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NOTES

1. In the texts that follow in part 2, translations of the Qur’an are from Arthur J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964, reprinted by permission of Harper-Collins Publishers Ltd, copyright 1955, Arthur J. Arberry), but the numbering of verses has been brought in line with the more normal system used in the Egyptian standard edition. Translations of the Bible are from the New Revised Standard Version (copyright 1989, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.)


3. Psalms 2, 72, 110.
4. 1 Timothy 2:2.
5. Exodus 19:5.
7. Romans 8:19–21.
9. Psalm 8:8; see also Genesis 1:28.
11. Genesis 1:3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 24. The seventh, climactic iteration of the formula of completion, “And it was so” (v. 30), applies not to human dominion but to God’s provision of food for all creatures.
15. al-Furqān 25:70.
17. al-Rahmān 55:3.
18. al-Shārā 42:11; and al-Infitār 82:7–8.
19. al-Taqbābun 64:3.
21. al-İ́sra’ 17:70.
22. Professor Abdel Haleem here uses Arberry’s translation, which had been distributed to seminar participants, but Abdel Haleem differs from Arberry in the translation of some important words.

24. Genesis 3:1–5, 6, 13, 16.


27. *Ṭa' Hā* 20:121.


31. See Jane Dammen McAuliffe’s discussion of some relevant Qur’anic texts in chapter 7.

32. In the ancient world the gods jealously guarded their superiority over humankind. For example, in the Greek myth Prometheus was condemned to torture for stealing fire from the gods to benefit humanity.

33. *Ṭa' Hā* 20:115; and *al-A'raf* 7:23.

34. *al-Baqara* 2:38.


36. Romans 7:25; and Romans 7:17, 20.


38. The word used for “devil” in Greek is *diabolo*, with which the name Iblis is surely cognate. The Hellenistic Jewish work is *The Biography of Adam and Eve*, dating at latest to the fourth century CE and perhaps even to the first century. The apocryphal *Gospel (or Questions) of Bartholomew* seems to date to the fifth or late fourth century CE. See Peter J. Awn, *Satan’s Tragedy and Redemption: Iblis in Sufi Psychology* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 20–22.


40. Whitney S. Bodman, “Stalking Iblis: In Search of an Islamic Theodicy,” in *Myths, Historical Archetypes, and Symbolic Figures in Arabic Literature: Towards a New Hermeneutic Approach*, ed. Angelika Neuwirth (Beirut: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 247–69. It should also be noted that the word “Satan” is Hebrew, meaning “accuser”—readers of the biblical text will notice in the Qur’ānic echoes of the figure in the book of Job. With God’s permission, Satan reveals by his trials the truth about human beings, and reveals who are the true servants (*al-Isra’* 17:65).

41. *al-A'raf* 7:12.

42. Ibid.


44. *al-A'raf* 7:23.


48. In the Western Church, Kingdomtide is the period in the Christian calendar that begins on the day after Pentecost and ends on Christ the King Sunday, the last day of the liturgical year. Known also as Dominontide or Ordinary Time, this season celebrates the coming of the Kingdom of God and Christ’s kingship. Eastertide begins with Easter and continues for seven weeks until Pentecost in the Christian liturgical calendar. The church during this period celebrates the resurrection of Jesus Christ and reflects on its significance for the salvation of humankind.

49. Although these chapters form a thematic unity, there are certain noticeable inner shifts in emphasis as God presents his vision. The final scene captured in Isaiah 65–66 may be presented in three episodes. In the first episode (65:1–16), Yahweh deals with his adversaries in his court, where his opponents are on stage, as it were, as they are being addressed. Verses 65:17–66:5
describe the second episode in which Yahweh directs his attention at completing the New Jerusalem. In the third episode (66:6–24), Yahweh completes the building of the New City and confirms his servants in it. People from different nations are gathered to Jerusalem to worship before him. This section brings the vision to completion. John Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*. Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, Texas: Word Books Publishers, 1987), 338.

50. Isaiah 65:17.

51. So stark is this break that many commentators designate this vision as apocalyptic. This term refers both to a specific genre of Jewish and Christian literature and to the characteristic ideas that literature presents. Chiefly, apocalyptic literature portrays the eschatological future as the result of direct divine intervention, universal judgment, and a new age of salvation in which the entire creation will be radically transformed.

52. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 19B (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 286. It is common to begin this passage with verse 16b. In this connection, the new creation is seen to be the reason for forgetting former troubles. See ibid., 285.


54. See Isaiah 42:5; 45:7, 12, 18, and so on. While there is certainly a connection between Isaiah 65:17–25 and the creation recital of Genesis 1:1–2:4a, which was composed around the same time and probably shares the same Weltanschauung, it is unlikely that the former is entirely dependent on the latter. Isaiah 40–66 generally has much to say about creation but often in terms quite different from Genesis 1. The passage under consideration refers not to the return to the Garden of the primordial creation but to the fulfilment of that creation, its telos in the new heavens and the new earth.


56. The new heavens and the new earth must be seen as the transformation or transfiguration of the present created order, not its destruction. As Claus Westermann has rightly noted, “The words, ‘I create anew the heavens and the earth,’ do not imply that heaven and earth are to be destroyed and in their place a new heaven and a new earth created. . . . Instead, the world, designated as ‘heaven and earth,’ is to be miraculously renewed.” Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, Old Testament Library (London: SCM, 1969), 408.


58. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 529. Although the theme of rejoicing is also found in a number of other passages (66:10, 14; and 35:1–2), it is central to the Trito-Isaian core (60:15; 61:10; and 62:5).

59. Ibid., 530.

60. Isaiah 65:18a.

61. Isaiah 65:19b.


63. Isaiah 65:19cd, 22–23, 24–25, respectively. A series of contrasts between the present age and the age to come is clearly delineated in 19b–25 (see Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, 354):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Not any more”</th>
<th>“But”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crying, distress</td>
<td>Rejoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An infant dying at a young age</td>
<td>A child lives to be a hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An elderly person dying prematurely</td>
<td>One hundred years of age is deemed an early age to die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else living in the house you built</td>
<td>Build houses and live in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant for another to eat</td>
<td>Plant and eat the fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for nothing</td>
<td>Enduring like a tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bear children in terror  
(Build houses for others to take)  
(Receive answers to prayer)  
(Constant violence)  

Wear out their own things  
(Build for children to live in)  
(Before they call, God answers)  
(No harm or destruction in all God’s mountain)

64. Isaiah 65:20. Life expectancy very clearly has a moral dimension in the Old Testament: a long life is correlative with a morally upright life while sickness and premature death is the result of immorality. In the postdiluvian world, life expectancy is at the maximum of 120 years (Gen. 6:3). The moral correlation has therefore resulted in problems when the righteous die at a young age (e.g., Josiah at 39) and the wicked live to a ripe old age (e.g., Manasseh at 67). 


66. See Isaiah 65:6–7, 12, 15c. Alec Motyer explains: “Once more metaphor is being used, but the reality is that even if, per impossibile, a sinner were to escape detection for a century the curse would still search him out and destroy him. Thus verse 20 expresses a double thought: death will have no more power and sin no more presence.” Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 530.

67. Isaiah 65:21–23. References to home (houses) and farm (vineyards) suggest that the blessing is to be seen everywhere, in every aspect of the lives of the elect. In addition, vineyards are mentioned here because they take a long time to cultivate and bring into production. In verses 21–22 there are two positive statements (21) and their negative counterparts (22ab). The negative statements in verse 22 relate to the fate of the disobedient (cf. Deut. 28:30). The fact that this is completely cancelled implies that only the righteous will inhabit the New Jerusalem. The metaphor of the tree, which suggests durability, longevity, and security, is used to describe the longevity and fruitfulness of the elect (22bc). The thought that nothing will mar the enjoyment of the elect is further elaborated in verse 23. The fear and insecurity that plagues life in the old order will be totally absent in the new heavens and earth. Thus, the elect are assured that they will not toil in vain (Deut. 28.33; and Jer. 3:24) and that their children will not have to live through disastrous and tragic events (Lev. 26:16; Ps. 78:33; and Jer. 15:8).


70. The expression “but dust will be the serpent’s food” surely recalls the curse that Yahweh has placed upon it in Genesis 3:14. But as John Watts has pointed out, “the context of the verse calls for understanding this, not as a parallel to enmity with humankind, but as a peaceful element of the newly created order,” Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, 355.


72. Isaiah 65:25b, 25d. Cf. Isaiah 11:7 and Isaiah 11:9. “Holy Mountain” is a phrase used by Isaiah to refer to the place where the presence, peace, and joy of Yahweh may be experienced (see Isa. 11:9, 27:13, 65:11, 25, and 66:20). This expression is also used elsewhere in the Old Testament (Jer. 31:23; Joel 2:1; 4:17; Zech. 8:3; Ps. 3:5, 43:3, 48:2, and Dan. 9:16, 20).

73. It is important to note the function of the appeal to intertextuality in this passage by its inclusion of the terminology of “my holy mountain” found in 11:9. The inclusion of this terminology in 65:25 aims to incorporate the heavenly Zion into the portrayal of the transformation of Jerusalem in 11:9. The new creation of chapter 65 is therefore identified with the messianic hope in First Isaiah (chapters 1–39), together with the promises in Second Isaiah (chapters 40–55). In this way, the beginning, middle, and end of the book of Isaiah are redactionally linked. As Brevard Childs has so pertinently remarked, “The promise in chapter 65 is not an apocalyptic flight into an imaginative world of fantasy, but the fulfilment of God’s will taking shape throughout the entire book of Isaiah.” See Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 538–39.

75. Some theologians have understandably concluded that the present created order will be annihilated and replaced by the “new heavens and a new earth.” This conclusion is based on a number of passages in both the Old Testament and the New. The prophets of the Old Testament spoke of the dissolution of the heaven and earth (see Ps. 102:26; Isa. 34:4, 51:6) while Jesus himself declared that “heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away” (Matt. 24:35). While this interpretation is understandable when considered in light of the earlier passages, other passages seem to suggest that more nuanced interpretation is necessary. Paul describes the present creation as waiting “in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed” and that it will be “liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God” (Rom. 8:19–22). This shows that the new creation will be a renewal of the old. This view corresponds with Paul’s statement regarding the renewal and rebirth of the person in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17). To destroy the present creation and to bring about another entirely new order of creation would mean that God has failed in his purpose to bring the original creation to fulfilment. Such an understanding of God would be incongruent with the general biblical portrayal. In addition, the annihilation of the present world and the creation of another *ex nihilo* would sever the link between creation and redemption. This is also incompatible with the account of the Bible taken as a whole, which does not speak of the redemption *from* the world (which is more akin to Gnostic soteriology) but rather the redemption *of* the world. The “new heavens and the new earth” therefore refer neither to the restoration of the original state (*restitutio in integrum*) nor to the destruction of the existing created order (*reductio in nihilum*). Rather it points to its transformation (*transfiguratio mundi*). For more detailed discussion, see Roland Chia, “Creation and Eschatology,” in *Theodicy and Eschatology*, ed. Bruce Barber and David Neville (Adelaide: ATF Press, 2005), 173–92.

76. The “sea” must be understood figuratively, not literally. Philip Hughes explains: “The disappearance of the sea does not imply that it was regarded as evil in itself, but rather that its aspect was one of hostility to man. It held in its depths the bodies of unnumbered persons who had perished in its waters (hence the concept of the sea giving up its dead at the last judgement, 20:13). Its claims were deceptive. Its restless turbulence was a picture of the instability of the wicked (Is 57:20f). And because its expanses separated men and peoples from each other, its removal may symbolise the harmonious unification as well as the security of all mankind in the renewed creation.” Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 222. The connection between the sea and evil made throughout Revelation here reaches its climax. Just as Daniel’s monstrous beasts rose from the sea (Dan. 7:3ff), so John’s Antichrist comes from the sea (13:1ff). In the same way, the anti-Christian empire in the Revelation has an identical appearance of the devil, that is, the characteristics of a sea monster (Rev. 17:3, cf. 12:3).

77. Revelation 21:2a.


79. See Hosea 2:16, 19; Isaiah 54:6; Ezekiel 16; 2 Corinthians 11:2; and Ephesians 5:25.


81. As place, the New Jerusalem is at once paradise, holy city, and temple. Richard Bauckham explains: “As paradise it is the natural world in its ideal state rescued from the destroyers of the earth, reconciled with humanity, filled with the presence of God, and mediating the blessings of eschatological life to humanity. As holy city, it fulfils the ideal of the ancient city, as the place where heaven and earth meet at the centre of the earth, from which God rules his land and his people, to whose attraction the nations are drawn for enlightenment, and in which people live in
ideal theocentric community. As temple, it is the place of God’s immediate presence, where his worshippers see his face.” Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 132.

82. Revelation 21:3. The statement “I will be their God and they will be my people” is a covenant formula that ties in well with the picture of God dwelling with his covenant people. There are a number of Old Testament passages that deal with this theme. In Exodus 29:45, the covenant language is used in connection with the establishment of the tabernacle: “Then I will dwell among the Israelites and be their God. They will know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them out of Egypt so that I might dwell among them. I am the Lord their God.” Leviticus 26:11–12 reads, “I will put my dwelling-place among you, and I will not abhor you. I will walk among you and be your God and you will be my people.” The same correlation between the divine presence (indicated by the metaphor of “dwelling”) and the covenant is found in Zechariah 2:10b–11, “’For I am coming, and I will live among you,’ declares the Lord. ‘Many nations will be joined with the Lord in that day and will become my people. I will live among you and you will know that the Lord Almighty has sent me to you.’” See David Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, Word Biblical Commentary (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998), 1109.


84. 1 Corinthians 15:26; Isaiah 65:19. The contrast is intended between the New Jerusalem and the Rome that the original readers of John’s Revelation knew. In Revelation, Rome is presented as “the great whore” (17:9) and portrayed as Babylon the great city and harlot. Babylon is also described as the “mother of whores,” which are the other cities in the Roman Empire that were corrupted by the influence of Rome and that share its luxury and evil. Babylon and the New Jerusalem are therefore contrasting pairs of women-cities that dominate the final chapters of the book of Revelation. Richard Bauckham provides a list that shows how the two cities are contrasted in John’s Revelation: The chaste bride, the wife of the Lamb (21:2, 9) versus the harlot with whom the kings of the earth fornicate (17:2); her splendour is the glory of God (21:11–21) versus Babylon’s splendour from exploiting her empire (17:4; 18:12–13, 16); the nations walk by her light, which is the glory of God (21:24) versus Babylon’s corruption and deception of the nations (17:2; 18:3, 23, 19:2); the kings of the earth bring their glory into her (i.e., their worship and submission to God: 21:24) versus Babylon rules over the kings of the earth (17:18ff); they bring the glory and honor of the nations into her (i.e., glory of God: 21:26) versus Babylon’s luxurious wealth extorted from all the world (18:12–17); uncleanness, abominations, and falsehoods are excluded (21:27) versus Babylon’s abominations, impurities, deceptions (17:4, 5; 18:23); the water of life and the tree of life for the healing of the nations (21: 6; 22:1–2) versus Babylon’s wine, which makes the nations drunk (14:8; 17:2; 18:3); life and healing (22:1–2) versus the blood of slaughter (17:6; 18:24); God’s people are called to enter the New Jerusalem (22:14) versus God’s people are called to come out of Babylon (18:4). Bauckham, *Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 131–32.

85. Revelation 22:1. The water that in Ezekiel flows from the sanctuary of God now flows from the throne of God because there is no temple in the New Jerusalem. The water of life from the throne has a parallel in John 7:38–39: “Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, streams of living water will flow from within him.” See also Genesis 2:9–10; Ezekiel 47:1, 6–7, 12; Joel 3:18; and Zechariah: 14:8.

86. Revelation 22:2; and Genesis 2:9f.

87. See Isaiah 12:3, 41:17–18, 43:3–4; Ezekiel 47; Zechariah 13:1, 14:8.
NOTES TO PART TWO


89. Ezekiel calls the New Jerusalem “The Lord is There” (Ezek. 48:35) while Zechariah declares that the whole city is the temple of God (Zech. 14:20–21). Isaiah has excluded the ritually unclean from the New Jerusalem because they are excluded from the temple (Isa. 52:1; Ps. 24:304).

90. 1 Corinthians 15:28. In the Old Testament, the high priest wore the name of God on his forehead once a year and entered God’s immediate presence in the holy of holies of the earthly temple. The eschatological Jerusalem, however, is God’s eternal holy of holies in which all will enjoy the immediate presence of God without interruption. Bauckham, Theology of the Book of Revelation, 142.

91. Revelation 21:23. “In this context,” Beasley-Murray writes, “the lamp is the Lamb recalls the saying, ‘I am the Light of the world’ (Jn 8:12), uttered at Tabernacles, and which implies that what the Shekinah was to Israel in the desert and shall be in the coming kingdom, so Christ is for the whole world, the source of salvation and the manifestation of the divine glory for all mankind.” Beasley-Murray, Book of Revelation, 328.


96. Revelation 11:15.


98. Isaiah 60:3.

99. Cf. Revelation 22:15. Revelation does not present the view that in the end every human being will receive the salvation of God and be included in his holy city. Indeed, the entire tenor of the Bible—especially the New Testament—concerning salvation is the twofold outcome, namely, acceptance or rejection. This is seen in the parables of Jesus, such as the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31) and the parable of the bridesmaid (Matt. 25:1–13). Universalists argue that although the Bible does speak of divine punishment, these punishments are temporary and have a purificatory function. Thus, the metaphor of God as Judge must be contrasted with that of God as King. The latter concept points to the eventual unity of the kingdom of God under divine kingship. But this interpretation fails to take into account the passages in scripture that explicitly speak of the double end of history (see 1 Cor. 1:18; cf. Phil. 1:18; and Rom. 9:22). Universalists often appeal to the love of God, and argue that divine justice must be understood as serving divine love. Friedrich Schleiermacher therefore maintains that “there are great difficulties in thinking that the finite issue of redemption is such that some thereby obtain the highest bliss, while others . . . are lost in irrevocable misery.” He insists that the “milder view” should be embraced, that is, the view that “through the power of redemption there will one day be a universal restoration of all souls” Friedrich Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith, eds., H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1948), 722, §163. The history of theology, however, has presented eloquent objections to the doctrine of universal reconciliation. As Helmut Thielicke has put it, “But how can it (universalism) be affirmed and how can one refrain from calling it an ‘error’ (however unwillingly) according to the venerable judgement of theological history?” Apokatastasis can therefore never be a dogma. “If we call it this,” to cite Thielicke again, “then in view of its monistic basis we can hardly avoid the result of annuling the conditionality of the present hour of decision and letting things take their course in the name of the expected eschatological ‘happy ending.’” Helmut Thielicke, Evangelical Faith, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 455. See also Roland Chia, Hope for the World: A Christian Vision of the Last Things (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2006).
100. Cf. Revelation 2:11; 14:10; 18:8; 19:20; and 20:10, 14.
104. al-Wāqī'a 56:7–11.
105. E.g., al-Baqara 2:25; Āl-Imrān 3:15; and al-Nisā' 4:57.
106. E.g., al-Dukhān 44:54.
107. al-Wāqī'a 56:17; and al-Inṣān 76:19.
112. Fr. Alexei Young, “Authority and Obedience in Marriage,” *Orthodox America* 3 (September 1984): 32.
113. Pius XI, *Casti connubii* (December 31, 1930), §74. See also Pius XII, speaking to wives: “You are equal in dignity, but this equality does not preclude a hierarchy that establishes the husband as head, and the wife as subject to him. Catholic men and women have the duty to combat the changing social conditions that undermine hierarchy in the family.” Pius XII, “Allocution to Newlyweds,” September 10, 1941, in *The Woman in the Modern World*, ed. The Monks of Solesmes (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1959), 65.
118. Muhammad Asad’s translation: “Men shall take care of women with the bounties which God has bestowed more abundantly on the former than on the latter.”
120. The majority of the commentators (mufassirūn) make Allāh nominative, which gives three meanings: (1) God is guarding them; (2) God is guarding their dowries for them and requiring expenditures on them; (3) protectors in the [husband’s] absence of something that the command of God protects. Abu Ja’far puts it in the accusative (i.e., by what protects God), and it means by their protecting God with their obedience. Ibn al-Jawzī, *Zād*.
122. Ibid.
123. Ibid. But he also admits that some madhāhib do not require that admonishment follow this sequence. On this verse, particularly the terms “qawwamīna” and “nushūz,” see Ali, Sexual Ethics, 117–26; and Sa’diyya Shaikh, “Exegetical Violence: Nushūz in Qur’ānic and Gender Ideology,” *Journal for Islamic Studies* 17 (1997): 49–73.


127. Muhammad Asad’s translation: “Men have precedence over them.”

128. A final concern of the classical exegetes is whether this verse was abrogated either in whole or in part. Al-Jawzi, *Zād*: “The scholars disagree about whether this verse is abrogated or not. (1) Some say it is abrogated but disagree about what part of it is. One group says it is the phrase ‘divorced women shall wait by themselves for three periods.’ They say that it used to be incumbent on every divorced woman that she wait for three periods but the judgment about the woman who is pregnant was abrogated by *al-ʿTalaq* 65:4, ‘And for those with child, their period shall be until they bring forth their burden.’ The judgment about the woman divorced before consummation is abrogated by *al-ʿĀhzāb* 33:49, ‘If you marry believing women and divorce them before you have touched them, then there is no period that you should count.’ This is reported on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbas. Another group said that the first part of it is muḥkam and the abrogated section is ‘their mates have better right to restore them.’ They say that when a man divorces his wife, the better right to her return is as though it were the third divorce or beyond that. So it was abrogated by *al-Baqara* 2:230, ‘If he has divorced her [the third time] she is not afterwards lawful to him until she has wed another husband.’ (2) Others say that the entire verse is muḥkam. The beginning of it is of general applicability (*ʿamm).*”


133. Isaiah 2:5.


135. Proverbs 29:18; or NRSV, “Where there is no prophecy, the people cast off restraint.”


138. Isaiah 2:5.


140. Matthew 5:1; 17:1; 28:16.

141. Mark 16:15.


143. Romans 11:11f, 15f, 25f.


147. Galatians 2.
149. Galatians 2:10; 5–6.
152. Galatians 5:1.
153. See 1 Corinthians 12:13; and Colossians 3:11.
156. Romans 2:11.
158. Philemon 15–16.
159. Genesis 1:27.
161. 1 Corinthians 12:13.
164. Galatians 6:15.
166. See 1 Corinthians and Philemon, respectively.
169. See Revelation 7:4.
171. See Revelation 7:9, and 7:4.
172. See Revelation 7:14.
173. Revelation 1:5.
175. Revelation 3:1–6, 14–22; and Revelation 2:8–11; 3:7–13, respectively.
180. This verse is discussed in the essay by Jane McAuliffe, “al-ʿAḥzāb 33:35; al-Rūm 30:21; al-Nisāʾ 4:34; al-Bugara 2:228,” chapter 7.2.
181. This verse is discussed in the essay by Vincent Cornell, “Islam and Human Diversity,” chapter 2.2.
183. Genesis 8:22
184. E.g., Psalm 72:1–6.
187. Romans 8:19–21.
188. Isaiah 65:25.
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