

# Running Like Zebras

by  
Edip Yuksel

## PREFACE

This book contains a debate between Mr. Edip Yuksel, a proponent of the Quran's numerical structure based on the number 19, and its detractor and skeptic "par-excellence" Mr. Daniel (Abdulrahman) Lomax. The actual polemic took place on an Internet computer bulletin board, where Mr. Lomax has for the past several years posted his refutations of the Quran's mathematical structure.

The original work of decoding the Quran's mathematical pattern based on the number 19 (found in sura 74 verse 30, a chapter entitled "The Hidden") was done by the late Dr. Rashad Khalifa in the seventies and eighties. His work was initially welcomed in the Muslim world, until he arrived at the unavoidable conclusion that Muslims should follow the Quran, and the Quran alone, as a source of religious guidance. This was too hard for the power that be in traditional Islam (the religious scholars) to swallow. Dr. Khalifa's works were eventually banned in the Muslim countries (he was murdered in 1990), and ideas similar to his were either suppressed or hotly refuted.

In a sense, then, the debate contained in this book is an ongoing struggle between people who follow the Quran alone and those who follow hadith, sunna and consensus of the religious scholars and clerics. A debate between those who are satisfied with God's revelation and those who uphold religious traditions based on man-made dogmas. A polemic between the supporters of the true message of Muhammad and the supporters of the man-made sayings attributed to the man. In the end, the tone of the argument is not unlike the classic exchange of arguments between ahl al-Quran and ahl al-Hadith in early Islam.

In spite of the advances in the methodology of scientific investigation that our generation is blessed with, the heart of the main argument remains the same. True, one needs to be skeptical and to verify everything. At the same time, one must also be open minded, listen to all views and follow the best idea. There is a limit to skepticism beyond which lays a danger of closing of the mind from accepting any truth because of the contentiousness nature in us (Quran 41:45, 4:155; 18:54)

When it comes to understanding God's signs in the scripture, in the universe around us or within ourselves, we need to shift our paradigm, our way of looking at things, accordingly. In this case, the paradigm is given by this rhetorical question from the Quran: "Is God not sufficient for His servant?"(39:36) For those who answer affirmatively, God will manifest His signs accordingly. "We will show them our signs in the horizons, and within themselves, until they realize that this is the truth. Is your Lord not sufficient as a witness of all things?" (41:53)

Gatut S. Adisoma, Ph.D. Tucson, Arizona, August 14, 1995

## CLAIM 1

There is a whole Sura about the secret numerical code entitled "The Hidden Secret," namely Sura 74. In this Sura, God informs us that if anyone claims that the Quran is man-made (verse 25), God will prove him wrong by the number 19 (verse 30). God says that this number serves five functions: a) to disturb the disbelievers, b) to convince the Christians and Jews that this is a divine scripture, c) to strengthen the faith of the faithful, d) to remove all traces of doubts from the hearts of Christians, Jews, as well as the believers, e) to expose those who harbor doubt in their hearts and the disbelievers. They will say, "what did God mean by this allegory?"

LOMAX: The message of the passage in question has been distorted by this description, which is perhaps 90% accurate. What is not at all clear from that passage is that the Nineteen is an argument against the human creation of the Qur'an. It is clear that the number has these five purposes, but the last purpose could certainly be read as applying to those who attempt to find the hidden meaning of the Nineteen. This interpretation is very much in harmony with 3:7:

"He it is who has sent down to thee the book; in it are verses basic or fundamental; they are the foundation of the book: others are not of well-established meaning. But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is not of well-established meaning, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings, but no one knows its true meanings except Allah. And those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say 'We believe in the book; the whole of it is from our Lord:' and none will grasp the message except [those] of understanding." (Translation following Yusuf Ali.)

YUKSEL: The description does not distort the message of the verse 74:31. Claiming that "perhaps 90% accurate" without clarifying which part of the description is inaccurate is a dubious tactic, intended to put doubts on the entire description. I expect Lomax to unveil the 10% inaccuracy in our translation or understanding of the verse. If I try to be nit-picking, I can see only one problem: the translation of the Chapter's title which is "The Hidden Secret." It is a redundant title. A more accurate translation should have been "The Hidden One" which still carries an implication to the nature of the mathematical code. The title can be also translated as "The Enfolded One."

A statement in his objection puts doubt in my mind about either Lomax's literal capability or his honesty: "What is not all clear from the passage is that the Nineteen is an argument against the human creation of the Quran." This is an incredible statement made by a person who is highly educated and reads the translation of the Quran in his mother tongue. How can a person doubt about the context of Nineteen after reading until the 31st verse of Chapter 74? How can a person blind himself to the obvious connection between verse 25 and 30? I cannot believe that his attention span is less than five short verses. I bet with my life, that over 90% of middle school children will be able to see the purpose of Nineteen CLEARLY after reading the translation of those verses. Obviously, I am not suggesting the archaic language of Yusuf Ali, who mimics the style of King James Version and is very good in complicating simple statements. Probably, it would be a good

advice for Lomax not to "follow Yusuf Ali" alone. He can find many other translations written with much simpler English. However, a clear relation between the claim in verse 25 and the following verses is clear for an objective reader even from Yusuf Ali's translation Here are the translation of verses which according to Lomax are NOT CLEAR to indicate that "the Nineteen is an argument against the human creation of the Quran."

In the Name of God, Gracious, Merciful 1. O you (who are) hidden 2. Come out and warn. 3. Extol your Lord. 4. Purify your garment. 5. Forsake what is wrong. 6. Be content with your lot. 7. Be steadfast for your Lord. 8. When the trumpet is sounded. 9. That will be a difficult day. 10. For the disbelievers, not easy. 11. Let Me deal with one I created as an individual. 12. I provided him with lots of wealth. 13. And children to behold. 14. I made everything easy for him. 15. Yet, he is greedy for more. 16. He stubbornly refused to accept our revelations and/or miracles. 17. I will punish him increasingly. 18. For he reflected, then decided. 19. Miserable is what he decided. 20. Miserable indeed is what he decided. 21. He looked. 22. He frowned and whined. 23. Then he turned away arrogantly. 24. He said, "This is but impressive (or old) magic! 25. "This is nothing but word of human." 26. I will commit him to Saqar. 27. Do you know what Saqar is? 28. It is no more, no less (precise). 29. Succeeding screens (obvious) for people. 30. Over it is nineteen. 31. We appointed angels to be guardians of Hell, and we assigned their number (1) to disturb the disbelievers, (2) to convince the Christians and Jews, (3) to strengthen the faith of the faithful, (4) to remove all traces of doubt from the hearts of Christians, Jews, as well as the believers, and (5) to expose those who harbor doubt in their hearts, and the disbelievers; they will say, "What did God mean by this allegory?" God thus sends astray whomever He wills (or, whoever wills), and guides whomever He wills (or, whoever wills). None knows the soldiers of your Lord except He. It is a reminder for the people. 32. Absolutely, by the moon. 33. And the night as it passes. 34. And the morning as it shines. 35. This is one of the greatest (miracles).

Now, just ask yourself these two questions: "Who is subjected to Saqar retribution and number Nineteen?" Obviously, the answer is the disbeliever. Then, "Why?" Obviously, he did not believe that the Quran was authored by God; he claimed that the Quran was man-made. Therefore, he is immediately challenged by Saqar and Nineteen. I don't understand why this simple and obvious fact became difficult and ambiguous for Lomax. Furthermore, the following verse lists the objectives of the number Nineteen. According to that verse (74:31), it will increase the faith of believers, and remove doubts in the heart of Christians and Jews, etc. How can you disconnect this objective from previous argument regarding the doubt or rejection the divine nature of the Quran?

Finally, Lomax uses a mistranslation of 3:7 to make his erroneous point, that the verses about the number 19 are "mutashabih" and only hypocrites try to understand their meaning. First, I want to present my translation, and then explain why I think this is the correct translation, and why Yusuf Ali's translation is both wrong and dangerous. Please compare the important difference in punctuation of the last two statements:

"He revealed to you this scripture, consisting of straightforward verses, which are the essence of the scripture, as well as multiple-meaning verses (mutashabihat). Those

who harbor doubt in their hearts will pursue the multiple-meaning verses to create confusion, and to seek their meanings. No one knows their meaning except God and those who are deeply rooted in knowledge. They say, 'We believe in this; it all comes from our Lord.' Only those who possess intelligence will take heed." (3:7)

First, we should try to understand the meaning of "mutashabih." The word "mutashabih" comes from "shabaha" (became similar), and its usage in other verses clarifies its meaning as "similar." It describes the things or words that can be confusing for a novice because of the similarities. (see: 2:118; 2:70; 4:157; 6:99; 6:141; 2:25) Verse 39:23 uses "mutashabihat" for the entire Quran, referring to the overall similarity, in other words, its consistency. In its narrow meaning, "mutashabih" refers to all verses which can be understood in more than one ways. This includes all kind of allegories. The various meaning or implication of the same words require some qualities in the audience: attentive mind, positive attitude, contextual perspective, and patience for research.

Now, let's come to the crucial part. It is one of the intriguing feature of the Quran that the verse about "mutashabih" verses of the Quran is itself mutashabih, that is, has multiple meanings. Indeed, the verses about understanding the Quran themselves are not understood by those who betray the Quran by trading it with volumes of hadith books which are full of fabricated stories falsely attributed to the Prophet Muhammad (See our book "19 Questions For Muslim Scholars," and other literature published by ICS/Montheist Publication, P.O. Box 43476 Tucson, AZ 85733-3476, Telephone/Fax (520) 323-7636) Thus, those verses become an empirical proof for their own claim. For instance, see 17:46; 41:44; 56:79).

The last part of the verse 3:7 can be understood in two different ways by merely a punctuation change. If you stop after the word God, then you will (mis)understand like many Sunni scholars did. According to your punctuation, even those who possess knowledge will not be able to understand "mutashabih" verses. However, if you don't stop there its meaning will change to the opposite: Those who possess knowledge will be able to understand their meaning. Let's list our reason for preferring this later understanding:

1. The intention of those who try to understand the multiple-meaning verses is important. With the disease in their hearts, they try to confuse others by focusing on multiple meaning verses. Since only sincere believers possess the quality to understand the Quran (17:46; 18:57; 54:17), hypocrites will not be able to find the true meaning of multiple-meaning words. They either try to take them out of context or disregard other verses that bring explanation to them. For instance:

". . . And we sent down to you this message, to proclaim (litubayyena) for the people everything that is sent down to them, perhaps they will reflect (16:44).

The word "lituBaYyeNa" is a derivative of "BYN", which is a multiple-meaning word. It means: 1) To reveal what is concealed. 2) To explain what is vague. The first meaning is the antonym of "hide", the second is the antonym of "make vague". God

orders Muhammad to proclaim the revelation which is revealed to him personally. Indeed, this is the whole mission of the messengers." (16:35)

Prophets sometimes experience difficulty in proclaiming the revelation (33:37; 20:25). If the Quran is a profound Arabic book, if it is explained by God, and if it is simple to understand (5:15; 26:195; 11:1; 54:17; 55:1-2), then the prophet does not have an extra mission to explain it. Furthermore, the verse 75:19 does not leave any room for an extra human explanation. Thus, the word "litubayyena" of 16:44 is similar to the one in 3:187. Verse 3:187 tells us that the people who received the revelation should "proclaim the scripture to the people, and never conceal it."

The Quran broadcasts a very clear message. However, the problem is with our receivers. If our receiver does not hear the broadcast or cannot understand it well, then something is wrong with our receiver and we have to check it. If the signal is weak, we need to recharge our batteries, or reset our antennas. If we do not receive a clear message, we need to tune into the station, to the station of Quran alone, in order to get rid of the noises and interference from other sources. We may ask some help from knowledgeable people or experts for this task. If the receiver does not work at all, then we have to make a sincere effort to fix the broken parts. However, if we believe that the problem is in the broadcast, then nobody can help us. The divine broadcast can be heard in detail only by those who sincerely tune in, i.e., those who take it seriously and act accordingly. The condition of our receiver and the antenna, the power of the battery, and the precision level of our tuning are very important in getting the divine message properly.

"None can grasp it except the sincere." (56:79)

The Quran is simple to understand (54:11). Whoever opens his/her mind and heart as a monotheist and takes the time to study it, will understand it. This understanding will be enough for salvation. Beyond this, to understand the multi-meaning verses or allegorical descriptions you do not need to be a messenger of God. If you have a good mind and have studied the Quran as a believer, that is, if you have a deep knowledge, then you will be able to understand the true meanings of multiple-meaning verses. The verse 3:7, which is about the multiple-meaning verses, points this fact in a multiple-meaning way: ". . . No one knows their true meaning except God and those who possess knowledge. . ." Obviously, those who are confused by contradictory teaching of clergymen (ulama) do not possess knowledge and unable to understand this verse.

2. In order to believe in all the verses of the Quran, one does not need to be deeply rooted in knowledge. To be a "believer" is a sufficient condition to believe all the verses. However, one needs to have deep knowledge of the Quran in order to understand "mutashabih" (multiple meaning) verses accurately. Therefore, 3:7 mentions a narrow category (those who deeply rooted in knowledge) in relation with those multiple meaning verses.

3. God, the teacher of the Quran, encourages believers to study the Quran with patience. A portion of the Quran requires intensive analytical study. It advises us not to

rush into understanding without sufficient knowledge (20:114). Nevertheless, the Quran, in general, is easy to understand (54:17...). By mistranslating 3:7, you try to discourage and scare believers, including those who are deeply rooted in knowledge, from understanding the "mutashabih" verses, without a clear definition and identification of "mutashabih".

4. If we follow your translation of 3:7, then, we must have a clear definition of "mutashabih" verses in order to avoid trying to understand them. According to your translation, if one tries to understand a verse and that verse happens to be a mutashabih, then that person is in danger to become a hypocrite. Therefore, you must be able to identify ALL the mutashabih verses. Can you provide us with a list of mutashabih verses? Can you justify your criteria for your selection? How can your lack of understanding be criteria for others? Someone's lack of understanding of one verse cannot make a verse "taboo" for all other people. Otherwise, the lowest degree of understanding will be the common denominator in understanding of the Quran. The more verse you don't understand the more you will be safe, and the more verse you understand the more you will be a subject for accusation to be a hypocrite.

5. There are some Sunni commentators who support our understanding. For instance, the classic commentary of al-Baydawi prefers this understanding. Please note that Yusuf Ali also acknowledges this fact in the footnote of 3:7: "One reading, rejected by the majority of Commentators, but accepted by Mujahid and others, would not make a break at the point marked Waqfa Lazim, but would run the two sentences together. In that case the construction would run: 'No one knows its hidden meanings except God and those who are firm in knowledge. They say', etc." If you are not determining the truth by the number of votes (majority), then, I suggest you reflect on the reasons I have listed here.

6. It appears that you agree with us regarding the first four function or objectives of the number Nineteen. (1) to disturb the disbelievers, (2) to convince the Christians and Jews, (3) to strengthen the faith of the faithful, (4) to remove all traces of doubt from the hearts of Christians, Jews, as well as the believers.

How can you explain these statements? How can this Quranic description or prophecy occur without understanding the meaning or implication of the number Nineteen? How many "believers" increased their faith without understanding the meaning of the number? How many Christians or Jews accepted the Quran because of this number, without understanding its meaning? How many people's doubt were removed by your version of Nineteen, that is, a Nineteen devoid of meaning for humans?

The way of understanding the implication of number Nineteen, on the other hand, entirely fits these Quranic description. It is an incredible prophecy of the Quran that the message of number 19 mentioned in Chapter 74 was unveiled in 1974, exactly 1406 (19x74) lunar years after the revelation of the Quran. God Almighty has increased the faith of believers (thank God I am one of them), some Christians and Jews have accepted the message of the Quran and the fanatic disbelievers and hypocrites who do not really

care about divine revelation have been disturbed by this number; they get furious and nervous when they hear or see the number 19. This reaction is well described in the last verses of the same chapter, especially 74:49-51.

7. The question asked by disbelievers and hypocrites in 74:31 "What does God mean with this?" is not a question that expresses their curiosity for the meaning of God's word, but it is a question of ignorance and avoidance. They cannot or will not understand allegories, in other words, "mutashabih" verses. Please read verses 2:26 and 47:15-16, and note that after allegorical description of "heaven" disbelievers ask similar question. In the context, it is obvious that they don't want to understand the implied meanings of those allegories. Their arrogance and ignorance lead them to read those verses literally which brings nothing but ignorance, disbelief and confusion for them (17:60 and 37:62-66; 17:82).

Lomax' response is quoted after LOMAX. I have interrupted his response in order to make our argument easier to follow. You should consider Lomax' part as a continuous objection interspersed with my defence.

LOMAX: Mr Yuksel objects to my statement, which was not intended to be precise, that the presentation of the meaning of Sura 74 is "perhaps 90% accurate," and he questions my motives in not stating exactly what was 10% inaccurate. However, he goes on to acknowledge that the title "The Hidden Secret" is redundant (I would say misleading: Hidden is reasonably accurate, Secret is not), and he also objects to my specific statement that "What is not at all clear from that passage is that the Nineteen is an argument against the human creation of the Qur'an." This was the point. The sura, it must be acknowledged, threatens those who reject the divine source of the Qur'an with Hell. Then it says that "over it (Hell, presumably) are nineteen." This is a description of Hell, not necessarily an argument against human creation.

YUKSEL: For a person who is not a nitpicker there is no big difference between the meaning of "The Hidden One" and "The Secret." They entail each other. Random House Webster's College Dictionary defines "secret" as "hidden from sight; concealed." Accepting the "The Hidden One" as the accurate translation of "Al-Muddassir" won't enable Muhammedans to re-hide the code which was unveiled after 14 centuries through a monotheist biochemist Dr. Rashad Khalifa. The same dictionary describes the attitude of Muhammedans regarding the mathematical code of the Quran under the entry "hide": 1. to conceal from sight; prevent from being seen or discovered. 2. to obstruct the view of; cover up. 3. to conceal from knowledge or exposure; keep secret, etc.

The Quran repeatedly uses three words for hell: Jahannam, Jaheem, and Naar (fire). The word Saqar is the only time used here (74:26). It is obvious that the word Saqar did not have any conventional meaning related to hell, since the following verse defines or describes its meaning (74:27-29). Previous commentators who did not know about the mathematical structure of the Quran had the excuse to understand it as Hell. They even forced the meaning of "Lawwahatun lil-bashar" (Obvious, successive screens for humans) (74:29). They translated the verse as "scorching the skin," despite the fact

that the usage of the Quran did not justify such a meaning. For instance the word "basha" is always used for "human" being. Quran also uses the word "jild" for "skin."

It is noteworthy that Muhammad Asad in his translation "The Message of The Quran" does not follow the traditional bandwagon. Though he died before the discovery of the code, he demonstrates a good intuition. His translation of 74:29: "making (all truth) visible to mortal man." In the footnote he defends this translation: "Most of the commentators interpret the above elliptic phrase in the sense of 'changing the appearance of man' or 'scorching the skin of man'. The rendering adopted by me, on the other hand, is based on the primary significance of the verb laha- 'it appeared', 'it shone forth' or 'it became visible'. Hence, the primary meaning of the intensive participial noun lawwah is 'that which makes (something) visible'. . . "

Finally, even if those verses are understood as the description of Hell, still the Quran treats Nineteen as a number. The number Nineteen is isolated from Hell both in verse 74:30 and 74:31. No matter how hard you try, you cannot hide the number Nineteen in your imaginary Hell.

It is a short but good step for Lomax that finally he acknowledges the theme of the chapter as a "threat" to those who claim human origin for the Qur'an. However, he is not able to see the "intellectual challenge." What he can see is a "threat with Hell." Well, some prefer Hell.

LOMAX: Then the Sura goes on to state the reasons for the setting of this number. This part of the Sura is consistent with there being some kind of phenomenon involving 19 in the Qur'an. However, it is quite clear that this phenomenon is a trial for the disbelievers, and it also consistent with the passage to understand that those who seek the meaning of the 19 are the people "in whose hearts is a disease and the disbelievers." (74:31)

YUKSEL: Yes, this phenomenon is a trial for disbelievers and hypocrites. But Lomax is craftily trying to hide the rest of the verse. He knows well that the rest of the verse cannot be explained with his "meaningless, incoherent, anecdotal and coincidental" nineteen. Again, he repeats himself without answering my criticism regarding his interpretation of the question asked by disbelievers and hypocrites. I gave him verses 2:26 and 47:15-16 as a reference for similar questions. Lomax should go back and read the last paragraph of my first round defense for Claim 1.

LOMAX: Mr. Yuksel wonders what my problem is that I cannot see what he sees in this verse. The "problem" is that I saw what he describes years ago, and now I see more, not less.

YUKSEL: Evidently, he never saw the miracle, since this miracle requires independent research and good state of mind, not blind acceptance. He probably pretended to see the miracle by his "faith." When he saw some problems with Rashad's work he became a disbeliever of it. He became paranoid and an extreme skeptic, resorting



to every possible excuse to reject or cast doubt on this mathematical pattern. I understand this psychology. There is a proverb: "a scalded man fears cold water." He has volumes of stories and scholastic confusion at his disposal to take his revenge.

He is upset since he feels fooled years ago. Instead of blaming Rashad, I think he should blame his early ignorance. I agree that he can "see more" now. Samaritan too saw more, centuries ago (20:96).

LOMAX: It should also be made clear that I read the Qur'an in Arabic. I do not depend on Yusuf Ali. The translation which I use, personally, more than any other, is Muhammad Ali; I use Yusuf Ali when I want to present a standard, widely accepted translation. But there are obvious problems with Yusuf Ali, as there are with any translation. The translation given by Yuksel is highly interpretive; it reflects the conclusions of the translator, not the literal Arabic. I do not have time to exhaustively describe this. If Mr. Yuksel wants to start a topic on this translation, he is welcome. In the meantime, just look in a number of Qur'ans and see how far Yuksel's translation is from the rest. What is seen by everyone else as a description of Hell (which is multiply confirmed in the passage) is transformed into a description of the "miracle" of the 19 by a very loose translation.

YUKSEL: The claim that "everyone else" saw the verses as a description of Hell is false. This shows that Lomax still needs to see more! I have just quoted from Muhammad Asad's translation. If he wants to see more, I urge him to go to a library and do some research. For instance, he can see the commentary of famous scholar Fahreddin ar-Razi.

LOMAX: For example, 74:28. Yuksel has "It is exact and precise." M. Ali has "It leaves naught, and spares naught." (this is quite literal). Y. Ali has "Naught does it permit to endure, and naught does it leave alone." Arberry has "It spares not, neither leaves alone." Sale has "It leaveth not (anything unconsumed), neither doth it suffer (anything) to escape)."

YUKSEL: Well, I am ready to accept M. Ali's translation. After the discovery of the code it makes more sense. The literal translation of 74:28 is a description of exact and precise. We can translate the verse as "Neither does it leave, nor does it bear (no less, no more)."

Mr. Lomax has entirely ignored my lengthy criticism to his interpretation of verse 3:7 on "mutashabih" (multiple meaning) verses. When I questioned him by e-mail, he said that his answer would have been redundant. "Actually, the whole discussion is somewhat beside the point. The central issues are raised in the Draft FAQ: 19, Study Problems." In our previous e-mail conversation he invited me to answer his paper titled "On Dr. Khalifa's Theory of the Nineteen in the Quran." This paper is being posted over and over on Internet, Compuserve, America Online, etc. When he is pressed on concrete and specific examples, he is showing me another paper, which is an abstract argument

expressing his confusion and acute skepticism. I will deal with the Draft FAQ later, God willing.

## CLAIM 1a

The feminine pronoun "ha" (it or her) in the verse "Over it is Nineteen" (74:30) refers to Lawwaha (screen, plate, visually obvious) or to Saqar (challenge, difficult task, retribution). As for the feminine "heya" (it or she) in the last phrase of verse 74:31, "It is a reminder (zikra) for people" refers to the number Nineteen.

LOMAX: On the pronoun in verse 30. I noted that it is in the feminine (and therefore could refer to the blaze but not to the man). The "it" (feminine) at the end of 31 is unclear in reference to me. 'Ad+ (number) is masculine, as are "tis'a+ ashar" (19), "kitaab" (book), and "masal" (symbol). Feminine are "naar" (fire) and "saqar" (blaze), or perhaps just the general topic.

YUKSEL: It is obvious that the pronoun "ha" (it or her) cannot refer to the man, since man is masculine. It refers either to "lawwaha" or "saqar". These two words, however, are being mistranslated by many as "the thing that scorches" and "blaze," respectively. Many linguists claim that the word "saqar" is a foreign word. Here, we really do not need to find out the conventional meaning of the "word" saqar. Whenever the Quran uses a word followed by the question "do you know what that means?" then, the Quran adds or attaches a new meaning to that word in question. Please see 69:3; 77:14; 82:17-19; 83:8, 19; 86:2; 90:12; 101:3,10; 104:5. Therefore, it is better not to rush into the translation of "saqar" since God Almighty is going to describe or define it. If you notice, in my translation I left the word "saqar" as it is. You can derive its meaning from its context and description. Besides, there can be another candidate (sure, a remote one) for the reference of verse 30: "ayaat" (our signs and/or revelation) mentioned in verse 16. None of the possible references refute the mathematical implication of the number Nineteen.

Unlike Lomax, I am very clear regarding the reference of feminine "it" at the end of verse 74:31. Verse 31, in its beginning phrase, switches the subject from "Naar" (fire) to the number 19. Obviously, some people misunderstood the implication of 74:30. Later, verse 31 clarifies such misunderstanding. The number "tis'ata ashar" (Nineteen) in verse 30 can be also considered feminine. The word "eddatahum" (their number) in verse 31 is feminine too, and both words can be references for the pronoun "heya" (it or she) in the last phrase: "it is a 'zikra' (reminder) for the people." Referring to "eddatahum" (their number) is more meaningful because of the context and proximity of the word.

We can easily disqualify the feminine words "naar" (fire) and "saqar," since they are not "zikra" (reminder) in themselves. You can scan all the verses where various forms of this word is mentioned. It is noteworthy that in verse 49 of the same chapter we see a slightly different form of the same word, "tazkira" (reminder). It is used for something good, not bad: "Why are they so averse to this 'tazkira' (reminder)?" (74:49). Obviously, hell is something to be disliked. Therefore, the word "zikra" (reminder) in the end of verse 31 cannot refer to hell.

LOMAX: This "claim" was written AFTER the "objection" which follows. My original writing was investigative, not argumentative. Thus Yuksel can make my comments look dim-witted. Here is my actual response, written now:

>From the context, it is clear that the "it" in 74:30 refers to saqar (Hell-fire), or, less likely, to lawwAHa (a darkening of color). This word "saqar", according to Penrice, is "supposed to be of foreign origin," though he gives the meaning of the root as "to injure by heat." "lawwAHa" is a verbal adjective of intensity, used with li of . The root LAH means to appear (a star); Yuksel is apparently following modern meanings or possibly speculating to come up with his translation.

YUKSEL: My purpose was not to make your comments look dim-witted, but clarify the issue. I apologize if I caused such an impression.

A person who is a little bit familiar with the Quran does not really need to learn the meaning of saqar from Penrice, or someone else who is merely endorsing one of the many speculations. There is no need to speculate on the meaning of this "supposedly foreign" word, since the Quranic verses re-defines the word "saqar" in 74:26-29. As for "lawwaHa," Lomax has finally discovered one of its meaning, "to appear with intensity or frequency." It is not clear why Lomax tries to undermine my translation, since I agree with this meaning. Is there a contradiction or a big difference between "to appear intensely" and "visually obvious?"

LOMAX: The "it" at the end of 74:31, it appears, would refer either to the "number" at the beginning of the verse (which, by the way, establishes that nineteen is the number of the companions of the Fire [!], which confirms that Saqar is the Fire), or to the verse as a whole.

YUKSEL: Another good step! Now you disagree with the commentary of the majority of orthodox scholars who try to skip the number 19 and refer the pronoun "it" at the end of 74:31 to Hell. I will not argue further on this issue, since you are determined not to see the clear statements in 74: 30 and 74:31 that isolate the number Nineteen from the Fire. A fire that you are so eager to see everywhere. Indeed, the number 19 is an intellectual punishment for disbelievers and hypocrites in this world, and it is also the eternal punishment as the number of the angels guarding the Hell. Disbelievers and hypocrites can never escape from this number!

"Why are they so averse to this reminder? Running like zebras. Who are fleeing from the lion!" (74:49-51).

LOMAX: I have never denied that 74:30-31 may be read as referring to the topic of "nineteen" and the reactions of mankind to this "miracle." Rather, I point out aspects of this reference which are overlooked by Khalifites. One of the great dangers in reading the Qur'an is to assume that references to kafiruwn (unbelievers) are to "those people." It is essential, to be among those reminded, that we apply these words to ourselves, that we may be purified from kufr. To do otherwise is arrogance and pride, the opposite of taqwa.

This passage is a warning to all of us, not just to people who do not accept the "miracle of the nineteen."

YUKSEL: Trying to confuse the issue among the so called other aspects, and fighting against one of the greatest divine evidence is not righteousness. Lomax should follow his own advice since he prefers the so-called consensus of his scholars to the Quran.

LOMAX: By the way, Yuksel has edited my material somewhat, changing the transliteration scheme I had used. In a few places, this may be signifigant.

YUKSEL: I did for two reasons. First, I wanted to keep our reference of the same words consistent. Second, I found Lomax' transliteration bizarre and meaningless, since it contained some symbols which did not correspond to any sound nor letter. I found it confusing and difficult to follow. I wanted the audience to follow the argument without getting tired from ostentatious transliteration schemes. I believe that the changes were not significant. Besides, Lomax should not complain about this "itsy-bitsy" things. He has answered my "19 Questions For Muslim Scholars" without presenting my argument. His answer, which is downloaded on several network libraries, is an unfair presentation.

## CLAIM 2

The first verse in the Quran, known as the "Basmalah" consists of 19 Arabic letters.

LOMAX: Arguably true, but anecdotal. Of course, there are other ways to count the letters, but the method used by Dr. Khalifa here is reasonable.

YUKSEL: The number of letters in Basmalah is certainly true and significant. Though Lomax accepts this fact, he is trying to do his best in order to undermine this obvious physical fact. First, there is no reasonable argument about the number of letters in Basmalah. If he is referring to the absurd arguments raised by modern Sunni scholars who hallucinate by counting non-existing letters in order to blind people to the mathematical miracle of the Quran, then, he must know that everything can be arguable. With the same logic we can claim that the existence of the external world, including the Quran, is "arguably true", since some skeptical philosophers entertain doubts about it. I challenge him to show me "other ways of counting the letters" of Basmalah. Our counting is not merely reasonable, but the ONLY reasonable way of counting the Arabic letters in Basmalah. It is the simplest thing to do. Nineteen letters of Basmalah is a well known fact, since the well known formula of 786 which is used for centuries to represent Basmalah is the gematrical value of exactly 19 letters. In fact, there was no argument on the number of its letters until the discovery of the 19-based mathematical system. Nevertheless, I congratulate him for not following those Sunni scholars who pontificate that the number of letters in Basmalah are either 18, or 20, or 21; but never 19.

Second, how did he decide that this fact is anecdotal? Isn't Basmalah the FIRST, THE MOST REPEATED verse of the Quran, and CROWNS every chapter except Chapter 9? How can the number of its letters be considered anecdotal if there is possibility of a numerically structured system in the Quran? We should not forget that the importance and extraordinary nature of this system does not come merely from individual examples, but from the combination and interlocking nature of those examples. Remember that the Quran does not challenge disbelievers to bring one or several verses similar to its verses, rather it challenges them with more; in at least three verses. For the same reason, the word "ayat," in its singular form, is never used for the Quranic verses. On the other hand, its plural form, "ayaat," is used for both Quranic verses and miracles, signs etc. Please check the 84 occurrences of the singular form "ayat" and witness this unique Quranic semantic for yourself. Quran has a unique way of inserting details in conventional language. Besides, you will notice the grave mistranslation of the word "ayat" (singular form) in verse 2:106, and the ignorance of those who claim the existence of abrogation in the Quran.

In summary, the number of letters in Basmalah is certainly true and significant.

LOMAX: From an overall examination of the techniques of counting used to generate the "miracle," we can see that what may be obvious in one example is undermined in another. Khalifa (and Yuksel, following him), would claim, again and

again, that this count of 19 was completely obvious and that the assertions of scholars that there were additional letters were simply ridiculous. But when, in the next fact, the counts of the individual words in the Bismillah are given, what is counted for BSM is actually ASM. Where did this "A" come from? All I have stated is that there are other ways of counting letters than the one used by Khalifa, Yuksel, and others. Arabic orthography is, to a certain extent, arbitrary, and variations exist. We will come back to this issue: Is the Qur'an the written text, or is it the recitation? Since the word "Qur'an" means "The Recitation," I find the answer fairly obvious.

YUKSEL: Again, Lomax is confusing the matters. The first word of Basmalah, that is, BSM has three letters. However, without any prefix attached, the word is ISM. There is no other way of counting the letters in Basmalah, since it has a unique spelling. None so far succeeded or even suggested to change this famous spelling. It is different to count the letters of a statement and counting the frequency of its words, since in the later case, you can isolate the word from attached propositions or contextual format.

The Quran means "The Recitation" or "The Book of Recitation." The Quran is both the written text and recitation. There are many other names (attributes) mentioned for the Quran: Al-Kitab (Book), Suhuf (Scripture), etc. Obviously, Lomax has not read the Quran carefully enough to see this simple fact. Here are few verses as reminder: 80:11-16; 56:78. Nevertheless, the Quran, ultimately, is neither a recitation nor a book. It is a revelation in the heart of those who possess knowledge (29:49).

LOMAX: There are, and have always been, variations in the written text, as well as in recitation. If one is going to count alif as a letter (some say that it is not properly a letter), then we must face the fact that it is written in various ways, and, for example, Hafs and Warsh differ in the use of alif.

YUKSEL: We are here discussing the number of letters in Basmalah, nothing else. So far, there is no variations in its spelling. Hafs, Warsh and even Marsh versions do not differ regarding the spelling of the Basmalah. Muhammedan scholars who are masters of disagreement could not succeed to disagree on the spelling of Basmalah (or Bismillah). Again, Lomax is trying to confuse the issue by using a subtle implication.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "If he is referring to the absurd arguments raised by modern Sunni scholars who hallucinate by counting non-existing letters in order to blind people to the mathematical miracle of the Quran..."

The comment that alif was not a letter is taken from a non-Muslim scholar of Arabic. Yuksel exceeds bounds in argument, and imputes motives with little evidence. If it is a hallucination, how then can it be claimed that "ASM" is a word in the Bismillah?

YUKSEL: The statement, "You're hallucinating my friend" has 26 letters and it contains the word "are." Nevertheless, whoever claims that the statement has 27 letters is hallucinating. This is especially true, if the statement has been deliberately and consistently repeated that way, as in the case of the Bismillah.

LOMAX: Yuksel has not bothered yet to respond to my much shorter document, the draft FAQ: 19, Study Problems, which explains why the existence of various ways of counting things is significant. I would have preferred to discuss that first, since it establishes principles of analysis that might avoid many useless words of argument.

YUKSEL: Well, I will deal with it later, God willing. I hope then you will not complain that it was a "draft," not a finished work.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "I challenge him to show me "other ways of counting the letters" of Basmalah." This is truly bizarre. One would presume that Yuksel has read Philips on this subject, and further that he, himself, is capable of such an analysis. But, here goes.

This is a transliteration of the bismillah without haraka (vowel marks):

BSM ALLH ALRHMN ALRHYM As can be seen, this is nineteen letters.

Here is a translation with all the haraka (Hafs, Egyptian script): bis.mi all:hi alr:H.mAni alr:Hiymi (Sukun is written with a period, shadda with a colon.)

If I neglect the sukuns, and some would write additional sukuns, I come up with 29 letters.

The point is that to state how many letters there are requires a definition of "letter." It would seem an obvious precondition, but the Khalifites depend on such lack of definitions, because it allows them to shift definitions as needed to come up with "amazing" counts. One may argue that the short vowels are not letters. Okay, here it is without short vowels (and without sukun):

bsm all:h alr:HmAn alr:hym. 23 letters.

The shaddas (:) double letters. But perhaps we can eliminate them. bsm allh alrHmAn alrHym. 20 letters.

Some of these letters are not pronounced. We can eliminate them. bsmllh lrHmAn lrHym 17 letters.

The A in al-rahmAn is pronounced but not written (by convention). We can eliminate that too, for 16 letters.

One could also assert all these variations with an additional one, the elided alif in bism. This is a word which has been written in a special way; elsewhere in the Qur'an it does occur with the alif: bi Asm.



YUKSEL: Thank you Lomax for your exposition. You have proved that you are able to do anything and everything. An elementary level knowledge of Arabic alphabet is enough to notice the absurdity in your counting. It is one of the simplest and well known fact that Arabic has 28 (Twenty Eight) LETTERS in its alphabet. All Arabic dictionaries uses this 28 letters. Kindergarten children in Arabic speaking countries memorizes these 28 LETTERS. We are again discussing the number of LETTERS in Bismillah. I have challenged you regarding the LETTERS, not sounds, not shaddas, not harakas, not comas, not mumbles and bumbles.

This example is enough to demonstrate how Muhammedans are twisting the simplest facts in order to cast doubt on the mathematical miracle of the Quran. It is noteworthy that not a single Muslim scholar had a different count for the letters of Basmalah before the discovery of the code. Whoever mentioned the numbers of its letters acknowledged the simple fact: Basmalah consists of 19 letters. For instance, Molla Jami starts his Persian Divan by referring to the 19 letters of Basmalah. Fahreddin Ar-Razi, in his 30 volume commentary, et-Tafsir-ul Kabir, links the 19 letters of Basmalah with 19 guardians of Hell. Furthermore, the Abjad (Gematrical) value of Basmalah is well known as 786 for centuries, which is the numerical value of its 19 letters. Many a Muslim still use this number on top of their letters, instead of Bismillah...

LOMAX: Nevertheless, it does stand that one of the most simple and obvious ways of counting, that of counting the unvowelled and unmarked traditional Arabic letters, as written in the earliest manuscripts, comes up with nineteen letters. But to assert that this is the only reasonable way to count is mere polemic. It would be more honest and courageous for Yuksel to put his energy into making explicit the definition of "letter" that produces the count.

YUKSEL: Lomax and those Muhammedans who cannot digest the message of the mathematical code of the Quran are wondering the "explicit definition of letter!" I cannot imagine a more ridiculous question than this one. Lomax has an obsession with "definition." Should I ask him to define himself, or to define "definition"? In order to show him the sun you need to define the sun. He will not see the sun if you take him out and show him. Thousands of elementary Arabic books, thousands of Arabic dictionaries and encyclopedias, and millions of Arabs know their alphabet. Even my Random House Webster's College Dictionary lists the 28 Arabic Letters in a table in the entry of "alphabet."

My 5 year old son, Yahya, discovered a word-game that amuses and sometimes frustrates me. For instance, if I tell him "You are cute," he asks, "What does 'cute' mean?" If I say, "It means 'charming,'" he asks "what does 'charming' mean?" In the end, I give up, "I don't know." He continues, "What does 'I don't know' mean?"

Instead of defining what is letter, I believe it is shorter, practical and more meaningful to list the Arabic letters. This way, I will try to deprive Lomax from nitpicking on the definition. Here they are: alif, ba, ta, tha, jim, Ha, kha, dal, dhal, ra, za, sin, shin, Sad, Dad, Ta, Za, 'Ayn, ghain, fa, qaf, kaf, lam, mim, nun, ha, waw, ya.

That's all I can do. If someone has planted his feet in the concrete, what can you do?

LOMAX: Yuksel quarrels with my use of the term "anecdotal" in reference to this fact. He has not quoted the parts of my paper which establish the meaning of this term in context. This means that it is a single measure. It refers to the problem of attempting to prove a hypothesis by referring to isolated events. For example, my wife went to the doctor, and she did not get better. Therefore medicine does not work. This is anecdotal evidence. In order to really confirm such a hypothesis, one needs to examine all occurrences of the same class of event.

A relevant way of doing that would be to examine the letter counts in all distinct verses of the Qur'an (that is, all verses which differ from each other in some way.) How are the letter counts distributed? Is there some preference for divisibility by 19 that is outside the normal distribution? Such a finding would be very significant. But that a single verse, even a verse which is repeated so many times, is divisible by nineteen is not evidence of a pattern. There are "facts" asserted which are not anecdotal. But they are not verifiable. I am referring to the counts involving alif. Others seem to represent multiple occurrences of a pattern, but, if one looks closely, no pattern produces more than a few hits without there being some change in the method of analysis. I have never seen any of these phenomena that are outside normal statistical variation.

YUKSEL: Lomax will never be able to see a miraculous pattern with this attitude. He has just demonstrated his method of evaluation regarding the numbers of letters in Basmalah.

As for those who can see, they do so for their own good, and those who turn blind, do so to their own detriment. I am not your guardian (6:104).

Indeed, they have rejected this without studying and examining it, and before understanding it. Thus did those before them disbelieve. Therefore, note the consequences for the transgressors. (10:39).

LOMAX: "Anecdotal" is not a counter-argument to significance, by itself. It merely cautions against generalizing without actually analyzing the whole population of statistics of a particular kind. (And if there is only one member of the population, any fact is inherently anecdotal: If I know only one red-haired person, and he is very intelligent, I can still make no generalization about red-haired persons.)

YUKSEL: The number of letters in Basmalah, the frequency of the four words that it contains, and many other related features cannot be explained with probability. But, it is always possible to cover the truth with fabricated excuses, or extreme skepticism. What was the excuse of those who disbelieved Moses, or Jesus after they were provided with supernatural physical miracles? Contemporary disbelievers are no different than medieval ones.

### CLAIM 3

Every word in this verse is mentioned in the Quran in multiples of 19. a) The first word (Ism) is mentioned in the Quran 19 times,  $19 \times 1$ . b) The second word (Allah=God) is mentioned in the Quran 2698 times, or  $19 \times 142$ . c) The third word (Al-Rahman=Most Gracious) is mentioned in the Quran 57 times, or  $19 \times 3$ . d) The fourth word (Al-Raheem=Most Merciful) is mentioned in the Quran 114 times, or  $19 \times 6$ .

LOMAX: The counting of words in the Qur'an, to be simple, requires a clear definition of what words are to be included and what are to be excluded. To arrive at the counts reported by Dr. Khalifa requires arbitrary and inconsistent judgments, at best, and, at worst, errors or alteration of the text.

a) The count of Ism, as given, excludes the invocation itself. It also arbitrarily selects and rejects various forms of the word. There are many ways the words are written. For instance the word "ism" is written in many different forms adding to a total of 38 or  $2 \times 19$ . But, you eliminate half of it by arbitrary selection. The problems is obvious. "Word" is an undefined term. Later, we will see that, by the practices Dr. Khalifa follows with other word counts, the first word of the invocation is "BISM," not "ISM." ... He excludes the BSM in the invocation itself, whether found at the beginning of a chapter or elsewhere as well as the plural, which is formed by adding "A" (Alif) at the end.

b) The count of 2698 for Allah, as reported by Dr. Khalifa in VP does not include occurrences at 9:15, 25:68, 40:74, and 46:33. (The first three of these omissions involves reporting two occurrences as a single one.) He has counted an extra Allah at 22:60. The net result is a count of 2701. This count and the remaining two also involve the arbitrary exclusion of the other 112 initial invocations. Furthermore, he includes the word "Allah" with prepositions, such as, "Lillah" and "Billah." This is inconsistent with his counting method for the first word of Basmalah, that is, "Bism."

c) The count of 57 for Al-RaHman is accepted and verified.

d) The count of 114 for Al-Rahim involves the arbitrary inclusion or exclusion of various forms of the word, and completely omits the occurrence (which is a form otherwise included) at 9:128. The question of the exclusion of 9:128-9 from the Qur'an, as proposed in Dr. Khalifa's later publications, is definitely not simple. Dr. Khalifa did not even mention that this was necessary in VP. I certainly suspect that this was simply a reaction to his embarrassing and fairly easily discovered error. Further, we must note that we included in the count for al-Rahim the forms without the article, Rahim, and the forms with an additional alive at the end, Rahiman. The word al-Rahim occurs 116 times. However, it seems easy to exclude the one in verse 48:29, since the plural of "Ism" also were excluded. This leaves us with 115 occurrences. This is a different method of counting than was used for Ism where Ism was counted and Isman was not. Only one out of four counts is correct, and even that count requires an arbitrary decision (the exclusion of 112 invocations).

YUKSEL: Yes, there is a peculiarity regarding the counting of the word Bism. However, I strongly believe that there is still a consistent method of counting words. The word Allah, Rahman and Rahim are counted according to the same method. I will discuss two reasons for the peculiarity in the counting of the word Bism: 1) Leaving a perceived loophole for arrogant disbelievers and hypocrites to find an excuse to reject the great mathematical system of the Quran; they don't deserve to see the miracle. 2) To teach us a linguistic lesson regarding the difference between the first letter of "Ism" (name) and "Allah" (God). Now, let's explain.

a) I believe this is a fair objection. However, this apparent problem can blind a person to impressive and extraordinary examples of the mathematical system by its priming effect. Our exposure to a certain information in advance can change our perception and cognition dramatically. If you start closing one of your eyes while watching a stereogram, you will not be able to see the three dimensional picture hidden among arbitrary-looking dots. Not only you need to keep both of your eyes open, but also you need to focus on the picture with a positive attitude. Otherwise, you will reject the existence of a three dimensional picture and make fun of those who claim to see it. You may even write a book trying to prove how those colorful dots do not have any pattern. Similarly, if you make up your mind based on a questionable criteria regarding the system of the Quran, you may disqualify yourself to see the extraordinary picture. If you don't see the picture you will not be able to understand the reason for that apparent problem. I will not speculate further on this point, but I leave it to your own choice. It is God's system to show His miracles to believers (2:118), not to fanatic disbelievers or hypocrites. I know the philosophical problem (circularity) with this argument. Too bad, since miracles are not presented as proof for disbelievers. Therefore, I am not arguing this topic in order to convince someone who has already made up his mind; but to help those who have an open mind. I am not judging you. I think you are sincere and honest in your search. God knows, you may tomorrow witness this great miracle of the Quran yourself. I hope that your personal feelings towards Rashad is not creating a psychological mountain between you and the truth.

I will divert from My revelations/miracles those who are arrogant on earth, without justification. Consequently, when they see every kind of miracle/evidence they will not believe. And when they see the path of guidance they will not adopt it as their path, but when they see the path of straying they will adopt it as their path. This is the consequence of their rejecting our revelations/miracles, and being totally heedless thereof (7:146).

Therefore, I believe that if you want to reject this mathematical system, you will be provided with some deliberately arranged "loopholes" (3:7; 17:82). God distinguishes sincere believers and hypocrites in various ways (3:179; 74:31). We will find out the ultimate truth in the Day of Judgment.

However, I would like to remind us that we should not gullibly accept the claims regarding a "miracle," since attributing our speculation or wishful thinking to God

Almighty is a very serious sin. This forces us to be extremely careful in accepting or rejecting ideas regarding the Quran:

Who is more evil than one who fabricates lies and attributes them to God, or rejects the truth when it comes to him? Is Hell not just retribution for the disbelievers? (29:68).

Curiously, Fuad Abdulbaqy too, in his famous Concordance of the Quran, Al-Mu'jamul Mufahras, follow the same method of counting. While categorizing the words, he consistently distinguishes the form of a word attached to a conjunction from the one without or separate from a conjunction. He also consistently distinguishes the regular form of a word from the contracted form, for instance, when a preposition is attached to a word starting with Alif, as it is the case with "Bism".

However, he is not consistent with this method of classification in the counting of the word God. This inconsistency is curious, since this is the only method of classification that we can obtain 2698 (19x142) for the frequency of the word God, if we exclude 9:128-129 and un-numbered Basmalahs. (If you study this concordance you will find that the author separates the word Allah in three parts according to their last vowel points as an exceptional treatment. However, this is not because he considered them as different forms of the word. This exceptional treatment is to make it more convenient for us to find a verse containing the most repeated word in the Book.)

Here is how Abdulbaqy's concordance classifies the different forms of Ism. Ism or Bism (Name, in the Name. The three original letters of the word remains unaltered):

No	Sura	Verse	1	5	4	2	6	118	3	6	119	4	6						
121	5	6	138	6	22	28	7	22	34	8	22	36	9	22	40	10	49		
11	11	55	78	12	56	74	13	56	96	14	69	52	15	73	8	16	76		
25	17	87	1	18	87	15	19	96	1	Bsm (In the name. The first letter is dropped):	1	1	1	2	11	41	3	27	30

Ismuhu (His name. A pronoun is attached to the original form):	1	2	114	2						
3	45	3	19	7	4	24	36	5	61	6

Asma' (Names. The original form is changed):	1	2	31	2	2	31	3										
7	71	4	7	180	5	12	40	6	17	110	7	20	8	8	53	23	9
59	24																

Asmaihi (his names) 1 7 180

Asmaihim (their names) 1 2 33 2 2 33

Totaling to 39 words.

No one can claim that Fuad Abdulbaqy cooperated with us by putting the number 19 under the word "Ism" as its frequency, since he completed his concordance in 1938 and died before the code was discovered.

The exceptional method applied to the counting of the word Bism might be due to its first letter, that is "A" (Alif). When this letter is omitted it changes its basic form, that is, ISM becomes SM. If we accept this fact as one of the reasons for a different method of counting, then, we have to accept that the first letter of "Allah," that is "A" (Alif) does not belong to its root. In other words, the first letter of "Allah" is "A" of the definite article "Al" (The). Some linguists have claimed that the word "Allah" is the Arabic word for "the god," which we write as God, with a capital G. According to this understanding, omission in the first letter of "Allah" cannot be considered a change in the basic form of the word.

Again, we observe according to our current knowledge and sometimes learn new facts from our observation. Our observation in science occasionally forces us to modify our theories. Likewise, we study the mathematical structure of the Quran with our current knowledge; however, sometimes we may be forced to correct some of our preconceived ideas. An outsider may accuse the scientist of being inconsistent or cheating, but an insider will see it as a sincere search for a better understanding and explanation.

b) There were typing errors in the list published in VP (Visual Presentation of the Miracle). I really don't know how they occurred. However, the errors can be corrected by a careful comparison. As I have stated, I do not argue my position with the authority of Rashad, but with verifiable and falsifiable physical facts. Therefore, speculating on his errors is not relevant here. So far, you have found few errors. I will give you the complete list of typing errors. My or your errors cannot change the number of the frequency of the word "Allah" (God) in the Quran. Independent researchers can find the real results. Here is the complete list of errors in VP with their correction. (The first number on the left is the index number, the second is Chapter, and the third is verse number, and the parenthesis contain corrections):

565	4	69	(64)	784	5	47	(48)	828	5	57
(87) 1120 b	9	5	(add)	1176	9	46	(48)	1264	9	119 (118)
1271(1272)9		127 1489	15	97	(96)	1672	22	60		(subtract)
1792 b	25	68	(add)	2220 b	40	74	(add)	2306	46	23
(subtract) 2310 b	46	33	(add)	2457	58	4	(subtract)	2576		
63	7	(6)								

As you see above, we have 4 additions and 3 subtractions. That means, we have one extra word to add to the claimed result, that is,  $2698 + 1 = 2699$ . This result includes the word "Allah" in 9:129.

Now, please tell me what is the result of your own counting? If you agree with 2699, then we can continue this argument. (You can use Visual Presentation of the Miracle or Fuad Abdulbaqi's Al-Mu'jamul Mufahrasa Li-elfazil Quranil Karim to check

this number). By the way, it is becoming evident to me that your concordance is not accurate. You should not reject our counts based on your poorly edited concordance. I advise you to obtain Fuad Abdulbaqy's concordance, which is a well known work in Islamic circles, and compare it with yours.

Our counting excludes the 112 unnumbered Basmalabs. Had we include them, you would object again by labeling it as an "arbitrary inclusion of 112 unnumbered initial invocations which are merely repetition." Our exclusion is not arbitrary, since the other 112 Basmalabs are not numbered. You can see this fact in your own version of the Quran. Our method follows and justifies the well known difference between the other two Basmalabs and these 112 Basmalabs. It is a discovery which brings an explanation for this curious distinction. Though in the early manuscripts the verses were not numbered, they were ordered and separated from each other by dots which I believe justifies our numbering them. In fact, if there is a beginning and order of items of the same category, there is an implicit numbering in the structure. Therefore, early scholars were not wrong when they decided to number the verses as we know and use today.

c) The frequency of the word Rahman being 57, or  $19 \times 3$ , is obviously a significant fact regarding the numerical code.

d) As for the counting of "Rahiman," the form without the article, I believe that your objection is very weak since we do not apply a different method of counting for the other three words in Basmalah. I agree that you can count a word in several different ways. The number of reasonable methods of counting this word is much less than nineteen ways. Thus, according to probability, it is still interesting to find one of them being a multiple of 19.

I believe that the method of counting which leads to a miraculous system is the most reasonable one, and we use it consistently. Furthermore, if we follow the same method of counting words, we find the word "shahr" (month) occurs exactly 12 times, and the word "yawm" (day) occurs 365 times. These two examples with their empirical implication, I believe, gives us two important clues: 1) There is big possibility that the author of the Quran has attached meanings to the frequency of words. 2) While counting the words, the general method of counting should follow the same system that we discover in the frequency of these two words.

True, there are 115 occurrences of Rahim in current versions. But, we have always excluded the one mentioned in 9:128. Before we came to the conclusion that 9:128-129 is not from the original Quran, we had already and easily excluded it, since it is used for Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, the frequency of God's name Rahim is 114 ( $19 \times 6$ ) in the Quran.

LOMAX: Edip Yuksel wrote: "Yes, there is a peculiarity regarding the counting of the word Bism. However, I strongly believe that there is still a consistent method of counting words. The word Allah, Rahman and Rahim are counted according to the same method."

There is not just one peculiarity, there are at least two. However, Yuksel is reduced to saying "I strongly believe" because he is unable to state what the method is. I don't like to shout, but:

#### WHAT IS THE METHOD OF COUNTING WORDS?

As will be noted from Yuksel's word counts from AbdulBaqi, 19 is the frequency of one particular form of ASM, and this is not the form found in the Bismillah. Other forms have other frequencies. Once again, I will note my amazement that Yuksel casually allows that there is an alif in BSM, so soon after he has called this a "hallucination" when it is asserted by "Sunni scholars."

YUKSEL: Again, Lomax is trying to confuse things. I have explained it before. The BSM of Basmalah does not have "A" (alif) in it. However, when we count individual words we can strip them off from attached propositions which are only relevant when they are in a sentence. I have briefly expressed the method of counting the words, and brought an explanation regarding the difference in the count of the first word, Bism.

LOMAX: I could infer from some of these facts a method of counting words. But it is a lot of work, which I am not going to exert right now. It is up to those who claim the miracle to state the experimental conditions. I have tried to do it in the past, and always found inconsistencies.

But, by varying the definition of "word" one can certainly increase the occurrence of any desired modulo 19 remainder. It is not difficult to do this with just four words, and this has been done with the Bismillah.

YUKSEL: Lomax was asking us the definition of "letter" too. He was confused on that simplest and most obvious linguistic fact. Knowing his great talent in confusing matters, I avoid to waste my time to bring a definition for "word." It seems that nothing can clear his fuzzy eyesight.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "b) There were typing errors in the list published in VP (Visual Presentation of the Miracle). I really don't know how they occurred." Especially since these lists were supposedly produced by computer. Khalifa allowed people to assume that his counts were generated by analyzing a computer text of the Qur'an. It is likely that he did keypunch (yes, keypunch!) part, or perhaps all, of the Qur'an in the early 1970s. But his database was full of errors, and it is likely that his later work was done without the benefit of a computer-readable Arabic text. So his "computer" proof was actually just a manually- compiled spreadsheet. How did he come up with 2698?

YUKSEL: It really does not matter. I do not care how he came up with this number. I know for myself that there are exactly 2698 occurrences of the word "Allah" (God) in the numbered verses of the Quran, excluding the 9:127. Lomax might again



marshal his Hafs and Warsh! By repeatedly referring to his versions of the Quran he reminds me his ancestors mentioned in verse 10:15.

LOMAX: He followed AbdulBaqi, who did not count 1:1 as part of the Qur'an, and who, I am told, reports 2698 occurrences of "Allah." Then he made his spreadsheet, and kept looking for errors until he had the same total as AbdulBaqi. It has been said that this was an error in AbdulBaqi, but perhaps he was following the Warsh reading, which does not number the initial Bismillah.

YUKSEL: AbdulBaqi DID count verse 1:1 as part of the Quran. His claim shows how shallow is his "research." If he has just checked his concordance for the other three words of Basmalah (Bism, Rahman, and Rahim) he would have realized that the omission of the word "Allah" in 1:1 is a typographical or a human error. The numbers indicating the frequency of the word "Allah" (God) is one less than the actual list. Therefore, he lists 2699 occurrences, including 9:127. Again Lomax' obsession with Warsh forces him to a wrong conclusion. AbdulBaqi did not care about Warsh version.

X-Sender: ey61525@mailhost.goodnet.com Date: Sat, 16 Dec 1995 22:24:09 +0200 To: Saeed Talari <sam786@submission.MV.COM>, ey61525@goodnet.com From: ey61525@goodnet.com (Edip Yuksel) Subject: Zebras 3 (second part)

LOMAX: Yuksel could have saved me a great deal of trouble by sending me the list of errors in VP two years ago, when I first mailed him a copy of my paper. It met with complete silence then. I had to find those errors myself. At this point, I consider it unlikely that there are more errors, and tentatively accept that there are 2698 occurrences of "Allah" in the accepted Qur'an, plus 113 occurrences in the initial Bismillahs. I add the qualification "accepted," because I have a copy of the Tashkent muSHaf, and I have found, on a fairly cursory examination, that there is a verse in it which does not have an "Allah" which is present in modern versions. Because it is "innallaha" and the subject of the following verb is obviously Allah, it does not change meaning. I would not be surprised to find other occurrences like this.

YUKSEL: Individual manuscripts might contain certain unintentional errors or omissions because of the human factor. If there was a "deliberate" omission of the word "Allah" in Tashkent copy it would not have escaped from public attention and hot debate among early scholars. There is no such a debate on that missing word, even in the books which argue the tiniest variations among different versions.

Lomax may hope to equate his "discovery" with ours. In the case of the spelling of "BasTatan" we had clues and evidences to suspect the spelling of that word. Furthermore, we did not rely on Tashkent copy alone, we checked some other early manuscripts too.

LOMAX: Again, it would be useful if Yuksel would address the point mentioned in the draft FAQ: 19, Study Problems, "What is the Qur'an?"

YUKSEL: Here, I will briefly attempt to define the "Quran." Lomax may not like this unconventional definition. The Quran is a unique book and it has a unique (he may call it bizarre!) definition:

The Quran is a revelation of God to Prophet Muhammad in Arabic language containing 114 chapters, a number which equals the Gematrical value of God's attribute Jami' (The Editor). (Lomax may wonder: "what does 'chapter' mean? I will define it for him if he explain what does "mean" mean!) Its chapters, except the Chapter 9, start with a 19-lettered verse, Bismillahirrahmanirrahim.

It is a numerically coded book, detailed and explained by its author, easy to understand for believers, impossible to understand for hypocrites and disbelievers. With its 6346 verses (including unnumbered Basmalabs), it is complete and the only source of guidance. Disbelievers seek other sources besides it. Its a book of recitation which its preservation is guaranteed by God. It does not belong to Hafs, Warsh, neither East, nor West; it is God's light. Where can we find this Quran? It is in the heart of those who possess knowledge. Who are those who possess knowledge? They are those who know the Quran and accept its self-definition without doubt. How do they know the Quran? God teaches them. How can we know that God teaches them? If God teaches you too! How do I know that God teaches me? You will not trade God's word with medieval fabrications and consensus of clergymen.

LOMAX: Yuksel writes: "Though in the early manuscripts the verses were not numbered, they were ordered and separated from each other by dots which I believe justifies our numbering them."

The Tashkent muSHaf is not numbered, nor is it dotted in any way. Dots were added later, and some of them were used to indicate pause. Yuksel ignores the fact that different readings of the Qur'an divide verses differently. If he really is interested in authenticity, he should probably be studying Warsh instead of Hafs, since it is likely that Warsh is closer to the Qur'an as recited by the Prophet (SAS).

YUKSEL: Lomax again is advertising his Warsh version. However, he has lost his credibility since he is the same guy who strongly advises people to accept the authenticity of hadith books which are collection of primitive stories. As for the Tashkent copy, I can see clear marks separating verses, even without my eyeglasses. Lomax probably has a newly discovered Warsh version of Tashkent manuscript ;-)

LOMAX: As to the remaining counts, since al-Rahman is used in only one form, I can state that it occurs, in Hafs according to modern numbering, 57 times in numbered verses. Since Yuksel has not stated the rules for counting words, I will refrain from confirming the Rahiym counts. It is also a bad sign that the necessary qualification "Hafs" and "numbered verses" needs to be stated by me. It should be part of the original claim, as should be the necessary definitions. Without those definitions, counting is impossible.

YUKSEL: Lomax appears to have a short memory. He had confirmed the frequency of Rahiym in his previous work. He could count 115 Rahiym (including 9:128) without trouble (see: Lomax' first round objection to Claim 3). With the exclusion of 9:128, the frequency of Rahiym comes to 114 which is a ZMN of 19. Lomax is learning so much that he has lost his ability for counting clear words ;-)

LOMAX: It is easy to define "word" in English, because we separate words with spaces. Arabic is not like that. Even so, in English we could run into problems if we try to count words. If I count the occurrences of the word "truck," should I also count "trucking" and "trucks?"

YUKSEL: Lomax should just count the word "truck," if he is counting only the "car" the "bicycle" and the "bus!" This is exactly what we did in the count of the words in Basmalah.

LOMAX: Yuksel is actually proposing that we should use the definitions which produce the multiples of 19. There is nothing wrong with doing this, as long as one recognizes the possibility that one is thereby creating the "miracle." Such a hypothesis (that the "miracle" is man-made) could later be disproven by showing that the results were of far higher significance than could have been created by such manipulation.

For example, I can decode the cryptogram in the newspaper by trying out certain letter conversions. If some of these conversions seem to produce a real word, I then look at all the occurrences of the translated letter, and see if other words appear as well. Because of the nature and complexity and redundancy of a genuine message, I can generally be very sure if I have found the correct code, because it produces a message with much greater coherency than can be explained by the relatively simply process of choosing letter conversions.

YUKSEL: Good job! Sometimes I wonder how can Lomax be among those who are blind to the mathematical miracle of the Quran.

LOMAX: But if I am allowed to do more than just substitute one letter for another, and if the spaces are considered part of the code as well, and if I can add positional coding (in other words, the translation varies with the position), then, if I am not limited in the complexity of the translation, I can convert any message into any other message of the same length. But the code will approximately as complex as the message decoded.

I find, on examining the claims of the Khalifites, that the decoding they do is as complex as the message it produces. They shift analytical methods as needed to produce multiples of nineteen. But to demonstrate this requires an overview.

YUKSEL: Lomax consistently tries to stigmatize us by labeling us as Khalifites. He is appealing to orthodox masses who excommunicate people by labeling them with

names, ironically, in the similar way of how they call themselves: Hanefites, Shafiites, Malikites, Hanbelites, Wahhabites, etc.

After receiving my answer rejecting the claims that do not follow a consistent method of calculations, Lomax still insist to repeat his original criticism. He enjoys to punch a straw-man. It is a tactic that works for politicians who appeal to the emotions of the masses.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "True, there are 115 occurrences of Rahim in current versions. But, we have always excluded the one mentioned in 9:128. Before we came to the conclusion that 9:128-129 is not from the original Quran, we had already and easily excluded it, since it is used for Prophet Muhammad. Therefore, the frequency of God's name Rahim is 114 (19x6) in the Quran." Yuksel here shows how slippery all this is. Apparently, it is meaning that is being counted, not words. But this is not stated in the original "fact." True, Muhammad (SAS) is "raHiyma", merciful, but the word in the Bismillah is al-raHiym (The Merciful), so I would agree that it is a reasonable choice not to count this, but on the basis that it is an adjective, not a name or title. Al-rahiym, the title or name, occurs 34 times in the Qur'an. All Yuksel has demonstrated is that there is a way to count that produces a multiple of 19.

YUKSEL: In the Quran, all the attributes of God are adjectives. It is entirely arbitrary and baseless to divide them into groups of names and adjectives. Again, Lomax contradicts his previous count of Rahiym. All Lomax has demonstrated is that there is a way to distort and manipulate the facts that produces a result lacking a mathematical pattern.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "I agree that you can count a word in several different ways. The number of reasonable methods of counting this word is much less than nineteen ways. Thus, according to probability, it is still interesting to find one of them being a multiple of 19."

Yuksel's knowledge of math is, well, deficient. Each possible method of counting reduces the significance of the result. Because it is possible to combine the results of various counts (particularly in this case, where words exist in many different forms), and also because of probability theory, one does not need nineteen different ways to make it likely that one of them is divisible by nineteen. In fact, with thirteen different ways, there is a fifty percent probability that one or more of them is divisible by nineteen, even without allowing combinations.

It is more complex to determine the odds with combinations, but a rough estimate would be that, if one may combine forms (as Khalifa did), four different forms is sufficient to make it likely (more than 50% probability) that one combination exists which is divisible by 19.

There are about seven forms of ASM, at least two forms of ALLH (Allah and Lillah), one form of ALRHMN, and four forms of ALRHYM. From this, one might

expect more than one way to combine forms for ASM to produce a multiple of 19, and, in fact, there is: The total of all forms of ASM is, in fact, 38, or  $19 \times 2$ , in the numbered verses in Hafs.

YUKSEL: Lomax generalizes my statement for the word ISM to the other three words in order to claim deficiency in my math. We have counted the word ALLAH, al-RAHMAN, and ALRAHIYM according to the clearest and most obvious method in a consistent fashion. The same method was employed by many independent researchers who did not have motivation to reject nor defend the mathematical code of the Quran. It is amusing to see many new methods of counting is being discovered by today's Muhammedans who are terrorized by the number 19. After their new discoveries they complain from confusion. In this endeavor, no wonder they end up losing the most common knowledge. They seriously ask what is letter? What is the Quran?

Below is one out of many examples from previous works that do not demonstrate any problem in counting particular words. Though their count may not be exact, it will show that they have employed the same way of counting. Prof. Dr. Suad Yildirim, in his comprehensive book on the attributes of God in the Quran, "Deity in the Quran" (Kuran'da Uluhiyet, Kayihan Yayinevi, Istanbul, 1987) gives the frequency of the word Allah 2697 (p.101), the word Rahman 57 (p.115), the word Rahiym 114 (p. 124). Though Dr. Suad Yildirim is not interested in the mathematical code of the Quran (most likely he rejects it) he came up with the same counting method and with the same results, except he was one short for the count of "Allah."

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "I believe that the method of counting which leads to a miraculous system is the most reasonable one, and we use it consistently." This should be printed with every piece of Khalifite literature. It is an open acknowledgment that the methods of counting are selected to produce the "miraculous system." Now, if such a method is found, and it then produces consistent results applied to new data, it would truly be miraculous. But the Khalifites keep modifying the system as new data is presented, and, in fact, as will be seen, they do not use and system "consistently."

Now, their inconsistency is not a guarantee that there is no pattern. It merely means that they have not demonstrated one. The Khalifites are apparently not aware that the human mind is very, very capable of projecting pattern. It is a very useful capacity, but it has its limits. Perhaps our older readers will remember the "canals of Mars." Many astronomers drew them from observing Mars, but somehow they never showed up in photographs. No one draws them anymore, now that excellent photographs from close up fail to show them. Gamblers believe that they can detect patterns in random variations, and they bet everything they have on this.

YUKSEL: Again Lomax is not dealing with my position. He can always find someone who will introduce some inconsistent or false counting. Instead of dealing with my argument, he is still looking for straw-men among what he calls "Khalifites". This attitude is irritating. As the readers have noticed I have occasionally lost my patience with Lomax.

Lomax obviously distorts my statement for his cause. Here I will re-word it to make it clearer: I believe that our method of counting is the most reasonable one, and we use it consistently. This method leads to a miraculous system.

LOMAX: I have challenged the Khalifites (and other students of "numerical miracle" in the Qur'an) to come up with a coherent statement of exactly what the miracle is, so that we could then determine if it exists in other books. So far, no takers. Until such a statement exists, it is really impossible to prove that the miracle does not exist, for exactly the same reason that an honest atheist would admit the general impossibility of proving the non-existence of "God." In order to disprove a proposition, the proposition must first be stated in a way that can be tested.

YUKSEL: An impressive and eloquent statement with no substance. I do not have any motivation to come up with a coherent statement of exactly what the miracle is for someone who is not able to see the simplest facts. You cannot help someone who stubbornly closes his eyes to the light and complain of not being able to see it. What if that person demands a coherent statement of exactly what the light is? Personally, I would not bother to bring a technical and comprehensive definition of the light for someone who hates the light and demonstrates all kind of blindness in the past.

#### CLAIM 4

The Quran consists of 114 chapters (Suras) which is 19x6.

LOMAX: True, but anecdotal. The number of chapters is not part of a pattern. I will make this "anecdotal" comment many times; I should explain it. Suppose I have a telephone book. I can generate a large number of counts from that book. In fact, the number of counts, the number of ways that the data can be analyzed, which can be generated from such a large collection far exceeds the number of atoms in the known universe. Approximately one out of 19 of those counts will be divisible by 19. By selecting and presenting only those counts, especially if I worked at it for fifteen years or so, I could show an amazing collection of facts, all of which would be undeniably true. I do not intend to do this; I consider it a recipe for insanity.

On the other hand, if I could show an extensive pattern, appearing with the application of a few simple rules, I would have found something truly interesting. Dr. Khalifa's early claims of the letter frequencies showed exactly such a pattern, which is why they interested me so much. Out of 14 initial letters, 8 showed total counts divisible by 19. There is substantially less than one chance in a million of that happening simply by coincidence. Unfortunately, even those counts already included what can only be considered deliberate modification of the data to create divisible counts. (To consider this kindly, Dr. Khalifa probably thought that he was discovering the "correct" way of counting or the "correct" text.)

YUKSEL: It is true, and it is very important. Why should the number of chapters should not be a part of the pattern? The number of the Chapters being multiple of 19 is surely an important support for the importance of number 19 as the code of mathematical structure of the Quran. Yes, it is not difficult to compose a book with a certain number of chapters. However, if we have many examples of a mathematical pattern in a book and the number of chapters (the biggest element in a book) also supports that pattern, then, it becomes important. I am sure if the number of chapters were not multiple of 19, skeptics would repeatedly raise this question: "How can you claim that this book is constructed on a numerical code, and its chapters, the most obvious element is not a multiple of that code?"

There is no alternative counting for the number of chapters. For instance, if someone claim that the number of statements in a book which starts with letters B, C, E, M, R, T are each multiple of 7, then, I could object him by saying "It is just a coincidence. What about other 22 letters? You have one out of 7 chance to have such a case. Approximately 4 out 28 initial letters will be multiple of 7. It is not significant to have 6 of them being multiple of the same number." But, I cannot object to the number of chapters by accusation or allegation of selective counting. The number of chapters has a unique importance in the numerical composition of a book.

Let me modify my example in order to get some insight regarding the mathematical structure of the Quran: If someone claims that the number of statements in

a book which starts with letters Y, U, K, S, E, L are multiple of 6, then, I would not rush in rejecting it as coincidence, if I knew that the author of that book is Edip Yuksel. I would raise some cautious questions: "How did you put these letters in this order? Why not K, L, Y, U, S, E or other pattern? " If I am provided with a reason for that order, then, I may consider the example intentional. For instance, "they are ordered according their first occurrence" or "they are ordered according to their frequencies, that is, Y occurs 6x50 times, U occurs 6x43 times, K occurs 6x12 times, so on so forth." Some other examples, for instance, the number of chapters and sentences may convince me regarding the intention of the author on using the number 6 as a code. In this case, in order to be convinced, I may need three times more examples than I need for a 19-based pattern, since 7 is smaller.

In order to claim a unique and extraordinary mathematical design in the Quran, we should first be convinced regarding the intention of the author. The number of chapters, I believe, is a crucial element regarding this conviction. Though the discovery of "intention" is important, it is not sufficient for to claim that the mathematical composition is authored by God. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.

Your example of a telephone book is deceptive for at least three reasons. First, a typical telephone book contains much more characters than the Quran which contains approximately 300,000 letters. The white pages of Tucson's phone directory, excluding suburbs, contains approximately 8,500 characters in one page totaling 5,200,000 characters. This includes approximately 200,000 different phone numbers with approximately 1,400,000 digits. (Quran, on the other hand contains 30 different numbers and 8 fractions, and they are repeated less than 300 times). This volume is obviously more than 17 times of the Quran. Therefore, in order to believe in a mathematical structure for a typical phone book, we need much more examples than we need for the Quran. Besides, the volume of a phone book is a discouraging factor for verification for any claim.

Second, you did not come up with any real examples from any phone book. You just made up a hypothetical claim. If any book shows similar pattern, I am ready to discard the mathematical miracle of the Quran. I am not talking about selecting fragmented patterns collected from a fraction of details from a vast number of possible elements, since I consider many so-called mathematical miracles as manipulation or selective calculations. I have written a lengthy article to distinguish between a genuine mathematical pattern and a fake one. I may include it to our argument later.

Third, it is absurd to look for a mathematical system in a phone book, since it has no chance to be beyond probability. Even if someone claims the existence of such a system, we lack motivation to verify or falsify those claims. However, it is relevant and reasonable to look for a mathematical pattern in a book which claims to be a "miraculous" message from the Creator of the Universe, the Greatest Mathematician. It is wrong to equate a probable and meaningful mathematical system in the Quran with improbable and meaningless "mathematical system" in a phone book.



Fourth, instead of a phone book, a novel or a non-fiction could be more relevant. Quranic verses and chapters have semantical relation and common theme. The numerical relation among elements can be supported by their meaning. Sometimes few examples are enough to give us a message. For instance, the frequency of month and day in the Quran. A phone book contains a number of fragmented information without literal quality.

LOMAX: Edip Yuksel wrote: "There is no alternative counting for the number of chapters."

This is not true. I am quite sure that if there were 115 chapters, for example, Khalifa would have pointed out that there is no bismillah at the beginning of Sura 9, that it is really a continuation of Sura 8. It raises the question of how we know how the chapters are divided. In modern editions, there are distinctive markings at the beginning of chapters, but in the Tashkent Qur'an, there are no such markings. I have not looked yet at the division between 8 and 9 in the Tashkent muSHaf; it is a bit difficult to find. I will report in a future posting what is there, insha'allah. Further, apparently, the muSHaf of Ibn Mas'ud had 111 chapters, and that of Ubay bin Ka'b had 116 chapters, as did that of Ibn Abbas. (Ibn Mas'ud excluded the Fatiha and the last two chapters, apparently considering them merely supplications, and the two additional chapters of the others are also known as supplications.) However, my statement that this number is an anecdotal fact still stands. It is not based on the application of a pattern.

YUKSEL: Second-guessing hypothetical claims can be deceptive. I can claim similar thing for Lomax: I am quite sure if he was living during Moses and had witnessed one of his miracle he would have claimed that he was doing magic. Lomax again has found something useful in his holy hadith books, books that he can find whatever he wishes (68:35-38). Knowing the credibility problem of his sources, he craftily avoids to give reference for his claim regarding the manuscript of Ibn Mas'ud and Ubay bin Ka'b. The original reporters of this claim are Bukhari and Ibn Hanbel, which are full of fabricated narrations. According to the same books there was a verse legislating stoning to death and it was abrogated by a hungry goat after Muhammad's death. Half of the moon fell down on Ali's backyard after it was remotely split by Muhammad's index finger. Monkeys practiced Sunnah by stoning a couple of adulterer monkeys to death. Muhammad possessed sexual power of 30 men. Muhammad negotiated with God to reduce the number of prayers from 50 times a day (every 28 minutes) to 5 times a day, after getting advice from Moses who was residing in the sixth heaven. Etc., etc. According to Lomax, the number of chapters in the Quran is doubtful based on the books that narrate this kind of stories! What an argument!

It is noteworthy that Lomax, who do not hesitate to ignore Quranic verses for the sake of the consensus of scholars, ignores the consensus about the number of chapters. Lomax again proves that he is ready to fight against the mathematical code by any means possible. This time he resorts to the collections of medieval lies.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "For instance, if someone claim that the number of statements in a book which starts with letters B, C, E, M, R, T are each multiple of 7, then, I could object him by saying "It is just a coincidence. What about other 22 letters? You have one out of 7 chance to have such a case. Approximately 4 out 28 initial letters will be multiple of 7. It is not significant to have 6 of them being multiple of the same number." But, I cannot object to the number of chapters by accusation or allegation of selective counting. The number of chapters has a unique importance in the numerical composition of a book."

Every fact is unique. However, some facts are related to others as applications of a pattern. If, for example, I were to assert that every initial letter occurs in its chapter an exact multiple of 19 times, this is a single description which would cover many facts, and it would truly be miraculous, if it were true. Other facts are isolated and do not prove anything. If my house number is divisible by 19, or is not divisible by 19, what would that prove?

YUKSEL: Every element in the Quran is obviously related to each other since they are parts of the same book. Sure, some elements are more important and obvious than the others. If your house number was divisible by 19, and it had 19 windows and 19 pillars, and it had a lot number divisible by 19, and had 19 peach trees in its backyard, and had a phone number divisible by 19, then we could seriously think about a deliberate arrangements or extraordinary coincidences. If additionally, it had a long welcome note engraved on its door starting with a 19 lettered headline and containing a "vague" statement: "on it is nineteen" then we could talk about a deliberate arrangement.

If a skeptic had come up with an objection such as "There is no relation between windows and trees or between house numbers and telephone numbers" we would tell him: "Yes, they are generally are not related but here (in this house) they are related, since they can be listed as elements of a single category, that is, the house." If the critic challenged us with a smirk on his face, "Define the window. What is the difference between windows and doors? In fact, I can claim that there are 21 windows (including the two doors). Why do you distinguish between doors and windows? They are all holes in the walls. You separate them to manipulate numbers and create an impressive pattern. You are a charlatan!" You would not probably waste your time to bring a "coherent" and "satisfactory" definition for windows. If you came up with any definition, you are sure that the critic is smart enough to find a vague point that can confuse doors with windows. He could reject your definition by saying that people can enter from windows if they want, or, some windows can extend down to the floor, etc. He would dance on that fine line repeating his claim: "You see, you cannot define what is window without excluding doors." Furthermore, if he could not find a fine line to dance on, he would resort to a fictional book written by a former resident claiming that his house number was 20 instead of 19!

You cannot count anything with such a person; even the number of eyes in his head. He would invite you to define the "eye." In case you gullibly accepted the invitation he would dwell on your definition and find a way to confuse the eye with ear or nose or

with some allegorical concept! This is not a hypothetical imagination, but how mind of a knit-picking extreme skeptic works. Personally, I can do what is Lomax doing. Here is my challenge for Lomax: "if you believe that you have two eyes in your head you are wrong! There are different ways of counting eyes. First of all, you should provide us with the definition of 'eye.'"

LOMAX: What the Khalifite claim boils down to is that significant counts of various phenomena in the Qur'an are divisible by 19. What Yuksel does not face is that these phenomena are part of a larger class of phenomena, and only those members of the larger class have been presented for examination which are divisible by 19. Yuksel claims that the chapter count is particularly significant. Perhaps it is; perhaps, indeed, it is the most obvious thing one could count: it is certainly the easiest, and, indeed, it is, in all modern texts, divisible by 19.

YUKSEL: Here again Lomax is appealing to the tribal emotions of orthodox Muslims by labeling and insulting me as Khalifite. This is a psychological tactic called "projection." Lomax again twists his argument. After so much words he acknowledges the fact that the number of chapters are divisible by 19. This is a pattern in Lomax' argument: claims full of "maybes" and "perhaps" occasionally end up with "certainly" and "indeed," or vice versa.

LOMAX: But I have no problem with the concept that nineteen has something to do with the structure of the Qur'an. In fact, it appears to me that a certain level of nineteen-related significance has indeed been woven into the Qur'an, enough to make a fitnah, a trial, for us. This is how I understand 74:30-31. Satan's temptation to us, however, is to say what we do not know, which, in this case, is to exaggerate the significance of nineteen and to create, from the threads which exist, a much more elaborate structure than is justified by the evidence. YUKSEL: What a lousy logic: "God arranged some 19, but not enough to make a miracle. This 'certain level' of 19 is a test for those who can see a miracle!" The Quran, repeatedly mentions those who do not see the obvious miracles. God portrays them as "musrifun murtab" that is, extreme skeptics.

Besides, Lomax is repeating his false claim regarding the meaning of 74:30-31 without answering my criticism. I have challenged his (mis)understanding in the first round argument. Unfortunately, he repeats himself like a broken record! LOMAX: It is a very big step from the discovery of certain nineteen-related facts to asserting that enough of the pattern has been demonstrated that one is justified in excluding two verses from the Qur'an. Dr. Khalifa's early work proves beyond doubt one thing: it is possible to find a perfect pattern in imperfect data. He claimed that his early data proved the exact preservation of the Qur'an. When errors were found, he did not abandon his hypothesis; he merely re-analyzed the data with new criteria, and again claimed perfect preservation. When more errors were found, he preferred his hypothesis over perfect preservation. These "facts" that Yuksel is presenting are the result of extensive analysis and re-analysis of the data using the criterion that he admitted earlier: if it is divisible by 19, keep it; if it is not, keep looking for the "correct" way to count.

YUKSEL: This is a general accusation based on biased evaluation of a meticulous and arduous research that needed time to be completed. You can undermine and ridicule many scientific discoveries with the same criticism. They can be seen the same way through the eyes of skeptics.

Lomax falsely attributes a "criterion" to me by chopping and distorting my words. Let me reciprocate with the same style: The criticism that Lomax is presenting is the result of extensive analysis and re-analysis of the data using the criterion that he admitted earlier: if it is not divisible by 19, keep it, if it is, keep looking for "another" way to count. If still there are some pattern left after trying all imaginable ways then claim that the irreducible minimum is a divine test for those who try to understand and appreciate the pattern.

LOMAX: NEVER have we seen from a Khalifite an honest statement about this, such as "We examined 430 facts and found that 24 of them were divisible by 19." They just present the 24 facts and it looks very impressive.

YUKSEL: Well Lomax, we use our time intelligently. We know that out there, there are many Muhammedans biting their fingers out of rage because of this number. We leave the examination of those 406 "facts" for them. As in the case of Lomax' house number metaphor, we leave it to them the counting of bricks, studs and nails in the walls (harakas, shaddas, sukuns, etc.), or the number of weeds in the backyard (differences in Warsh version), or investigating the history of the house from fictional books (Ibn Masud's and Ubay b. Ka'b's personal manuscripts reported by Bukhari and Ibn Hanbal), or the invisible ghosts that reside in the house after dark (invisible letters in Basmalah), etc.

Lomax, who is shouting with majuscule NEVER., should listen to the proverb "never say never." If Lomax considers me a KHALIFITE (a cheap label frequently used by him despite my frequent reminder) then I have given "an honest statement" whenever it was relevant. We cannot find "430 facts" regarding the four words of Basmalah, or 430 methods of counting for the simple count of its letters, or 430 alternatives to examine the statistical probability for the frequency of "day" as 365, or 430 manuscripts regarding the number of its chapters, etc.

However, whenever we felt a relevance or necessity for such a revelation, we tried to convey that. For instance, in the count of the attributes of God and their Gematrical values we have stated that out of more than 120 names we examined we found only four of them have a ZMN frequency and again only four of them have a ZMN Gematrical value.

I want to mention another criticism for this fact. In his DRAFT FAQ: 19 Lomax claims: "Some years ago, confining myself to names of God found in the Qur'an, I found: At 17:42, there is &y |L@r\$ (possessor of the throne), which is clearly a name of God. The value is  $700 + 10 + 1 + 30 + 70 + 200 + 300 = 1311$ , or  $19 \times 69$ . I did not find any others, but I was using a computer only to aid in the calculations, not to find the names; I

cannot testify that there are no others." With his bizarre transliteration he refers to "Zil'arsh" (Possessor of the throne). This claim indicates his level of Arabic. You cannot mention "Zil'arsh" as the name of God by itself. It should be "Zul'arsh," since "Zil'arsh" is a grammatical form that can be correct only in the context of a sentence as an object. I will try to use an analogy in English: "Yahya's brother Matine drools on everything he likes." Now, what is the name of Matine's brother? Lomax's answer will be "Yahya's" when in fact, the boy's name is "Yahya."

Therefore, the Gematrical value of "Zul'arsh" is not 1311, but is 1307, and is not divisible by 19.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence." Exactly. To claim a miraculous pattern requires more than a few important (in the sense of obvious, like chapter count) facts divisible by 19. Such a pattern could easily occur by chance. The only statistical calculations I have seen from Khalifites have been seriously defective, overstating the probability of a single count by a factor of 10,000 (What was, in fact, 1 in 19 was reported as 1 in 190,000, by Arik.)

YUKSEL: Well, the number of chapters being 114 and the name of God "Jami" (the Editor) having exactly a Gematrical value of 114 ( $3+1+40+70$ ) cannot be discarded easily as a coincidence. In order to see the mathematical system of the Quran, Lomax should stop treating primitive story books as the second source of God's religion. Then, he should go and study an elementary level Arabic Alphabet in order to see that there are 28 letters in Arabic language and there is no question regarding the definition of letters. Then, he can start learning how to count words from an expert, such as Fuad Abdulbaqi.....

LOMAX: Yuksel was not happy with my mention of the possibility of finding patterns in a telephone book. He complained that I did not actually count words or whatever in a phone book. I will respond that if he will provide a description of exactly what the miracle of the nineteen is, in terms that are testable against any book, I could then attempt to find a similar pattern in another book. I must note, however, that it took almost twenty years of work, counting and recounting, analyzing and reanalysing, for Khalifa to come up with his final statement of the "miracle;" it would be arrogant for me to think that I could invent a similar "miracle" in a few days. It takes work to find these things. I could certainly do it faster than Khalifa, because I have better access to computing power, and, further, an explicit knowledge of how to generate these statistics; I could automate the process. But it would still be, probably, many man-months.

YUKSEL: There is again two contradictory statements concocted in a single paragraph. If Lomax is sincere in his need for "a description of exactly what the miracle nineteen is" then how can he invent a SIMILAR miracle in many man-months? How can someone imitate something if he does not know what that thing really is? I am sure that Lomax can invent impressive statistics in less than many man-months. I am sure they will be similar to the lousy, foggy and incoherent pattern he sees in the Quran. It is always easy for a legally blind to imitate the portrait of Mona Lisa.

LOMAX: Milan Sulc is working on a description of the prime rank phenomena he claims to have found in the Qur'an. It has been suggested that he offer a very substantial reward for anyone who can show a similar phenomenon in another book. If he can find the description, it will be possible to test it. Until then, all these claims are unprovable.

Khalifa claimed that this "miracle" was "scientific." The potential of disprovability is the essence of science. Khalifa's hypothesis has never been stated with sufficient clarity to be disprovable if it were not true. (Actually, this is not quite true. Short summaries of the "miracle" are quite easily disprovable, as we have seen with the "claims." In order to test the claims, one needs additional definitions and qualifications....)

YUKSEL: Again the same pattern. First, say "never" then correct it! I call this idiosyncratic style "rickety-wobbly arguments" As if it was not Lomax who was rejecting many claims as "false." How can someone reject something as "false" if that thing is nonfalsifiable? Here is the reality: Lomax always found an easy way to reject our claims. If there is a way to falsify it, state an alternative way of counting, no matter how improbable it is. If the claim survives after attempts of falsification, then exclaim that the claim is not clear, it needs definition and clarification. You can cut every rope with this double-dided sword in your hand.

## CLAIM 5

The first verse, which can be considered as the foundation of the miracle, occurs 114 times despite its conspicuous absence from Sura 9 (it occurs twice in Sura 27) and 114 is  $19 \times 6$ .

LOMAX: True, but anecdotal. The count of Basmalah is not part of a pattern. Based on common recitation practice, it could also be said that the Quran contains only two Basmalabs (at 1:1 and 27:30), rather than 114 times.

YUKSEL: Not only is the claim true, but it is important. How can you say that the count of Basmalah (or Bismillah) is not part of a pattern. Are we not discussing a pattern which involves the number of its letters, the frequency of its words, etc.? Why should the frequency of the whole formula should not be considered as part of this pattern?

You claim that there are two Basmalabs in the Quran. If you follow the Hanafite sect (I know, you call it Hanafite School of Thought!), you are left with only one Basmalabs, that is 27:30. Hanafites do not recite Basmalah of al-Fatiha, since they do not accept it as the first verse of the Quran. However, none of the Orthodox Sunni scholars deny the existence of other Basmalabs. The argument is about whether they are independent verses or just repetition based on revelation. The prominent view is that Basmalah is an independent verse in 2 cases and a repetition in 112 cases. No one claims that these repetition is man-made. Thus, the total of all Basmalabs come to 114, which is multiple of 19. Chapter 9 is well known for the absence of Basmalah in its beginning. This fact makes it clear that other 113 Chapters do HAVE Basmalabs.

In fact, the role of Basmalah in the mathematical structure of the Quran reflects this peculiarity. Now we know why there were arguments regarding the status of Basmalabs. We have discovered that the unnumbered 112 Basmalabs participate in the count of letters and the total number of verses of the Quran. However, only the two numbered Basmalabs (1:1 and 27:30) participate in the frequency of words in the Quran. This is an observation guided by the theory of 19. The theory is supported by this possible method of counting. As in natural sciences, ambiguity is solved based on clear and certain facts. Similarly, if clear and unquestionable parameters convince a person regarding an intentional design, then he/she can easily discover and see the intended design in ambiguous cases.

One point to reflect on: If every Chapter had Basmalah as their opening statement, we could not cite the number of Basmalabs being multiple of 19, since it would be redundant. It would follow from the number of Chapters. However, the author of the Quran, by deliberately violating this pattern in Chapter 9, pulls our attention to one missing Basmalah. While looking for the 114th Basmalah He shows us His intention by restoring it 19 Chapters later with an extra Basmalah. The verse number of this extra Basmalah is also significant, since it indicates the semantical relation between 19 and Basmalah.

LOMAX: Discussing "Claim 5," Yuksel defends the assertion that there are 114 Bismillahs in the Qur'an. However, in counting words earlier, he excluded all the Bismillahs except for two. Now, he objects to my comment that it is possible to say that there are two. Which is it? This is a variation on the question "What is the Qur'an?" which, so far, has not been answered by those who claim to see a numerical miracle in it. If the envelope of the Qur'an can be contracted and expanded as needed to produce facts, they are not as significant as they would be if a constant definition were used, and, perhaps, they are not significant at all.

YUKSEL: Lomax is a perfect example how people pretend to argue while instead they are performing a monologue tirade. I have explained the reason behind this different treatment of Basmalah. If 112 of Basmalahs are part of the Quran but not numbered, then it is very reasonable not to treat them like other Basmalahs which are numbered. This Quranic distinction is observed in their role in the mathematical system of the Quran. A simple question for Lomax would be enough to blow out his balloon: Are all those 114 Basmalahs have the same position in the Quran? Is there any difference between the Basmalah, say, in beginning of Chapter 2 and the Basmalah in the middle of Chapter 27? I hope Lomax's answer will not repeat his "rickety-wobbly" style of argument.

LOMAX: Are the vowel marks part of the Qur'an? Are the verse numbers part of the Qur'an? How about the meanings we associate with the words? Where is the limit? What, exactly, are we studying? If vowel marks and verse numbers are included, which version do we follow, since there is variation in these things. In fact, with any characteristic, it may be relevant which text we study, since it appears that the 'Uthmanic copies may not all have been identical in every respect.

YUKSEL: Vowel marks are not part of the Quran. An elementary knowledge of Quranic archeology is enough to learn this fact. The verse numbers are the part of the Quran, since the verses of the Quran are not jumbled but positioned in ordered chapters. Numbering verses is acknowledgment or expression of this existing order. Besides, the Quran describes itself as "Kitabun Marqum" (Numerically Structured Book) in verses 83:9, 29. (I know that Lomax will have problem with the meaning of "marqum")

Here Lomax is becoming a philosopher by wondering the "meanings we associate with words." He is not aware that he is digging his own grave by obviously quoting this philosophical question. He does not wonder the "meaning we associate with HIS own words, and the meaning he associates with OUR words" He wants to toss our argument based on the Quran to oblivion by this apparently innocent question. He wants to cast doubt on the QURAN ALONE. Yes, the Quranic words have meaning and believers can associate correct meanings with Quranic words by grace and guidance of God, who is the teacher of the Quran (55:1-2).

LOMAX: (Some of my scholar friends confirmed this, others are offended by the statement. There is a dogma under scrutiny here. I suggest that the Qur'an which is preserved is the recited Qur'an, and, from the beginning, variations were allowed. 'Uthman (RA) tried to settle on a single text, by consensus, and nearly succeeded.)



YUKSEL: Lomax thinks he is defining his Quran by saying "the recited Quran." Who is reciting it? The one that I do or Lomax? This claim is a sure way to reject any mathematical miracle, since it is not possible to witness a mathematical system coming from the mouth of Lomax or Abdulbasit. If the Quran is only a recitation, then Muhammad and his companions made a big mistake by putting it in a book. How can a Quran which orders believers to write down their financial transaction before live witnesses not choose to be written down? Does it consider itself less important than financial transactions?

## CLAIM 6

From the missing Basmalah of Sura 9 to the extra Basmalah of Sura 27, there are precisely 19 chapters.

LOMAX: True, but anecdotal. Further, it must be recognized that there are other positions which would produce a ZMN fact. For example, if it were Sura 28, instead of 27, which had the extra invocation, we could make exactly the same statement, and it would still be "true."

YUKSEL: The claim is true and important. Again, so many parameters on Basmalah encounter us with the number Nineteen. We observe that there are 19 chapters between the missing Basmalah and the extra Basmalah. This reduces the probability of coincidence dramatically if evaluated TOGETHER with your other so-called "anecdotal" examples. You are trying to diminish the power of accumulated evidences by isolating them from each other. Each evidence can be minor, but a number of related minor evidences can create a very strong thread of evidence. This example is related to Basmalah and decreases the probability not by addition of 1/19, but by multiplication of 1/19.

As for different "other positions," you give only one example. I really wonder how you will come up with other reasonable positions. Your suggestion is not better than the actual position we observe in the Quran, since it would have justified a more serious objection.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "You are trying to diminish the power of accumulated evidences by isolating them from each other. Each evidence can be minor, but a number of related minor evidences can create a very strong thread of evidence. This example is related to Basmalah and decreases the probability not by addition of 1/19, but by multiplication of 1/19."

Yes, "a number of related minor evidences \*can\* create a very strong thread." I emphasize the word CAN. If the evidences are related, and all examples which satisfy the relation are given, and all of them are divisible by 19, then a strong thread would be created. But if each fact is independent of the others, sharing only the fact that they are counts of objects in the Qur'an, then the whole population of similar counts must be studied (or a representative sample) to show significance. I'll give an example from a phone book. Suppose I look in a phone book, and I find a list of fifty people, all named Smith, whose phone numbers are divisible by 19. Is this significant? To answer, we would need to know how many Smiths were in the phone book, and whether or not the sample was biased.

YUKSEL: It is true that 50 Smiths in a phone book may not show any significance. The whole population of similar counts should be considered. However, it is not true to that the facts that I have listed in the end of the first round argument can be criticized by this phone book metaphor. We have discarded the claims that suffers from

selective method of counting. Please note that this criticism is an answer to my defense for CLAIM 6. Please read the claim and my defense again. There is no relevance of FEW selected Smiths from a large phone book, since the entire population of Basmalah is considered. Lomax is expressing a meaningful criticism for an unrelated case.

LOMAX: We already know that the sample shown to us by Yuksel is biased. I have done a lot of counting in the Qur'an. 19 does not show up particularly often; I would suggest that it shows up about 5% of the time.

YUKSEL: Remember our house metaphor. You can equate basic and clear elements with trivial and vague elements and come up with 5% probability. You can reject the periodic table with the same mentality. You can count many other aspects of atoms and suggest that periodical table of elements is an arbitrary and biased arrangement. Well, my friend, even if it is biased, I see an obvious pattern and system in the periodic table.

LOMAX: "This example is related to Bismillah." But we can generate many, many facts from the Bismillah, and all of them are related, but not all of them are divisible by 19. For example, take each word in the Bismillah, exactly as it is spelled. In the whole text considered by Khalifa to be the Qur'an (i.e., excluding 9:128-129), BSM occurs 115 times, ALLH +LLLH, 2810 times (I don't know the breakdown), ALRHMN 169 times, and ALRHYM 146 times. None of these numbers is divisible by 19. It is not that all of Khalifa's counts are wrong (in his later work, errors are more rare), rather it is that equally significant counts which are not divisible are not mentioned.

YUKSEL: You are contradicting your own previous counts. Again you start with a strong objection ending up "not all of Khalifa's counts are wrong..." etc. Another example of "wobbly argument."

LOMAX: Of all the Khalifite apologists, Yuksel is the most coherent. But, apparently, he still has not understood what it would take to really show a scientific correlation. I highly recommend an introductory course in statistics.

YUKSEL: How did he come up with this conclusion? What is his population of study? How many "Khalifite apologists" has he seen in order to make such a superlative claim about me? I think I know what he is trying to do. He wanted to bring me to the top floor and then push me out the window. He deserves credit, since he is pretty consistent in following his "wobbly" pattern.

LOMAX: I note that Yuksel acknowledges the lack of an explicit definition of "word" in Arabic. This is refreshing, given the heaps of abuse piled on me by Azhar Khan for pointing this out in earlier discussions. Fuzziness in definitions allows the creation of 19-divisible statistics. As far as I have seen, Khalifa was NOT fully consistent in his choice of word divisions. There are examples in Philips.

YUKSEL: I have refrained using few examples that involve the count of total words in a text (not a particular word). The mathematical miracle of the Quran is so vast that it does not need those few examples which can be rejected by skeptics.

## CLAIM 7

It follows that the total of the Sura numbers from 19 to 27 is 342, or  $19 \times 18$ . This total (342) equals to the numbers of words between the two Basmalabs in Chapter 27.

LOMAX: Partly true, partly not verifiable, and anecdotal. That the sum is ZMN simply follows from fact 6, and, without a definition of "word," the word count is not verifiable.

YUKSEL: The claim is possibly wrong, difficult to verify, but interesting. I agree with you that "the sum is ZMN simply follows from fact 6 (the previous claim)" since it is a mathematical property. The total of every 19 consequent numbers will give a sum which is divisible by 19. However, if you have noticed, we don't mention this as a part of the miracle. That is why Rashad began this claim with the qualifier "it follows." The number of words between the two Basmalabs in Chapter 27 being multiple of 19 and matching exactly the total of the Sura numbers from 19 to 27 is what we count.

I agree with Lomax regarding the problem in counting all the words contained in a text. I had verified the number of those words as 342 for myself many years ago. To be sure, I counted them again according to the consistent definition of words implicit in Rashad's counting. After several attempts I came up with 344, excluding the initial combination of letters. This is 2 words more than the claimed 342 ( $19 \times 18$ ). It would be an interesting feature if the number of these words were multiple of Nineteen.

However, I have an unanswered question regarding the definition of "word." Inshallah, I will explain this later. Still, it is significant, if we come up with this number according to a consistent counting system.

[I did not receive the second round response from Lomax regarding the claims 7 and 8].

## CLAIM 8

The total number of verses in the Quran is 6346, or  $19 \times 334$ . There are 6234 numbered verses and 112 unnumbered verses of Basmalahs, and  $6234 + 112 = 6346$ . Note that  $6 + 3 + 4 + 6 = 19$ .

LOMAX: Anecdotal, arbitrary, false. There is substantial disagreement on how to divide verses. Without specifying an edition of the Qur'an, it is impossible to verify the "6234 numbered verses." However, totaling from the table of contents to Madinah, I get 6236 numbered verses. Provided that I have calculated correctly, this "simple fact" requires the exclusion of two verses, presumably 9:128-129. Note also that the ZMN total is arbitrarily created by the inclusion of the 112 unnumbered invocations, which were excluded from counting in fact 3.

The digit count sum is arbitrary as it depends on numerical representation and number base. This works with base 10 "Arabic" numerals (which actually came later from India and were not used by the Arabs of the time of the revelation.) I am quite sure that if such a total did not come out to 19, it would not be mentioned.

YUKSEL: The claim is true (if 9:128-129 is excluded) and becomes significant with other related parameters. The ZMN total for the absolute value of digits is arbitrary. It is true that the numbering system was adopted from India two centuries after the revelation of the Quran. However, the Quran uses the base 10 system. Numbers are represented by names and also by alphabet letters called Gematrical system. In fact, you can notice the base 10 system in the Arabic name of numbers. Since modern numerical representation is based on the base 10 system, it is not difficult nor unreasonable for an Omniscient author to employ such a representation for future generations, that is, us. If I see enough examples of this kind of calculation then I will not have any problem for accepting it. On the contrary, such a pattern will be a strong evidence regarding the divine nature of the book. Personally, I am convinced regarding the relevancy of this method of calculation. The example that convinced me is the absolute value (digit count sum) of the frequency of "HaMim" letters. They exhibit a marvelous mathematical pattern. Inshallah, I will present that evidence later.

## CLAIM 9

The famous first revelation (96:1-5) consists of 19 words.

LOMAX: False unless qualified. Until a better definition of an Arabic "word" comes along, I'll follow this: a "word" is a unit of meaning, as found in Arabic dictionaries. I.e. "rabbuka" is two words, "rabbu" (Lord) and "ka" (your). Evidence for this is that it is impossible to translate such a phrase with less than two words into English without major loss of meaning. There are further refinements which would be necessary to be thoroughly consistent: I'm not going to work them out now.

By this definition, 96:1-5 consists of 28 words. I have counted the definite article as a separate word. I am quite aware that this definition is arguable, but it is incumbent on one who wishes to argue to state an alternative. We could then look at these "facts" and verify them. Dr. Khalifa, as far as I know, never specified his method of counting words, and his counts do not seem to follow a consistent pattern.

YUKSEL: The first revelation consists of either 19 or 20 words. By just looking at Rashad's counting I was able to understand what was his definition of "word", since he demonstrated several lengthy examples of his counting one by one. He did not need to further verbalize this well illustrated task. For instance, if I claim that there are Ninety Nine words in this paragraph, it will give a good idea regarding my definition of words. If I give several more examples of my word count, then, by comparison you can have a very clear understanding of my method of counting.

Since I am not a linguist, and English is my fifth language, my lexicon is not sufficient to define our method of counting words. I believe you can do this, since you did a very good job in defining the simple fact regarding the count of letters in Basmalah. Obviously, Rashad is accepting a word as a monogram. If prepositions, prefixes, and suffixes are attached or dependent to the main word, he accepts all of them as one word. Furthermore, by his non-verbal definition, a word should have at least two letters. He does not consider a single letter as a word as it is the case with conjunction "W" (and) in Arabic.

I believe that our method of counting words is virtually physical (does not require extensive grammatical knowledge and linguistic speculations), clear (for those who are not blinded by antagonistic passion), and the most reasonable one. Many researchers, independent of Rashad, employed the same method in the counting of words. For instance, Dr. Mahdi Bazargan who later became a prime minister in Khomeini's first cabinet, in his great statistical work on the size and topic of verses according to the chronology of revelation, gives the same count, 19, for the first revelation. (Sayr-i Tahawul-i Quran, -Process of Quranic Evolution-, published by Book Distribution Center, P.O. Box 22933, Houston, TX 77027, in 1974).

I found your claim bizarre: "evidence for this is that it is impossible to translate such a phrase with less than two words into English without major loss of meaning." This

statement is both arbitrary and baseless. I can translate "Rabbuka" (your Lord) by one word into Turkish as "Rabbin", by one word to Persian as "Khudayet" or by two words as "Khuday-i Tu" How can you claim that the English translation of Arabic words is the criterion for defining Arabic words. With your reasoning, an Arab should reject the word count of my Microsoft Word Processor Program by translating one English word with two or three Arabic words!

Finally, I find Rashad's method of counting for the sum of words consistent, relevant, and reasonable with the exception of two problems: First, he does not count "Ma" (both negating adverb and pronoun) as a word. "Ma" is the only exception with its two letters. I do not see any grammatical or physical justification for this exceptional treatment. However, I find the results of counting based on this exception impressive. Curiously, this exceptional treatment is independently committed by other researchers. Maybe you and I should study this subject more thoroughly.

Second, probably the most important problem: he relies on narration to establish the chronology and the size of early revelations. Narration regarding the early revelations can be considered more reliable than the other narration (hadiths) which were shaped and filtered by dubious and diverse motivation and agenda. But, personally, I do not feel comfortable with any mathematical pattern based on those conjecture, since those information is not the part of the Quran, at least.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: "I believe that our method of counting words is virtually physical (does not require extensive grammatical knowledge and linguistic speculations), clear (for those who are not blinded by antagonistic passion), and the most reasonable one."

If it is "virtually" physical, then it should be possible to describe the algorithm so that we could use a computer to count words. Yuksel pleads ignorance of English for his inability to state explicitly what standards are used to divide words. Sorry, his English, while it is obviously not his native language, is quite good enough.

YUKSEL: My vocabulary of the linguistic terminology is limited. Therefore, I wanted to avoid granting you errors to dwell on. I believe that there is no consensus about the counting of all words in a text. But, I found Rashad's method of counting the most reasonable one. The same method is also used by many independent scholars BEFORE him. I found only one problem which I mentioned earlier.

LOMAX: But we already know how to divide words: divide them so that the counts of certain important chapters or pieces of text come out divisible by 19. The more that one does this, however, the pattern becomes fixed, and additional counting will only work out one out of nineteen times. But one can still get a few good "facts" out of manipulating the word divisions.

Yuksel acknowledges that "maa" is two letters but is not treated as a separate word. He can find no justification except the fact that it produces ZMN (zero modulo 19,



i.e., divisible by 19) counts. How many does it produce? I noticed early on that while other statistics continued to pile up, where methods of analysis could be varied indefinitely, these word counts slowed to a trickle.

YUKSEL: Enough said on this.

LOMAX: Yuksel also acknowledged the problem that Khalifa relied on hadith to make claims about sequence of revelation, whereas he elsewhere denied hadith. It would be very useful if, before we proceed, Yuksel would direct his attention to the Draft FAQ: 19, Study Problems, which has been posted and also e-mailed to him. (It is available on request). Unlike the material to which Yuksel is replying, which is over two years old, this represents a more mature analysis of the problems in these studies. Most or all of what Yuksel continues to claim is without the kind of foundation necessary to establish statistical significance. Otherwise we stay bogged down in hordes of details with no standards for determining what is coincidence, what is the result of manipulation, and what is, possibly, a genuine miracle.

YUKSEL: I agree with Lomax regarding the necessity of foundation to establish statistical significance. However, ultimately, we have to deal with "hordes of details." He was the one who first dealt with those details and published it with his copyright stamp on it. I believe that we will agree on almost all of the statistical foundation, but we will still have differences in evaluating particular examples. I found Lomax occasionally abusing those statistical foundation when they were not relevant.

## CLAIM 11

The word God (Allah) is mentioned 2698 times as shown above,  $19 \times 142$ , and when we add the numbers of the verses wherever the word "God" occurs, the total comes to 118123, which equals to  $19 \times 6127$ .

LOMAX: False unless qualified, not simple, anecdotal. I have not verified the verse number totals. It is an arduous task to find such a sum without having a comprehensive verified database, which is not accessible to me. I suspect that such a database was not available to Dr. Khalifa, either; otherwise he would not be repeating such errors as the count of the word Allah. Therefore I have little confidence in the total 118123. Remember, too, the numbering of verses is not an obvious "fact," unless the edition is specified. But at best, this is anecdotal.

YUKSEL: While I was translating the Quran to Turkish, I recorded the cumulative frequency of the word God on the left bottom of the page, and the cumulative sum of verse numbers where God occurs on the right bottom of the page. I came up with the same result, 118123, using my calculator. I agree that verification is an arduous task, and I am still not certain about my result regarding this big number. It is still possible, though with low probability, that I have made a mistake which brought me to the same result. Therefore, I say, "it is true unless it is proven wrong." You can verify (or falsify) the accuracy of this number (118123) by checking the third revised edition of Rashad's translation. You can find the cumulative sum of verse numbers where the word God occurs at the right bottom of each page. The burden of disproof is on you, since we have demonstrated our count page by page. If the result is true, I think it is more than anecdotal, since it is a reasonable part of an interlocking mathematical pattern regarding the most important word in the Quran, that is, God.

[Lomax did not continue the second round debate on Claims 11, 12, and 13.]

## **CLAIM 12**

The word, "Quran" is mentioned in the Quran 57 times, or  $19 \times 3$ .

LOMAX: Vague, arbitrary, anecdotal. I haven't looked at all of them, but my concordance shows 70 occurrences. Some of them have the definite article, some not, some have affixed pronouns, etc. Perhaps there is some narrowing of the specification which will produce the magic 57; is it worth checking?

YUKSEL: Clear, arbitrary, and anecdotal. There are 68 occurrences of the word Quran. Quran (58), Quranan (10). The other two occurrences are in form of "quranahu" and is not a name, but a verb. To be consistent with our method of counting, I find 68 occurrence of the Quran. One of them is not used for the Quran, that is as a proper name for God's word, but referring to its literal meaning, i.e., a quran (book of recitation) other than the Quran (10:15). Therefore, the total comes to 67, which is not multiple of Nineteen. It is clear that Rashad did not include Quranan (with an Alif in the end, indicating its grammatical position in the sentence), which occurs 10 times. I find this method of counting inconsistent with others and reducing the significance of other counts by half.

### **CLAIM 13**

The word "Quran" is mentioned in 38 suras, 19x2.

LOMAX: True but anecdotal. Since we do not agree on the number of mentions of "Quran," it is astounding that my concordance agrees on the number of Suras. Either the extra "Quran"s are only found in suras with the "real" occurrences, or Dr. Khalifa's friends have changed their method of counting. Nevertheless, this is very much anecdotal: this is the first time that we encounter this method of counting.

YUKSEL: True but anecdotal. I agree with what are said by Lomax. Unfortunately, in this case the method of counting is changed.

## CLAIM 14

Sura 96, first in the chronological order, consists of 19 verses.

LOMAX: True, but anecdotal. Well, it is true if we exclude the invocation, which is traditional. Nevertheless, we have established no pattern that the verse counts of suras is a multiple of 19.

YUKSEL: Since Sura 96 is not just any chapter, but it is chronologically the first chapter, it does not need a pattern among other chapters to be significant. This can justify a unique treatment. Furthermore, if every chapter had 19 or multiple of 19 verses, the mathematical code of the Quran would not have remained hidden in a Chapter called "The Hidden One" for centuries. If the purpose of this mathematical miracle of the Quran was to provide the computer generation with a mathematical miracle, then it is very appropriate for it to be hidden from previous generations (10:20).

The position of Chapter 96 is also interesting: it is the 19th Chapter from the end of the Quran.

LOMAX: Nevertheless, within the parameters of our use of the term "anecdotal," the term still applies. Certainly it is possible to justify the unique treatment of anything, but if all we have is a collection of unique treatments, which may be chosen according to whatever shows the pattern of 19, there is no way to distinguish between a "miracle" and the result of a series of choices.

YUKSEL: What if we are convinced that those choices are intended in the Quran? What if we can predict or explain many things based on those unique treatments? In the end of the first argument I provided some examples.

LOMAX: It is to be noted that it is not impossible that Allah intended there to be an increase over the normal occurrence of 19-divisible statistics, without there being an absolute code or pattern. This would be consistent with the description of this number as a "trial" in 74:31. However, even this increase has not been demonstrated by Yuksel, Khalifa, or any other worker in this field. In general, the statistical problems have been ignored.

YUKSEL: Previously, Lomax claimed that there was a little pattern that functions as a trial for disbelievers. Now, he makes that position looser by making it a mere possibility. Another twist, in other words, wobbly pattern.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The position of Chapter 96 is also interesting: it is the 19th Chapter from the end of the Quran."

There is no end to specially-constructed facts. Note that a chapter has four ways to have a 19-divisible count of this kind, because one may choose to count from the beginning or end, and one may count cardinally or ordinally.

YUKSEL: There are only two ways of counting the position of chapters. And we found it significant that the 19th chapter from the end of the Quran has 19 verses and is unanimously believed as the FIRST revealed chapter. One does not need to take an introductory nor a doctorate level of statistics to see the significance of this simple fact.

## CLAIM 15

Sura 96 consists of 304 Arabic letters and 304 equals to  $19 \times 16$ .

LOMAX: Arbitrary, unverifiable, anecdotal. Some hamzas are counted, some not. An example of an uncounted hamza is sitting on the alif in the first word, 'Iqra', and one counted is in Raahu, the 25th "word" shown in VP. The text used is not specified (although Dr. Khalifa gives the words for this: some uncounted hamzas are shown). Hamzas are ordinarily not considered letters, but rather marks. While it is not unreasonable to count them, the choice is arbitrary. If it depends on pronunciation, we have abandoned our rule that it is the written language that is being studied. In any case, again, we have no pattern that the letter count for suras is ZMN.

YUKSEL: Not arbitrary, verifiable, interesting, but most likely false. It appears that your lack of knowledge in Arabic is the reason for your arrival at arbitrariness regarding this count. Both "Iqra" the first word, and "Raahu", the 25th word, have 4 Arabic letters in current manuscripts. If you had looked carefully to their spellings you would find a difference justifying this count. In fact, you can tell this difference also from their pronunciation. Dr. Khalifa uses a known Uthmani text, which is the official text of the manuscripts published in Saudi Arabia and all of the Arabic speaking world. Turkish, Pakistani and other non-Arab Muslims use a manuscript that contains extra "Alifs" in many words in order to help people to read easily and accurately. I came up with the same count which includes Basmalah, 304 ( $19 \times 16$ ). The count can easily be verified by a person who is little bit familiar with Arabic calligraphy. Therefore, I have no doubt that Rashad's counting is consistent, verifiable, and leads to an interesting pattern in the "chronologically first" Chapter.

However, I believe the count of letters should be less than 304, because early manuscripts did not contain "hamza." Hamza is a scriptural innovation intended to help unsophisticated readers when many non-Arab nations converted to Islam. Though dots were also invented later during the reign of Uthman, the Arabic language had 28 letters even before the revelation of the Quran, and native speakers could differentiate among different letters written in almost identical appearance, such as, B, T, S, Y, N. When I study the Tashkent Copy, I see the difficulty of reading the early manuscripts written without dots and other paraphernalia. It requires a good command of Arabic and a high IQ to be able to read them. Reading those manuscripts is like solving quadratic problems. While trying to read a word you are required to distinguish and identify several identical characters. You eliminate some candidates based on your familiarity with the shape of words. Then, you narrow down your choice to one specific combination of letters based on the context and position of the word. It is sometimes possible that you may have two legitimate readings and meanings for a word. If their meanings do not contradict the overall context, you may end up with two equally accurate but different meanings for a single statement.

Anyway, the count in early manuscripts is less than 304. I do not have time to search other early copies, nor do I have the time to deduce the counting from the Tashkent Copy that I have. The copy is not complete.

LOMAX: I have learned a great deal of Arabic since writing the document Yuksel is responding to; it is over two years old. But my comments still stand. In the case of the hamza on the initial alif of Iqra, some styles of writing do not use write it, some do. Arabic scholars have also asserted that Khalifa's counting of hamza is arbitrary, and examples can be given of contradictions in his counting.

YUKSEL: I hope you will learn more Arabic. However, and more important than Arabic, you need to learn the fact that those who trade God's word with medieval fabrications and follow other sources besides God's word (Hadith, Sunnah, Consensus of Ulama, etc.) are handicapped from witnessing the miracle of the Quran. Miracles are divine blessings for believers and for those who sincerely search for truth.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Both 'Iqra' the first word, and "Raahu", the 25th word, have 4 Arabic letters in current manuscripts. If you had looked carefully to their spellings you would find a difference justifying this count. In fact, you can tell this difference also from their pronunciation. Dr. Khalifa uses a known Uthmani text, which is the official text of the manuscripts published in Saudi Arabia and all of the Arabic speaking world."

First of all, the text used by Khalifa in Final Testament is, as Yuksel claims, a so-called Uthmani text, following the Hafs reading. But so are the Warsh texts, and they differ substantially in the use of hamza. Since Warsh is preferred in quite a few Arabic-speaking countries, it is not true to call this text "official" for all the Arabic-speaking world. It appears, moreover, that Warsh is probably closer to the dialect of the Prophet, SAS.

YUKSEL: Another Hafs-Warsh mumbo jumbo. I am very doubtful about the truth-value of your endorsement. By using SAS after "the Prophet," that is Muhammad, you prove, besides your acknowledgement, that you are a dedicated Muhammedan. You have mentioned God's name frequently without any additional praise words. SAS is used for the purpose of praise, since anyone who does not use that phrase after Muhammad's name is considered disrespectful to Muhammad. However, like other Muhammadans you feel obligated to add the fabricated abbreviation SAS (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) each time you mention his name or refer to him. Anyone who is not blinded by Hadith and Sunna can see that the meaning of "Salli Ala" (support) in 33:56 is distorted by Muhammad worshipers in order to exalt him more than they exalt God. In order to see the distortion, please compare verse 33:56 with 33:43 and 9:103. You will see the same expression is used in all of them. I have a lengthy argument on this traditional deliberate distortion, but here is not the place.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Turkish, Pakistani and other non-Arab Muslims use a manuscript that contains extra "Alifs" in many words in order to help people to read easily and accurately."



This is true. But there are many other variations besides this.

YUKSEL: I wish Daniel Lomax could give some examples. He made same claim about the number of letters in Basmalah, and later his examples demonstrated the absurdity of his claim.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "I came up with the same count which includes Basmalah, 304 (19x16). The count can easily be verified by a person who is little bit familiar with Arabic calligraphy."

Note that the Bismillah is included in the count. Elsewhere, when counting the verses and words, the Bismillah is excluded. But, in this case, it makes no difference, since, as Khalifa counts, the Bismillah contains 19 letters; if it is 19-divisible without the invocation, it will also be so divisible with it. But this does, once again, demonstrates how the Khalifites do not use consistent methods of counting.

YUKSEL: I have given my answer for this tirade before.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Therefore, I have no doubt that Rashad's counting is consistent, verifiable, and leads to an interesting pattern in the "chronologically first" Chapter.

Khalifa was apparently not consistent; and, as Yuksel notes below, hamza was not written in the early ms. of the Qur'an. To be verifiable, a text must be given and rules for counting specified: we have only anecdotal evidence as to Khalifa's rules for counting.

YUKSEL: As I said before, I do not really consider this example as centerpiece of the system. Indeed, I accepted it as false considering the "hamzas" in old manuscripts.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote: [Lomax quotes the third paragraph of my answer in the first round mentioning the calligraphy of the early manuscripts.] Actually, this is true for unvowelled Arabic as well, though the problem is not so severe. But to one who already is familiar with the Qur'an and Qur'anic language, it is not so difficult to read the Tashkent text.

YUKSEL: I agree.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Anyway, the count in early manuscripts is less than 304. I do not have time to search other early copies, nor do I have the time to deduce the counting from the Tashkent Copy that I have. The copy is not complete." I suspect that we have the same copy, or at least parts of the same copy. the original is obviously in poor condition. The edges of some pages are missing, and one finds holes in the text. But enough is there to raise serious questions about any attempt to count letters and words in the Qur'an. There are numerous variations from the modern conventional text!

YUKSEL: I don't know which copy you have either.

## CLAIM 16

When we add the numbers assigned to the verses wherever the word "the Quran" is found, the total comes to 2660 or  $19 \times 40$ .

LOMAX: Arbitrary, anecdotal. I have not verified this; notice that, presumably, we are only looking at the word with the definite article. We have no pattern that words occur in verses which add up to a multiple of nineteen. Of course, about one out of nineteen common words will have such a total.

YUKSEL: Difficult to verify, anecdotal. I have not verified this either. If the count of "the Quran" is multiple of 19 and the verse numbers wherever they occur add up to a multiple of 19, it might be considered interesting. Sure, one out of nineteen common words will have such a total. However, if we find that most of the key words exhibit this pattern, then we may exclude other common words from our statistics. Obviously, it will be a matter of dispute which ones are the key words, and how many of those words we have. I think none will dispute the fact that the word "Allah" (God), and "The Quran" (The Book of Recitation) can be distinguished as "key" words. But, in order to assess their significance in the mathematical system we need to have an approximate idea regarding the members of this category. Therefore, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to objectively verify the significance of this count in the mathematical system of the Quran.

LOMAX: Yuksel is beginning to acknowledge the difficulties. I would point out that if one decides what are the significant words in the Qur'an *after* finding out which ones have allegedly special numbers associated with them, then the process is open to the charge that the results have influenced the selection. It is a major step forward that Yuksel recognizes that the "miraculous" phenomena are selected out of a larger group of phenomena. So far, his claim that there is a miracle here seems to be based on nothing more than an impression produced by looking at a lot of 19-divisible statistics, which were largely preselected. To convert such an impression into objective knowledge, at least in a scientific sense, requires that a *comparative* study be done.

Milan Sulc saw this right away, when I pointed it out. So he has set for himself the task of describing the numerical phenomena he has found in a way that they can be studied comparatively. I do not think it will be an easy task. All this talk about the 19 began in an atmosphere of puffery and hype, where only evidence on one side of the question was considered. We find a few numbers and they are divisible by 19 (or have prime rank linkages, in Sulc's case) and we get very excited. This is addicting. I know; I believed it for about twelve years.

YUKSEL: An important acknowledgment that explains why Lomax is so paranoid about this mathematical system! Lomax, "believed" it for about twelve years. That is the difference between him and me. I never believed in the miracle. I saw it and examined it from the very beginning. I did not swallow everything presented by the discoverer. Lomax, on the other hand, got addicted and excited without sufficient knowledge and examination. He just believed it as many people do. Later, certain things

forced him to examine the system. I can only guess what has triggered his suspicion after twelve years of gullible faith! He found himself in a dilemma, like many other Muhammedans did: either accept the Quran alone, or follow orthodox teachings promoted by Muslim clergy. He chose the orthodox teachings.

## CLAIM 17

If we take the above number (2660) and add the number of suras where "the Qur'an" occurs to it, the total becomes 2698, or  $19 \times 142$ , which is exactly the frequency of occurrence of the word "God."

LOMAX: False, anecdotal. When two large numbers, produced by separate calculations, are identical, we are impressed. However, note that, since these two numbers are already presumably established as ZMN, we are really saying that  $140 \text{ plus } 2 \text{ equals } 142$ . This is not nearly as impressive, and, in fact, suggests a method for generating such impressive statistics. Unfortunately, the count for the word "God" has not been shown to be 2698; it is likely 2701.

YUKSEL: Redundant, anecdotal. It is an obvious mistake to count this as an example of the mathematical system of the Quran, since it is simply a mathematical property, as Lomax indicated. However, the count for the word "God" is 2698 without 9:127-128, and Lomax's number 2701 is surely false. I have discussed this before, and if needed I can present the list of the 2698 ( $19 \times 142$ ) occurrences.

LOMAX: As I have acknowledged before, my early examination of the count of "Allah" was complicated by numerous undiscovered errors in Khalifa's published work. Philips had found some errors in it; I (and he, apparently) assumed that there were no more, which was incorrect. As I have pointed out, there are still problems with this count, but it is apparently true if properly qualified (i.e., if the ms. is specified and exceptions noted).

YUKSEL: We have noted the exception. We did not need to specify the manuscript, since we thought it was obvious for people. Now we are learning that we need such a specification because of Lomax who apparently became an expert of finding odd and non-existing manuscripts, such as the ones that contain less or more chapters.

Probably, it is better to specify the manuscripts by negation: our manuscript is not the non-existing manuscripts which are reported by hadith books. Also, our manuscript is not the Warsh version which is esteemed by Lomax.

## CLAIM 18

When we add the Sura number, plus the number of verses, plus the sum of verse numbers ( $1+2+3+\dots+n$ , where  $n$  = number of verses), the grand total of all suras is 346,199 or  $19 \times 1822$ .

LOMAX: False if unqualified, arbitrary method. Following the Madinah edition (which is not the only way of numbering the verses), this statistic is false. However, if verses 9:128-129 are excluded, it is true. Why that particular combination of figures? The answer is simple. Because the answer comes out as a multiple of nineteen. The kicker is the sum of verse numbers, a completely arbitrary, out-of-the blue statistic, which is not an independent variable (it equals  $(n \cdot n + n) / 2$ ). There are many such dependent variables which could be chosen; all we need to do is to find one that comes up with a ZMN figure.

Note that if  $n$  is ZMN, then  $1+2+\dots+n$  is necessarily ZMN, so the inclusion or exclusion of the sum of sura numbers from the calculation makes no difference (since there are  $6 \times 19$  suras). It merely makes the calculation seem more complex. This calculation is also redundant to Facts 34 and 35; that is, it is necessarily true if they are true.

YUKSEL: The claim does not have any mathematical value for the reasons well explained by Lomax.

## **CLAIM 19**

The Qur'an is characterized by a unique phenomenon -- twenty nine suras are prefixed with "Quranic initials." There are 14 letters which make up 14 sets of initials and these occur in 29 suras. The total of these numbers is  $14 + 14 + 29 = 57$ , that is  $19 \times 3$ .

LOMAX: True, anecdotal.

YUKSEL: True, anecdotal.

## **CLAIM 20**

Sura 50 is entitled Q (Qaf) and prefixed with the initial "Q". The letter Q occurs in this sura 57 times, or  $19 \times 3$ .

LOMAX: True, anecdotal. The occurrences of the letter "Q" in suras 42 and 50, and the identity of their sum with the number of suras in The Quran is one of the interesting true facts Dr. Khalifa discovered. I keep returning to God's explanation of the Nineteen. For some people, these true facts (and even the false assertions) may lead to an increase in faith; others are led down endless pathways of delusion, obsession, and worse.

YUKSEL: The claim is true and significant. Examples of the frequency of other letters that prefixes Chapters provide a very strong evidence for their role in the mathematical system of the Quran based on the code Nineteen. The true facts can only increase the faith of those who understands and accepts them.



## **CLAIM 21**

The only other sura prefixed with the Quranic initial "Q" is Sura 42. This sura also contains 57 Q's, or 19x3.

LOMAX: True, anecdotal. This is anecdotal because the method of analysis does not apply to any other Quranic initial. Originally, Facts 20 and 21 were indeed part of a pattern; as I mentioned above, in Dr. Khalifa's early publications, 8 out of 14 totals for the abbreviated letters were ZMN. However, after suffering corrections, Dr. Khalifa's figures now show only 3 ZMN totals, and two of those require changes to the text (See below, Facts 23 and 24).

YUKSEL: The claim is true and very significant. Since the total of the letter "Q" is 114 (19x6) in the chapters where it prefixes, the method of analysis do apply to other Quranic initials. The general method of counting is this: if we see an initial letter or combination of letters in the beginning of a Chapter we count all the occurrences of those letters in ALL chapters where they prefix. If some letters have extra significance, such as the letter Q, there is no reason not noticing it, especially if we are provided with a good reason for that peculiarity.

LOMAX: Yuksel is still avoiding the problem with "good reasons." It is possible to generate a "good reason" for many different ways of counting. I believe I have done a study on applying the method of analysis which Yuksel proposes; it does not at all give consistent results. I will follow up with a copy of that, inshallah.

## CLAIM 22

"Q" stands for Quran, as the total of all Q's in Sura 42 and Sura 50 is 114, the same as the number of suras in the Quran.

LOMAX: Redundant. Again, because we have preselected for ZMN, this is equivalent to saying 3 plus 3 equals 6. The assertion that "Q" stands for "Quran" is speculative, though not unreasonable.

YUKSEL: The claim is not redundant but an interesting and meaningful speculation. If the total was 152 (19x8) or another ZMN, then it would be redundant to mention this again. The claim is about the relation between the total frequency of "Q" in the Chapters where the letter "Q" prefixes and the number of Chapters in the Quran. If it is a reasonable speculation to find a relation between "Q" and the "Quran," it is also reasonable to see the relation between the frequency of "Q" and 114 chapters of the Quran.

Another point: You are evaluating these claims with a double standard. For instance, you have labeled the claims 20 and 21 as anecdotal by saying that their "method of analysis does not apply to any other Quranic initial," that is, they are counted separately. Now, you reject the total count which shares the same method of analysis applied to other Quranic initials. This time your excuse is "redundancy." Objecting something on the basis of redundancy implies that you have accepted the previous one. Otherwise, you should not object to this claim on the basis of redundancy. In brief, your argument is fallacious and it is like saying "X is insignificant because of Y, and Y is insignificant because of X."

In order to eliminate your objections I will re-arrange the order of the claims. Please consider the Claim 22 before the Claim 20 and 21. Let's see:

20. There are 114 (19x6) letter "Q" in the two chapters that start with the letter "Q".

22. The frequency, 114, is equal to the number of chapters in the Quran. This is numerically meaningful when we consider that the letter "Q" stands for the Quran.

21. It is a special feature of the letter "Q" to occur 57 (19x3) times in both Chapters. With this arrangement, the claim 22nd becomes significant, since it is analyzed according to the same method used for counting other initials. You cannot ignore others as redundant either.

LOMAX: I am glad to see Yuksel using the word "speculation" regarding the significance of these claims. Remember that Khalifa et al have called these claims "Absolute Proof."

YUKSEL: I do not call the mathematical system as the "proof." They are divine evidences (ayaat) for those who can see them.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Another point: You are evaluating these claims with a double standard. For instance, you have labeled the claims 20 and 21 as anecdotal by saying that their "method of analysis does not apply to any other Quranic initial," that is, they are counted separately. Now, you reject the total count which shares the same method of analysis applied to other Quranic initials. This time your excuse is "redundancy." Objecting something on the basis of redundancy implies that you have accepted the previous one." No, it merely means that the claim is redundant, at least to some degree, to another claim. The two claims are really not two separate phenomena. If one is allowed to multiply claims by simple restatement using different words, one may create an appearance that 19-divisible statistics are more common than they actually are.

YUKSEL: Great. Does this mean he has accepted the claim 22 as "another claim" and the two previous claims "the redundancy"?

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Otherwise, you should not object to this claim on the basis of redundancy. In brief, your argument is fallacious and it is like saying 'X is insignificant because of Y, and Y is insignificant because of X.' " Yuksel is not without a point here. Really, the situation is that Claim 20 and 21, considered together, because they use the same method of analysis, are a little more than anecdotal, and the two claims, added together, produce another interesting result (cited in Claim 22) which equals the number of Suras of the Qur'an. But we have already used the number of Suras of the Qur'an as Claim 4, and, since we are now dealing with a selected population of 19-divisible statistics, this is equivalent to saying that there are 3 blocks of Q in sura Q, and 3 more blocks in another Sura, and  $3 + 3 = 6$ , which is the number of blocks of Suras in the Qur'an. It does sound a little less impressive stated that way, doesn't it? So, let us say that there is a little less here than enumerated. How much less depends on definitions; in the absence of a clear definition of a "numerical miracle," we could argue for thousands of years....

YUKSEL: Lomax is playing with numbers to make it less impressive. He seems to be not aware of the statistical trick he is employing. Obviously, matching with a smaller number (6) is less impressive than a bigger number (114). In other words, surely, the total of Qs being equal to 114 (the number of real chapters) is much more impressive than being equal to 6 (the number of supposed chapters). Lomax cannot devalue this fact by suggesting us to pretend fake Qurans.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "In order to eliminate your objections I will re-arrange the order of the claims. Please consider the Claim 22 before the Claim 20 and 21. Let's see: (20) There are 114 (19x6) letter "Q" in the two chapters that start with the letter "Q". (22) The frequency, 114, is equal to the number of chapters in the Quran. This is numerically meaningful when we consider that the letter "Q" stands for the Quran. (21) It is a special feature of the letter "Q" to occur 57 (19x3) times in both Chapters. With this arrangement, the claim 22nd becomes significant, since it is analyzed according to the

same method used for counting other initials. You cannot ignore others as redundant either."

A consistent method has NOT been used for analyzing initials, as we will see.

YUKSEL: We will see, inshallah.

## CLAIM 23

Sura 68 is initialed with "N" (Noon), and contains 133 N's or  $19 \times 7$ .

LOMAX: Deliberate deception. It is incumbent on the claimant to specify the text upon which this assertion is based, and further to state whether or not this is the same text upon which the other counts are based. It is obvious upon reflection that the freedom to pick and choose between texts would allow one to fabricate ZMN totals.

All Qur'ans available to me show N as an abbreviated letter, with 132 of them in the sura. As I mentioned above, Dr. Khalifa, in VP, crudely altered the text in his photocopy to expand N to NwN, so, I assume, he did not possess any such original.

YUKSEL: You do not need to assume, it is true that Rashad did not possess any such original. "NwN" is one of the 4 corrections made based on the mathematical system of the Quran. Have you thought why it is just 1 (one) less in your Quran? A proofreader can correct my spelling errors based on conventional language and the context of my statements. Similarly, we can find errors committed by scribes. If I am convinced about the mathematical structure of the Quran, I can make some corrections based on compelling evidences. Obviously, scribes were humans and they did commit some errors while writing. Besides, the accuracy of the mathematical code is proven with a prophetic correction. I will explain this later when we discuss the number of "Saad"s.

By the way, I do not think our "alteration" of the text is crude! Though this is an irrelevant and a silly argument, I will tell you a secret regarding this correction. While I was assisting Rashad at the Masjid Tucson, it was me who corrected it. In order to do this correction I followed a sign from my Lord. I cut the last part of "Zan-NuN" in verse 21:87 and pasted it there. Inshallah, in the end of this defense I will explain my reason for this apparently bizarre transfer.

LOMAX: It is true that one could make corrections in a text which is covered by a code. But first it must be established that the code exists and is sufficiently precise to justify the corrections. So far, Khalifa has managed to demonstrate that a code will appear in false data. In other words, that a code can be found does not guarantee that the data is correct. The converse is also true. If there is a "defect" in the code, it does not mean that the data is incorrect. It is possible, for example, that the method of analysis is incorrect. Since Khalifa varied the method of analysis as necessary to produce 19-divisible results, and since, in many cases, no clear standards exist for counting, changing the text \*without notice\* is very, very shaky, especially as part of a demonstration that the code exists.

This is like a scientist who is convinced that his theory is true, so he alters his data to make his results more convincing. After all, if the theory is true, that particular experimental result must have been wrong anyway.

YUKSEL: Another monologue eloquently stated. It blends a general common sense with his biased evaluation. I quote this to be fair with him. I believe that Lomax is doing a great job by providing excuses for those who do not want to see the miracle. No wonder he became a hero on Muhammedan news groups. It is a blessing to witness miracles. May the Possessor of Infinite Bounties guide us.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "By the way, I do not think our 'alteration' of the text is crude! Though this is an irrelevant and a silly argument, I will tell you a secret regarding this correction. While I was assisting Rashad at the Masjid Tucson, it was me who corrected it. In order to do this correction I followed a sign from my Lord. I cut the last part of "Zan-NuN" in verse 21:87 and pasted it there. Inshallah, in the end of this defense I will explain my reason for this apparently bizarre transfer."

I was a typesetter and layout artist. I described the change as "crude" because it was clearly visible. One can see, in Visual Presentation of the Miracle, two defects: first, there is some extraneous ink on and to the right of what would have been the original Nuwn; and, second, the added letters are hanging into the right margin. It can be clearly seen, unlike the change done elsewhere with the letter Sad. It is true that this is not an argument against the "miracle," since it is not required that Messengers be layout artists. But, somehow, I think they would not resort to this kind of deception, and it *\*is\** deception to change the text of the Qur'an and use it to prove a numerical phenomenon which is then the excuse for changing the text. Only if the phenomenon is first shown, on strong evidence, to exist in a received text, would it become legitimate to, with notice, restore the original text.

YUKSEL: There is a misunderstanding. I was referring to the Rashad's translation of the Quran that contains the original text. I do think that it was a mistake not to notice the change in Visual Presentation of the Miracle. The size of the mistake depends on the circumstances and intention of the person who committed it. I will not condemn Rashad for this. If I did not know him personally, it could be easier for me to accuse him of deliberate deception as well.

LOMAX: This does not prove that the change is not correct, just as the alteration of data by our dishonest scientist does not prove that the original data was correct or that his or her theory is wrong.

However, Yuksel has now acknowledged that the errors of Khalifa are also his own errors; in fact, this particular one was done with his own hand. I fear for him, in this life and the next.

YUKSEL: Ditto. Thank you for your concern about my salvation.

LOMAX: One more point. If N is spelled out, why is it considered an initial letter?

YUKSEL: Would it be a word? If a letter is spelled out, it is "a spelled out letter."



## **CLAIM: 24**

Three suras are prefixed with the initial "S" (Saad), and the total occurrence of the letter "S" in these suras is 152, or 19x8.

LOMAX: Deliberate deception. In his early publications, Dr. Khalifa shows chapter 7 as having 98 S's, 19 as having 26, and 38 as having 28. This adds up to the ZMN total of 152. He emphasized the miraculous nature of this total by pointing out the unusual spelling of "bsTatan" as "bSTatan" in 7:69 as necessary to preserve the miracle. (He made a similar point about the spelling of Makkah as Bakkah in 3:96.)

However, it was discovered that his total of 28 for chapter 38 was incorrect, the true total being 29. In order to preserve the miraculous total, it was necessary to eliminate a letter.

In his presentation of the count of S in VP, at 7:69, "bSTatan" has been altered to "bsTatan" by drawing the one letter in place of the other, reducing the count in chapter 7 to 97 and restoring the ZMN total. In this case, the change was done with sufficient skill as to be undetectable without comparing with another text.

Note also that there is a chapter initialed with S alone (chapter 38). If the chapter initialed with Q alone were ZMN in Q (as it is), and the chapter initialed with N were ZMN in N (as it is, only one short), then, if there is a pattern, we might expect the chapter initialed in S also to be ZMN in S. It couldn't be further away from that.

Neither of these textual changes alter the pronunciation, as the name of the letter N, which is how it is read, is NwN, and bSTatan was always pronounced bsTatan.

YUKSEL: The claim is true, the objection is based on suspicion, lack of knowledge, and fallacious argument. Since Lomax is coming with a very big accusation, I will give a relatively longer reply to this objection.

Dr. Rashad Khalifa put the Quran into the computer at Monsanto Company, while working as a biochemist, in 1969. He did not have a particular expectation regarding a mathematical code. At the time, he was interested in the meaning of "Huruf al-Muqatta" (Initial Letters) which were considered as mysterious by virtually all Muslim scholars. In 1973, he published the results of his research in a book titled "Miracle of the Quran: Significance of the Mysterious Alphabets" (Islamic Productions International, Inc. St. Louis, 1973. The book was revised and endorsed by Virgil I. Moss, Ahmad H. Sakr, Sulayman Shahid Mufassir, and Mujahid Al-Sawwaf). In this book, he pointed to some significant statistics, since at that time he was not aware of the hidden code 19. He had discovered that the frequency of initial letters were very high in chapters that they prefixed. For instance, the frequency of letter "N" in Chapter entitled "The Pen" (Al-Qalam) was 133 and was among the top six chapters with the highest percentage of letter "N". Another example: he found that the two chapters initialed by letter "Q" contain total 114 "Q"s matching the total number of chapters in the Quran.



In early counting there were some errors. Some were typing errors, and others were caused by vague or primitive method of counting. It is very interesting that in the earliest computer data (also in the book published in 1973) the count of the letter "N" in the chapter that starts with "NwN" was 133 ( $19 \times 7$ ). This was one extra from the manuscripts used and accepted by Dr. Khalifa. In other words, he got 133 by "mistake," years before he decoded that 19 was the common denominator and years before he noticed the traditional error in the spelling of the initial letter "N". Similarly, the frequency of the letter "S" (Saad) in three chapters containing this initial was 152. In fact, it was 153 in the manuscript he used.

The third "error" which led Rashad to the discovery of the pattern of 19 was in the count of "Allah" when he was not aware of the big problem generated by 9:128-129. These early "errors" actually helped us to see the miracle. With my own personal experience, I have no doubt that this was a divine wisdom and mercy; through our "mistakes," God, the possessor of infinite bounties, led to us to discover the truth and see the real "errors." Had we not commit those errors, neither Rashad nor the rest of us would have seen or accepted the mathematical miracle of the Quran.

As I mentioned above, our early count of "S" (Saad) despite our error was 152, and this number was a multiple of 19. None can claim that Rashad deliberately played with numbers in order to deceive people, since it is an unquestionable fact that he was not aware of the significance of 19 at the time of his early publication. If he had such a secret agenda, we should have witnessed such manipulations in the frequency of ALM (Alif, Lam, Mim) in those publication before 1974. Two publications, *The Perpetual Miracle of Muhammad* and *Miracle of the Quran: Significance of the Mysterious Alphabet*, raise a serious doubt for such an accusation.

We also repeated the error

In the discovery of the code 19, the importance of 152 was paramount. It was one of the few numbers that inspired Rashad to see the common denominator of the frequency of initials, that is, code 19. If it was 153, instead of 152 ( $19 \times 7$ ), probably Rashad would not have noticed the mathematical system. Even if he could, he would have had hard time to publish it.

This is not a mere conjecture, since I had almost the same experience. I repeated two crucial errors exactly as Rashad committed in his computerized work. I will not go to the details of how God's great signs proves His control and blessings in our life.

I was representing Muslim Turkish Students in an International Conference held in August 1980, when I first heard about the mathematical code of the Quran. Ahmad Deedat, president of the Islamic Propagation Center in South Africa, summarized Rashad's work with passion. It was a prophetic surprise for me since I had a political-personal experience with that number without knowing its importance in the Quran in 1979-1980 (FT/19). I decided to translate Deedat's book, *Al-Quran The Ultimate Miracle*,

after checking its argument and data. However, I was arrested few days after this conference because of my political activities and the publication of my articles promoting Iranian-style Islamic revolution in Turkey. The military regime sentenced me to six years in prison and two years of banishment.

In prison, I spend several months to check the data presented in Deedat's book. Since my childhood I was always questioning the things I hear or read. I was in a Turkish military prison when I verified Rashad's claims summarized by Ahmad Deedat. I used Fuad Abdulbaqy's concordance to check the frequency of words. I did not have a computer to verify the count of the letters. (Indeed, it was a luxury to have books in the prison at that time. Several months later, personal books and magazines were banned by prison administration.) I mobilized my inmate friends who happened to be the members of my political organization. I assigned the same page to five different groups who were able to read the Quran. We counted all of the initials except the letter ALM (Alif, Lam, Mim), since I knew the problematic nature of letter "A" (Alif). I would compare their count of letters verse by verse. If there was a difference we would re-count and check the result. It is still a mystery for me how we also came up with 152 "S" (Saad) in the three chapters starting with that letter. Years later I was surprised when I learned that both Rashad's count and our's were one short. In retrospect, I see this "error" as a blessing from God, the Most Wise.

Otherwise, I would not have translated that book and would not have believed in the mathematical structure of the Quran. I kept the list of our letter count as a memento. Later, when Rashad discovered that his early counts were one short, I checked my list again. I found that we had forgotten to count the letter "S" (Saad) in verse 38:41. The compensating letter came from "BaSTatan" of 7:69.

If you check a Quran manuscript you will see that the word "BaSTatan" in verse 7:69 has a unique spelling: it is written with letter "S" (Saad) having a letter "s" (Sin) written on top of it. Furthermore, you may find in many manuscripts an interpretation written in tiny Arabic letters "yuqrau bis sini" (it is pronounced with "sin"). There was another, less popular interpretation of this peculiar spelling: the word could be written in two different spellings without change in its meaning. However, there were several hadith supporting the first interpretation. The mathematical code of the Quran finally solved this problem: The correct spelling of the problem word in 7:69 was with "s" (Sin), not with "S" (Saad).

#### Bankruptcy of traditional interpretation

Before noticing an extra "S" (Saad) in our count which was caused by an error in spelling of "BasTatan" of 7:69 in current manuscripts, we found the unique spelling of "BaSTatan" interesting and shared the traditional interpretation based on several hadiths. According to a hadith narrated by Ibn Ebi Davud in Kitabul Masahif p. 108, and several other sources, Prophet Muhammad reportedly said: "Gabriel revealed this word specially spelled with letter "S" (Saad)." We found that this word with its unique spelling of "S"

(Saad) had a significant meaning in a chapter that starts with combination of letters A.L.M.S. which includes "S" (Saad).

However, after the discovery of an extra "S" (Saad), Rashad suspected the very word that he initially found so interesting. I was shocked when I first noticed the correction made by Rashad in his book Visual Presentation of the Miracle. I think it was irresponsible of him not to indicate this important change with a footnote, probably with some explanation. This change shocked me for two reasons: I felt that Rashad was manipulating the text. Second, I had a lengthy evaluation regarding the important role of the word "BasTatan" in the count of letter "S" (Saad) with its unique spelling, in my book "Kuran En Buyuk Mucize" which became a best seller in Turkey for several years.

I went to the Sulaimaniya library and Topkapi Palace Museum to see the oldest available manuscripts. I was relieved when I saw in several manuscripts the word "BasTatan" written with "s" (Sin), not "S" (Saad). Those manuscripts, including the Tashkent copy did not contain a "specially" spelled "BasTatan." I took the photograph of the verse 7:69 of the Tashkent copy, and later presented it to Rashad. We put it in the first appendix of his 1989 translation as a historical support of the miracle. The mathematical system of the Quran had predicted a spelling error, and it was confirmed by early manuscripts.

Now, I can comfortably say this: The word "BasTatan" in verse 7:69 of today's Quran manuscripts in circulation contains a spelling error. The hadiths defending this error is obviously a fabrication and they illuminate the early arguments on the spelling of this word.

#### The Deliberate Deception of The Supporters of "Saad"

According to both mathematical system of the Quran and the earliest manuscripts, the word "BasTatan" should be written with letter "s" (Sin). Now let's speculate on what have happened in the past. The duplicated manuscripts of the Quran was not error free despite the extraordinary care of the scribes. Since there were no printing or photocopy machines it was eventual that human errors would creep in the text of copies of copies. One of the early copy of the Quran misspelled the word "BasTatan" of 7:69 by writing it with "S" (Saad) instead of "s" (Sin). A careful proofreader or just an ordinary reader found the scribal error and corrected it by writing a tiny letter "s" (Sin) on top of the letter "S" (Saad). Unfortunately, later scribes who duplicated that copy did not realize the correction; they copied the word with both its spelling error and correction. Since then the word became famous with its peculiar spelling, that is, a "S" (Saad) carrying a "s" (Sin) on its top.

Of course, there were copies with correct spelling. Most likely an argument erupted between pro-Saad and pro-Sin groups. When those arguments caught public attention, the pro-Saad group resorted to fabricating hadiths to support their position. Finally, the pro-Saad group won the day and the Quran manuscripts containing spelling error in 7:69 became popular in Muslim world. Your Quran version most likely contains

the extra "S" (Saad) which was supported by fabricated hadiths. Now, it is up to you to correct the spelling error, which is a product of deliberate deception, with an ink pen. This will show that you have witnessed the mathematical miracle of the Quran, the preservation of the Quran by a divine system and you are not following your ancestors blindly. Furthermore, this will teach you how hadith books serve the worst deceivers in the history of the world.

LOMAX: Note that Yuksel is presenting information about the state of mind of Khalifa in 1969, long before he knew him, as if that were a fact known to him. This is a man who hates "hadith"!

YUKSEL: No Lomax, I will not let you get away with this accusation. As I have expressed in the beginning of this argument, the mathematical code of the Quran can be examined and witnessed independent from its discoverer or his early work. However, your personal accusation based on Rashad's early work forced me to mention the other side of the story. I reject "hadith" as a source of my religion. I do not invite anyone to accept the mathematical miracle of the Quran based on stories from Rashad. Nevertheless, if a person like you comes up with a personal accusation of "deception" regarding my close friend and teacher, then I am compelled to tell the truth of the matter. This is especially critical since, the accusation is coming from a person who repeatedly claims personal acquaintance with Rashad in order to gain credibility. No Lomax, you cannot falsely accuse my close friend and get away with it.

Besides, it can be inferred by ANY non-paranoid person that Rashad Khalifa did not have any particular expectation regarding a mathematical code. His early books and articles in magazines clearly indicate this fact. Especially, the errors in his early works are solid proof that he did not know about the code when he first printed his computer results. Thus, my defense of Rashad's state of mind is not a personal or subjective testimony, but it is a strong argument based on his early works published through various media, including periodicals.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The third "error" which led Rashad to the discovery of the pattern of 19 was in the count of "Allah" when he was not aware of the big problem generated by 9:128-129. These early "errors" actually helped us to see the miracle. . ."

In other words, it was false data which led to the theory. Now, Khalifa said, in the last issue of Submitter's Perspective before his assassination, that "A False Messenger is a Messenger of Satan." Is this not a warning? Does this not indicate that one should check such information and the reasoning process used to analyze it very, very carefully?

YUKSEL: You intentionally confuse the expression "false messenger" with "unintentional personal errors." What a hideous tactic to falsify the truth!

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "As I mentioned above, our early count of "S" (Saad) despite our error was 152, and this number was a multiple of 19. None can claim that Rashad deliberately played with numbers in order to deceive people, since it is an

unquestionable fact that he was not aware of the significance of 19 at the time of his early publication."

Yuksel has mistaken my comment of "deliberate deception" to mean that all of Khalifa's work was deliberate deception. No, I think that Khalifa himself was deceived. However, my reference was specifically to the alteration of the text in Visual Presentation of the Miracle without mentioning that it had been altered. He knew he was altering it; he knew that his readership would have been unhappy with alteration; so he did not mention the alteration. Yuksel was there. In this case, these "claims" came from Sam Khalifa, who is himself responsible for what he has claimed, since I would expect that he too knows these "details."

YUKSEL: Again Lomax is wobbling. Now he is trying to switch the meaning of "deliberate deception" with "self-deception." However, again, he goes back to his original accusation.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "If he had such a secret agenda, we should have witnessed such manipulations in the frequency of ALM (Alif, Lam, Mim) in those publication before 1974. Two publications, The Perpetual Miracle of Muhammad and Miracle of the Quran: Significance of the Mysterious Alphabet, raise a serious doubt for such an accusation."

Yuksel is responding to a charge that I did not make. The comment "deliberate deception," I will repeat, refers to the publications of the Nuwn and Sad counts.

YUKSEL: My response is valid for your specific charges too. If a person is choosing "deception" as a method, then we should be able to see some traces of deception in his work where he could employ his deception easily. My knowledge of his work stops me from such an accusation. People sometimes make mistakes during their research and in its presentation. I can only blame his passion for "one of the greatest" miracles. Who is error free? If you were a contemporary of Muhammad, most likely you would have rejected him as a false messenger, since he committed serious errors. (22:52-55; 33:37; 80:1-12)

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "We also repeated the error In the discovery of the code 19, the importance of 152 was paramount. It was one of the few numbers that inspired Rashad to see the common denominator of frequency of initials, that is, code 19. If it was 153, instead of 152 (19x7), probably Rashad could not have noticed the mathematical system. Even if he could, he would have had hard time to publish it."

Yuksel has made this argument before, on the telephone. Essentially, it is an argument that a series of mistakes was the will of God. This is not to be denied. But Khalifa did not make mistakes just in his data. He also followed an implicit theory of probability, which was itself fallacious. He never faced the problem that it was possible to create a "miracle" like this through selection of data and analytical method. The history described above proves the point. When the data was found to be false, the theory which

rested on the data was not changed. Rather, the data was re-analyzed to fit the data [theory? sic]. Any scientist who deals with statistical data is cautioned against this kind of analysis. They teach about this in first-year statistics.

YUKSEL: A person with one eye and not being able to see the 3-D holographic picture can accuse us of "self-deception" or remind us of first-year statistics course. The existence of the code is so obvious, even an ardent enemy such as Lomax is compelled to acknowledge that it serves as a "trial." What he does not realize is: this: it is he who is on "trial." This is "thought" in the first-verses of "The Spider" (Chapter 29 of the Quran).

LOMAX: This is not a mere conjecture, since I had almost the same experience. I repeated two crucial errors exactly like Rashad committed in his computerized work. I will not go to the details of how God's great signs proves His control and blessings in our life.

I also report similar experiences. In fact, I started studying the Qur'an again because it had been "proven" by Khalifa that it was literally the word of Allah. And I found miraculous patterns in the Qur'an that disappeared when the data was examined more closely.

YUKSEL: And Lomax later traded the Quran again with collection of hadith books. What an unfortunate circle.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "I assigned the same page to five different groups who were able to read the Quran. We counted all of the initials except the letter ALM (Alif, Lam, Mim), since I knew the problematic nature of letter "A" (Alif). I would compare their count of letters verse by verse. If there was a difference we would re-count and check the result."

This is an excellent method; however, there are potential pitfalls, especially if those counting can read the words. It is possible that there is a particular word in which the spelling deceives people according to what would be a common misreading. But what Yuksel did was better than what Khalifa himself did. I would expect Yuksel to come up with far fewer errors than Khalifa, using the method he described. If this method were applied to create a computer-readable copy of the Qur'an, one could be pretty sure that it was without errors.

Yuksel wrote, "It is still a mystery for me how we also came up with 152 "S" (Saad) in the three chapters starting with that letter. Years later I was surprised when I learned that both Rashad's count and ours were one short. In retrospect, I see this 'error' as a blessing from God, the Most Wise." Or a trial. What Khalifa did, I am fairly sure, once he had developed the theory of nineteen-divisibility, was to keep looking for errors until counts came out to nineteen. Once he had a 19-divisible count, he stopped looking. This is why it took so long to find all the errors, if, indeed, they have all been found.

YUKSEL: Yes, as a "trial" too. Curiously, Lomax tend to ignore the other objectives of the mathematical code. What he see is "Hell" and "Trial." Nothing else. But, the verse 74:31 mentions two positive objectives of the number nineteen. Why does Lomax keep forgetting them? The answer is simple: his meaningless 19 cannot function that way, except in case of few anomalies.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Otherwise, I would not have translated that book and would not have believed in the mathematical structure of the Quran [. . . ]The mathematical code of the Quran finally solved this problem: The correct spelling of the problem word in 7:69 was with 's' (Sin), not with 'S' (Saad)." Yuksel does not know or does not mention that what he has said is according to the Hafs reading. Warsh has a Sad and reads it as Sad; in fact, it is difficult to pronounce a sin just before an emphatic Ta. It is actually more likely that the pronunciation as a sin was inauthentic, though it is one of the accepted readings.

YUKSEL: Lomax again is thumping on his Warsh version. Whenever he exhausts all the excuses to reject the miracle of the Quran he resorts to his Warsh version!

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Bankruptcy of traditional interpretation Before noticing an extra 'S' (Saad) in our count [. . . ] We found that this word with its unique spelling of 'S' (Saad) had a significant meaning in a chapter that starts with combination of letters A.L.M.S. which includes 'S' (Saad)."

Khalifa, before his error in counting Sad was known to him, used to cite the use of a Sad as one of the miracles: if the word had beenspelled as pronounced, the 19-divisibility would not have been preserved. When the error was found, he no longer made that claim.

YUKSEL: See the rest of my response.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "However, after the discovery of an extra 'S' (Saad), Rashad suspected the very word that he initially found so interesting [. . . ]The mathematical system of the Quran had predicted a spelling error, and it was confirmed by early manuscripts."

Confirmed by one early manuscript, yes. But, as we will see, there are other variations in those manuscripts which demolish other major pillars of Khalifa's theory, such as the count of "Allah." One again, we come back to one of the central problems: what is the Qur'an? If we can pick and choose pieces from manuscripts, we can choose them so as to create or amplify a numerical pattern. Together with variations in analytical method, this is a powerful tool for forging a "miracle," so powerful, in fact, that it can work to a certain extent without conscious intent.

YUKSEL: As I noted before, I did not just look at one manuscript, but several. Manuscripts are not error-free. A comparative study is required for questionable cases.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Now, I can comfortably say this: The word 'BasTatan' in verse 7:69 of today's Quran manuscripts in circulation contains a spelling error. The hadiths defending this error is obviously a fabrication and they illuminate the early arguments on the spelling of this word."

It would be necessary, though not quite sufficient, before claiming this, to establish that the pattern of 19-divisibility is necessary. But the Khalifites have never done the work to demonstrate that. Instead, they rely on bluster, as Yuksel is not doing.

YUKSEL: Lomax, as an acknowledged Muhammedan, ( and I have publicly stated that we are not "Khalifites,") ignores that this particular case is one of the examples that establishes the pattern of 19-divisibility. Lomax is repeating this for each individual pattern that he is forced to accept as correct. Here is the caricatured demonstration of how his argument works.

Premise: There are four main features of "X." They are A, B, C, D.

Objection: Though they are basic features, there are some others. According to "W" version there are five or six features.

Claim: A is divisible by 19. Objection: Anecdotal. You did not establish a pattern yet. Claim: B is divisible by 19. Objection: Anecdotal. You did not establish a pattern yet. Claim: C is divisible by 19. Objection: Anecdotal. You did not establish a pattern yet. Claim: D is divisible by 19. Objection: Anecdotal. You did not establish a pattern yet.

He fragmentizes or isolates each parameter of the pattern and rejects it in the name of that pattern. What is evident is that Lomax has established a pattern of denial: "you did not establish a pattern yet."

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The Deliberate Deception of The Supporters of 'Saad' [. . .] Since then the word became famous with its peculiar spelling, that is, a 'S' (Saad) carrying a 's' (Sin) on its top."

All of this neglects the fact that the word is \*pronounced\* in Hafs with a sin. The Qur'anic manuscripts were only aids to recitation. However, it is certainly possible, in fact it is certain, that there have been spelling errors or variations in texts of the Qur'an. In this case, it is more likely that the sin of the Tashkent was idiosyncratic. Yuksel examined a copy of the Tashkent text. There is another reputed Uthamic [Uthmanic, sic] recension at Topkapi. What does it show for this verse? What do other very early copies show? Yuksel's analysis is reported from a point of view of one who already knows the "correct" answer; he also apparently does not know that Warsh has no "sin" written above the letter.

YUKSEL: I did not check the copy in Topkapi Museum which has fake blood on it. But, I checked several other ancient manuscripts and found that they confirm our



prediction based on the mathematical code of the Quran. If your Warsh version does not have "sin" on the suspected word, it only shows that it is not corrected by a careful editor.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Of course, there were copies with correct spelling. Most likely an argument erupted between pro-Saad and pro-Sin groups. When those arguments caught public attention, the pro-Saad group resorted to fabricating hadiths to support their position. Finally, the pro-Saad group won the day and the Quran manuscripts containing spelling error in 7:69 became popular in Muslim world. Your Quran version most likely contains the extra 'S' (Saad) which was supported by fabricated hadiths."

Now Yuksel, without any appropriate evidence, is stating that hadith are fabricated. Perhaps he is right. But how is he so certain? What, precisely, is the method by which this "numerical code" can be used to "correct" the text? Of course, it would first be necessary to prove that the code is real. How, precisely, can we know that?

YUKSEL: Again Lomax repeats his pattern with different wordings: you did not establish a pattern yet. I will not repeat my answer anymore.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Now, it is up to you to correct the spelling error, which is a product of deliberate deception, with an ink pen. This will show that you have witnessed the mathematical miracle of the Quran, the preservation of the Quran by a divine system and you are not following your ancestors blindly. Furthermore, this will teach you how hadith books serve the worst deceivers in the history of the world."

We already knew that hadith can be incorrect; this is not even controversial. Surely Yuksel is drawing a much bigger conclusion than is justified from all the evidence seen so far. He has not, in 24 claims, shown anything more than a few interesting number correlation. None of these correlation warrant the conclusion that there is a numerical code sufficiently pervasive to allow correction of the text. His comment here is merely a lapse into his habitual polemic and diatribe against hadith. One must look for emotional causes to understand this. It is not in the data, nor in any logical or rational analysis.

YUKSEL: Thanks to Lomax for his psychological analysis. Have you seen a bald doctor prescribing medicine for baldness? Or have you seen someone who lives in a glass house stoning others?

## CLAIM 25

Sura 36 is prefixed with the initials "Y.S." (Ya Seen) and the total occurrence of these two letters in this sura is 285, or  $19 \times 15$ .

LOMAX: True, interesting. If I may accept totals not rejected by Philips [op.cit.], this total is accurate, and one of three such suras where the initial letter totals are definitely ZMN. If we did not know the totals, we could predict that, about one time out of thirty, such a coincidence would occur (there is a probability of .035 that three or more events would occur, each of which has 1 chance in 19 of occurring, out of a set of 28 trials.) Coincidences of this level are everyday experience.

YUKSEL: True and more than interesting. As we had demonstrated and we will continue to do so, the mathematical system of the Quran is well beyond probability.

LOMAX: There has not been one single demonstration in this discussion of a result which is wildly improbable! Yuksel is, again, lapsing into habitual polemic. This phrase, "Beyond Probability," is from a book by Abdullah Arik, who has successfully demonstrated in it his utter ignorance of statistical theory. Yuksel is not showing any better understanding.

YUKSEL: Lomax demonstrates a wisdom of knowing that the probability of using the words "beyond" and "probability" together without quoting from a book is zero. Who is demonstrating utter ignorance of statistical theory? (By the way, I do not necessarily endorse all of Abdullah Arik's calculations).

## **CLAIM 26**

The letters K (Kaf), H (Ha), Y (Ya), 'A ('Ayn), and S (Saad) occur in the "K.H.Y.'A.S."- initialed sura (Chapter Mary) 798 times, or  $19 \times 42$ .

LOMAX: True, interesting. See Fact (claim) 25.

YUKSEL: True, and more than interesting. See claim 24, 25 and the following claims.

LOMAX: Note that this claim is a "within the sura" count. Some counts are like that, some require combination across suras. It is really necessary to look at tables showing all the combinations, and then to apply the different methods of analysis, consistently, to these tables. Whenever I have done this, I have found the number of 19-divisible statistics to be within normal variation. But by varying the analytical method with each "fact," it is possible to find some "interesting" result for each initial letter or initial letter combination. This is the functional anatomy of a miracle.

YUKSEL: There is no varying analytical method, except in the count of T.S.M. which I will mention later. Lomax fails to see the simple method we use. All chapters that share the same initials are counted together. For instance, there is a SINGLE letter "S" that starts the Chapter 38, thus, we count all the cases where this single letter is an initial letter. The same with H.M. and other initials. Since K.H.Y.'A.S. of Chapter 19 is not repeated anywhere it is consistent to count it in that chapter alone.

## CLAIM 27

The total occurrence of "H.M." (Ha Mim) in their 7 suras (40-46) is 2147, or 19x113.

LOMAX: Probably true, interesting. I have counted a few of these suras. The count given requires the inclusion of the invocation each time (i.e., each letter in the invocation is counted seven times), contrary to the "Important Rule" announced earlier by Dr. Khalifa, and still followed with his word counts. Further, his totals have changed from earlier reports. Always including the invocation for each chapter (the invocation has 2 H and 3 M):

	c. 1976	c. 1980	1982	(old xerox)	(SNC)
(VP) count of H: sura 40	64	+0 =>	64	+0 =>	64 sura 41 58 -10 =>
48 +0 =>	48 sura 42	53 +0 =>	53	+0 =>	53 sura 43 45 -1 =>
44 +0 =>	44 sura 44	16 +0 =>	16	+0 =>	16 sura 45 31 +0 =>
31 +0 =>	31 sura 46	37 -1 =>	36	+0 =>	36

count of M: sura 40	389	-9 =>	380	+0 =>	380 sura 41 276 -2	
=> 274 +2 =>	276 sura 42	308 -9 =>	299	+1 =>	300 sura 43 317	
+6 =>	323 +1 =>	324 sura 44	145 +5 =>	150	+0 =>	150 sura 45
200 -1 =>	199 +1 =>	200 sura 46	227 -2 =>	225	+0 =>	225 totals
2166 -24 =>	2142	+5 =>	2147			

totals modulo 19:	0	14
0		

It is apparent from these figures that Dr. Khalifa's early work was extremely sloppy. My suspicion is that, initially, he merely counted the letters once and accepted his numbers if they produced the results he wanted. If they did not, he recounted until he had found sufficient errors to produce the desired result. The large drop in the counts from the first to the second publication is odd. He may have changed some critical measure. At the second publication, he still hadn't gotten it right; some letters were still overlooked. I am aware of no errors in the third publication.

In doing the counts myself (I have counted two of these chapters), depending on my state of mind, I have made as many as 10 errors in counting a chapter, always errors of omission. My procedure was as follows:

I xeroxed the pages of the Quran in question. I marked with distinctive colors the letters under consideration. I then checked my counts by comparing them with Dr. Khalifa's, page by page totals (in VP). If a count disagreed, I reexamined the page, looked for missing letters.

I estimate as high as one chance in 30 of missing a letter by this method, and a much lower chance of counting non-existent letters. The chance that two persons

counting will miss the same letter is perhaps 1 in 900, although it could be argued that some letters are particularly easy to miss (such as the m in bma), especially for a non-Arabic speaker like myself.

Ultimately the way to produce solid, reliable counts is to have multiple persons count the chapters, reporting totals by page, carefully examining any discrepancies, proving that each discrepancy from the final count was produced by an error. Even better (and easier in the long run) would be to have multiple persons key the Quran into a computer, then to compare the results letter by letter, which can easily be automated, producing a reliable database.

Given that many persons have critically examined Dr. Khalifa's work, it may be reasonable to accept the counts in VP. On the other hand, he produced so many other relatively easily discoverable errors that it may be that the other researchers simply gave up at this point.

Most significant is the fact that with all three sets of data he claimed ZMN perfection in the total. How did he do this in SNC? Simple (actually, not so simple; in fact, quite clever). He included the invocation once only, with the count of H and excluded it entirely (violating his rule) from the count of M. This results in the removal of 6x2, or 12, H's and 7x3, or 21, M's. The original remainder of 14, less 12, less 21 results in a ZMN total of 2109.

In other words, he created the HM total in SNC by a combination of errors.

YUKSEL: The claim is true and more than interesting. Though Lomax feels obligated to accept this fact in his first statement with a dubious "probably," he tries his best to undermine this fact by speculating on early errors of Dr. Khalifa's work. After a lengthy demonstration of how he is careful and meticulous and how Dr. Khalifa was sloppy, he ends up with an entirely negative remark. An "interesting" fact in his first statement transforms to "a combination of errors" in his last statement. Instead of accepting the truth he tries his best to loose it among early errors committed by a human like him. (By the way, Lomax made an error while correcting Dr. Khalifa's earliest report. The count of M for chapter 45 was correct and the correction -1 was not needed.)

The question is simple: How many H and M letters are there in chapters starting with the initials of H and M? Through our research and observation we have learned that unnumbered Basmalahs participate in the counting of initial letters. We consistently include them in the counting of letters. However, in the count of words we observe a clear pattern that requires the exclusion of unnumbered Basmalahs. This method is consistent and also meaningful in distinguishing unnumbered verses from numbered verses.

Furthermore, I would like to introduce a recent discovery made by Milan Sulc regarding the frequency of HM letters in seven chapters initialized by them:

The frequency of H (Ha) and M (Mim) letters in those 7 chapters are 2147, that is 19 x 113. The probability of this fact is 1/19. There are only four subgroups whose combinations result in a multiple of 19. (Two of them depend on the other two). This can be seen as an arbitrary arrangement or coincidence, since there are 112 possible combinations out of the seven chapters. However, if you add the digits of each frequency you will end up with 113, which is exactly equal to the multiplication factor. This is valid also for all the subgroups. The digits of the individual occurrences of these letters in the individual suras always add up exactly to the coefficient of the number 19 in the total group as well as four determining sub-groups, as shown below:

SURA	H	M	Adding Digits	Total 40	64	380	6 +
4 + 3 + 8 + 0	21	41	48 276	4 + 8 + 2 + 7 + 6	27 42		53
300	5 + 3 + 3 + 0 + 0	11 43	44	324	4 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 4	17	44
16	150	1 + 6 + 1 + 5 + 0	13 45	31	200	3 + 1 + 2 + 0 + 0	6
46	36	225	3 + 6 + 2 + 2 + 5	18	-----		
Total	2147	26 + 32 + 16 + 24 + 15	113	(19x113)			

SURA	H	M	Adding Digits	Total 40	64
380	6 + 4 + 3 + 8 + 0	21 41	48 276	4 + 8 + 2 + 7 + 6	
6	27 42	53 300	5 + 3 + 3 + 0 + 0	11	-----
----- Total		1121	15 + 15 + 8 + 15 + 6	59	
(19 x 59)					

SURA	H	M	Adding Digits	Total 43
44	324	4 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 4	17 44	16 150
1 + 6 + 1 + 5 + 0		13 45	31 200	3 + 1 + 2 + 0 + 0
6 46	36	225	3 + 6 + 2 + 2 + 5	18
----- Total		1026	11 + 17 + 8 + 9 + 9	54
(19 x 54)				

SURA	H	M	Adding Digits	Total 41
48	276	4 + 8 + 2 + 7 + 6	27 42	53 300
5 + 3 + 3 + 0 + 0		11 43	44 324	4 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 4
17	----- Total		1045	13 + 15 + 8 + 9 + 10
55	(19 x 55)			

SURA	H	M	Adding Digits	Total 40
64	380	6 + 4 + 3 + 8 + 0	21 44	16 150
1 + 6 + 1 + 5 + 0		13 45	31 200	3 + 1 + 2 + 0 + 0
6 46	36	225	3 + 6 + 2 + 2 + 5	18
----- Total		1102	13 + 17 + 8 + 15 + 5	58
(19 x 58)				

The probability of this phenomenon for each subgroup is 1/9. Therefore, the combined probability of these phenomena occurring altogether is 1/(19 x 9 x 9 x 9 x 9 x 9), or 1/1,121,931.

I hope Lomax will not rush into falsely labeling this extraordinary mathematico-literary pattern as a mathematical property.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The claim is true and more than interesting. Though Lomax feels obligated to accept this fact in his first statement with a dubious "probably," he tries his best to undermine it by speculating on early errors in Dr. Khalifa's work."

I said "probably," because I have not verified the counts personally, and I know of no non-Khalifite who has verified the numbers (and, really, only one Khalifite: Yuksel himself.) But I do consider it likely that the counts are accurate, as far as they go. The speculation about errors becomes relevant when one realizes that, through a host of errors, one thing remained constant: Khalifa always reported a multiple of 19 in his counts.

YUKSEL: Lomax should learn another lesson: never use ALWAYS. He is not aware that his passion for denial of the miracle of the Quran makes him exaggerate and falsely accuse the proponents of the miracle.

Dr. Khalifa did not always report a multiple of 19 in his counts. For instance, he did not claim that the number of all verses in the Quran is multiple of 19 until he discovered that the last two verses of Chapter 9, Ultimatum was not part of the original Quran. Again, he did not claim that the sum of the verse numbers that contain the word God is multiple of 19 until that discovery. He discarded his claim regarding the frequency of 9 words in the last two verses of Chapter 9. (See Muslim Perspective, March 1985.) As with many human, he had sometimes rushed and committed errors and inconsistency in counting.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "After a lengthy demonstration of how he is careful and meticulous and how Dr. Khalifa was sloppy, he ends up with an entirely negative remark. An 'interesting fact' in his first statement transforms to 'a combination of errors' in his last statement."

Yuksel has completely misunderstood what was being discussed. The "combination of errors" reference was not to the final figures presented later, and which Claim 27 is about, but to the numbers shown in a paper from Khalifa called Secret Numerical Code, or SNC. This was fully referenced in the original paper.

YUKSEL: Thanks for the clarification.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Instead of accepting the truth he tries his best to loose and hide it among early errors committed by a human like him. (By the way, Lomax made an error while correcting Khalifa's earliest report. The count of M for chapter 45 is correct and the correction -1 is not needed.)"

The correction of -1 refers to what is necessary to change the original number to the number in SNC. If one looks at the table, one will see that this is balanced by a later

change of +1 to get the number in Visual Presentation. I made errors in the writing of the original paper, but this was not one of them.

YUKSEL: Thanks for this clarification.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The question is simple: How many H and M letters are there in chapters starting with the initials of H and M? Through our research and observation we have learned that unnumbered Basmalahs participate in the counting of initial letters. We consistently include them in the counting of letters. However, in the count of words we observe a clear pattern that requires the exclusion of unnumbered Basmalahs. This method is consistent and also meaningful in distinguishing unnumbered verses from numbered verses."

However, Khalifa did not always follow this rule. Further, there are other rules which must be stated, otherwise one would not know why this particular series of chapters was chosen. Yuksel has still not responded to the concerns in the Draft FAQ: 19, Study Problems, apparently preferring to focus on the old writing in my paper, written over two years ago, and before a lot of new data was available to me, including the Tashkent copy of the Qur'an. Yuksel claims that the method is consistent. If this is true, why does he not simply state the method used to determine that there is a miracle here? In other words, answer the questions in the Draft FAQ. But he knows, I think, that such a document would expose how complex the selection criteria are: I assert that they are complex enough to account for the patterns which they reveal.

YUKSEL: Lomax is not telling the truth regarding Rashad's treatment of Bismillahs in the count of words and letters. The only exception is the word "BSM" and we have explained the possible reason behind this exception. Here we are talking about a simple counting of two simple letters: H.M. Lomax's criticism is not relevant here.

I have stated the counting method. Instead of criticizing my method, Lomax repeats his chronic complaint: "If this is true, why does he not simply state the method used to determine that there is a miracle here?"

Lomax pontificates: "There are other rules which must be stated, otherwise one would not know why this particular series of chapters was chosen." What rule? Is it a difficult thing to infer that we count initials together in the chapters where they are found? This miracle is neither for morons, nor for extreme skeptics.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "Furthermore, I would like to introduce a recent discovery made by Milan Sulc regarding the frequency of HM letters in seven chapters initialized by them: The frequency of H (Ha) and M (Mim) letters in those 7 chapters are 2147, that is  $19 \times 113$ . The probability of this fact is  $1/19$ ." I have suggested to Mr Yuksel that he study probability theory. His statement of probability does not state the experimental conditions sufficiently to judge that probability.



I could say that the probability that a random number is divisible by 19 is  $1/19$ . But if the number has been preselected by someone, who is only presenting multiples of 19, I could say that the probability that such a number would be divisible by 19 is very close to 1. So the history of how the number came to be the number under consideration is very, very relevant.

YUKSEL: At first I suspected that the discovery was a mere mathematical property. I was almost sure about it. However, when I checked it extensively, I realized that it is not a pattern that I know. Therefore, I took it for evaluation to a professor in number theory at the University of Arizona. He worked on it for about 40 minutes, and finally found a formula for it. I lost the formula, but it was based on number nine.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "There are only four subgroups whose combinations result in a multiple of 19. (Two of them depend on the other two). This can be seen as an arbitrary arrangement or coincidence, since there are 112 possible combinations out of the seven chapters."

Now, I am glad that Yuksel mentions the number of possible combinations, because the very fact that there are such subgroups has been cited by other Khalifites as a miracle in itself, when, given a total divisible by 19, it is actually completely normal that there would be such subgroups.

Yuksel wrote, "However, if you add the digits of each frequency you will end up with 113, which is exactly equal to the multiplication factor [ . . . ] Therefore, the combined probability of these phenomena occurring altogether is  $1/(19 \times 9 \times 9 \times 9 \times 9 \times 9)$ , or  $1/1,121,931$ ."

This probability is overstated. The variables are not independent variables, for there are relationships between numbers and the sum of digits, and the relationships are stronger when the numbers involved are divisible by 19. For example, if the sum of a series of seven numbers is divisible by 19, it is not unlikely that the multiplier of 19 will be equal to the sum of digits of the individual numbers, when the numbers are within certain ranges. It would take more time than I now have to give to this problem to show why, and to quantify this. But note that the probability is stated without any substantive comment as to how and why it is appropriate to multiply the probabilities. Multiplication of probabilities is only valid when each event is independent, and sums of digits are not independent from the digits. I'll give a more concrete example. Take any series of numbers, the sum of which is divisible by 19. Take the sum of digits of the series of numbers. If the result has two or more digits, add them together, and repeat this process until there is only one number remaining as the result of the process. Do this same process with the sum of the series. The single digit resulting will be identical with that from the sum of the individual numbers. And it will also be identical with the repeated sum from the multiplier of 19. These are not independent variables.

YUKSEL: You are explaining a well-known property of the number 19. Knowing this property, initially, I discarded the pattern as a mathematical property. However, my

later examination showed that they are independent variables. Lomax could examine it for himself by changing the numbers while keeping their sum as multiple of nineteen. After a score of trials he will realize that he has rushed to the conclusion despite my warning.

LOMAX: Now, because there is more than one way to come up with this sum, it is not rigidly determined that the non-repeated sum is identical. But if the original numbers are of a certain average size, and the list is of modest length, it is not particularly unlikely. I do not have time for a rigorous analysis here.

YUKSEL: If this is not "gobbledygook" nothing is.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "I hope Lomax will not rush into falsely labeling this extraordinary mathematico-literary pattern as a mathematical property." But there are certainly mathematical properties involved. Yes, the pattern is interesting, like most of Milan Sulc's work. But it is not conclusive. For one thing, once it is really true that computers are being used to find these patterns, it becomes less and less remarkable that one can find a way to analyse a body of data that produces results like this. But a really good code will not have a probability of one in a million of being produced by chance: more likely, the probability will be smaller than one in the number of atoms in the universe. What is the probability that the letters in this paragraph came together merely by chance? Honestly, we might as well say that it is zero; the difference between it and zero is insignificant.

YUKSEL: I expected from Lomax to study this particular pattern. However, he is not facing it. Rather, he hides behind his rhetoric, speculations and generalizations.

## CLAIM 28

The total of "A.S.Q." in their sura (42) is 209, or  $19 \times 11$ .

LOMAX: Probably true, interesting. Dr. Khalifa has been faulted for separating 'A.S.Q. from the preceding HM, but it is not an unreasonable analysis, as they are separately numbered verses. The effect of this choice is merely to reduce the significance.

YUKSEL: True, more than interesting if evaluated with other patterns of the mathematical system. Again, Lomax inserts a sly "probably" in order to reduce its significance.

LOMAX: As before, "probably" is inserted because the count has not been independently verified. That does NOT reduce the significance; significance is reduced by idiosyncratic selection criteria. In this case, there is not other split set of initial letters such that one could know whether or not a pattern exists. Thus the phenomenon is anecdotal. What is missing from Yuksel's analysis of the initial letters is a comprehensive statement which covers all initial letter analyses. In fact, the analyses vary with the initial letter under analysis. It is precisely this variation which makes it possible to assert the possibility that these counts have been deliberately chosen for 19-divisibility, out of a population of possible ways of counting which are equally as reasonable.

YUKSEL: I repeated several times a comprehensive statement that covers all the cases except one (T.S.M.). And I strongly believe that the exception is due to our incomplete and erroneous count. A more accurate count will show that the method of counting of initials is comprehensive.

Lomax is a very good example of how a good mind can be blinded with sectarian agenda and personal vendetta. I really feel sorry for him, since he confuses the simplest facts and cannot see the clearest pattern.

Have you noted the one whose god is his ego? Consequently, God sends him astray, despite his knowledge, seals his hearing and his mind, and places a veil on his eyes. Who can guide him, after such a decision by God? Would you not take heed? (45:23)

## CLAIM 29

The initials "A.L.M." (Alef Lam Mim) occur in 6 suras, and the total occurrences of the three letters in 6 suras are as follows: [6 ZMN totals for chapters 2, 3, 29, 30, 31, and 32 omitted)

LOMAX: Unverifiable, at least partly false. Dr. Khalifa's method of counting A (alif) is not based on any known or stated system. Sometimes upright fetha is counted, sometimes not. Sometimes hamza is counted (as A -- which is arbitrary, @ would make more sense); , sometimes not. Because upright fetha and hamza are common, it is quite difficult to untangle his counting rules. By varying slightly the rules, it is possible to manipulate the counts.

Philips [op.cit., p. 21] points out that Dr. Khalifa has missed an L (Lam) in 30:21. He further shows how the hamza in "Lain" has been counted in 3:158 and not counted in exactly the same word (and written the same) in 30:51.

Dr. Khalifa changed his counts of A, L, and M greatly over the years:

count of A sura 2 4592 32 => 4624 -122 => 4502 sura 3 2578 21 =>  
2599 -78 => 2521 sura 7 2572 18 => 2590 -61 => 2529 sura 10 1353 5 =>  
1358 -39 => 1319 sura 11 1402 10 => 1412 -42 => 1370 sura 12 1335 12  
=> 1347 -41 => 1306 sura 13 625 -1 => 624 -19 => 605 sura 14 594 10  
=> 604 -19 => 585 sura 15 503 9 => 512 -19 => 493 sura 29 784 9  
=> 793 -19 => 774 sura 30 545 22 => 567 -23 => 544 sura 31 348 12  
=> 360 -13 => 347 sura 32 268 0 => 268 -11 => 257

count of L sura 2 3204 -2 => 3202 0 => 3202 sura 3 1885 6 =>  
1891 1 => 1892 sura 7 1523 5 => 1528 2 => 1530 sura 10 912 1 =>  
913 0 => 913 sura 11 788 3 => 791 3 => 794 sura 12 812 -1 => 811  
1 => 812 sura 13 479 1 => 480 0 => 480 sura 14 452 0 => 452 0  
=> 452 sura 15 323 0 => 323 0 => 323 sura 29 554 0 => 554 0 =>  
554 sura 30 396 -3 => 393 0 => 393 sura 31 298 -1 => 297 0 =>  
297 sura 32 154 1 => 155 0 => 155

count of M sura 2 2195 -1 => 2194 1 => 2195 sura 3 1251 5 =>  
1256 -7 => 1249 sura 7 1165 -3 => 1162 2 => 1164 sura 13 260 0 =>  
260 0 => 260 sura 29 347 -3 => 344 0 => 344 sura 30 318 -1 =>  
317 0 => 317 sura 31 177 -4 => 173 0 => 173 sura 32 158 0 => 158  
0 => 158

Somehow it still continues to astound me that Dr. Khalifa never wavered from his claim that his numbers proved the perfect preservation of the Qur'an, even when he began changing the Qur'an to make his results neater. Each change in the numbers brought a new method of analysis which recovered the "miracle."

In the light of the above figures, I look at a statement in the April 1990 Submitters Perspective: "The Quran's mathematical composition is so vast and intricate that we do not expect these people who cannot even count simple letters to go beyond the opening verse in the Quran."

Who can't count letters? Who publishes extravagant claims before doing the work to back them up? This fact, if verifiable, by itself, would bring the Nineteen to the edge of certainty. It is the simplest rule that produces the most hits. With facts 30-32, we have all thirteen A initialed suras producing (it is claimed) ZMN totals within each sura. The chance of this occurring without a code or other underlying cause is about one in 42 followed by 15 zeros.

Unfortunately, the most likely explanation is manipulation of the count of A (Alif) to produce the ZMN totals. In fact, the very simplicity and depth of this claim, compared with many of the others, is evidence that the "Miracle" is indeed an artifact of the investigation process. Where is not necessary to resort to arbitrary combinations (because the letter counts themselves can be arbitrarily altered due to the ambiguities around A), no such combinations are needed to find ZMN.

YUKSEL: I have always found the count of A.L.M. letters problematic. However, I do not think that it is unverifiable. By a comparative and analytical study of earlier manuscripts, I believe, it is possible to obtain an accurate count of Alifs. I strongly believe that the count of ALM of six chapters will produce a ZMN total. I do not expect them to have ZMN totals within each sura, since the pattern seen in other initials does not require it. Dr. Khalifa became aware of the errors after they were indicated by critics. We were planing to an extensive research on the count of A (Alif). However, he could not fulfill the plan since Sunni fanatics brutally assassinated him in January 1990. Inshallah, one day we will fulfill this research.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "I have always found the count of A.L.M. letters problematic."

Yuksel is the only dedicated Khalifite who has ever admitted this to me. (Milan Sulc believes in numerical coherency in the Qur'an, but is not, most definitely, a Khalifite.) But this is obvious to anyone who actually tries to count alif and verify Khalifa's counts.

YUKSEL: Lomax, somehow, is sparing Milan Sulc from his derogatory label. This way, he put himself in a position of a fair judge.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "However, I do not think that it is unverifiable. By a comparative and analytical study of earlier manuscripts, I believe, it is possible to obtain an accurate count of Alifs."

Having examined the Tashkent copy, which is one of the two earliest known manuscripts of the Qur'an, I am very skeptical. For one thing, it appears that the early

manuscripts were not identical. For sure, the Tashkent copy does not confirm Khalifa's counts. As Yuksel has noted, hamza was not used in the Tashkent Qur'an, and it was variation in the count of hamza which allowed Khalifa to assert 19-divisibility. Is it not odd that one finds the most perfect pattern of 19-divisibility, a pattern which repeats itself across many Suras with no change in the apparent rule for counting, where it was possible for Khalifa to modify his counts pretty much at will?

YUKSEL: After seeing the problem in the count of A.L.M., Lomax does not hesitate to call it as "the most perfect pattern of 19-divisibility" I wonder whether he would say similar things about the counts of H.M letters or K.H.Y.'A.S. or Q, or Y.S., if some errors were found in them.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "I strongly believe that the count of ALM of six chapters will produce a ZMN total. I do not expect them to have ZMN totals within each sura, since the pattern seen in other initials does not require it. Dr. Khalifa became aware of the errors after they were indicated by critics."

Khalifa's method was generally to count and keep recounting until the count came out to a multiple of 19. Then he would publish. But Yuksel has essentially acknowledged that this pattern has not yet been verified. And this makes the claims that it is proof of a miracle false and misleading.

Yuksel wrote, " We were planning to do an extensive research on the count of A (Alif). However, he could not fulfill the plan since Sunni fanatics brutally assassinated him in January 1990. Inshallah, one day we will fulfill this research."

Someday, someone will find a way to combine fragments of the early manuscripts with more modern texts in such a way that a pattern of 19 will be reported with more substance. But since there is no way to authoritatively determine what the original manuscript was for the Qur'an (there were, it is very likely, variations between the 'Uthmanic copies in the writing of alif, which often does not affect pronunciation -- which makes it very difficult to check), this will mean nothing.

This is why an overall pattern, combining all occurrences of an initial letter set, is such a poor coding. It is true that it is very sensitive to errors: even one error destroys the pattern. But a good coding will remain even if single bits are destroyed; enough of the pattern will be left that the original message can be reconstructed. Now, this possibility is truly exciting, and it is what attracted me initially to the "miracle of the nineteen." But it is not that kind of pattern, and if it is, it must be said that it has been applied by people who do not understand the laws of probability and the danger of creating the pattern out of selective analysis.

YUKSEL: A good lecture. And it is the right place to repeat the rhetoric once more. After witnessing Lomax' attitude towards the clearest and basic facts I really do not much hope that he can ever see the miracle of the Quran.

### **CLAIM 30-38**

The initials of seven suras initialed with ALR, ALMS, or ALMR, occur in their respective suras ZMN times.

LOMAX: Unverifiable (30-32), false (31). See Fact 29. Note that Dr. Khalifa's totals for R and S have changed over the years, and, as mentioned above (Fact 24), he has altered the count of S in chapter 7 by changing the text.

YUKSEL: Verifiable (30-32). Again, a comprehensive comparative research on older versions can verify the count of these initials. The "alteration" in the count of S in chapter 7 is in fact a correction directed by the mathematical system and supported by the oldest versions of the Quran. The peculiar spelling of the word "BaSTatan" of 7:96 in modern versions is another evidence for the justification of this correction. It is Lomax and the majority of Muslims who have a version of the Quran with an altered text! We have discussed this issue in our defense on claim 24 in detail.

LOMAX: Yuksel's statement that these claims are verifiable is a mere insertion and shows no appreciation for the difficulty. Further, it is dishonest to claim the counts of Sad in ALMS without noting the textual variation which is followed. IF one has shown that there is a pattern in initial letter counts which is outside of normal statistical variation, then it might be possible to assert that the use of S in the modern texts is an error. But Yuksel has exaggerated the case, I suspect. I know of one ancient text which has a Sin in the place of Sad in the passage in question. It is possible that others exist; but it is my understanding that there are other ancient texts with a Sad there. This is a textual variation; it is not the only such variation.

YUKSEL: This is the only textual variation that is acknowledged in a unique way: an idiosyncratic spelling of the word in the versions that contain the error. This peculiarity explains everything regarding the variation. Somehow Lomax is unable see this clear sign.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The peculiar spelling of the word "Bastatan" of chapter 7 in modern versions is another evidence for the justification of this correction. It is Lomax and majority of Muslims who have a version of the Quran with an altered text! We have discussed this issue in our defense on claim 24 in detail.

I have the Tashkent Qur'an showing this variation. But it also has other variations which demolish the Khalifite claim of 2698 occurrences of Allah in the Qur'an. Once again, if one can pick and choose pieces out of texts, it becomes possible to create, deliberately or otherwise, this fairly fragile "miracle." Further, the texts of the Qur'an, quite obviously, are not what was protected by Allah, for they all contain variations. Rather, it is something else. Perhaps it is the recited Qur'an, though variations exist with that, as well. My own view is that it is the message which is eternally preserved; individual letters are not that important. The reports that the Prophet (SAS) allowed recitation in dialect confirm this view....

YUKSEL: I do not want to repeat my response. There are only few instances that we referred to ancient copies of the Quran, and with a good reason. Lomax, as usual, exaggerates it.

Lomax, with his theory of the Quran, cannot defend any claim regarding the preservation of the Quran. It is a historical fact that the original Quran, the Quran written by Muhammad disappeared while Muhammad's grave, cloth, teeth and hair were well preserved! The original Quran reportedly was burned by Marwan, the Umayyad ruler. If someone asks: "how do you know that this verse or that verse is from the Quran?" what will be his answer? "My friend, or father-in-law recites it this way?"



### CLAIM 33

The initials "H" (Ha), "T.H." (Ta Ha), "T.S." (Ta Seen) and "T.S.M." (Ta Seen Mim) occur in the suras (19, 20, 26, 27 & 28) a total of 1767 times, or 19x93.

LOMAX: Arbitrary, anecdotal. First, it should be noted that the "Ha" here is different from the "Ha" in "Ha Mim." Dr. Khalifa and his followers use a non-standard system of transliteration which obscures some of the differences. My system is also non-standard, but is designed to allow the distinction of letters. Here we are discussing "h", "Ha Mim" uses "H".

Second, and perhaps most important, there is no visible logic to the lumping together of these particular initials, except that the result is ZMN. Suras 20, 26, 27, and 28 at least share one common initial as the first initial. But "Ha" is not an isolated initial. Sura 19 is prefixed with KHY'AS. Why count h and not KY'A, and S? Why include Sura 19 at all?

Third, I note again that the counts of these letters changed repeatedly over the years, yet each change simply brought a new method of analysis to find a ZMN total. Either the invocation was included with each sura, or not included at all, or just included once for the total and not for each sura. The suras were combined in different ways as well.

YUKSEL: The claim appears to be arbitrary and anecdotal as Lomax said. I wish I had time and resources to count those letters using the earliest manuscripts. Lomax is unfair by criticizing Dr. Khalifa for non-standard system of transliteration. He could see that Dr. Khalifa distinguishes Arabic letters in VP (Visual Presentation).

LOMAX: Dr Khalifa was not "criticized" for using a non-standard system. It was merely mentioned to point out that the letter h and H were not the same. As I have pointed out, my own system is also non-standard, being designed to allow ASCII characters to designate unique Arabic letters, without using digraphs.

YUKSEL: I found your system much more obscure and complicated.

### **CLAIM 34**

When we add the sura number, plus the number of its verses, plus the sum of verse numbers in each sura, we find the grand total for the 29 initialed suras is 190122, or  $19 \times 10007$ .

LOMAX: True, arbitrary. This Fact should be considered together with Facts 18 and 35.

YUKSEL: The claim is true, but arbitrary. Adding sura numbers, plus the number of its verses, plus the sum of verse numbers in each sura is an arbitrary arrangement, since it is one out of many possible arrangements.

LOMAX: Once again, Yuksel is unique among Khalifites for acknowledging much of what is clearly true. But he does not see the degree to which arbitrary selection of counting methods penetrates Khalifa's claims.

YUKSEL: We will see together inshallah!

### CLAIM 35

The same calculations for the 85 un-initialed suras produces 156066, or  $19 \times 8214$ .

LOMAX: False if unqualified. If Claim 34 and 35 are true then Claim 18 is true. (ZMN plus ZMN always equals ZMN.) Therefore Fact 18 is redundant.

Using the Medinah edition, this Claim is only true if one or more verse counts are changed. One possibility is to eliminate any two verses from chapter 9. Presumably this is what has been done. However, there are many other ways to make this total come out ZMN. The elimination of one verse from any chapter having a number of verses which is 11 modulo 19 (has a remainder of 11 when divided by 19) will produce this result, in particular, 37:182, 52:49, 62:11, 67:30, 89:30, 93:11, 100:11, and 101:11. The same result, of course, would appear if a verse were merely combined with the preceding or following verse, as many are in recitation. Thus there are 335 places where a small change which might have been invisible to the main guardians of the Qur'an (the reciters from memory) would have produced a ZMN total.

Similarly we could add a verse (or split a verse, which is also common in recitation) where there are 5 modulo 19 verses. 4:176, 53:62, 59:24, 97:5, 105:5, 111:5, and 113:5 fit this criterion, or another 282 verses.

The addition of a verse from 21:112, 54:55, 83:36, 86:17, or the elimination of a verse from 8:75, 39:75, 49:18, 64:18, 74:56 will have no effect on the remainder modulo 19. Basically, the statistic in this Fact is a poor guardian against change. Most of the other statistics are sensitive to changes of one word or one letter or one verse, this one is not (and the same is true for Fact 18 and Fact 34).

What is hidden by the complexity of this statistic is that it is simply dependent on the pattern of verses. Why is the statistic not simply the sum of the verse totals? That answer is obvious: because it does not come out zero modulo 19. So our diligent researchers simply look for another measure that does. There is no end to this.

YUKSEL: I agree with Lomax that the statistic in this claim is a poor guardian against change. However, we should always consider all examples as a whole. Though one of the three claims is redundant, the chance for the two cases to produce ZMN total is  $1/361$ . The three claims can be summarized in one claim: "When we add the sura number, plus the number of verses, plus the sum of verse numbers in each sura, we find the grand total for the 29 initialed suras 190122, or  $19 \times 10007$ . The same calculations for the 85 un-initialed suras produces 156066, or  $19 \times 8214$ ." Again, I see an arbitrary selection of combinations in this calculation.

LOMAX: Once again, I will object to the statement of a probability without stating the experimental conditions. It is true that there is one chance in 361 for two independent random numbers to both be divisible by 19. But both these numbers have

been selected out of a much larger universe of possible ways of counting suras and verses, and, further, the sum of verse numbers is not independent of the number of verses.

YUKSEL: Lomax has a point here. As I expressed earlier, this claim does not have significance.

LOMAX: It follows that if the original number is divisible by 19, and it is also divisible by 2 (i.e., it is divisible by 38), then the sum will also be divisible by 19. Another way of putting this is that half of all numbers which are divisible by 19 will show an integer sum which is also divisible by 19.

YUKSEL: This is not true. For instance, 2698 is divisible by 38, that is, 19 and 2, but the sum of its integers are not divisible by 19.

### CLAIM 36

The numbers mentioned in the Qur'an are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 99, 100, 200, 300, 1000, 2000, 3000, 5000, 50000 and 100000. The sum of these numbers is 162146, or  $19 \times 8534$ .

LOMAX: Anecdotal. I have not verified this statistic. It is not clearly specified. Is the sum the sum of the numbers mentioned, each one being counted once? (No, that does not equal 162146.) Does it include all uses of the dual, which is the normal way in Arabic to indicate that there are two of something? In fact, most nouns clearly indicate whether one is speaking of one, two, or more than two, so the singular is definitely present in the language as well. This is not an easy statistic to check without the kind of publication that Dr. Khalifa produced in VP.

YUKSEL: The claim is interesting, and significant if other related cases are considered. I have verified this statistic. Each number is counted once and they add up to 162146. Lomax most likely omitted the number 50000 while trying to verify (indeed, falsify!) this claim, since I corrected his quotation. The claim is not vague and cannot be clearer. The numbers have nothing to do with dual or plural forms of words. This is one of the easiest statistic to check, since it is based on the sum of all the different numbers mentioned in the Quran. To falsify this claim you need only to show a Quranic number which is not mentioned in the claim, or vice versa.

I would like to mention here another claim made by a Syrian author which I have not verified yet. All the numbers mentioned in the Quran, with repetitions, occur 285 times, that is,  $19 \times 15$ . The total of all these 285 numbers is claimed to be also multiple of 19.

LOMAX: I checked my copy of Submitter's Perspective from which this claim was taken. 50,000 was also missing from the list there. With the restoration of this number to the list, the sum is indeed 162146. The claim that it is significant if "other related cases are considered" is empty unless the principle for relating cases is stated.

YUKSEL: Well, I checked mine and saw 50,000 was not missing (Muslim Perspective, September 1988). Probably, Lomax has another issue, or just have obtained a Warsh version of Muslim Perspective ;-)

Sadrudin (sotec@HK.Super.NET) wrote: "Br. Yuksel has put it very aptly. These numbers do add up to 162146. I do not understand how br. Lomax can say otherwise. If it were untrue, one only needs to point out which number does not appear in the Quran, or state any other number that does."

LOMAX: Yuksel misquoted my original list of numbers, which was taken from the list of claims printed in Submitter's Perspective. That original list was missing one of the numbers. Yuksel did note that he had "corrected" my list, but then he speculated that

the error was mine and made out of eagerness to refute. But I specifically stated that I had not verified the list.

Many, perhaps most, of the numerical claims turn out to be true if the method of counting is properly qualified, in other words, if the choices which might be made in counting are precisely specified.

YUKSEL: Again another "wobbly" argument. Lomax appears to be accepting the numerical structure. He just wants us to specify things (some of the elementary facts too) more clearly.

LOMAX: What must be understood, however, is that this particular claim is anecdotal; i.e., it is not part of a clear pattern.

YUKSEL: Again, Lomax parades with his pattern: "it is not part of a clear pattern." Aren't we examining the importance of the number 19 in the mathematical system of the Quran? What can be clearer than to check the numbers mentioned in the Quran? What is more reasonable than to examine their total?

LOMAX: There are many different ways to count the occurrences of numbers in the Qur'an. This particular way, the brother has verified as totaling a multiple of 19. Probably most of the other ways do not. This actually proves nothing.

YUKSEL: Again, Lomax is talking about "different ways" to count of numbers in the Quran. How many different ways? We witnessed how he counted the letters of Bismillah in different ways, and we saw how he counted the number of chapters in different ways! Obviously, he can come up with many different, but false ways of counting things.

Yes, the number of all numbers is important and it is not multiple of 19, since there are 30 non-repeated numbers in the Quran. However, there are only 8 different fractions mentioned in the Quran. The total of all numbers, without repetition again is divisible by 19.

LOMAX: One can find a practically infinite number of 19-divisible statistics in any large collection of random numbers. But to qualify as a clear code, there would need to be something very different from these anecdotal statistics. For example, if every sura initialed by the initial letters, contained those letters an exact multiple of 19 times, then there would be a very strong evidence. Now, there are several ways to understand what I have written, and by applying different understandings, one might be able to say, yes, there are these multiples: but I am referring to a single method of counting.

Khalifa did report such a pattern with the suras involving alif and a few others; if these reports were verifiable, the kind of evidence needed to assert a code with confidence would have already been discovered. But the alif counts are not verifiable, for reasons which have already been presented in detail. As to the other suras, it is true for

Sura Qaf; for Nun, it is necessary to use a non-standard spelling. Khalifa also reports 19-divisibility for the initial letters of Sura 19. If this latter report is true, there are two Suras that have the pattern reported in the received Hafs Madina text. This is not statistically significant. Nor would be particularly significant.

YUKSEL: It is incredible to see how Lomax craftily ignores the pattern in initials of Chapter 36 (Y.S.), of seven chapters starting with H.M., the three chapters starting with letter S., etc. As I have explained earlier, all the counts of these chapters follow the same method of counting and are divisible by 19. We should listen to the warning of our Creator, the Lord of the Day of Judgment:

"Do not confound the truth with falsehood, nor shall you conceal the truth, knowingly" (2:42).

### CLAIM 37

Why 19? Nineteen is the Gematrical value of the Arabic word "WAHD" which means ONE. "WaHd" has a Gematrical value of  $W(6) + A(1) + H(8) + D(4) = 19$ .

LOMAX: False. Causation has not been established. The question "Why 19?" is essentially the question asked by the unbelievers and those in whose hearts is a disease (74:31), and the reasons are given there. This is not one of them. Further, the value of this word depends on how it is spelled. If it is waHd, then, indeed, the value is 19. But if it is spelled wHd (with upright fetha on the w), then the value is 18. Now, the edition of the Qur'an that Dr. Khalifa has reproduced in VP (which generally matches Madinah) shows the word as wHd at 41:6, 42:8, and 38:65. I haven't seen it spelled as waHd in his text. But it appears from his counts of "A" that he may be counting the upright fetha as "A". Once again, what text is he using?

When Dr. Khalifa's critics count upright fetha in claiming that the invocation does not have only 19 letters, his follower says "these people ... cannot even count simple letters." From 2:13, "When it is said to them: "Believe as the people believe, they say, shall we believe as the fools believe? Are they not indeed the fools? But they do not know."

YUKSEL: The Abjad (Gematrical) value of "waHd" is 19, if it is spelled with "a" (Alif). Lomax is right in his criticism regarding the different spelling of this word. In order to answer this criticism conclusively I need to have a research on the topic. The Gematrical value of "waHd" (One) being 19 is a common knowledge for both Arabs and Jews. Here I would like to quote from Dr. Cesar Adib Majul, former dean of Institute of Islamic Studies, University of Philippines:

"Incidentally, that 19 is the numerical value of Wahid in terms of the Abjad is well known to persons knowing both the Abjad and the "Names" of Allah, especially those enumerated in the so-called "Ninety-nine Names of Allah." Such knowledge has also been in the possession of many persons in parts of the Muslim world who applied it for astrological, magical and other superstitious purposes. Relations between the Abjad and Names of Allah can also be found in Western literature of the last century. (See for example, the article on "Da'wah" in Thomas Patrick Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, London, 1885, pp. 73-76; and Ja'far Sharif, Islam in India: Qanun-i-Islam, translated by G. A. Heklots, pp. 255-258.) To some students such correlation was simply utilized to distinguish such names in terms of their numerical values. For example, J. Redhouse used the Abjad to distinguish the Name Wajid (numerical value of 14) from WaHid (numerical value of 19). (See J. W. Redhouse, "On 'The Most Commonly Names,' i.e., The Laudatory Epithets, or the Titles of Praise bestowed on God in the Quran or by Muslim writers." Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. Volume XII, 1880, p. 65). But all this is a matter of numerals; it was Dr. Khalifa who first pointed out that the number 19 is not just a number serving merely as a base for the mathematical structure of the Quran, but that it has a reference to the Quranic argument that Allah is One." (The Names of Allah in



Relation To the Mathematical Structure of Quran, Cesar Adib Majul Ph.D., Islamic Productions, Tucson, 1982, p. 13).

The "causal relation" between 19 and WaHid (One), is very clear for me. Dr. Majul's work establishes the relationship between 19 and God's attributes with a very strong argument. I will give an example of that argument at the end of this defense, God willing.

Lomax does not see any relation between the number 19 and God's attribute "WaHd." Obviously, Lomax is not taking the entire Quran in regard of the meaning of 74:31. A careful study of the Quran puts God's oneness in a very close relation with the objectives mentioned in 74:31. Those unbelievers and hypocrites who block themselves from understanding the meaning and implication of 19 after it is revealed by God; they are the ones who are not happy with ONE GOD as the ONLY source of power and religion. Those who are not satisfied with God and His word ALONE, those who associate fabricated medieval narration (Hadith and Sunna) and sectarian jurisprudence issued by Muslim clerics (ulama) are handicapped from seeing this great mathematical structure. To witness the relation between 19 and the authenticity of the Quran and its prime message, that is, oneness of God, requires some qualifications. The Quran repeatedly mentions those qualifications.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "The Abjad (Gematrical) value of "waHd" is 19, if it is spelled with "a" (Alif). Lomax is right in his criticism regarding the different spelling of this word. In order to answer this criticism conclusively I need to have a research on the topic. The Gematrical value of "waHd" (One) being 19 is a common knowledge for both Arabs and Jews."

Yes, but the point is that this is not the Qur'anic spelling of the word. Rather, it is based on the non-Qur'anic language. I might add, however, that, long before I heard this argument from Khalifa as to why 19, I was asked the same question by Abdul Aziz Said at American University in Washington, D.C. My answer was, immediately, "wahid." I then checked the abjad values, and, indeed, they came out to 19. I did not even know all the abjad values at that time, and I still do not. I had to look them up.

YUKSEL: I am cautious about making such a universal claim regarding the spelling of "waHd" before an extensive and comparative study.

LOMAX: I will not repeat the quotation from Dr. Majul, whom I knew from Tucson before I knew Dr. Khalifa, and whom I also recently had the pleasure of seeing again. I will say that he was absolutely opposed to the kind of extreme conclusions to which Khalifa took his work on the 19. Like many, he initially supported Dr. Khalifa's work, then warned Khalifa of extremes of interpretation, extremes which were not supported by the data. The 19 in the Qur'an is quite interesting; regardless of what subsequent research may show. But we did not suspect that Khalifa had falsified data, and it appears that he did, whether deliberately or not is open to interpretation. The strongest case may be made with the alif data, but it can also be seen that he was less than

forthcoming in many other situations where his data was based on special interpretation or textual variation. We have already discussed this in the case of the extra Nuwn at the beginning of Sura Qalam. It was altered in Visual Presentation (by Yuksel, he now tells us), without any notice that there was anything unusual. In the context of a stand-alone "proof" of the miracle, this is nothing less than deceptive.

YUKSEL: I know Dr. Majul too and occasionally exchange ideas with him. He is cautious by nature and feels free to criticize Rashad whom he still calls as "ustad" (teacher). He communicated with Rashad until his assassination. Dr. Majul is well convinced about the miraculous mathematical code.

The real "deception" is trying every means possible to fight against "one of the greatest" signs of God.

### CLAIM 38

The Word "WAHD" (ONE), referring to God occurs 19 times.

LOMAX: False. I find the following 21 occurrences: 2:133, 2:163, 4:171, 5:73, 6:19, 9:31, 12:39, 13:16, 14:48, 14:52, 16:22, 16:51, 18:110, 21:108, 22:34, 29:46, 37:4, 38:5, 38:65, 39:4, and 41:6. Now, I haven't checked every one of them. I notice that 3 have a closing "A", which I understand does not change the meaning in the least: 2:133, 9:31, and 38:5. I don't see any way to come up with 19.

YUKSEL: The claim is false if the word had been counted with a consistent method used for the count of other specific words, such as, Raheem (Merciful=114), Yawm (Day=365), etc. There are 22 occurrences of the word "WaHd" (One) in the Quran. Lomax has missed the occurrence in verse 40:16. Here I want to congratulate Lomax for not having problem in identifying and counting a word correctly. Had he employed the same method in other cases such as in the count of Rahim he would not have problem with Claim 3. Evidently, Lomax deviates from this authentic method whenever it confirms the mathematical structure of the Quran, and he employs it whenever he sees that it does not bring the number 19, the number that he tries hard to escape from. In our language we call this kind of behavior as double standard. Some use double standard to increase the number of mathematical pattern, while Lomax does the same thing to blind himself to the physical facts. Where is objectivity?

By the way, the frequency and gematrical values of divine attributes demonstrate a marvelous mathematical pattern. We have demonstrated it in "The Prime Argument" a two-round debate with Dr. Carl Sagan. That pattern would have been destroyed if the occurrence of "Wahid" were 19.

LOMAX: Yuksel is, simply speaking, making polemic where there is only caution. What I have consistently said is that Khalifa did not follow a consistent counting method. In some cases, I could not find a method of selection which would give Khalifa's results, in which case I simply reported all possible forms known to me. Yuksel now calls this the 'authentic method,' but earlier he claimed other standards, for example with counting the first word in the bismillah. I'd say the first word in the bismillah is either bi or bism. Is it not?

YUKSEL: As I stated before, the word "BSM" is the ONLY exception, and I have cited some possible reasons for that exception. Lomax, intoxicated with his agenda is not ready to reflect on it.

"Bi" is not a word. It is the pronunciation of letter "B", the second letter in Arabic Alphabet. Lomax needs to study elementary instead of advanced Arabic. Remember, that he was not able to identify Arabic letters.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "In our language we call this kind of behavior as double standard. Some use double standard to increase the number of mathematical pattern,

while Lomax does the same thing to blind himself to the physical facts. Where is objectivity?"

Indeed. What is the objective standard? That is the very question raised by the Draft FAQ, which, so far, Yuksel has not answered, instead occupying himself with this old paper. By the way, the full original paper is still available on request by e-mail from me, which is the only way it has ever been distributed, except where some persons uploaded it to AOL or Compuserve file archives. I still find the paper useful as a record of my inquiry into the 19, but it is by no means free of errors or complete.

YUKSEL: I have answered this before.

LOMAX: Yuksel wrote, "By the way, the frequency and gematrical values of divine attributes demonstrate a marvelous mathematical pattern. We will give some examples of this in the end of this first round debate, God willing. That pattern would have been destroyed if the occurrence of 'Wahid' were 19." There is no end to claims. So far, not one has produced anything more than a mild coincidence, on close examination. What Yuksel has mentioned is at the core of this hoax. If one count does not work out, another can be found which does. Since there is no practical limit to the number of ways in which the text can be analysed, there will be more and more of these "amazing facts." And some of them will be quite amazing, indeed. But as long as the probabilities are down in the millions and billions or so, it only means that some cleverness has been exercised in the search process. Now, if it were possible to verify that alif count....

YUKSEL: Whenever Lomax fears that dealing with an impressive pattern will put him in trouble, he resorts to his apparently sound general rhetoric. The pattern observed in the triple relation among the frequency of the words in Bismillah and the frequency and gematrical value of the attributes of God is enough by itself to show a "simple to understand and impossible to imitate" mathematical system in the Quran.

"Enlightenments have come to you from your Lord. As for those who can see, they do so for their own good, and those who turn blind, do so to their own detriment. I am not your guardian" (6:104).

### CLAIM 39

The word "Alone" (Wahdahu), when it refers to God, occurs in (7:70, 39:45, 40:12 & 84, and 60:4); the sum of these numbers is 361, or 19x19.

LOMAX: False. The usage in 17:46 is also in reference to God, as "rbk" (your Lord). The arbitrariness of this statistic is extreme. What we have is the numbers of the suras in which the word occurs, plus the numbers of the verses. In spite of the fact that there are two occurrences in sura 40, 40 is only counted once in the sum. Why? Why do you think?

YUKSEL: The claim is true. The usage in 17:46 is NOT a reference to God. The verse is commonly mistranslated by the followers of Hadith and Sunna, since the verse clearly rejects other sources besides the Quran as the source of divine law. This verse is one of those miraculous verses that is a self-proof for its own claim. Those who are not certain about the hereafter are blocked from understanding the Quran and witnessing its miracle.

Muslim clergy, who promote mishmash collections of primitive fabrications that were compiled two centuries after Prophet Muhammad, have distorted the meaning of many Quranic verses. Lomax is referring to those mistranslations that conforms to pagan medieval Arab culture disguised in Hadith books. For those who want to investigate, I will write the transliteration of the original followed by its correct translation. I will explain, God willing, why the translation of orthodox Muslims is false.

"Wa jaalna 'ala qulubihim akinnatan an yafqahu wa fi azanihim waqra. Wa iza zukkirat rabbuka fil QURANI WAHDAHU wallaw 'ala adbarihim nufura." (17:46).

The translation:

"We place shields around their minds, to prevent them from understanding it, and deafness in their ears. And when you commemorate your Lord in the QURAN ALONE, they run away in aversion."

The orthodox translation of the phrase in question is "when you commemorate your LORD ALONE in the Quran..." As you can see we differ regarding where to place the adjective "wahdahu" (alone). The Arabic text uses the adjective after the Quran, not right after the word Lord. In order to make this argument clear for those who do not know Arabic, I will kick the ball to Lomax: "If you want to translate our translation to Arabic how would you say it?" Please consult those who know Arabic without reporting this debate. First ask them this question: "How can you translate this phrase to Arabic: 'when you commemorate your Lord in the Quran alone?'" Then, ask them to translate 'when you commemorate your Lord alone in the Quran.'

I believe this is the right time to demonstrate Lomax' real problem: he does not accept God alone as the source of his religion. He cannot trust God when He repeatedly

asserts that the Quran is detailed, clear, and is sufficient as the source of divine guidance. He chooses man-made fabrications as his second source of religion and criticizes us for not accepting them. This wrong choice is what makes him blind and deaf to the mathematical miracle of the Quran. It is the same Lomax who is an extreme skeptic in regard of mathematical system of the Quran. On the other hand is extremely gullible in accepting volumes of books full of nonsense, contradictions and lies attributed to Muhammad, the final prophet. In order to demonstrate his real problem and motives, I will quote some narration from Sunni's most authentic hadith books which Lomax has defended by any means possible on Internet.

"The Prophet never urinated in standing position" (Ibn Hanbal 6/136,192,213). "The prophet urinated in standing position" (Bukhari 4/60,62). "A group from the Ureyneh and Uqayleh tribes came to the prophet and the prophet advised them to drink urine of camels. Later on, when they killed the prophet's shepherd, the prophet seized them, gouged out their eyes, cut their hands and legs, and left them thirsty in the desert" (Bukhari 56/152, Ibn Hanbal 3/107,163). "Moses was scared by the angel of death, thus Moses slapped him and blinded one of his eyes". "I am the most honorable messenger, on the day of the judgment only I will think of my people" (Bukhari 97/36). "Do not make any distinction among the messengers; I am not even better than Jonah" (Bukhari 65/4,5; Ibn Hanbal 1/205,242,440). "Bad luck is in the woman, the horse, and the home" (Bukhari 76/53). "If a monkey, a black dog or a woman passes in front of a praying person, his prayer is nullified." (Bukhari 8/102; Ibn Hanbal 4/86). "The prophet gave permission to kill children and women in war" (Bukhari, Jihad/146; Abu Dawud 113). "The earth is carried on a giant bull; when it shakes its head an earthquake occurs" (Ibn Kathir 2/29; 50/1). "Leaders have to be from the Quraish tribe" (Bukhari 3/129,183; 4/121; 86/31). "You shall kill all black dogs, because they are devils" (Ibn Hanbal 4/85; 5/54). "God is the time" (Muwatta 56/3). "To prove His identity, God opened his legs and showed the prophet His thigh." (Bukhari 97/24, 10/129 and the comment on the Sura 68.) "The parchment that the verse about stoning to death for adultery was written on was eaten and abrogated by a goat." (Ibni Majah 36/1944; Ibni Hanbal 3/61; 5/131,132,183; 6/269). "A tribe of monkeys arrested an adulterous monkey and stoned it to death, and I helped them" (Bukhari 63/27). "When the prophet died his armor had been pawned to a Jew for several pounds of barley." (Bukhari 34/14,33,88; Hanbal 1/ 300; 6/42,160,230). "The punishment for cutting the fingers of a woman is to pay her: 10 camels for one finger, 20 camels for two fingers, 30 camels for three fingers, and 20 (twenty) camels for four fingers" (Ibn Hanbal 2/182; Muwatta 43/11). "The prophet had been bewitched by a Jew, and for several days he did not know what he was doing" (Bukhari 59/11; 76/47; Ibn Hanbal 6/57; 4/367). "Muhammad possessed the sexual power of 30 men" (Bukhari). "Do not eat and drink with your left hand, because Satan eats and drinks with the left hand" (Ibn Hanbal 2/8,33). "The prophet said:'Do not write anything from me except the Quran. Whoever wrote, must destroy it" (Muslim, Zuhd 72; Ibn Hanbal 3/12,21,39). "The prophet ordered Amr Ibn As to write everything that he speaks" (Ibn Hanbal 2/162). "Omar said: Quran is enough for us, do not write anything from the prophet" (Bukhari, Jihad 176, Gizya 6, Ilim 49, Marza 17, Magazi 83, Itisam 26; Muslim, Wasiyya 20,21,22).

Here are more from Bukhari and Muslim, two most popular hadith books:

"The intelligence and the religion of women are incomplete." "If a monkey, a black dog, or a woman passes in front of a praying person, his prayer is nullified." "To find a good woman among women is similar to finding a white crow among a hundred crows." "The marriage commitment is a kind of slavery for women." "If anybody has been required to prostrate before others beside God, the woman should prostrate before her husband." "I have been shown the dwellers of hell; the majority of them were women." "If the body of the husband is covered with pus and his wife licks it with her tongue, she still will not be able to pay her debt to him."

Yes, Lomax is rejecting the correct translation of 17:46 in order to save the books that endorse these kind of narration. I cannot understand how one can preach righteousness and at the same time promote these primitive lies attributed to God and His messenger.

LOMAX: I have looked at a whole series of Muslim and non-Muslim translations of this verse. Khalifa is the only one who translates it as referring to the Qur'an. I have been aware of his interpretation for a long time. It sounds very wrong to me, for reasons which I have explained elsewhere. But my point, as it is relevant here, is that an occurrence is omitted based on an arbitrary consideration, and, further, that the counting method is also arbitrary in other ways. Normally, Yuksel admits this. But he is not doing so here, because this particular count is part of a centerpiece of Khalifite theology.

YUKSEL: The same Lomax, who proudly claims that he knows Arabic and that it is easy to read the Tashkent copy written without dots and vowels, is resorting to those translations which distort the meaning of many Quranic verses in order to make them compatible with Hadith. Why did not Lomax answer my translation by his own advanced Arabic? The verse is very short and has a very simple Arabic. Unfortunately, translations of the Quran authored by those who do not believe in the divine assertion that the Quran is complete, detailed, clear and the only source of God's religion, are full of distortions. Even non-Muslims are deceived by today's corrupt teaching. They consider hadith as the second source besides the Quran. I have written a book in Turkish on the topic: "Errors in Turkish Translations."

For those who are not scared to see common blunders of those translations, I will give our translation of a verse. As an example:

"If anyone thinks that God cannot support him in this life and in the Hereafter, let him turn completely to heaven (God), and sever (his dependence on anyone else). He will then see that this plan eliminates anything that bothers him." (22:15).

This verse is difficult to understand, unless its immediate context and Quran's overall message is studied. Now, please read "a whole series of Muslim and non-Muslim translations of this verse," and appreciate Dr. Khalifa's solitary translation. They attribute an absurd and ridiculous challenge to God Almighty. (For a collection of various

translations please see the Pakistani scholar Al-Maududi's commentary of the Quran: "Tafhim-ul Quran")

For other examples, please see my response to Sign Magazine.

LOMAX: [trash about Hadith and other irrelevancies omitted]

YUKSEL: Wow! Lomax is trashing my quotations from his second source of guidance. Lomax is probably embarrassed to see the glaring primitive stories next to his brilliant and scientific analysis. However, they are very relevant, since they shape his mind and block his vision. I wish he had trashed them forever.

I will end this argument with one of our discussion on Internet: "Why Trash All The Hadiths?" Hadith is a sneaky virus in the mind of Muslims, and it is very relevant to avoid it for the sake of our salvation.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**(BY DANIEL LOMAX)**

Of 39 "Simple Facts," only 16, that is, numbers 2, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, and 34, are clearly true. The most impressive of the "Facts" turn out to be either unverifiable or clearly false. Of the verified facts, I cannot say that the level of significance is sufficient even to warrant further investigation. If there is a code verifying the accurate preservation of the Qu'ran (or disproving it, as, ultimately, Dr. Khalifa was led to claim), it has not been discovered.

A code consists of more than just a number used in its calculations. Primarily, it is a method of calculation or translation. No consistent method was followed in the analyses behind the "39 Simple Facts." Such imprecision as to analytical method destroys the significance of the relationships which may be discovered, as one learns in the elementary study of statistics.

Dr. Khalifa's claims, at best, fall into the category of pious fraud. At worst, he was a messenger of Satan and a conscious deceiver: quoting the title of an article in the last issue of Submitters Perspective with his name on the masthead (March 1990), "A False Messenger is a Messenger of Satan." But I do not agree with the article. Like most of his writing, it is replete with non-sequiturs and false premises.

The new, additional miracles claimed by Dr. Khalifa's followers, so far, are uniformly anecdotal. It can be expected that with continued effort, many such statistics will be discovered. In fact, eventually I would expect some truly amazing "coincidences" to be found, especially if others continue to search. Of course, if Facts 29-32 are ever demonstrated, or the like of them, the whole matter will require reexamination.



One further consideration occurs to me, which I have never seen stated elsewhere. The Qur'an is a clear message; it is easily recognized as the message of God by those whose hearts are free from obstruction. Had God intended the Qur'an to carry a code verifying its perfect preservation, he could have done it much more effectively and simply than the complex, arbitrary, and inconclusive "code" claimed by Dr. Khalifa. I would expect the code, once discovered, to be as clear as the book itself.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**(BY EDIP YUKSEL)**

I would like to thank Lomax for articulating the view of those who reject the role of number 19 as a code of the mathematical structure of the Quran; his criticism gave us the chance to clarify the issue for those who need to hear both sides. I also congratulate him for his courage to discuss the issue publicly, which most of the Muslim scholars try hard to avoid it. It is unfortunate that his criticism is a mixture of reasonable criticism blended with blind refutation, a refutation by any means possible. We occasionally witnessed a topsy-turvy method of evaluation which reminds me the joke about a critic who finds an empty flower pot standing up-side-down on a table. The critic holds the pot and turns to his friend in astonishment: "look at this pot, it does not have opening." Then, he turns the empty pot up-side down to see the bottom. This time he exclaims in greater surprise: "wow, it does not have bottom either!" Similarly, Lomax tries to confuse the mathematical system. He tries to justify the existence of facts that he could not refute by a ridiculous and oximoronic interpretation: interesting examples of this incomplete, arbitrary, complex, anecdotal, meaningless and inconclusive mathematical structure is a plan of God (fitna) to test people who see a mathematical miracle in the Quran! Lomax is not able to see the logical problem with this interpretation.

His last paragraph, however, is the most ironic one. He claims that the Quran is clear, but the code 19 is not as clear as the book itself. It is ironic for several reasons. First, it was Lomax himself who just claimed that the verses of Chapter 74 were not clear. Second, we had a lengthy debate on the role of Hadith in Islam before this one. In that debate, Lomax repeatedly labeled many Quranic verses vague. For instance, he does not see the beginning verses of chapter 24 clear enough and accepts the pagan fabrications which inserts the punishment of "stoning to death" to Islam. Another example, despite the clear warning regarding man-made dietary prohibition (6:145-150), he accepts hadiths that fabricates numerous contradictory dietary prohibition. Now Lomax is telling us that he finds the Quranic message very clear. I hope he has changed his mind since our last argument.

After witnessing his ability to complicate the simplest facts, after witnessing his talent to cloud the clearest facts, I do not have much hope for him whether he can ever see any mathematical system in the Quran. Many smart, but extremely skeptic or fanatic people could not see the clearest miracles in the past. (6:25; 7:132; 15:14-15; 40:34). It is evident that the fuzziness and atmospherics are in his mind that complicates the simplest

facts for him. It is the Quranic prophecy that those who are not happy with GOD ALONE will not be able to understand the implication of 19 after its revelation. If Lomax really wants to see the truth, he must first stop associating man-made teachings as another source besides God's word (6:114). He must start enjoying mentioning God's name alone without adding Muhammad's name in his shahada (3:18; 39:45). Then, inshallah he will be able to see one of the greatest miracles (74:35).

Here I will list the clear examples of the mathematical structure of the Quran followed by other examples that were not mentioned by Lomax. New examples are marked with circles:

\* The first verse in the Quran, known as the "Basmalah" consists of 19 Arabic letters.

\* Every word in this verse is mentioned in the Quran in multiples of 19. a) The first word (Ism) is mentioned in the Quran 19 times,  $19 \times 1$ . b) The second word (Allah=God) is mentioned in the Quran 2698 times, or  $19 \times 142$ . c) The third word (Al-Rahman=Most Gracious) is mentioned in the Quran 57 times, or  $19 \times 3$ . d) The fourth word (Al-Raheem=Most Merciful) is mentioned in the Quran 114 times, or  $19 \times 6$ .

\* The multiplication factors of the words of the Basmalah mentioned above ( $1+142+3+6$ ) add up to 152, or  $19 \times 8$ .

\* The word God (Allah) is mentioned 2698 times as shown above,  $19 \times 142$ , and when we add the numbers of the verses wherever the word "God" occurs, the total comes to 118123, which equals to  $19 \times 6127$ .

\* Each letter of Arabic alphabet corresponds to a number according to their original sequence in the alphabet. The Arabs used this system for calculations. When the Quran was revealed 14 centuries ago, the numbers as we know today did not exist. A universal system was used where the letters of the Arabic, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek alphabets were used as numerals. The number assigned to each letter is its "Gematrical Value." A study on the gematrical values of more than 120 attributes of God that are mentioned in the Quran, shows that only four names have gematrical values that are multiples of 19. These are "Wahid" (One), "Zul Fadl al Azim" (Possessor of Infinite Grace), "Majid" (Glorious), "Jaami" (Summoner). Their gematrical values are 19, 2698, 57, and 114 respectively, which are all divisible by 19 and correspond exactly to the frequencies of occurrence of the Basmalah's four words.

\* The Quran consists of 114 chapters (Suras) which is  $19 \times 6$ .

\* The first verse, which can be considered as the foundation of the miracle, occurs 114 times despite its conspicuous [sic] absence from Sura 9 (it occurs twice in Sura 27) and 114 is  $19 \times 6$ .

\* From the missing Basmalah of Sura 9 to the extra Basmalah of Sura 27, there are precisely 19 chapters.

\* The total number of verses in the Quran is 6346, or  $19 \times 334$ . There are 6234 numbered verses and 112 unnumbered verses of Basmalahs, and  $6234 + 112 = 6436$ .

\* Twenty nine chapters starts with one letter or combination of letters. Exactly 19 of these chapters contain these combination of letters as independent verses.

\* Between the first initialed sura (Sura 2) and the last initialed sura (Sura 68) there are 38, or  $19 \times 2$  un-initialed suras.

\* Between the first and last initialed sura there are 19 sets of alternating "initialed" and "uninitialed" suras.

\* There are 114 ( $19 \times 6$ ) letter "Q" in the two chapters that start with the letter "Q".

\* The frequency, 114, is equal to the number of chapters in the Quran. This is numerically meaningful when we consider that the letter "Q" stands for the Quran.

\* It is a special feature of the letter "Q" to occur 57 ( $19 \times 3$ ) times in both Chapters.

\* Sura 68 is initialed with "N" (Noon), and contains 133 N's or  $19 \times 7$ . (if the initial letter is spelled NuN).

\* Three suras are prefixed with the initial "S" (Saad), and the total occurrence of the letter "S" in these suras is 152, or  $19 \times 8$ . (if the scribal error in the spelling of the word "baSTatan" of 7:69 is corrected).

\* Sura 36 is prefixed with the initials "Y.S." (Ya Seen) and the total occurrence of these two letters in this sura is 285, or  $19 \times 15$ .

\* The letters K (Kaf), H (Ha), Y (Ya), 'A ('Ayn), and S (Saad) occur in the "K.H.Y.'A.S."- initialed sura (Chapter Mary) 798 times, or  $19 \times 42$ .

\* The total occurrence of "H.M." (Ha Mim) in their 7 suras (40-46) is 2147, or  $19 \times 113$ .

\* There are four subgroups of chapters initialed with "H.M." whose combinations result in a multiple of 19. This can be seen as coincidence, since there are 112 possible combinations. However, if you add the digits of each frequency (the absolute value of each number) you will end up with 113, which is exactly equal to the multiplication factor. This is valid also for all the subgroups.

\* The total of "A.S.Q." in their Sura 42 is 209, or  $19 \times 11$ .

\* The numbers mentioned in the Qur'an are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 99, 100, 200, 300, 1000, 2000, 3000, 5000, 50000 and 100000. The sum of these numbers is 162146, or  $19 \times 8534$ .

\* Why 19? Nineteen is the gematrical value of the Arabic word "WAHD" which means ONE. WaHd has a gematrical value of  $(6) + A(1) + H(8) + D(4) = 19$ .

\* The key commandment: "You shall devote your worship to God alone" (in Arabic "Wahdahu") occurs in 7:70; 39:45; 40:12,84; and 60:4. The total of these numbers adds up to 361, or  $19 \times 19$ .

In Sura "The Hidden One," namely Sura 74, God informs us that if anyone claims that the Quran is man-made (verse 25), God will prove him wrong by the number 19 (verse 30). God says that this number serves five functions: a) to disturb the disbelievers, b) to convince the Christians and Jews that this is a divine scripture, c) to strengthen the faith of the faithful, d) to remove all traces of doubts from the hearts of Christians, Jews, as well as the believers, e) to expose those who harbor doubt in their hearts and the disbelievers. They will say, "what did God mean by this allegory?"

#### How Can One Distinguish Diamonds From Pieces of Glass?

It needs a good mathematical intuition and experience in order to distinguish arbitrary and selective calculations from a systematic and objective calculation. Here, I would like to give you three methods of recognizing pieces of glasses from diamonds. I cannot provide examples since I have literally thousands of them, and choosing the typical ones requires a lot of time. Also, I don't have much space here.

1. When you are provided by a calculation labeled as "mathematical miracle" don't just accept the claim without investigation (17:36). Be extremely careful for the temptation to please the person who wants to give you a ride in his/her fantasy bandwagon. Especially, be more careful when the person is using God's name and praising him after his/her so-called discoveries. You may attribute the absurd and most stupid calculations and ideas to the Greatest Mathematician, the Most Wise. You should check whether the method of calculation is arbitrary, and the claimed relations are personal speculations.

Each method of calculation weakens the significance of calculations. Two methods of calculations increase the probability twice. Three methods of calculation increases thrice, and four methods of calculations quadruples the probability. For instance, if you sometimes add numbers and sometimes put them next to each other and get multiple of 19, you need twice as many examples than usual in order for your arithmetic to go beyond probability and be considered interesting, or extraordinary.

Arbitrarily processing a bunch of arbitrarily selected chapter and/or verse numbers by an arbitrary process of adding or concatenating or both adding and

concatenating , and using an arbitrary number of items in this combination and finding a mathematical relation does not have any significance in the science of mathematics.

Finding a multiple of 19 by selecting a combination of two, or three, or four, or five, or .... verses out of more than 6000 Quranic verses and passing them through numerous different calculations does not have any objective quality of mathematics. Unfortunately, I have received many letters and bulletins filled with thousands of examples of deceptive calculations ending with "Praise be to God" or "Subhanallah."

The number of combinations (sets) that can be created out of more than six thousand elements exceed the biggest number known to our dictionaries, except googolplex, of course. According to the law of probability, there should be trillions of combinations that will form multiple of 19, since one out every 19 numbers will be multiple of 19. Some (thousands) of them, surely will show some semantic relation, especially, if the book contains repetitions and the discovery of relation and interpretation is left entirely to our wish!

2. Pay attention to the mathematical properties. Not only mathematical illiterates, but even a college educated person can be deceived by mathematical properties. They can see them as part of the divine mathematical design. For example, the total of all chapter numbers being multiple of 19, that is, 6555 ( $19 \times 345$ ), is a mathematical property. If the number elements in an addition is multiple of N, then, the total of those elements will be multiple of N too. Another example: The total of Chapter numbers from 9 to 27 ( $9+10+11+\dots+27$ ) is 342, and it must be multiple of 19, since exactly 19 consecutive numbers are added. Therefore, 342 being a multiple of 19 is a mathematical property in that context, since, the total of every consecutive N whole numbers is a multiple of N.

3. Claims should be "falsifiable." We can find or attach meaning or reference for any number. You can arbitrarily select some chapter or verse numbers and arbitrarily put them together by adding, dividing, multiplying, subtracting or concatenating, or by another method, and when finally you arrive to a number which you can relate to some Quranic or to a "special" number, you may exclaim "Subhanallah" thinking that you have discovered a great mathematical miracle.

We should pay special attention to the criterion of "falsifiability", since even university professors can fall victim in confusing expert manipulations with mathematical calculations. We should question those who arrive a certain number after using unlimited ways of calculations and different methods and then try to assign a meaning or a relation to that product. Here is the question:

Is it logically possible to 'falsify' your calculations and results? In other words, would it be wrong or a non-miracle if your result were Y instead of X? Or, in that case, couldn't you just find a relation or a meaning for Y in the Quran, or in the universe of numbers? If you had difficulty in putting that number in a context, wouldn't you add several more calculations and come up with a number that you could attach a meaning

to? It is a great responsibility to label your speculative and manipulative calculations as a "miracle" by claiming that God has calculated all the numbers."

It is therefore significant that the beginning verses of Chapter 74 warns us: "Do not be greedy!" (74:6).

### How Can One Distinguish A Good Scientific Theory From A Bad One?

According to the majority of scientists, a good scientific theory should demonstrate three qualifications:

1. It should have an explanatory power. 2. It should be able to make accurate prediction. 3. It should provide economy in thought.

When scientists are going to choose among alternative theories they act according to these three criteria. The advance in science and technology is the result of using these criteria. For instance, before the Copernican model of solar system was proved, scientists preferred Copernicus' sun-centered model to Ptolemaic earth-centered model by using these intuitive and practical criteria. History of science is full of positive results of these criteria.

In order to help those who consider the mathematical structure of the Quran as a "theory," we will evaluate the mathematical system according to the first two criteria. You think on the third one!

#### 1. Explanatory Power

1.1 The challenge of the Quran regarding the impossibility of imitating the unique and superhuman nature of the Quran gains an objective (mathematical) criterion with the code 19. The Quranic challenge (2:23-24) is provided a meaningful and universal arena, instead of practically meaningless (or, subjective) and culturally limited "literary miracle."

1.2 The evidence for a divine authorship being in a mathematical design in physical structure rather than being in eloquent use of Arabic is in harmony with the universal appeal and message of the Quran.

1.3 Initial Letters (Huruf-u Muqattaa) that prefixes 29 chapters obtains a unique meaning and purpose. Numerous speculations made by interpretators for fourteen centuries ending up or starting with the confession of "we really do not know their meaning" finally is replaced with a clear message.

1.4 The reason why the Quranic expression "These are the miracles (ayaat) of this book" follow the Initial Letters in all eight occurrences is understood.

1.5 The discussion regarding different spellings gain a new dimension. For instance, why the first word of Bismillahirrahmanirrahim "Bsm" (in the name) is written without "A" (Alif) and why the "Bism" in the first verse of Chapter Alaq (Embryo) is written with an "A" (Alif)?

1.6. The mathematical system puts an end to the chronic arguments among various sects whether Basmalah is the first verse of Chapter Al-Fatiha or not. Now, it is clear that the Basmalah in the beginning of Chapter Al-Fatiha (The Opener) is the first verse while other 112 Basmalahs crowning the other chapters are un-numbered verses.

1.7. It is not a question anymore why the Chapter 9 , Bara'ah (Ultimatum), does not start with Basmalah and why Chapter 27, Al-Naml (The Ant) contains an extra Basmalah. in verse 30.

1.8. The prophecy of Chapter 74, Al-Muddassir (The Hidden One), is unveiled and especially 74:31 is being fulfilled.

1.9. We have learned another reason why some numbers are mentioned in an unusual way. For instance, the Quran gives Noah's age with a subtraction, 1000 - 50. The number of years which the young monotheists spent in a cave is expressed with an addition, 300 + 9. There is a clear relation between these interesting unusual expressions and the mathematical code.

1.10. The question "Why the Quran consists of 114 chapters?" receives several meaningful answers.

1.11 The divine guarantee regarding the preservation of the Quran is confirmed by the discovery of the code. Thus, a skeptical argument that casts doubt on authenticity of the verses, including the ones that guarantee preservation of the Quran is refuted.

1.12. The historical speculations about what is "Ism-i Azam," the Greatest Name of God, are ended.

1.13. It becomes more evident that Prophet Muhammad was a literate "ummi" (gentile).

1.14. The identity of the witness mentioned in verse 46:10 is unveiled as Rabi Judah of the eleventh century. The identity of the curious creature made of earthly material that was prophesied in verse 27:82 is unveiled as the "computer."

1.15. The description of "Kitabun Marqum" (Numerically Coded Book) in verses 83:9 and 20 is clearly understood.

1.16. The question "Why Jonah (Yunus) is referred as 'Sahibul Hut' (The friend of fish) in verse 68:48 and referred as 'Zannoon' (Possessor of Noon)?" receives a meaningful explanation.

1.17. Quranic verses states that those who follow their parents and leaders blindly or those who rejects the truth with arrogance and ignorance are not able to see the clear miracles and signs. The mathematical miracle of the Quran proves to us this incredible fact. ----- 2. The accuracy or the predictive nature of The Mathematical Code Here I want to give two examples. First a spelling correction, second a prediction.

### 2.1 Correcting a scribal error

Three chapters of the Quran, chapter 7, 19 and 38 contains letter "Saad " in their initial letter combination. Curiously, in verse 7:69 we see a word with a unique spelling: "BaSTatan ." Over the letter "Saad " is written a small "Sin." This word occurs in the Quran with two different spellings and it makes no difference to the meaning. Just like the English words skeptic or skeptical. Commentaries of the Quran interpret it as an instruction on how to read the word. They claim that though it is written with "Saad" it should be read as if it is "Sin." They narrate three Hadiths (allegedly Muhammad's words) to support this interpretation .

The total number of "Saad" with this word "BaSTatan" becomes 153, and it is not multiple of 19. Therefore, we concluded that the letter "Saad " in the word "BaSTatan " is an orthographic error and should be corrected.

Indeed, when I checked one of the oldest manuscripts of the Quran, I found that our prediction was confirmed. Please see the document below:

### 2.2. Symmetry in the table of God's names

In my second letter I had attached a list of God's names with their numerical values and frequencies in the Quran, and the mathematical relation between these names and "Basmalah."

Dr. Cezar Edip Majul, in his book "The Names of Allah in Relation To The Mathematical Structure of Quran" discovered the following two facts:

1. Only four names (adjectives) of God have Gematrical (numerical) values that are a multiple of 19.

2. The numerical values of these four names exactly correspond to the frequency of the four words of "Basmalah," that is, 19, 2698, 57, and 114.

While I studied this table I noticed an asymmetry. On the right side of the table there are four names of God, but on the left side there are only three. Obviously, "Ism" (Name) was not a name of God. Therefore, I made two predictions. There must be one name of God that must have a frequency of 19, and only four names of God must have frequencies of multiple of 19. When I examined the frequency of all the names of God, I found that ONLY four of them are repeated in the Quran as multiple of 19. We already



had discovered three of them: Allah (God), Rahman (Gracious), and Raheem (Merciful). The fourth one was "Shaheed" (Witness). This name is mentioned in the Quran exactly 19 times and thus fills the empty space corresponding to the numerical value of "WaHid" (One) on the right side of the table.

## WHY TRASH ALL THE HADITHS AS THE SOURCE OF RELIGION?

Behnam SADEGHI: I have three questions for Yuksel:

1. How can you claim that several thousand sahih hadiths are necessarily false while you cite only a few sahih hadiths which have debatable contents? Is this not generalization from scanty data?

2. Why do you assume that either all sahih hadiths should be rejected or all of them should be accepted? Why not judge each hadith based on its individual merit according to all the available data about its isnad, its transmitters, and so on?

3. Suppose we cease to use hadith as a source of information about the Prophet, his life, and his career. Then we notice that the Qur'an itself says very little about the Prophet's life. It also says nothing about how it was compiled. The historicity of the Quran is based on hadiths. It is from hadiths that we know how the Quran was compiled. It is also from hadith that we know about the life of the Prophet.

YUKSEL: Here are my answers:

1. If any book contains a few lies (which we have more than just "few" examples), then, the endorsement of that book is not reliable. If you see dozens of repeated fabrications introduced as trustworthy (sahih) hadith, then, how can you still rely on other narration of the same book?

2. Judging each hadith on its individual merit may seem attractive for those who are not satisfied with God's book, but it is a waste of time and a deceptive method. If the signature of narrators (sanad) cannot provide authenticity about the source of hadith, then, our only guide to decide on the content of hadiths (matn) will be our personal wish or our current inclinations. How can we decide which hadith has a merit? How can we decide which hadiths is accurate? We may say "by comparing them with the Quran!" But, what this really mean? If it is "me" who will compare a hadith to the Quran, if it is again "me" who will judge whether it contradicts the Quran or not, then, I will end up with "hadith" which supports "my" personal understanding of the Quran. In this case hadith cannot function as an explanation of the Quran. They will be confirmation or justification of my understanding of the Quran; with literally tasteless, grammatically lame language.... Furthermore, what about hadiths that bring extra duties and prohibitions?

3. Again, there are many hadiths about the prophet's life which you cannot accept them with a sober mind. They are narrated repeatedly in many so-called authentic books. We cannot create a history out of a mishmash of narration by a subjective method of pick and choose. We can create many conflicting portraits of Muhammad out of those hadiths. As for pure historical events that isolated from their moral and religious implications, they are not part of the religion, and we don't need them for our salvation. I never said "we should not read hadith." In fact, we can study hadith books to get an approximate idea about the people and events of those times. We can even construct a "conjecture" about the history, without attributing them to God or his prophet. Please don't forget that the "history" is not immune of filtration, censorship and distortion of ruling class. You can see many different versions of histories (!) regarding the era of early Islam . Just read Sunny and Shiite histories.

4. We cannot disregard God's frequent assertion that the Quran is detailed, complete, clear, and easy to understand. What do you think about the verse 17:46? "When you preach your Lord, in the Quran ALONE, they run away with aversion."

5. Hadith books are full of contradictory teachings. They eventually lead us to a sanctified and justified sectarian division in the name of the Prophet. Their very nature is another proof that hadith collections cannot be divine, since God, characterize his word and religion being not having contradiction: "Why do they not study the Quran careful? If it were from other than God, they would have found in it numerous contradictions." (4:82). This verse clearly refutes the traditional argument that hadith books contain other revelations besides the Quran, since the followers of Hadith and Sunna wrongly attribute verses about the Quran to hadith, such as: "Your friend (Muhammad) is not astray, nor is he deceived. Nor is he speaking out of a personal desire. It is a divine inspiration." (53:2-4). Furthermore, verses 39:27-28 describes the Quran and the following verse distinguish the divine teaching from other teachings. "God cites the example of a man who deals with disputing partners, compared to a man who deals with only one man. Are they the same? Praise be to God; most of them do not know." (39:29). Obviously, hadith narrators and collections are "disputing partners," while the Quran is a consistent source.

6. Give me one, only one "hadith" that you think it is necessary for my salvation besides the Quran. If you are not ready to discuss the necessity and accuracy of a single hadith, then please give up from your invitation for hadith and Sunna.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE TOPIC

YUKSEL: If any book contains a few lies (which we have more than just "few" examples), then, the endorsement of that book is not reliable. If you see dozens of repeated fabrications introduced as trustworthy (sahih) hadith, then, how can you still rely on other narration of the same book?

LOMAX: The bound collection of testimony from any court is certain to contain some lies and some errors. The reliability of any piece of evidence remains debatable. Where the narrators agree, where there is no irreconcilable conflict with the Qur'an,

where the hadith is not offensive to tawhid, etc., we may well be justified in accepting it as reliable.

And if a collector collects a thousand hadith and makes a few errors, neither is he to be condemned as unreliable.

YUKSEL: Not a single court will accept the testimony of Bukhari who collected contradictory hadiths about the Prophet Muhammad, narrated from generation to generation 200 years after his departure. You try to minimize the number and size of errors. There hundreds lies, not "few errors." And they are grave ones: They attribute stupid and contradictory laws and words to God. They create a men-made religion in the name of God! They are full of insult to God and his messenger. They are not trivial, since God Almighty does not accept those "few errors" as trivial:

". . . Who is more evil than the one who fabricates lies and attributes them to God?" (29:68)

LOMAX: If the hadith are not mutawatir, Edip should know by now that most scholars would say that one is free to disregard it, though not necessarily without peril. The issue Edip raises about the difficulties of decision regarding hadith also apply to personal interpretation of the Qur'an. No, the Qur'an makes it clear, we cannot disregard any evidence out of hand, not even the evidence of an unrighteous man; how much less the evidence of those against whom we have no evidence of unrighteousness or lack of caution?

YUKSEL: First, can you please tell us how many mutawatir (accepted with consensus) Hadith are there. What are they and where are they? Second, can you give me few names of those "most scholars" who would say that I am free to disregard non-mutawatir hadiths? As far as for evidences.... Sure, we cannot disregard evidences for our daily affair, even of an unrighteous man. But, God's religion is not left to the mercy of those evidences. God explained and detailed his religion in his book, which is described as complete, detailed, and perfect. It does not contain any doubt. Furthermore, God promised to preserve it. An He did it with a unique mathematical system which hypocrites and disbelievers are unable to see. -----

YUKSEL: Again, there are many hadiths about the prophet's life which you cannot accept them with a sober mind.

LOMAX: I have answered Edip about of a number of these hadith. Certainly I personally have trouble with certain hadith; however, I must always ask myself whether or not it is my own view which is in error, rather than the hadith. Perhaps there is something I have not thought of.

For example, there is a hadith which Edip loves to cite mentioning the drinking of camel's urine, which Edip seems to believe is particularly ridiculous. Does he base this on a scientific study of the virtues of drinking camel's urine. I think not. Nor does he ever

mention that nomadic peoples, not just Arabs but including them, often consume the waste products of their animals. So "cannot accept" is definitely culturally conditioned. But no one has claimed that drinking camels' urine is required of any Muslim.

YUKSEL: Well, the prescription of camels urine in that hadith is the minor problem. You can even find some Sunni doctors who pontificate that camel's urine is panacea for every disease. The big problem was about gouging their eyes after pruning all their legs and hands, etc. You craftily skipped this part. -----  
---

YUKSEL: Give me one, only one "hadith" that you think it is necessary for my salvation. If you are not ready to discuss the necessity and accuracy of a single hadith, then please give up from your invitation for hadith and Sunna.

LOMAX: Edip confuses Hadith and Sunna. Hadith is only one of a number of major sources of Sunna, other major sources being the Qur'an and the practice of the community. The latter is how we generally learn to pray, by the way.

To answer the question about necessity of hadith without going deeply into the whole concept of necessity is impossible.

But I will answer this way: if a hadith transmits a wisdom necessary in a particular situation, and one turns away from that wisdom merely because it was a hadith (and not some other preferred modality), then one becomes culpable for failure to act correctly in the situation. This could, indeed lead to hell-fire. Of course, the same is true of the Qur'an, or even the preaching of a Christian.

YUKSEL: If you think that some one is wrong and even misguided because of his rejection of hadith and that person challenges you with that question you don't answer like you did above. You did not or could not answer my challenge. Answering questions is not an act of writing irrelevant lines after the question. Please come to the point.

". . . Indeed, we believe in the message he brought"(7.75)

By Edip Yuksel

Editor of Signs, peace be on you.

I was very happy to see the Signs magazine promoting the message of the Quran alone. However, the third issue was a surprise. You have dedicated most of the pages of the magazine to attacking Dr. Rashad Khalifa, a monotheist believer. Though I do appreciate some points you raise, I find your evaluation of Rashad's work biased.

Personally, I consider myself lucky to have met him and assisted him in Masjid Tucson. I was a Sunni political activist and author advocating Sunni Islam in books published in Turkey before 1986. I was tortured and imprisoned for four years because of

my articles in magazines calling for an Islamic revolution in Turkey. After a year-long correspondence and debate with Rashad I came to the conclusion that the Quran is the only source of guidance. It was no surprise that my acceptance of the Quran alone brought excommunication, attacks from religious media and death threats from my previous readers.

I believe that Rashad Khalifa was a messenger of God. If you ask why do I believe, I can list quite a few reasons. However, I prefer to repeat the answer of the believers who supported Salih: "indeed, we believe in the message he brought." Rashad is now with his Lord, and he is dead as far as we are concerned. He will be judged by God Almighty on the day of judgment, when every one of us, including all the messengers will worry about their own neck (21:28). Rashad IS no longer a messenger. The Quran is a living and talking messenger until the Last Hour. Therefore, I'll stick with the Quran alone, inshaallah. I hope you will receive this letter with empathy, not with paranoid theories of "conspiracies."

To make it convenient for the readers to follow the argument, each point is numbered. May God guide us to the truth, since The Truth is one of the attributes of God. I'm willing to dismiss any part of my argument if you enlighten me with sufficient reason and evidence from the Quran, inshaallah. May God give us the patience to understand and tolerate each other. We may not be able to agree on every issue; however, we should be extremely careful about labeling or condemning each other.

#### Rashad was a fallible human messenger

1. Rashad never claimed to be infallible, nor did he claim that his translation, with parentheses, footnotes and appendices is a revelation, since he never doubted that the Quran is the last book revealed to the last prophet. However, I agree with him that his translation is authorized by God for its clear emphasis on worshipping God alone and not adding any other sources (including Rashad's) to God's word, which is perfect and fully detailed. Rashad was a student of the Quran, trying to purify his mind from the atmospherics of his traditional past that was preventing him from getting the clear broadcasting of the divine message. He was usually humble in acknowledging his errors. For instance, he encouraged us to edit and discuss his second revision of his translation verse by verse. During this intense consultation period we had numerous discussions. We continuously learned from each other according to God's will. During that period, he was persuaded to correct some of the mistakes of the first edition. For instance: 2.106; 3:97\*; 7.75; 11.87; 11.88; 12.88; 18.83; 21.96; 21.112; 24.35; 27.42; 37.63; 38.44; 39.6; 43.61; 56.79; 72.7; 72.18; 74.31; 96.2.

Later, when he re-revised his translation, he continued correcting his errors. For instance, 4.176!; 6.74\*; 12.88; 18.83; 30.3; 38.59; 95.5!, etc.

Briefly stated, he never claimed to be infallible. The three revised editions of his translations are blatant witnesses to the fact that he was in a continual learning process and open-minded to reasonable criticism. If he were alive, he would surely make many

corrections in his third revision. In fact, it is the experience and fate of all translators. Every time I edit my Turkish translation of the Quran which has been in my computer since 1990, I find errors caused by insufficient information, imperfect attention, shortcomings, linguistic problems and unintentional mistakes. Nevertheless, I still believe that my translation will deliver the message, inshaallah. Thank God we have the original Quran that we can refer to anytime we have a question. It would be an unfortunate repetition of history if one day some of those who responded to Rashad's call to worship God alone claim that Rashad's translation, Quran The Final Testament, is "the English Version of the Quran," or is "the ultimate English translation of the Quran," or "a revelation from God." I do see signs pointing to this constant human tendency: hero-worship.

All messengers were fallible humans for a good reason

2. All previous messengers were humans, not angels. During their mission they lived like their contemporary fellows. They made mistakes, sometimes grave ones. Those mistakes, paradoxically, functioned as a blessing for believers, and an excuse for disbelievers and a test for hypocrite idol worshippers: believers would focus on God alone and stop idolizing messengers, while disbelievers would use those weaknesses and mistakes as an excuse for their disbelief, and idol worshippers would claim the infallibility of the messenger and try to defend the evident human errors and attribute them to The Most Wise.

Please imagine that you are dwelling in Madina during Muhammad's time. He has some friends and many enemies. You hear conflicting news from people about his personality and his message. Meanwhile, you witness some of his weaknesses and shortcomings. For instance, you see him trying to hide his intention or revelation from people regarding the estranged wife of his adopted son (33.37), you hear him favoring a rich person and ignoring a poor blind man (80.1-11), you see him rushing into speculating on some verses without sufficient knowledge (20.114; 75.16-19), you experience the "devil's interference" in his wishes followed by a great communal chaos and feud (22.52-55), you witness his tendency of trying to compromise with his categorical enemies (17.74), etc. What would you do? Obviously, you could react in three ways. You could either dismiss his claim of messengership, or accept him as a human messenger, or idolize him as an infallible messenger and interpret those errors and shortcomings as virtue.

I believe that if you use the same standard of criticism you will not dwell on some human errors and weaknesses on the part of Rashad Khalifa. You can appreciate many positive things if you can overcome your prejudices. Please compare Rash