stosch come from different backgrounds—Khorchide being Muslim and Von Stosch Christian—they share a common goal of interpreting the Qur'an in a way that addresses contemporary challenges. For example, Khorchide wrote "Islam is Mercy" to counter the portrayal of Islam as a religion of violence, while Von Stosch wrote "Challenges of Islamic Theology" to explain these very challenges. Following this approach, they have attempted to reconcile the Qur'anic account with the New Testament narrative of Jesus' crucifixion.

This article aims to elucidate the primary meaning of Qur'an 4:157 while critically engaging with these scholars' interpretations. The analysis employs the methodology of Qur'anic exegesis (*Tafsīr al-Qur'ān Bi'l Qur'ān*), supplemented by references to both

the Old and New Testaments. Given the recent emergence of these scholars' interpretation of the verse, it has not yet received substantial engagement from traditional commentators, and as a result, classical exegetical works have not systematically addressed this particular perspective.

### 1. The Qur'an and the Crucifixion of Jesus

The Qur'anic position is that the crucifixion of Jesus was a matter that remained obscure to Jews and Christians. The accounts of this event did not arise from deliberate deceit or hostile intent but from a fundamental misapprehension of what actually transpired. The Qur'anic revelation, through the Prophet Muhammad, clarifies this historical misunderstanding by explicitly affirming that Jesus was neither crucified nor killed.

Nevertheless, the explicit accounts of this event in Christian scripture, particularly in all four canonical Gospels (Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24, Luke 23:33, and John 19:18), have firmly established the crucifixion narrative within Christian theology. This foundational belief subsequently gave rise to the pivotal doctrine of Atonement. This doctrine is the theological cornerstone of Christianity, positing that Jesus' crucifixion atones for human sin as a divine ransom, enabling forgiveness and humanity's reconciliation with God.

In contrast, the Qur'an's rejection of Jesus' crucifixion has been unanimously affirmed by Muslim scholars, with minimal historical dissent. Among the works supporting this view are *al-Mizān* (Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 1996 AD/1417 AH: 5, 132), *Majma' al-Bayān* (Ṭabrisī, 1993 AD/1372 SH: 3, 208), *al-Tibyān fī Tafsir al-*

*Qur'an* (Ṭūsī, n.d.: 4, 382), *Ḥāshīyah al-Shihāb* (al-Khafaji, 1996 AD/1417 AH: 3, 186), *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Ḥakīm* (Rashīd Riḍā, 1990: 4, 200), and *al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr* (Ibn 'Āshūr, 1999 AD/1420 AH: 4, 307). Additionally, some later commentaries, such as *al-Furqān fī Tafsir al-Qur'an bi'l Qur'ān* (Sadeghi Tehrani, 1986 AD/1365 SH: 7, 424), have also rejected the historicity of this event, presenting various arguments based on the Qur'an and the Bible.

However, some Muslim thinkers, such as the Ismaili missionary *Abū Ḥātam al-Rāzī*, have engaged with critiques regarding the commentators' denial of Jesus' crucifixion. In his work *'Ālam al-Nubuwwah*, *Abū Ḥātam* recorded debates with opponents who challenged Islamic doctrine, questioning why Muslims accord supreme authority to the Qur'an when its narrative of Jesus' crucifixion contradicts established historical accounts maintained by both Jewish and Christian traditions (Lawson, 2009: 123-4). *Abū Ḥātam*, in his defense of the Qur'an, sought to harmonize the Qur'anic account with the narratives found in the Gospels. He argued that a proper understanding of Surah *al-Nisā'*, verse 157, requires consideration of related Qur'anic verses, specifically Surah *al-Nisā'*, verse 158, and Surah *Al-Imran*, verse 169. According to *Abū Ḥātam*, when these verses are read together, the Qur'anic portrayal closely aligns with the account in the Gospel of Luke, which describes the event in which only the physical body of Jesus was killed, while his spirit remained alive and returned to God (Lawson, 2009: 123-124). It should be noted, however, that this interpretation is uncommon within the Muslim

exegetical tradition, with only a minority of commentators endorsing such a view.

Meanwhile, Orientalists who have studied the Qur'an, particularly its narrative of the crucifixion of Jesus, have expressed diverse views in their interpretations of this verse. Some scholars have contested the Qur'anic account, arguing that its divergence from the New Testament narrative undermines its historical validity. These critics maintain that the Qur'an's version cannot be authoritative, as its author lacked direct witness to the events. Among the earliest recorded critiques is that of John of Damascus (c. 676-749 AD), who explicitly challenged the Qur'anic narrative (Lawson, 2009: 25).

Conversely, certain non-Muslim Qur'an scholars have adopted an alternative approach by seeking reconciliation between the Qur'anic and Biblical narratives. Rather than disputing the Qur'an's historical accuracy, they propose interpretive frameworks that accommodate both accounts. Khorchide and Von Stosch exemplify this tendency, advancing exegetical and theological arguments to demonstrate that the Qur'an does not outright deny the crucifixion of Jesus but instead aims to rectify misunderstandings surrounding this crucial event. This perspective finds a parallel in Montgomery Watt's analysis, which posits that the verse principally addresses Jewish polemics rather than constituting a direct response to Christian doctrine (Zahniser, 2017: 20). In the following sections, we will explain the arguments put forward by Khorchide and Von Stosch and then critique their views regarding the crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'anic narrative.

## **2. Khorchide and Von Stosch's Arguments Supporting the Crucifixion of Jesus**

In the fourth chapter of "The Other Prophet," Khorchide and Von Stosch examine whether the Qur'an affirms Jesus' crucifixion. Through Qur'anic and theological analysis, they contend that the text does not fundamentally oppose the crucifixion narrative, arguing instead that traditional Islamic exegesis has historically imposed this interpretation. While their arguments are somewhat fragmented, we have organized them into the following categories for clearer analysis and response:

### **2.1. The Absolute Agency of God**

The Qur'an presents God as the absolute agent in creation, with all human agencies subordinate to the divine will. Within this theological framework, Khorchide and Von Stosch interpret Qur'an 4:157, arguing that its negation of Jewish claims to have crucified Jesus does not deny the historicity of the crucifixion, but rather affirms that it ultimately occurred by God's decree. They substantiate this reading by referencing Qur'an 8:17, where God declares to the Muslims after battle: "You did not kill them, but God killed them". They suggest that God makes a similar statement in Qur'an 4:157 to negate the belief of the Jews that they killed Jesus and to emphasize the importance of God's role (Khorchide and Von Stosch, 2019: 99). This interpretation is paralleled in Reynolds' analysis, who contends that Qur'an 4:157 negates not Jesus' death, but Jewish claims of agency in it, consistent with the Qur'an's broader theology that God alone takes life (Qur'an 2:258, 3:156). The term *Mutawaffika* applied to Jesus further supports this, as its usage elsewhere (Qur'an 6:60; 10:46, 104) invariably denotes natural death,

reinforced by Jesus' own post-resurrection reference to his *Tawaffi* (being taken in death) in Qur'an 5:117 (Reynolds, 2018: 181).

## 2.2. The Qur'an's View of Martyrs

The Qur'an presents martyrs as eternally alive, stating: "Do not consider those killed in God's way as dead. Rather, they are alive with their Lord, receiving sustenance." (Qur'an 3:169) Khorchide and Von Stosch extend this theological framework to interpret verses about Jesus, arguing that Qur'anic assertions that Jesus was not killed should be understood analogously to martyrs who are physically departed yet divinely sustained in life (Khorchide & Von Stosch, 2019: 99-100).

## 2.3. The Incompatibility of Divine Justice with Crucifying an Innocent Person

Traditional Islamic exegesis often resolves the crucifixion question through substitution theories, which posit that another individual was crucified while observers mistakenly believed it was Jesus. Khorchide and Von Stosch critique this view as theologically problematic for two reasons. First, they argue it contradicts divine justice, since if Jesus was condemned for claiming messiahship, justice would require him to bear the consequences rather than an innocent substitute. Second, they suggest that witnesses at the crucifixion (including Jesus' mother) would have recognized a substitute unless God actively obscured their perception, perhaps by miraculously altering the substitute's appearance (Khorchide and Von Stosch, 2019: 100).

## 2.4. The Delayed Revelation of Truth

Khorchide and Von Stosch question how God could permit Christianity to remain unaware of the "true" nature of Jesus' death for approximately six centuries. They note that after centuries of Christian belief in this sorrowful event, the Qur'an later presents an alternative account of what occurred (Khorchide and Von Stosch, 2019: 100).

## 2.5. The Distress of Mary, Mother of Jesus

Building on Biblical accounts, the scholars highlight the profound grief experienced by Mary while witnessing her son's crucifixion and question how a compassionate God could inflict such emotional suffering on an innocent mother (Khorchide & Von Stosch, 2019: 100).

## 2.6. The Qur'an's Account of Jesus' Death

The researchers cite Qur'anic verses such as Qur'an 19:33 and Qur'an 3:55, which use the words "*Amūtu*" and "*Mutawaffika*", respectively. They argue that these words, according to Qur'anic usage, indicate a natural life and death for Jesus and cannot signify his ascension to heaven (Khorchide and Von Stosch, 2019: 99). They claim that by citing these verses, they are demonstrating that even from a Qur'anic perspective, there is no statement contradictory to Jesus' crucifixion.

## 2.7. Denial of the Jews' Role in the Crucifixion of Jesus

Another interpretation, though considered unlikely by Khorchide and Von Stosch, is that Qur'an 4:157 states that the primary killers of Jesus were the Romans, not the Jews. This view is based on the idea that the Qur'an considers the crucifixion of Jesus a given and

instead addresses the identity of the perpetrators. The method of punishment—crucifixion—supports this theory, as it was a Roman form of execution for criminals, whereas Jews typically stoned those they accused of apostasy and blasphemy (Acts 6). The Gospels further describe two thieves being crucified alongside Jesus (Luke 23:32-55), a punishment naturally within the purview of the Roman government, not the Jews. Therefore, this argument suggests the crucifixion was carried out by the Roman Empire, and the Qur'an refers to this historical fact rather than denying the event itself.

### 3. Critical Analysis of the Arguments

Of the seven arguments presented, four require a direct response rooted in the Qur'anic context, while the remaining three necessitate an examination of their theological underpinnings.

#### 3.1. Response to the First Argument: Divine Agency

Khorchide and Von Stosch place significant emphasis on Qur'an 8:17, arguing that divine agency supersedes human agency and that God is therefore the primary actor in human deeds. The question is whether Qur'an 4:157 can be similarly interpreted through this theological framework.

A precise understanding of this verse requires careful analysis of the Qur'an's distinctive rhetorical patterns concerning divine agency. A close examination of Qur'anic verses reveals that while God acknowledges the killing of prophets in multiple instances, such acts are never attributed to divine agency. Instead, the Qur'an consistently identifies Jews and disbelievers as

the perpetrators (Qur'an 2:61, 2:87, 5:70), and in Qur'an 3:112, refers to them as "Disbelievers," a general term for non-Muslims. This linguistic pattern aligns with the Qur'an's broader rhetorical framework, where morally reprehensible acts (e.g., the killing of Ṣāliḥ's camel in Qur'an 91:14) are ascribed to human agents, while beneficial outcomes (such as the defeat of enemies in Qur'an 8:17) are attributed to God. This expressive pattern in the Qur'an demonstrably invalidates the interpretation advanced by Khorchide and Von Stosch.

Contextual analysis of the surrounding verses further corroborates this reading and provides critical insight into the authentic meaning of Qur'an 4:157. Two verses before the one in question, in Qur'an 4:155, God identifies the Jews as the killers of prophets. This indicates that in verse 157, as in verse 155, God is narrating the event from a historical perspective, and while the Jews were indeed the perpetrators in the killing of many prophets, they were not successful in killing Jesus, and the matter was made dubious for them. Consequently, Khorchide and Von Stosch's metaphorical interpretation proves untenable, as the Qur'an's historical narration here fundamentally differs from the metaphorical statement of divine agency in Qur'an 8:17.

The rhetorical function of "*Bal*" (but rather) in Qur'an 4:158 serves a crucial role following the denial of Jesus' crucifixion in the previous verse. As established in Arabic literary tradition, this particle operates to negate the preceding claim about Jesus' death (Ibn Hishām, 2015 AD/1437 AH: 112). Thus, while God describes the matter as dubious to the Jews and Christians in Qur'an 4:157,

verse 158 seeks to explain the reality that remained hidden from them. The complete understanding of the previous verse depends on understanding what comes after "*Bal*" (but rather), which is the ascension of Jesus to heaven. The contextual evidence therefore conclusively demonstrates that the divine negation specifically targets the killing and crucifixion of Jesus as historical events. If the verse were merely emphasizing divine agency in the manner proposed by Khorchide and Von Stosch, the subsequent "*Bal*" would logically require phrasing attributing Jesus' death to God—precisely as occurs in Qur'an 8:17, where God explicitly claims agency over the combat deaths ("It was not you who killed them, but God"). Therefore, the only remaining possibility is that the verse is speaking from a historical perspective and should not be interpreted metaphorically.

### **3.2. Response to the Second Argument: The Martyrs**

The second argument put forth by Khorchide and Von Stosch is that, according to the Qur'an, martyrs are alive and have not truly been killed, citing Qur'an 3:169 to support this view. In response, we can refer to the answer from the previous section: "The context of these verses indicates that God is narrating the event from a historical perspective. Therefore, He not only does not deny the killing of previous prophets but, on the contrary, specifically introduces the Jews as the perpetrators. For this reason, Qur'an 3:169 cannot be legitimately cited in the interpretation of Qur'an 4:157."

It must be emphasized that Qur'an 3:169 neither denies the killing of prophets nor

claims that martyrs were not physically slain. Rather, while acknowledging the historical fact of believers' martyrdom, the verse discloses an eschatological reality: that such martyrdom does not terminate their existence, as they remain sustained by divine providence. This stands in direct contrast to Qur'an 4:157's categorical denial of Jesus' killing. Consequently, using Qur'an 3:169 to interpret the verse in question is unsound and incorrect.

### **3.3. Response to the Third Argument: Divine Justice**

In response to the argument that crucifying a substitute would lead to the punishment of an innocent person, several points should be considered. First, this argument falsely portrays Jesus as a sinner. He committed no sin for which a substitute would be punished. Whether Jesus or a substitute was crucified, an innocent person would have been crucified in either case. The centurion's testimony to Jesus' innocence during the event confirms this (Gorman, 2016: 155).

Second, according to some commentators, the person crucified in Jesus' place may have been the very individual who betrayed him and showed his hiding place to the Jews, leading to his arrest. In this case, this person would have deserved punishment for his actions against a prophet of God.

Third, even if the person was one of Jesus' loyal companions, their crucifixion could be seen as an example of John 15:13: "Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends". Therefore, such an event cannot be considered impossible or contrary to the justice of God.

### **3.4. Response to the Fourth Argument: Delayed Revelation**

To explain why God might have kept such an important secret hidden for approximately 600 years, two answers can be proposed. First, the doctrines of the Trinity and salvation are unique to Christianity among the Abrahamic religions. Despite their importance for Christians, no trace of them can be found in Judaism, which believers followed for centuries. This is one of the fundamental differences between Judaism and Christianity (Bridger & Wolk, 1976: 90). The understanding of a doctrine like the Trinity would have been essential for humanity, yet it was hidden from believers from the time of Moses until the life of Jesus, a span of about 1400-1500 years. If we also consider believers before Moses, this time span becomes much longer. Therefore, the 600-year concealment of the nature of Jesus' end seems comparatively small.

A second consideration arises from an examination of early Christian sources that notably omit any reference to Jesus' crucifixion. The Gospel of Thomas and the hypothetical Q source—both dated to the first and early second centuries CE, respectively (Hogeterp, 2009: 189)—contain no mention of this event (Russell, 2006: 112). This absence suggests two possible interpretations: either these authors considered the crucifixion narratively insignificant, or they held divergent theological views regarding Jesus' death. These writers can be seen as representatives of a relatively common belief during that era. Perhaps these opponents of the crucifixion were among the individuals (alongside the Docetists) to whom Ignatius of Antioch referred in his letter, speaking of their disbelief

in the crucifixion. The existence of this letter indicates that even in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD, some Christians denied the crucifixion of Jesus (Louth, 1987: 146), though these individuals cannot be exclusively identified as Docetists.

### **3.5. Response to the Fifth Argument: Mary's Distress**

In response to the objection that a benevolent God would not cause Mary to suffer unjustly and mourn the loss of her son, it is possible that Mary and Jesus's other relatives were aware of what was happening behind the scenes. They may have feigned distress to protect Jesus and prevent government officials and others from discovering his escape from this predicament.

Furthermore, even if we accept that Mary was unaware of Jesus' salvation, this is not necessarily incompatible with God's love and kindness, as broader and greater interests often take precedence. God, in His justice, compensates for such hardships in the afterlife, just as He did for Jacob, who, despite Joseph being alive and well, grieved him as if he were dead (Genesis 42:35). Therefore, even from the perspective of Christian and Jewish scripture, such an event cannot be considered to conflict with God's justice and mercy.

### **3.6. Response to the Sixth Argument: Jesus' Death**

The invocation of Qur'an 19:33 and Qur'an 3:55 as evidence for the Qur'an's acknowledgment of Jesus' death cannot be legitimately extended to support the crucifixion narrative. The mortality referenced in Qur'an 19:33 must be understood within its eschatological context, specifically relating to

the universal death that will occur at the trumpet blast, an event encompassing all living beings according to Islamic eschatology (Leaman, 2006: 195). This interpretation is supported by the verse's immediate textual context, where Jesus' declaration "*Amūtu*" (I die) is directly followed by "*Yawma Ub'athu Hayyā*" (the day I am raised alive), clearly situating the reference within an end-times framework. The structural and thematic parallelism between these phrases demonstrates that the described death pertains to the eschatological cycle of death and resurrection rather than any historical crucifixion event.

Regarding the use of the word "*Mutawaffika*" in Qur'an 3:55, it should be noted that while this word sometimes means "death" in the Qur'an, in Qur'an 6:60 it refers to the separation of the soul from the body during sleep, so it does not necessarily mean death. The two phrases that follow this word support this interpretation: "*Rafi'uka Ilayya*" (I will raise you to Myself) and "*Mutahhiruka min al-Ladhina Kafarū*" (and purify you from those who disbelieve). These phrases, mentioned after the word, indicate that the meaning of "*Tawaffi*" here is something other than natural death. Rather, it seems to specifically refer to God removing Jesus from among those people through his ascension. This verse does not mention crucifixion, and therefore cannot be used as evidence for it.

### 3.7. Response to the Seventh Argument:

#### Denial of the Jews' Role

Although Khorchide and Von Stosch do not consider this argument—that the verse merely negates the role of the Jews and emphasizes the role of the Romans in the crucifixion—to

be very plausible, addressing it is necessary given the existence of proponents for this theory.

First, the claim that the Holy Qur'an is stating that the crucifixion of Jesus was carried out by the Romans and not the Jews is inconsistent with the beliefs of Christians themselves, who have put forward this claim. According to the Gospel of Matthew, Pilate, the Roman governor responsible for Jesus' trial, absolved himself of his blood and had no interest in the crucifixion. It was the priests who encouraged the people to ask Pilate to execute Jesus. Therefore, such a claim by Christians conflicts with their own scripture, and the main perpetrators of the crucifixion in both Jewish and Christian tradition are the Jews, not the Romans.

From an Islamic perspective, accepting this argument also faces opposition from the Qur'an and Islamic narrations, some of which were mentioned in the first section, such as the context of the verses in which this verse is located. As mentioned, the word "*Bal*" (but rather) is used to negate what came before and to express something new that is the main intention of the speaker. If the main purpose of these verses was to emphasize the role of the Romans in the crucifixion of Jesus, then at the beginning of verse 158, after the "*Bal*," the Qur'an should have said: "But rather the Romans crucified him." This would have introduced the Romans as the perpetrators of the killing while negating the role of the Jews, as some have claimed. However, in verse 158, immediately after denying the crucifixion of Jesus in verse 157, the Qur'an says: "But rather God raised him up". This reveals the main purpose of the Qur'an in verse 157, which is

nothing but the non-crucifixion of Jesus. In addition to this, verses like Qur'an 3:55, which were raised in response to the sixth objection, can also be used here.

Another reason that can be mentioned is that even if we consider the Roman soldiers as the people who killed Jesus, based on the biblical perspective, we cannot ignore the influence of the Jews in the crucifixion. From the perspective of Islamic narrations, the Jews are responsible for the killing of the prophets because they handed them over to the rulers of their time. As stated in a narration from Imam Ṣādiq (AS) regarding the killing of the prophets by the Jews: "By God, the Children of Israel did not kill the prophets with their hands and swords; rather, they heard and disclosed their words, as a result of which, the rulers and tyrants of the time arrested the prophets and martyred them." (al-Barqī, 1951 AD/1371 AH: 88) Based on this narration, the killing of the prophets by the Children of Israel was a result of the sin of revealing secrets. While in some cases they did not directly kill the prophets, this narration introduces them as directly involved because of their role in revealing the secret. With this explanation, even if we were to say that the Qur'an's denial of the crucifixion means the denial of the Jews' direct involvement and considers their role only as handing him over to the Romans (Matthew 27:1-2), and introduces the Romans as the agents of the crucifixion, the aforementioned narration indicates that even in this case, the Jews should be introduced as the killers of Jesus. However, the verse denies this matter and does not even consider the Jews involved in the crucifixion to this extent; it fundamentally denies the cross, and not just the role of the Jews in this event.

## Conclusion

The claim by Khorchide and Von Stosch regarding the alignment of the Qur'an and the New Testament concerning the crucifixion of Jesus is so contradictory to the text of the Qur'an that almost none of the important Shia and Sunni commentaries have presented such an interpretation. Although they tried to prove this with seven Qur'anic and rational reasons, an examination of these reasons shows that none of them prove the agreement of the Qur'an and the Gospels regarding the crucifixion of Jesus. Furthermore, their reasons are flawed and contradict the text of the Qur'an and even the Bible. Consequently, their arguments fail to substantiate the claim that Jesus was crucified. On the other hand, the consensus of commentators from the beginning to the present day in support of the non-crucifixion of Jesus leaves no doubt that, in the view of the Qur'an, Jesus was not actually killed or crucified in this incident, and God saved him from the clutches of the disbelievers.

## Sources

- Holy Qur'an
- Al-Barqī, A. (1951 AD/1371 AH). *al-Maḥāsin*. Qom: Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah.
- Bridger, D; Wolk, S. (1976). *The New Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York: Behrman House.
- Gorman, H. (2016). *Interweaving Innocence*. USA: Pickwick.
- Hogeterp, A. (2009). *Expectations of the End*. Netherland: Brill.
- Holy Bible (NIV).
- Ibn Ashour, M. (1999 AD/1420 AH). *al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*. Beirut: Institute of History.
- Ibn Hishām, A. (2015 AD/1437 AH). *Mughnī al-Adīb*. Qom: Center for Managing the Seminaries of the Islamic World.

- Khafaji, A. (1996 AD/1417 AH). *'Ināyat al-Qāḍīwa Kifāyat al-Rāḍī*, Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah.
- Khorchide, M; von Stosch, K. (2019). *The Other Prophet: Jesus in the Qur'an*. (Pare, S. Trans). London: Gingko.
- Lawson, T. (2009). *The Crucifixion and the Qur'an*. England: Oneworld.
- Leaman, O. (2006). *The Qur'an: An Encyclopedia*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Louth, A. (1987). *Early Christian Writings*. (Staniforth, M. Trans). Penguin Publishing Group.
- Mathias, H. (2017). *The Mission and Death of Jesus in Islam and Christianity*. Oregon, United States: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Rashid Reza, M. (1990). *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Hakīm*. Cairo: Egyptian General Book Organization.
- Reynolds, G. (2018). *The Qur'an and the Bible*. London: Yale University Press.
- Russell, M. (2006). *Understanding the Real Jesus*. USA: Infinity.
- Sadeghi Tehrani, M. (1986 AD/1365 SH). *al-Furqān fī Tafsir al-Qur'an bil Qur'an*. Qom: Cultural Publications.
- Ṭabāṭabā'ī, M. H. (1996 AD/1417 AH). *al-Mīzān fī Tafsir al-Qur'an*. Qom: Islamic Publications Office of the Society of Teachers of the Qom Seminary.
- Ṭabrisī, F. (1993 AD/1372 SH). *Majma' al-Bayān fī Tafsir al-Qur'an*. Tehran: Nasir Khusraw Publications.
- Ṭūsī, M. (n.d.). *al-Tibyān fī Tafsir al-Qur'an*. Najaf: Al-Amin Library.

