

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(APRIL 1902.)

CONTENTS.

SUBJECT.	PAGE.
ISLAM, II.	
THE MORAL CONDITIONS OF MAN	121—140
UNITY <i>versus</i> TRINITY, III.	
THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CONSIDERED WITH RE- FERENCE TO HIS ALLEGED SINLESSNESS	141—146
SINS ATTRIBUTED TO JESUS	141
NIYOGA	142
THE FATHERLESS BIRTH	143
FALSE CHARGES AGAINST THE PROPHETS OF GOD ...	147
MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS	152
TRUE NATURE OF THE SECOND ADVENT	154
WEAK POINTS IN JESUS'S TEACHINGS	156
NON-RESISTANCE OF EVIL	159
TO THE READER	164

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

ISLAM--(contd.)

THE MORAL CONDITIONS OF MAN.

Having briefly indicated what directions the Holy Quran gives in the first stage of reformation, we now come to the second. After it has given to the savage the necessary rules of guidance, it undertakes to teach him high morals. Time and space do not allow us to treat this subject at full length here. We shall therefore mention, as a specimen, only a few of the moral qualities upon which the Holy Quran has laid stress. All moral qualities fall under two heads: (a) those which enable a man to abstain from injury, and (b) those which enable him to do good to others. To the first class belong the rules which direct the intentions and actions of man so that he may not injure the life, property or honour of his fellow-beings by means of his tongue or hand or eye or any other member of his body. The second class comprises all rules guiding the intentions and actions of man in doing good to others by means of the faculties which God has granted him, or in declaring the glory or honour of others, or in forbearing from a punishment which an offender justly deserves, thus giving him the positive benefit of having escaped a physical punishment or loss of property which he would otherwise have certainly suffered, or in punishing him in such a manner that the punishment turns out to be a blessing for him.

CHASTITY.

The moral qualities which fall under the heading of abstaining from injuries are four in number, and each one of these is designated by a single word in the Arabic language whose rich vocabulary supplies a different word for different human conceptions, manners and morals. First of all we shall consider **احسان** (*ihsán*) or chastity. This word signifies the virtue which relates to the act of procreation in men and women. A man or a woman is said to be **محصن** or **محصنة** (*muhsin* or *muhsana*) when he or she abstains from illegal intercourse and its preliminaries which bring disgrace and curse upon the head of the sinners in this world and severe torture in the next, besides the

disgrace and loss caused to the relatives. None is more wicked than the infamous villain who causes the loss of a wife to a husband and that of a mother to her children; and thus violently disturbs the peace of the whole household, bringing ruin upon the head of both, the guilty wife and the innocent husband and children. The first thing to remember about this priceless moral quality which we call **احضان** *i. e.*, chastity, is that no one deserves credit for refraining from satisfying his carnal desires illegally if nature has not granted him the desires themselves. The word 'moral quality' therefore cannot be applied to the mere act of refraining from such a course unless nature has also granted a man the powers which produce in him the capability of committing the evil deed. It is refraining under such circumstances, *i. e.*, against the desires of the passions which nature has granted man, that deserves to be credited as a high moral quality. Nonage, impotency, emasculation or old age nullify the existence of the moral quality we term chastity although a refraining from the illegal act exists in their case. But the fact is, that in their case it is a natural inclination, and there is no resistance of passion, and consequently no propriety or impropriety of the act. This, as we have already said, is a distinction of importance between natural inclinations and moral qualities, in the former of which there exists no tendency to go in the opposite direction, while in the latter there is a struggle between the good and evil passions which necessitates the application of the reasoning faculty. There is no doubt then that, as above indicated, children under the age of puberty and men who have lost the power, upon which restrictions are to be imposed, cannot claim to possess a moral quality of so great a value, though their actions might resemble those of chaste men and women. But their chastity, if it might at all be called chastity, is only a natural inclination over which they have no control.

The directions contained in the Holy Word of God for the attainment of this noble quality are described in the following words:—

قل للمؤمنين يغضوا من ابصارهم ويحفظوا فروجهم ذلك ازكى لهم وقيل للمؤمنات يغضن من ابصارهن ويحفظن فروجهن ولا يبدين زينتهن الا ما ظهر منها وليضربن بضمهن علي جيوبهن ولا يصرين بارجلهن ليعلم ما يفتين من زينتهن وتوبوا الي الله جميعا ايها المؤمنون لعلكم تفلحون (النور)

Say to the believing men that they should restrain their eyes from looking upon strange women whose sight may excite their carnal passions, and that on such occasions they should cast down their eyes. Say to them also, that they should observe continence, and so keep their ears from the hearing of sweet voices and songs of strange women and stories of their beauty; for this is the best way of having pure sights and hearts. Say to the believing women that they refrain from casting their looks upon strange men and restrain their ears from listening to their lustful voices, and observe continence; and that they display not the decorated parts of their bodies except those which are external; and that they draw their veils over their bosoms so as to cover their heads and ears and necks and breasts; and let them not strike their feet together like dancers. This shall be a sure method of saving them from stumbling before evil. And they should all turn to God and pray that He should protect them from stumbling; that is, the second remedy. **ولا تقربوا الزنا انه كان**

Draw not near unto fornication, i. e.,
فاحشة وساء سبيلا (بني اسرائيل)
 keep aloof from occasions which give rise to such ideas, and keep away from paths which might lead to a commission of the sin; for he who commits fornication does an extremely wicked deed, and it is an evil way, for it keeps back from the goal and is a dangerous obstacle in attaining the desired perfection: **وليستعفف الذين لا يجدون لكا حا (النور)**
 and let those who cannot find a match employ other means to preserve their continence, as fasting or taking light food or doing hard work. **ورهبانية ابتدعوها ما كتبناها عليهم فمارعوها حق رعايتها (الصدید)**
 Some people have devised methods of their own for restraining themselves from sexual relations as by adopting celibacy or monasticism, and thus deprecating marriage, or by submitting themselves to castration, but all these methods have been invented by the people themselves. We did not prescribe these to them, and the result was that they could not observe those innovations as they ought to have observed.

Here Almighty God negatives the assertion of His having prescribed the methods of castration, etc., for had these been the commandments of the Almighty, all the people would have had to observe these rules, and then the human race would long since have disappeared from the face of the earth. In addition to the disadvantages and immorality attaching to the evil practice, it is an objection against the Creator for having created such a power in man. Moreover, it can be

easily seen that there is no merit in being unable to do an act, but that credit is due to him only who has to resist the evil tendency and overcome the evil passions from a fear of God. The person who has the energy in him deserves a two-fold credit, *viz.*, for the application of the energy in the proper place and for refraining to apply it where there is not the proper occasion. But the man who has lost it, is not entitled to either one of these. He is like a child, and deserves no credit for refraining from what he has lost the power to do. There is no resistance, no overcoming, and consequently no glory.

These verses not only contain excellent teachings for the attainment of chastity, but point out five remedies for observing continence. These are : restraining the eyes from looking upon strangers, and the ears from hearing strange voices exciting lust, not hearing the love-stories of strange men and women, avoiding every occasion where there may be fear of being involved in the wicked deed, and, last of all, fasting, etc., in case of celibacy.

Here we can confidently assert that the excellent teachings upon chastity, together with the remedies for continence, as contained in the Holy Quran, are a peculiarity of Islam. One particular point deserves special attention. The natural propensity of man, in which sexual appetite takes its root, and over which man cannot have full control, except by undergoing a thorough transformation, is, that whenever there is an occasion for it, it takes fire and throws its object into serious danger. The Divine injunction in this respect is therefore not that we may look at strange women and their beauty and ornaments or their gait and dancing so long as we do it with pure looks, nor that it is lawful for us to listen to their sweet songs or to the stories of their love and beauty, provided it is done with a pure heart; but that it is not lawful for us to cast glances at them, whether to lust or otherwise, and to listen to their voices, whether with a pure or an impure heart. We are forbidden to do an act in doing which we are not treading upon sure ground. We must avoid every circumstance which might make us stumble some time or other. Unrestrained looks are sure to lead to danger, and therefore we are commanded not only not to look to lust after a woman but not to look at her at all, so that the eye and the heart should remain pure and perfectly free from every dross. If the eye is accustomed to look after strange women, there is fear lest it should sometime lead to dangerous con-

sequences. For the attainment and preservation of chastity therefore, there could be no higher teaching and no nobler doctrine than that inculcated by the Holy Quran. To let loose a hungry dog over loaves and then expect that it would not do so much as think of them, is a vain desire. The Word of God therefore restrains the carnal desires of man even from smouldering undetected and enjoins upon him to avoid the very occasions where there is danger of the excitement of the evil passions.

This is the secret underlying the principle of the seclusion of women in Islam. It is sheer ignorance of the noble principles of that religion if we take the seclusion in the sense of shutting up women like prisoners in a gaol. The object of seclusion is only this much that both men and women should be restrained from intermingling freely, and that neither sex should be at liberty to display its decorations and beauty to the other sex, and this rule is no doubt conducive to the good of both sexes. It should further be borne in mind that **غض بصر** is in Arabic the casting down of one's eyes when the object of sight is not one which it is proper for a person to look at freely, and not the refraining of one's looks on the proper occasion. Every one who has a yearning after righteousness of heart, should not, like savages, be looking on all four sides. The casting down of eyes on proper occasions is the first requirement of a social life. The habit without causing any serious disadvantage to man in his social relations, has the invaluable advantage of making him perfect in one of the highest morals which we call chastity.

HONESTY.

We come next to the second moral quality of refraining from injury which is called in Arabic **امانة**, i.e., honesty, which consists in not injuring others by cheating them or taking unlawful possession of their properties. This quality is naturally met with in man. An infant, free as it is from every bad habit, is averse to suck the milk of a woman other than its mother, if it has not been entrusted to her when quite unconscious. This habit in the infant is the root from which grows the natural inclination to be honest, and which is later developed into the moral quality known as "honesty." The true principle of honesty is, that there should be the same aversion to the

dishonest taking of another's property, as the child has to suck the milk of others than its mother. In the child, however, this is not a moral quality but only a natural inclination, inasmuch as it is not regulated by any principles, or displayed on the proper occasion. The child has no choice in the matter, and unless there is a choice, the action not being the action of a moral being, cannot be included in the category of moral conditions. The person who, like the child, shows this inclination in obedience to the requirements of his nature without looking to the propriety of the occasion, cannot, in the strict sense of the word, be called an honest and faithful man. The person who does not strictly observe the conditions which raise this natural inclination to the status of a moral quality cannot lay any claim to it, although his action might, to outward appearance, resemble the action of a moral being which is done with all the requisites and after a due consideration of its advisability. We cite as specimen a few verses from the Holy Quran bearing upon the subject :

ولا تؤنوا السفهاء أموالكم التي جعل الله لكم قياما وارتزقوهم فيها واكسوهم
وقولوا لهم قولا معروفا وابتلوا اليعامى حتى اذا بلغوا النكاح فان آنستم
منهم رشدا فدفعوا اليهم أموالهم ولا تأكلوها اسرافا وابدارا ان يكبروا و
من كان غنيا فليستعفف ومن كان فقيرا فليأكل بال المعروف فاذا فدعتم
اليهم أموالهم فاشهدوا عليهم وكفى بالله حسيبا وايضش الذين لو تركوا من
خلفهم ذرية ضعافا خافوا عليهم فليتقوا الله وليقولوا قولا سديدا ان الذين
ياكلون أموال اليتامى ظلما انما ياكلون في بطونهم نارا وسيصلون سعيرا
(النساء) " And if there are among you any owners of property
who are weak of understanding, being minors or orphans, and
have not sufficient prudence for the management of their affairs, you
should assume full control over their property as a Court of Wards, and
do not make over to them that which God has placed with you as a
means of support and as stock of trade, but assign them a portion of it
such as is necessary for their maintenance and clothing ; and speak to
them useful words such as may sharpen their intellects and mature
their understandings, and train them for the business which is most
suited for their capacities, giving them full instruction in these respects.
And examine them in whatever you instruct them in, so that you may
be able to see if they have made any progress. And when they attain
the age of maturity (for which the proper limit is eighteen), and you

perceive that they are able to manage their affairs well, hand over their substance to them. And do not waste it profusely, nor consume it hastily under the fear that they will shortly be of age, to receive what belongs to them. If the guardian is rich, he should abstain entirely from taking remuneration from the orphan's estate; but if he is poor, he should take according to what is reasonable. (It was a well-known rule among the Arabs that the guardians of an orphan's property, if they had a mind to take any remuneration for their services took it, so long as possible, out of the profit, which the trade brought in and did not touch the stock. The Holy Quran therefore permits the taking of recompense in this reasonable manner). And when you make over their substance to them, do it in the presence of witnesses. God takes sufficient account of your actions. And those who are dying and leave behind them young and weakly off spring, should fear lest they make a bequest detrimental to the rights of children. Surely they, who swallow the substance of orphans unjustly, do not swallow substance but fire, and shall at last themselves be devoured by the burning flames of hell-fire."

This which God has preached, is the true honesty and faithfulness, and its various requisites are clearly set forth in the verses quoted above. Honesty which misses any of these requisites cannot be classed as one of the high morals but a natural inclination in its crude state, and not quite safe against every breach of faith. Elsewhere the Holy Quran says :—

ولا تاكلوا اموالكم بينكم بالباطل وتدلوها الي الحكام لتاكلوا فر يثامن
 (البقرة) Do not consume each other's wealth unjustly, nor offer it to judges as a bribe, so that, with their aid, you may seize other men's property dishonestly. ان الله يامركم ان
 توذوا الامانات الي اهله (النساء) Verily God enjoins you to give back your trusts to their owners. ان الله لا يحب الغائبين (الانفال) For verily God does not love the treacherous واوفوا الكيل اذا كلتم وزنوا بالقسطاس المستقيم ولا تبغسوا الناس اشياء هم ولا تعثوا في الارض مفسدين (الشعراء) Give just measure and be not of those who minish. And weigh with an exact and equal balance, and defraud not men in their substance, and do not walk upon the earth with the intention of acting corruptly therein, i.e., committing theft or dacoity, or picking pockets, or otherwise unlawfully seizing other men's property.

ولا تتبدلوا الذهب بالفضة (النساء). And do not give worthless things, in substitution or in exchange, for good ones; for as it is unlawful for one person to lay hold of another's substance wrongfully, so is it also unjust to sell things of an inferior and worthless quality, or give them for those of a higher one.

These are comprehensive injunctions against all sorts of dishonest dealings, and every breach of faith comes within them. Separate offences are not enumerated here, for a comprehensive list of them should have required much space, and even then it would have been very hard to set a limit to them. The Holy Quran has therefore made a general statement which comprehends in its plain meaning all sorts of dishonesty. In short, the person who shows honesty in some of his dealings, but is not scrupulous about it to the minutest degree and does not observe all nice rules, is not gifted with the moral quality of honesty, but acts out of habit in obedience to the natural inclination and without applying the faculty of reason.

MEEKNESS.

Coming to the third class of morals falling within the first division, we have to deal with the quality known in Arabic as *هدنة* (*hudna*) or *هون* (*hun*). It consists in refraining from causing bodily hurt to another person, and thus living a peaceful life upon earth. Peaceableness is no doubt a blessing for humanity, and must be valued for the great good which proceeds from it. The natural inclination out of which this moral quality develops, is witnessed in the young of a human being in the form of *الفت* or attachment. It is plain that divested of reason man cannot realize peaceableness or hostility. A natural inclination towards submission and attachment so early witnessed in the young human being is, therefore, only the germ out of which grows the high moral quality of peaceableness. It cannot itself be classed as moral so long as it is not consciously resorted to upon a recommendation of reason. It is otherwise when reason and judgment come to the assistance. The directions contained in the Holy Quran may be briefly noticed *الصلح خير (النساء)* There is much good in agreement. *واصلحوا ذات بينكم (الانفال)* And live peaceably with one another. *وان جنوا للسلام فاجنح لها (الانفال)* And if they incline to peace, do thou also incline to it. *وعباد الرحمن* And the servants of the *الذين يمشون على الارض هونا (الفرقان)*

Merciful are those who walk meekly upon earth. **واذا مروا باللغو مروا كراما** And when they hear frivolous discourse which they fear might lead to some quarrel, they pass on with dignity, and do not pick up quarrels on trifling matters, *i.e.*, they do not take up an hostile attitude so long as no material injury is caused to them. The guiding principle of peaceableness is, that one should not be offended at the slightest opposition to one's feelings. The word **لغو** (*lughw*) used in this verse requires to be explained. A word or deed is said to be **لغو** or frivolous when it causes no substantial loss or material injury to its object, although done or said with a mischievous or bad intention. Meekness requires that no notice should be taken of such words or deeds, and that a man should behave gentlemanly on such occasions. But if the injury is not trivial and causes material loss to life, property or honour, the quality required to meet this emergency is not meekness, but **عفو** or forgiveness which shall be treated in its proper place. **ادفع بالتي هي احسن فاذا الذي بينك وبينه عداوة كانهولي** Turn away the word or deed which is vain or frivolous with what is better, and then the person between whom and thyself was enmity shall become, as it were, thy warmest friend. In fine, the overlooking of trivial injuries is included in peaceableness.

KINDNESS.

The fourth and last class of the morals of the first division is **رفق** (*rifq*) or kind words. The preliminary stage of this quality, as witnessed in the child, is **طلاقة** or cheerfulness. Before the child learns to speak, the cheerfulness of its face serves the same purpose as kind words in a grown-up man. But the propriety of the occasion is an essential condition in classing kindness as a high moral quality. The teachings of the Quran on this point are as follows: **وقولوا لا يسخر** And speak that which is good to men. **لا يسخر** قوم من قوم عسى ان يكونوا خيرا منهم ولا نساء من نساء عسى ان يكن خيرا منهن ولا تلمزوا انفسكم ولا تهاجروا باللقاب... واجتنبوا كثيرا من الظن ان بعض الظن اثم ولا تجسسوا ولا يغتب بعضكم بعضا... واتقوا الله ان الله اتواب العجايب) **الرحوم** Let not men laugh other men to scorn who haply may be better than themselves, neither let women laugh other women

to scorn who haply may be better than themselves. Neither defame one another, nor call one another by nicknames. Avoid entertaining frequent suspicions, for some suspicions are a crime. Pry not into other men's failings, neither let any of you traduce another in his absence, and fear God, for God is relenting and merciful **ولا تقف ما ليس لك به علم**

ان السمع والبصر والفؤاد كل اولئك كان عنه مستعولا (بني اسرائيل)
And accuse not another of a crime if you have no sure proof of his guilt, verily the hearing and the sight and the heart shall all be called to account for this.

FORGIVENESS.

Having finished the first division of morals, *viz.*, those relating to the avoidance of mischief, we come now to the second heading under which we shall give examples of the moral qualities taught by the Holy Quran for doing good to others. The first of these is **عفو**, *i. e.*, forgiveness. The person to whom a real injury has been caused, has the right to redress himself by bringing the offender to law or himself dealing out some punishment to him, and therefore when he foregoes his right and forgives the offender, he does him a real good. The Holy Quran contains the following injunctions upon this point:—

والكاظمين الغيظ والعافين عن الناس (آل عمران)
They are the doers of good who master their anger and forgive others when it is proper to do so. **جزاء سيئة سيئة مثلها فمن عفي واصح**

فاجرة على الله (الشورى) The recompense of evil is only evil proportionate thereto, but if a person forgives and this forgiveness is exercised on the right occasion so that matters amend thereby, he shall find his reward for it from God. This verse furnishes the guiding rule as to the occasions of forgiveness. The Holy Quran does not teach unconditional forgiveness and non-resistance of evil on every occasion, nor does it inculcate that punishment is not to be given to the offender under any circumstances. The principle, which it lays down, commends itself to every reasonable person. It requires the injured person to exercise his judiciousness, and see whether the occasion calls for punishment or forgiveness. The course, which is calculated to render the matters better, should then be adopted. The offender would, under certain circumstances, benefit by forgiveness and mend his ways for the future. But on other occasions, forgiveness may produce the contrary effect and embolden the culprit to more deeds. The

Word of God does not therefore enjoin nor even permit that we should go on forgiving faults blindly. It requires us to consider and weigh the matter first and see what course is likely to lead to real good. As there are persons of a vindictive nature, who carry the spirit of revenge to an excess and do not forget an injury for generations, there are others who are ready to yield and too prone to forgive on every occasion. Excess in mildness, like excess in vengeance, leads to dangerous consequences. The person who winks at gross immoralities, or forbears an attack upon his honour or chastity, may be said to forgive; but his forgiveness is a despicable deed, and strikes at the root of nobility, chastity and self-respect. No sensible person could praise it as a high moral quality. It is for this reason that the Holy Quran has placed the limits of propriety even upon forgiveness, and does not recognise every display of this quality as a moral quality, unless it is shown upon the right occasion. The mere giving up of claim to requital from an offender, whatever the circumstances and however serious the nature of the offence, is far from being a great moral quality to which men should aspire. Nay, the forgetfulness of injuries is a natural quality which we witness even in the child which is not yet able to think and to reason. The mere presence of this quality in a person therefore does not entitle him to any credit unless he shows us by its use, on the right occasion, that he possesses it as a moral quality. The distinction between natural and moral qualities should be clearly borne in mind. The inborn or natural qualities of man are transformed into moral qualities when a person does or refrains from doing an act upon the right occasion, and after a due consideration of the good or evil that is likely to result from it. Many of the lower animals are quite harmless and do not resist when evil is done to them. A cow may be said to be innocent and a lamb meek, but to neither do we attribute the high moral qualities which man aspires after, for they are not gifted with reason and do not know right from wrong. It is the occasion only upon which anything is done that justifies or condemns a deed, and the wise and perfect word of the Omniscient God has therefore imposed this condition upon every moral quality.

GOODNESS.

The second moral quality, by means of which man can do good to others, is *عدل*, *i.e.*, good for good; the third *احسان*, *i.e.*, kindness; and the fourth *ابناء ذى القربى* *i.e.*, the tenderness of kindred.

Thus the holy Quran says : **ان الله يامر بالعدل والاحسان وايضا ذي** (النحل) **God commands you** to do good for good, and (if you can avail yourselves of an opportunity of doing more than mere justice) to do good without having received any benefit, and (if it befits the occasion) you should bestow gifts with the natural kindness of kindred; and He forbids exceeding the limits of justice and directing goodness to a wrong end, and carrying to excess or fixing upon an improper object the feeling of tenderness.

This verse calls attention to three stages in the doing of goodness. The lowest stage is that in which man does good to his benefactors only. Even an ordinary man who has the sense to appreciate the goodness of others, can acquire this quality and do good in return for good. From this there is an advancement to the second stage, in which a man takes the initiative to do good to others. It consists in bestowing favours upon persons who cannot claim them as of right. This quality excellent as it is, occupies a middle position. To it often attaches the infirmity, that the doer expects thanks or prayers in return for the good he does, and the slightest opposition from the object of compassion is termed ungratefulness. He would fain have an acknowledgment of the benefit conferred, and is led sometimes to take advantage of his position by laying upon him some burden which the other could not have otherwise willingly borne. To remedy this defect the Holy Quran has warned the doer of goodness, saying **لا تبطلوا صدقاتكم بالمن والاذي (البقرة)** i.e., make not your alms, which should proceed from sincere motives, void by reminding those, whom you relieve, of your obligation, and by injuring them. The word **صدق (sadqa)**, which is rendered in English into *alms*, is derived from **صدق (sidq)**, meaning sincerity. If therefore there is no sincerity in the deed, alms are of no effect being mere show. In short, this is an infirmity attached to the noble deed of doing goodness to another, that the doer is led sometimes to remind the person relieved, or boast of his obligation. A third stage has therefore been taught by the Holy Word of God, which is free from every flaw. To attain this perfection man should not think of the goodness he has done, nor expect even an expression of thankfulness from the person upon whom the benefit is conferred. The idea of doing goodness should proceed from sincere sympathy like that which is shown

by the nearest relations; by a mother, for instance, towards her children. This is the last and the highest stage of showing kindness to the creatures of God, and beyond this man cannot aspire to anything higher. This stage has been termed **إيتاء ذي القربى** or the kindness of kindred. But from the lowest to the highest form of doing goodness, an essential condition has been imposed upon all, *viz.*, that it should be done on the proper occasion; for the verse affirms, in plain words, that these noble qualities are liable, without great care, to degenerate into vices, **عدل** or the requital of goodness becomes **فصحاء** or an undue excess productive of harm rather than good; **احسان** or the doing of simple goodness, becomes **منكر** *i.e.*, a thing which, when ill-bestowed, conscience rejects, and from which reason recoils; **إيتاء ذي القربى** or the sympathetic feeling like that of kindred, when directed to a wrong end, becomes **بغى** or oppression. **بغى** originally means the rain which by its excess destroys the crops. Therefore any excess or deficiency in the doing of that which would otherwise have been most beneficial is termed. **بغى**. Nor, it should be borne in mind, is the mere doing of goodness in either of the three forms above mentioned, a high moral quality unless attested to as such by the propriety of the occasion and an exercise of judgment. On the other hand, these are the natural conditions and inborn qualities which are transformed into moral qualities by means of a good judgment and by their display on the right occasion.

Upon the subject of **احسان** or the doing of goodness, the Holy Quran has also the following injunctions, in every one of which the definitive **ال** calls attention to the particular condition that the proper occasion should in each case be observed. Thus it says: **يا ايها الذين آمنوا انفقوا من طيبات ما كسبتم ولا تيمموا الصبيح منه ... لا تبطلوا صدقاتكم باليمن والاذى^ك لذي ينفق ما له رياء التامن ... احسنوا** O you who believe! bestow alms or give by way of charity from the good things which you have legally acquired, *i.e.*, in which there is no mixture of property acquired by theft or bribes or misappropriation or by oppression or by any other dishonest or unjust means; and let the idea be far from your heart of giving in charity that which you have gained otherwise than by lawful means. Make not your alms void by laying obligations upon those whom you have relieved or by injuring them, *i.e.*, do not remind them of the good you did them, nor

injure them in any way ; for if, you do so, your goodness will be of no effect ; nor spend your substance to be seen of other men ; and do good to the creatures of God, for God loves those who do good.

ان الابرار يشربون من كاء من كان مزاجها كافورا عينها يشرب بها عباد الله يشعرونها تشجيرا..... ويطعمون الطعام على حبه مسكينا ويتيمما واسيرا... Verily those who do deeds of real goodness shall drink of a cup tempered with *kafur* (camphor) *i. e.*, the heart-burnings, the poignant regret and the impure desires of this world shall be washed away from their hearts. (The word *kafur*, *i. e.*, camphor is derived from *كفر kafir*, meaning to suppress and to cover, and therefore by the quaffing of camphor drink is here meant that their unlawful passions shall be suppressed, their hearts shall be cleansed of every impurity, and that they shall be refrigerated with the coolness of the knowledge of God). And then it goes on to say : The servants of God, *i. e.*, those who do good, shall drink on the Day of Judgment of a spring which they are making to gush forth with their own hands here. (This verse throws light upon the secret which underlies the true philosophy of Paradise. Let him, who will, attend to it). And further, who, on account of their love for God, bestow their food on the poor and the orphan and the bondsman, though longing for it themselves, and say we do not confer any obligation upon you, but our only desire is that God may be pleased with us, and we do it only for the sake of His face. This is a service for which we seek from you neither recompense nor thanks. (This verse recommends the third stage of doing goodness, which proceeds out of a sincere sympathy and seeks no reward, not even an acknowledgment of the obligation conferred).

واي المال علي حبه ذوي القربى واليتامي والمسكين وابن السبيل والسائلين وفي الرقاب (البقرة) The truly righteous are those who, in order to please God, assist their kindred out of their wealth, and support orphans and take care of the needy and give to the way-farer and to those who ask and spend also in ransoming and in discharging the debts of those who cannot pay. اذا انفقوا لم يسرفوا ولم يقتروا وكان بين ذلك قواما (الفرقان) And when they spend, they are neither lavish nor niggard and keep the mean. والذين يصلون ما امر الله به ان يوصل ويغفون ربهم ويغفون سوء العاصب (الرعد) And who join together what God has bidden to be joined, and fear

their Lord and dread the evil of the reckoning. وفي اموالهم حق
 (المعارج) And of whose property there is a due portion for those who ask and for those who are prevented from asking (including all the dumb animals). الذين ينفقون في السراء والضراء
 (آل عمران) Who give alms not only in prosperity but spend also so far as they can when they are in adverse circumstances. وانفقوا مما
 (الرعد) And who give alms in secret and openly. (They give in secret so that there may be no show, and openly in order to induce others). انما الصدقات للفقراء والمساكين والعمالين عليها
 (الموئدة) وفي الرقاب والغارمين وفي سبيل الله وابن السبيل
 (التوبة) Income from alms should be spent in support of the poor and the needy, and to remunerate the services of those who are appointed as collectors or distributors, and to save those who are likely to be led into the trap of evil, and for the redemption of captives, and to relieve those who are in debt and insolvent or implicated in other troubles, and in other ways which are solely for God's cause, and to assist the way-farer. This is an ordinance from God and God is knowing and wise. لن تنالوا البر
 (ال عمران) حتى تنفقوا مما تحبون (ال عمران) You shall by no means attain to goodness till you expend in the cause of your fellow-beings out of that which you love. وآت ذاك القربى حقه والمسكين وابن السبيل ولا تبذر
 (بنو اسرائيل) And give your kindred what they require in time of need and also to the poor and the traveller, but waste not your substance wastefully. (This verse forbids prodigality and the squandering away of wealth in luxury, and at the time of marriage or the birth of a son, or in the observance of other customs. وبالوالدين احسانا وبزى
 القربى واليتيمى والمسكين والجار ذي القربى والجار الجنب والصاحب بالجنب وابن السبيل وما ملكت ايمانكم ان الله لا يحب من كان مختالا فخورا
 الذين يبخلون ويامرون الناس بالبخل ويكتمون ما اتم الله من فضله (النساء)
 Show kindness to your parents, and to kindred, and to orphans, and to the poor and to neighbours who are your kinsmen, and to neighbours who are strangers, and to your familiar companions, and to the way-farer; and whatever your right hand possesses, be they your slaves or servants or horses or other domestic animals, for this is what God loves, and He does not love the vain boasters and the selfish and does not like those who are niggardly themselves and bid others to be niggards,

and hide away what God of His bounty has given them, saying to the poor and the needy " we have not got anything."

COURAGE

The fifth virtue, which resembles the instinct of bravery, is شجاعة or courage. The young human being, when it has no reason, displays bravery and is ready to thrust its hand into fire, because, having no knowledge of the consequences, the instinctive quality is predominant in it. Man in this condition fearlessly rushes even to the lions and other wild beasts and stands out in the hour of contest alone against whole armies; and people think that he has the courage to do so; but the fact is that it is more a mechanical movement than a noble quality. The dog and other wild beasts are on an equality with him upon this ground. The virtue which we call courage شجاعة cannot be displayed but after a good deal of reasoning and reflection and after a full consideration of the propriety or impropriety of the act. It is a quality which can be classified as a noble and exalted virtue only when it is displayed on the right occasion, and the Holy Quran contains the following directions upon this point. والصابرين في الباس والضراء وحين الباس (البقرة) The truly brave are those who lose not their hearts but stand firmly and behave patiently under ills and hardships and in battles. والذين صبروا ابتغاء وجه ربهم (الرعد) Their patience in adversities and battles is only for the sake of God and not to display their bravery. الدين قبل لهم الناس ان الناس قد جمعوا لكم فاخشوهم فزادهم ايمانا وقالوا حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل (آل عمران) When they are threatened with the mustering of people against them and are told to fear the forces gathering to crush them, they are not dispirited thereby. This circumstance, on the other hand, increases their faith and they say: " God is sufficient for us and He is an excellent guardian." (Their courage is not like the bravery of dogs and wild beasts, not a mechanical movement depending upon passions and therefore flowing in one direction only, but they utilize their courage in two ways; viz., with its aid they resist and overcome the the passions of the flesh sometimes, and again utilize it to resist the attacks of an evil-doer when it is advisable to do so, not in obedience to brute force but in the cause of truth. They do not, moreover, trust their own selves, but have their confidence in the support of God at the time of trials). ولا تكونوا كالذين خرجوا من ديارهم بطرا ورياء الناس (الانفال) Be not like those who marched from their

houses in an insolent manner and to be seen of other people. (The truly courageous do not display their bravery in an insolent manner and with a view to appear with ostentation to other men, but their only consideration is the pleasure of God). All this leads to the conclusion that true courage takes its root in patience and steadfastness. The courageous man resists his passions and does not fly from danger like a coward, but before he takes any step, he looks to the remote consequences of his action. Between the daring dash of a savage and the indomitable courage of a man there is this vast difference that the one is prepared to meet real dangers but he reasons and reflects, though in the fury and tumult of battle, before he proceeds and takes the course best suited to avert the evil, while the other, in obedience to an irresistible passion, makes a violent onset in one direction only.

VERACITY.

The sixth virtue, which is developed out of the natural conditions, is veracity. So long as there is no incentive to tell a lie, man is naturally inclined to speak the truth. He is averse to lie from his very nature, and hates the person who is proved to have told a plain lie. But this natural condition cannot claim our respect as one of the noble moral qualities. Unless a man is purged of the low motives which bar him from truth, his veracity is questionable. For if he speaks truth only in the matters in which truth produces no harm to himself and tells a lie or holds his tongue from the utterance of truth when his life or property or honor is at stake, he can claim no superiority over children and madmen. In fact no one speaks untruth without any motive, and there is no virtue in resorting to truth so long as there is no apprehension of harm. The only circumstance which can serve as a test of truth is the occasion when one's life or honor or property is in danger. The Holy Quran contains the following injunctions upon this point. **فاجتنبوا الرجس من الاوثان واجتنبوا قول الزور (الحج)** Shun ye the pollution of idols and shun ye the word of falsehood. (The shunning of idols and falsehood is enjoined in the same breath to indicate that falsehood is an idol, and the person who trusts to it does not trust in God, for he bows submission to an idol and does not worship his God). **ولا ياب الشهداء اذا ما دعوا ولا تكتموا** The witnesses shall not refuse present to themselves whenever they are summoned. And conceal not

true testimony, for he who conceals it has surely a wicked heart. (الانعام) And when you speak a word or pronounce a judgment, be true and just, though the person concerned be your kinsman. كونوا قوامين بالقسط شهداء لله ولو على اقربين (النساء) Stand fast to truth and justice and let your testimony be only for the sake of God, and speak not falsely, although the declaration of truth might injure yourselves, or your parents, or your kindred, such as children, etc. ولا يجرمكم شنان (المائدة) And let not hatred towards any induce you not to act uprightly. والصدقين والصدقات (الاحزاب) The men of truth and the women of truth shall find a rich reward. وتواصوا بالعق وتواصوا بالصبر (العصر) They enjoin truth and steadfastness upon each other. لا يشهدون الزور (الفرقان) Do not sit in the company of liars.

PATIENCE.

Another virtue which develops out of the natural conditions of man is صبر or patience. Every one has to suffer, more or less, misfortunes, diseases and afflictions, which are the common lot of humanity. Everyone too has, after much sorrowing and suffering, to make his peace with the misfortunes that befall him. But such contentment is by no means a noble moral quality. It is a natural consequence of the continuance of affliction that weariness at last brings about conciliation. The first shock brings about depression of spirits, inquietude and wails of woe, but when the excitement of the moment is over, there is necessarily a reaction, for the extreme has been reached. But such disappointment and contentment are both the result of natural inclinations. It is only when the loss is received with total resignation to the Will of God, and in complete submission to His pleasure that the deed deserves to be called virtuous. The Word of God thus deals with the noble quality of patience:—

ولنبلوكم بشيء من الخوف والجوع ونقص من الاموال والانفس والثمرات وبشر الصابرين الذين اذا اصابتهم مصيبة قالوا ان الله وانا اليه راجعون اولئك عليهم صلوات من ربهم ورحمة اولئك هم المهتدون (البقرة)

“ We shall surely prove you by afflicting you in some measure with fear, and hunger, and decrease of wealth, and loss of lives, and making failure to attend upon your efforts or bringing death upon your offspring; and bear good tidings to the patient who

when a misfortune befalls them say 'we are God's creatures and His charges and therefore must return to the owner of the charge.' Upon them shall be blessings from their Lord and mercy and they are the rightly guided." In short, it is the quality of patience when a man declares himself satisfied with God's pleasure. In another sense it is also justice; for when God has made numerous provisions in accordance with the pleasure of man and does, on so many occasions in his life, bring about things as he wills and has provided him with numerous blessings, it would be highly unjust if a man should grumble because Almighty God wills a thing in another way, and should not take the good that God provides with cheerfulness but turn aside from His path.

SYMPATHY.

Another quality falling under the same category is the sympathetic zeal. People of every nationality and religion are naturally endowed with the feeling of national sympathy, and in their zeal for the interests of their countrymen or co-religionists throw scruples to the winds and do not hesitate to wrong others. Such sympathetic zeal, however, does not proceed out of moral feelings, but is an instinctive passion; and is witnessed even in the lower animals, especially ravens in whose case the call of one brings together thousands of them. To be classified as a moral quality, it must be displayed in accordance with the principles of justice and equity and on the proper occasion. It is to express this condition that the Arabic word *مواساة* meaning sympathy is used. The injunctions of the Holy Quran upon this point are as follows :

تعاونوا على البر والتقوى ولا تعاونوا على الأثم والعدوان (المائدة)
 ولا تهنوا في ابتغاء القوم ولا تكن للخائنين خصيما ولا تعادل عن الذين
 يفتنون انفسهم ان الله لا يهب من كان خوانا اثيما (النساء)

Sympathy and assistance for your people must be shown in deeds of goodness and piety, but you should not be helpful to one another for evil and malice. And slacken not in your zeal for the sympathy of your people. And be not an advocate for the fraudulent, and plead not for those who defraud one another, verily God loves not him who is deceitful and criminal.

To be continued.

UNITY v. TRINITY, III.

The Divinity of Jesus considered with reference to his alleged sinlessness.

Other sins attributed to Jesus by his adverse critics.

Besides drunkenness, which is admitted by the Gospels, there are many other charges which the Jews and others bring against him. They say, for instance, that Jesus showed disrespect towards his mother (Matt. xii : 47), which was a sin by the law of Moses. They also charge him with having destroyed the property of an innocent person intentionally (Matt. v : 13). By the law of Moses, they say, he is also sinful, because he did not prohibit his disciples from eating what was lawfully another's, without the owner's permission (Matt. xi : 1). Stress has also been laid by them upon his hateful sin of having allowed a harlot to bring certain parts of her body into contact with his and to anoint him with ointment which was part of her earnings from adultery (Luke vii : 37, 38). Another deadly sin, which they impute to Jesus, consists in his having slighted Almighty God by making himself His equal and held His sacred name in disrespect. They regarded the conduct of Jesus in this respect so damnable that they declared him as the arch-heretic and sought to slay him (John v : 18). The Jews also object to the too familiar connections of Jesus with Mary Magdalene, who, they say, was of a dubious character, whose company he ought to have shunned. As further proof of his sinfulness, they also allege that he once praised the beauty of a woman, and upon this one of the elders, who had taken Jesus in tutorship, enraged at this impropriety of his pupil's conduct, cut off all ties of love with him (*see* The Jewish Life of Christ, p. 13.). All these objections against the sinlessness of Jesus culminate in the charge against Mary's chastity. In other words, these inveterate enemies of Christianity declare Jesus to be the offspring of an unlawful connection,—a fact which they say strikes at the root of all claims to immaculacy. In connection with this point the apologists of Christianity have to grapple with the greatest difficulties, for they admit that Jesus was not born of a father. The *onus* therefore lies on them

to show that women are sometimes impregnated by a ghost—the Holy Ghost, if they please. Unless the matter is cleared beyond all reasonable doubt, and instances are given in which children have been born through the instrumentality of a ghost, we cannot rationally stop the mouth of the objectors.

NIYOGA.

Such legends abound in Hindoo Mythology, and the Puranas relate similar stories of certain women made to conceive by the moon, the sun, the god Indra or other gods. But these instances cannot be relied upon as certain evidence of the matter in dispute. For the custom of *Niyoga* which is prevalent among the Hindoos and regarded sacred by them, offers a much more reasonable explanation of such conceptions. It appears that the natural modesty of man overcoming this indecent but recognised practice, the children of *Niyoga* were attributed to gods and to the brilliant heavenly bodies. However repugnant to the morality of other nations, the custom is regarded as sacred by the Hindoos, being sanctioned by the Vedas, and therefore even the civilised Hindoo of to-day has no aversion to it. According to this dogma of the Hindoo religion, the wife of a man who has no children, is allowed to have carnal knowledge of another person for the purpose of raising up seed to the unfortunate husband. And this liberty is permissible so long as the number of male children born to the apparent father in this out-of-the-way fashion does not exceed eleven, female children being excluded from the number, and there being no limit as to them. We may safely conjecture that during the earlier period when this custom came in vogue, the *Niyoga* was subject to the condition that the person who was made the instrument of raising up children, should be a sacred 'Brahman' and the same was metaphorically designated by the sun, moon, Indra or other gods. This also served as an expedient to conceal the true nature of the birth from the ignorant. As time passed on, the restrictions imposed were taken away. The word Brahman itself was divested of the sanctity formerly attached to the name and every member of the priesthood was regarded as being entitled to be elected as the *birajdata* or the giver of the seed. Thus is it now that the members of a particular community known as Brahmans, who regard themselves as the descendants of those earlier

sages, are, without any reference to their own sanctity, allowed to raise up children to other men under the custom of *Niyoga*. The custom has prevailed, and even now prevails, to a very large extent, among the Hindoos, but from its very nature it is not practised openly.

In short, the instances amongst Hindoos of children born of gods betray signs of a suspicious character, and the Christians cannot avail themselves of such occurrences. Cases of miraculous conceptions are not wanting in Greek mythology, but to the Greek we cannot give any more credit than to their brethren in India, and it seems probable that when at bottom the intercourse was not of the popular nature resulting from lawful wedlock, the child was ascribed to the amours of some god; or, like the Hindoos, their sacred priests were regarded by them as gods. The idea of *avatars*, however, though common to many other ancient religions, found especial prevalence among the Hindoos, who regarded their *rishis* as the incarnations of the Deity in human form. It is also for this reason that a large number of women live in the temples of Kanshi and Jaggannath to be gifted with children from some sacred Brahman. Certain Yogis too, who on account of the hard religious exercise to which they submit themselves, are reputed as the very image of the Deity, pass their lives in the jungles of Ajudhia, Kanshi or Jaggannath, on the banks of a pond or under the shade of a banyan tree, and are so lost in religious meditation and devotion that they seem to have no connection with what is around them, and appear to be the very incarnations of the Deity. It is not an uncommon practice to regard these sages as the givers of children. Probably the origin of the word *Ramjani* (born of Ram), which is applied to Hindoo dancing girls, may be traced to some similar origin, *viz.*, the sages who are the real progenitors of such children are regarded as Ram, *i.e.*, the Deity, their seed being known as *Ramjani*, or born of the Deity.

THE FATHERLESS BIRTH.

In short, the Hindoo and Greek Mythologies do not furnish us with any reliable evidence of children being born without a father, and all such stories that are current among these people, are metaphorical expressions and not real descriptions of the events. Although we admit the possibility of such events, yet the possible existence of anything does not prove its actual existence. With the refusal of the Jews to admit such a birth in the case of

Jesus, on the one hand, and the absence of any similar instances in the hands of Christians, on the other, the question of the birth of Jesus is a hard nut to crack for the defenders of Christianity. The eye of scepticism casts a slur upon the sacred name of Jesus Christ and lays the axe to the root of his alleged innocence. It therefore behoves the Christian Missionaries to untie this Gordian knot first of all. To state his Divinity as proof of his strange birth, is to argue in a circle and bring one assertion in support of another. The hostile critic discredits the Divinity even more than the birth. The alleged miracles of Jesus are pure romance so long as they are not accompanied with solid proof; and even admitting them for the sake of argument, we find them common to the other prophets. Even supposing that Jesus, being a God, could dispense with a father, the question still remains to be answered, why he could not dispense with a mother also? There is ground, and a reasonable one, for a sceptic to say that as there is a mother in the case, the natural inference is that there must be a father somewhere too. Without strong and convincing proof, the enemy cannot be silenced. And there is the further objection that if the sons of the sun, the moon or Indra are to be taken in a metaphorical sense, why not allow some similar interpretation in the conception of Mary? The Quranic statement that Jesus had no father cannot serve as a weapon in the hands of a Christian controversialist. The revelation of the Quran is not with him a Divine Revelation but the fabrication of a man. Can he then rationally support his dogma, which has no other legs to stand upon, by what he believes to be the fabrications of an impostor? He cannot avail himself of the testimony of the Holy Quran unless he first admits it to be a Divine Revelation.

SOLUTION OF THE MYSTERY.

A Muhammadan sect of recent growth, known under the name of the *Naichri* sect, has made an attempt to solve the difficulty by taking up the plausible position that Jesus was in fact the seed of his father Joseph, but argument and scriptures contradict this novel doctrine. For, if Jesus was born like his brothers and sisters in the ordinary way, how are we to explain the tremendous commotion caused by the event among the Jews as to the chastity of Mary, to which reference is made by the Holy Quran in the words *وماكانت أمك بغيا* "and thy

mother (O Mary) was not a harlot" (quoting the Jews). (Mary, 29). Such startling words could not have followed an ordinary birth. The existence of a physical father, in whose lawful wedlock Jesus could have been born, cannot therefore be rationally inferred from the circumstances attending the birth. The plain text of the Quran also rejects such a supposition. While Mary was yet in the womb of her mother, the latter had according to the Quran taken a vow that the baby shall be dedicated for life to the service of God's temple, and promised that it shall be detached from all worldly occupations and desires including that of matrimony. How was it possible then that Mary should have been betrothed in face of the strong vow? It appears, on the other hand, that as soon as it was possible after her birth, the child was removed to the care of the custodians of the temple, and the parents had given up all authority over it. Testimony is borne to this by another verse of the holy Quran **وكفلها ذكريا** (The Family of Imran, 32.), "the child was placed in the charge of Zacharius." The mother of the girl presented her to the priest who had care of the temple as one dedicated to God, and she was committed to the care of Zacharius. The practice of dedication for the service of the temple was of old standing among the Jews, and the consecration by parents of their children was considered as binding the latter to lead their lives as monks and nuns.

The following verse of Alqoran testifies to the truth of the statements made above with regard to the dedication of Mary:—

اذ قالت امرأة عمران رب اني نذرت لك ما في بطني محررا فتقبل مني انك انت السميع العليم "Remember, when the wife of Imran said: 'My Lord! verily I vow unto Thee that the child which is within my womb shall be dedicated to Thy service freed from all the trammels of worldly life and detached from all worldly connections; accept it therefore of me, for Thou art He who heareth and knoweth.'" (The Family of Imran, 31.). In this verse two words should be specially noticed, *viz.*, **نذر** and **محرر**. The word **نذر** is applied to the thing which a man sets apart or dedicates for a particular purpose or person. The word **محرر** emphasizes the meaning of **نذر** and denotes that the thing dedicated shall be so completely freed from all other connections and so wholly devoted to the particular purpose that it shall not be subject to the partnership of any one else

so much so that even parents shall lose their control over the child, and shall not subject it to the control of any body else. Now this verse proves it to satisfaction that Mary was vowed to lead an hermetical life in the service of the temple. As, by the law of Moses, the Jews were strictly enjoined to fulfil their vows and oaths, the parents of Mary had no authority to break the vow and betroth her.

The idea of the betrothal of Mary to Joseph and her subsequent conception by him is ridiculously absurd and contradicts the plain words of the Holy Quran. The Gospels also falsify this position for the Apocrypha which contain these statements in detail confirm the Quranic view of the question in all its aspects. They even go further and affirm that not only the mother but the father also vowed to God to consecrate Mary to His service, and that Mary herself on attaining majority had renewed the vow and strengthened it with her own covenant that she will not know man till her death. The question arises which I have not as yet seen answered by any advocate of Christianity, *viz.*, why notwithstanding all these strong vows and covenants of Mary and her parents, was she given in marriage and the commandment of God violated ?

The position is one of extreme difficulty, but I have met with a solution of it in a book written by a Jew. He writes that when Mary had grown up and was of an age to be able to render service to the temple, she performed the sacred duty admirably for some time, but soon after attaining puberty, she was mysteriously found pregnant with a child. This raised suspicions in all quarters and the Jews accused a Roman soldier as the cause of the scandal. Anyhow the discovery of Mary's pregnancy shocked the custodians of the temple, who deemed it advisable to exclude Mary from the precincts of the sacred house, and not to allow her to remain in the service of the temple any more. For this end they considered it proper to have the young lady married, and an old Israelite was fixed upon for the purpose. He was compelled to take Mary for a wife. He was an old man, not in well-to-do circumstances, a carpenter by profession, and had already a wife. These were the obstacles in his way, and he therefore refused to enter into a marriage contract, and begged to be excused on account of old age, and his encumbrance under the heavy duties of a husband and a father, but the priests insisted on the match and had the young lady married to the old man in all haste. The performance of the

marriage ceremony was the signal to her to depart from the temple, a step which was hastened for fear lest the sacred house of God suffer from the objection of defilement. Soon after, the baby was born and called *Yasu'* (Jesus). The Jews have always emphatically denied the miraculous in the birth of Jesus.

This version of the story, as given by the Jewish writer, explains the necessity of Mary's betrothal. The Gospel narrative that the betrothal had taken place in the ordinary manner seems to be an after-thought and an invention of the narrators. The fact is, that the elders on finding the virgin with child and fearing that the disclosure of the secret would bring censure and reflect dishonour upon the family, thought of this expedient to conceal what seemed to them a blemish. They were perfectly aware that such a marriage was in violation of the Scripture, for her parents had devoted her to the service of the Lord, and she herself had vowed virginity to Him, which vow could not be dissolved or broken, yet, as the honour of the family was at stake, they were obliged to take this scarilegious step. But notwithstanding all their efforts to conceal the pregnancy, the evil-minded enemies of the house gave publication to the event representing it in the worst possible light. It is on account of this deep-rooted hatred that they do not call him *Jeshua* (in Arabic *Yasu'*), but *Jeshu* (in Arabic *Yasu*), intentionally rejecting the final letter *ain*. The significance of the word in its curtailed form is extremely disgusting, and I therefore refrain from giving it here. I am led to think that this was the reason why the Holy Quran adopted the name of *Isa* instead of *Yasu'*; as the sense of the latter word was corrupted by a very slight change in its form. Such odious appellations were invented by the mischief-making Jews to cast a slur upon the honour and reputation of Jesus and his mother, and as evidence of their guilty and sinful natures.

FALSE CHARGES AGAINST THE PROPHETS OF GOD.

The base charges hurled at Mary and her son, and the numerous faults found with them, are far more detestable than the crimes and faults attributed to any other prophet of God. Every honourable person can easily conceive the shock these abominable imputations must have caused to the feelings of both mother and son. It was the result of these false charges wilfully imputed to the righteous

servants of God, that the Jews were cursed with the prevalence among their males and females of the worst sins with which they charged Jesus and his mother. Such is the Divine Law that the people who falsely charge their prophets with crimes, are themselves involved in their commission, and are guilty of the same. The Christian critics of Islam unscrupulously laid obscene crimes to the charge of our holy Prophet and the writings of Christianity teem with this scandal. But mark the sequel. The vice of Christian countries, the widespread and daring corruption of their men and women, is worse than any recorded of the most uncivilised people on the face of the globe. Intemperance and prostitution rage among them to an extent not known to any other people. In short, the denunciations flung at Christ and his mother, and the life of sinfulness attributed to them by the Jews, should give a lesson and a warning to the Christian Missionaries that they should be careful in finding faults with the righteous servants of God.

All this shows clearly that for the calumniators there is everywhere room for the culling of errors and for defaming the reputation of great and good men. Vain is the attempt to show the blamelessness of Jesus by stigmatizing all other prophets, for they themselves would thus lead others to put Jesus in the same black book where their own leaders have so unjustly been put. Success can never attend such a base and scandalous measure, nor should it be the task of well-bred and good-natured gentlemen. What good can result from abusing the sacred apostles of God, whom he has, by His powerful hand, seated on the thrones of glory, by making them the preceptors who have furnished guiding rules to millions of human beings. Let him bear in mind who will that a world of sins imputed to the holy ones cannot make the son of Mary a hair's breadth more guiltless than he is. The prophets of God are but one body, and if one limb is involved, the whole body suffers, not that particular limb alone. "Judge not that ye be not judged," said the prophet rightly; but his followers have not heeded this good advice. Alas! they do not understand that they cannot do any good to one by blaming the others. They must all stand or fall together. If they are all innocent, he also is blameless; if the others are guilty, he cannot be free. Nay, the jealousy of God for His holy messengers, whom He selected for the guidance of the world, has at last come into motion, and the critics

of Jesus have shown his life to be most of all blamable. They have attacked the chastity of his mother and cast a slur on his birth. Wherein lies then the boasted sinlessness, and who can assert innocence in face of this scandal ?

It is a benefit which the Holy Quran has benevolently conferred upon Jesus and his mother that it made millions of men to hold their tongues with respect to the suspicious birth of Jesus. It enjoined upon them to believe in his birth without a father. Had it expressed the same opinion as to the conduct of Mary and the birth of Jesus, as the Jews did, the whole world would have been inclined to adopt the view held by such an overwhelming majority, and the refutation of these charges would then have become an impossible task. And although the world can hardly see its way to the comprehension of the queer logic that the Holy Ghost can also make virgins conceive and the absence of any instance of like nature makes the matter still more suspicious, yet the Muslims have in obedience to the Revelation of God, as granted to them through their Holy Prophet, admitted the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus, and it forms a part of their belief.

Returning to the main point of my argument, the words of Jesus "Why callest thou me good" cannot bear the interpretation that Jesus was not pleased with being called good, unless he were called by the more dignified title of God. Every sensible person can easily understand that it was owing to a feeling of his own humility and insignificance compared with the power and glory of the Most High God, and a knowledge of such of his own weaknesses as are natural to humanity that Jesus did not allow the use of the word 'good' for himself. It is even possible that Jesus might have meant to insinuate to the inquiring Jew his insincerity and the holowness of the words in which he praised him as at heart the Jews regarded him a black sheep, a wine-bibber, a profligate, a sabbath-breaker, a dis-respecter of parents, and the most shocking of all, a bastard and a friend of harlots. The reasonableness of this idea is evidenced by the fact that the Jews up to this moment deny any goodness in Jesus. Any one who has studied their writings or enquired as to the character of Jesus from their learned men, shall agree with me in holding that the faults attributed to our Prophet by the Christian

Missionaries are far inferior in number and intensity to those put to the charge of Jesus by his inveterate enemies, the Jews. I dare say that there is no sin against piety and righteousness which the Jews have not imputed to Jesus and his mother or his disciples. The impudence with which they have done this could never for a moment attend the words of a *Muslim*.

THE NON-APPEARANCE OF ELIAS FALSIFIES THE CLAIM TO MESSIAHSHIP.

Many of their objections, however, require to be seriously dealt with. They have the plain word of God in their support, wherein it is written (Malachi iv : 5) that the Lord shall send the Prophet Elias before the coming of the Messiah. The Jews therefore could not accept the son of Mary as the true Messiah, for the Prophet Elias did not descend from the heavens before him. Jesus' reply that the coming of Elias was fulfilled by the appearance of John who came in his power and spirit, is rejected by the Jews as a distortion of plain words and an heretical perversion of the true sense which he devised to establish his own pretensions to the title of Messiah. A learned Jewish writer says that they (*i.e.*, the Jews) cannot be called to account for rejecting the claim of Jesus to Messiahship, for the Lord had plainly told them by the mouth of his Prophet Malachi that Elias, and not his like, shall appear before the coming of the great day of Messiah.

JESUS NOT A DESCENDENT OF DAVID.

They further allege that according to the Gospels, Mary conceived of the Holy Ghost, but it is also written (Acts ii : 30) that God had sworn with an oath to the Prophet David that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ. If, they say, Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, he cannot be of the loins of David, for descent according to the law is always taken from the male side.

FAULTS ATTRIBUED TO JESUS.

Side by side with the adverse criticism of the Jews, we cannot help noticing the views of learned writers from among the Christians themselves, who are not less severe upon the alleged innocence of Jesus Christ. To establish the claim to innocence, say they, the claim out should be free both from error and from sin. Both

drawbacks, according to them, are observable in the life of Jesus. He himself drank wine so long as he lived and supported the cause of intemperance. He had free and intimate connections, they further assert, with women of dubious character and drunkards (Matt. xi: 19). He was also, they maintain, the occasioner of loss to certain innocent persons. He set a very bad example to his followers by introducing wine into the Lord's Supper, of which every Christian must partake. This opened the way to excess, and the result is a wholesale drunkenness of the Christian nations. With these facts before them, would the critics assert, how can they draw any conclusion as to the innocence of Jesus, the natural inference from them being the very opposite of it? In like manner he was not free from error. Thus it appears that for selfish motives he rejected the plain meaning of the prophecy relating to the second coming of Elias, and adopted an interpretation which suited his own purpose, *viz.*, that some one else had appeared in the spirit and power of Elias. Malachi prophesied the advent of Elias before the Messiah, and if the words be taken in their plain and natural meaning, there is an end even to the apostleship of Jesus, to say nothing of his deity. The most favourable view of Jesus in this respect, stated in the mildest terms, must adjudge him guilty of an error as against the Jews. In plainer words one could say that to establish his own claim to messiahship, Jesus knowingly rejected the plain and true sense of the words of the prophecy.

THE SECOND COMING OF JESUS AND ELIAS.

If we believed in good faith and right intent his interpretation of the prophecy as the correct one, *viz.*, that by the second advent of Elias was meant the appearance not of Elias but of somebody else, why did he not interpret his own second advent similarly and say plainly that not he but some one in his spirit and character shall appear in the world in the latter days. It hardly needs to be stated that the second advent of Elias, which the Jews expect to this day, falsified the claim of Jesus. The personal second advent of Elias, he therefore denied only with the object of furnishing a handle to his own cause. Without such an interpretation he could not have been accepted, nor had he the power to raise Elias from the dead—as some imagine—to set all doubts right.

THE MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS.

In the promise of his own second advent too, he had an object. He asserted to have come to establish the throne of David, but the assertion never took any practical shape. Many of those who had joined him under the hopes of soon seeing a temporal Jewish kingdom established, deserted him on the frustration of the scheme. But it was not all over with the matter. Jesus informed them that his kingdom was of heaven and not of this world. This blighted all their bright prospects, and the assurance of a heavenly kingdom did not avail much. The Jews had set their eyes upon a temporal kingdom, and to them the kingdom of heaven was but a cloud-land. They lived on the only hope of the appearance of a Messiah from among them who should found a powerful temporal rule, destroy their enemies, and deliver them from their bondage. Now Jesus, instead of fulfilling their expectations of a deliverer for whom they had yearned for so many centuries, told them to believe that the deliverance promised to them from bondage meant the deliverance from the bondage of sin; that kingdom meant not an actual kingdom upon earth, but the prospective kingdom of heaven, and that Elias meant John. This was a strange explanation of the plain words of the prophets. The Jews were told to take the language of the prophecies as metaphorical and have faith upon it, to pass their lives in slavery and be happy. Jesus, no doubt, came to deliver them, but only in the inexplicable spiritual way. He was their king but on heaven, not upon earth. The Jews, who had been afflicted, crushed and ruined under a foreign rule for centuries, forced to emigrate and reduced to subjection and slavery, could not comprehend the use of such a deliverer to them, and could not be satisfied with a few assertions which practically meant nothing. They were anticipating a Messiah, a temporal sovereign, who should remove the tyrant's yoke and rule the enemy with a rod of iron.

THE DELIVERANCE FROM THE BONDAGE OF SIN.

As to deliverance from the bondage of sin, the Jews failed to observe even here any good example. Those who accepted the deliverer, even the apostles themselves, were as yet the slaves to selfish pride, ambition and sin in various forms, and cursed at last the great deliverer

himself. The absence of any evident sign of the promised deliverance from sin justified the Jews in rejecting Jesus as a spiritual deliverer. They repeatedly requested him not to trouble himself about their sins; they would look to their souls themselves, and Moses was a sufficient guide to them in that respect. They also knew, they asserted, that he could not do much for them in this particular, his disciples having failed to show any good example of the constancy and firmness of faith, and of the renunciation of the world and its vanities. With this spiritual poverty of the chosen ones, they could hardly expect that any great spiritual blessing was in store for them. So that was all trash for them which they could never accept. Such turning and twisting of the words, on the other hand, tended to widen the breach, deepen the enmity and augment the hatred of the people. What was desired for, was, if he was the true Messiah who came in fulfilment of the old writings and messianic hopes fostered by generations of prophets, that he should find some remedy for their national languor, deliver them from the yoke of the foreigner, bring back the emigrated tribes to their native land, redress their evils as had been promised to them, destroy the enemy that had crushed them, and raise them to earthly prosperity and power, as Moses did. If he could confer this benefit upon them, he would win their hearts and souls to his obedience. They set little value upon the promises of being saved from an unseen hell-fire when the Messiah could do nothing to save them from the hell upon earth and the devouring flames of adversity and ill-luck.

CHANCES IN JESES' POSITIONS.

This argument of the Jews, Jesus left unanswered, but he must have felt its force as he readily shifted his position. At first he gave out that he came to establish the kingdom of David. But soon discovering the impossibility of ever realizing the claim, he readily changed the kingdom of David into the kingdom of heaven. The Jews scorned the idea and Jesus adopted a third course. He had come, he said, in meek and humble garments and could not be an earthly ruler in his first career—such, of course, being the will of the Father—but that in the latter days he shall descend in full glory from heaven and deliver Israel from misery and subjugation. This, he thought, would silence the enquirers and save him further worry, every one looking with ardent hope to distant future. But the Jews were

not thus to be baffled; they knew that he was but prevaricating, and humbly urged the uselessness to them of glory and greatness when death shall have laid them in dust. But Jesus as readily shifted to a fourth side and said that he shall come back before that generation passed away, and that they shall soon see the son of man coming in his glory on the clouds. It was a flattering lie, and the Jews took this as happy news of their long lives and did not pest him with any further questions, for flattery, as a rule, softens down opposition. The ready-wittedness displayed by Jesus in this controversy with the Jews, is at least a proof of his being a great genius. But the critic would say, it was a shame ful lie which Jesus spoke.

THE TRUE NATURE OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

These are only a few instances of the scathing criticism to which Christianity is subjected at the hands of not only its opponents but also its own people. The Christian finds fault with others and the Freethinker with the Christian. Thus a Freethinker would argue that when Jesus interpreted the plain words in Malachi, relating to the second advent of Jesus as meaning the coming of another person (John) in the spirit and power of Elias, why did he not describe his own second advent in a similar manner. The interests he had in view were twofold. Elias did not appear before him and therefore his claim to messiahship was false on the very face of it, unless he could show that it was not necessary for Elias to come personally, but that the prophecy could be fulfilled by the coming of some one else in the spirit and power of Elias. Hence the assertion that John was Elias. Again, the Jews could not be satisfied with a nominal redeemer who could do nothing to avert the evils under which they suffered. To console them he said that after a trip to heaven he would be again among them in a short time, and then deliver Israel from, and exalt them over, their oppressors. But to the eye of criticism the conduct of Jesus does not appear justifiable. He twisted the words in the one case and made a false claim in the other to serve his own selfish purpose. This, as we understand, is an irrefutable objection on the Christian doctrine of second advent. But a closer examination of the scriptures shows the falsity of the objection. In Matt. xvii : 10—12, the words of the prophet clearly indicate that as Elias had to bear persecutions twice, once in his first appearance, and

again in his second advent, the latter however not being his actual but only a spiritual re-appearance, so shall the Messiah suffer twice also, each of his appearances resembling that of Elias, with this difference only that in his first coming he shall suffer all patiently, whereas in the second (*i.e.*, spiritual appearance) he shall finally be triumphant over his enemies. Elsewhere in the gospels, Messiah likens his own coming (*i.e.*, the second one) to that of a thief (Matt xxiv : 43). And it is a plain matter of fact that the thief hides his face and comes in disguise. Such was to be his own advent.

STRIKING RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN JESUS AND ALIAS.

A study of Kings I and II, along with the gospel, discloses a striking resemblance between the lives of Elias and Jesus. For instance, Elias worked miracles equal and even superior to the miracles on whose strength the man Jesus has been made God. I say superior, because the prayers and prophecies of Elias destroyed his enemies before his eyes, but Jesus was a failure in this respect. The second point of resemblance between them is, that has ignorance has made the one ascend to the heavens, so has Jewish superstition put forward a similar claim for the other. Likewise as to descent from that resting-place, Christian ignorance expecting the descent of Jesus and Jewish that of Elias from the etherial regions. Moreover, as the enemies of Jesus persecuted him and devised plans to bring about his death, so did those of Elijah. And last, though not least, as the second advent of the one was only a spiritual and not an actual one, so is that of the other. This is also the drift of the three verses in Matt. xvii: 10—12. At the end of the last verse Jesus says: "Likewise shall also the son of man suffer of them," which is plainly to assert that as Elias suffered at the time of his first appearance, and again in his second advent in the person of John the Baptist, so shall Jesus suffer twice, in his own person and in that of his like, but shall finally be triumphant over his enemies and declare the glory of the All-powerful God.

JESUS DID NOT FORETELL HIS PERSONAL SECOND ADVENT.

In short, the objection cannot stand that it was to hide his own fault and throw a veil over his inability to establish the throne of the great King and Psalmist that Jesus promised to the disappointed

Jews a second coming more glorious than the first, and thus employed deceit for the purpose of alluring the credulous into the belief that though it was hopeless to expect the establishment of any temporal Jewish monarchy during his first career, yet the object was sure to be attained in his second advent. As already stated, he never asserted in plain words that he himself would come in the last ages. It is a slander upon Jesus, for he strongly refuted the idea of his personal second advent on more than one occasions. By promising the sign of Jonas he declared his resemblance to that patriarch, thereby giving to understand that like Jonas he shall enter alive into the grave, thus refuting the idea of his death on the cross. Again, he described his likeness to Elias, and put it beyond all doubt that his own second advent would be like that of Elias and that he shall suffer on both occasions from the blindly prejudiced ignorant, as did Elias before him. All those things which were spoken of old have been fulfilled to-day, for when the humble writer of these lines has made his appearance in the spirit and character and after the manner of Jesus, he is rejected by the Muhammadans and Christians alike. Abuses are hurled at him, he is called an infidel, and *Mullanic fatwas* declare him to be deserving of the penalty of death.

WEAK POINTS IN JESUS' TEACHINGS.

Turning to the point from which we started, we see that as the "higher critics" and sceptics among the Christians have done all they could to deal a death-blow to the alleged innocence and blamelessness of Jesus so far as his deeds are concerned, and have prepared a long list of his errors, they have not failed to point out, at the same time, grave and serious faults in his sayings and have shown the weak points in his teachings along with those in his conduct. For instance, it is alleged that Jesus recommended castration and that the injunction was faithfully carried out by certain early pious believers. But this hateful practice, it is clear, is opposed to all laws, divine and human, and calculated to blot out human beings from the face of the earth in a few years. The practice is therefore the greatest bane that society can suffer. Criticism therefore sees enough of faults in the sayings of Jesus, and strongly objects to a claim of infallibility with regard to his teachings. Almighty God did not protect him against faulty sayings, and it is equally certain that He did not protect him against

erring conduct. He had not been given a judgment free from error. The claim of sinlessness therefore falls to the ground in the eye of a critic; and he is the more to blame for the errors of his teachings, for the danger which they involve is of a far more serious character than that threatened by failings of conduct, as Jesus himself taught, saying, that "There is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man." Mark vii: 15. In other words, guilty sayings which teach infidelity and looseness of morals are deadly sins, and foibles of conduct or frailties of human nature are only secondary errors arising out of these.

GOD'S BIRTH.

It would not be out of place to refer to another abominable dogma taught by Jesus according to Christian belief, *viz.*, that God penetrated into the womb of a woman, that God was born, that God gave birth to a son, and that God himself became a bouncing boy. Equally detestable is the execrable blasphemy that God is not perfect unless the Holy Ghost and Jesus son of Mary join with Him and that these three lumped together make one God. Now all these absurd teachings, which are manifestly false, could not have been preached by Jesus, had he been proof against sin. Nay, these teachings are the most deadly sins of which man can be guilty. Sinful deeds affect only man's self, but iniquitous sayings affect all men and in ever-widening circles corrupt the whole world. Transgressions in deeds destroy the soul of the delinquent only, but erroneous teachings are destructive to the world. Apart from these considerations, the sins of the tongue are more dangerous than the sins of the other organs. For instance, lying, exaggeration, abusing, cursing, reviling, blaspheming, *shirk* (praying to others than God) and bearing false witness, are undoubtedly of a more poisonous nature than misdeeds. It is also apparent that eternal hell is the punishment for sinful sayings, though not for sinful deeds.

THE EVIL CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOGMA OF ATONEMENT.

The Freethinkers and inquirers among Christians bring forward another serious objection against the teachings of Jesus Christ. The

ill-advised dogma of man's salvation not through any good or virtuous deeds, but through the blood of Jesus, has opened wide doors to moral depravity of the worst kind. The laxity and corruption of Christian nations need no mention, and the looseness of morals and uncontrolled licentiousness have taken them so far away from true reformation and the re-generation of the soul that there is now almost an impassable chasm between them. The lustful European soldiers raven and ravish like wolves, and like vultures fall blindly upon every rotten carcass of evil. Had there been any truth in the dogma of atonement, every grade of Christian society should have morally benefitted by its wholesome influence in practical life. But instead of being a blessing, the dogma has been a curse to Christian Europe, and has deluged the continent with rivers of the poison of evil and transgression. Whatever inclinations to vice there were in human nature, have, by the aid of this doctrine, been developed in their worst form. The excess of the drunkards and gamblers of Christianity has eclipsed the worst record of all nations, past and present. As to prostitution, Christian nations seem to have almost a monopoly of it. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his "Christ and His Times" confesses that "Intemperance is in far greater rage and ravage in England than it was among those Gentiles denounced by St. Peter." The "streets of London," the Archbishop further says, "fling temptation broad-cast before youth and inexperience," and "Our medical authorities speak of a river of poison flowing into the blood of this nation." These words coming from the highest dignitary of the richest Christian Church, establish conclusively the truth of the statements made above.

Doubtless then the dogma has been the chief agent in planting countless trees of vice in Europe. In the face of these facts, is it reasonable to allege that the person who taught this doctrine did nothing wrong and took no erring step? Can he remain sinless with all this visible evil that has been brought into the world as a consequence of the dangerous doctrine he taught? Nay, from the fornicators spoken of in I Cor. v : 1, 2, 6, and vi : 9, 12, 19, to the adulterers and prostitutes who now abound in Paris, London and other parts of Europe, cities whose vice is worse than that of any of the worst cities of antiquity, the sins of every Christian people and every

Christian generation are on the shoulders of the person who brought all this evil into the world, and who emboldened his followers in the commission of sins by the doctrine he taught. The idea of the physical death of the Infinite God is no doubt the worst blasphemy that has been uttered in the world—even a denial of God coming next to it—but the spiritual and moral death of men which the dogma has brought about is not less horrible. God, it is said, had “sent” His son to save His children and die in their stead, but the death of the *only* son only hastened the death of His children.

From the beginning all the prophets and reformers taught that virtue atoned for vice and good deeds for bad ones, and the law also seems to be established by experience, for the strengthening of the soul by virtue minimises the power of evil and weakens the hold of Satan. But Jesus could not teach this true and noble doctrine and therefore the deadliest sin is to be attributed to him that he is at the root of all Christian corruption.

THE NON-RESISTANCE OF EVIL AS TAUGHT BY JESUS.

Nearly every part of Christ's teachings, when put under the test of criticism, appears to be full of difficulties and objections. Thus it has been argued that his counsel of not resisting evil and of turning over the other cheek on being smitten on the one, is very objectionable and far from being unerring. If Jesus' advice be taken seriously and adopted as a basis of action, it works the greatest mischief. It tends to corrupt the morals of the oppressor by emboldening him in the commission of evil and endangers the life of the oppressed. The inculcator of this doctrine is guilty of two sins. In the first place by allowing the tyrant to go scot-free and unpunished he assists him in his oppression and allows the spreading of iniquity and oppression upon earth. In the second place he shuts the doors to the redress of grievances, and thus becoming an enemy to the noble quality of justice assists in filling the earth with tyranny and oppression. Can such a person be a well-wisher of the whole of mankind? From a rational point of view Jesus' advice that whenever our life, honour or property is attacked, instead of resisting the attack we should assist the malefactor in his guilty designs, is not only repug-

nant to all ideas of nobility and respectability but strikes at the very root of all social welfare. These impracticable teachings wrongly termed "counsels of perfection" are subversive of all social order, and the society which adopts them as a basis of action shall go to ruin in a very short time. With this advice as the guiding rule of life, even the ladies of respectable gentlemen could not be safe within their houses, for they are as much bound to observe the rule of non-resistance against evil-doers as the stronger sex. Is it with this teaching in hand that the Missionaries are labouring to proselyte the whole world, or can they with any show of reason praise it as the noble doctrine of forgiveness? Nay, it is the enemy to all social order, the enemy to justice, and the enemy to true righteousness. Could these be the words of a God, who in His laws of nature, has clearly shown that He regards justice and mercy with equal favour, and that each in its proper place is a blessing to the world? His works as displayed in the outside world are neither based solely upon the one nor solely upon the other, but upon both in their proper places. It is further necessary that the words of God should agree with his works. But the teachings of Jesus are opposed to the Divine laws as shown in God's works, which is a certain proof of their uninspired origin. Why do not the zealous preachers and advocates of Christianity, who are day and night engaged in cavilling and carping at other religions, ponder over these teachings of the Gospels which make no provision, either for the relief of the oppressed, or for the chastisement of the oppressor. Can the teacher of this contemptible dogma claim infallibility? Why do not the learned Christian priests, who have spent long years of their lives in the study of logic and philosophy, bring these doctrines under these scientific tests and inform the world, if there are any principles which lend a colour to these doctrines? Is there any lover of truth among the Christians who can show any truth in the doctrine that we should suffer to be attacked in respect of our life, property or honour without offering the least resistance? If there is truth in this maxim, why do not the Christians act upon it? One of the two conclusions is unavoidable, *viz.*, either that those who failed to follow the advice are sinners, or that he who preached the dangerous dogma which, if acted upon, was to bring certain injury and ruin upon them and their children, is morally culpable.

SEVERITY BENEATH THE APPARENT FORBEARANCE.

And yet there is another aspect of the question. At the bottom of this boasted forbearance, extreme severity is observable. The offender is spared the slighter punishment, but only to undergo the severer one. For instance, in the same sermon we are told that if the eye look to lust, the whole body shall for ever be consumed in hell-fire. Thus, on the one hand, we have the injunction not to oppose, nay, not even to check, evil of any sort including that proceeding from unchaste looks or attack on the chastity of women, and such resistance is forbidden to a true Christian ; but, on the other, eternal burning in hell is threatened as the punishment of an act of adultery. Now it is evident that if the delinquent had been chastised in proportion to his offence when its nature was slight, a double advantage would have accrued to him, *viz.*, that of being saved from eternal hell-fire and that of being checked in the commission of evil. But the Gospel teaching whereas it emboldens him in the commission of crime, threatens him with the severest punishment in the next life. Such a method would prove a certain failure in effecting a diminution of crime. Jesus' teaching, if acted upon, is equally injurious to both parties. It is hard upon the oppressed inasmuch as it does not afford him any relief, or give any redress for the grievance ; it is also hard upon the oppressor, because by forbearing to inflict the slighter punishment it brings him under the extreme penalty of the law and deprives him of an opportunity to reform himself.

THE QURANIC DOCTRINE OF FORBEARANCE.

Such are some of the objections of the advanced thinkers from among the Christians. As to ourselves, we no doubt admit that forbearance is an admirable quality but only when used on the proper occasion. Out of place it becomes an evil and a cause of great mischief. On this point the only teaching that can claim perfection is that contained in the Holy Quran. We have seen above the defenceless state of the Gospel injunctions relating to forbearance. The Quranic doctrine settling the question of the allowableness of forbearance or revenge is contained in the following verse :—

“ The punishment for an offence is to retribute to the criminal what is proportionate to his offence (such are the requirements of justice), but if any one forbear (from punishing the offender or from bringing him to punishment) and his forbearance is conducive to any good (and does not cause any mischief or disturb public tranquility, in short, is used in the proper place), he shall be rewarded from heaven (for, by his forbearance he has saved a soul and reclaimed it without causing any disturbance or mischief to the people at large). It will be readily admitted that all defaulters are not of the same disposition and equally inclined to evil. Some there are who, if their offences are pardoned and their failings overlooked, are readily converted and reform themselves, avoiding the evil and shunning bad company in future. Not many, however, belong to this class. There are others, and the majority are such, upon whom forbearance has the contrary effect. If they are not rebuked and punished for their offences, they are emboldened to commit grosser ones, and so long as they are not corrected, they are bent upon mischief like the evil spirit. Forbearance in their case injuriously affects the public. They are like the serpent whose nature is to bite people and to which the biting of one person is only an inducement to bite another. It is no satisfaction to it if a whole city falls prey to its poison. It must bite until its head is crushed. The pangs of conscience or the compunctious visitings of nature are not known to them.

THE ALLEGED FORBEARANCE A TRAP FOR DEFAULTERS.

Some apologists of Christianity admit the impropriety of forbearance on all occasions, but offer a different explanation of the words of Jesus, *viz.*, that it is intended that the individual instead of resisting the evil himself and taking the law into his own hands, should refer the matter to the authorities and call the state for his aid, for whom this injunction is not meant. But this explanation resorted to to ward off an attack, subjects the Gospel to a more serious one. The Gospel teaching would in that case be reduced to this, that when a Christian is smitten on one cheek, to make the hurt a grievous one and consequently the crime a more serious one, he should turn the other cheek, so that the exasperated criminal may smite it with greater force and even break a tooth or two. Then is the time for the meek Christian to prosecute the duped defaulter under a more

serious charge in a Court of law and triumph over his punishment. If this is the intention of the teacher of this doctrine, as the Missionary exponents of the Gospels would have it, we regret to say that the morality taught here falls far short of any other known ethical system. It is rather just the opposite of morality. It is acting the wolf in the clothes of a lamb. To outward appearance it is meekness and forbearance, but really it is vengeance of the basest type, for it is to involve the accused in a more serious crime than that which he intended. It is downright dishonesty that forbearance should be shown with the intention that the enemy may make himself liable to a graver charge, and when he has fallen into the trap, then bring him to law that he may undergo a severer punishment. If this is the drift of the verses enjoining forbearance and forgiveness, the Gospel teaching on this point is sadly to be noted as brutally deceitful, for its object is not to forgive a criminal but to involve him in a more serious crime and subject him to a severer punishment. The proper course consistent with the laws of morality and considerations of public good, should have been that taught by the Holy Quran and stated above, *viz.*, that neither punishment nor forgiveness would do alone in every case, but that the proper occasion for the exercise of each should be observed from the circumstances of each particular case, and that the welfare of the criminal as well as that of the public should be always kept in view.

THE MUSLIM DOCTRINE IS A MEAN BETWEEN TWO EXTREMES, THE
JEWISH LAW OF STRICT VENGEANCE AND THE CHRISTIAN
LAW OF UNQUALIFIED NON-RESISTANCE.

We take the words of the prophet Jesus in their plain and natural sense and do not hesitate to admit the fact that his object in laying so much stress upon the doctrine of forbearance was to put a stop to the long-established usage among the Jews of extreme vengeance in every case. It is true that the Jews had gone to one extreme by a strict application of the law of "tooth for tooth," but it is equally true that Jesus in preaching the doctrine of forbearance on every occasion without any regard to the circumstances of the case, went to the other extreme. Both doctrines went to extremes and were equally divergent from the path of truth. Therefore Providence willed that the true and middle path should be revealed through the Holy Quran, which admirably combines the law of

requital with that of forgiveness, each to be administered after a due and deep consideration of the circumstances of each case in such a way that mischief should not be the result. Both the Old and the New Testament are under the stigma that they could not offer the wise and golden rule which the holy and living Word of God, the Quran, has so judiciously taught.

The fact is, that both these books must be taken as special or local laws. The excesses of the Israelite people rendered it necessary at a certain stage in their history that the law of strict vengeance should have been preached to them, while at another period it was equally necessary that the law of forbearance should have been given to them in an exaggerated form. It needs no demonstration to prove and History sufficiently bears out the fact that the advancement of man towards civilization and refined manners has been slow and gradual. Therefore it was necessary and in harmony with the circumstances of man's life in the world's history that at an earlier stage of his civilization, when man's nature was more subject to the sway of passions, he should have a liking for the law of vengeance. But as he progressed under the Divine Law, there came a period in his history when his nature from a desire of getting freed from the slavery of passion called for a law in which stress was laid on forgiving injuries. Later development and the experience of centuries that the law of extreme vengeance and that of extreme forbearance were both imperfect, taught him to prefer the wise and middle course of acting according to the circumstances of each case and accordingly his nature called for, from Almighty God, some such injunction which neither took away a tooth for a tooth in every case, nor absolutely forgave the offence. All three books therefore were given to meet the call of human nature, *viz.*, the Old Testament laying undue stress on punishment, the New Testament preaching highly exaggerated forbearance, and the Holy Quran which adopts the middle course and teaches moderation in every case.

TO THE READER.

We are sorry to say that we have not been able to publish in this number the promised subject upon *sinlessness*. The reader shall, however, find much in it that bears directly upon the subject and shows the very poor standard of sinlessness the christians have. (Ed.)