

Vol. II.

No. 10.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(OCTOBER 1903.)

Digitized by Khilafat Library

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE SECOND ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH ...	363
AN APPEAL TO THE UNIVERSITIES, OR CHRISTIANITY IN A STRAIT ...	381
THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY ...	390
JESUS AMONG THE TEN LOST ISRAELITE TRIBES IN THE EAST, V ...	393
MR. McCUSKEY IN THE "UNION SIGNAL" ...	400

For Subject-matter of the next Issue, see page 404.

PUBLISHED BY

"THE ANJUMAN-I-ISHA'AT ISLAM, QADIAN."

District Gurdaspur, Punjab, India.

Annual Subscription ... Rs. 4. | Single Copy As. 6.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL II.]

OCTOBER, 1903.

[No. 10.]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

The Second Advent of the Messiah.

THE importance of this subject can hardly be over-estimated. It rests on the sacred books of three great religions of the world. Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The Messianic belief took its birth with the Jews. The Hebrew prophets were the first utterers of the prophecy and their sayings were recorded in the sacred books and traditions of Judaism. The prophecy was to them the brightest hope and in its fulfilment were centred all their hopes. As to true notions respecting the person of the Messiah, the Jewish sacred books and traditions as interpreted and understood by the Jews are our best authority. By the advent of the Messiah the Jews never understood, nor could they so long as they believed in the teachings of Moses and the prophets conceive the idea, that a God incarnate would make his appearance in their midst. The firm Jewish belief in One Immaterial and Infinite God was absolutely opposed to a belief in the Divinity of a man, and, therefore, neither their prophets could teach, nor the Israelites believe in, such a doctrine. The Messianic era meant to the Jews an era of peace and of the prosperity of the Jewish nation peculiarly characterized by the predominance of the doctrine of Divine Unity. In fact the great hope of Israel to which it had been led by the prophets, was that with the advent of the Messiah, the absolute Unity of the Divine Being, would become the universal dogma of all tribes. Their Messiah was to be a prophet of the type of the prophets that already appeared among them. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the Messiah who had been promised to the Jews was

not to be God, but a prophet of God. There are however even in Jewish tradition traces of prophecies speaking of the advent of two Messiahs, the first of whom is spoken of as the suffering Messiah and the other as the victorious one; the two descriptions meaning only that the first Messiah will not succeed in establishing the universality of Monotheism, but that this honor will belong to the second. We may add here that the Christians and the Muhammadans regard the prophecy of the appearance of the first Messiah to have been fulfilled in the advent of Jesus, while the Jews by rejecting Jesus as a false prophet are still expecting the appearance of the first Messiah. And yet amid all the troubles and persecutions suffered by the Jews, the belief in the advent of the Messiah was the bright hope which bore them up through all adversities and gave them courage and fortitude. The Jews have thus furnished a practical proof of their strong faith in the advent of the Messiah. The importance of this prophecy with the Christians, however, is even greater. Jesus himself taught and the apostles firmly believed in the second advent of the Messiah, and every Christian generation since that time has had a clear and certain faith in the prophecy, to which it has looked as its only hope. So great is the importance given to it in the Christian faith that it is considered by the Christians the "*greatest of prophecies*" and the 'best possible proof that *the Bible is from God.*' If the Messiah does not come, the Bible falls to the ground. With the Muhammadans, it is a solemn Divine promise regarding whose fulfilment not the least doubt can be entertained, that the Messiah will appear among them, and this promise is based on the Holy Quran and was explained by the Holy Prophet himself.

Three points arise in the solution of the question of the second advent, *viz.*, its time, manner and object. The element of time, if it is rightly calculated, should be our most important consideration. Moreover, believing in God as the All-wise and Beneficent Master, the conclusion is inevitable that the Reformer must come at a time when he is most needed. So the time of the advent is determined not only by calculations based on prophecies and the fulfilment of the signs foretold, but also by the need which is felt at the time. As a matter of fact, the three nations, Jews, Christians and Muhammadans, to whom the promise of the advent of the Messiah was given, agree in one thing, if they agree at all, *viz.*, that the time is come. This

remarkable agreement of opinion as to the advent of the new Messianic era, supported as it is by a general feeling prevailing throughout the whole world that it is just the hour of the appearance of the Promised Messiah and by the strong need which is felt at the present moment by all religions, proves to demonstration that in respect of time we cannot go a step further, and that if the Promised Messiah has not still appeared, the promises of his appearance are all in vain.

The Jews notwithstanding their utter indifference to religion which is the consequence of centuries of suffering, are showing signs of activity in religion which are unmistakably significant. There are national movements among the Jews in all parts of the world, whose object is to bring back the scattered people to their original home. Thousands have already settled at Jerusalem and hundreds of thousands are making preparations. They have a strong belief that the Messiah is coming very soon and hence they are sacrificing all their worldly interests, notwithstanding their proverbial love for money, for making preparations to receive the Messiah. Never were their hearts better prepared to receive the Messiah than at the present moment, and this is an unmistakable sign that he who is anxiously waited for has come.

Christianity is even more prepared to receive the Messiah at the present moment. From the time of the first Christian generation, when the words of Jesus (Matt. 24: 34) indicating that he will not die upon the cross, were mistaken for a promise of the second advent of the Messiah, to the present hour, such a fervent hope was never entertained that the Messiah is coming. Men's minds are everywhere uneasy and their hearts throb as if the Messiah were knocking at the doors. Ah! he is knocking no doubt, but who will open? There is a universal belief throughout Christendom that the hour of the Messiah's advent has come. The voice is heard from all places, near and remote. It is very remarkable that not only are we declared to be on the eve of the Messiah's coming, but the most accurate calculations based on Biblical prophecies have shown that the hour is already left behind. The fact is that all the signs for the coming of the Messiah have been fulfilled, but since most Christians are in error as to the manner of his coming, therefore they carry on their expectations further, vainly hoping that Jesus will come in the manner in which they wish it. Their calculations are right, and they do not

fail to see the fulfilment of the signs of the advent, but it is the manner and object of the advent that they fail to recognise.

Individual attempts to calculate the time of the advent of the Messiah were made as early as the commencement of the eighteenth century, but no general cry was raised at the time. The erroneousness of these views was pointed out by later calculations, and by a careful interpretation of the prophecies and the enumeration of the signs fixed for the coming of the Messiah, it was shown that the Messiah must come in 1868. These views found a general acceptance and the fixed hour was anxiously waited for, but it passed away without any change in the clouds. It was a great shock not only to the advocates of this opinion but also to the public generally, but the belief remained rooted with the same firmness as before, and the failure was ascribed to errors in calculating the actual date. The "Millennial Dawn" was published in 1889, and improving upon the earlier calculations, it showed that the sixth thousand after Adam at the end of which it was necessary that the Messiah should come ended in 1873. It further showed by calculations based on Biblical prophecies which we need not repeat here, that 1873 was the year of the coming of the Messiah, that from that time up to 1914 he would gather his saints and that then his kingdom would be firmly established so as to be seen by all men, but that until that time he was not to be recognised but by the chosen few. It also held that the mistake of the previous calculators did not lie so much in errors in calculations as in failing to recognise the manner and object of the Messiah's advent. Mr. Dimbleby brought out his famous book "The Appointed Time," of which a second edition was published soon afterwards in 1896. He was well-known as a member of the British Chronological and Astronomical Associations, and as the author of several works such as "All Past Time," and "Date Repeating Cycles of Eclipses." By the application of the principle of the measurement of time by Eclipses or Solar Cycles, he calculated the year 1898 to be the ultimate date of the appearance of the Messiah. In the preface to this book, the learned author wrote: "This book is written in order to place before Christian readers the best and latest methods by which evidence is obtained of the approaching fulfilment of the great prophecies, and in such a way that readers may see and judge for themselves.....Now that the study of prophecy has become a science, we are reaping a great harvest of new

facts, and accumulating a mass of overwhelming evidence which places the subject beyond all question..... When the prophecies are thus tabulated, they form a framework of completeness which cannot be altered without rejecting the words of scripture, and wrecking the universe. I have, therefore, had to continue the same cardinal dates, all of which focus their light on the end of the Gentile times in $5896\frac{1}{2}$ (our 1898 $\frac{1}{4}$), which every intelligent mind must now admit is the beginning of a new era." To people who were impatiently waiting the advent of the Promised Messiah, this book came as a blessing, for it helped them to keep on the hope which had brought disappointment so many times. But even this book was characterized by the same mistake, *viz.*, no heed was paid to the manner of advent and, therefore, it brought only a fresh disappointment. The year 1898 passed away but nothing happened which the Christians, involved as they were in fatal error as to the manner of advent, could look upon as bringing about a fulfilment of their cherished hopes. But the expectancy of Christianity became even more intense on this bitter disappointment, and Colonel Roberts brought out a book in which he showed by his calculations that the coming of the Messiah could not go further than the year 1899. And now we see almost a legion of booklets showing the fulfilment of the signs and stating that the hour of advent is very very near, and that the Anti-Christ is to be found in the present form of the Christian Church itself. "The Unveiling of the Daughters of an aged Mother" published in 1900, discovers the Anti-Christ in "the profession of the day." It makes "Popery in the Church of Rome" as "the Great Anti-Christ," and looks upon almost all denominations of Christianity as branches of the same, "daughters of the whore" as it likes to call some of them.

What do we learn from this? All these facts decidedly lead to the conclusion that the coming of the Messiah is now or never. In fact it appears clearly that the hour is left behind and that the date has been carried on farther and farther only on account of repeated disappointments, and that according to the best calculations the Messiah must have already come. Too much stress has been laid by the Christians on one side of the question to the utter neglect of the other sides. On every disappointment it was thought that there was some error in calculations, and, therefore, not the least attention was bestowed on the question of the manner of the Promised Messiah's advent.

Every interpreter of prophecies assuming a particular manner of advent, added a few years to the previously calculated date to avoid a total disappointment. But the hope being a real hope has not been obliterated from the hearts of men notwithstanding sad disappointments every now and then. A similar mistake caused the Jews to reject Jesus: At his birth they were anxiously waiting for a Messiah, but the idea never occurred to them that though coming at the appointed time, yet he might come in a manner different from that in which they thought that he would appear. They never lost the hope that a Messiah would come to them but they could not accept Jesus for he did not come in the manner in which they expected his appearance on the basis of their sacred books and traditions. The Christians ought to have profited by their example but they are repeating the same error. Every sign that was foretold has been witnessed, but they are looking for the Messiah in the wrong direction though at the right time. Earthquakes, plague, famine, wars and terrestrial as well as heavenly phenomena bear witness to the one fact that there is to be no more waiting for the Messiah's advent.

We will now consider the time of the advent of the Messiah as fixed by the Muslims. In this case we have several very important considerations which conclusively settle the question of time. In the first place, the Holy Quran describes the Holy Prophet as the like of Moses in the chapter entitled *Al-Muzammal*, thus claiming the fulfilment of the prophecy of Deut. 18: 15-18 in his person. In another chapter entitled the "Light," it promises that from among the followers of the Prophet, successors will be raised to him "like unto" the successors raised to Moses. These two resemblances, the likeness of the Founder of the Muslim Law to the Founder of the Israelite Law, and the likeness of the successors of the one to the successors of the other, clearly demonstrate that as a Messiah terminated the chain of the successors of Moses, a Messiah would also appear to terminate the chain of the successors of the Holy Prophet. The prediction of the advent of a Messiah in this manner clearly indicates several resemblances between the two Messiahs of which we are at present concerned only with the resemblance in time. The distance of time between Moses and Jesus is 14 centuries or according to the Jewish account 13 centuries. It was, therefore, necessary that a Messiah should have appeared in the fourteenth century after the Prophet and this brings to us

the present time. What is needed is only a resemblance, and the view that the present is the time for the coming of the Messiah is strongly corroborated by other considerations.

The Quran has wisely fixed certain signs for the advent of the Messiah so that all men might know from their fulfilment that the time is come. Of these the most important sign is the predominance of the Christian religion and the activity of the Christian nations in every department of life. Of this predominance and activity there is not the least doubt. The Christian Missionaries have crept into the corners of the earth. There are at present upwards of 77,000 men engaged in missionary work and the enormous sum of Rs. 50,000,000 is annually spent on them. There are 250 missionary societies, with agents working at more than 20,000 stations. Men and women are both engaged in the task. If the Messiah is not needed now, will he be needed when the whole world is led to believe in the false doctrine of which the Holy Quran had said: "The heavens might almost be rent there at, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in pieces?"

Another great sign of the advent of the Messiah to which a reference is contained in the Quran, and of which the particulars are detailed in a tradition, is that relating to the eclipses of the moon and the sun occurring respectively on the 13th and 28th of the month of *Ramzan*. This came to pass in 1894 and it is a visible sign of the advent of the Messiah, foretold thirteen hundred years before its occurrence and manifested in such a way that every individual could see it for himself. Among other signs related in the Holy Quran and authentic traditions are the appearance of the plague, which is at present devastating India and several other countries, the introduction of a new mode of conveyance in place of camels, &c., which has been fulfilled by the construction of railways throughout the world, the increase of knowledge, the mixing together of people living in distant lands, the multiplicity of canals, the spreading of papers and a host of other signs which we cannot detail here. Our object is simply to show that the signs are all fulfilled and that they denote not that the advent of the Messiah is yet expected but that it has already taken place. These signs show that the Messiah has appeared and it is the duty of every seeker after truth to find him out. Another point which

deserves to be noticed is that the revelations of all the Muhammadan saints fix the appearance of the Messiah at the commencement of the 14th century of Hejira, and not a single revelation takes it further. There is moreover an authentic tradition to the effect that a spiritual Revivalist will be raised among the Muslims at the commencement of every century, and since the Messiah will also be a spiritual revivalist, therefore if he does not appear in the earlier part of the century, his advent shall have to be delayed for another century, an idea not only repugnant as suggesting the decline of Islam for another century, but also opposed to all prophetic writings.

We have thus seen that the present is a time which the Jews, the Christians and the Muhammadans declare with one voice to be the time of the advent of the Promised Messiah. The concurrence on this point of three great religions, otherwise differing in their conceptions of the Messiah, is a very significant fact. The first Messiah was expected by one nation only and that a very small one, but the second Messiah is expected by three great nations and they all agree that the time of his advent is come. It is a time when all religious and national prejudices should be thrown away lest they might prove a hinderance in the acceptance of the truth. The Messiah is come and it is, therefore, the duty of every seeker after truth to walk after him. No stronger proof is needed to establish that the Messiah has come than the agreement of three different religions, each coming to the same conclusion by a different channel of arguments and on the authority of different sacred books. The signs foretold by the Israelite prophets, such as Daniel and others, as well as those described by Jesus and his apostles and those predicted by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, are strangely enough all appearing at the same time. If ever a prophecy was fulfilled exactly, we are indeed witnessing the plainest fulfilment of such a prophecy to-day.

The next thing we have to consider is the manner and object of the advent of the Messiah. The statement will no doubt startle many but truth is alway startling when it has long been forgotten. It may be said that the manner of his advent is plainly given and there is no need of discussing this point. But the fact is that this is the very point on which people have stumbled before, and, therefore, it is on this ground that our steps should be carefully guided and cautiously taken.

There is a settled conviction in the minds of millions that all the signs have been fulfilled and that it is the time of the Messiah's advent. The world seems to have entered on quite a new era and every heart feels that some change has taken place. It is, therefore, the more necessary that the question of the manner of the Messiah's advent should be carefully considered.

It is particularly gratifying to learn in this respect that we are not left to guesses in the determination of this momentous issue. We have a clear and straight road before us chalked out by the Word of God and His Laws. We are already acquainted with the prophecies of the advent of the first Messiah—or, of the first advent of the Messiah: put it as you will—and with their fulfilment, and they will be the safest guide to us in the solution of the question before us. The prophecies on which the Jews based their Messianic hopes were to be found in their sacred books believed by them, as also by the Christians, to be the Word of God. The most important sign by which the true Messiah was to be distinguished from the false claimants, was the descent of Elijah the prophet from heaven before him. The Jews believed on the authority of their sacred books that Elijah had been taken up to heaven alive and that he would descend from that celestial resting place before the advent of the Messiah. They had, therefore, not the least fear that they would not be able to recognise the Messiah at his advent. There was a sure sign in their hands by which he was to be recognised and there was not the least possibility of their missing the welcome opportunity. Such a supernatural event as the descent of one of the most revered prophets from heaven could not pass unnoticed. It was by means of such a striking miracle that the advent of the Messiah, who was to be their great deliverer, was to be announced to them. Such was the prophecy but mark its fulfilment. A child was born in the house of Zacharias and was named John. He was a righteous man and began to preach after the fashion of the Hebrew prophets. Jesus received baptism at his hands confessing his sins and declared himself as the Messiah. The objection was naturally raised that he could not be the true Messiah as his advent was not heralded by the miraculous appearance of Elijah. In answer to this, Jesus pointed to John and told the Jews that "this is Elias which was for to come." But how could the Jews believe it? Any impostor, they argued, could say this. Almighty God had pro-

mised to them that the prophet Elijah himself would be sent back and this much they were sure that John could not be Elijah as they knew him to have been born in the house of Zacharias, while Elijah was to come down from heaven. It was, no doubt, the right time for the coming of the Messiah, but Jesus, they thought, could not be the Promised one as he did not appear in the manner described in their books. The prophecy clearly indicated that Elijah himself would come. It did not say that the like of Elijah would come. Even if they had believed Jesus, they could have supposed John to be the like of Elijah but not Elijah himself. Yet the like of Elijah had never been promised to them. How could they change the Word of God and read for "Elijah," "the like of Elijah." The very first condition which could have pointed out the advent of the Messiah was totally wanting.

The Jews had other difficulties in recognising Jesus as the true Messiah. Whenever the deliverance of Israel was brought about it was by means of striking miracles, so that the chosen people might at once recognise their deliverer. They had seen extraordinary manifestations of Divine power; they had heard His voice amidst wind and storm; they had seen Him manifesting Himself to Moses amidst thunder and convulsions of nature at the Sinai; and they had been told to expect similar wonderful signs at the advent of the Messiah. Apart from such prophecies, the idea was deeply rooted in their hearts that such a great deliverer as the long-expected Messiah ought to have his advent declared by some such startling revelation. But how were their expectations fulfilled? They witnessed nothing extraordinary until they heard the words from the lips of Jesus that he was the Messiah. The effect of the former miracles which they had witnessed at the advent of Moses and other great prophets was so great upon them that they could not for a moment conceive the idea that the Messiah could appear among them all of a sudden without any previous extraordinary revelation, notwithstanding plain prophetic statements promising such wonders.

That was not all. The prophecies clearly told them that the Messiah was to be of royal descent, a descendant of David that is to say, and he was to re-establish the kingdom of his great ancestor in Israel. He was to deliver the Israelites from the foreign yoke and bring about their independence by freeing them from the bondage

of tyrants. As for his birth, those who could remember it, were highly suspicious of its legitimacy. At the most they could take him for a son of Joseph, the carpenter, and the royal descent was far from being established. Within a short time after he set up his claim to Messiahship, they further saw that it was vain to expect that he would restore the throne of the prophet-king and deliver them from the Roman yoke. All their hopes in relation to Jesus at once failed for no prophecy that declared the manner and object of his advent was fulfilled in his person. According to their calculations, the time had no doubt come, but they could not believe in a person in whom none of the prophecies was fulfilled. They were ready to hail the advent of the Messiah, but not without the realization of the promises which formed the central hope of the prophecy.

Again a large number of prophecies unanimously stated that the time of the Messiah was to be an era of universal peace, harmony and brotherhood and Jerusalem was to be the centre of the world. Could Jesus be recognised as the Messiah by this sign? Nothing that had been predicted, had appeared. It was impossible that a true Messiah could appear without the manifestation of a single one of the numerous signs that had been foretold. The words of the sacred books which had been revealed to the prophets were before their eyes. How could they accept a Messiah by rejecting the very books which invited them to such a belief. They sighed amid all their misfortunes for the Messianic time of which such beautiful pictures had been drawn to them; they looked for the Messiah who was to sit on the throne of David and deliver them from foreign yoke; they longed for the day when Jerusalem was to be the centre around which all nations had to gather; and they prayed for the moment when Israel instead of being trampled under the feet of others was to rule all nations of the world. But in Jesus and his advent, they could not see the manifestation of a single sign.

The question here naturally arises that the prophecies being so clear whose fulfilment was not witnessed in Jesus, were the Jews in the right in rejecting the Messiah as an impostor? From Christians and Muhammadans we cannot expect an answer in the affirmative. Yet what is to be done with the prophecies? They are found in books accepted by Jews and Christians as forming part of the Word of God.

Their words are plain. If the Jews had not required their fulfilment, they would have been guilty of rejecting the Word of God. Moreover they would not have in that case been able to distinguish between true and false claimants. The pseudo-Messiahs who before and at the time of Jesus had appeared in abundance among the Jews had rendered them distrustful of such claimants. From these considerations it would appear that it was the duty of the Jews to lay stress on the fulfilment of the prophecies before accepting the claimant to Messiahship. Were the Jews then really excusable in rejecting Jesus? What are the arguments that they were not? And yet both Christians and Muhammadans hold them to be guilty in rejecting Jesus. Nay, Jesus himself declared them to be guilty in the sight of God for rejecting him. What was their fault? If it was simply a difference of opinion with regard to the interpretation of the prophecies which might be construed both ways, the Jews, though in error, did not deserve to be condemned thus outright. Unless they manifestly took a wrong course and insisted upon it, notwithstanding having reason to believe it to be erroneous, their fault would be very slight and they would be excusable in the sight of God. Their greatest objection against Jesus was that Elijah had not appeared. If his own appearance was permissible according to the Divine Laws, their objection was valid, because a promise of his return had been given to them in clear words; but if his personal appearance was not permissible, their insistence deserved to be punished. Hence, people who condemn the Jews for rejecting Jesus, whether Christians or Muslims, shall have to admit that the personal second advent of Elijah, and for that reason of any person whatever, was not allowed in the Divine Law though a promise to that effect might be found in the Word of God. But had the Jews reason to believe that such an advent could not take place? It cannot be denied that at the advent of Jesus, the Jews were anxiously waiting for the appearance of the Messiah. According to their best calculations the time had come when the deliverer should have appeared. The time of advent being established, it was their duty to refrain from demanding a literal fulfilment of the words of prophecies. But their materialistic spirit could not yield to the spiritual explanations given by Jesus. They were bent low upon worldliness and hence they expected everything to be fulfilled literally and materially. The coming

of Elijah the prophet could have been easily understood to mean the advent of one in his spirit and power, for they knew well that it was against the Divine Law, that a prophet should come down from heaven, nor was there a single instance of it in the history of the Jewish religion. Every prophet was born of mortal parents. Even Moses, the Law-giver, was no exception. These and similar other considerations could have easily led them to the conclusion that the advent of Elijah only meant the advent of one in his spirit and power, and that, therefore, Jesus was right in thus interpreting the prophecy relating to his advent before the commencement of the Messianic era.

It should however be borne in mind that in thus condemning the Jews for the rejection of Jesus, we assume it as a Divine Law that a personal and literal second advent of a person who has left the world never takes place, and that such a promise is to be construed spiritually. If the second advent of a person were permissible in Divine Law, the Jews who rejected Jesus will have to be declared free from the least blame. But the Jews are not free, nor is such an advent possible. Any one who holds the contrary in the latter proposition, must hold the same in the former. If second advent was permissible, why were the Jews condemned without any fault on their part. They found it written in what had been given to them as the Word of God that Elijah the prophet would come a second time. They were not told that the like of Elijah would come. Nor did Jesus inform them of any error in their belief respecting the second advent of Elias. He did not deny that the prophecy plainly spoke of the advent of Elijah himself, but he told them that his second advent had taken place in the person of John who came in his spirit and power. The second advent was, therefore, to be understood only as the second advent of the spiritual part of the man and not the second advent of his physical part or body. It is the spirit that lives and not the body and, therefore, the spirit might come back. We do not mean soul by the spirit, nor are we advocating the theory of transmigration, but we take it exactly in the same light in which Jesus took it.

Let us turn now to the discussion of the question of the second advent of the Messiah, or of Jesus as the Christians would have it. The prophecy as given in the Christian Scriptures is exactly like the one we have just been considering. Matthew says:—

“For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even

unto the west; so shall also the coming of the son of man be..... Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 27-31).

Compare this prophecy of the second advent of Jesus with the prophecies relating to the advent of the first Messiah, as uttered by the Israelite prophets and given to the Jews.

"Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple.....For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up.....and ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this.....Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," (Malachi: 3 and 4). "Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about.....In that day saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness.....Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives.....and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north and half of it toward the south.....And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear nor dark.....And it shall be in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea.....and the Lord shall be king over all the earth and the wealth of all the heathen round about shall be gathered together, gold, and silver, and apparel,

in great abundance." (Zech. 12 and 14). "In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, we will go with you : for we have heard that God is with you" (Zech. 8 : 23.)

Similar other prophecies promising wonders in the Messianic age abound in the Jewish sacred books, and yet not a single one of these wonders was manifested at the advent of Jesus, and not a single expectation of the Jews was fulfilled. Yet between these wonders and those promised for the second advent of Jesus, no line can be drawn. No sensible person would ascribe such an inconsistency to Jesus as that while refusing to manifest to the Jews those promised wonders and visible signs and telling them to take all promises metaphorically, he promised to his disciples similar wonders and similar visible signs to be taken literally, regarding the second advent of the Messiah. Nay, it would not be an inconsistency, but an intentional deception practised upon the people. When a conscientious man explains certain wonders and signs as merely metaphorical descriptions of spiritual phenomena, he must be understood to be talking metaphorically when he himself speaks of the occurrence of similar wonders and phenomena. If the Jews were culpable in rejecting Jesus, the conclusion is unavoidable that the wonders relating to the second advent must be construed metaphorically, and if they were not, the claim of Jesus to Messiahship was false. Why condemn the poor Jews if we ourselves must wait for the fulfilment of similar signs and wonders literally and not metaphorically, physically and not spiritually. The path of the Jews was no doubt obscure, but ours has been rendered clear by the example of the Jews themselves. They were not in a position to see so clearly the truth of the spiritual interpretation as we are. They had no example to guide them in that great difficulty, but we have an example. All those who believe Jesus to be the Messiah—leaving out of consideration the question of his divinity for the present and taking him as he was expected (as a man and not as a God) and as he actually appeared to the people at the time—are constrained to believe that his second advent must take place in the same manner as was the second advent of Elijah, and the wonders relating to it must be taken spiritually as were taken the wonders relating

to the advent of the first Messiah. By not sending Elijah as promised, God has made His meaning clear when He speaks of the second advent of a person. If a physical second advent were permissible in the Divine Law, the Jews were entitled to have Elijah back among them, and until that time were quite right in condemning every claimant to Messiahship as an impostor. But the condemnation of the Jews involves a condemnation of the belief that Jesus himself will come back; and the wonders that are expected at his advent must be taken to be spiritual phenomena, for they have been proved as such by the appearance of Jesus himself. If the first Messiah could come without the manifestation of a single wonder, although a host of such wonders had been promised, why cannot the second Messiah make his entrance into the world in the ordinary way, and why should we make ourselves fools in the eyes of all sensible men by looking in vain to the clouds, and thus ourselves remain in the clouds? Let us turn our eyes in the right direction that we may walk in light and see the true Messiah.

If it be said that the hearts of the Jews were turned to wickedness and that their narrow ritualism did not allow them to understand heavenly things aright, the same objection is to be met with in the present case. We could amply quote from Christian writings, showing that the Church is at present marked by the same narrow spirit of ritualism and involved in the same evils as was the synagogue at the advent of Jesus, but we will content ourselves with a few quotations from the Bible only. "But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money boastful, haughty, railers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, traitors, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." (2 Tim. 3: 1-4). "When the son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18: 8). "Holding a form of godliness but having denied the power thereof." Does not this reveal a worse condition than that of the Jews? Are men devoid of faith and bent low upon earth, capable of understanding heavenly things and a right interpretation of the prophecies?

Did the Jews intentionally reject the blessing for which they were so anxiously waiting? No sensible person would hold this

opinion. They were surrounded with difficulties at the time and keenly felt the necessity of Divine help. They were ready to hail their deliverer and were impatiently waiting for his appearance. They were God's chosen people. Innumerable blessings had been promised to them upon the acceptance of the Messiah. Nay, the very idea that a Messiah would appear among them was a comfort to them amid all their troubles. Jerusalem, that beloved city, to be made the centre of the world, the Jews to be raised above every people, peace and security to be restored for ever; how pleasing the idea and how rapturous the delight! Could these men reject this blessing intentionally? That is a cruel idea, to say the least of it. No; they remained involved in a serious error as to the true significance of the prophecies. Even assuming that they were excusable for having fallen into such an error, not the slightest excuse is left for this generation for falling into the same error again. The people to whom every blessing had been promised, who were termed as God's chosen people, were condemned for falling into an error; let us take care that we are not making the same error over again. We have seen the fulfilment of the signs with our eyes, we know that this is the time; let not then a literal interpretation of the word of prophecy be a hinderance in our way, for we know too well that adherence to such a literal interpretation brought a people to destruction before us. To await a physical and personal advent of the same Jesus as the Jews waited for a physical and personal advent of the same Elijah, is to follow the footsteps of a people condemned by Jesus himself for adhering to such a literal significance of prophecies.

Several other considerations lead to the same conclusion, *viz.*, that the second Messiah, though spiritually one with the first Messiah, is not physically the same person who lived and died before. In the Gospels Jesus likens his advent to that of a thief. This shows that there will be some obscurity attending it. If the prophecies mentioned above are to be taken literally, the existence of any such obscurity is impossible. A person descending from heaven and met by an army of the elect in mid-heavens, can hardly be said to be coming like a thief. The thief is hidden from every eye except perhaps the eye of the watchman who is awake when the whole world sleeps. The sleepers cannot know or recognise the thief. Besides coming in the dark, the thief comes in disguise. So must Jesus

come. Those who trust to his glorious descent from the clouds are really the sleepers while the watchmen are the few who understand the true interpretation of the prophecies. Moreover being spiritually the same man (as John was spiritually Elijah) he comes in the person of a different man, and for putting on this disguise his advent is likened to that of a thief.

Another verse that deserves to be noticed in this connection is Luke 17: 26. "And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the son of man." What happened in the days of the Noah, was this that Noah announced himself a messenger of God but was rejected, and preached to the people but was not listened to and therefore God avenged Himself upon the wicked generation by bringing destruction upon them. So must it happen in the days of the son of man. Mark that it is not at his advent but *in his days*. He will come and will not be recognised, he will preach and will not be listened to but will be persecuted instead, and ultimately Divine wrath will overtake the people for this wickedness. As the *days of Noah* do not mean the hour of his advent, for the deluge did not destroy the people until Noah had preached to them for a long time, so the *days of the son of man* do not mean the hour of his advent, but the time during which he preaches to the people until they are destroyed by the wrath of God. Thus it is further on stated: "They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage until the day....." and this was done notwithstanding Noah's preaching. His word was not heeded. The same thing will happen when the Messiah will preach during the last days. "In that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other left." All this refers to the vengeance of heaven brought down upon the people in the form of plague for not heeding the word of the Messiah. God does not punish a people until His word has been preached to them through a messenger and until clear signs have been shown to them. How can it be that the people will be smitten with wrath from heaven without ever obtaining a chance to mend themselves. Such has never been the Divine Law since the world began.

Matthew 17: 12 is another evidence. "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." Here Jesus refers to the coming of Elias and that is his second coming in the person of John we all know. But though Elias had come a second time as predicted, yet the Jews did not recognise him and therefore persecuted him. *Likewise* must Jesus suffer. Here he plainly refers to his suffering in the second advent, because Elias to whom he likens his case, was then suffering in his second advent. As he was not recognised though in the words of Jesus he had come a second time, in the same way was Jesus to suffer when coming a second time like Elias, *i.e.*, not in his own person but in the person of some one else.

To be continued.

An Appeal to the Universities,

OR

Christianity in a Strait.

We take the following from the Cambridge Chronicle of 31st July 1903 :—

"The following appeal has been forwarded to the Chancellors of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

"In India the position of the Bible and Christianity is most menacing, owing to the spread of the Higher Critical theories which are now shown there as emanating from English Universities. The native press, notably the Punjab '*Review of Religions*,' shows publicly that such teaching is actively anti-Christian, and certainly inferior to the Quran in truthfulness, and therefore in morality. Similar statements and complaints come from Bongal, Syria, Australia and other parts of the world. The position of Christian Missionaries is almost grotesque ; teaching from the Christian Bible whose truth is denied at the headquarters of Christianity, the Universities themselves. And though all such denials of Higher Critical theories are being shown in this country to be groundless, in the light of deeper knowledge, more recent discovery, and more expert science in all branches of Biblical

Criticism, linguistic, archæological, literary, historical, and over and above all this, in physical science itself—yet these denials of the truth of the Bible have gone forth from the Universities to the world, until the Bible is now held up to natives by thoughtful Muhammadans, as teaching no more than the Quran, and, as far as truthfulness is concerned, demonstrably inferior to the Quran, the truthfulness of which is not questioned by its adherents. It is all very well for this country now to have been put in possession of the scientific refutations of these Higher Critical theories, and to have acquired these scientific refutations independently, and chiefly outside the Universities: and whether or no this position is recognised at the Universities, it is a position which is becoming widely recognised through this country, owing to the spread of more mature knowledge contained in the many recent expert works on the whole subject. But if the University endowments are still to be diverted from upholding Christianity, and if the official channels of the Universities continue to be used for denying the truth of the standard authority for Christianity, the Bible, or for diluting the strength down to that of the Quran, then a public appeal must lie to the Chancellors of the Universities: for the Universities are, in the highest sense, a national heritage and the embodiment of that Christian education which is enshrined in the University motto *Dominus illuminatio mea*: and for the Universities to persist in a course of teaching which is recognised by the very heathen—to convert whom to Christianity, this country sends out Missionaries—as in no way differing from *Allah illuminatio mea*, is absolutely, entirely *ultra vires*, and constitutes an active breach of the University statutes. The immense correspondence on this subject in the secular, no less than the religious press, discloses the fact that full and detailed knowledge is becoming general as to the scientific grounds on which the conclusions of the Higher Critics are now seen to have been mistaken, and beyond question, the credit of the Universities, as “centres of religious and useful learning” will be seriously impaired if they continue to pursue a course of destructive Biblical criticism, which the country recognises now to have been a mistaken course. Above all, the transfer by the Universities of allegiance from God and Christianity however effected, either by temporary intellectual over-balance, resulting from the last half century’s discoveries and surmises, or by any other means must not, cannot be made without the sanction of the general community of this Christian land. In truth it is a fundamental, vital question, which cannot be settled locally at the Universities, but must be warranted by the common assent of British Christianity throughout the world.”

These statements of Mr. Corfe are not less grotesque than “the position of Christian Missionaries.” One is surprised at the character of the objection to the teaching of the Universities. However seriously this appeal may have been submitted to the Chancellors, the position is simply absurd. The Universities

cannot promulgate teachings which they know to be false. If the Christian public has for the last nineteen hundred years been the dupe of a fatal error, there is no reason why the Universities should stick to it after it has been exposed. The Universities were not established to teach error or falsehood. To insist that they are bound to uphold the views of the masses, whether true or false, is the veriest absurdity.

The extravagance of the views of Mr. Corfe does not however end here. While on the one hand he is fearful of the "menacing" position of Bible and Christianity owing to the spread of Higher Critical theories, he feigns on the other an inward satisfaction for having "been put in possession of the scientific refutation" of those theories. He claims to have obtained "more mature knowledge contained in the many recent expert works on the whole subject," by which the Higher Critical theories are all refuted. We wonder if the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* does not fall within the description, the last volume of which was issued only a few months ago, and which is the result of the mature deliberation of the ablest Bible scholars of all countries. Among the contributors to this valuable production, we find the names of eminent Bible scholars of the Continent side by side with those of well-known British scholars, and the names of all these learned men are a sufficient guarantee for the comprehensiveness and accuracy of its views. It is incredible that, men like Professors Cheyne,^a Tiele,^b Wellhausen,^c Schmidt^d, Schmiedel^e, Geldner,^f Noldeke,^g and numerous other Professors, Lecturers and Fellows of different Christian Universities in England as well as outside it, should all have been ignorant of the "more mature knowledge" and "scientific grounds" known to Mr. Corfe. It should not be imagined that these men wrote in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* with any prejudice against Bible and Christianity. Their love for the Bible is as great as, perhaps

-
- a. Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford.
 - b. Professor of Comparative History and Philosophy of religion, Leyden.
 - c. Professor of Semitic Philology, Gottingen.
 - d. Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature, New York.
 - e. Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Zurich.
 - f. Ph. D., Professor, Berlin.
 - g. Professor of Semitic Languages, Strassburg.

more than that of Mr. Corfe. In the Preface the Editors say: "They cannot however conclude this section without a hearty attestation of the ever-increasing love for the scriptures which critical and historical study when pursued in a sufficiently comprehensive sense, appears to them to produce."

It is from the Christian Universities, the seats of Christian learning, that the truth can be learned about the Christian religion, and not from ignorant masses or prejudiced religious papers whose object is to tickle the fancies of the masses. Mr. Corfe is of opinion that the Universities should not proclaim the truth until they have obtained "the common assent of British Christianity throughout the world," *i.e.*, until the masses have agreed thereto. This is the veriest absurdity. True religious views, as in fact all true scientific views, never originate with the masses. They are only blind followers of rotten and corrupt views until truth fully gains ground. Though the Clergy and the Missionaries can never be expected to denounce the false views, because to them they are the source of livelihood, but as regards the Higher Critical views of the Bible, not a few Clergy and Missionaries subscribe to them openly.

This strange appeal of Mr. Corfe reveals, however, a sad picture of the Christian religion. It is in effect an appeal to the Universities not to give a death-blow to Christianity by denouncing the views upon which the Christian religion is based and which the Christian world has unanimously held for 1900 years. What a calamity! A mighty religion that has for two thousand years held the fates of millions of men in its hands, and whose sway extends over such a large portion of the world, has now stooped before a few men to crave a judgment for its existence. A religion once so great and powerful has at last been compelled to assume so beggarly and contemptible an attitude! Even if the Chancellors take pity on it, the discovery of the tomb of Jesus cannot allow Christianity to raise its head again. Sad as the position of Christianity is at present, it was necessary that these circumstances should have been brought about and that it should have been reduced to these straits, so that the great distinction between truth and falsehood might have been brought to light. A heavenly religion would look to heaven for assistance when it is encompassed with difficulties, but an earthly system stoops

to earth. Christianity has not to cope with greater difficulties than Islam, but the one has been succoured from heaven with a heavenly messenger and re-animated with heavenly water, while the other begs assistance at the doors of earthly men. When the miracles of Christianity are shown to be fables, it finds itself devoid of means to clear itself of the charge, although it had been said that the followers of Jesus would show miracles like the master himself, but the religion which is from the Living and Powerful God, the noble religion of Islam, shows even now the same heavenly signs of its Divine origin as it did thirteen hundred years ago. The principles which Christianity has owned for 1900 years are now shown to be false and erroneous, and an appeal is preferred against this judgment to the Chancellors of the Universities. But when men left to act upon the pure principles of Islam, Almighty God sent His messenger, the Promised Messiah, to re-claim them and to re-establish the purity and truth of Islam by heavenly signs. Is it not a clear distinction between a living and a dead religion, a true and a false system? If religion is a heavenly thing, if it does not proceed from earth, it is unquestionable that the truth of its principles, when they are seriously attacked, should be established by heavenly signs as it was at its birth, and not by the opinions of men who are not inspired by God. But can Christianity claim such signs to-day? Is there a single individual in the pale of Christianity who can say that assisted by the holy spirit he can show heavenly signs in the same manner as Jesus showed? Had any such man been found in Christianity, it could have claimed to be a living religion. But no! it is Islam only which can claim this noble distinction, this only criterion of a religion from heaven teaching true and living principles.

The sad position of Christianity and the force of the attack (appearing in the *Review of Religions* for May 1903, under the heading of Higher Criticism and the Christian Missionaries) which provoked Mr. Corfe to make this appeal, have been far more plainly admitted by the Rev. J. F. Hewitt, Principal of the C. M. S. High School, Krishnagar, Nudya, Bengal, in a letter published in the *Record* for June 26th, 1903. Writing to that paper, the Rev. gentleman says:—

“The United Conference of Missionaries, held monthly in Cal-

cutta, recently took up the subject of Higher Criticism. The report of the proceedings has been carefully followed by an observant Muhammadan controversialist Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, Punjab. I enclose an article which appeared in the last issue of his magazine, *The Review of Religions*. It is interesting as showing how closely this and kindred subjects are being followed by non-Christians in India at the present time. And it is instructive to all engaged in, or interested in, the spread of Christ's kingdom in the world. The Mirza lays hold of the most recent and advanced criticism, claims that this school teaches what the Quran has always taught, urges Missionaries to give up teaching a Bible which has been proved false, and to recognise that the so-called divinity of Christ is nothing more than every other man possesses. It is a curious position to find the critics in. A Moslem teacher, actively hostile to Christianity, claims them as co-workers. I wonder whether the ordinary English clergyman, who in this matter of Higher Criticism depends on the authority of some great name, has realized the logical outcome of such teaching? It must result in new and serious obstacles to the spread of Christianity among the Muhammadans. The Mirza is logically right and the only answer we can give is that the teaching is as yet mere theory; but in effect this is only to ask him to wait while the Christians fight out the question of the truthfulness of the Bible. A sad position to be reduced to surely! How do the critics propose to deal with it?

These remarks of Mr. Hewitt show clearly that the principles of Higher Criticism are accepted even by the Clergy and the Missionaries. The *Harvest Field*, a Missionary Magazine, lays great emphasis on the point when it says: "We believe that it is very desirable in the interests of truth and of the Christian Church in India that more attention should be paid to the doctrine of Inspiration as the majority of the leaders and scholars of the Christian Church now formulate it," thus indicating clearly that the said doctrine is and should be formulated now in a different manner from what it was formerly. And still more explicitly when quoting "the wise words of the *Indian Witness*" as its own views, it says: "The vast majority of Indian ministers are wholly ignorant of the new views of the Bible entertained by the bulk of the missionaries. . . . Senseless denunciation of higher criticism and contemptuous reference to the critics are unworthy of Christian truth-seekers and should cease." Should not

the remarks of Mr. Corfe be termed "senseless denunciation of higher criticism" in the words of the *Harvest Field*. Is not Mr. Corfe guilty of concealing the truth when he says that the principles of Higher Criticism have been refuted, when they are so clearly being adopted by the Christian Missionaries and the Church dignitaries. The Bishop of Bombay declared the other day in emphatic words that the Bible was by no means to be taken as free from error. There are churches—call them liberal but they are *Christian Churches* still—which plainly teach that the Bible is not the Word of God, but "a mixture of fact, fancy and fable; truth, error and absurdity," from which we must sift out what is reasonable and reject the rest. Nay, more; the fact is preached from *orthodox* pulpits that the Bible is not the Word of God. The truth is that the mighty revolution in Biblical Criticism, that is going on in the west, is not at all discarded by the Church or the Evangelists. On the other hand, it is the doctrine of verbal inspiration and of the inerrancy of the text of scripture that is now rejected by every sensible person, as in justice it ought to have been. Mr. Hewitt's remark that the new doctrine is as yet a mere theory, cannot be accepted as true. All intelligent thinkers and most high Church officials as well as Christian Missionaries are agreed that the Bible is not free from error. The ignorant masses may still stick to the old doctrine but their opinion has no value when compared with the great thinkers and leading churchmen.

And here we cannot help drawing the reader's attention to an important point. Admitting for the sake of argument Mr. Hewitt's view that the two parties, *viz.*, those advocating the inerrancy of the Bible and those rejecting its verbal inspiration are still in a state of contention, and that we must wait till one of them comes off victorious, or even supposing for a while that Mr. Corfe has really got in hand a "scientific refutation" of the Higher Biblical Criticism, does not the question ever present itself to the minds of these or other thinkers, why is the Bible itself silent on the point? Putting off for the present the question of varying manuscripts and differing translations, which destroy the whole value of the claim of the Bible to a heavenly origin, the idea is grotesque that the weight of opinion on one side or the other can decide the question of the Divine origin of the book. Can such a book be from God, the truth

of which is to be decided by the opinions of a few men? How can the book claim any respect whose followers fall out on the question of its origin and think of settling the matter by votes? One need not laugh at the simplicity of the Icelanders who decided the question of the adoption of Christianity by putting the matter to votes in the national parliament, and the whole population adopted the Christian religion owing to the majority having raised their hands in favor of it, when a similar question awaits a similar solution even among the civilized Christians of the twentieth century. May we suggest that to have the matter decided early and not to keep the public long in waiting, the question of the inspiration of the Bible may be put to votes in the House of Commons as that assembly represents the whole English nation, and the decision to which that House comes may be made known at an early date, so that the friends and foes of Christianity may no longer remain in suspense. Such is the fate of the book which has for two thousand years been regarded blindly as the true and unerring Word of God. It never occurred to its followers that to regard a book as having a Divine origin and as being free from error which is itself silent on the point is to set up for it a claim which it does not deserve, and the error of which must sooner or later be exposed. It is folly to take a book as being the Word of God which neither makes any assertion to that effect nor gives any argument in support of that claim. The Holy Quran is the only Book in the world which has clearly and emphatically asserted its Divine origin and given conclusive arguments showing the truth of that assertion. It has repeatedly asserted that it is a Book sent and revealed by God, that it is pure and unmixed truth, that falsehood cannot come to it, and that every word of it is free from error. It has also given numerous arguments in support of this assertion to one of which only, for sake of brevity, we here draw the reader's attention. In the very first *Sura* the Holy Quran says, and the same is repeatedly affirmed in the other chapters: *وان كنتم فى ريب مما نزلنا على عبدنا فاوتوا بسورة من مثله وادعوا شهداءكم من دون الله ان كنتم صادقين* "And if you be in doubt as to that which we have sent down to Our servant, (i.e., the Quran), then produce a *sura* like it, and summon your assistants besides God, if you are men of truth"; and then adds . . . *فان لم تفعلوا ولان تفعلوا* "But if ye do it not, and by no means shall

ye do it” This is a plain assertion and a plain argument of the Divine source of the Holy Book, and it has stood unanswered for thirteen hundred years. The Christians or any other people may reject the Holy Book, but every sensible person can see that their rejection stands condemned so long as they do not produce a like of the Holy Quran. The whole world may gather together but it is impossible that the like of the Holy Quran should be made. Not only did the Arabs show conclusively their inability to produce the like of the Quran and thus give irrefutable evidence of the truth of its claim, but millions of men to whom the Quran has been proclaimed during thirteen hundred years have also shown by their acquiescence in this claim of the Holy Book that the Quran proceeds from a superhuman power. Does the Bible make a similar claim or furnish a similar proof? Why should have its followers fought over the question of its origin if it had given some conclusive proof of its Divine origin? We have given here only one argument of the truth of the Quran simply to show that even if the majority votes for the Divine origin of the Bible, still no sensible person can put his trust for salvation in a book which is to be taken or rejected according to the caprice of a few men.

Only one thing more with regard to the remarks in the Cambridge Chronicle. Mr. Corfe seriously misrepresents the Muslims when he says that “the Bible is now held up to natives by thoughtful Muhammadans, as teaching no more than the Quran.” Muslims have *always* held that the Bible is far inferior in its teaching to the Holy Quran. The Christians have now begun to see what the Muslims have *always* held, *viz.*, that the Bible is not free from errors. The Christians persistently opposed this view until time has brought home to them the truth. They may comfort themselves for a while by thinking that this is a theory as yet or that they have got a refutation of it in hand, but they will soon discover that this is an empty solace, and the Bible falls never to rise again as was predicted by the Holy Prophet. The Promised Messiah has come and with his advent every falsehood must vanish and truth prevail. Thus it had been foretold and thus will it come to pass.

The Fall of Christianity.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the Christian Missionaries to evangelise the whole world, the religion of Christ is coming to a sad end by the destruction of the basis on which it stood. Apart from the discovery of the tomb of Jesus at Srinagar which deals a death-blow to every Christian claim, the Resurrection which has always been regarded as the central dogma of Christianity, is frankly denied by all the advanced Christian thinkers and the ablest Bible scholars. In proof of this statement, we give several quotations from the most recent publication containing the views of the great Bible scholars of the world, *viz.*, the fourth volume of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. As to the importance of this doctrine in the Christian faith, we cull the following from its introductory remarks on the Resurrection and Ascension narratives:—

“The Resurrection of Jesus is held to be the central fact upon which the Christian Church rests. Even at a date so early as that of I Cor. Paul treats it as such in an elaborate discussion. . . . It seems accordingly in logic inevitable that if at any time it should come to be recognised that the resurrection of Jesus never happened, the Christian faith with respect to all the points just mentioned would necessarily come to an end. . . . The reason for dreading all these dangers is that upon the assumption of the resurrection of Jesus . . . are based propositions which are fundamental to the Christian faith,—propositions concerning God and His relation to men upon the truth of which no less an issue depends than the salvation of mankind.” Consider this mighty superstructure and then cast a glance at the empty basis. The *Encyclopaedia Biblica* says on this point: “Yet what is this basis? It consists in an affirmation regarding a fact in history which is known to us only through tradition, and accordingly is open to historical criticism just as any other fact is. Indeed . . . we find that the resurrection of Jesus—as is not surprising in view of its supernatural character—is in very many quarters and with growing distinctness characterized as unhistorical, and that not merely when it is conceived of as having been a revivification of the dead body of Jesus, but also when it is defended in some spiritua-

listic form." In what light such an accident is to be read and with what evidence is then stated. "The normal procedure of the historian accordingly in dealing with the events of the past, will be in the first instance to try whether a non-miraculous explanation will serve, and to come to the other conclusion only on the strength of quite unexceptionable testimony."

As to the sources of evidence, the Gospel-narratives are taken first of all. "These, however, exhibit contradictions of the most glaring kind. Reimarus enumerated ten contradictions; but in reality their number is much greater." Of the extra-canonical sources, "several are often regarded as superior to the canonical in antiquity; so, for example, the Gospel of the Hebrews." But this too is not wanting in "bold contradictions to the canonical Gospels." "In the fragment of the Gospel of Peter discovered in 1892, various scholars, and particularly Harnack, have discerned a maximum of really ancient matter ('a first-class source')." There is much here that is incredible and the element "that admits of being regarded as especially old is that the first appearance of Jesus occurs in Galilee and to Peter. . . . Furthermore it might seem to be original here that the first appearance does not occur until more than eight days after the death of Jesus." A "Coptic book of anti-Gnostic tendency, found at Akhmim" reports "the conversation of risen Jesus with his disciples." "It contains much that is new, but nothing that could claim greater credibility than the canonical Gospels." There are other isolated extra-canonical details. According to one of these "Jesus gives what is left from what he ate (fish and honeycomb) to the disciples." Another apocryphal work now found in a Georgian translation, relates that Joseph of Arimathaea was the first person to whom Jesus appeared.

Jesus remained for forty days upon earth according to the narrative of the Acts. But "according to the Valentinians and Ophites, Jesus remained on earth for eighteen months after his resurrection; so also in the Ethiopic text; according to *Pistis Sophia*, I, eleven years." The first appearance of Jesus to the apostles happened at Galilee, for it could not have happened both at Galilee and at Jerusalem. Traditions which make them happen at Galilee and Jerusalem respectively cannot be equally valid. Many

reasons are given that Galilee could have been changed into Jerusalem but not *vice versa*. "If Mk. and Mt. had to fall back on their own powers of conjecture, where else were they to look for appearances if not in Jerusalem where the grave, the women, and the disciples were? Thus the tradition which induced them to place the appearances in Galilee, must have been one of very great stability."

Several incidents on which the resurrection is based are then shown to be unhistorical. The nature of the resurrection-body is then discussed and all miraculous explanations as to Jesus' appearance after the crucifixion are rejected. Of the non-miraculous explanations, the two following are mentioned while the writer himself sticks to the view of "subjective vision." The hypothesis is rejected "that, although Jesus did not recover, the disciples spread abroad, and found credence for, the rumour that he was alive. Apart from all other difficulties, such a hypothesis is from the outset untenable for two reasons." The other non-miraculous explanation now remains to be considered. "The hypothesis that Jesus was only apparently dead found many supporters in the days of rationalism, and it has also been espoused by a writer so modern as Hase." But Professor Schmiedel does not accept this view and advances the theory that the seeing of Jesus by the disciples was only a subjective vision which he himself explains to be "a product of the mental condition of the seer." Apart from the discovery of the Ointment of Jesus and his tomb at Srinagar,—facts which settle conclusively that Jesus did not die upon the cross—, the evidence of the Gospels themselves is strongly in favor of the explanation of apparent, not actual, death. In fact it is the only explanation consistent with the truth of the narratives of the Gospels. That Jesus met his disciples at Galilee and not at Jerusalem as proved by Professor Schmiedel himself supports the same conclusion. There is no reason why a subjective vision could have occurred at Galilee and not at Jerusalem. In the other case however there existed very strong reasons why Jesus should have shown himself to his disciples at Galilee and not at Jerusalem? It was in Jerusalem that the excitement of the Jews was at its height against him, while Galilee was comparatively a quieter place where Jesus had no fear of being discovered. That death

could not have been caused only by three hours' suspension on the cross, is absolutely certain. That Jesus ate, drank, walked, slept and felt hungry and tired cannot be denied, but these incidents are not consistent with the subjective vision. Similarly the incidents narrated in the Gospels that Jesus walked in disguise as a gardener, that he forbade his disciples to disclose the fact of his being alive, and that the wounds were seen on his body, strongly support the conclusion that Jesus did not die upon the cross. Pilate and the Jews themselves were in doubt as to the actual death of Jesus, and there is every reason to believe that the so-called resurrection, which is now rejected by the great Christian thinkers in the sense in which it has been understood by the Christian Church for 1900 years, was really a recovery from a state of senselessness. For two thousand years the Christian Church has been teaching a tremendous error which has ultimately been exposed.

Jesus among the Ten Lost Israelite Tribes in the East, V.

MEDICAL EVIDENCE.

In hundreds of books on medicine we read of an ointment, which is known as "Marham-i-Isá" or the Ointment of Jesus. These books have been written by the followers of different religions, Jews, Magians, Christians, and Muslims, some of them having been written hundreds of years ago. On a close investigation it appears that the recipe of the "Ointment of Jesus" was originally communicated orally and thus became known to hundreds of thousands of men. When it became famous on account of its great efficacy, it was reduced to writing and was written down in a *Materia Medica* in Greek shortly after the crucifixion. When speaking of this recipe, the book stated that it was first prepared for the injuries received by Jesus Christ. The book was translated into various foreign languages, and an Arabic version of it appeared in the time of Almamun.

All the learned physicians, Jews, Magians, Christians and

Muslims, who have written on medicine, have made mention of this important recipe, stating that it had been prepared by the disciples of Jesus for their master. It would appear on a careful perusal of the books dealing with the properties of drugs that this ointment is particularly adapted to the cure of wounds, and is a sovereign remedy to stop the flow of blood from external injuries. One of its ingredients is Myrrh (mentioned also in the Old Testament), which is well known for its medicinal property in healing a wound and keeping it safe from corruption. The ointment is a very useful cure for all kinds of boils as well as for the glands of the bubonic plague. It has not been stated whether the ointment was prepared on the advice of a physician or whether its ingredients were communicated to Jesus by divine revelation. After the ointment had been applied to the wounds of Jesus for three days, he gained strength enough to travel on foot the long distance of about seventy miles from Jerusalem to Galilee. The wounds were perfectly healed in a very short time by the wonderful effect of this medicine. Suffice it to say in its praise that Christ healed others, but this ointment healed Christ.

The reference to this ointment is found in over a thousand books on medicine, which are well known to those who follow the Greek school of medicine : but for the sake of brevity, we will give here the names of a few books only. They are as follows :--

- (1). *The Qanún* by Bú Ali Sina (Avicenna), Vol. III, P. 133.
- (2). *The Sharh-i-Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Qutb-ud-Din of Shiráz, Vol. III.
- (3). *The Kamil-ul-Sand'ah*, by Ali bin Abbas al Majusi (Magian), Vol. II, P. 602.
- (4). *A Dictionary of Medicine*, by Rabley Dunglison, M. D., L. L. D. (1866).
- (5). *Lexicon Medicum*, by Dr. Hooper, P. 1241.
- (6). *The Majmu'd Baqdi* (a Collection by Baqa) by Mahmud Muhammad Ismail, Vol. II, P. 497.
- (7). *The Tazkara-i-Ulul Albab*, by Daúd-uz-Zarir-ul-Antaki (i.e., of Antioch), P. 303.

- (8). *The Latin Materia Medica*, Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (9). *The Umdatul Muhtdj*, by Ahmad bin Hasanir Rashidi, Alhakim.
- (10). *The Qarabadin Farsi* (the Persian Materia Medica) by Hakim Muhammad Akbar Arzani; Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (11). *The Shafa-ul-Asgam*, by Hakim Khizar bin Ali, Vol. II, P. 230.
- (12). *The Mirat-us-Shafa* (M. S.) by Hakim Nathú Shah; Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (13). *The Zakhira-e-Khwarzam Shdhi*; Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (14). *Sharh Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Hakim Ibn-Nafis Qarshi, Vol. III.
- (15). *Sharh-i-Qanún* (a Commentary on the Qanún) by Hakim Ali Giláni.
- (16). *The Qarabadin* (Materia Medica) by Ulvi Khán, Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (17). *The Ilajul Amraz*, by Hakim Muhammad Sharif, Page 893.
- (18). *The Greek Materia Medica*; Chapter on the Diseases of Skin.
- (19). *The Tuhfatul-Muminin*; printed on the margin of Makhzanul Advayah, P. 713.
- (19). *The Muhit fit Tib* (Cyclopaedia of Medicine), Page 367.
- (21). *The Iksir-i-'Azam*, by Hakim Muhammad 'Azam Khan, known as Nazam Jahan, P. 33).
- (22). *The Qarabadin Mâsumi*, by Mâsum, bin Karimud Din, Shastari of Shiráz.
- (23). *The Ijala-i-Nafid*, by Muhammad Sharif of Delhi, P. 410.
- (24). *Tibbi-i-Shabbri, or the Lawdméd-i-Shabbri*, by Sayad Husain Shabbar Kazmi, P. 471.

- (25). *The Makhzan-i-Sulaimani* (an Urdu version of Arabic text *Iksir*) by Muhammad Shams-ud-din of Bahawalpur, P. 599.
- (26). *The Shafa-ul-Amraz*, by Hakim Muhammad Núr Karim, P. 282.
- (27). *The Tibb-i-Dara Shakohi*, by Nur-ud-Din Muhammad Abdul Hakim Ainul Mulk of Shiráz, leaf 360.
- (28). *Minhdj-ud-Dukan, Badastur-il 'Ayan fi 'Aml wa Tarkib-il Nafidh-lil Abdan*, by the learned Abdul Mana bin Abi Nasar-ul Attar al Israeli Al Karimi (a Jew, P. 86.
- (29). *The Zubda-tul-Tibb*, by Abu Ibrahim Ismail bin Hasan, ul-Husaini ul Jarjáni.
- (30). *The Tibbi Akbari*, by Muhammad Akbar Arzani, P. 242.
- (31). *The Mizan-ul Tibb*.
- (32). *The Sadidi*, by the learned As Sadidul Gazarúni, Vol. II, P. 283.
- (33). *The Hdv-e Kabir* by Ibn Zakariya, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.
- (34). *The Qarabadin*, (Materia Medica) by Ibn Talmiz; Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.
- (35). *The Qarabadin* (Materia Medica) by Ibn Ali Sadiq, Chapter on the Diseases of *Skin*.

Many of these books were used as text books in the Muslim Colleges in early times and were eagerly studied by the scholars of Europe also. There is not the slightest exaggeration in the statement that these books have been circulated amongst millions of people in every century, and that hundreds of thousands read them from beginning to end. We can assert with confidence that out of the many learned scholars of Europe and Asia, there is not one who is not acquainted with the names of some of the notable books mentioned above. At the time that Spain was the centre of learning and universities had been established there, people flocked from all parts of Europe and

eagerly learned such books as the *Qanún* of Bu Ali Siná (Avicenna), a very important work on medicine, containing the recipe of the Ointment of Jesus, and his other works on Philosophy, Science, Astronomy, etc., known as "Shafa," "Ishárát" and "Bushárát." Similarly the translations from Greek and the original works of Abu Raihan, Sabit bin Qurah Israeli, Hunain bin Ishaq, Ishaq and other scholars, were taught in these universities. The translations of these books may still be found in some parts of Europe.

The Muslim Monarchs were always anxious to encourage Literature and Science, and hence we find translations of the best Greek works effected by their orders and under their patronage. For a long time the reins of Government were held by Caliphs who cared more for the spread of knowledge than the extension of their dominions. They also invited learned Pandits from India on very high salaries to effect translations from the Indian works on Medicine. Thus they laid mankind under a deep obligation by upholding the cause of Literature and Science. But the greatest benefit they have done to humanity is, that under their patronage and at their cost, such Greek and Latin works were translated into Arabic as contained references to the Ointment of Jesus, and stated with an authority far greater than that of inscriptions, that the ointment had been prepared for the injuries received by Jesus. The learned Muslim doctors, who besides their efficiency in Medicine, Physics and Philosophy had a competent knowledge of the Greek language, when they translated the *Materia Medica* in which the Ointment of Jesus had been mentioned, very wisely preserved the word شليخا (a Greek word meaning twelve) in the Arabic version so that it might furnish an evidence that the original *Materia Medica* from which the Arabic translation had been made, was in Greek. The word will hence be found in almost every work on Medicine.

It may also be noted here that ancient books which have continually been published amongst millions in every century and which have served as text-books in big colleges, furnish evidence far more authentic and weighty than that furnished by coins and inscriptions on many historical points. In the latter, there is every possibility of forgery, but in the case of literary, especially scientific,

books, circulated amongst millions of people and guarded with interest and care by every nation, there can not be the least doubt as to their authenticity. Evidence based on coins and inscriptions falls far short of that supported by writings. Can any one name a coin or inscription so well known to the world as the *Qanun* of Bú Ali Siná for instance ?

Briefly, all seekers after truth will find in the Ointment of Jesus a most trustworthy evidence, and if such a strong proof is rejected, all historical evidences will become worthless and unreliable. The man who does not accept a proof, based on the authority of over a thousand books, widely circulated so early and written by well known authors, sets at naught the important science of History and is an open enemy to all historical methods of research. Can we overlook such a strong and solid evidence ? Or is it reasonable to question a proof based on writings, whose authority has been admitted from very old times, both in Europe and Asia—a proof which is strengthened by the testimony of the learned doctors of Jewish, Christian, Magian, and Muslim faiths ?

Arise ye souls of the seekers after truth and weigh this strong evidence ! Get up, Ye lovers of justice and consider this lucid and conclusive proof ! Is it compatible with justice and honesty that no heed be paid to such clear and forcible arguments ? It is absurd to say that Jesus might have received these injuries before he began to preach the Word of God, or that he might have received them during the three years of his public life, but by some other cause than that of crucifixion, as for instance, by falling from the roof of a house. For, in the first place, we find the Apostles mentioned in this ointment (it being known also as *مرحم حوارين* the Ointment of the Apostles), and there were no apostles before Jesus began to preach as a Prophet. The word *شليخا* also, which is the Greek word for *twelve*, is still found in these books. In the second place Jesus before his ministry was not a famous man that the memory of his injuries should have been thus kept safe. As for the second supposition, it is clear that the whole period between the time that Jesus began to preach and the time, when he was crucified, was only about three years, and according to some authorities only

one year. Now the record of this period is kept so minutely and the writers of the Gospels are so particular in noting down every word and deed of Jesus, and every event concerning him that it is impossible they should have omitted to mention such an important accident. But when we turn to these narratives about Jesus to search for any trace of any injury except that brought about by the crucifixion, we find that nothing is related or alluded to. The crucifixion is admitted by the whole world and no one can deny that nails had been driven into the hands of Jesus at that time. If any one affirms to the contrary and says that the ointment had been prepared for injuries received otherwise than by crucifixion, the burden of proof lies on him. Both the Jews and Christians agree that Jesus received injuries on the cross, but no one has ever come forward to state that such an accident, *viz.*, one that should have necessitated the preparation of an ointment to be applied to the wounds, had happened at any other time or from any other cause. To urge such groundless objections is, therefore, straying away from the path of truth. The arguments we have stated above are too strong to be shaken by such unfounded allegations. Can we set at naught such a strong proof as baffles all efforts to refute it? Had it been limited to the writings and books of Muslim authors alone, rash and ill-advised critics could have accused it as a forgery committed to attack the Christian belief. But such an idea is evidently absurd from several points of view.

The Muslims like the Christians believe that Jesus was carried off alive to the heavens. They go a step further than the Christians, and allege that Jesus was not even nailed to the cross. How could they, then, in conformity with this belief commit a forgery to the effect that Jesus had received injuries on the cross. Besides, before the Islamic faith came into existence, books had been written in Latin and Greek and widely circulated, which contained an account of the Ointment of Jesus and stated that it had been prepared for Jesus by his disciples. Again, the fact that the Jews, the Christians, the Magians and the Muslims, who in point of faith were ever opposed to each other, mentioned this ointment without any regard for their religious beliefs, leads us to the undeniable conclusion that the ointment and the incidents connected with it were too well-known to leave any room for denial or doubt.

One thing is remarkable indeed that notwithstanding the publicity this ointment had obtained amongst so many different nations, their attention was never for a moment directed to the great historical event which it reveals, and none ever thought of using it for historical purposes until the time came which was fixed for the appearance of the Promised Messiah. We can give no other explanation of this strange occurrence than that such was the will of God, and that it had been ordained from the beginning that the discovery of this weapon, this sound and comprehensive argument, which was to put an end, once for all, to the Christian belief, should be effected by the Promised Messiah. The Holy Prophet of God declared 1300 years ago that the religion of the cross would not decline, nor would its progress be retarded until the Promised Messiah, at whose hands the cross was destined to break, appeared in the world. The prophecy only indicated that in the time of the Promised Messiah such circumstances would come into existence as would throw true light on the Christian doctrines of crucifixion and ascension which would then fall into oblivion, and their days would come to an end.

Mr. McCuskey in the "Union Signal."

Mr. McCUSKEY, who is somebody in the Foreman Christian College, Lahore, informs the "Union Signal" (Chicago) that Dr. Griswold has proved the falsity of the claims of the Promised Messiah. Putting off the review of Dr. Griswold's pamphlet for some subsequent issue of the magazine, we ask Mr. McCuskey what constitutes a proof of the falsity of a man who claims to be a messenger from heaven? If simply an assertion that the claimant is false or that his prophecies are not fulfilled, is a satisfactory proof of falsity, the Pharisees adequately proved the falsity of the claims of Jesus and millions of men have since then proved his falsity. If not, Mr. McCuskey will kindly point out to us the arguments in Dr. Griswold's thirty-two paged pamphlet, showing, for instance, that it is not the time for the coming of the Messiah, that the second advent of Jesus is

to be a physical and personal advent and not a spiritual one (remembering of course how Jesus construed the second advent of Elijah to satisfy the Jews that he was the true Messiah), that Jesus did die upon the cross, rose from the dead and subsequently went up to heaven, that the arguments of the Promised Messiah to the contrary are not good and valid arguments, and that the signs of the Promised Messiah are not as conclusive and well-proved as those of Jesus, if the latter actually showed the signs related in the Gospels. Perhaps Dr. Griswold told Mr. McCuskey that he had proved the Messiah's falsity and Mr. McCuskey could not question his friend's honesty by himself considering the amount and weight of the evidence brought forward by him in contravention of the claims of the Promised Messiah. Or, with due respect to Mr. McCuskey's logical profundity, we may suggest that like his friend Dr. Griswold, he cannot distinguish between an assertion and an argument, and takes the Doctor's assertions, as he himself took them, for arguments.

But while Mr. McCuskey bases the first part of his letter on information supplied to him by Dr. Griswold, the second reveals his own ability and learning. He thus delivers himself: "As far as I can see or learn, the influence of this 'Qadiana' extends over a constantly decreasing number of people, and the orthodox Muhammadans reject him with great scorn." Mark this "Qadiana." But Mr. McCuskey is silent as to the influence of that "Nazarene" and the honor with which he was received by the expectant Jews. Is it true that he too was received with "great scorn," and something more? For true information on this point, we would defer to Mr. McCuskey's authority. One thing more. It is said that a very large number of the followers of Jesus apostatized on one occasion. Nay, more; one of the chosen twelve to whom Jesus had promised a throne to sit upon, not only apostatized but also betrayed Jesus into the hands of his enemies, and the others denied Jesus and fled from him when he was arrested. If it is true, Mr. McCuskey, we hope would have no objection to admit it, however painful the admission may be. But how did he see or learn that the number of the Promised Messiah's followers was constantly decreasing? Did he ever see any of the Ahmadiyya weekly papers issued from Qadian? Or, is it that the establishment of a College, the erection of a minaret, and the publication of one English and three Urdu periodicals within the last year or two appear to him indica-

tions of a "constantly decreasing" following? It cannot be that he is unaware of the steady progress which is being made by the Ahmadiyya movement, but he could not win any credit from the Missionaries without making a misrepresentation. Does he think that he can extinguish the light kindled by God with the breath of his mouth? He is mistaken.

For Mr. McCuskey's information, we may further state that it is a heavenly sign of the truth of the Promised Messiah that his following will continually increase and never decrease, as stated and earnestly desired by Mr. McCuskey and his friends. It was in the year 1880 that the first work of the Promised Messiah, the "Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya" was published, and in it were announced the prophecies revealed some years earlier of which the fulfilment is witnessed to-day. At that time not only the Promised Messiah had no followers but he was hardly known abroad. His life then was a solitary life. It was in that loneliness that the Word of God came to him informing him that people will flock to him from the four quarters of the world. He was told to enlarge his house for the large number of visitors that would come to him. He was enjoined not to get tired of the great masses that would come to see him. Almighty God addressed him saying: *انت منى بمنزلة توحيدى وتفريدى فحان ان تعان وتعرف بين الناس* "Thou art to me as my unity and oneness; the time has come that thou wilt be assisted and made known among the people." This revelation also shows that at that time he was neither known, nor had he any follower. The prophecy indicated that a time was coming when he would be granted by the Divine assistance a large following and a wide recognition. And again *يا تون من كل فج عميق* "People will come to thee from every distant path." It struck the inspired one at that time with no less wonder than it strikes us to-day when we witness thousands of people coming only to see the face of the messenger of God, not only from the most distant quarters of India but also from other countries. Were people to come to him whom no body knew, he thought? Similarly, he received the prophetic injunction saying *لا تصعر لخلق الله ولا تسئم من الناس* "Do not turn away thy face from the people and do not get tired of them." Imagine these words revealed at a time when hardly a man came to see the recipient of this revelation. At that time he could not even think

how God would bring about all these things and bring people to him in such large numbers that, but for the Divine injunction thus given a quarter of a century before the time of its fulfilment, he would have got tired of them. Thus it happens now and on certain days he has to shake hands with more than a thousand men who come from distant places to see him. Sitting in a solitary room he could not have even conceived the idea that such large masses would gather round him. Along with these promises he was told that opposition would rage high against him and people would leave no stone unturned to destroy him and wipe off his name from the face of the earth. Of that severe opposition he was informed in numerous revelations, yet at that date his solitary condition did not allow him even to conceive the nature of this opposition. In one revelation Almighty God told him *ان يطفئوا نورا لله بافواههم والله متم نوره ولو الكافرون* "They will try to extinguish the light of God by the breath of their mouth, but God will complete His light though the unbelievers may feel aversion to it." And again the Word of God came with a fresh assurance: *اذ جاء نصر الله والفتح وانتهى امر الزمان* "When the assistance of God and victory will come to thee, and after vain opposition people will ultimately see that all power is in our hands, then will it be said: Is it not true." Here we are plainly told that ultimately God will grant the Promised Messiah such a glorious victory that the truth of his claim will be generally felt.

All these revelations granted to the Promised Messiah more than a quarter of a century ago, and published about 21 years ago, when he was hardly known to any one outside his village, show clearly the hand of God working in the movement. The truth of the words which were then revealed is now felt by every unprejudiced mind. Is it within the power of a mortal to publish in the whole world such facts a quarter of a century before their occurrence. It is one of the best proved miracles of knowledge and power: a miracle of knowledge because it shows a deep knowledge of the future which cannot be known to any but God, and a miracle of power in as much as it reveals the power of God in assisting his messenger and vanquishing his enemies. Plots were formed against

his life but Almighty God brought them to naught and fulfilled His promise which he had given him thirty years before the existence of such plots that he would be saved from them all. A few years after their publication the whole country rose in opposition to him. Then did the Divine assistance come as promised and the opposition began to subside by degrees. The number of disciples in 1895 was 313 but to-day they number about two hundred thousand, and the number is increasing with an astonishing rapidity.

Mr. McCuskey has told a disgraceful lie. We need not discuss what his motive was in telling it. Perhaps he thought of pleasing the American public by the false statement and keeping them in the dark as to the true state of things. We challenge him to produce the data on which he calculated the alleged decrease, though he has been clever enough to guard himself against such an emergency by adding "as far as I can see or learn." Does he think that the religion of Christ will prosper by such falsehoods. These are the only instruments now left in the hands of the Christian Missionaries, these preachers of the "Gospel of truth." We bind ourselves to pay him Rs. 50,000, if he can prove the truth of this assertion. If he has not intentionally told this untruth, he must admit the falsity of his statement.

The next issue of the *Review of Religions* will not come out on the fixed date. The November and December numbers will be issued together at as early a date after the 20th November as possible. This has been necessitated by a very important and lengthy contribution from the pen of the Promised Messiah under the heading of the Story of the two Martyrs in the course of which is given a resume of the arguments for the truth of his claim to Messiahship.