

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

## AN ANSWER

TO

## *Dr. DOWIE'S PREDICTION*

OF

## A GENERAL DESTRUCTION OF ALL MUHAMMADANS.

---

EVERY seeker after truth must bear in mind that when false doctrines prevail upon earth and there is a general departure from the ways of righteousness, when people forsake the true and living God who revealed Himself to Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Jesus, and last of all to the greatest and noblest of the prophets, Muhammad Mustafa, on whom be peace and the blessings of God, in short when the earth is defiled with *shirk* (the joining of gods with God), impiety, wickedness, worldliness and carelessness, Almighty God commissions one of His servants to reform and regenerate the world, breathes into him a soul from Himself, bestows upon him wisdom of His own wisdom, gives him power of His own power, and grants him knowledge of his own knowledge. It is a criterion of his being from God that the world cannot withstand him. If an adversary chooses to vie with him in religious truths and knowledge, the messenger of God comes off victorious; if the competition is as to the supernatural signs, his adversary is a certain failure; and if anyone tries conclusions with him in *Mubahila* and prays to God, alone or in opposition to him, that the liar should perish before the other, the enemy of God's messenger must perish in his lifetime.

According to this time-honored Divine law, when Almighty God saw that the earth had become corrupt, that millions of men had set up gods with God—more than four hundred millions having deified a weak man, the son of Mary, and along with it plunged into

drunkenness, licentiousness, worldly-mindedness and spiritual apathy, —He raised me in order to reform these evils. About a hundred thousand persons have already been converted by me from the ways of evil, and these have sworn repentance on my hands. The grace of God has been my constant companion, and He has shown more than 150 heavenly signs at my hands to which publication was given before their occurrence and consequently millions of the people of this land bear witness to them. I have been sent to re-establish the Unity of God upon earth, to deliver people from the snares of idol-worship and human-worship, to turn them to the worship of the One and Invisible God who has no partner, and to bring them back to true purity and righteousness. I see that a movement has already begun in the world and thousands of the people are repenting at my hands. The winds that are blowing from heaven are bringing men nearer to the recognition of the great truth of Unity and producing a general tendency towards its acceptance, and thus heaven itself is assisting my cause. There are certain signs and sure indications in earth as well as in heaven that Almighty God has determined to extirpate the abomination of human-worship from earth. For the attainment of this great end, He has brought into existence the various necessary means. The worshippers of a weak human being—I mean the Christians who with persistent blindness look upon the son of Mary as God,—are not satisfied with the progress which that pernicious doctrine has already made and long to see the day when the whole world should give up the true God for the supposed divinity of a weak and helpless man who was crucified by a few nameless Jews. Such are the evil consequences of the despicable practice of bowing down in worship to a fellow-creature that those who are involved in it, seeing do not see and hearing do not hear and having hearts do not understand. But the audacity of the evangelists of this religion is astonishing, for they do not like to see a single person who should worship the true God who existed before Mary or her son ever came into existence. It is the height of their ambition that the whole human race should worship the son of Mary as God, Creator, Lord and Savior of the world. But I see that the God of glory has with patience allowed this cancer to grow on the Divine religion. His honor and glory were given over to a weak human being but still

He smote not the utterers of this blasphemy, for the Lord is patient as He is jealous.

The blind human-worshippers have divested the Almighty Being of all His glorious attributes and invested the son of Mary with them, so that Jesus alone is now their Lord in earth and in heavens. The true God is like the rich man who for the sake of his dear relatives built a magnificent and spacious house with an orchard in the yard yielding fruits and flowers and giving shade. When the house was built, he gave one portion of the house to his relatives, locked up his property and valuables in another portion and set apart the rest as an inn for the travellers to take rest in. When the owner of the house was away on a trip, an impudent stranger who came and lived in the inn, took possession of the whole of the house set apart for public use, and with the exception of the compartments which contained the owner's property and relatives, turned the rest to his own individual use. Not content with this, the usurper turned out the relatives and broke open the rooms containing the valuables, taking wrongful possession of all the owner's property. When, therefore, the owner of the house who is also the king of the country shall come back, what shall he do and how shall he deal with the rude tyrant? He shall do to him as his monarchy, jealousy and power require. He shall turn him out of the house, restore it to his relatives, give them back the property of which they had been wrongfully deprived and give to them also the possession of the inn, so that none might tarry there again against their will.

In like manner the time has come when God shall settle all religious disputes. The pike and the sword have had their day but *Jehad* and crusades were equally unable to settle the question. Many encounters have taken place and lances have been broken, with the only lesson that sword cannot be the arbiter in religious struggles. But the days of heavenly judgment have drawn near, for the name of the Jealous God is held in great contempt upon earth. Every Christian Missionary has it in the heart of hearts that the true God preached by Moses and the prophets should be stripped of His glory and the throne of His majesty given to a frail mortal, Jesus the son of Mary. They do not wish that a single worshipper of the true God should breathe upon earth, and heartily desire that all nations should

join in the monstrous cry, until the corners of the earth echo and re-echo with the acclamation, that Jesus Christ is Almighty God, the Creator of worlds and the Lord of lords. The huge sums of money that are spent, the bulky volumes and the numberless leaflets that are written, the restless activity of the Christian Evangelistic Societies, and the plenty of resources they have in hand, are quite unknown in the history of any other movement.

Instead of resisting these forces of evil in a reasonable manner, the Muhammadans either sit silent or look to *Jehad* as the only means of advancement. They are looking forward with eagerness and anxiety to the time when their expected Mahdi and Messiah shall put an end to all infidel nations, and thus reply with the sword the objection of the ignorant critics against the Holy Prophet's taking up the sword. I think the chief reason of the decline of Muhammadans is that the feelings of love and sympathy are on the wane in their hearts. I do not judge all Muhammadans to be guilty of this hard-heartedness but it cannot be denied that there are millions among them who are thirsty of the blood of their own kind. Would a bloody-minded person like that some one should put an end to his life by a sudden stroke and leave his widow and orphans helpless and unfriended? Why does he do to others then what he does not like that others should do to him? The Muhammadans would certainly have conquered the hearts of Christian Europe, had it not been for the curse of trusting to the sword for the propagation of religious truths.

The Christian religion is one that cannot make its stand for a moment against the strong current of reason. The theory that one who was born of a woman was God, is the greatest insult to human intelligence. The son of Mary has not the slightest superiority over other men; nay, we can point to men who have been far superior to him. And in this age, the writer of these pages has been sent to convince people that he enjoys a greater grace and favor in the sight of God than Jesus Christ. That Jesus Christ is still living, that he sits on the heavens, that he actually quickened the dead, and that on his death the graves were opened and the dead arose and went into the city, are all legends as fabulous as those found in the Puranas of the Hindoos. The only truth about all these extravagances of the wonders wrought by Jesus, is that he

wrought certain miracles like all other prophets of God and as are even now being wrought by Almighty God at the hands of His Promised Messiah. But in the case of Jesus a grain of fact has been mixed with a mountain of fiction. What a disgraceful lie is it for instance that he ascended to heaven? The fact is only that he did not die upon the cross. This he had himself foretold in the words that "There shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonas the prophet." (Matt. 12 : 39). In these words he plainly indicated that as Jonas remained *alive* "in the whale's belly," so shall he remain *alive* "in the heart of the earth." If he did not enter alive into the grave, his prophecy was a sad failure, for the only vital point of resemblance is thus brought to nothing. But the truth is as is strongly corroborated by all the other circumstances attending his crucifixion that he was alive when taken down from the cross. Jesus remained fastened to the cross only for three hours, an interval of time by no means sufficiently long to produce death on the cross. The painful impaling, however, suspended sensibility for a while and produced a loss of consciousness. Thus there was an apparent state of death and consequently he was spared the breaking of bones, a necessary step to ensure the death of those who were nailed to the cross. The darkness caused by an eclipse of the sun and a violent burst of the storm accompanied with an earthquake, affrighted the Jews who immediately departed and left Jesus to be taken care of by a rich man, a secret disciple, Joseph of Arimathea, who lavished care upon the master. Two or three days' rest in the sepulchre which was in reality a room hewn into a rock, with the anxious care which Joseph bestowed upon his master, resuscitated Jesus, who after this event thought it advisable to bid adieu to his native land and travelled eastward. It has now been proved on the strength of arguments of unquestionable validity that he peacefully passed the rest of his days in the valley of Cashmere, and his tomb in the Khan Yar street at Srinagar, falsifies the legend of his ascent to heaven. Thousands of persons bear witness that the prophet Jesus lies asleep in the sacred dust of Cashmere, and before the light of this fact, the fiction of his ascent to heaven vanishes away as every fabrication must.

The result of a careful investigation with regard to this tomb

has been embodied in a book which shall be published shortly. Articles on this subject will occasionally appear also in this Magazine. I wonder at the crass ignorance of the Missionaries of Christianity who with a dullness which is the common lot of all superstitious people declare Jesus to be God on flimsy arguments. Their deification of a weak man with no proof in their hands, is a disgrace to their boasted philosophy and science.

I have lately been hearing of a messenger of Jesus Christ born in America. John Alexander Dowie, for such is his name, claims to have been sent by the son of Mary in his capacity of Godhead that as his apostle he may draw the whole world to a belief in the despicable dogma of his Divinity. A powerful God, indeed! who could not save himself from a handfull of Jews. A treacherous disciple betrayed him into the hands of the authorities and he was unable to prevent the betrayal or hold back the betrayer. Pinched with hunger, he ran to a fig tree and (bless his omniscience!) he did not know that the tree was barren. When he was asked of the day of judgment when it shall come, he confessed his ignorance, and the most shocking of all, it is alleged, that he became subject to *la'nat* (i.e., was accursed) which means that his heart became impure, turned away from God and was removed further off from Him and His mercy. But the marvels displayed by this God, do not end with the curse. He had to traverse countless millions of miles in space to reach his father, and the distance could not be removed but by his bodily ascent. It was the fate of the Christian Deity to remain involved in contradictions. The son and the father were "one," and yet the son had to travel millions of miles to go to the father. He there sits on the right hand of his father, yet how this could take place, both being one, must be left to be solved by Christian ingeniousness.

But notwithstanding all this Dr. Dowie looks upon the man Jesus as his God, and looks upon himself as his messenger. He further asserts that he fulfils the prophecy of Deut. 18: 15 in which Moses promised a prophet like to himself, and also claims to be Elias and the messenger of covenant. But he must be aware that his

sham deity was never dreamt of by Moses. His repeated injunctions to the Israelites were against the making "of any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath" or the "similitude of any figure," for, as he said: "The Lord spoke unto you out of the midst of fire. Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. Take ye, therefore, good heed to yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb." But Dr. Dowie wants to take advantage of the prophecy of Moses while rejecting the one and invisible God who inspired the great Law-giver and taking for his God one, who had a mother and four brothers, and sisters to boot. This messenger of Jesus, informed by his mock Deity, awaits a destruction of all Muhammadans and publishes his predictions that all those who do not recognise the son of Mary as their God, and Dowie himself as the messenger of that self-made Deity, shall perish. Here are some of his ejaculations: "Except they repent they shall all perish. They shall all perish Jew and Gentile alike." And again: "That nation, that people, that kingdom that will not recognise Christ as the king, and will not recognise the Christian Catholic Church in Zion as the forerunner, and the front of the Army of the Church of the Living God, that nation or that kingdom will perish, because God has said it."

Since Dr. Dowie is the messenger of the powerful Deity who was crucified by the Jews, I would entreat him to refrain from destroying the whole body of Muhammadans living upon the face of the earth. If they do not take the son of Mary for their God, the fault is not theirs. Where is the requisite proof, and how can they be convinced of the Divinity of one whose very tomb has been discovered in this country. Nay more, they have in their midst the Promised Messiah who has made his appearance, in accordance with the prophetic promises, at the close of the sixth and the commencement of the seventh thousand, with a host of heavenly signs. Moreover, it is not the Muhammadans alone who must perish according to Dr. Dowie's assertion. The Christians themselves are not out of danger. All must perish who though accepting the Divinity of Jesus, do not recognise his messenger in Dowie. "Lon-

don with all its millions, could be destroyed in the same way and time as St. Pierre." "Everything has to come into the Christian Catholic Church in Zion. If you do not come in, you will perish. . . . Your organizations will perish." To be saved, therefore, all the Christian Churches whom Dowie calls "Apostates" must follow Dr. Dowie, the blood of Jesus alone being insufficient to save them. They must admit that as Jesus is God, so is Dowie Elias and the messenger of covenant and the like of Moses promised in Deut. 18: 15. If they do this, they shall be saved; if not, they must perish like the Muhammadans.

In short, Dr. Dowie emphatically asserts and repeats his assertion over and over again, that all must perish who do not admit his authority along with the Divinity of the son of Mary, and the Christians of Europe and America will do well to accept his message. They have no difficulty, for when they accept one groundless assertion regarding the Divinity of Jesus, they may also accept a second one equally, if not more, groundless, and add to the rotten chain of the dogma of Jesus' Divinity, another rotten link of the Elijahship of Dowie. The Christians may thus escape the threatened destruction. As regards the Muhammadans, we hope Dr. Dowie will renounce his claim upon all if the decision can be come to by an easier method. Whether the God of Muhammadans or the God of Dowie is the true God may be settled without the loss of millions of lives which Dr. Dowie's prediction would involve. That method is that without threatening the Muhammadan public in general with destruction, he should choose me as his opponent *and pray to God that of us two whoever is the liar may perish first.* I look upon the son of Mary as a weak human being although I recognise him as a prophet of God, while Dr. Dowie takes him for the Lord of Universe. Which of us is right, is the real point at issue. If Dr. Dowie is certain of the Divinity of the son of Mary, he should publish the proposed prayer with the signatures of at least one thousand men affixed to it. Upon receiving it, I shall address the same prayer to Almighty God and publish it with the signatures of the same number of witnesses. If Dr. Dowie has the courage to accept this challenge, he will thereby open a way for all other Christians to the acceptance of truth. In making this



proposal, I have not taken the initiative, but the jealous God has inspired me upon Dr. Dowie's presumptuous prediction that all Muhammadans shall perish.

Dr. Dowie should further bear in mind that this challenge does not proceed from an ordinary Muhammadan. I am the very Messiah, the promised one, for whom he is so anxiously waiting. Between Dr. Dowie's position and mine the difference is this that Dowie fixes the appearance of the Messiah within the next twenty-five years, while I give him the glad tidings that the Messiah has already appeared. I am that Messiah, and Almighty God has shown numerous signs from earth as well as from heaven in my support. My following which already claims a hundred thousand souls is making a rapid progress. The proof that Dr. Dowie furnishes in support of his extravagant claims is the very height of absurdity. He claims to have healed hundreds of sick men. But why did his healing-power fail in the case of his own beloved daughter where it should have been exercised in the highest degree? Why was he unable to restore her to health whose death has been the most violent shock to him, for which he has not ceased to lament since. In the same way there are many other instances of the cases of his disciples in which he was called in time but failed to afford any relief with the result that his victims perished. It should also be borne in mind that the art of healing is one which is practised abundantly even in this country without any sanctity being attached to the character of those who are skilled in it. I wonder at the simple-mindedness of the Americans who attach any value to this absurdity. Was not the burden of deifying a man sufficient for them that they have added to it another equally heavy burden?

It is important to note that the art of healing diseases from its very nature and its prevalence among different people apart from divine inspiration and irrespective of religious sanctity, cannot serve as a criterion of truth. A sort of therapeutics which may appear supernatural to superficial observers, has been practised among various nations from time immemorial. It is practised by the Hindus. Among the Jews it was a common thing to effect the

cure of certain diseases by means apparently inexplicable. Even now there are men among the Muhammadans who lay claim to the healing of diseases exactly in the manner in which Dr. Dowie does it. The truth is that the healing of diseases is not a proper criterion for judging the falsehood of religious principles, for adherents of any system may be able to practise it. The Gospels themselves relate incidents showing that there were contemporaries of Jesus who were reputed for curing the sick in the same manner as Jesus did, and yet these thaumaturgists were not among his followers. There was even a pool at the time a dip in which had the miraculous power of removing bodily infirmities. The mere capacity to heal certain diseases cannot, therefore, be a serve test for the truth of a religion. In one case only can it serve as a criterion, *viz.*, when two parties each claiming the truth for himself, divide by lot a number of sick men between themselves. In such a case, the party who is able to heal the greater number in comparison with his antagonist, is entitled to claim it as a supernatural sign of the efficacy of prayer in his favor and hence as evidence of his truth. Sometime ago I invited my opponents to ascertain the truth or falsity of my claims by this test but no one accepted this challenge. I am certain that if Dr. Dowie or any one of his co-religionists stands forth even now to meet me on this ground, my God shall surely disgrace him, for he is a liar and his god is an embodiment of falsehood. But the remoteness that exists between us, does not allow of such a contest. I may, however, take advantage of Dowie's own assertion that the Muhammadans stick to falsehood and shall therefore perish. Dr. Dowie would not, I hope, resent the slight amendment that instead of making the whole body of Muhammadans as the aim of his prophetic denunciation, he ought to choose one opponent who may serve the same purpose. Would he hesitate to adopt a method by which he may save millions of lives without the least harm to his own cause? If he does, we must doubt his honesty. Dowie's assertion has moreover a subterfuge about it, for he has placed no limit upon the time within which the Muhammadans must perish. What if he himself dies before his predicted destruction! Shall one go to his tomb then and blame his dead body for his daring falsehood? Is it not a subtle shift to escape the blame of falsity so long as he lives? If Dr. Dowie is in

earnest and his statements regarding the destruction of Muhammadans are *bonâ fide*, and taught to him by the son of Mary, his alleged deity, there should be no equivocation in the method he adopts. It would be braver and more honest on his part to choose a single great adversary instead of hiding himself behind a multitude whose destruction he may be pleased to postpone to any suitable moment. Let him like an honest gentleman obtain permission from his Lord to accept the challenge and take his stand against me. I am an old man over sixty-six years of age and Dr. Dowie is more than eleven years younger than myself and, therefore, on the ground of age, he need not have any apprehensions. Moreover, I am suffering from various diseases and my life does not depend upon my health but upon the the will of God. If the self-made Deity of Dr. Dowie has any power, he shall certainly allow him to appear against me and spare him for many years after me. Dr. Dowie shall attain his object easily for instead of waiting for the destruction of all the Muhammadans, he shall have only to procure my destruction in his life-time, and then he will have in his hands a manifest sign of his mission from Jesus. Millions shall then bow their heads in submission to the son of Mary and recognise Dowie as his messenger. I say it truly that if the hatred of all the Muhammadans of the world for the Christian Deity were placed in one scale of a balance, and the hatred which I alone entertain towards him, in the other, my hatred would far outweigh that of the whole Muhammadan world.

Of all the birds I have an extreme liking for pigeon flesh, because it is the emblem of the Christian Deity. How Dr. Dowie likes it, it is difficult to say. He may for aught we know do justice to it on account of its deliciousness or spare it on account of its Divine sanctity. From our experience of the Hindus of this country, we should have expected the latter alternative, because since they have attached a sanctity to the cow, they do not use its flesh as an article of diet. But the Christians seem to have awkwardly lagged behind their Hindu brethren in this respect. They have shown no respect to dove which is the semblance of their deity who called out to Jesus from heaven: "Thou art my beloved son." From this it would appear that the dove stood in paternal relationship

to Christ who being himself God, the dove may be described as the Father of God. But notwithstanding this extreme sanctity, the Christians eat its flesh unscrupulously and never think of the reverence that is due to it. Thus they pitilessly mince its meat whereas they ought to have addressed it as "Lord." God created man in His own image and therefore human flesh was forbidden to be eaten out of respect for the Divine image. How is it then that the dove which addressed Christ as a son is fondly eaten? The Christians not only eat it but praise its flesh as "excellent for the table." In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is stated: "As regards flavour, however, those who have been so fortunate as to eat them, declare that the Fruit—Pigeons of the genus *Treron* and its allies surpass all birds." The Christians, therefore, prize it for its relish without paying any heed to its sacred character. According to the Law of Moses, two pigeons or turtledoves were required as an offering when the woman who gave birth to a child was not able to bring a lamb (Lev. 12: 8). The mother of Jesus, not being in well-to-do circumstances, offered a pair of turtledoves (Luke 2: 24). What a contradiction that on the one hand, the dove is made the semblance of God Himself and on the other the poor bird is not only used as a sacrificial victim but also slaughtered and eaten largely on account of the relish of its flesh. Jesus was crucified once and became thereby the Savior of the world, but the poor dove, notwithstanding that its meat is ever ground under the teeth, has not been granted any share in the salvation business. The statement in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* as to the number of its varieties must be corrected and to the 500 species mentioned there, another species must be added which may be called the Divine Dove. Without including it, the list is incomplete by one.

In short I hold him in abomination who being born of a woman says that he is God, although I declare Jesus Christ to be free from the charge that he ever claimed Divinity for himself. With me such a claim is the most horrible sin and an arch-heresy, but I, at the same time, know that Jesus was a good and a righteous servant of God who never presumed to assert Godhead. I have seen him many a time, but he has always expressed his

humbleness and submissiveness. On one occasion, he and I ate beef upon one table from one dish in *kashf* which is really a state of wakefulness. With expressions of humbleness and love, he told me that he was my brother, and I also felt that he was my brother. Since then I have looked upon him as my brother. I believe in what I saw and entertain the feeling of brotherhood towards him. There is no doubt that Divine wisdom has entrusted a far greater and more important work to my charge and has given me promises of a far greater kindness and grace, yet spiritually, Jesus and I are one in essence. It is for this reason that my advent is his advent. He who denies me, denies Jesus also. He saw me and was pleased, and therefore he who sees me and is not pleased with me; is not of us, neither of me nor of Jesus. Jesus is from me and I am from God; blessed is he who recognises me; and undone is the person from whose eyes I am hidden.

Now if Dr. Dowie is certain that Jesus is the Lord of the universe, it is his duty that instead of threatening the whole Muhammadan world with destruction, he should adopt the fair method which I have proposed above, by which one man's death in the other's life-time will decide the truth or falsehood of either view. If he is an honest believer in Jesus' divinity, he must defend it and stand by it to the death. But if Dr. Dowie assumes silence and gives no response to this offer, or if having decided to enter the lists he prays in his boastful manner and adopts the procedure herein recorded and then dies in my life-time, in either case it shall be a sign to the whole of America. Upon the manner in which death should take place, it is necessary to impose the restriction that it should not occur through human hands, but it may be the result of a disease, a stroke of lightning, snake-bite, &c. The time-limit within which Dowie is at liberty to respond to this call is fixed at three months from the date that the announcement is issued. And we pray God that He may be with the righteous. Amen.

MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD,

Chief of Qadian,

India.

# THE PROMISED MESSIAH & DR. LEFROY,

## OR

### ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY

---

WE have been asked to publish the following correspondence which passed a little more than two years ago between a representative committee of the Muhammadans and the Bishop of Lahore in connection with a proposed religious debate to be led by the persons whose names adorn the heading of this article. The idea of such a set controversy between the two religions was suggested by Dr. Lefroy himself who was engaged toward the close of winter in the year 1900, in addressing special discourses to the Muhammadans on subjects identical with those which will be found in the challenge to him. Whether his Lordship acted judiciously or otherwise in coming down from his giddy ecclesiastical eminence and taking the humble position of an evangelist or controversialist, thus acting against the commandments of the Holy Ghost, we do not wish to discuss. We cannot, however, help remarking that he rushed in when he saw that there was no prominent adversary in the field, but as soon as he saw that the gauntlet which he had so inadvertently thrown was taken up by a formidable foe of Christianity, his Lordship was too discreet to risk a battle and retired from the field to take shelter in the eminence of his position. Of this, we think, every unprejudiced reader shall be convinced on a perusal of the correspondence which follows. The challenge from the Muhammadans to the Bishop ran thus :—

“REVEREND SIR,

“We, the undersigned, respectfully beg leave to submit the following proposal to you. As our transient wordly life is passing away like a summer cloud and the time draws near when it shall pass away into eternity and leave not a rack behind, it is our deepest concern that the pilgrimage of life should come to a close in true righteousness and heavenly bliss, and that we may breathe our last as professors of a faith which shows the path to Divine Will. If we are

not on the right path, we are ready heart and soul to accept the truth provided it is elucidated to us with clear and cogent arguments. If any one can pluck up courage to come forward and prove to us the truth of the Christian religion, he shall lay us under the greatest obligation. It is our hearts' inmost desire and we are always anxious that an inquiry be made into the comparative merits and excellences of Christianity and Islam, and that on the result of the investigation we should bow submission to the Holy Prophet who transcends the whole world in the purity of heart, excellence, Divine power and moral rectitude. Since we have heard of your lectures at Lahore on the subject of "*The innocent prophet*" and "*The living apostle*," we are of opinion that among the Christians of this country you are unrivalled in religious learning. It has since occurred to us that no one can better represent the Christian faith than yourself on account of your vast and practical knowledge, your acquaintance with Arabic, Persian and Urdu languages and your amiable and polished manners. On the other hand, when we cast a glance on the learned men among the Muslims, we are convinced that the best representative of Islam is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani, the Chief of Qadian who not only lays claim to the Promised Messiahship but has made good that claim by strong and conclusive arguments, and has proved himself to be the Promised one whose appearance has been foretold in the Holy Quran and the Bible. About thirty thousand persons living in different parts of the world have a staunch belief in his doctrines and admit him as their spiritual leader. In short, among the learned Christians in the Punjab and India your presence is of the utmost importance, and among the Muslims that of the Mirza whom God has chosen and anointed with His own hands. Fortunately for us, therefore, we may avail ourselves of your abilities on the one side, and of God's Messiah's on the other. On these considerations we humbly request you to hold a controversy with the Promised Messiah on several contested points. The Messiah has kindly given his consent to discuss the following five questions :—

" 1. Which of the two prophets, Jesus and Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon them, can be shown, from his own book or by other arguments, to be perfectly *ma'sûm* ?

" 2. Which of them can on the same authority as above be de-

servedly called the Living prophet and possesses Divine power ?

“ 3. Which of them is on like authority entitled to be the intercessor ?

“ 4. Which of the two religions, Christianity and Islam, can be called the Living faith ?

“ 5. Of the teachings inculcated in the Holy Quran and the Bible, which is the more excellent and natural ? Discussion on Unity and Trinity falls under this head.

“The controversy shall be regulated by the following conditions :—

“ I. One day shall be dedicated to the discussion of each question, and thus the controversy will come to an end in five days.

“ II. Three hours shall be allowed to each party every day.

“ III. Each party shall bring forward proof in support of his own prophet or book and shall not be allowed to attack the book or the prophet of the opposite party. For, such attacks are not conducive to any good and often injure the feelings of the party attacked. The public on a comparison would be able to know the strength or the weakness of the arguments brought forward by each party. Each party shall, however, have the right to refute attacks which could in all likelihood be made by the other.

“ IV. The controversy shall be conducted in writing and each party shall be attended by an amanuensis who shall write whatever is dictated to him. Each party shall also be attended by a person who shall read aloud to the audience the contents of the writing. After this a copy of the writing duly signed shall be furnished to the opposite party.

“ V. The controversy shall take place at Lahore. The fixing of the place of the meeting and other necessary arrangements shall be in your power.

“ VI. After the close of the controversy either or both of the parties shall publish the speeches of both the parties in the form of a pamphlet. No addition or alteration shall be made by either party.



"The Promised Messiah, the leader on the Muslim side, has given his consent to these conditions and as they are very plain and equitable, we hope they will meet also with your approval and that you would kindly inform us at your earliest convenience as to the time when you are prepared for holding such a controversy. We also humbly beseech you not to reject this proposal but to accept it in the name and for the honor of Jesus Christ. We hope that for the sake of that beloved and chosen prophet of God, you will intimate to us your acceptance of our proposal by means of a printed letter. In this request there are no absurd conditions or terms from which reason may recoil. The controversy is to be conducted on entirely civilised principles and is based on good wishes and a search after truth. Moreover, when our request to an eminent person like yourself is accompanied with an adjuration in the name of Jesus Christ, we are quite certain that you will accept this proposal, although the time at your disposal may be short, without any alteration or amendment for the honour of Jesus' name. For we know that if a similar request had been preferred to us by any body in the name of Jesus Christ, we would have looked upon its rejection as a deadly sin and an affront to Christ's dignity. How can it be expected then of you who lay claim to an unbounded love for Jesus Christ, of judging which we have got this first opportunity.

"The reply should be addressed to Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., L.L.B., Pleader, Qadian, who is the Secretary of this Committee."

---

Our space does not allow us to reproduce the large number of signatures appended to the challenge. The *Pioneer* wrote:—

"The letter has a great many signatures, of which the first few names will be sufficient to indicate the widespread interest and expectation with which the Muhammadan community are looking forward to the encounter."

In reply his Lordship wrote:

"HARVINGTON, SIMLA,

"12th June 1900.

"DEAR SIR,—I have received a printed letter, signed by yourself

and a number of other gentlemen, asking me to appoint a time and place for a public discussion with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, on certain tenets of Christianity and Islam. I am sorry that I cannot accept the proposal which you make, and this chiefly for the following reasons :—

“ 1. I decline to meet Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in any such friendly relationship as the discussion which you propose would involve. The Mirza Sahib, in venturing to call himself the Messiah, assumes with no shadow of authority that name by which we Christians are called and which we regard with profoundest reverence, and offers in my opinion a most grievous insult and dishonour to Him. Whom I worship as my Lord and Master. How then can I possibly consent to meet him in a friendly way ?

“ 2. You refer in your letter to my own desire in all controversy to conduct it with entire courtesy and with respect for the feelings of those with whom in matters of belief I am compelled to differ. I can honestly say that it always has been my sincere wish to conform to this rule, and to utter nothing which could legitimately hurt the feelings of those who hold views differing from my own. When, however, I read what the Mirza Sahib has from time to time written on the subject of the Christian Faith, and see with what bitterness and scurrility he refers to incidents in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ as narrated in the four Gospels which we Christians receive and reverence as part of God's Holy Word, I can only draw the conclusion that he does not set before himself the same standard of courtesy and respect for the feelings of an opponent in controversy as that at which I have always aimed. On this ground, therefore, again I am not willing to meet him on a common platform.

“ 3. The Mirza Sahib may, as you assure me, have a considerable number of followers, but no one can deny that his claim to be the Messiah is entirely rejected and indeed treated with ridicule and contempt by an overwhelming majority of Muhammadans in this Province ; therefore while I, however unworthy I may personally be, am in some sense truly representative of the Christian community by virtue of the office which I hold, the Mirza is not, in any sense what-

ever, representative of the Muhammadan community. Why then should I consent to meet him on an equal platform ?

"4. It is necessary to remember that, since my appointment as Bishop of this Diocese, my *primary* work must necessarily be that of attending to the wants of the Christian Church, and doing my utmost to strengthen it and build it up from within in the true faith of God and in holiness of life, and that consequently the work of a simple evangelist (*i. e.*, of one who devotes his time to preaching to, and in various methods striving to bring to a belief in the Christian faith, those who are at present outside of it) can only occupy a secondary place in my time and thoughts. It is indeed a work to which I am greatly attached, and in which I engage with much pleasure, but when God has called me to serve Him in another way, I must obey His voice. I cannot, therefore, in any case give up from my primary work the amount of time which you desire for the purpose of controversy of this kind.

"5. Lastly I think it very important to emphasise a great difference of standpoint between yourself and me as regards the possible results to be obtained from such religious controversy. In your letter you express your desire that "on the result of the investigation we should bow submission to the Holy Prophet who transcends the whole world in the purity of heart, excellence, Divine power, and moral rectitude." In other words you consider it possible to ascertain the path of true religion and prove conclusively the superiority of one religion over another by purely intellectual controversy. I believe that this view is fundamentally wrong and contrary to the teaching of God's Holy Word; and that its prevalence in the minds of many in this country is doing enormous injury. I cannot, therefore, consent to give countenance or support to it by any action of mine. We believe that religion appeals not to the reason only but to the whole of man, his will, his feelings, his moral desires, his capacity of faith, in short to his heart as well as to his head. In the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, the knowledge of God and of His true Faith is connected not so much with acuteness of intellect as with purity of heart and humble obedience to Him in the actions of life. Thus on one occasion Christ says: "Blessed are the pure in heart for *they shall see God.*" (St.

Matthew, v. 8). And again in another place, which is, I think, of immense importance in this connection, He says : " If any man willetth to do His will (that is, God's will) he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself " (St. John VII : 17). My own firm belief is, that no man can be brought to a living knowledge of the true God except by the help of His Holy Spirit, and that such help is given as I have already indicated to the penitent and pure in heart and the humble and upright in life rather than to those men of acute intellect, who are best able to sustain well a part in religious controversy. It is quite true that I do think it very desirable for the members of the two faiths (Christian and Muhammadan) to come to know each other, and to understand each other's beliefs much better than has been the case in the past. This is why I am myself glad, on the one hand, at times to study those writings of your faith which may best enable me to understand its true contents and doctrine ; and, on the other, to give lectures such as those recently delivered in Lahore, thereby affording an opportunity for questions to be asked by which those who are present may, perhaps, come to a truer and clearer understanding of the doctrines of the Faith than they previously possessed. But this, I think you will see, is very different from joining in a controversy the professed result of which is to be the acceptance by those who take part in it, of that religion, the claims of which to be divine should seem at such a time to have been most conclusively demonstrated. It is not, therefore, possible for me at any time to engage in a discussion on this condition. Although this letter is not in print it is entirely open to you to have it printed, or to make such use of it as you deem desirable. I assume that I am dealing with Muhammadan gentlemen, and that, therefore if printed at all, it will be printed in its entirety and without any variation.—I beg to remain, Sir, your most obedient servant." (Sd.) G. A., Lahore.

The Committee of the Muhammadans requested the Bishop to reconsider his decision and wrote :—

" QADIAN :

" *Dated the 10th July 1900.*

" RIGHT REVEREND SIR,

"Your Lordship's reply refusing to enter in a fair controversy with

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the Chief of Qadian, was intimated to the Committee and received with deep regret. The reasons on which your Lordship's refusal is based are the result of certain misconceptions and errors, and I have been directed to deal with them at full length in a pamphlet which will shortly be published in case the reply to this request is as disappointing as to the former. Before sending the proposed pamphlet to print, however, it has been thought advisable once more to urge to your Lordship the necessity of such a controversy as a large majority of the Muslim public is anxious to hold.

"The Muslims and the Christians equally longed to see the proposal accepted and many of the foremost Anglo-Indian papers not only expressed an interest in it but clearly stated their opinion that the proposal, from whatever point of view one may look at it,—from the high repute, learning and influence of the proposed champions, the quarter from which the challenge came, the questions that were to be discussed, the fairness of the terms and last though not the least from the highly beneficial result that was expected to come out of it—deserved your Lordship's unqualified acceptance. The members of the Muslim community who ventured to address you on this point hailed from all parts of the country and were all men of good position and high education whose request deserved a deeper consideration. The proposal was made in an earnest and sincere spirit to lead, if possible, the public out of the sea of doubt in which it floated as to the true religion. The terms were as fair as could be desired, for hostile attacks were excluded from the pale of the controversy. Your Lordship's work as a Missionary for many years in this country, your acquaintance with the manners, creeds and language of the Eastern people, the toleration with which you allowed the Muslims to refute your arguments in the lectures delivered by you at Lahore—to which facts immense importance was added by your present exalted position—, all combined to convince the Muslims that you would be the best representative of Christianity in the fair field of controversy. Your initiative in calling upon the Muslims to prove the innocence and life of their own Prophet against those of Jesus Christ—a sort of controversy in which one side was quite unprepared and unrepresented—was a further inducement to the Muslims to offer to Your Lordship a field of discussion in which the merits of both the

religions and their founders could be more properly and fairly tested. It is also noticeable that the representative whom they proposed to bring into the field against your Lordship was no *Mulla* or preacher of ordinary degree, for in offering such an opponent they would have made light of your abilities. To do justice to your position and talents, therefore, an adversary was proposed who occupied no mean position but whose claims to the high spiritual rank of the Promised Messiahship had attracted the attention of the whole Indian continent for several years past, and whose sect made a marvellous progress notwithstanding the bitterest opposition from within and without. With two such remarkable personages as the champions of the two great religious systems of the world, the public should not be left in the dark as regards the solution of a question that has occupied the greatest minds of every age. Although your Lordship deems the reparation of the Christian Church from within as your primary duty, yet it cannot be denied that the primary duty of every good Christian must be that of bringing light and life to those who in his opinion have fallen into the pit of death and darkness and who are therefore in a much more dangerous state than those who have received baptism. The latter at any rate are saved from hell while the former shall, according to the Christian belief, be doomed to everlasting fire and punishment. As to which is the business of first importance, whether ministering to the needs of those who are already out of all danger or taking those by the hand who are falling into the pit of death and darkness, I leave to Your Lordship's conscience to decide. Could the proposal be rejected on the ground that your Lordship cannot set apart five days out of your whole life for such a good deed ?

"Again your Lordship has declined to meet Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in any friendly relationship for his having assumed a name which the Christians honour and worship as their Lord and Master. Had it been even as your Lordship thinks, it could not have been a good ground for hatred and the cessation of friendly relations, for the Holy Bible inculcates love towards enemies. Treatment of this nature towards an adversary cannot be expected from the followers of any religion, not to say anything of a Christian and especially of a Church dignitary whose duty it is not only himself to act upon Matthew V, 44, but also to teach that doctrine to the laity and to preach it to the

non-Christians. But I may assure you that the Mirza Sahib does not assert that he is actually Jesus Christ but one coming in that Prophet's spirit and character and preaching after his manner, as John came in the spirit and power of Elias. Moreover, the Muslims honour Jesus as a true and eminent prophet and the Mirza Sahib, being the foremost Muslim of his day, pre-eminently does so, whereas millions of people who do not profess the Christian or Muslim faiths do not look upon him even as a prophet and thus offer the greatest affront to his dignity, and your Lordship must often, I suppose, have come into contact with such persons. Yet I do not think that your Lordship has ever expressed the same feeling of hatred towards them as you express towards Mirza Sahib in your letter to me.

"Here, however, I must state another point of material importance for your Lordship's consideration. When this matter was referred to the Mirza Sahib and he was asked whether, as your Lordship declined to meet him in a friendly way, he also was disposed to entertain similar feelings towards your Lordship, he gave the following reply :—

" 'I do not look upon any one in the world as my enemy. I hate not individuals but the false beliefs they entertain. As regards individuals, my feelings towards them are of the utmost sympathy and good wishes. How can I then regard any one as my enemy who enjoys respectability among his own co-religionists and is moreover honoured for his position and learning. I love him though I do not like his doctrines, but my hatred towards these doctrines extends only so far as the attributes of God are ascribed to human beings and human faults and weaknesses to the Lord of the Universe. I am not averse to meeting his Lordship in a friendly way for it is possible that either party may reap some advantage from the other, as the seed of sincerity must bear fruit. It is the first requisite in the performance of a man's duties as a reformer or preacher that he should receive those who hold views differing from his own, in the most cordial and cheerful manner. In truth, I would not only be departing from my functions as a reformer but dealing at the same time a death-blow to all moral laws if I regard as my enemies, persons who deserve compassion for having unfortunately fallen into errors. Such a step on my part would only deprive a large majority of those noble and holy

truths which it is my duty to preach to all.' And further added—

“ ‘Nobody can do any good to a person whom he regards as his enemy but I say truly that if ever an opportunity offers itself when I find it in my power to do both good and evil to his Lordship, I will do him a good that will surprise the world. The power to call people to the path of righteousness and a zealous desire for their transformation grow in true love. Enmity obscures wisdom and extinguishes sympathy. The Holy Quran says عزیز علیہ ما عنتم حریص علیکم and in another place لعلک باخع نفسک الا یقولوا مومنین In other words, ‘We have sent unto you a Prophet whose heart is full of sympathy for you so much so that all your cares and anxieties grieve him in the same manner as if they had actually happened to him, and he is always anxious for your comfort and happiness;’ and again, ‘Shalt thou, O Prophet! put an end to thy life on account of grief that these people do not accept the truth.’ The last verse contains a reference to the true sacrifice of life which the Prophets of God make for the reformation of the people. These are the verses upon which I act and one can easily understand from this the nature of my feelings towards those who regard themselves as my enemies.’

“ Before I close this letter let me also assure your Lordship that the proposal although signed by a few followers of the Mirza Sahib is one of whose acceptance the Muhammadan public is in general anxious to learn. The Mirza Sahib does not differ from other Muslim sects in the essential points of faith, but the points of difference are only secondary such as exist in the different sects of every great religious system, Christianity being no exception. If your Lordship attaches any importance to this point, thousands of educated Muslims who do not follow the special doctrines of the Mirza Sahib, will be glad to put their signatures to the proposal.

“ With the copies of the translation which your Lordship asked for, I take the liberty to send to you the *Indian Daily Telegraph* of the 19th ultimo, which contains some remarks on this challenge.

“ I hope your Lordship will on reconsidering your reply come to a different conclusion and not disappoint so many anxious hearts that await its acceptance.”—(Sd.) M. MUHAMMAD ALI, Secretary.



But his Lordship could not be moved to acceptance, and wrote in reply :—

HARVINGTON, SIMLA,  
12th July 1900.

“ DEAR SIR,

“I have received your letter of the 10th instant, but I have nothing to alter in, or add to, the reasons assigned in my former letter for declining the controversy with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad to which you invited me.

“Thank you for the spare copies of your previous letter which you have kindly sent me.”—(Sd.) G. A., Lahore.

---

A reference to the press opinion, on the challenge and Dr. Lefroy's refusal thereof would, we hope, enhance the interest of this correspondence. But our space does not allow us to quote more than one instance in each case. The *Pioneer* when publishing the challenge in its columns headed it with the significant remark : “Undoubtedly great interest will attach to the meeting if Dr. Lefroy does decide to enter the lists.” The *Indian Daily Telegraph* wrote in its issue of June 19th, 1900 :—

“ We reproduce on another page a most interesting religious challenge from the school of Islam in this country which follows Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian to the Bishop of Lahore. It is interesting because it seems to be put forward in an earnest and sincere spirit. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani is the Chief of Qadian, and, according to the wording of the challenge, ‘not only lays claim to the Promised Messiahship but has made good that claim by strong and conclusive arguments, and has proved himself to be the promised one whose appearance has been foretold in the Holy Quran and the Bible.’ It seems that the following of this somewhat remarkable personage numbers about thirty thousand\* ‘in different parts of the world,’ and his friends and disciples are anxious that he should hold an elaborate and learned argument on the respective truth of Christianity and Islam

---

The number now amounts to about a hundred thousand.

with the Bishop of Lahore, whose lectures at that place have convinced the Muhammadans that he is ' unrivalled in religious learning in this country. His vast and practical knowledge, his acquaintance with Arabic, Persian and Urdu and his amiable and polished manners are also enumerated as further reasons why he should be asked to enter into a controversy with this champion of Islam. The challenge throughout is worded in conciliatory terms and an evidently keen desire for a formal and set controversy *in fair terms to both parties* on the ' comparative merits and excellences of Christianity and Islam ' (not Islam and Christianity) and the challengers who are great in numbers and hail from all parts of India, hope by adjuring the Bishop in the name of Jesus Christ to gain his consent to a controversy.

" We are of opinion that the Bishop would do well to accept the challenge. To assume a superiority that cannot stoop to controversy would be a mistake, as the challengers would be entitled from their point of view to say that the case being undefended went by default and to claim the victory. Also the fact that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani is not the " promised one whose appearance has been foretold in the Holy Quran and the Bible," ought not to influence the learned Bishop towards a refusal to enter into argument with him. This question is not to be discussed in the proposed controversy, but the Bishop may possibly convince his opponent of error if the challenge is accepted. The fact that the Muslims desire to pit their " Messiah" against the Bishop is the highest compliment they could desire to pay to his learning; they wish to intimate that they recognise him the first authority in India. Again, we do not see how the Bishop can plead that such an elaborate controversy would take up too much of his time. He should on no account lose an opportunity of refuting, silencing and convincing much opponents, especially where he is desired to prove, ' which of the two religions, Christianity or Islam, can be called the living faith? ' and ' of the teachings inculcated in the Holy Quran and the Bible, which is the more excellent and natural? ' We should like to see the challenge accepted because we think it would prove highly interesting."

The Indian Spectator wrote on the Bishop's refusal:—

"The Bishop of Lahore seems to have retired with more haste than

dignity from a challenge which he had himself provoked. His Lordship sometimes back, set before himself the task of proving to Muhammadan audience that Christ was the true Messiah and the challenge was taken up by Mirza Ahmad of Qadian to whose claims of Messiahship we referred sometime ago in these columns. Now, Mirza Ahmad may, for aught we know be a rank impostor, or he may really believe himself to be what he claims to be. In either case we do not see why the Bishop should decline to argue with him. His Lordship speaks of Mirza Sahib as offering "a grievous insult and dishonour to Christ by venturing to call himself the Messiah." The Jews of two thousand years ago crucified Christ for the self same reason. They felt insulted by his venturing to call himself the Messiah. What is even more strange is the Bishop's pointing to the fact of Mirza Ahmad's claims "being treated with ridicule and contempt by an overwhelming majority" of Punjab Muhammadans, as conclusive proof of the falsity of those claims. When Pilate asked assembled Jews as to whom they would like to be liberated on the day of the passover—Christ or Barabbas?—they unanimously voted for the impenitent thief. Did that prove that Christ's claims to Messiahship were unfounded. We are not among the followers of Mirza Ahmad and have not intention of upholding his claims in preference to those of Christ, but we object to the logic of the hastings being introduced in discussion on religion. If the whole Muslims would have acclaimed the Mirza, would the Right Reverend prelate of Lahore have altered his opinion of his mission. Religious beliefs in this country are in a state of dissolution just now. It behoves those who are anxious to see them crystalize round the truth, not to employ arguments which are not of the purest temper."

From this correspondence and the press opinions it would appear that Dr. Lefroy was urged to enter into the controversy which he had himself provoked, both by his opponents and his co-religionists, but he could not be prevailed upon. Public opinion was very strongly in favor of the acceptance of the challenge, and the challengers themselves did all that was in their power to induce the Bishop to resume the position which he had himself first taken, but his Lordship was deaf to all exhortations. If Dr. Lefroy's reasons are on a critical examination

found to be peurile and absurd, the conclusion will be inevitable that his Lordship left the field into which he had entered of his own accord, with a blot of defeat on the back of Christianity. Had he been prompted to address his lectures to the Muhammadan public of Lahore with a sincere desire to show them the truth, he could not have acted in the discreditable manner in which he did afterwards. His one-sided lectures at Lahore where no rejoinder could be expected, and his subsequent refusal when he was asked to discuss the same questions in a fair controversy gainsay his Lordship's boasted love of justice and fair play.

It will not be out of place to look into the reasons urged by his Lordship. We shall be obliged to refer again and again to Dr. Lefroy, because he attacks the Promised Messiah personally and not his doctrines and teachings. A surface glance leads us to the conclusion that although his Lordship is pleased to call them reasons, they are really lame excuses to avoid a fair controversy in which he was required to *prove* the truth of the Christian religion. The most impotent of these excuses which the Bishop regards as the most important is that which heads the list. How can he meet in a friendly way a person who inspired by God claims to be the *Messiah*, because by assuming such a name, he offers "a most grievous insult and dishonour to him whom his *Lordship* worships as his "*Lord and Master.*" Indeed ! such a thing seems to be impossible. But why does his Lordship love to be addressed as "*my Lord.*" Is it not "a most grievous insult and dishonour" to him whom he worships as his "*Lord.*" Are we not entitled to advise his Lordship in the *polite* words of Jesus Christ as narrated in Matt. 7: 3-5, or at least in the more civilised words of a modern statesman that it would be better for the ministers of Jesus "to take the beam of their own eyes before endeavouring to remove the mote from their neighbour's eye." Why does not his Lordship mind the plain injunction of the Gospel which says "neither be ye called masters," and why does he assume the still loftier form of being addressed "my Lord," "your Lordship"? His only answer can be that he is legally entitled to it. But has a legal title more force with him than the text of the Gospel? Why does the Bishop love to be called "*Lord,*" while hating the man who inspired by God calls

himself the Messiah? Why do not the ministers of the Gospel first make a representation to the Government that no one should be called " Lord " in future? Or do they think that Jesus made a mistake in the two texts " blessed be ye poor " and " neither be ye called masters," for he took the Gallilean fishermen as the type of his ministers?

But if simply the name Jesus or Messiah is objectionable in the case of any other person than the supposed God of the Christians, his Lordship will have to face other difficulties. How shall he account for the names of the fifteen men living at the time of the Christian era who bore the name of Jesus. And how shall he reconcile the divinity of Jesus with the fact that the robber whose surname Barabbas is found in the English Gospels also bore the name of Jesus? In proof of this fact we may only mention that the revised editions of the Greek Testament (Fritzsche and Tischendorf) read in the place of Matt. 27 : 17 ("whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas or Jesus which is called Christ"), "Jesus Barabbas or Jesus which is called Christ," and that the same reading occurs in no less than twenty-one Greek Manuscripts. Has not his Lordship ever considered that this historical fact offers "a most grievous insult and dishonour" to his master.

Why is the Bishop offended if another man does not look upon Jesus as God. It is his business to prove the Divinity of Jesus first and then he shall have a right to be offended at its denial. In assuming the name of Messiah, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has offered no insult to Jesus except that he has brought him back from his false position of Divinity to the level of mortals. Did not Jesus take his flesh and bones in the womb of a woman called Mary, and then come into the world in the same manner as mortals do? Was he not subject to infirmities and diseases of every sort and did he not feel hunger and thirst like ordinary mortals? Was he not brought up like a mortal with his younger brothers and sisters? Was he not rejected and beaten by a small community of the Jews and arrested and dragged into a court of justice? Did he not after all like an ordinary mortal meet his fate with the despairing words " Eli Eli, lama Sabachtani " on his

hips ? Did he work a single miracle greater than those which the former prophets did ? And yet his Lordship is offended because Jesus is treated as an ordinary man. In demanding reverence for his opinions from an adversary whose task is to discuss and refute them, the Bishop commits the logical error of having a controversy decided in his favor before it is commenced. He was required to prove the Divinity of Jesus but he requires an adversary who should admit it first. How did his Lordship manage his missionary work when he had not yet the good fortune to occupy the high position of a Church dignitary ?

Does Mirza Ghulam Ahmad make an assertion which he is unable to prove ? He claims to be the Messiah about whose advent there are prophecies in the Old and New Testament, as well as in the Word of God and the word of His Prophet. And yet he does not depend upon the prophecies only but offers independent proof of the truth of his mission from God, a proof of a far more valid character than that which was given by Jesus. If his Lordship could make himself as earnest in the search after truth as the Jews who demanded of Jesus a proof of his Divine Mission, he would find abundant proof of the truth of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claims. The apparent objections to his claims are far less severe than those which existed against the claims of Jesus. Our space does not allow us to treat this subject at any length here, but we shall consider one instance. The greatest objection to Jesus' claim was that according to the plain words of the prophecy, Elijah ought to have come before him. Jesus insisted that John was Elias but the Jews would not allow such a perversion of the sacred words. Why did not Almighty God say to them that not Elias but someone in his spirit and character, shall come before the appearance of Jesus ? To this valid objection of the Jews, Jesus did not, and the Christians cannot even now, give an answer. If Jesus had the power of raising the dead, why did he not raise Elias first of all and silence the importunate Jews. The Christians prefer a similar objection against the claims of the Promised Messiah. He says that he has come in the spirit and character of Jesus, but they say that Jesus himself must come back. The validity of their objection is however broken in more ways than one. In the first place Jesus him-

self explained to them the meaning of second advent. He explained the second advent of Elias to mean the advent of a person in his spirit and character. He clearly refuted the idea of a personal second coming of anybody and therefore his own second advent cannot be taken in any other sense. If the second advent of a person does not mean the advent of another in his spirit and character, Jesus was an impostor, for his claim was falsified on the very face of it, and if it does, the second advent of Jesus means not his own coming but that of a person in his spirit and character. His Lordship may adopt whichever alternative he likes and he has his choice of standing on either horn of this dilemma. But Jesus made himself more plain. He asserted in plain words that he shall suffer in the same manner as Elias suffered. "But I say unto you that Elias is come already, and they knew him not but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the son of man suffer of them." (Matt. 17 : 12). The son of man shall suffer in the same manner as Elias suffered. But how did Elias suffer ? Not in his own person *but in the person of John, in his second advent. Similarly the son of man shall suffer in his second advent in the person of another man who shall come in his spirit and character.* We, therefore, say to the ministers of Jesus in their master's words though with more truth. "And if you will receive it, this is" the Messiah "which was for to come; he that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Jesus moreover likened his coming to that of a thief (Matt. 24 : 43). The watchmen watch one way and the thief takes another. So has it happened in the case of Jesus. The Christians wait his own coming but he has made his appearance in the person of another. They must now give up all extravagant and unreasonable theories. According to their own calculations, the time of his advent has already come. If he does not come now, he will never come.

The Promised Messiah moreover does not like Jesus refuse to give proof of his mission. At the request of Atham, a well-known Christian of Amritsar, Almighty God showed a heavenly sign at his hands which launched Atham into the grave. The Christians could have profited by it, but they did not, like the Jews of old. Again at the request of Lekh Ram, an Arya Pundit, he prophesied his

destruction within six years and furthermore gave details as to the manner, the date and the hour of his death. This prophecy which was published among millions of men beforehand by its utterer as well as by its victim was fulfilled in all details at the prophesied hour. In fact, the Messiah has shown more than 150 supernatural signs, to which evidence is borne by millions of men, and anyone who demands a sign even now in earnest, is not disappointed. There is no valid proof of the truth of the fulfilment of a prophecy unless its facts are published before its fulfilment. To relate miracles and prophecies years after their occurrence is an easy task and the books of all nations abound with such stories. But the Promised Messiah is a living witness to the truth of miracles and prophecies. His prophecies are all published before their fulfilment; so that when they are fulfilled in due time, the public is able to see their truth. The Christians cannot claim a single prophecy of this sort for Jesus. His only prophecies that were published before their fulfilment have proved a sad failure to the great bewilderment of his ministers. When we look at Jesus, as represented in the Gospels, we meet with a fine contrast. He did not only take precautions to avoid being known, but when the learned Jewish priests demanded of him a sign of his truth, his only reply was "no sign." The Pharisees in their anxiety to ascertain the truth of his claims entreated him to show a sign. "But he answered and said unto them, an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet Jonas." (Matt. 12:48). Dr. Lefroy, we hope, will never like to hear similar words from the present Messiah. And he need not, for he is willing to show him a sign if he comes in earnest. But the sign which Jesus meant to give them was to appear after his death and, therefore, could not serve as proof of his mission and could give no satisfaction to the enquirers. Jesus observed this obstinate silence throughout his career. On another occasion, when the Pharisees asked of him a sign from heaven in support of his mission, he sighed deeply, perhaps because he had not the power to show a sign, and said: "There shall no sign be given unto this generation." The present generation is, therefore, much more fortunate, because its Messiah gives proof of his mission and shows and has shown heavenly signs in abundance.



Instead of refusing to enter into a controversy on this ground, the Bishop ought to have taken this occasion of silencing an adversary who was eradicating the evil doctrines of Christianity. His Lordship's refusal simply betrays his disability, and with this excuse, he has only tried to cover his defect. No one ever requested his Lordship to prove to Muhammadans the truth of Christianity; nor was it his proper sphere. But he took the initiative and proposed to solve the mystery of Christianity to Muslims; not because he had actually any proof in hand,—his own subsequent conduct negating any such idea—but because he wished to overawe the judgments of the common people who he thought would look to him as a god on eminence and believe in his words without questioning their truth. His missionary activity could not lie dormant so soon and of this combined with his high ecclesiastical position, he thought of taking an advantage in order to exercise an undue influence on the ignorant masses. As soon as he saw a Muhammadan leader ready to meet him on his own ground he beat a retreat giving to Islam a decided victory.

Dr. Lefroy's second "reason" for retreat, goes against Jesus and his followers and not against the Promised Messiah. He refers to the "bitterness and scurrility" of the Promised Messiah in referring to "incidents in the life of Jesus Christ." Is his Lordship unaware of the base scurrilities of the Christian Missionaries with regard to Islam and its noble founder, especially when he has himself been a missionary for so many years? Does he not know that the vilest epithets which their vocabulary affords have been heaped upon the Prophet of Islam by the preachers of the Gospel? The basest motives have been assigned to his words and deeds and every circumstance of his life has been cruelly distorted by the Christian carpers. Has his Lordship ever done anything to eradicate this evil from among his Missionary brethren? The scurrilous writings of the professional preachers of the Gospel have again and again stirred the blood of the Muhammadan community and it was to pour oil on troubled waters that the Messiah sometimes wrote with a just severity, and thus afforded an exit to the excited passions of the people which would otherwise have assumed a more dangerous form. The initiative was

taken by the ministers of the Gospel and the Messiah only resorted to a harsh measure to provide a remedy for the evil which the Missionaries had wrought. But there is another reason for the Missionaries taking the writings of the Promised Messiah as harsh. They assume a certain superiority and want to introduce the principle of inequality in the domain of thought. They assume that it is everybody's duty to adopt a reverential attitude towards their opinions whether right or wrong. In the case in hand, for instance, the Bishop is offended because inspired by God Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claims to be the Promised Messiah and thus assumes an equality with or even a superiority over Jesus of Nazareth. But he himself following his passions calls the noble Prophet of Islam an impostor and depicts him in the blackest colours and still thinks that he is fair to Islam and has respect for the feelings of the Muhammadans. In fact, the flock of Christ will say whatever they like regarding the founders of other religions but cannot hear one syllable uttered against that of their own. They worship the son of Mary as their God and themselves love to be worshipped as minor gods. They are all rage against the man who ventures to criticise their opinions. Truth is a bitter dose indeed for those who stick to falsehood. The only fault of their opponent is that he offers truth.

His Lordship cannot but be aware of the depraved and scurrilous tone of his fellow-workers. Did he then, or did any other Minister or Missionary of the Gospel of Jesus, ever take steps to stop this mean course? It was the Promised Messiah who made three several representations to the Government to enact laws to stop the vulgar course in which controversies were conducted by petty controversialists. Had the Missionaries made similar prayers, the Government could have seen its way to adopt the plan proposed by the Promised Messiah. And last of all did not the first letter addressed by the Muhammadans to the Bishop contain express rules that no attack upon the opponent's religion shall be allowed, and that each party shall only afford the proof of the truth of his own. But if the Bishop in spite of these assurances thought it expedient to remain aloof from the controversy, he was afraid of his own shadow and not of any substantial thing.

We dismiss the Bishop's second reason with one word more. If he sees any bitterness in the language of the Promised Messiah, he must ascribe it to a similarity with him whom he worships as his "Lord and Master." The harshness with which Jesus treated the Jewish leaders is only proverbial among that people. The Jewish writers all complain of the scurrility of Jesus' language towards their leaders and priests whom he always attacked with violence. The Jews addressed him in polite words calling him "Master" and "Rabbi," and demanded proof and signs. But they were in return addressed as hypocrites, sons of vipers, an evil and adulterous generations, &c. In fact these were common words with him. He plainly denounced the respectable men and women and the elders of the Jews as worse than publicans and harlots. Did it not injure their feelings? Yet they were still respectful towards him. The Jewish leaders in fact showed a leniency far surpassing that of any of the modern priestly and missionary classes however civilised the latter may be in appearance. Indeed his Lordship ought to sympathise with the respectable leaders of the Jews who held high positions under the Government and who were spoken of by Jesus as worse than harlots, termed an adulterous people, likened to swine and dogs, addressed as sons of vipers, referred to as asses and styled as blind men. Fools, ignorant, hypocrites, and full of all manner of corruption, were his common forms of address to them. In fact Jesus seems to have exhausted the whole abusive vocabular and the Missionaries only imitate him in their vituperations. With such a "Lord and Master," his Lordship ought to have been more careful in bringing the charge of bitterness and scurrility of language against the Promised Messiah.

Dr. Lefroy's third excuse is as false as the others. He could not enter into a controversy with the Promised Messiah because his claim was "rejected and indeed treated with ridicule and contempt by an overwhelming majority of Muhammadans in this province," but his Lordship, however, "unworthy" he "personally" might have been, was "truly representative of the Christian Community"—though not a *worthy* representative, we may say, for he left the blot of defeat upon Christianity without a struggle—"by virtue of

the office" which he held. But Jesus himself was rejected and treated with extreme ridicule and contempt by almost all the Jews of Syria. Should we then conclude that he falsely claimed to be the king of the Jews, and that the prophecy relating to the appearance of a Messiah who should be the king of the Jews was not fulfilled in him. Moreover the peculiar form of faith to which his Lordship adheres is rejected by the majority of the Christians. Will he kindly inform the public what proportion do Church of England men bear to the rest of those who trust in the blood of Jesus and take him for God? He will then see that he is also ridiculed by the majority of the Christians and that as regards the rejection, he stands in no better relation to Christianity than the Promised Messiah does to Islam. Nay, he stands in a worse relation. His office or his salary has no hold in religious matters even upon his co-religionists. He is not the leader of his congregation but its slave. He must blindly follow the traditional beliefs and formal practices without swerving a hair's breadth from them. A minister cannot follow that which reason and conscience dictate but that which considerations of the maintenance of income and office require. Has any minister the courage to declare his difference from a single word of the established faith, and if he does, will a single person follow him out of regard for his ministerial dignity. The Promised Messiah on the other hand is actually the leader. The hundred thousand or more persons that follow him, look upon him as God's representative upon earth and admit his authority in all religious matters. If the Bishop had silenced him, he would have stopped the mouths of a hundred thousand persons. If he could have convinced him, he would have convinced the same number, and thus done a work which hundreds of Missionaries have been unable to do in a hundred years. Had the Bishop done this important service to the cause of Christianity, he certainly would have found a greater favor with the Holy Ghost and been raised to a higher office, and become a true as well as worthy representative of the Christian community, whereas now he is neither. And last of all, his Lordship ought to remember that his excuse has no basis, for the questions to be discussed were not the special doctrines of the Messiah in which the other Muhammadans differed from him, but

the principles and teachings of the faith of Islam, and for this purpose the Muhammadan Association wrote to the Bishop that all Muhammadans were ready to sign the challenge if he thought it desirable. But the only excuse that his Lordship had, he had taken care not to reveal in his letter and, therefore, no reasonable reply was sufficient to induce him to take up the controversy.

Dr. Lefroy's fourth excuse relates to his own special position. We should have been willing to admit it, had it not been falsified by own previous conduct. How was it that he got time to give lectures at Lahore? Did the church stand in less need of him then? Moreover, it is plain that the task of saving those who are outside the fold is of a far greater importance for every Christian than that of attending to the needs of those who are already saved. From a Christian point of view, the work which Dr. Lefroy was doing as a Missionary, was of a greater importance than that which he is doing now. The Holy Ghost thought otherwise, but the Holy Ghost probably had other considerations. But if not for saving others, his Lordship ought to have stood at least for the defence of his faith. The Press had expressed its opinion before his reply that he ought to accept the proposal, and that otherwise the Muhammadans shall be justified in claiming the victory. The *Indian Daily Telegraph* wrote in forcible words: "Again we do not see how the Bishop can plead that such an elaborate controversy would take up too much of his time. He should, on no account, lose an opportunity of refuting, silencing and convincing such opponents, especially where he is desired to prove 'which of the two religions, Christianity or Islam, can be called the Living Faith.'" But the Bishop thought it more advisable to let the case go by default as undefended than enter into argument and suffer a decided defeat. The Bishop's refusal cannot be explained on any other ground. But we differ from his Lordship. We think it is more honorable to face the enemy than to show him the rear. He who shows his back suffers as decided a defeat as the one who falls under the sword of the enemy in a face to face fight, only the former has to suffer the additional disgrace of cowardice while the latter falls with dignity. A Bishop cannot excuse himself on the

ground that he has other work. The defence of religion is the primary duty of every man who adheres to any religious belief and all other duties are secondary. Even a layman should not do what a minister of the Gospel has done. Would it be of any use to tell the enemy while he is bombarding your fortress: "Sir, I have to settle certain civil disputes," It is equally discreditable to leave the citadel undefended whether you do or do not state an excuse for doing so. Such a statement shall be only additional proof of your weakness.

The last excuse of the Bishop is the more difficult to understand because it is veiled in a cloud of words. His Lordship proceeds upon the supposition that religious truths cannot be proved by arguments, and hence the uselessness of controversy. But this means that religious truths cannot be proved at all, for a proof without arguments, is an unknown thing. Millions of books have been published by the Christians wherein an attempt has been made to prove the doctrines of Christianity by "intellectual arguments." Was all this to no purpose and does Dr. Lefroy consider it as an absurdity on the part of the writers? His Lordship himself condescended to deliver lectures in public on important religious questions. Was this an absurdity, or were his lectures devoid of arguments and rational reasoning? And why did he invite the Muhammadans to raise objections then? What need was there of raising objections to nonsense? We do not, however, entertain such a low opinion of his Lordship's intelligence. Encouraged by his learning and literary attainments, he tried to establish the truth of Christianity by having recourse to logic and reasoning, but when he discovered that the monstrous dogmas of Christianity defied all reasonable explanations, and were incapable of being rationally demonstrated, he refused to proceed on the argumentative line. His experience convinced him of the futility of upholding his religious dogmas on reasonable grounds. We concur with his Lordship in holding that the dogmas of Christianity are really incapable of proof rationally, but beg to differ with him when he pronounces this pernicious verdict against all religious truths. If his Lordship goes beyond his own proper sphere and thinks of including the noble doctrines of Islam among the reli-

gious dogmas that are incapable of a rational demonstration, we are bound to contradict him, and tell him that the challenge to himself from the Muhammadans is a living proof of the reasonableness of Muslim doctrines.

His Lordship says: "The knowledge of God and His true faith is connected.....with purity of heart." But is he not aware that the purity of heart is claimed by the adherents of all religions. The Hindoos and the Buddhists say the same. How should we know that his Lordship's assertion of purity of heart is true while the others in making such an assertion are all false? We shall have again to depend upon arguments. Again, his Lordship says: "Religion appeals.....to the whole of man, his will, his feelings, his moral desires, his capacity of faith, in short to his heart as well as to his head." But what weight can be attached to these statements when the merits of a religion are in question. His Lordship may feel the truth of Christianity; the Muhammadans feel the truth of Islam. But if neither has any arguments in hand, both feel because they were trained to it. Moral desires also differ according to surroundings and circumstances and are determined, perhaps to a great degree, by the particular manner in which a person is brought up. A Bishop's moral desires indulge in the divinity of a weak human being who was born of a woman and whose remains are only recently discovered lying entombed in the Khan Yar Street of Srinagar; those of a Muhammadan revolt against such a blasphemous theory. His Lordship feels relieved of all burden on account of the redemption of humanity by the death of the Son of God, but Thomas Paine felt that God was "too good" to hang his own son, and "too almighty to be under any necessity of doing it," and his nature revolted against the shocking idea. The use of wine may be a necessary element in the Christian's faith, but the idea is repulsive to the moral feelings of the Muhammadans. In fact, numerous instances can be quoted in which the feelings and moral desires of one community and individual differ from those of another. What standard does his Lordship propose to determine this point. In fact the appeal to the heart is the Christian way of describing sentimental arguments, which the Bishop may use when preaching to his congrega-

tion, but their use in a controversy is simply absurd. Is it not ridiculous that sentimental arguments should be appealed to for proving religious truths, and intellectual arguments, the only safe guides, treated as insufficient? His Lordship may smile at the doctrine that Ganges water takes away sins, but is it not more ridiculous that the blood of Jesus does what Ganges water is unable to do. Still the Hindoo feels the truth of the one and his Lordship that of the other. If questions of faith are to be decided on sentimental arguments, his Lordship's work as a Missionary was only the wasting of so much money and time. Men who stick to any form of belief feel its truth, and the Christian Missionaries only disturb their peace.

---

## THE TRUE SIGNIFICATION OF ZANB.

THIS question was discussed in connection with the exposition of the doctrine of sinlessness which appeared in the May number of our Magazine. We are obliged to recur to it on account of its wilful perversion by one Mr. J. M. in the Epiphany of July 19th under the heading of "The Koran," &c. Evading the questions at issue, the writer has taken about two columns to prove that the word *zanb* as used in the Holy Quran means in five places the actual commission of sin, which we never denied. With his waste of time or that of the paper of the Journal in which his article appears, we have nothing whatever to do, for they are hardly ever better employed, but it is necessary to bring to light his wilful perversion of our words. Referring to the "expedients for doing away with the meaning of the verses" in the Holy Quran which speak of "the sinfulness of the prophets," Mr. J. M. remarks that one "lately re-introduced assertion" resorted to by "a new school of apologists" is that the word *zanb* "does not mean sin, but *only* the natural weakness of man for which he requires the strength and support of God."

We appeal to Mr. J. M.'s conscience if this is an honest repre-



antation of our article. Neither his ignorance nor the dullness of his understanding can be an excuse for this wilful misrepresentation. What he has done is simply this that he has quoted the last line of a paragraph dealing with the difference between *zanb* and *jurm*, while he knew that that single line could by no means serve as an abstract of the whole para, and did not even form a complete sentence by itself. To save the reader the trouble of referring to back numbers, we quote here the whole para.

"The word *zanb* occurring in the verse *واستغفر لذنبك* is not the equivalent of sin. Sin, in Arabic, is *jurm*, and between *jurm* and *zanb*, there is an important difference. *Jurm* is sin as defined above, an act inviolation of the commandments of God deserving to be punished. But the word *zanb* is applicable *also* to the weakness of human nature. It is for this reason that since the prophets of God partake of human nature, and consequently of the weakness of the flesh, the word *zanb* has been applied to them in the Word of God. But that *there* it has been used only in the sense of human weakness, and *not in that of actual commission of sin* by them, is apparent from the fact that the word *jurm* which is the exact equivalent of sin, has never been applied to any prophet of God. Had it been the intention of the Word of God to describe prophets as sinful men, we cannot understand why it should have avoided in their case the use of a word (*jurm*) which plainly meant sin, notwithstanding that that word has been made use of by the Holy Book in a hundred places in respect of the opposers of the prophets whom it actually regards sinful. Why it has kept this distinction points to the unmistakable conclusion that the word *zanb* if ever used by the Holy Word for the prophets, means not sin but only the natural weakness of man for which he requires the strength and support of God."

As no one could have read the last line without reading the first portion of the paragraph, Mr. J. M. could not have any but a dishonest motive in misrepresenting us. The most shallow-brained reader could not have drawn from our words the conclusion which J. M. has drawn, and even the grossest contempt for his intelligence leaves the matter quite unexplained. We said in plain words that

*jurm* is the exact equivalent of sin but that *zanb* is applicable also to the weaknesses of human nature. We further alluded to the fact that the Holy Quran had intentionally refrained from attributing *jurm* to any prophet of God and thence drew the conclusion that if the word *zanb* was ever used in reference to a prophet, it could not be in the sense of the actual commission of sin but only in that of human weakness. The real points at issue were whether the Holy Quran has not kept any distinction between the words *zanb* and *jurm*, whether the word *jurm* has ever been applied to the prophets of God, and whether the Holy Quran has threatened every committer of *zanb* with the same punishment with which it has threatened every committer of *jurm*. Being at a loss to answer any of our arguments, J. M. proceeds to show that *zanb* sometimes means sin, as if we denied the application of *zanb* in that sense, and after giving five instances in which the word *zanb* is used of others than prophets, he employs one of the common tricks of his craft and jumps to the conclusion for which he has stated no premises: "Therefore, the term *zanb* is applied to the sinful actions of prophets including Muhammad." For a Christian Missionary this may be praiseworthy, but for an honest controversialist it is most discreditable.

The subject of the sinlessness of prophets, we intend to take up as promised in some subsequent number of the Magazine, and request our readers to wait patiently for its comprehensive treatment from a point of view different from the one from which it was discussed in a previous number. We wish, however, to lay emphasis here upon the distinction which the Holy Quran has so judiciously kept between the use of the word *zanb* and all other words implying sin. Besides the word *zanb*, which is capable of a double signification, the Holy Quran has frequently used the words *jurm*, *ism*, and *fisq* to denote sin. Here we are not concerned with the slight differences of meaning which exist in these words themselves, but wish to point out the broad distinction observed by the Holy Quran between the use of all these words and that of the word *zanb*. Taken together these three words with their derivatives are used nearly two hundred times in the Holy Quran, while the word *zanb* has only been used about forty times. Now

it is a fact which can by no means be ignored that notwithstanding the frequent use in the Holy Quran of the first three words to denote sins, they have not been used on a single occasion concerning the prophets of God, while the word *zanb* notwithstanding the infrequency of its use in comparison with these three, has on several occasions been made use of by the Holy Word when speaking of the prophets of God. No amount of evidence could be more convincing than the clear distinction which the Holy Quran has thus observed between the use of these words. So it is not *jurm* alone which is not attributable to the prophets according to the Holy Quran, but the other words denoting sin are also avoided in their case and only one word, i.e., *zanb* is restricted for this use. It would be foolish to suppose that *zanb* is a graver form of *jurm*, &c., because then we shall have to hold that persons who committed graver sins were entrusted with the commission to reform those whose faults were only slight. But the Holy Quran itself has refuted this idea and established the fact that whereas *jurm*, *ism*, and *faq* negative sinlessness in a person, the mere use of the word *zanb* does not rebut such a presumption.

We shall take *jurm* first, and see in what manner the word has been used in the Holy Quran. A single verse decides the question: *ومن يأتى ربه مجرماً فان له جهنم* "Whoever shall come to his Lord as a *mujrim* (i.e., shall have committed a *jurm*), shall be punished with hell." Here we have a general statement that the committer of *jurm* shall be punished. *Jurm* is, therefore, a deed in disobedience to the commandments of God which must be punished. Similarly we have in the Holy Quran: *انا من المجرمين منتقمون* "Verily we shall revenge ourselves upon all those who are *mujrim*s i.e., commit *jurm*)." Take *ism* next, and we have in the Holy Quran: *ومن يكسب اثماً فانما يكسبه على نفسه* "Whoever commits an *ism*, commits it against his own soul, (i.e., shall be answerable to God for it)." *Ism* is, therefore, also a deed which deserves punishment and its committer is a sinful person. As we have else where in the Holy Quran: *ان شجرة الزقوم طعام الاثيم* "Verily the true of *zaggoom* (which is elsewhere described to be a tree growing in the bottom of hell) shall be the food of everyone who commits

ism." And again, **والله لا يحب كل كاف راثم** "And God does not love every thankless person who commits an *ism*." Verses of this kind abound in the Holy Quran but those already quoted will suffice to show that *ism* is like *jurm*, a deed in disobedience to the commandments of God which deserves to be punished. The word *fiq* has also been defined by the Holy Quran as a wilful disobedience of the commandments of God. Thus we have: **الفسقين الذين ينقضون عهد الله من بعد ميثاقه ويقطعون ما امر الله به ان يوصل ويفسدون في الارض اولئك هم الفاسقون** "The *fasiqs* (i.e., persons who commit *fiq*) are those who break the Law after God has established it, and cut in sunder what God has bidden to be joined and act corruptly upon the earth: verily all these shall perish." Elsewhere we have also: **والله لا يهدي القوم الفسقين** "Verily God never guides those in the right path who are *fasiqs* (i.e., to whom *fiq* is attributable)." And again, **ان الذين فسقوا فما لهم اننا ر** "But as for those who are liable to *fiq*, their abode shall be hell." *Fiq* is, therefore, a transgression or an open breaking of the commandments of God for which the punishment is hell-fire, and the *fasiq* is not guided into the right path. We may further add that the word *junah* which is written in Persian and Urdu as *gunah*, and corresponds to the English word *sin*, has also never been used in the Holy Quran regarding any prophet of God, and this also shows that the Word of God regards them *be-gunah* or sin-less. *Junah*, it should be borne in mind, is derived from a word which means *to incline to a course*, and, therefore, is used only where the doer of an act is inclined to evil.

Now although the word *zamb* has been used to indicate sin in some instances in the Holy Quran, yet nowhere does the Holy Quran make a general statement of punishment for the *muznib*, (i.e., the person who commits *zamb*) as it makes in the case of those who commit *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq*. The *zamb* of the *mujrim* is a sin; so the *zamb* of the *asim* and that of the *fasiq*, but the mere ascribing of *zamb* to a person does not show him to be sinful unless the context shows clearly that it is to be taken in that sense. The fact is, as we have already stated, that *zamb* has a wider signification than all the other words which are the exact equivalents of sin, and

that *zanb* in a person does not negative sinlessness. Can Mr. J. M. show a single instance in the Holy Quran in which it may be said that the person who commits a *zanb* shall be punished with hell or that such a person breaks the commandments of God. The verse "And the *mujrim*s shall not be asked concerning their *zanb*" does no good to his cause, for we have already said that the *zanb* of the *mujrim* (the person who commits a *jurm*) is sin, and furthermore, that the word means *sin* where the context shows it clearly. We affirm, however, that *zanb* has a wider meaning and if it means sin in some cases, in others it does not mean sin but only the natural weakness of humanity. This is the reason why the word *zanb* and not *jurm*, *ism*, *fiq* or *junah* has been applied by the Holy Word to the prophets of God and His righteous servants. If *zanb* in the case of the prophets means the same thing as in that of their opponents, why has the Holy Quran persistently and invariably avoided the words *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq* in their case while it has used them so frequently of the sinful opponents of the prophets? And why has it not said of the *muznib* what it has said of the *mujrim*, the *fasiq* and the *asim*, that he shall be punished with hell? Why do not the Christian Missionaries like honest and straight forward critics refute these statements? The word *zanb* having thus been proved to have a wider interpretation than *jurm*, *ism* or *fiq*, and to include in its meaning the natural weakness of humanity, which if unsupported by the strengthening hand of God leads into actual transgression, it is clear that when this word is used of the prophets of God, it bears only the latter signification, because the exact words for sin such as *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq*, which the Holy Quran has plainly defined to be deeds in disobedience to God's commandments deserving punishment,—the word *zanb* having never been so defined—are constantly avoided in their case while frequently used of all other persons, and because of the prophets, Almighty God speaks in exalting terms quite inconsistent with the idea of their sinfulness, such as "We have sent thee as an embodiment of mercy for all mankind," "The prophet speaks nothing of himself but only that which is revealed to him from God," "Whatever thou hast done, not thou but God has done," "Say, if you love God, then imitate me that God may love you," "My prayers and my sacrifice and my life and my death are all

unto God, "I have resigned myself wholly to the will of God," "O Satan! thou hast no power over my righteous servant," "God has made *kuf'r* (unbelief), *fiq* (transgression) and *isyan* (disobedience of the commandments of God) hateful in your eyes," and many other expressions speaking in laudable terms of the righteous prophets, thus contradicting on their very face the attributing of sinfulness to them.

But while the jaundiced eye of the Christian Missionaries discovers a mote in their neighbour's eye, it is blind to the beam of its own. A man when called good, rebukes the sayer and tells him in plain words that he should *not call him* good for there is none good but one that is in heaven. From these plain words the Missionaries would conclude with "an excessive ingenuity of a subtle intellect" (to the use of words of one of their own number) that the man was sinless. To establish his sinlessness they make ludicrous attempts and make him sometimes man and God combinedly and sometimes man and God alternately. We should not wonder if according to the Missionary mode of interpretation, *zanb* cannot mean the natural weakness of humanity, for their dictionary interprets words by contraries, where "not good" is the equivalent of "good." Wilful misrepresentation assists them in the one case as it does in the other. For an exercise of their ingenuity and especially for that of Mr. J. M., we here lay down the propositions which settle the meaning of the word *zanb* :—

(1). The word *zanb* is used only about forty times in the Holy Quran, while the words *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq* are used about two hundred times.

(2). Notwithstanding the frequency of their use, the Holy Quran has not in a single instance used the words *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq* of the prophets of God.

(3). The words *jurm*, *ism* and *fiq*, have been expressly defined by the Holy Quran to be deeds in violation of the commandments of God deserving punishment and their committers are in plain terms threatened with hell.

(4). The word *zanb* has nowhere been so defined in the Holy Quran, nor has its committer been threatened with hell.