

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(FEBRUARY 1902.)

CONTENTS.

SUBJECT.	PAGE.
RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES AND OUR POSITION IN THEM	41—63
JESUS AND THE JEWS	41
THE AHMADIYYAH SECT	45
DR. CLARKE AND THE PROMISED MESSIAH	50
CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS	53
RELIGION AS A SCIENCE	58
UNITY <i>versus</i> TRINITY	64—78
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION	64
EVIDENCES FROM NATURAL LAWS	65
" " HUMAN NATURE	66
" " THE BIBLE	67
EVIDENCE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK	68
OTHER EVIDENCES OF THE DIVINITY OF JESUS	72
JESUS AND MUHAMMAD ﷺ COMPARED... ..	73
ONE OF THE GREATEST DISCOVERIES OF THE AGE	79—80

Printed at The "Albion Press," Lahore :—and published
by the Anjuman-i-Isha'at-i-Islam, Qadian,
District Gurdaspur, India.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES

AND

OUR POSITION IN THEM.

One feels sorry indeed when one's honest service to the cause of humanity is misconstrued into a wrong to a certain section of society. When we issued the prospectus of our Magazine, we considered nothing so improbable as that the pamphlet shall be considered an attack upon any one religion in particular; but the contrary assertion has actually been made in some quarters. Such, we think, is also the drift of certain remarks made by "The Civil and Military Gazette" of Lahore, in its issue of 31st December, in a review upon our prospectus which it declares to be "a new kind of *Jehad* upon Gaiours," intending probably to express in these words that our language is harsh and offensive. A perusal of those pages, which we for this purpose reproduced in the first number of the Magazine, shall be sufficient, we hope, to demonstrate the groundlessness of the charge. In starting this Magazine it has been one of our chief objects that the vulgar style in which religious controversies are still conducted and which is barren of fruits but productive of harm to society, should be transformed into a milder and more polite method in which reason and arguments should supply the place of idle tales, groundless assertions and abusive words. One can easily understand what should have been the safest course for us to adopt with such a noble object in view, and that in departing from that course we would have done harm to our own cause.

The truth is that the person who is charged with the heavy responsibilities of a reformer, cannot escape the carping of adverse critics. The way is beset with so many difficulties that not even the prophets of God have been spared. Christian Missionaries are very fond of boasting of the extreme mildness taught by Jesus, so much so that the Bishop of Calcutta, in his firm conviction of the high tone of morality contained in Gospel teachings, was led to propose the introduction of the Bible as a compulsory subject into all schools and colleges, in order to raise the morality of non-

Christian India to a higher level than their own religions could breathe into them, but the Jews who experienced the mildness of those teachings by coming into contact with the teacher himself, and the people who do so now by being brought under the influence of the preachers of the Gospel, think otherwise.

The Jews, for instance, say that a man cannot be a teacher of morals who pretends to teach meekness and humility to others but does not himself act upon those principles. Jesus no doubt taught his disciples to love their enemies, but his own example in this respect was quite worthless and misleading. He taught one thing and did another,—a fact which, they assert, throws discredit upon the sincerity of his desire to bring about a true reformation. Whenever their elders came into contact with him, he addressed them in harsh and abusive words. The high and respectable leaders of the Israelites were insulted and abused, and their venerable priests and Pharisees were addressed by him as adulterous and wicked people. He told others not to call any one a fool, but when the time came to act upon this injunction, he took a different course and did not hesitate to call the elders of the Jews as swine and generation of vipers. It is clear from these instances that the Jews are not quite empty-handed in finding faults with Jesus, but have enough of material to make use of for this purpose. This we are obliged to confess, notwithstanding that we, as his admirers, know that Jesus must have made use of such harsh words on the proper occasion and not merely to injure the feelings of his opponents. It is not easy, however, to make an hostile critic take them in that light and assure him that the abusive tone is justified on account of the use of the words on the proper occasion. An unprejudiced mind will no doubt sympathise with the Jews, and even an admirer of Jesus cannot overlook the difficulties which kept them back from the acceptance of his mission. They were hardly able to reconcile his deeds with his words. His teachings were not supported by his own practice. On the one hand, he enjoined his followers to turn the left cheek on receiving a slap on the right, however serious the blow might be, and to show mildness and forbearance on every occasion ; and, on the other, he adopted a course quite the contrary of what he taught. The Jews addressed him as master, but he paid back their politeness in the harshest words. One who is ignorant of the real circumstances can assert

with plausibility that the teachings and example of Jesus lead different ways.

This example well illustrates how a reformer is sometimes obliged to make use of words which on a surface look might appear as harsh and abusive. We are, however, sure that the prospectus we issued did not contain any such word as might appear harsh to an unbiassed critic. But as our opinion in matters of religion is different from that of the Christian Missionaries, we cannot accept the principles of their religion, nor can we declare them to be upon the right path, nor hide our opinion only because it differs from theirs. With this difference we cannot understand if we have overstepped the limits of politeness and decorum which persons with opposite views can observe towards one another. We hope "The Civil and Military Gazette" will point out the offensive words which led it to call our writing "a new kind of *Jehad*," in which the pen had taken the place of the sword, so that the public might be able to judge of the truth of its remarks. But if our words are within the limits which can be allowed for a difference of opinion, we hope the paper will, in justice to us, take back its remarks regarding the undue harshness of our language, for if they remain uncontradicted they will mislead the Government and the public.

Everyone is aware that religious opinions, being imprinted upon the brain from an early age, are usually so firm that the slightest opposition to them is strongly felt. Any statement involving a refutation of the opinions of a party is likely to injure his feelings, and that shall be the case so long as human nature is not altered. Nay, the mere mention of hostile opinions is often enough to rouse revolt. No one can be pleased with the religious opinions of another man until he actually subscribes to them. Ill-feeling between holders of opposite religious views is therefore, to a large extent, a necessary consequence of this difference. One of the greatest benefits of the British Government is the religious liberty which it has conferred upon us. It takes no objection to an honest declaration of opinion in religious matters. Just as the Christian Missionaries are at liberty to declare openly their hostile views regarding other religions, Government has placed the adherents of other religions on an equal footing by giving them the right of publishing their views upon the Christian faith.

Another remark of the Lahore daily in its review upon our Prospectus requires to be explained. "This counterblast to Christian Missionary effort, we understand," says the paper, "comes really from the modern *Soi-distant* prophet of Islam.' We leave it for the editor to consider if these are gentler words than ours. We respect Jesus Christ and revere his name not only as other Muslims do, on account of his being a prophet of God, but our love and reverence for him are greater than theirs, on account of the resemblance which our Imam, the promised Messiah, bears to him. We no doubt admit that the Magazine has been started in accordance with the wishes and in furtherance of the cause of the promised Messiah, and it is under his guidance that we shall be able to present, in these pages, religion as a science, for he is averse to every kind of religious warfare, whether openly conducted in the form of Jihad or Crusades with steel weapons, or disguised in the form of petty religious controversies in which all limits of decency and politeness are broken, and sacred religious leaders abused as deceivers and imposters. We intend in this Magazine to treat questions of religion in the scientific method of research, not as idle tales of things done in the past as to the truth of which no reliable testimony can be brought forward. Since the beginning of his mission, the promised Messiah has always had this object at heart and publicly expressed his desire upon more than one occasion. On the last occasion, he submitted a memorial to the Government of India, accompanied with about 15,000 signatures, praying for the enactment of a law which should check religious controversies temporarily at least for a period of ten years, and allow the discussion of religious questions only to the extent of stating the merits of one's own religion without abusing those of others. The Government, however, could not see its way to the acceptance of that memorial. The challenge to the Bishop of Lahore, to which the "Civil and Military Gazette" has also alluded, was proposed to be conducted on the same lines, but his Lordship refused to accept the challenge upon grounds whose futility we shall show elsewhere.

The Magazine has now been started, and in it every question shall be discussed upon principles of reason and research, so that availing ourselves of the invaluable boon of religious liberty which Government has conferred upon us, we might be able to serve the cause of truth so far as we can. Now that the religions

of the world have entered the lists for a competition and are contending with one another for supremacy, a new religion has sprung up which, standing apart from all, desires to reform all. This is the religion known by the name of the Ahmadiyyah religion whose leader and guide is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, chief of Qadian, who being inspired by God and with the evidence of heavenly signs in his support, claims to be the Promised Messiah. To identify this propaganda with the existing Muslim sects is a mistake, and it is not improbable that some Government officials who are not fully aware of the principles of this movement, might be labouring under a similar misconception. We, therefore, wish to say expressly that we hold aloof from the existing Muslim sects. Many articles of their belief which are based upon puerile narratives or incorrect theories, are rejected *in toto* by the Ahmadiyyah sect. Such beliefs are against the will of God and against reason. For instance, there is the idea of *Jehad* which, however concealed, lurks in many minds and has, to the great misfortune of the Muslims, such a strong hold over them that they cannot bid a last welfare to it. Almost every sect of the Muslims still expects the advent of a bloody Mahdi who shall wage religious wars against all non-Muslims and fill the earth with blood. This expectation has blinded their reasons so that they cannot understand that religious truths instead of being established by bloodshed, are thrown into further darkness and doubt.

In direct opposition to this dangerous doctrine, the peaceful teachings of the promised Messiah are that *Jehad* is strictly prohibited and that the person who takes up the sword for the propagation of religion is a sinner before God. He proves it from the holy Quran and from authentic reports that the promised Messiah who shall come in the latter days of the world (and who has already made his appearance), shall not wage wars. It shall, on the other hand, be a sign by which he shall be recognised that he shall declare the illegality of *Jehad*, and bring people to the path of righteousness by heavenly signs and clear arguments. It is therefore a necessary condition of *Ba'at* that the disciple shall hate such ideas and look upon them as sinful. This difference should not be looked upon as insignificant, for it has not only led to hatred and malice against the new sect but brought denunciations

and *fatwās* of heresy upon the head of the founder. The appearance of a Messiah who denounces the shedding of a drop of blood for the sake of religion, has blasted all their hopes of *Jehad* and plunder and hence the bitterness of feeling towards the claimant.

Every now and then we see a Mahdi arising with the sword followed by thousands of Muhammdans who never demand a single sign but are ready to accept every claim upon a call to arms. The case of the founder of the Ahmadiyyah sect presents a fine contrast to this. Notwithstanding that he has shown more than 150 signs in support of his claim, he is rejected by the Maulvis and pronounced as an heretic. The reason of this difference is nothing but the rejection of their theory of a bloody Mahdi and the ideas of *Jehad*. The Government may not be aware of this but, sooner or later, every truth must be revealed, and we therefore respectfully request the authorities to set themselves at rest, as to the true principles inculcated by this sect, by all possible means and to pry into its internal conditions. Some men have even gone so far as to attack our honesty in this matter and accuse us of flattery. To this we can give no reply but that their case is that of the blind man who, in spite of his feeling the heat of the sun and the testimony of an overwhelming majority, may yet deny the existence of that glorious orb of light. Since the Promised Messiah began his career as an author,—a period extending over almost a quarter of the last century—he has incessantly preached against *Jehad*, and this he has done with no ambitious motives but simply as a duty to Government and to the community. Such views he has not only published in India but circulated vastly in other Muslim countries, such as Afghanistan, Persia, Syria, Arabia, Egypt and Turkey through his Arabic and Persian writings, a fact which supplies an irrefutable testimony to the honesty of his motives. His praises of the Government are, moreover, not mere assertions but supported by weighty arguments which establish its obligations and benefits beyond all doubt over the people whom it delivered from a fiery furnace. Is it possible that the person who has spent such a long portion of his life, bringing him close upon old age, in the performance of a service to which he was not actuated by any motives of gain, has all along been a hypocrite? Or can one imagine that the man who has to teach thousands of his followers, speaks a lie before every

one of them? Or can he, consistently with his position as a spiritual guide, induce them to tell lies and deceive people? Could a single man under these circumstances acknowledge him as a spiritual leader? As a subject of conversation the doctrine of *Jehad* is repeatedly discussed in his company. The assumption of concealment in respect of such a beaten subject is monstrous. On numerous occasions we have heard him say that as he bears a complete resemblance to Jesus Christ so much so that his advent is, on account of this close union, looked upon as the coming of Jesus, just as the appearance of John was looked upon as the advent of Elias, it was therefore necessary that he should, like Jesus Christ, have appeared in humble garments unattended by any regal pomp. But, fortunately for us, he has opened the way to clear and cogent arguments for truth, and his earnest advice, repeatedly given to his disciples, is that they should look upon the British Government as a blessing from God, for no Muslim Government could ever have allowed us the freedom of expressing our religious opinion which we enjoy under the English rule.

If circumstances do not allow us to fully avail ourselves of our good intentions towards this Government, we are at least certain that the Government has not conferred special rights of religious freedom upon people who, day and night, tread Islam under their feet with their pens and tongues, but that its equity and justice extend their benefits equally to all. The wise policy of the Government which has under it people of different religious persuasions, is based on deep political considerations, and it therefore allows no special favour to the Christian Missionaries, but open-handedly and ungrudgingly gives the same rights to its non-Christian subjects for expressing their opinions against the Christian religion as it gives to the Christian Missionaries in respect of other religions. We as a sect do not acknowledge any temporal ruler other than the British Government, as *Khalifa* of the Muslims, as many Muhammadans do, and therefore it is from this Government alone that we expect the protection of our liberty both in religious and temporal matters. We are willing, heart and soul, to sacrifice our lives in the cause of the Government, but to humour the Christian Missionaries is out of our power. It is with a heart full of sympathy that we say that a searching inquiry and complete investigation keeps us back from the state-religion, but we know that the Government loves truth and observes the principle of

neutrality in religion, and therefore the man who loves and spreads truth, does not act against its intentions or violate its laws. The ultimate consequences of truth are always beneficial to society, and love of justice is a valuable gem. But the man who rejects that which is demonstrated to be true, deals a death-blow to the cause of truth. One thing is no doubt necessary, *viz.*, that in case where opposite opinions are to be refuted, it should be done in fair words and good manneredly. In raising objections one should observe the limits of moderation, and in arguing questions one must show civility and politeness. It is on these principles that we intend to conduct the Magazine.

It should be clearly understood that difference in religious opinions in no way interferes with sincere loyalty to Government. It is on the other hand a blessing from God, for which the Government should render thanks to Him, that He made it so prosperous and flourishing as to have under its shelter numerous sects differing in principles of religion from one another. The Government resembles a huge tree on which birds of every color and climate take their rest. Those who allege the partiality of the Government for the Christian Missionaries are in error, for the Government neither leans towards one sect nor hampers the progress of another. Our wise Government is far from committing the political error of bestowing unequal favours upon different sects, or expressing its displeasure upon anyone of them in particular, in religious matters, in a country where the subjects do not profess the same religion as the ruling authorities.

It is true that we described Jesus only as a man, as he was taken to be in the age in which he lived, and we further alluded to his death—facts which have exasperated the missionary gentlemen as contradicting their cherished beliefs. But we cannot avoid that, when the holy Quran is full of verses decrying the monstrosity of Christian belief in taking Jesus for God and stating in plain words that he was a man who died like other men. His deification, the holy Book clearly says, is a human error, of which there have been numerous instances among all ancient people before the time of Jesus. There are thus two opposite views, the Muslims holding one view as correct, and the Christians the other. With this difference the Government does not

interfere, for upon not a few questions, religious as well as others, there exist so many differences of opinion in the world. It may itself hold some one view, but then it cannot hold persons guilty who in good faith hold the opposite. If the missionary gentlemen have seen the deity of Jesus, or if they have got any proof of it in hand, they should come forward with it instead of showing excitement on the expression of the contrary view. If it is a truth which they can demonstrate, no reasonable person would reject it. But they have no reason to be offended if another man offers reasons for his own assertions, however blasphemous they may appear to them on the first sight. The acceptance of truths which are conclusively proved to be so, sharpens the intellect and adds to the wisdom of man. It is impossible for a jaundiced eye to look clearly into matters, but in justice the opponents of Christianity have as much right to adduce arguments against the deity of Jesus as the missionaries have to bring forth reasons, if there are any, in support of it. If they can make out a case they should not fear any opposition which is offered to it, but if the opposite view is the correct one, their excitement is in vain.

Advancement in spiritual truths depends upon three things:

- (1) There should be a natural inclination in the people towards truth and honesty.
- (2) The people should be fond of deep research and close investigation.
- (3) The Government under which they live should encourage literary taste and act upon principles of justice.

We think that by God's grace and mercy all these conditions are fulfilled in our country. There is many a heart that loves truth sincerely and is willing to undergo the severest trials for its sake. There are others whose brains are naturally adapted for research. They are not only ready to accept every spiritual truth, but are enabled by the light of research within them to draw pure truth from the darkness of difference. And lastly, the British Government whose benevolent rule has been vouchsafed to us by Almighty God, is a liberal

and high-minded government that loves the spread of truth and knowledge. Its high officials are characterized by a spirit of impartiality and deal out even-handed justice to its subjects without distinction of creed or color. It is by the blessing of this equal treatment that mysteries are being unriddled and hidden truths coming to light. They are not led away from the principles of justice and equity by any bias for religion in dealing with the Christian Missionaries. They have practically shown themselves to be patrons of learning, lovers of justice, and searchers after truth. These statements are not destitute of proof, but we can establish their truth by facts.

Their love for justice and freedom from all religious prejudice is evinced in a case in which the promised Messiah, the leader and founder of the Ahmadiyyah religion, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Chief of Qadian, was personally involved. The case is interesting both from its facts and the parties to it. Long before the institution of the prosecution, the promised Messiah informed such of his followers as were then present at Qadian—a large number of them being always there as permanent or temporary residents—that God had revealed to him that he was going to be involved in a serious case in which he shall be dragged into the Court of law, but that ultimately his innocence shall be established and he shall be acquitted. The whole body were anxiously waiting as to what guilt could be laid to his charge when a few weeks after he received a summons to present himself in the Court of the District Magistrate of Gurdaspur. A respectable Christian Missionary gentleman of Amritsar, Dr. Henry Martyn Clarke, had prosecuted him for abetment of his own murder. One Abdul Hamid, who had twice or thrice become a renegade to Christianity, and as often reverted to Islam, went to the missionary gentleman above-named and duped him into the belief that he was a Hindoo by birth and was desirous of receiving baptism. Mischievously instigated by some paid preachers of the Gospel of Jesus, who worked under Dr. Clarke, he declared that the Mirza of Qadian had sent him to murder the said doctor. These native evangelists then appeared in the court as witnesses for the prosecution to give further proof of their love for enemies, and left no stone unturned to get the Mirza implicated. The prosecution had apparently made out a case, for there was the statement of Abdul Hamid and the evidence

of so many respectable preachers of the Gospel of truth. Had the Magistrate been a little less sagacious and just, or had he made a little less close inquiry into the circumstances of the case or shown the smallest favor to the respectable missionary prosecutor, the ends of justice would have been departed from. But he saw with a keen sight that the case was got up, and after a complete investigation got the truth in hand. Captain W. Douglas, now Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, showed praiseworthy impartiality in the case and gave a practical proof of the 'fair field and no favor' policy of the British Government. This was indeed a trying occasion for showing impartiality, for the prosecutor was not only a co-religionist of the Magistrate, but a respectable preacher of the Gospel, whose position and vocation gave weight to his statements. The evidence also was largely made up of the statements of Christian Missionaries, and the whole body were desirous of bringing their opponent under the clutches of the law. The accused was on religious grounds the greatest opponent missionaries had ever had to encounter. The case in which he was implicated was of a serious nature, being a murder case ; and a finding against him would have brought ruin upon his head. But not a single one of these considerations had the smallest weight with the noble-minded Magistrate. With clear insight he saw that the accused being a prominent opponent of Christianity, the case was one of religious hatred carried to excess.

These are the peculiar features of the British rule which attract the hearts of its subjects and make them so devotedly attached to it. The broadness of heart displayed by the Magistrate in the above case deserves to be written in letters of gold, for he not only declared the innocence of an opponent of Christian religion, but, without any fear of censure, hesitated not to cast a slur upon the missionary gentleman and his followers by declaring that they had brought a false case against their religious opponent. This justice and impartiality is one of the chief causes of the prosperity of the Government. We are also glad to note that the present head of the Government of India has on many occasions shown the same spirit of impartiality, and his model serves as a guide for all Government officials. Such instances have strengthened the mutual relations of sympathy and devotion between the rulers and the ruled. To get irritated or bear a malice on matters of difference in religious opinions, is

far from a broad-minded and prosperous government to which Providence has entrusted the care of millions of human beings of every creed and colour, and to which the Heavenly government has granted power as its vicegerent upon earth. The same law holds good in the workings of the Divine government which extends the benefit of its mercy to all alike, whatever their religious persuasions, though only one of the so many opposing religions is true and the others are all false. Heaven does not send down stones upon any religion as a mark of its displeasure, nor does it punish anyone for his erroneous doctrines, but the sun, the moon, the elements and every thing that God's hand has made, are engaged in the common service of all men, and every body reaps his share of advantage from them. If God ever sent down His punishment upon those who own a false religion, it was not simply the falsity of their religion that brought down the wrath of heaven upon them but the excess of their iniquities and an open revolt against His commandments. The Divine Law is not for sending punishment in this world upon people who follow other than the true religion, or for depriving them of the blessings which God's general mercy has vouchsafed to all. In the same manner, religious discrepancies do not weigh with just rulers as reasons for ill-will against any particular sect. They deem themselves as trustees charged with the care of the creatures of God who live under them. Irascibility and irritation on being confronted with opposing religious views, betray a narrow mind and illiberal views.

Religious difference does in no way affect the rights of man and his claim upon our civility and morals does not suffer on account of variance in religious opinions. Let us look into the causes which provoke a man to anger upon a refutation of his opinions. If the reason of his indignation is the rejection of the eternal salvation which he offers for the welfare of others, he should be moved to compassion for them and not to anger, because they do not accept the salvation which has been prepared for them. But if he is indignant because of the rejection of the dogmas which he professes, he is guilty of an iniquity hardly surpassed in its unreasonableness ; for he has then no sympathy with the poor creature but wishes to coerce him to the course which he himself follows. That a mere difference of opinion in religious matters should not be considered as a cause of

hatred and ill-will, is a principle of first importance and it is one which is conducive to the peace and welfare of society. Provocation on such differences which form part and parcel of the human nature, is a degradation for the noblest of God's creatures. The man, whom a refutation of his views lashes into fury, is really a mad man and dangerous to the peace of society. For instance, if a man denies the mission of our holy prophet, may God pour His choicest blessings upon him, and he is in doubt as to the nature of his revelations, it behoves us as sympathetic and merciful human beings to explain it to him with politeness and try to clear his doubts in gentle words. We should convince him that we treat him as a friend and not as an enemy, and that with true love and sympathy we are ready to clear his mind of all reasonable doubts. But if we take a different course and consider the honest doubts of another man as an insult to our religion, as most of the Maulvis do, our ire shall only do harm to our own cause. Unable to assist one who deserves our assistance for not being able to comprehend the principles of our religion, our narrow-mindedness shall make upon him a further impression of our low standard of morality. One who rejects a belief for which sufficient grounds are not stated to him, has the right to do so, and incivility towards him is really to put a restraint upon his religious liberty. Such a course of conduct is equally rejected by reason, justice and human sympathy.

Men whose minds are swayed by religious prejudice, are utterly devoid of true morals and kind feelings. A Muslim does not deserve to be so called if he does not extend his good manners and sympathy to all alike but confines them within the pale of his own narrow views. Similarly, we must condemn the conduct of the Christian Missionaries who, taken away by religious prejudice, lose their temper, and not only bid farewell to the teachings of the Gospels and the text of "Love your enemies," but insist that the Government also should adopt their wrong policy. We notice indeed a remarkable contrast between the conduct of the Christian Missionaries and that of the British officials. The Gospel humility, gentleness and impartiality which one should have naturally expected in the preachers of the Gospels, is witnessed in the Government dignitaries. In the instance already cited, one reverend gentleman assisted by the minor evangelists prosecuted, with all

earnestness, our holy Imam and guide for an attempt of murder. But the District Magistrate, who tried the case, got to the reality and clearly saw that the evidence for the prosecution was wanting in substantiality. Here one is naturally led to inquire why a missionary gentleman did an act by which he would have involved an innocent and guiltless person in a murderous deed, and used every effort to bring a holy man into discredit, and Captain Douglas, who was also a European but with this difference that he was not an exponent or preacher of the Gospel like Dr. Clarke, at once saw with an eagle-glance the reality and rejected the whole mass of doubtful, chiefly false, evidence brought for the prosecution. Out of the darkness, the truth flashed upon him like a flash of lightning bursting from amidst the dark clouds and lightening the sky and the earth.

If the keen sight and pure conscience which enabled Captain Douglas to judge truth from falsehood in an instant, were the result of Gospel-teaching, how was the effect of those teachings nullified in the case of the missionary gentlemen who day and night studied and preached the Gospel. We can hardly imagine Captain Douglas being able to spare, from his already over-tasked time, some hours daily to read the Gospels or to preach them to the heathen. How did he then acquire that perspicacity and enlargement of mind which did not fall to the lot of an evangelist? What was the source from which he got that integrity which alone enabled him to remain unflinching in the course of justice in a case in which a little less scrupulousness or a little more spirit of favoritism, could have led to injustice without fear of censure or blame. He remained neutral all along and delivered his judgment in the same spirit, though it was given against the wishes of a body of missionaries. Captain Douglas did not, we suppose, acquire this love of justice and untiring zeal to find out the truth through the Gospel-preaching gentlemen, but inherited these two noble traits of character from his parents and they were his personal excellences. Otherwise, we are unable to account for the total want of such qualities in the missionaries themselves who ought to have been the fountain-source of all that is noble and exalted. But the facts which show that Captain Douglas possessed these high qualities, prove that the missionary gentlemen concerned were totally devoid of them.

It is not uncharitable to conclude from the facts of this case that most of the English officials who come here as administrators, do not owe the nobility of their character to the reverend gentlemen at home, and their love for justice and fairness is not acquired through religious training but forms part and parcel of their nature. If it can be specially attributed to any one cause, it is due to the good-will of the sovereign. It is natural that when the ruler displays a spirit of impartiality and justice, those who carry out his commandments are imbued with the same spirit. As the Queen possessed these characteristics in an excellent degree and showed an admirable neutrality in religious matters in her dealings with her subjects, her course of justice never being darkened by religious prejudice, therefore her subordinates too guided themselves in all their actions by the same rule of conduct. The Queen, though she is no more among us, has left her model of absolute freedom from religious prejudice behind her, which every officer of Government and every editor of a newspaper must try to emulate. There is not a single instance in which the Queen allowed religious prejudice to interfere in her politics. She was so kind to her subjects that a Muhammadan, under her peaceful and just rule, thought as if he was living under the protection of a just Muhammadan monarch, and a Hindoo considered that an *avatar* had been sent to rule over him. The subjects did not feel that they were under a foreign rule, so close were the relations between the rulers and the ruled. Her conquest over hearts was as great and wide as her conquest over countries, and if the one was effected by force of arms, the other was brought about by her winning manners and her kind treatment.

The vast popularity she enjoyed cannot be described in words. The Muhammadans felt bound to her by an inexpressible tie when they saw her kindness towards them and witnessed the royal favors bestowed upon one of their co-religionists whom she had condescended to choose as her Munshi. These expressions of her kind feelings towards the Muslim community produced a trust and a sympathy in the hearts of the subjects and the Government officials respectively, and made the former conscious of the anxiety with which the Queen looked to their welfare. The royal favours, which the Queen bestowed upon her Muhammadan Munshi, could not have been quite in accordance with the wishes of the Missionaries. The annals of her reign

abound in similar acts of liberality which display a broadness of mind quite inconsistent with the narrow sympathies of prelates and evangelists. In short, the love of justice and equity which we witness in so many officials of the British Government, is due to the influence of their sovereign.

It was not her love of justice alone for which the late Queen was so remarkable and popular, but she was also characterized by a clemency of nature, being ever ready to forgive the faults of those under her shelter. In 1857* a large majority of disloyal and faithless Indians mutinied against her Government and brutally butchered thousands of innocent Europeans with their wives and children and committed the most horrible atrocities. The people of this country shall ever feel ashamed at this blot in their escutcheon. The horrible nature of that crime called for an exceptionally severe punishment, and thousands of the faithless mischief-makers especially the religious leaders who excited the mobs to inhuman deeds, deserved to be punished with death. But when the proposal of inflicting such a punishment upon the delinquents was brought before Her Majesty, she did not consent to it. When told that the delinquents being rebels deserved to be severely handled, the Queen replied that such punishment was not, at any rate, consistent with the gentleness of her sex. Such was her kindness towards her Hindoo and Muhammadan subjects, that she could easily forgive them when strict justice or political considerations would have necessitated another course. The Queen, though she professed the Christian religion, was free from every religious prejudice and bigotry. Her prosperity and greatness were in a large measure due to her vast sympathies which went without any considerations of religion. But this liberality and broad-mindedness she did not acquire through priests and preachers. Her noble descent, her own pure nature and sympathetic soul had placed her upon this eminence. It cannot be denied that the people who can be, most of all, expected to have benefitted from the gospel teachings, are the gentlemen who preach it day and night, and who are ever anxious to introduce its high moral teachings as a compulsory subject in Govern-

* This event tried the loyalty of the Indian Chiefs. Mirza Ghulam Murtaza, the father of our Imam, the Promised Messiah, Chief of Qadian, rendered faithful service to the Government at this critical moment by assisting it with 50 horses and 50 sows, which he supplied at his own cost—a step which considering the scanty income of his reduced estate, he could have only taken by selling a large part of it.

ment schools and colleges. But if we may be allowed to compare their manners with those displayed by the sovereign and his officers, we shall find a remarkable difference. The superiority of the latter over the former leads us to the only conclusion that the source from which excellent morals and sympathetic views practically flow, is not and cannot be the New Testament. This statement is based upon facts. We see that the missionaries who are nearest to the source, are totally devoid of the excellent liberal-mindedness displayed by men whom the welfare of their kind and their worldly affairs keep farther off from the source.

Human nature where it has been endowed with so many faculties, possesses two noble characteristics. Firstly, a moral greatness above all religious prejudice and narrowness of views. Secondly, a high degree of sagacity, an acuteness of intellect and an enlargement of mind which should rarely, if at all, mislead one in politics and the welfare of the people at large. Now, if to attain to a perfection in these noble qualities the Gospel is the only way, we can only conclude that the Christian Missionaries must possess them in the highest degree. But when we come to facts, we are utterly disappointed in our conclusion. If we could suppose the reins of government placed in the hands of the highest church dignitary in this land, we could not expect from him the broad-mindedness, the far-sightedness and the neutrality which we witness in the present head of the Government of India. The sympathetic views of the missionaries are very narrow, and their moral and intellectual progress is impeded by religious prejudice and short-sightedness. In their simplicity they think that the time has come when the belief of Jesus' divinity shall be welcomed by the majority of mankind. They are not yet aware that the intellects of men have been sharpened and their understandings refined to such an extent that the monstrous doctrine of the deity of man is the last thing which can meet their acceptance. Europe was plunged in ignorance and darkness when this dogma was introduced there but now the case is otherwise. Had the circumstances been a little less favorable to the growth of this doctrine, and had Europe reached the high stage of progress a few centuries earlier, there is no doubt that it could not have suffered the introduction of this error.

In short, it is an established fact that the Christian Missionaries do not exhibit the vast sympathies and liberal views which are important factors in strengthening the hold of Government upon its subjects, and which so eminently characterize the Government officials. But what a surprise when we further learn that the doctrine of the deity of Jesus upon which so much stress is laid by the preachers of the Gospel, lacks the support of all reasonable evidence. It is from habit only that this belief now appears so dear to them. In fact, ideas to which the mind habitually recurs and which are at last associated with national unity and national institutions, are so deeply rooted in the heart and so strongly imprinted upon the brain that their eradication is a task attended with the most serious difficulties. The existence of God being under a veil, those alone fear him who walk upon the earth in justice and righteousness. It is they who find their peace, their paradise and their bliss in truth alone. All others are involved in religious prejudices and worship not their God, but their customs, their habits and their national institutions. Christians as well as Muham-madans are equally under this blame. So long as man leads a formally religious life and is not animated with the spirit which is breathed by God, his righteousness is merely a word of the mouth, be he an Evangelist, a Maulvi or a Pundit. Until a soul of purity is breathed into him, he cannot be free from prejudice. It is easier for putrid matter to be divested of its foul odour than for such a man to be invested with high morals. But the man who is freed from conventionalities and traditional beliefs, and walks upon the scientific line of research, is not influenced by prejudice. He keeps away from narrow views, and his sympathy widens its circle.

The distinction should be clearly kept in mind. In every religion the ranks of the clerical and the preaching professions are usually filled up from men of a poorer type. It is not narrow-mindedness alone which characterizes this class but generally a dullness and a weakness in the upper story. They deem themselves above the laity but are really its slaves. They have not the opportunity to transform themselves; they are never persecuted and abused so that their real worth—a thing quite different from the false dignity which they assume from being raised on a platform—may be brought to light. They pass their whole lives in blindly following their traditional beliefs and formal practices without turning a hair's breadth from them. Their

sole considerations are the maintenance of their income and the preservation of their supposed dignity with the masses, and they worship the idol of national prejudice. All their moves are determined by that idol, and they pass away from the stage of existence without ever getting a single opportunity to oppose the masses on religious views. Their conscience often accuses them that the creed which they profess and preach, does not stand fair and open criticism but other, and probably weightier, considerations do not allow them to argue the other side of the question. They cannot submit their teachings to close and searching inquiries which other men do in their most trifling worldly affairs. The sincere spiritual motive of a zeal for truth does not operate with them to any considerable extent.

Take, on the other hand, the case of a man who proceeds with religious questions upon the scientific method of reasoning. He does not stick to doctrinal beliefs to please the masses but starts with true zeal to enquire after truth. He is not satisfied until he has established a fact with clear and convincing arguments. He is not, moreover narrow-minded and ill-tempered, for his sympathetic nature is not satisfied until he has enlightened others with the light of knowledge that has been revealed to him. He is naturally endowed with a philanthropic spirit, and his universal benevolence is like the loving-kindness of a father towards his children. He neither himself finds any satisfaction in unwarranted statements and unreasonable assertions, nor does he like that others should adopt such a course. He loves convincing arguments and when his own are put to the test of reasonable criticism or opposed on legitimate grounds, he listens with patience.

The age in which we live is essentially an age of reason, and as such its first requisite is that religious disputations should be conducted upon intellectual lines. The assertions and idle tales from which most religions have largely drawn their nourishment hitherto, have not benefitted mankind in the least, nor thrown light upon any pure truth. The greatest harm has proceeded to the world from this quarter. They have impaired morality, narrowed sympathetic views and dealt a serious blow to spiritual advancement. It cannot be, therefore, that now when science reigns supreme in the material world, religion should have been left behind in the matter, and religious disputations should not have been placed upon a scientific footing.

Almighty God has brought this about by sending the Promised Messiah as His messenger upon earth to bring about this transformation. He has been appointed to throw the light of true scientific research upon the realities over which the religious world is holding controversies. All reasonable minds have felt the need that when the material world has made a marvellous progress and donned the bright clothes of science, religious truths must also assume some better aspect. Out of so many contending religions the one that can claim for itself truth and beauty far above others, must now come forward with the crown of transcendent reason upon its head, and with an intellectual force that can appeal to all reasonable men.

It should be clearly borne in mind that if the religious contest is destined to come to a determination some day, that must be the day when all questions are judged upon a scientific basis. The religion that can establish its superiority by a systematic appeal to reason, shall win the hard contest. But those days should not be considered far. In fact they have already come, and the intellects of men are now sufficiently refined to discard error for truth and to prefer a scientific research to the foolish stories that pleased the bygone ages. Men who show an acumen in the discharge of their worldly affairs, have come so far nearer the realization of spiritual truths, and are expected to show an equal, if not a greater, grasp of intellect in the apprehension of religious matters. The growing refinement of the calibre of men is therefore a sign that they shall soon be able to grasp the truth in religion. In short, the dawn of a new age has appeared, in which every thing that is of some importance to man, is treated on a scientific basis, and the intellectual capacities of men are fast improving. It appears as if it had been destined from the very beginning that all childish theories and fallacious statements be exploded in this age of reason and the reality be unveiled by means of demonstrable facts. The new age has brought a new test for the discrimination of truth from error and for judging the validity of that which claims to be a remedy for the existing evils. Morally, the society is rotten to its very core. If we were to picture the moral conduct of men, we should represent it as a sick man whose every limb languishes under some disease and suffers from some ailment. Religiously, the beliefs are in a corrupt and rotten state ;

morally, the whole atmosphere seems to be vitiated ; socially, the mutual relations are in a shockingly deplorable condition.

The question naturally arises where is the remedy to be sought for these all-absorbing evils. Religion alone could afford it but not religion as it exists ; it must be treated upon a surer and a more systematic method. The true knowledge of God should first be established by clear and convincing arguments and all erroneous views should be exposed. When this important question is set at rest, then the moral and social relations of men should be treated upon the same experimental basis. After the requisite issues are formed and a complete investigation has finally sifted truth from error, we shall be able to arrive at certain conclusions upon all religious, moral and social questions. The weakness which now attaches to all matters in connection with these questions on account of the incertitude which prevails in them, shall thus be removed. Every remedy that mortal efforts could propose, has been tried and proved insufficient for assuaging the flood of passion. The world stands in need of a guide who should point out the true remedy for the evil, and show the way by walking in which the trammels of passion and low desires should be cut asunder. A regeneration of the world can only be effected by bringing about a true knowledge of God, a high tone of morality, and an uprightness and integrity in all social relations and transactions. The greatest harm has resulted to the world from departing from these three courses of righteousness and it is being dragged down, lower and lower every day, into the depths of iniquity.

Every nation of earth has plunged into this darkness in one way or another. There are, first of all, the Christians who have made Jesus their God and thus polluted the pure fountain of God's unity with an enormous amount of rubbish and filth. Thinking minds among them are, no doubt, conscious of the monstrosity of this dogma which takes a weak mortal for the eternal and living God, and with all his faults and weaknesses sets him on the throne of God's glory, perfection, and majesty. The Muhammadans, on the other hand, while professing a belief in the eternal, unchangeable and omnipotent God, who undergoes no trials, nor suffers birth or death, have practically taken a wrong course, and their deeds contradict their lip-beliefs. It is no doubt true that the belief itself, which is the nucleus of truth, has by the eternal grace of God,

been the noble possession of Islam and its beauty; but at the same time there can be no denying the fact that the vast majority of Muhammadans who claim to believe in the true God, have really no faith at all. Their faith does not step beyond their lips and is not accompanied by the true assurance which is its vital force. They have no trust in His providence and no earnestness and sincerity in their prayers. They do not realize the certainty of the oneness of God. Nay, had their faith in God been based upon even a high degree of probability, their morality and their social relations would still have been of a more elevated character. The reformers work is not therefore limited to any one community. The nations of the earth all stand alike in need of being guided in the paths of purity, so that strengthened by God they may reach the goal of truth and righteousness.

This grand reformation cannot be effected by mortal efforts. The prevailing evils defy human wisdom, for it is not accompanied by the heavenly light which gives true satisfaction to hearts. No religious preaching and no advanced movements can effect the desired regeneration. A reference to the past avails but little now. People have outgrown the religious dogmas based on childish narratives. The true grandeur of religion cannot be impressed upon the people if they are simply to be referred to miraculous narratives in the by-gone times. To regain its conquest over hearts, religion must show its true worth and make it palpably felt. The supernaturalistic legends of what happened or is thought to have happened so many centuries back, are taken only for what they are worth, and cannot save religion from being drowned into the flood of materialism and the current of atheism which have already undermined its foundations. Their mass is simply dead weight without any force. A living power is needed to overcome the evil tendency. The darkness that now exists cannot be dispelled by the mere name of light but by its actual presence. It is therefore necessary that to draw the world out of the depths of darkness, there must be actual light whose radiant beams should shatter the pervading gloom. Religious belief has withered away and any conviction about it is now impossible until its truth is demonstrated upon sound and conclusive arguments. No solemnity, so great as to draw the hearts of all seekers after truth towards it, can attach to a belief until it is firmly founded upon reason, especially in an age when all dogmas of religion, devoid of inherent force and

based upon silly narratives, are threatened to be swept away in the strong current of Atheism and Freethought and to be crushed down under the silent but heavy pressure of a thousand other agencies. A mere appeal to the feelings, devoid of truth and reality, does not suit the advanced intellects of the new age. Narratives of the miraculous, with no foundation, which wrought upon the minds in the past cannot please the new generation. Every one feels that he stands in need of a complete scientific research in all matters.

This is the spirit of the age in which we live and people and governments alike feel the change. Nothing is more unreasonable than to assert that the Government under which we live, views such researches in religious questions with disfavour. It is entertaining unreasonable doubts about the honest policy of the Government's neutrality and its admirable principle and love of justice. The Government believes in the sincere loyalty of its Indian subjects, especially of the families whose attachment and faithfulness have been tested in the Mutiny of 1857. The constancy of this loyal class which gave proof of its sincerity in the trying moments of the mutiny, defies impeachment and cannot be wavered by any consideration or motive. The officials of the Government have full confidence in their loyalty whenever there is an occasion. It is to one of these families that our Imam, the promised Messiah belongs. His father, Mirza Ghulam Murtaza, rendered faithful service to the Government, which was acknowledged by the authorities. His brother, Mirza Ghulam Qadir, personally fought against the Mutineers at Timmo Ghat, and thus the family has given proof of its service to the Government with life and property. To these Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who is the leader of the Ahmadiyyah sect, has made a valuable addition by means of his pen. During the last twenty-two years he has written about fifty books in Arabic, Persian and Urdu in which he has laid stress upon rendering true obedience and faithful service to the British Government and declared the illegality of *Jehad*. These publications have been circulated abroad in the Muslim world in large numbers. He has further made it a condition of *Bai'at* that the disciple should be loyal and faithful to the Government. The sect may therefore congratulate itself upon this eminent distinction that as a body it rejects those dangerous dogmas which have been a disgrace to the name of Islam. Every new member has to undergo a transformation of which this one is no unimportant feature.

UNITY v. TRINITY.

I.

For those who believe in God and His attributes and in the reward of good and evil hereafter, it is of the first importance to find out the true means of salvation

If the Divine laws of nature, the human nature itself, the plainest evidence in the teachings of the holy books of God, the opinion of the majority of the believers in His revealed word, and other living and incontrovertible proofs, all tend to show and speak with one voice that there is no salvation except through the blood of Jesus Christ, and no deliverance from eternal punishment but through a belief in the mysterious doctrine of Trinity, injustice and iniquity could go no further than reject these two blessings to fallen humanity. These are sure and infallible tests and can never lead to an erroneous conclusion, and therefore we may trust to their combined evidence for guidance in determining the truth or falsity of the two central dogmas of the Christian faith. We shall briefly consider the evidence of each of these five witnesses and point out the conclusions that follow.

The doctrine of salvation, as preached by the Christian Missionaries, is too well-known to be stated at any length. Salvation, they say, depends upon two things. In the first place, a man should believe in the doctrine of Trinity *i.e.*, he should regard the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost as three separate and co-eternal Gods, yet constituting only one eternal God. Thus he must believe them to be three and one, at one and the same time. The second indispensable requisite for salvation according to the Christians is a belief in the dogma that Jesus Christ died on the cross, and by means of this accursed death shared with Satan the curse which of old had always been the lot of the Prince of Darkness and the unclean spirits. And we are told that those who believe in the curse upon Jesus, shall be saved the evil consequences of the dangerous curse which sows the seed of unbelief, iniquity and all other evils in the

heart of man, turns him to the path of faithlessness, blinds the heart, and is the cause of an ever-widening separation and an ever-increasing enmity between the heart of man and the Divine Master. As to those on whom this curse falls and who partake of it, it is necessary that, as heirs of the author of evil, their hearts should turn away from God, and that they should hate Him, and thus fall into an eternal hell; for curse is the dark taint which brands the face of Satan. But Jesus, it is said, so loved the world that he himself requested his Father to subject his heart to this perilous curse so fraught with danger and attended with consequences equally dangerous.

This is the summary of the principles on which rests the salvation offered by the Christian Missionaries, and it is with regret that we have to say that both these dogmas are dead against the laws of nature, repugnant to the nature of man, unsupported by the holy books of God, uncorroborated by any living and conclusive proofs, and rejected by the opinion of the majority of those who have inherited the revealed books.

Take Trinity first and we see that Divine law goes quite against this strange doctrine. Every thing, in its simplest form, has been created by God in a spherical or round shape—a fact which attests to and is consistent with the Unity of God. Look at the earth and the great heavenly bodies, the sun, the moon and stars; are they not all spherical? The elements also show a rotundity in shape. Take a drop of water and it is also spherical. Had the doctrine of Trinity been true, all these things should have been created in a triangular shape. The handiwork of a three-cornered God ought to have been three-sided like its maker. The stars of the heavens and the elements of the earth should all have been triangular so as to serve as an indication to trinity in the person—or persons, whichever is consistent with the Christian theology—of the Creator. It strikes strange that the nature of God should have been triangular, and the creation of His hand should without an exception have followed the law of sphericity. The more we look into the laws of nature, the more are we convinced that the doctrine of Trinity finds no support in nature and is plainly rejected by the Divine law.

Evidence from the first source thus utterly subverting the theory of Trinity, we shall now consider if it is consistent with human nature. A mere glance would show that the idea is as strongly repulsed by human nature as by the natural laws. Christian theologians admit, and Rev. Pfander supplies written testimony in his *Mizan-ul-Haq*, that people who have not been brought to the knowledge of Trinity by missionary efforts, though otherwise endowed with reason and all the human faculties, shall not be called to account for not believing in Trinity, but that their salvation shall only depend upon a belief in the Unity of God, unlike those to whom the doctrine of Trinity has been preached, whom a belief in the Unity shall not avail. Had the doctrine of Trinity any reality, it should have had its evidence in human nature, and then all human beings whom God had granted reason, no matter this doctrine had or had not been ever preached to them, should have been judged according to their belief in the Trinity of God. If there is any trace of this doctrine in the human nature, why is not man culpable for rejecting it. It is evident that the laws revealed to man through the prophets of God, are an image of the principles implanted in the nature of man. It is highly repulsive to the moral feelings of man that he should be compelled to accept that as his faith, of which he does not witness the least trace in his own nature. The plain dictates of human nature are the Unity of God and the absence of any rival or partaker. The three or four-sidedness of God or His alleged composition of three persons, is quite foreign to the nature of man. It is otherwise as to His oneness which is strongly impressed upon man's nature. It is for this reason too that although ignorance and superstition have invented thousands of gods and goddesses to serve particular purposes, yet human nature, never resting satisfied with these self-made deities, has always attested to the existence of One Supreme God, and even idolators have acknowledged the existence of the Supreme Being with whom their minor deities served as intercessors. How can we account for this except that human nature bearing as it did very strong impressions of the Unity of its Creator, could never rest contented with the plurality of gods, but was compelled from within to acknowledge, above them all, the One True God.

Having seen the utter failure of the scheme of Trinity so far as Divine laws and the human nature could testify, we shall now turn to

the third criterion and see what the prophets taught in plain words on this much contested point. Notwithstanding the alterations and corruptions which the teachings of the prophets have undergone, we still observe a strong element in them relating to the Unity of God. From the Book of Genesis to that of Malachi, all the prophets have in unfaltering tones declared the Unity of God, and have laid stress upon it to an extent that establishes the doctrine conclusively and renders it impenetrable to the least doubt. A few instances will suffice by way of illustration: Ex. 34 : 14 ; Dan. 3 : 28 ; Is. 40 : 18, 44 : 6 and 8, 55 : 5 and 6 ; Jer. 10 : 6 ; Hos. 13 : 4 ; Ps. 86 : 10 ; Neh. 9 : 6 ; I Chs. 17 : 20. Instances can be multiplied by hundreds in which the books of the Old Testament have taught in clear words the Unity of God. The Gospels notwithstanding that they have been, most of all, subjected to alterations from human hands, also bear witness to the same teaching in plain words in their plainest sense and no trace of Trinity will be observed in them. If the clear teachings of all those books which inculcate the Unity of God were placed in one scale of a balance and the false and whimsical assumptions of Christianity, due either to a misconstruction of certain prophecies or to a misunderstanding of certain allegorical phrases of the New Testament, in the other, the difference in the weight of evidence will be apparent to the dullest understanding, if it is not dead to all sense of shame and fear of God. Any one who takes the trouble to cast a glance first at the conclusive and positive evidence relating to the Unity of God preached by the prophets and the holy books, and then at the dubious and vague assertions, the whims, so to say, of the Christians, brought forward and even fabricated to establish the Divinity of Jesus Christ, shall not have the least hesitation in coming to the conclusion that to expect any evidence of Trinity in the Holy Word of God delivered to mankind through the prophets, is as vain a desire as blowing at the sun under the delusion of extinguishing its light. I challenge every hired and unhired defender of Christianity to come forward and show if the same clearness and definiteness, the same emphasis and repetition, mark the teaching of Trinity as that of Unity in the Word of God. I most emphatically assert that the weight of evidence in the case of the latter principle is out of all proportion to the weight of the alleged proof in that of the former.

If any one can show that the same stress is laid upon Trinity

as upon Unity in the revealed word of God, I would be the first to recant my principles and accept the opposite doctrine. But if such strong proof of Trinity cannot be had anywhere, it does then become the Christians to doff religious prejudice and not to reject the strong and conclusive arguments of Unity with nothing but whims and flim-flam in their hands to support their mysterious dogma. If they are determined to erect the whole building of their creed on the shaky foundation of obscure and vague assertions, what reason have they to blame their Hindoo brethren for deifying Rama or Krishna. If gods can be made in this arbitrary fashion, the list of gods, instead of being limited to three, would soon swell to an enormous extent. What a bare-faced injustice that when the words God or Son of God or similar other metaphorical phrases are spoken of the prophets in the Bible, they still remain men and do not for that reason partake of Divinity, but when the same or even inferior words are used of Jesus Christ, or are only deemed to have been used of him, it being a matter of dispute whether they actually apply to him or to some body else, he is metamorphosed and becomes a God. If we can make gods of men in this arbitrary manner, then although the turning of copper into gold may be impossible, yet the turning of men into gods or the God-manufacturing business would be an extremely easy task. But I ask if we can depend upon and find consolation in a God that is the creation of mortal whims and fashioned by mortal hands.

Having shown that the Bible lends no support to the doctrine of Trinity, we now come to the fourth point. Under this heading we shall discuss if the majority of the people of the Book have regarded Trinity as true. It is admitted on all hands that the Jews are the first heirs to the Bible, and among them Moses was the greatest prophet who gave a standing and perfect law to his people. He not only delivered the law to them but himself acting as the commentator explained it fully and cleared off all doubts as to the meaning of any passage in it. Now all the books of Moses without a single exception lay stress upon and assert the oneness of the Lord God in clear, definite and emphatic words, and the Israelites were commanded to learn these teachings by heart, bind them for a sign upon their hands and write them upon the posts of their houses and upon their gates. They were also warned that if they went aside from the path (of Unity) set for them and forgot the teachings

relating to it, they shall be destroyed from off the face of the earth, severely punished from heaven as well as earth, smitten with incurable diseases, scourged with scale and itch, and brought to destruction in blindness and madness. The same teachings were further emphasized by giving, along with this warning of curse, a promise of blessings and bounties if they stuck fast to them.

To all these precautions for the safe preservation of this all-important doctrine, is to be added the fact of successive prophets continuing to rise from among the Israelites for fourteen hundred years which bring us close upon the time of Jesus. They never witnessed an interval during which they were left without a prophet. Moses himself did not leave them at the time of his death without a guide and guardian, but left Joshua his Minister as his substitute and as a leader of the people. The system of prophets that rose among the Israelites after Moses and walked in the footsteps of their great predecessor, is without a parallel in the history of the world. An enquirer, who casts aside the trammels of prejudice for a while, will at once be convinced that nothing could be more wonderful than that the Jews could have forgotten the central and most emphatic doctrine of all the books and the great aim of all revelation, which had repeatedly been communicated to them through an unbroken chain of continuously rising prophets, which was ever kept fresh in their memories and which had practically been acted upon by their fathers. And wonder of wonders that the radical principles of the Bible teachings, the doctrines of Trinity and Atonement, taught to the Jews through the prophets should have so passed out of their memories as not to have left the slightest trace behind them.

The teachings relating to the person and attributes of God were not simply related in the Bible as tales but were most deeply impressed upon the minds of the people, so much so, that their children and old women were also cognisant of them. Now if a denial of the Trinity and Atonement was really such a deadly sin and a blasphemy that the denier was for that reason to be condemned to eternal hell, how was it that the teachings of the prophets related these cardinal doctrines in such an obscure and ambiguous style. If really the case had been as is deemed by the Christians, it was the primary duty of all the prophets to bring Trinity to the front and enjoin a belief in it in the most unmistakable terms, taking care to avoid all words

that could have led to the contrary conclusion of the oneness of God. But to the great bewilderment of the Christian theologians, the case is quite the contrary. All the books from the first to the last teem with the teachings of Unity, and the whole attention of the people was directed to this one great purpose, and the result was a deep impression upon the whole nation of the Unity of God. Had all the prophets from Moses downwards inculcated the doctrine of Trinity and declared this to be the chief object of their embassy from the Most High, the Israelites could not have been so utterly ignorant of it. If, as is alleged, Trinity and the blood of Jesus formed the groundwork on which rested the salvation of men, why did Moses and the prophets keep back this matter of life and death and not promulgate it? And if they ever propagated such a doctrine, it still remains to be solved why their books do not contain the slightest trace of it? How are we to explain the obvious fact that all the Jewish sects are as unconscious of this puzzle of Trinity as the son of a Muslim of the gods of Hindoos, of their modes of worship and of the formulæ of idol-worship? The solution of this problem remains as great a mystery as the doctrine of Trinity itself.

From the earliest times to our own day the Jewish sects have borne an unbroken testimony in their speeches and writings, and they still proclaim with a loud voice, that they were never taught Trinity and Atonement, nor is there the remotest trace of these strange doctrines in their holy books, and that a God-man had never been promised to them. Even if we admit the stubbornness, the blood-thirstiness, the iniquities and the transgressions of the Jews, justice compels us not to be so hard upon them as to suppose that they at any time expunged from the Bible the teachings of Trinity and Expiation which were the foundation-stones of their faith, and inserted in it in numerous places the simple doctrine of the oneness of God which resembled the teaching of the Quran on the point, and that they had all arranged and agreed to take this step. The absurdity of any such supposition appears further from the fact that the various Jewish sects, notwithstanding numerous points of difference, all testify in one voice that the doctrines of Trinity and Atonement had never been preached to them.

To secure further evidence, I wrote to certain learned Jews enquiring of them if the doctrines of the Old Testament relating to the

person and attributes of God, resembled the Trinity and Atonement of the Christians or the teachings on the point of the holy Quran. Their evidence was simply asked for as unprejudiced testimony, for they denied the revelation of the Quran and the Gospels alike. Their reply was in accordance with what I have shown above, viz., that the Bible taught the Unity of God from the first to the last, and not one jot of it gave any support to the doctrine of Trinity or Atonement. The injunctions of the books of the prophets in this respect, they wrote, resembled those of the Quran and were totally opposed to the Trinity and Atonement of the Christians. The books of Moses and those of the other prophets did not contain the slightest trace of the Christian doctrines, and they were at a loss to know how to reconcile the plain teachings of their holy books with the puzzling innovation of the Christians. It is the duty of every one who claims to follow truth to decide for himself this most important question and not to allow it to pass unnoticed. It is known to all that the Jews, who are called the people of God, were chosen as the first scholars in the Divine school under the guidance of righteous prophets who were constantly among them during the 1,400 years that followed Moses. Notwithstanding the continuous revival of the teachings of the books of Moses by the successive rising of the prophets, and the constant presence of the Word of God spoken through them, which rendered a resort to the principle of analogical deduction unnecessary, nothing is more surprising than that the Jews should have remained so ignorant of the doctrines of Trinity and Atonement, although upon them alone depended their salvation. In vain did the prophets preach and in vain were their lives spent if they did not even communicate to the people the true doctrine of salvation, and thus utterly failed to fulfil the object for which they had been raised by God. Does not a thinking mind pause here to seek the reason of this deep mystery? Can the Christian doctrine of the attainment of salvation be reconciled by any sane person with the utter absence among the Jews of any sect or school which might for a moment have ever thought of faith in these two mysterious dogmas?

Add to it the circumstance that among the Christians there have been, and there still are, sects that have rejected Trinity. Consider now what remains in the hands of a Christian to boast of. Had all the sects of Christianity been unanimous as to this doctrine, a Christian might have caught at this last straw to console himself. But

as it is, this is a bitter draught for Christians that internal differences as to the supposed corner-stone of salvation have undermined the whole foundation of their faith, and brought them face to face with the convincing argument of the Unity of God. The existence of Christian Sects that have rejected Trinity from the oldest times, as the Quran has also testified, proves it beyond doubt that as the doctrine of Trinity is repugnant to the Divine laws and to human nature, and disclaimed—nay repudiated—by the Holy Word of God, it is in like manner rejected by the evidence of an overwhelming majority of those who have inherited the Book of God.

All these witnesses having separately and combinedly disproved the doctrine of three Gods, it remains for us to see if there is any peculiarity about Jesus Christ on whose basis his claim to Deity is supported. With a full knowledge of all the facts that are known about Jesus, I assert it positively, before all the world with a conviction as strong as it is possible for man to have, that there is nothing in Jesus above an ordinary human being, which may lead us even for a moment to entertain the idea that he was God. Much stress is laid upon his birth, but what are we to say of the first man, the parent of mankind, who had neither father nor mother. We never consider him God. Moreover, we see in our every-day experience thousands of worms brought into existence without any father. Shall we for that reason take them to be the Almighty Being that created the Universe, or are they to be considered as the sons of the Most High? I consider it as an invaluable favour of the Quran upon Jesus and his mother that it falsified the base charges of 600 years' standing by verifying the birth of Jesus to have taken place in a manner which washed off the blemish from Mary. As to what the Jews allege with regard to this birth, the subject is so indecent that even a passing allusion could not be made to it. In short, the birth of Jesus is unattended with any such peculiarity as may entitle him to divinity. On the other hand, learned physicians of the Greek and Indian Schools have given instances of such cases, rare though they be, and shown the possibility of a child being formed in the mother's womb without the seed of man.

Neither does the fact that Jesus called himself the Son of God serve as any evidence of his actually being the Almighty God, for the Old Testament teems with such expressions as the Son of God, and not only the sons but also the daughters of God have been men-

tioned therein. One verse goes even so far as to say that we are all gods, and of Israel the Lord says, "Israel is my son, even my first-born." Ex. 4 : 22. Now all that is stated is that the expression Son of God has been used of Jesus Christ, but, as we have shown above, the same expression and even stronger ones have been used of numerous other persons in the Bible. What is the test to decide and who shall decide that in the one case the expression has been used metaphorically and in the other literally and actually? Is there any reason to suppose that the words are to receive a particular interpretation in the case of Jesus? The truth is that unable to realize the true sense of the expression, the Christian theologians have committed a blunder in interpreting it. Those who understand theological terms, know full well that expressions of honour and endearment, similar to the one under discussion, are constantly used in the Word of God of such of his chosen people as are His beloved ones. It is these metaphorical expressions which, when they fall into the hands of ignorant persons, are turned to the use of deifying those to whom they refer, an idea quite foreign to the original use. In the Gospels even Adam is spoken of as the Son of God. Are we then to take him actually so? Before we proceed to consider the claims of Jesus, it must be settled whether Adam was actually the Son of God, for he, too, like Jesus is honoured with the title.

If the use of such metaphorical expressions is sufficient to turn a man into a God, a Muslim may as well declare his own holy Prophet **صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم** as God on the strength of the holy Quran. Speaking of the Prophet the holy book says **يد الله فوق ايديهم** "the hand (of the Prophet) which is upon your hands is the hand of God." Thus in this verse Almighty God terms the hand of the Prophet **صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم** as His own Divine hand. Another verse runs this :

قل يا عبادي الذين اسرفوا علي انفسهم لا اتقنطوا من رحمة الله
 Say (O prophet!) O my servants! who **ان الله يغفر الذلوب جميعا**
 have transgressed upon your souls, do not despair of the grace of God, for God forgives all the sins." In this verse all the people have been called as the servants of the Prophet being elsewhere called **عباد الله**, the servants of God, and furthermore the verse gives him the right of pardoning the sins of men. If the actual Divinity of man can be inferred from any circumstances, what stronger evidence than this is required

to establish the Divinity of our Prophet. And this is not all. Verses to the same effect abound in the holy Quran to such an extent that one may, if one chooses to take allegorical language literally, deduce from them the most definite conclusion as to the Divinity of our holy Prophet, and the fact stands in bold contrast to the doubtful evidence to the sonship of Jesus, furnished by the vague and scanty material produced from the Gospels, notwithstanding all the pretensions of the Christian Missionaries to the contrary.

So far as to evidence from the Scriptures of the two religions, but when we proceed a little further and look at actual facts, we meet with a total absence in Jesus Christ of that power and predominance which is the necessary requisite of Divinity, whereas in the person of our own holy Prophet ﷺ we find its manifestation as clear as day-light. When the Prophet declared his mission, the most violent opposition raged against him. As his mission was universal and contained an invitation to all the nations of the earth to Islam, similarly was the opposition not confined to any particular sect or community, but gradually extended its circle, as the sphere of his preaching became wider. People of all denominations and religious sects were determined to cut up Islam, root and branch, and none spared the least effort to injure him. Monarchs also sent their men to have the Prophet arrested and put to death, but were hopelessly baffled in their evil designs. Consider then what saved Muhammad ﷺ from all these formidable foes, and what protected him in this wide-spread fire of enmity? The secret of it lies in the strong and deep connection of his soul with the Infinite, such a connection as no man has ever before or since attained. The Prophet was jealous for the honour of the Lord his God and the Lord was, in return, jealous for the honour of His Prophet.

Comparisons are odious but we can not refrain from briefly referring to one between the Companions of our holy Prophet and the Apostles of Jesus. One of the latter, Judas Iscariot, betrayed his master for the paltry sum of thirty half-crowns. This shows to what extent the chosen ones had faith in the righteousness of their teacher. In fine contrast with the despicable behaviour of Judas, shines out the noble conduct of the Companions of our Prophet who forsook brothers, sisters, parents, sons, lands, properties and all, for

the sake of their beloved master, because they saw in him a visible and glorious manifestation of the Most High God. Their fidelity to their master is unparalleled in the history of the world. Who can fathom the bottomless deep of the faith which undulated in their hearts? It was the face of God they saw clearly reflected in the face of their Prophet. But the conduct of the Apostles in relation to their master is quite inexplicable, and we are unable to say what opinion they entertained of him. Peter, who had charge of the keys of heaven, cursed Jesus and was not satisfied until he thrice repeated his imprecations.

Take another circumstance. Not a few designs of the Prophet's murder were, over and over again, formed by his internal and external foes, but they were all hopelessly frustrated, notwithstanding his utter helplessness against his powerful enemies. On the other hand, whoever rose with the evil design brought ruin upon his own head. For instance, Khosru Parviz, the ill-fated monarch of Persia, became thirsty of the Prophet's blood and accordingly sent his men to arrest him. But hardly a night had passed before he himself became a morsel of death, notwithstanding that there is no evidence that our holy Prophet even prayed for his destruction. It is reported that when the soldiers of the emperor brought to the Prophet the news of his contemplated arrest under the orders of the monarch, he replied that it was no business of his but that the whole matter lay in the hands of God who alone would give the response. Next morning he revealed to the soldiers the news of the assassination of their monarch under the supreme and unavoidable command of the Lord of heavens and earth. Here indeed we see a manifestation of the Deity for no sooner did Khosru Parviz conceive the idea of the Prophet's arrest than the Angel of Death, in obedience to the absolute decree of heaven, was upon him in Persia and cut short his life. What a contrast again when we cast a glance at the circumstances of Jesus' arrest as narrated in the Gospels! We are obliged, with the utmost regret, to confess that a whole night's prayers of Christ proved quite barren. He passed the night in a state of restlessness with eyes heavy and full of tears, but as soon as morn appeared, one Police Constable of the Roman Government with whom was a multitude of the people (the Jews), came and having arrested him put him into custody before 10 A.M. Is this the all-powerful God whose end

was so sad and pitiable ? How can we put faith in a man as having a deep connection with God so long as we do not see him distinctly accompanied with the grace of God in this very world ?

From the evidence recorded of him what is Jesus but a man who fell on his face before God and prayed to him earnestly that the fatal cup may pass away, but his prayers were not answered, so do the Christians admit. But our Lord and Master the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم was the chosen one of God, upon whom Divine assistance was showered even without his praying for it. Hence it was that when the companions of the Prophet witnessed Divine assistance and favor distinctly showered upon him, they forsook everything for his sake, shed their blood in his cause and allowed themselves to be butchered like sheep and goats and died in faith and fidelity to him. Had the worship of man been allowed in the Divine faith, they would have gladly rejected the gods that were the creation of man's imagination, and worshipped their master, the Lord's elect as the great God. The reverence in which they held him and the obedience which they showed to his commandments, were neither shown towards Moses, nor had Jesus the good fortune to witness them in his devoted disciples. If anyone should care to compare the fickleness and unbelief of the disciples of Jesus with the steadfastness and faith of the companions of Mohammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, he should read the disgraceful acts related of Judas, or if not satisfied with his conduct, he may cast a glance at the testimony of Peter, the chief of the twelve who shall sit on thrones to judge Israel.

It should be clearly noted that the fear and timidity displayed by the disciples on the arrest of Jesus, was without any foundation. The Jews had not the power and means to cause any material physical injury, not even so much as a slap on the face, to the followers of Jesus. For, in the first place, Jesus himself was a Jew and the people were all his kinsmen. Moreover, owing to the dispersion and consequent loss of the majority of their tribes, they had been considerably reduced in number, and led humble lives under a foreign government. Notwithstanding all this weakness and adversity of the persecutors themselves, the disciples were so weak of faith that they were ever ready to forsake their master on being offered the

slightest rebuke. Is this the effect of the preaching of one who appears with the powers of the Deity? In short it is in the life of the holy Prophet of Islam only that the glory of the great and living God is manifested, and we cannot imagine the Deity or a manifestation of the Deity being laid hands on by the most abject persons and at last disappearing from the stage of life without any success or any Divine assistance coming to him.

From what has been said it is clear that the divinity of Jesus falls to the ground under all the important tests stated above. We shall now consider the subject from another point of view, *viz.*, his morals. Here again we are sadly disappointed by the absence of any sound argument in his favour. Speaking candidly and uprightly, not a single excellent moral in Jesus' character can be proved to any satisfaction. Morals may broadly be divided into two large classes. Firstly those that may be displayed in affluence and under easy circumstances. Secondly, the time for the display of the highest moral qualities arrives when a man, after years of suffering and persecution experienced in a state of helplessness and humility, is completely triumphant and gains absolute power over his enemies. In the case of Jesus both kinds are sadly wanting. Had he had plenty of resources and handsome fortune, and in that condition spent freely and given liberally, we would have been entitled to speak of him as a charitable and generous man who assisted widows, supported orphans, relieved the needy, clothed the naked, comforted travellers, took in strangers, fed the starving and gave timely help to the famine-stricken. But now we have no proof in hand of any of these commendable deeds. Similarly, had he after the years of sorrow and suffering during which he bore persecutions at the hands of the Jews, got triumph and complete victory over them and freely forgiven his bitterest enemies, he would have done a noble and exemplary deed worthy of emulation. We would have then had reason to say that he was of a mild and forgiving nature, as it is only at the time of absolute triumph over enemies that forgiveness can be shown. We, no doubt, love and revere Jesus Christ and consider him as a great prophet in the Mosaic line, but if we are asked to furnish evidence of his forgiveness and indulgence towards his enemies, we must confess our lack in this respect. There is no historical evidence of great and excellent moral qualities ever displayed by him. Our good

opinion of him as a great and good prophet cannot be questioned here as it is based on our belief and not on any such demonstrable facts and historical research as may satisfy other minds.

If, on the other hand, we cast a glance at the career of the holy Prophet of Arabia, we meet with an overwhelming proof of the presence in his sacred person of both sorts of morals in the highest degree. The evidence of the unbelievers, the opponents of Islam, who praised the unparalleled generosity and charitableness of the Prophet is sufficient to convince every man of common intelligence, and numerous acts of kindness and traits of hospitality are recorded in hundreds of books. When the Prophet made his triumphant entry into Mecca, after twenty long years of suffering, and his bitterest enemies, who, on account of their cruelties and bloodshed, had rendered themselves liable to a wholesale and indiscriminate murder of young and old, of male and female, were completely reduced to subjugation and lay at his mercy alone, he freely forgave them and granted an amnesty to the whole population of Mecca, and said "I pardon you as Joseph pardoned his brethren and grant freedom to you all." By the laws of war then prevalent they were all his slaves. This generous treatment unparalleled in the annals of war, was a sign to the Meccans, and their hearts leaped to accept the truth which they had before rejected. Heavenly power attracted them all towards it and before sunset almost all of them embraced Islam. It is manifest from this that excellent moral qualities which are a manifestation of the attributes of God, are not to be sought for in Jesus, but that they were manifested in the holy Prophet of Islam. He is not only generous and charitable but also meek, open-hearted and forgiving. The field of battle bears evidence to his courage and manliness, freely giving alms to his charity and bountifulness, and forgiving the enemy after obtaining triumph over him to his clement and merciful nature.

To be continued.

One of the greatest discoveries of the age.

It is more than five years hence that the Ahmadiyyah sect started an important investigation at the instance of its head. That investigation is now complete so far as to enable us to announce the result, which was partly printed in the form of a book, still in press. We intend now to take up this subject in the pages of the Magazine. We shall show that *Arabic is the mother of languages* or that languages which are supposed to have no connection with it, have sprung up from it.

We are not unaware of the conclusions at which modern philologists have arrived. We know that most of them are, in the first place, far from admitting a unity of origin of speech, and then doubts have been entertained as to the existence of any possible relations between, what they call, the Semitic languages and other families, the Aryan especially. We know that our announcement will be startling to the students of languages as well as to others. But we hope that our assertion shall not be discarded for the only reason that it goes against the investigation that has hitherto been made by learned European philologists. We think that sufficient attention has not been paid to the Semitic family of languages and among it especially to the chief member which alone could throw a light upon many obscure linguistic questions. It is only because the proper material has been wanting that the question has been left unsolved. Now that light has been thrown upon it after a due consideration and deep study, we hope it shall be taken for what it is worth.

The surprising richness of the vocabulary of Arabic which supplies simple words for complex and refined ideas, notwithstanding the extreme simplicity of the conditions of life among the ignorant people that spoke it and the very limited range of their ideas, and the expression of the slightest modification by a distinct word, are among the notable facts admitted by all philologists. But

more wonderful than all is the fact that the descriptive words of ignorant Bedouins disclose treasures of scientific facts which, we know not, how many thousands of years afterwards, were discovered by the world. From a religious point of view it is no less surprising and significant a fact that of all the sacred languages, *viz.*, languages in which religious laws were revealed to the world, Arabic is the only one that is living, and living a glorious life too, thus pointing to the life and glory of the religion which it reveals, whereas all others have, by their death, attested to the corruption of the principles which they taught.
