

# Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and the Taking of Poison

**Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and the Taking of Poison:**

**Rebuttal to David Wood's Offensive Video "Who Killed Muhammad?"**

By

Bassam Zawadi

David Wood's video could be seen [here](#). We encourage our readers to first watch the video in full and understand the arguments raised by Wood before proceeding to read this article, as this article will dive straight into addressing the arguments with the assumption that the reader has already seen the video. We apologize to our fellow Muslims for having to endure the offensive, sarcastic and immature video of Wood, however in order to be fully cognizant of what this article is refuting, one is recommended to watch Wood's video in full first, before proceeding on to read this rebuttal.

Ignorance of the Arabic language is bliss for Wood, since Wood doesn't know that the Arabic word translated as "aorta" in Surah 69, Ayah 46 is different from the word used in the hadeeth literature (e.g. **Saheeh Bukhari, Volume 5, Book 59, Number 713 & Sunan Abu Dawud, Book 39**).

*The word translated as "aorta" in 69:46 is al-wateen, while the word used in the hadith literature is al-abhar. Unfortunately, for Wood - whose entire argument has already crumbled - there is a difference in meaning between these words in the Arabic language.*

Az-Zubaydee in his famous Arabic dictionary *Taaaj al-'Aroos min Jawaahir Al-Qaamoos* cites the scholar Ibn Athir as saying:

الأبهر عِرْقٌ مَنَشُوهٌ مِنَ الرَّأْسِ وَيَمْتَدُّ إِلَى الْقَدَمِ

The Abhar is a vein that originates from the head and extends to the feet.

He then proceeds to say after assigning names to specific veins and their respective locations in the human body:

وَيَمْتَدُّ إِلَى الظَّهْرِ فَيُسَمَّى الوَتِينَ

And it extends to the back and is called *al-wateen*.

So here we observe that *al-wateen* is actually a part of *al-abhar*. This is why *al-wateen* is sometimes used synonymously with *al-abhar* in some dictionaries. It is because *al-wateen* is a part of *al-abhar*, however likewise can't be said vice versa, for *Al-abhar* doesn't necessarily refer to *al-wateen*.

Here is where the problem lies for Wood, for how could Wood clearly and decisively demonstrate to us that when the Prophet (peace be upon him) used the word *abhar*, that he was specifically referring to the *al-wateen* part of it? I can't fathom how Wood would be able to demonstrate this.

The famous linguist Al-Fayrooz'abaadi in his famous dictionary *al-Qaamoos Al-Muheet* said:

والأبهر : الظهر وعرق فيه ووريد العنق والأكحل والكلية ، والوتين : عرق في القلب إذا انقطع مات صاحبه

*Al-Abhar*: the back and the vein in it and the vein in the neck, and *akhhal* (vein running across the middle of the arm) and kidney. *Al-Wateen*: the vein in the heart, which if were cut off the person would die. (as reported by Burhaanudeen al-Biqai in his *Nadhm ad-Durar fi Tanaasub al-Ayaat wal-Suwar*)

Again, we see the clear distinction being made between *al-abhar* and *al-wateen*.

The problem for Wood doesn't even stop there. Arab linguists didn't form a consensus on the actual meaning of the word *al-wateen*. Al-Maawardi, in his commentary *An-Nukatu wal-Uyoon*, under 69:46 lists at least four different opinions in regards to the meaning of the word *al-wateen* in the Arabic language. So even if Wood miraculously finds a way to show that *al-wateen* could possibly mean *al-abhar* according to some dictionary, then how with his lack of Arabic knowledge know what is the intended meaning of *al-wateen* in the Qur'anic passage?

However, there is more, for Wood's ignorance of the Arabic language creates more obstacles for him. The phrase that the Prophet (peace be upon him) uttered "cut my *abhar*" was a common Arabic idiom back then used to denote death in any form, regardless of whether it was literally cut off or not.

Linguist expert and Qu'ranic exegete, Imam az-Zamakhshari in his book *Assaas al-Balaagha*[The Fundamentals of Rhetoric], pages 121-122 demonstrates that the phrase of the Prophet (peace be upon him) could be used metaphorically to denote one's passing away and perishing. *Ibn al-Abbar* in his book *'Itaab al-Kitaab*, Volume 1, page 42 cites a poem by Abdul Malik ibn Idris using the phrase in a sense denoting death and not literal cutting of the vein. Pre-Islamic poet Bishr ibn abi Khaazim in his poem *Ghashayta li-layla bi-sharqin Muqaama*, similarly used the phrase in a metaphorical way denoting death.

Given that we have established that this was a common Arabic idiom, how could Wood clearly and decisively demonstrate to us that when the Prophet (peace be upon him) used the word "cut my *abhar*", that he actually intended it in an absolutely literal sense?

In addition (yes, more difficulties for Wood), this question is not limited to the Prophet's (peace be upon him) statement. Rather, also when Allah speaks in Surah 69:46 there is no reason for us to necessarily believe that an artery is expected to literally be cut off in such a hypothetical circumstance and could equally also be understood as an idiom used to imply death. For example, when the Prophet (peace be upon him) was being buried one of the companions from the Ansar said:

قَطَعَتْ وَتَيْنِي

You cut my aorta (*al-wateen*). (Reported in *Mussannaf Abdur Razzaq*, hadith no. **5918** & *Mussannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah*, hadith no. **36342**. *Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani* in volume **2**, page **653** of his *Talkhees al-Hubayr* declared it *mursal jayyid*)

The companion obviously did not mean it to be literal, since he was still alive! It's clear that he said it metaphorically, in order to express his emotional pain and sadness. Hence, the phrase "cut his aorta" isn't necessarily literal. (See also *Ibnul Qayyim's citation of Ibn Qutayba in his book at-Tibyaan fi Aqsam al-Qur'aan*, page 78, *Ar-Razi's commentary Mafaateeh ul-Ghayb* and *Al-Maawardi's commentary An-Nukatu wal-Uyoon* under 69:46.)

So just from the linguistic aspect alone, we could observe many loopholes in Wood's argument. However, even if we were to assume for the sake of argument that the words

*al-wateen* and *al-abhar* could clearly be shown to mean the same thing, Wood's argument is still unconvincing for a number of reasons.

**First reason** being that there is absolutely no basis whatsoever for connecting 69:46 to the Prophet's (peace be upon him) statement. The connection is simply a non sequitur. What is Wood's argument for the connection? Well, it's only on one basis alone and that is that both 69:46 and the Prophet's statement (in the **English translation**) mention the cutting off of the aorta. That's all! How desperate could one be at trying to formulate an argument out of thin air!

The following questions put to rest this extremely feeble connection:

- Where on earth did the Qur'an say that Allah made the Prophet (peace be upon him) die because he ascribed things to Allah falsely?

- Why did Allah continue revealing verses after Surah 69 such as "Today I have completed your religion" (5:3) and made no mention of the Prophet (peace be upon him) ascribing false things to Allah?

- The Qur'an speaks about Prophets being martyred by corrupt Jews (e.g. 5:70), so why not link the Prophet's (peace be upon him) death to this verse by saying that such a tradition (i.e. of Jews killing prophets) has continued, instead of 69:46? On what basis would one connect the Prophet's (peace be upon him) death to 69:46, instead of 5:70 for instance?

**Secondly**, how should have the Prophet died then? Let's say for the sake of argument that he died in battle with a sword slicing his aorta, would the argument still be made? Let's say that he had chest trauma for whatever reason (e.g. getting kicked by a horse for instance), which resulted in traumatic aortic rupture, would the argument still be made? The reality is that there are many kinds of deaths that could take place, which would play a role with severing the aorta. So what now? The Prophet isn't allowed to die any of those deaths? This is absolutely ridiculous.

**Thirdly**, Wood clearly doesn't get the point of Surah 69:46. The verse is simply stating that if the Prophet (peace be upon him) ascribed some false things to Allah, then Allah would instantly kill him by cutting off his aorta. **That's all it is saying. It's not saying** that the Prophet (peace be upon him) is **not** going to die in a way in the future, where his death has nothing to do with his aorta getting cut off. Wood is clearly committing the

[questionable cause fallacy](#) and is assuming without any basis or evidence that the Prophet's (peace be upon him) death is an effect of the threat being made in 69:46.

**Fourthly**, why not be consistent? There are many passages in the Qur'an where Allah promises punishment to disbelievers. So if a trial happens to a Muslim, is Wood going to appeal to those passages and then say "Hah! It turns out you are a disbeliever according to your Qur'an!"? I'm assuming that Wood wouldn't sink that low and the reason for that is because he knows very well that there is no evidence for making such a connection. Why not? Because there are other narrations and verses in the Islamic literature, which indicate that even a believer could be punished in this life. Similarly, Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) could easily have died as a martyr and yet at the same time not have been punished by Allah.

**Fifthly**, Wood comes out with a fanciful theory that his "true Biblical God" intended to expose Muhammad (peace be upon him) as a false prophet according to the standard of the Qur'an. By taking this route, Wood fails to realize how he is hurting himself.

First off, why would Wood's God be so incompetent in taking so long to kill Muhammad (peace be upon him) and wait until Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) achieved his goal and mission?

Secondly, Wood fails to pay careful attention to what Surah 69 is saying. Let's read carefully:

It is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. And if he had fabricated against Us **some of the sayings**, We would certainly have seized him by the right hand, Then We would certainly have cut off his aorta. (Surah 69:43-46)

Shaykh ibn Taymiyyah in regards to this passage stated:

هذا بتقدير أن يتقول بعض الاقاول فكيف بمن يتقول الرساله كلها

This is with the assumption that he fabricates some sayings, what then if he were to fabricate the entire message? (**Ibn Taymiyyah, *An-Nubuwaat*, page 183**)

Wood seems to overlook the fact that this threat was made if the Prophet (peace be upon him) were to slightly tamper with **some of** the revelation, **not the entire** revelation. So is Wood trying to tell us that his Biblical god sought to punish the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) only for minor tampering with the revelation of God, while

generally speaking Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) was receiving revelation from God and abided by them?

**Sixthly**, the threat entails that the punishment would be swift (see [Ibn Kathir](#), [at-Tabari](#) and others) given that death is instant with the cutting of the aorta. However, the Prophet (peace be upon him) died more than three years after taking the poison. Doesn't seem so swift now does it?

So far we have seen that Wood's case is extremely weak and many obstacles that he would need to overcome exist in his path if he truly desires to push forth his argument successfully.

Wood in his video said there are ten reasons why Muhammad (peace be upon him) is a false prophet based on this story. Let's take a look at these ten reasons that he gives.

### **First Argument:**

At the 13<sup>th</sup> minute, 18<sup>th</sup> second of the video, Wood says:

*Think about Muhammad's argument in the Qur'an. "If I am a false prophet Allah will cut my aorta." People who make silly claims like this usually aren't prophets... "I'm a prophet, if I am not may God strike me with lightning". Uh! No lightning! This proves I'm a prophet!"*

First of all, there is no proof that 69:46 was utilized as a proof for prophethood by Muhammad (peace be upon him). This is Wood's assumption and is simply attacking strawman here.

Secondly, on the contrary Muhammad (peace be upon him) had courage, for he challenged the Arabist and linguist experts of his day head on to imitate the Qur'an. Which false and insincere prophet would author a book and challenge the best of Arab poets to find discrepancies in it? Would any sensible layman in mechanics challenge the mechanics of BMW or Mercedes to critique him and expose him? Doesn't this show that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was so confident about the revelations he was receiving?

Thirdly, the Prophet (peace be upon him) wasn't desperate to look for proofs bolstering the fact that he was a prophet if it meant being dishonest. One fine example demonstrating this is the following hadith report:

Narrated Al-Mughira bin Shu'ba:

"The sun eclipsed in the life-time of Allah's Apostle on the day when (his son) Ibrahim died. So the people said that the sun had eclipsed because of the death of Ibrahim. Allah's Apostle said, "The sun and the moon do not eclipse because of the death or life (i.e. birth) of some-one. When you see the eclipse pray and invoke Allah." [**Saheeh Bukhari, Volume 2, Book of Eclipses, Hadith number 153**]

Notice how the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him) erroneously believed that the sun had eclipsed due to the death of his son. If Muhammad (peace be upon him) were a false prophet, he would have easily used the opportunity to take advantage of the situation and affirm what his companions were saying and that is that the sun was eclipsing due to the death of his son. However, we see that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was forthright and denied that this was the case and that the sun and the moon do not eclipse because of the death of anyone. Here, we see that the Prophet (peace be upon him) was sincerely speaking the truth instead of using the chance to impress the people by affirming their erroneous beliefs.

### **Second Argument:**

At the 14<sup>th</sup> minute, 39<sup>th</sup> second of the video, Wood said:

*There are thousands of ways to die. Do you really think it's a coincidence that Muhammad died in exactly the way the Qur'an said he would die if he is a deceiver and a false prophet? Looks like divine judgment to me.*

First of all, we have already demonstrated that Wood cannot demonstrate that the Prophet (peace be upon him) did die by having his *al-wateen* literally cut off.

Secondly, we have already mentioned that Wood is committing the fallacy of questionable cause. Just because A&B could occur together that would not necessarily imply that A always causes B. So, just because the Prophet (peace be upon him) would have had his *al-wateen* cut off if he were to tamper with the revelation that doesn't mean that if the Prophet's (peace be upon him) *al-wateen* was cut off then that would necessitate that he was tampering with the revelation. This is logically fallacious. It's kind of like saying:

Premise 1: David would go to the hospital if he ever caught a severe fever.

Premise 2: David went to the hospital.

Conclusion: That means that David had a severe fever.

One could immediately spot the fallacy. Just because David would have gone to the hospital if he had a severe fever, that doesn't mean that David would **only** go to the hospital if he had a severe fever. Rather, he could have gone to the hospital for other reasons (e.g. remove a cast from his leg, had a stomach ache, etc.)

Similarly, even if we were to assume that the Prophet's (peace be upon him) *al-wateen* was indeed cut off, that wouldn't necessarily imply that he tampered with the revelation according to 69:46.

As for "coincidences" and what not, well this is nothing more than a subjective opinion, which carries no weight. It clearly is subjective, since such a thing didn't cross anyone's mind until Wood and his friends came up with the argument.

### **Third Argument:**

At the start of the 15<sup>th</sup> minute of the video, Wood said:

*Muhammad and his followers attack Khaybar. After the Muslims kill a bunch of men and rape a bunch of women - standard practice for Muslims back then -, a Jewish woman comes up to Muhammad. Muslims had slaughtered her family and she offers to cook dinner for Muhammad and his band of merry men and Muhammad accepts her offer. "Sure! I love lamb! So nice of you to cook dinner for us after we butchered your father and your husband." Look, if Muhammad doesn't have enough common sense to realize he probably shouldn't eat that lamb, why should we trust anything that comes out of his mouth?*

First of all, Wood seems to be confusing Islam, which teaches no such thing (see [here](#)) with his Bible (see [here](#)).

Secondly, this woman did not act alone. Rather, she was following orders of others. Furthermore, the battle was over at the time and Khaibar was conquered. (**See Saheeh Bukhari, Volume 7, Book 71, Number 669**). Also, the Prophet (peace be upon him) wouldn't have known whether the Jews were offering a sheep as a sign of truce and friendship, given that the fighting was over or not. He took a judgment call and trusted them. Now just because he made an error in judgment, that in no way implies that he is a

liar deceiving others about his claims of prophethood. There is simply no connection between making an honest error in judgment and honesty.

Thirdly, why would Wood have a problem with Muhammad (peace be upon him) making an error in judgment of one's character, but not have a problem with Jesus choosing Judas as a disciple? If Wood wants to say that it was because it was all part of a larger plan, then similarly Allah had specific plans for Muhammad (peace be upon him) in this regard (i.e. dying a martyr's death).

Fourthly, in his argument Wood erroneously assumes that the Muslims knew that the lady's father and husband got killed before she offered them the meal. Rather, the narrations only show that she said this after the Prophet (peace be upon him) ate the sheep and questioned her regarding her motives to poison it.

Fifthly, Wood in his usage of words such as "butcher" and "slaughter" seeks to give the false impression that somehow the Muslims were the bad guys at Khaybar. There could be nothing further than the truth. Read more [here](#).

#### **Fourth Argument:**

At the 16<sup>th</sup> minute, 11<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Since Muhammad died from the poisoning, he failed Zainab's (the Jewish lady) test.*

This argument must be the silliest one so far.

First of all, who cares about what the Jewish lady's criteria for prophethood was? Can Wood tell us why we should care?

Secondly, the Qur'an itself indirectly implies that it's possible for Muhammad (peace be upon him) to be killed without compromising his prophethood (see 3:144). So Muslims are concerned with the Islamic criteria and not with some disbelieving Jewish lady's self-made criteria.

Thirdly, prophets in the past have been killed by Jews according to both the Qur'an (5:70) and New Testament (Matthew 14:8-12; 23:35-37). It amazes me why Wood would then expect us Muslims or his Christian listeners to take these baseless criteria set by the Jewish lady seriously.

Fourthly, what is even more absurd is that Wood doesn't even bother to tell us that the Jewish lady herself is contradicting her own scriptures, for we find in the Old Testament itself that prophets were killed. For instance, 2 Chronicles 24:20-22 shows that Zechariah was stoned by order of King Joash. Also, during the time of Elijah there were supposedly unnamed prophets who were put to death by Jezebel (see 1 Kings 18:4, 13; 19:14). So this Jewish lady was even contradicting her own "holy" book!

Fifthly, Wood isn't highlighting the other wording in the narrating of this story. In the version by Al-Waqidi we read:

إن كان نبيا فستخبره الشاة ما صنعت

If he was a prophet, then the sheep would inform him of what I did. (**Al-Waqidi, *Al-Maghaazi*, Volume 1, page 276**)

This is similarly reported by Ibn Sa'd:

إن كان نبياً فسَتْخَبِرُهُ الدِّرَاعُ

If he was a prophet, then the arm (of the sheep) would inform him of what I did. (**Ibn Sa'd, *at-Tabaqaatul Kubra*, hadith no. 1922**)

Seeing that Wood doesn't care about the isnad system, how would Wood objectively determine, which is the correct reading? For one reading shows that the Prophet (peace be upon him) passed the Jewish lady's test with flying colors!

### **Fifth Argument**

At the 16<sup>th</sup> minute, 16<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Muhammad's companion Bishr could taste the poison as soon as he put the lamb in his mouth. Why did he keep eating? He kept eating because he believed in Muhammad... "There's no way this lamb is poisoned, Muhammad is eating it! He is the prophet!" Bishr's faith in Muhammad got him killed and I'm willing to lay this down as a rule. If I can't trust you with my dinner I definitely can't trust you with my salvation. If you can't figure out what's waiting for you in food, how could you possibly know what's waiting for you in the afterlife?*

First of all, the Prophet (peace be upon him) has nowhere ever stated that he would always ensure that he would protect his followers from getting killed. So this wasn't something ever expected from Muhammad (peace be upon him) to begin with. If the

Prophet (peace be upon him) himself could be harmed, then why not his followers? Wood is trying to impose his own personal criteria upon others and judge them by it. Why any of us should care about Wood's ridiculous and personal criteria shall remain a mystery.

Secondly, if Bishr **erroneously** assumed that the Prophet (peace be upon him) would never ever be put in a situation where he would eat food with poison in it then how does that become the Prophet's (peace be upon him) fault? Does Wood blame the man in Mark 10 for dropping the usage of the word "good" in verse 20 after using it in verse 17, for not understanding what Jesus "truly meant" (according to Christians) when he said "Why do you call me good?" or does he blame Jesus for being a bad communicator?

Thirdly, the Prophet (peace be upon him) wasn't omniscient. Not literally everything was revealed to him. Just because he is ignorant in certain areas, that doesn't necessitate that he would be unreliable in other areas. So Wood could just keep his silly "rule" to himself.

Fourthly, why doesn't Wood equally apply his silly "rules" to the Biblical Jesus and say for example:

*If I can't trust Jesus with teaching my children how to speak to their mother respectfully (Matthew 12:47-49 & John 2:3-4) I definitely can't trust him with my salvation.*

Or

*If I can't trust Jesus with avoiding the curse of God (Galatians 3:13) I definitely can't trust him with my salvation.*

Or

*If I can't trust Jesus with **unhesitantly** curing a sick child (Matthew 15:22-28) I definitely can't trust him with my salvation.*

Wood needs to realize that others could make "rules" as well. What really counts though is showing that they matter.

### **Sixth Argument:**

At the 17<sup>th</sup> minute of the video, Wood said:

*When Zaynab told Muhammad that she had poisoned him, Muhammad said that "Allah would never allow it". But Allah did allow it. So, if Muhammad was wrong about Allah then, please explain to me why I should trust him when he tells me other things about Allah?*

The statement "Allah would never allow it" meant that she couldn't kill him that instant as she intended, since the sheep spoke to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and saved him from swallowing the food at that moment.

Sheikh Al-Munajjid said:

Whatever the case, protection from being killed came before he finished conveying the message of his Lord, and he (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) did not die until he had conveyed it in the most complete manner. The context of the verse indicates that, as his Lord, may He be exalted, instructed him to convey the message and told him that He would protect him from the people.

This idea is also supported by what the Prophet (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) said to the Jewish woman: "Allaah would not have given you the power to do that." That was after she told him that she had wanted to kill him. **This is either a statement that refers to his being protected against being killed by poison until he departed this world, or it is a statement indicating that that would not happen before the message was conveyed.**([Source](#))

Ibn Muflih al-Hanbali stated:

وَقَصَدَتْ الْيَهُودِيَّةُ أَنَّهُ إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ نَبِيًّا أَنَّهُ يَمُوتُ، وَعَاشَ هُوَ - صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ - سِنِينَ عَلَى حَالِهِ قَبْلَ الْأَكْلِ  
يَتَصَرَّفُ كَمَا كَانَ فَلَمْ تَقْتُلْهُ الْيَهُودُ بِفِعْلِهَا كَمَا قَتَلَتْ غَيْرَهُ، وَأَحْسَنَ اللَّهُ سُبْحَانَهُ صَنِيعَهُ إِلَيْهِ عَلَى جَارِي عَادَتِهِ تَعَالَى،  
فَأُظْهِرَ أَنَّ بَعْدَ سِنِينَ إِحْرَامًا لَهُ بِالشَّهَادَةِ.

The Jewish lady intended (by her action to show) that if he wasn't a prophet, then he would die. However, he lived - peace be upon him - for years while being in a condition as he was before eating (the sheep with the poison) and behaved like how he used to before. The Jews did not kill him with her action just as she killed the others and Allah All-Mighty was good in His action towards him (i.e. the Prophet) as usual. The effects actuated years later as a way of honoring him (i.e. the Prophet) with martyrdom. (**Ibn Muflih, *Al-'Aadaab ash-Shar'eeyah*, Volume 3, pages 93-94**)

**Seventh Argument:**

At the 17<sup>th</sup> minute, 20<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Muhammad claimed that the lamb he was eating spoke to him and told him that it was poisoned. So he got a special revelation because he was a Prophet. Two questions: 1) Why didn't the roasted lamb say something 5 minutes earlier, which would have saved Muhammad's life, not to mention Bishr's life? and 2) Why did Muhammad need a revelation when you could taste the poison? Isn't this proof that Muhammad was actually making up revelations? Isn't it obvious that he tasted the poison same as Bishr, but instead of saying "Hey, I taste poison", He said: "It's speaking to me! I'm a prophet!" Sounds like a fake to me.*

Asking why God predestined that Bishr died in that fashion and why the Prophet (peace be upon him) ate the sheep is delving into God's divine plan for us. Wood knows better than to ask such questions, for he knows that in theology God has a plan for everyone and we shouldn't be pests needing to know the answer to every single thing ordained for us.

If Wood insists on asking such questions, then we would recommend a couple of beneficial questions to ask such as:

-Why didn't Jesus clearly and unambiguously communicate that he was God so that this wouldn't be a matter of debate after him?

-Why didn't God preserve the New Testament in a way so that none of its texts has doubt casted upon it and avoid the result of having millions of people apostatizing from Christianity and being turned off from converting to it?

Wood asks why revelation would have been necessary when the poison could be tasted. Was Wood there? Does he know how strong the taste of the poison was? Does Wood know how long it would take an average person to have detected it before swallowing it? These are just silly questions and Wood is just trying to push any argument he possibly can on this. This is nothing more than a clear sign of desperation.

### **Eighth Argument**

At the 18<sup>th</sup> minute, 10<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Muhammad did more than anyone else in history to provoke hatred against Jews. Muhammad did more than anyone else in history to oppress women. Muhammad told his followers that women are stupid and then Muhammad died a miserable, humiliating,*

wretched death after being outwitted by a Jewish woman. So God didn't merely disgrace Muhammad by severing his aorta, thereby identifying him as a false prophet. God added to Muhammad's degradation by severing his aorta through the hands of a Jewish woman seeking vengeance against the man who had brought her community nothing, but death and rape.

Oh really? The Prophet (peace be upon him) provoked hatred against Jews more than anyone in history? That's news to me (see [here](#), page 57). David really needs to study history and not throw his stones in a glass house (see [here](#)).

Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) taught his followers that women are **stupid? Where?** That is such a blatant lie! Wood is advised to first take a look at what his own "holy" book says about women (see [here](#)) before pointing the finger at others.

### **Ninth Argument:**

At the 19<sup>th</sup> minute, 28<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Allah sits back and watches as a woman poisons His prophet and He does nothing as His prophet dies a humiliating death. Why does Allah protect Jesus from harm and sends him straight to paradise, yet He turns around and sees Muhammad wallowing in freakish misery, Allah doesn't lift a finger to help him? Sounds like Allah was showing a little favoritism. "Don't mess with Jesus, Allah won't let you!" But go ahead feed Muhammad some rat poison, Allah doesn't care"*

First of all, we have already demonstrated that prophets according to the Old Testament, New Testament and Qur'an could be killed by God's permission. Some are killed, while others are not. We don't delve into God's divine plan when it comes to such issues.

Secondly, to say that Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) died in in a "humiliating" manner and "freakish misery" is an unwarranted exaggeration. Even if Wood wanted to insinuate that the Prophet (peace be upon him) died a painful death [see end of article for more on this], then it still wouldn't justify or qualify the use of the phrase "freakish misery". Such a statement would entail that the kind of death was abnormal or grotesque. Examples of such deaths would be someone being burned to death or crucified naked after being tortured (remind you of anyone?) or crushed under an elevator, etc. However, the Prophet (peace be upon him) died in his bed **years** after eating the poisonous sheep. In fact, the Prophet (peace be upon him) continued on to successfully finish his mission of spreading Islam (a big "Mwaah, haah, haah" to the Jewish lady's and Wood's face). So

could we say that the Prophet (peace be upon him) died in a "humiliating" manner just like Wood's god supposedly did? No of course not. Our Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is definitely more honorable than Wood's false god in both his life and death.

Thirdly, Jesus being saved from death wouldn't mean that Jesus (peace be upon him) is considered to be favored by Allah over Muhammad (peace be upon him), for this would be ignoring many other factors on this point (see [here](#), [here](#) & [here](#)). Allah saved Jesus (peace be upon him) because there was wisdom in Him doing so (see [here](#)).

Fourthly, talk about inconsistency. According to Christian theology, the Father allowed his "Son" to die the most humiliating and painful death possible just so that his "wrath may be appeased". Where is Wood's sarcastic mockery of theological beliefs when you need it?

### **Tenth Argument:**

At the 21<sup>st</sup> minute, 11<sup>th</sup> second, Wood said:

*Muhammad's ultimate wish was to die in battle and it was his greatest desire. But instead of letting Muhammad die while fighting the Jews, Allah lets him die a disgraceful death in utter agony at the hands of a Jewish woman.*

Wood bases this argument on a narration he cited shortly before in his video:

***Sahih al-Bukhari 2797** - The Prophet said, . . . "By Him in Whose Hands my soul is! I would love to be martyred in Allah's Cause and then come back to life and then get martyred, and then come back to life again and then get martyred and then come back to life again and then get martyred."*

Nowhere is the word "battle" mentioned in the narration. The word mentioned is "martyred" and martyrdom isn't only achieved in the battle field. Getting killed for the cause of God is martyrdom and if the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) died by poison by an enemy of God as Wood himself is telling us, then that would mean that the Prophet (peace be upon him) died the death of a martyr and got his wish.

### **Regarding the Prophet's Suffering and Endurance of Pain**

Wood in the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> minute of the video presented the following narrations:

*Sunan Ibn Majah 1622 - Aishah said: "I never saw anyone suffer more pain than the Messenger of Allah."*

*Sahih al-Bukhari 2588 - Aisha said, "When the Prophet became sick and his condition became serious, he requested his wives to allow him to be treated in my house, and they allowed him. He came out leaning on two men while his feet were dragging on the ground."*

It is indeed true that the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to feel greater pain than the rest of the people. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said in one narration:

"The people who are most sorely tried are the Prophets, then those who are closest to them, then those who are next closest." (Ahmad, 26539; classed as saheeh by al-Albaani in al-Silsilat al-Saheehah, 1165).

Why is this so? The Prophet (peace be upon him) explains:

"A man will be tested according to the level of his religious commitment, and the trials will keep affecting a slave of Allaah until he is left walking on the face of the earth with no burden of sin whatsoever." (Narrated by Ibn Maajah, 4013; classed as saheeh by al-Albaani in Saheeh Sunan Ibn Maajah, 3249, cited [here](#)).

We also read:

Narrated by 'Abdullah

I visited Allah's Apostle while he was suffering from a high fever. I said, "O Allah's Apostle! You have a high fever." He said, "**Yes, I have as much fever as two men of you.**" I said, "**Is it because you will have a double reward?**" He said, "Yes, it is so. No Muslim is afflicted with any harm, even if it were the prick of a thorn, but that Allah expiates his sins because of that, as a tree sheds its leaves." (Saheeh Bukhari, Volume 7, Book 70, Number 551)

While Wood attempts to argue that the Prophet's (peace be upon him) pain was a result of being humiliated by God, we in fact see that the complete opposite is actually the case!

## Conclusion

In the words of Wood (53<sup>rd</sup> second of the video)...Mwaah, haah, haah!

[https://www.call-to-monotheism.com/prophet\\_muhammad\\_peace\\_be\\_upon\\_him\\_and\\_the\\_taking\\_of\\_poison](https://www.call-to-monotheism.com/prophet_muhammad_peace_be_upon_him_and_the_taking_of_poison); accessed online on 04 January 2019