

Vol. III.

No 4.

# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(APRIL 1904.)

Digitized by Khilafat Library

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE BLESSINGS OF ISLAM ... ..	117
RESTORING THE DEAD TO LIFE	
JESUS AND THE HOLY PROPHET COMPARED ... ..	126
UPSON AND A. M. ON SINLESSNESS... ..	137

QADIAN,  
DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

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

# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. III,]

APRIL 1904.

[No. 4.

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ  
نَحْمَدُهٗ وَنُصَلِّیْ عَلٰی رَسُوْلِهِ الْکَرِیْمِ

## The Blessings of Islam.

*(By the Promised Messiah.)*

What is the fruit which a man can reap by following Islam, is the most important question which offers itself for solution. And the answer is plain and simple. When a man with a true search for his Lord and Master is firmly established in the faith of Islam and completely resigned to His will so that all his mental and physical powers are, not by any constraint and exertion but freely and naturally, engaged solely in the service of God, the final and permanent fruit of this state of submission is a wonderful transformation which he witnesses in his life. The highest manifestations of Divine guidance unimpeded by any obstacle overshadow him, and manifold Divine blessings descend upon him. The truth of the injunctions and the beliefs which are accepted at the outset on grounds of probability and on the authority of others as a matter of faith, is ultimately made clear and fully realized by clear revelations and sure and certain inspirations. The doors that were formerly closed to the seeker are thrown wide open, and the hidden truths and secrets of law and religion are made manifest. He is made to travel vast journeys in the kingdom of God, so that he may attain to perfection in Divine knowledge and certainty of Divine existence. Divine blessing is imparted to his tongue and his speech, his words and his deeds, and all his movements. He is granted an extraordinary courage, perseverance and bravery, and set

on the high pinnacle where a man's breast is opened for the favourable acceptance of truth. Being perfectly freed from narrowness, meanness, avarice, repeated stumbling, shortsightedness, slavery of passion, depravity and vileness of morals and every trace of the darkness of sensuality caused by the veils of humanity, he is filled with the light of Divine morals. Being thus perfectly transformed, he dons the clothing of a new birth. When he hears and sees, he hears and sees from God; and when he moves or stands, he moves or stands with God. His wrath is the wrath of God, and his mercy the mercy of God. His prayers are then granted on account of his election and nearness to God and not on account of any affliction, and their acceptance leads to his welfare and not to his ruin. He is upon the earth an argument for the existence of God and a Divine protection to the creatures. There is rejoicing in heaven because of his existence upon earth. The highest gift which he receives from God is, that God speaks to him and addresses him, and these words of the Divine Being are free from every doubt and darkness and descend upon his heart with the calmness of moonlight and have in them a powerful bliss and bring with them a satisfaction, content and tranquility of mind. Such words of the Divine Being are a thing distinct from Divine inspiration, for the fountain of inspiration is in constant flow for those who have reached this stage, and it is with the holy spirit that they speak or hear or see, and by the holy spirit that their inclinations are breathed into them. As images of the person spoken of in the verse : *وما ينطق عن الهوى ان هو الا وحي يوحى* "Out of his desire he does not speak, but every word that he utters is a revelation that is revealed to him," they speak and move by Divine inspiration. But the words spoken by God to His chosen ones, who are perfectly established in Islam, are quite distinct from this constant inspiration and breathings of the holy spirit. The words come to them from the mouth of God and belong to the category of *wahy-t-mallu*. They receive answers to their questions from Almighty God in the same manner as a friend receives answer from his friend. This perfect and highest form of revelation cannot be defined otherwise than by saying that it is a peculiar manifestation of Divine glory, and is communicated through the angel that has nearest access to the Divine Being. The object of this communication is to inform the

recipient of the acceptance of his prayers, or to disclose to him some deep secret unknown to him, or to reveal to him some events of the future, or to make known to him the pleasure or displeasure of God in any matter, or to make him attain, in some other respects, certainty and a perfect Divine knowledge. In short, such revelation is the voice of God, and He speaks to His servant to bring him to true satisfaction and perfect knowledge. It is impossible to give any description of it beyond the fact that it is a voice from Almighty God due solely to a Divine impulse and breathing, and is not the result of any contemplation or reflection on the part of the man or any desire of the soul. It is a voice in sweet and blissful words, and has within it a manifestation of Divine glory and Divine majesty, and is so felt by its recipient.

The question would naturally arise here in the mind of every seeker after truth as to what he should do in order to attain to the stage of perfection in which he can be the recipient of the favour of Divine revelation. The answer to this question is, that it is after a new life with new faculties and new powers is granted that a man receives the favour of being spoken to by God. But the new life does not begin until the previous life is brought to extinction, by which is meant a true and real sacrifice of all desires, wealth, honor and dignity, and a complete annihilation of the passions of flesh. The second life in which a man receives the gift of revelation is breathed on the extinction of the life of desires and passions. The signs of such extinction are clearly seen by the seeker. The former characteristics of the soul and passions of the flesh give place to new characteristics and new impulses, and a mighty transformation in the nature is clearly witnessed. The conditions of morality, faith and worship are so thoroughly changed that they appear to have been coloured in another dye. In short, the seeker finds himself quite a new man when he considers his own condition and finds a new God revealed to him, so thoroughly transformed is his conception of the Divine Being. A new bliss is felt in the praise and remembrance of God, and a new delight is experienced in the patience which a man shows under sufferings. The soul has an unbounded trust in God and feels an utter indifference to, and absolute independence of, all

besides. The contemplation of Divine existence and presence reigns so supreme in the heart that every existence besides God is naught to him, and all plans and means are without any value or importance. His sincerity and faithfulness to God is so great that a conception of the greatest difficulties leaves no burden upon the mind; nay, instead of pain a pleasure is felt in sufferings, and a delight is experienced in difficulties. When all these signs are witnessed, it should be then clearly understood that the previous life is utterly annihilated.

Death upon the previous life brings with it wonderful new powers. There are things which men say but cannot do, and ways which they see but cannot walk in, and loads of which they ascertain the weight but which they cannot lift up; but the person whose life of physical passions undergoes a death, is granted power for all these things, for it is not his own mortal power with which he works, but it is the power of God which works in him. It is this Divine power which makes him as steady as a mountain. It grants him a faithful heart with which he is able to do such mighty deeds for the manifestation of the glory of God, and to show such faithfulness and perseverance in his way as it is not within the power of any mortal to do or show. He cuts asunder all his connections from all besides God, and surmounts all obstacles that hinder him in the slightest degree from union with God. His faithfulness and perseverance are tried in the crucible of temptations and sufferings and proved to be genuine. The heavy sufferings to which he is subjected, and the great difficulties with which his way is beset, would crush down mountains and darken the light of the sun and the moon, but he shows extraordinary perseverance and suffers all hardships and faces all difficulties with an open heart. Even if he were ground to dust in the mortar of sufferings, "I am with God" would still be the voice that would proceed from the powder. When a person reaches this stage, he is no more a man of this world, and is granted the guidance and high place granted to the holy prophets and messengers of God before him, as if he were their image. Such a man becomes the inheritor of the blessings granted to the prophets and he is their vicegerent upon earth. What is termed *mujiza* in the prophets is termed *karamat* in him, and what is termed *ismat* (sinlessness) in the prophets is called *mahfuziyyat* (protection)

in him, and what is called *nabuwwat* (prophethood) in the prophets is designated *muhaddisyyat* in him. The distinction in these designations does not arise out of a difference of quality but a difference of degree.

There arises the further question, when and under what circumstances is the person, who is granted the blessings of being spoken to by God, in a fit condition to receive the Word of God. Now, though no particular time can be fixed for the revelation of the Word of God, yet in sufferings and difficulties the Word of God comes to His righteous servants to solace and strengthen them. When they are troubled on every side, and crushed with unbearable sufferings and calamities, and their affliction reaches its climax, the Divine attribute of speech is then manifested upon their hearts and they are comforted and consoled with sweet and charming Divine words. The truth is that the state of perfect submission and utter helplessness of the inspired one is a powerful incentive to kindle the flame of inspiration. When a recipient of the Word of God is cast into the excessively heated furnace of afflictions and encompassed with thorough distress, when excessive grief and sorrow mixed with perfect humility, faithfulness and sincerity engross all his ideas, he is suddenly brought opposite to the rays of Divine glory which falling upon him illumine his whole being. This light of Divine glory is manifested sometimes in the form of revelation and sometimes in the form of spoken words. Like the candle, which is lighted by being brought near a flame of fire, the heart that turns to God is illumined with Divine light. The perfect one who knows God is thus in a most suitable condition to receive the Word of God when in his affliction he falls down on the Divine threshold in utter helplessness, and having cut asunder all connections, strengthens anew his connection with, and resignation to, God. When with a heart replete with grief and sorrow, he cries out for Divine help, Almighty God listens to his cry and gives him an answer in loving and sweet words, and having compassion upon him accepts his prayers. It is downright atheism to think that prayer has no efficacy and that the urging of a prayer is utterly useless in bringing about the attainment of an object. It is one of the highest graces of the, Divine Being which is shown to His servants, that He accepts their

prayers and grants their requests very frequently, however hard their fulfilment may be. What is *walayut* (sainthood) but the attainment of such a nearness to, and dignity in, the presence of the Almighty Lord as brings to one the gift and favor of having his prayers accepted most of all? The *wali* or the saint is the friend of God, and it is a test of sincere friendship that his requests be granted on most occasions. It is sheer ignorance of the true principles of the faith of Islam and of the Book of God, to assert that by the acceptance of prayer is meant nothing more than that Almighty God hears the prayer. If the mere hearing of a prayer is its acceptance, then every one has a right to say that his prayers are not rejected. Almighty God knows and hears what is done or said, for He is the Knowing and the Hearer, but in this there is no difference between the righteous and the unrighteous. If only the hearing of the prayer is all that is meant by acceptance, the believer and the unbeliever are on a par in the prayers they offer, for Almighty God hears the unjust as much as He hears the just. To draw any line between the faithful, and the unfaithful while taking this view of the acceptance of prayer is to lay down an absolutely arbitrary distinction. But this view is utterly opposed to the Holy Quran. The prayer of the faithful servants of God is accepted of a certainty; or, if its acceptance does not tend to the welfare of the suppliant, he is informed of the fact in sweet and soothing words coming from the Divine Being. Almighty God is the fountain-head of mercy and compassion, and He is most of all merciful and compassionate towards His faithful servant. He comforts him in his afflictions, and takes him by the hand and protects him from every mischief. Even if the whole world turns against him, Almighty God grants victory to His chosen one, and extends the days of his peace and safety. His enemy desires his failure and destruction, but it is the enemy who is made to taste of the bitter cup of failures, and it is he who is ultimately brought to destruction. The curses of the enemy He turns back against himself, and brings their evil effect upon him, while for His faithful servant He displays His wonderful signs by the acceptance of his prayers. How is a miracle wrought? The acceptance of the prayer of a faithful servant of God brings about the performance of most difficult and apparently impossible deeds which confound reason and throws the whole world into a surprise. This is not an assertion devoid of argument. I can afford the clearest and

most conclusive proof of it, but he who shuts his own eyes cannot see the light of the sun.

It should be further borne in mind that for proof of the blessings and fruits of Islam stated above, we do not refer the seekers after truth only to the past. Islam is not a dead religion, and we are not compelled to say that the blessings of Islam are left behind. It is in fact the unique excellence of the holy faith of Islam that its blessings are unbroken and continuous. It offers not only its blessings in the past but similar blessings even now. The world stands ever in need of blessings and heavenly signs, and it is absurd to suppose that it stood in need of such signs in the past but can do without them now. Man is a weak creature, and he walks blindly until he is shown traces of the heavenly kingdom; and his faith is a blind faith until he witnesses the wonderful signs of the existence and power of God. The signs shown in a previous age are of no avail in a later age unless they are renewed. The relation of stories of wonders displayed in the past can never produce the conviction which signs witnessed by a man himself can do. Every new century is the inauguration of a new era and the beginning, as it were, of a new world. The God of Islam, who is the true God, therefore manifests new signs in each new world; and in the commencement of every new century, especially when the world goes astray from probity and righteousness and is involved in darkness, He raises a vicegerent of the Holy Prophet, in the looking glass of whose nature the person of the Holy Prophet is imaged forth. The representative so raised shows the excellences of the Holy Prophet whom he follows and establishes the charge against his opponents by truth, by showing the reality and by exposing them; by truth, because He shows that the prophet whom they rejected was a true prophet, and shows the heavenly signs for his truth; by showing the reality, because he solves all difficulties in the comprehension of the religion of the prophet, and removes all doubts that are entertained with respect to it, and refutes all objections that are urged against it and by exposing them, because He rends asunder all the veils under which they hide themselves and lays bare before the world their folly in not comprehending nice points of religious truths, their love of remissness, ignorance and darkness, and their being forsaken by God and cut off from communion with Him. The perfect man who



is raised for this purpose is a recipient of Divine revelation, and he is purified and blessed and has his prayers accepted by God. He shows with clearness that God exists and that He is powerful over all, sees, hears and knows every thing, and regulates affairs according to His will, that prayers are in fact accepted and have an efficacy, and that the men of God actually show heavenly signs. He is not only himself rich in Divine knowledge, but his appearance brings about a life in the faith of the people. The heavenly signs which were rejected and scoffed at by people as opposed to the laws of nature and contrary to reason, or, if treated with respect, were considered at the most to be stories, are not only accepted as truths at his appearance because of their renewal at his hands, but the absurdity of the former position is also fully realized. It is then clearly seen and even regretted that what was taken to be wisdom was really folly, and that which was considered to be knowledge of the laws of nature was in fact ignorance. In short, the holy one raised by God falls like a flame upon the world and gives a light to every one according to his capacity. He is at first tried, thrown into afflictions, persecuted on all sides, abused and injured by all possible means, and every attempt is made to bring him to disgrace, but as he has with him the argument of truth and Divine assistance, he overcomes all difficulties and vanquishes his enemies, and the rays of the light of his truth are made to pierce into the world by a powerful hand. When Almighty God sees that the earth has rejected him, He commands the holy host of heaven to bear testimony to his truth. Therefore a clear and bright testimony comes down for his sake from heaven in the form of extraordinary heavenly signs, acceptance of prayer and the disclosure through him of deep religious truths and verities. This heavenly testimony gives sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and the power of speech to the dumb. There are many who are drawn at that time to the truth; but blessed are they who accept him previously, for they on account of their strength of faith are granted the dignity of the *siddiqs* (the truthful servants of God). But this is the Grace of God, and He bestows it upon whom He wills.

To complete the argument that Islam is a living religion, I deem it my bounden duty to state further that finding the world involved in utter darkness and plunged in the depth of ignorance, remissness, unbelief and *shirk*, and finding faith, sincerity and righte-

ousness vanishing away, Almighty God has raised me to re-establish in the world the purity of doctrine and practice, and the purity of morals and faith, and to save Islam from the hostile attacks of those who with the weapons of a false philosophy and science, lawlessness, atheism, etc., are trying to damage this impregnable rock. It was exactly the time when Islam stood in need of heavenly assistance, and this Almighty God has vouchsafed by raising me. The general prevalence of error, which is to be witnessed in this age, has taken place in fulfilment of the prophecies relating to the appearance of the anti-Christ, as foretold by the prophets of God. The basis of these errors has been laid by Christianity, which inculcates the most fatal error. It was, therefore, necessary that the revivalist or representative of the Holy Prophet appearing at the commencement of this century, should have come after the name of Christ, for the foundation of the present evil has been laid by the followers of Christ. It has been disclosed to me in a revelation that the soul of Jesus being informed of the poison with which Christianity affects the spiritual atmosphere, came into motion for a spiritual re-advent into the world. Having thus come into motion, and finding his own people spreading destruction in the world, the soul of Jesus required that one resembling him in all points and having the same spirit and character should appear as his representative upon earth, there being such a spiritual likeness between the two that they may be considered as one. So, according to the promise which Almighty God had already made, he raised one resembling Jesus and in him was manifested the resolution, character and spirituality of Jesus. He and the Messiah were so closely united as to be considered as being of the same essence. The attractions of Jesus made his heart their habitation and fulfilled their requirement through him. In this sense, therefore, his personality was considered as the personality of Christ himself, for the resolution of Christ was manifested in him and this manifestation was metaphorically expressed in spiritual language as the second advent of Christ. It is a deep spiritual law that the resolution of some one of the perfect ones who have passed away, is imaged in some living perfect man, and the unity of their ideas makes the connection so strong that the appearance of the latter is looked upon by the former as his own appearance. The person whose soul is thus united with the soul of a past saint becomes, as it were, an instrument for the manifestation of the will of

the latter, and the will of the one is made by Almighty God identical with the will of the other. It short, it is a Divine law that the former prophets re-appear in the world in this manner. The second advent of Elias in the person of John took place according to this law; and if this law is not recognised, the Messiahship of Jesus would be seriously in question.

## Restoring the Dead to Life:

### JESUS & THE HOLY PROPHET COMPARED.

It is an unchangeable Divine law that when the world is dead in sin and disobedience and unbelief, Almighty God raises a prophet to renew faith and to restore those to life who are spiritually dead. Accordingly we find in the current Gospels certain words attributed to Jesus in which he claims to have come to give life to the dead; while the Holy Quran teems with verses in which it is stated that the Holy Prophet was raised only to give spiritual life to the dead, and cites it further as an argument for the truth of the Holy Prophet, that he was sent at a time when the whole world was dead, and was not called back until he was perfectly successful in having breathed life into his followers.

Jesus is reported to have said: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live." (John 11, 25). In other words, the assertion is here attributed to Jesus, that those who believed in him would be delivered from the death of sin, remissness and unbelief and granted the spiritual life of obedience to God. The Christians think that no man besides Jesus ever made such a claim, and even if any one had put forward such claim, it would have been impossible for him to prove the truth of such an assertion. They, therefore, not only think that this assertion was actually made by Jesus, but also consider that he proved this to be true. As a matter of fact, both these points are devoid of proof, whereas their clearest proof is afforded in the life of our Holy Prophet. As for the first point that Jesus actually spoke these words, there is no authority except the Gospels, and they are no authority on the point. It is not known by whom they were written, nor how long after the

utterance of the words alleged to have been spoken by Jesus. Their titles show that they were not written by Matthew, Mark, Luke or John but by other men, nobody knows who they were, on the alleged authority of words uttered by the evangelists whose names they bear, because every Gospel is introduced to us as Gospel "according to" so and so. The chain of reporters through whom these words were transmitted to the writers is not given, and we are unable to say how far the Gospels contain the element of ancient tradition, right or wrong, and what has been supplied by the writers' brains. Fact and fiction therefore remain inseparably mixed in the Gospels, and it is absurd to offer them as certain proof of what Jesus said or did.

The second point is, whether Jesus actually breathed a spiritual life into his followers. For this we have to see the effect of Jesus' teaching, firstly upon his immediate followers, and secondly upon the later generations. The effect of his teaching upon his apostles was so weak that it could not raise them above low and worldly ideas. When he was arrested, they showed such cowardice, scepticism and faithlessness as has been deplored and condemned as disgraceful by all learned men. With these facts before us, is it not the very reverse of truth to say that Jesus was the spiritual resurrection, and that through him the spiritually dead were restored to life? The unworthy example of the apostles of Jesus in showing a want of perseverance, scepticism in faith and even backsliding, must have cast an unwholesome influence on the succeeding generations of Christianity; for every person who is gifted with ordinary common sense can easily understand that if the miracles and wonders, which are recorded in the Gospels, had actually been performed by Jesus, his apostles, who had accepted him as the Messiah, would not have been guilty of such shameful conduct, that one of them should have treacherously betrayed him into the hands of the enemy for a few pieces of silver, another cursed him in his face, and the rest deserted him when he was arrested. Such disgraceful deeds are hated by men into whose hearts faith has entered and who have been granted a new life. Their faithfulness to one whom they know to be their guide, their master and their Lord, is not shaken by the severest trials. Not only is this deed of faithlessness and treachery a proof that Jesus could not breathe a life into his apostles, but his own words recorded in the Gospels support the same

conclusion. It is strange to find that men who passed their days and nights with Jesus, who are said to have been eye-witnesses to his miracles, and who were chosen by him to do mighty deeds, were spiritually so weak and empty-handed that Jesus himself was obliged to call the chief of them "Satan" and "little of faith," and generally he told them that they had not so much of faith as a mustard-seed. Such was the condition of the apostles during the life of Jesus, a faith in whom is asserted to have the effect of bringing eternal life to the spiritually dead. When we cast a glance at the later generations, a ghastly sight meets our eyes. There is hardly any one in the ranks of Christianity who can be said to have risen from the grave of sensual desires and to have been animated by a new spiritual life. Nay, we see them buried in the narrow and dark graves of desires, and spiritually rotten to the core. The wind of spiritual life has never blown upon them, and they do not know who their God is, and how great His majesty, might and power are, and how He grants a new life to the pure in heart, and approaching them makes their hearts His holy seat. They have taken a weak human being for God, and are pleased with the idea—it should have hardly given them any pleasure so abhorrent it is,—of loading him with the sins which others do. Remissness, sin, *shirk* (setting up deities with God) and unbelief are the four ways to spiritual death and all four kinds may be witnessed in Christianity. The Christians are dead in remissness, because their whole attention is given to the things of this world and to the pleasures of eating, drinking and living comfortably, and they do not care, or try in the least, to remove the veil which hides the face of the Almighty from them. Their death in sin is sufficiently testified by the violation of the laws of chastity that prevails in most Christian countries. As to death in *shirk*, nothing is more clear. They have deified a weak mortal and forgotten the true and living God. Their death in unbelief is apparent from their denial of the Holy Prophet of God. All this goes a long way to show that it is the height of absurdity to think that Jesus was the resurrection in raising the spiritually by dead to life, and the assertion is not supported by the slightest argument.

We shall now consider the restoration to life effected by our Holy Prophet. The Holy Quran from beginning to end bears witness

to the fact that the man of perfect attributes, whose holy name is Muhammad, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, was raised at a time when the whole world was dead and all continents and islands were a hot bed of corruption. The world was in a perfectly rotten state when the Holy Prophet was raised by God and he gave new life to the world, and taught afresh the doctrine of Unity which had almost been blotted out from the face of the earth. Leaving aside for the present the consideration that the claim set up for Jesus is not borne out by a single fact or the slightest testimony, we find that the claim of the Holy Quran for the Holy Prophet as having been raised to give life to the dead, is contained in far more majestic words and shines out like the meridian sun on account of the bright proofs which attend it. Thus the Holy Quran says with regard to him *اذ انا دعانا كما دعاكم لما يحييكم* "And this Our Prophet invites you so that he may give you life." Here those who are invited by the Holy Prophet are spoken of as dead because of their being plunged in the depths of sin and unbelief, and the Prophet is expressly spoken of as having been raised to restore them to life which they could not otherwise obtain. Again, the Holy Quran repeatedly says that the whole world was dead and that God restored it to life by sending His Apostle, as in the verse *اعلموا ان الله يحيي الارض بعد موتها* "Know it that the earth was dead and God is restoring it to life after its death." Exactly to the same purport is the tradition in which the Holy Prophet says: *انا انا لعاشر الذي يحيي* "I am the restorer of the dead to life at whose feet the dead are raised." Again in the Holy Quran we have: *قال يا اعدائي الذين كفروا لا تتفخروا بهم ولا يتفخروا بكم من ربنا ان الله يغفر الذنوب جميعا* "Say, O my servants who have transgressed upon your souls, do not despair of the grace of God, for Almighty God will forgive all your sins (and grant you a new life which is free from sins)." It should also be noted in this verse that instead of saying: *قل يا اعدائي للذنوب* "Say: O servants of God," Almighty God adopts the form *قل يا اعدائي* "Say: O my servants." The revelation of this verse gave the glad tidings of countless blessings of the Divine Being, and of a second and pure life to be granted through the Holy Prophet to those who on account of their being soaked in sins were spiritually dead. In order to state that the new life and the blessings could not be granted otherwise than by following

the Holy Prophet and without his intercession, the form of invocation "يا عبادى" "O my servants" has been adopted, indicating clearly that whoever was desirous of being raised from the dead and granted the new life which was a spiritual life, should so completely lose himself in the obedience and love of the Holy Prophet as to deserve to be called a servant of the Prophet and he would then, being delivered from the death in sins, be restored to life. Almighty God has, moreover, given in this verse an example of His countless blessings which He grants to His faithful servants. By commanding the Holy Prophet to address people as his servants, He has indicated the high dignity which the Prophet attained by complete obedience to Him so that what was of God became his and the person who desired salvation and spiritual life was required to act in complete obedience to the Holy Prophet. The same purport is expressed in different words in another verse of the Holy Quran, which runs thus : *قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فا تبعونى يحببكم* "Say, if you love God then follow me and God will love you and forgive your sins." In this verse it is indicated that by complete obedience to the Holy Prophet a person becomes the beloved of God and is delivered from the bondage of sin. Both verses bear the same signification, for perfect obedience requires that a person should do nothing except under the commandment of him whom he obeys and thus he stands to him in the relation of an obedient servant to a master.

All the verses quoted above point to but one conclusion, *viz.*, that people who follow and obey the Holy Prophet with their whole heart and soul and become his servants, are granted the light of faith and the love of God which frees them from all besides God. They are freed from sins and granted in this very world a new and pure life after being taken out from the dark and narrow graves of sensual passions and carnal desires. It is to indicate the same purpose that the Holy Quran says with regard to the companions of the Holy Prophet: *وايدهم بروح منه* "And God assisted them with the Holy Spirit from Him." The assistance of the Holy Spirit is that it gives a new life to the heart, frees a man from the subjection to spiritual death and grants purified powers, purified senses and a pure knowledge. It takes a man onward in his journey by means of a certain knowledge and conclusive arguments until it

makes him attain the nearness of God. For, none attains to the nearness of God except the man who knows with certainty that God exists, that His power, His mercy, His punishment and His justice are all true, that He is the source of all blessings, the fountain-head from which the system of the universe springs up and the final cause to which every cause and effect may be traced, and that He works according to His own will and holds the kingdom of heaven and earth in His hands. Now the conclusive and certain knowledge of all these things upon which salvation depends, cannot be attained except a man is granted the life which is the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Quran claims in repeated and forcible words that this spiritual life is obtained only by following the Holy Prophet, and that all those who do not submit to the obedience of the Prophet are dead men and devoid of the life of the Spirit. By spiritual life it is meant that the thinking and working faculties of a man receive a new life and new energy from the Holy Spirit. It further appears from the Holy Quran that there are six hundred commandments which Almighty God wishes a man to observe. The six hundred wings of the Archangel Gabriel may therefore be considered as requiring from man obedience to the six hundred Divine commandments in order to make him a perfect man. The man who walks in obedience to the six hundred commandments is completely covered by the six hundred wings of Gabriel and becoming a perfect man obtains a new birth which is a birth of perfection and a new life which is a life of perfection. The new-born spiritual children who obtain a new life through the Holy Spirit by following the Holy Prophet, are in all characteristics of the new life far above the spiritual children who obtained the new life by following the former prophets. It is to this that the following verse of the Holy Quran speaking of Muslims refers: *كفتم خيرا مة اخرجت لنا س* "You are the most excellent of all nations raised for the regeneration of people." In fact, the characteristic excellences of the Holy Quran are evidence of the superior capacity and endowments of the followers of the holy book. For, the revelation which Almighty God vouchsafes to a people is in accordance with the aptitude of the people who are required to follow it. Take the Gospel teachings revealed to Jesus, for instance. The critics are all agreed that it is not



a perfect teaching, for it lays stress on one side of human nature utterly ignoring the other. This is not, however, the defect of the Divine revelation, but the fact is due to the inaptitude for a more perfect teaching of the people for whom it was meant. The progress of man has been gradual and there were men in the early ages comparatively weak-headed, feeble-minded, dull-brained, short-witted, poor-spirited, low-minded, credulous and avaricious, weak of heart as well as brain. But by the time that our Holy Prophet was raised, human understanding and intelligence had gradually attained a maturity and in its natural endowments the world was wholly transformed. The revelation of a perfect teaching was therefore called forth by the improved capacity of the age in which the Holy Quran was revealed and of the later age for which it was meant.

What was practically done by the Holy Prophet? One glance at the condition of Arabia before and after Islam is sufficient to answer this question. A nation of fetish worshippers, a people who savagely bowed before idols and considered images of stone invested with Divine power and dominion over the world, who weltered in the most horrible sins and gloried in the basest iniquities, who were characterized by base and beastly qualities that are a disgrace to human nature and who drank wine like water, were completely transformed within the course of a few years by the holy magnetism of one man. They not only recognised their God with a clear and certain knowledge but also became the staunchest supporters and the most zealous preachers of the Unity of God and laid down their lives for its sake. Their evil dispositions were changed for virtuous inclinations. Their nocturnal orgies gave place to heart-felt prayers. They hated every evil and loved every good and cut asunder all connections to unite with God. It seemed as if a flood of light had suddenly lightened the Arabian peninsula and dispelled every trace of darkness. Let any one consider for a moment what the people of Arabia were before the appearance of the Holy Prophet, and what they became by following in his footsteps, how they rose from the depths of degradation to the highest point of spiritual perfection, how savages were transformed within a few years into the most civilised people of the world, how they sealed the sincerity and truth of their faith with their blood, how they showed perseverance and

firmness of faith by sacrificing their property, honor, glory and their very lives, and by forsaking every comfort, their homes and their dearest friends only for the sake and love of God and in His cause—let him ponder over all this and he will see a most mighty and stupendous miracle performed in this wonderful transformation and in the perseverance, faithfulness and sacrifice shown and made by the companions of the Holy Prophet. His holy attraction acted so powerfully upon them that they were completely lost in the love of God and being totally annihilated in Him did wonderful deeds of sincerity and righteousness. The same purity which was manifested in their deeds was also manifested in their beliefs. They did not entertain the blasphemous idea of making a man God or of considering God as standing in need of children. Theirs was a pure monotheistic faith which recognised the true and living God, the Glorious, the Unchanging, the Living, the Sustainer, the Unbegetting and Unbegot, Pure and free from birth and death. Such was the teaching given to them by the Holy Prophet. These people had in fact come out of the pit of death and taken their stand on the lofty minaret of pure life. Every one of them had been animated with a new life and in their faith they shone like bright stars.

Indeed there was only one perfect man who in a most complete and perfect manner brought about a marvellous spiritual awakening and a wonderful resurrection of the dead. He gave life to the dead of thousands of years, and re-animated rotten bones. By his appearance the graves were opened and life was breathed into old and decayed bones. His advent has proved beyond doubt that he is the only spiritual resurrection, the only raiser of the dead to life, at whose feet a world was brought back to life. It was for this reason that he said : *انا ارحم الراحمين* "I am the raiser of the dead to life at whose feet the people are raised to spiritual life." This spiritual resurrection brought about by the Holy Prophet was not limited to the companions, but the powerful and all-knowing Lord who had raised that announcer of glad tidings and warner for every people, every age and every country, made the blessings continuous which were to be granted to those who walked in his footsteps, and did not limit them to one age or one generation or one people. He gave a promise that the light and the Holy Spirit which had been granted

to the blessed companions of the Holy Prophet would also be granted to the future generations of his faithful followers. The Holy Quran says : *هو الذي بعث في الامم رسولا منهم يتلوا عليهم آياته ويزكيهم ويعلمهم الكتاب والحكمة وازيان ما كانوا يعملون* "The merciful God has sent among the ignorant people of Arabia a Prophet from among themselves who rehearses His signs to them and purifies them and teaches them the Book and wisdom, though they were aforesaid in manifest error. The same Prophet shall also teach others who (having acquired the same conditions as the companions) will be (regarded as) from among them but who have not yet overtaken them, and He is the Mighty, the Wise." Now this verse tells us in plain words that Almighty God raised the Holy Prophet not only to teach the Arabs, his companions, but also to teach another people who were separated from the companions by a great distance of time and who are called in the verse *الآخرين* i.e., coming last or in the latter ages. Since the Holy Prophet is stated to be the spiritual teacher of other people who were not to come in his lifetime, it is plain that they were to come at a time when external means of receiving the blessings of Islam would be cut off and errors and innovations would find their way into the religion of Islam. Then will Almighty God raise one who would be instructed in Divine truths and made spiritually perfect by the spiritual training of the Holy Prophet himself. Through him He would then make a people who would spiritually have a strong resemblance to the companions of the Holy Prophet, for the teacher of the companions would also be their teacher, and the blessings of the Holy Prophet would flow to them in abundance. They would resemble the companions because of their attainment of the same excellences and their getting similar opportunities to show their faithfulness in Divine cause. They would be considered as faithful as the companions because of their perseverance when they would be alone and helpless and deserted by all like the early Muslims. The age in which they would appear would be a time of great afflictions and tribulations and of the prevalence of iniquities. The righteous at that time would therefore have to face the same difficulties as the companions of the Holy Prophet had to face, and on showing the same perseverance they would be considered as from amongst the companions. The Prophet has spoken of three different periods, viz., his

own time, the time of the *al-kharīn* or those coming last, *i. e.*, the Promised Messiah and his followers, and the time between these two, which on account of the height of the temporal power of Islam was a time of spiritual decay, while the other two are designated as times of spiritual awakening.

To recapitulate, even if it be admitted for the sake of argument that Jesus claimed to be the resurrection and life, his mere assertion has no value. If one man performed a noble deed without making an assertion that he was going to do it, he would be far better than the other who makes an assertion but fails to perform the thing. The Gospels bear testimony that the claim of Jesus to be the resurrection and life is not supported even by the condition of the apostles, to say nothing of those who came after them. He had to leave even the chosen twelve in the graves of worldly desires and could not breathe into them true spiritual life. When we compare the assertion of Jesus with that made in the Holy Quran concerning the Holy Prophet, we witness a difference as great as that between darkness and light. The assertion of Jesus is involved in complete darkness and there is not a single ray of light to make its truth clear. But the assertion of the Holy Quran shines forth in full effulgence like the mid-day sun. Moreover, the clearest proof of the latter assertion is afforded by the fact that the blessings of the Holy Prophet are granted in all ages to his true followers. Any one who walks even now like a servant in his footsteps is raised from the grave and granted a spiritual life. The signs of this life are clearly manifested, and heavenly assistance, heavenly blessings and the assistance of the Holy Spirit are granted to him. He stands unique in the world and Almighty God speaks to him, reveals to him His hidden secrets, discloses to him the treasures of truth and knowledge, manifests in him the shining signs of His love and favors, sends His assistance to him and imparts to him His blessings and makes him the manifestation and looking-glass of His Divinity. His tongue utters words of wisdom, springs of truth flow from his heart, deep secrets are revealed to him and Almighty God reveals Himself to him in all His Glory and comes near to him. He is far above all and vanquishes his opponents in the acceptance of his prayers, in having access to the hidden treasures of knowledge, in the disclosure of deep secrets and in being the recipient

of heavenly blessings and assistance. Such a one has been raised by God in Islam in this age and he is present among us. He has invited his opponents repeatedly to cope with him in these assertions if they believe that spiritual life can be obtained otherwise than by following the Holy Prophet, or to witness silently like seekers after truth the blessings and signs of Islam as manifested through him. By their silence his opponents have sealed the truth of his claims.

There is no validity in the objection that even among the Muslims there are men who are deeply steeped in sins, and who, affected with spiritual diseases, still lie in their graves. If any one fastens upon himself the doors of his house and likes to sit in a dark corner, it is not the fault of the sun that sunlight does not penetrate to him. Besides this, those who are within the circle of Islam firmly believe in the Unity of God notwithstanding the intervention of so many veils which keep them back from obtaining a spiritual life. They do not deify a man, and have on account of the blessings of unity a torch of light burning within them, feeble though it be, and have still in them a certain warmth of life. Though they are in a dangerous condition, yet they are not actually dead. Any one who puts forward these feeble objections and turns away his face from the sure and certain proof which is offered, gives proof of his own ignorance and prejudice. Where there is a rose there must also be thorns, but what our opponents offer is nothing but a heap of thorns in which there is no rose. To insist in spite of these proofs that Jesus was the spiritual resurrection and that the Christians have been granted a life through him, is sheer absurdity. There is not the faintest proof that the life of Jesus is a type of resurrection and not a single Christian has obtained life through him. The Christians are in the worst state of death and they are drowned in *shirk*. They have neither the spirit of faith, nor its blessings. Nay, they do not profess even the lowest form of Unity which consists in not setting up creatures with God, and they worship a weak human being like themselves. There are three grades in the recognition of the Unity of God, the lowest of which is to abstain from worshipping human beings, idols, fire or any heavenly body or any thing else besides God. The second grade in the recognition of the doctrine of Unity is not to place too great a confidence in one's plans or consider them as absolutely effective in bringing about a certain

result. The unitarian trusts not the means or causes but the Appointer of means and the Causer of causes. The highest stage of the recognition of the Unity of God can be attained only when the perfect manifestations of Divine glory being witnessed, a person regards every thing besides God as naught and considers his own existence as nothing, so that he sees annihilation in all things except the person of the Divine Being. True spiritual life consists in the attainment of these three stages of unity. Any one can now see that eternal fountains of spiritual life have been made to flow by the advent of the Holy Prophet. The Muslims are the people who though not called prophets are like prophets spoken to by God, and though not termed apostles, the brilliant signs of God are manifested at their hands like apostles. The rivers of spiritual life flow within them and no one can cope with them in these blessings.

---

## Upson and A. M. on Sinlessness.

The question of "Sinlessness of Prophets" we had dealt with exhaustively in diverse issues of this paper, but no amount of reasoning seems to be sufficient to silence the Christian controversialists. We have already replied, in the February number, to Mr. Monro's objections regarding Adam's eating of the forbidden fruit, and now we have before us Mr. Upson on Adam and David, and a certain Mr. A. M. upon the general principles of sinlessness and the sinlessness of Adam in particular. Mr. Upson does not seem to have read our articles in original, otherwise he would not have made the rash statement that "the Mirza of Qadian has had the presumption to state that the only reliable authorities on the subject are Imam Razi, the writer of the great Tafsir, and the editor of Lisan-ul Arb, an Arabic Lexicon in ten (*sic*) volumes." However, since Mr. Upson is a Christian missionary, it should not be at all surprising if he has actually written a refutation without reading the articles which he has tried to refute. We (not the Mirza Sahib, for he is not the writer of those articles) plainly stated that we would take only the Holy Quran as an authority, as no Muslim ever took the commentaries to be the word of God, and Razi had to be quoted to show that reliable commentators did not uphold the stories related by Christian

controversialists, while some lexicon had to be referred to to explain the meaning of certain words, and we quoted Lisan-ul Arb without rejecting "other equally useful writers."

A. M. remarks with characteristic missionary presumption in the beginning of his book that with the exception of Jesus the Christians have always considered all saints and prophets to be sinful, while they have all agreed in holding Jesus Christ as sinless. Further on, he quotes from Razi to show that certain sects of Islam and some Muslim writers have denied the sinlessness of the prophets and these he, with his Christian charity, terms as *مصنفين* i. e., critics who have searched for the truth. But these "critics" do not make Jesus an exception, and consider him as much a sinner as any other prophet, and therefore their views are as little favorable to the position of A. M. as to ours, because he devotes one chapter of his book to prove the sinlessness of Jesus according to the Holy Quran. With this, however, we are not concerned at present. We never denied—nay, we plainly stated in the very commencement of our article "Monro on Sinlessness"—that the doctrine of sinlessness had been called into question in some quarters but still it remained the firm belief of an overwhelming majority of the Muslim world from the earliest times. But if some men and sects from among the Muslims have differed on the principle of the sinlessness of prophets (including Jesus), Christianity has not been lacking in sects and individuals who have either denied the sinlessness of Jesus, or regarded other prophets and good men to be equally sinless with him. A. M. wishes to hide this fact (because he is justified by the blood of Jesus), and therefore, when stating the Christian belief with regard to sinlessness, he puts it in words which lead to the inference that all the Christian sects have always admitted the sinlessness of Jesus and the sinfulness of other prophets. We must therefore contradict this misstatement. The Basilidean school of Christianity rejected the doctrine of sinlessness of Jesus and did not consider him free from sins. Abelard considered that Jesus had the real defects of human weakness whatever they were. The Ebionites believed that there was nothing that distinguished the author of Christianity from Moses and the prophets and from the founders of other religions. This was not a small sect of heretics,

but from the earliest times it claimed a vast majority of Jewish Christians as its members, and held predominance for a long time. The Pelagians denied the "hereditary corruption" of human nature and Pelagius taught not only that man enters into the world in purity and that evil is only an accident, but also that there have been many men in the world who lived, to the end of their lives, in perfect holiness, and even names Abel, Isaac and Jacob as examples of sinless men in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Add to these the fact that the Roman Catholic Church which was the predominant religion for many centuries, and to which almost half the Christian world still adheres, teaches the immaculacy of Mary along with that of Jesus. According to this Church Mary's conception was immaculate, and she was free from original as well as actual sins like Jesus Christ himself. The Roman Church further teaches the doctrine of the infallibility of popes as the successors of Peter, who is considered by some of them even as a mediator, and this notwithstanding the fact that Jesus called him Satan, though he bore testimony to his Messiahship. Again, there are the Unitarians who make the nearest approach to original Christianity, and they teach that Jesus rose by degrees "out of temptation and error" to purity, and that "all true men are Messiahs in fulfilling the best hopes of humanity, and mediators in assisting its strivings towards perfection." (Rise and Development of Deity of Christ). Let A. M. reflect how small in comparison with these is the number of Muslims differing on the doctrine of sinlessness of the prophets.

A. M. may pronounce all such sects to be heretical, and therefore we will now produce the testimony of a man whom he cannot condemn as such. Paul not only sets up a rival to Jesus, but mentions one who is far greater than he. In Heb. vi: 20, he states that Jesus is made a priest after the order of Melchisedec. And then goes on to say: "For this Melchisedec, King of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is, king of peace; without father,



without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." (Heb. vii : 1--3). Here is a man far above Jesus himself. Jesus must have inherited some taint of sinfulness from his mother but Melchisedec had neither father nor mother, and was therefore the "king of righteousness" and the "king of peace." He is not even subject to death and lives for ever, and therefore original or actual sin cannot be attributed to him, though Jesus did taste of death. Moreover, Jesus is made a priest after the similitude of Melchisedec. Again, consider the testimony of Luke as to the sinlessness of Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth: "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." (Luke i: 6). This verse gives also the lie to the Christians who say that no man has been given power to fulfil all the commandments of God, and that no one besides Jesus is blameless. And consider further the words in which the son of these two righteous parents has been spoken of by the same writer: "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink, and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God." (Luke i: 15, 16). Mark that Jesus was also one of the men whom John turned to the Lord their God. Now Jesus received the Holy Ghost at the age of 30, and his sinlessness can therefore, if at all, be presumed from that time; but John was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, and therefore he must be regarded, by every true Christian, as sinless from his birth. Quite contrary to this statement of the Gospels is the unwarranted assertion of A. M. that Jesus was a "born prophet." He could not be a prophet before he received the Holy Ghost, and the title of "born prophet" is applicable to Jesus' master and spiritual guide, John the Baptist. Mark also bears testimony to the sinlessness of John, for he says: "For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just and a holy man." (Mark vi : 20). This is a very plain description of the sinlessness of John, and there is not a single verse in the four Gospels from which the contrary conclusion can be drawn. Nay, the fact noted by the Gospels that John baptised and thus blessed others including Jesus, and that he himself did not stand in need of being

baptised, shows conclusively that he excelled all the men of his time including Jesus, and possessed a higher degree of sinlessness. These conclusions are based on the evidence of the Gospels. The above quotation, by the by, also gives a concrete example of sinfulness of which it declares the Baptist to be free. If abstinence from wine drinking was a virtue in John, the indulgence of Jesus in drinking was surely a sin; and if John deserves credit for his habits of temperance, Jesus must be blamed for his yielding to the temptations of wine. Thus while the words of Luke testify to the sinlessness of John, they indirectly impute sinfulness to Jesus inasmuch as he not only himself drank wine but also encouraged wine-drinking by setting an example to his followers.

Such is the testimony of Paul and the evangelists ; but in spite of this A. M. makes the bold assertion that all men besides Jesus of Nazareth have always been considered sinful by all Christians. Nay he makes the assertion that even the Jews share these views; for he says: "As the *Ahl-i-kitab* have denied, on the basis of their heavenly books, the doctrine of the sinlessness of prophets in general, so there have been among the Muslims....." Now the term '*Ahl-i-kitab*' includes both Jews and Christians. Even if the term has been used by the writer in a limited sense, it is necessary for us to consider the Jewish doctrine which is the original one, for the Christians were obliged to make innovations to uphold the Divinity of Jesus, and for this reason we find them contradicted in their own Scriptures. Having considered therefore the testimony of the majority of Christians and their Scriptures, we will now see what was the Jewish belief. It should be noted that the Jews expected a Messiah like the prophets that had gone before. He was to come as a servant of the law of Moses, and therefore he could not be considered as greater than the great Lawgiver. His inferiority to Moses, according to the Jewish conception, is also evident from the fact that he, like David, was only expected to deliver them from foreign yoke, though Jesus failed to fulfil even this object, whereas Moses was both a lawgiver and a deliverer. Now since it is asserted by the Christians that the Messianic prophecies declare the Messiah to be sinless, it follows, as a natural conclusion, that the Jews considered their prophets to be sinless. This conclusion is support-

ed by the evidence of the early Christians who adhered to the true, the Jewish, conception of the Messiah, and of the later sects founded on their views, as will appear from the references already given. It is further clear that the Jews could not conceive for a moment the idea that Abraham and Moses and their other prophets had passed away in sinfulness, and that their sins would only be taken away by the Messiah, who was coming after them. Nay, it is not until long after the time of Moses, that the hope of a Messiah is clearly given, and then too he is predicted as a deliverer of the Israelites from foreign yoke. No sensible person can, for a moment, entertain the idea that Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and so many other prophets, who never prophesied of the advent of Messiah and never taught to their people that God would come down from heaven in the form of a man, ever thought of being saved by the blood of a crucified man. They delivered the message of God to their people and communicated to them the Divine commandments, and taught plainly that they could obtain salvation and freedom from sin only by following the Divine injunctions and the precepts of the law, in letter as well as in spirit, and by walking in the path of righteousness pointed out to them by God. Not a single passage can be pointed out in the books of the prophets, in which they should have told their people that though they might fulfil all the ordinances of the law and walk in perfect obedience to the Divine commandments, yet one part of their sins would be reserved for the man Jesus, and that they should despair of attaining to true purity of life until that man should appear. Nor did the prophets ever disclose that it was not within the power of man to fulfil the Divine commandments. On the other hand, in Num. 15 : 40, Almighty God says to the Israelites that "ye may remember and do all my commandments and be holy unto God," thus clearly indicating that they could do all the commandments and attain to holiness. If therefore the prophets taught, as they actually did, that perfect purity of life could be attained to by following the Divine commandments revealed to them, there is no room for the unique sinlessness of Jesus to take away the sins of the world which could not be taken away by the teachings of the prophets. If the prophets knew that the utmost they could do was to make men only half-angels and half-devils, they ought to have so told the

people. Nor should Almighty God in such a case have brought any punishment or disgrace upon those who rejected the prophets or led their lives in sins and granted assistance to those who obeyed Him, for the difference was but a nominal one between the believers and the unbelievers.

There is another view of the question. In John ix : 16, the Jews are reported to have said : " How can a man that is a sinner do such deeds. " And further on, in the course of the same controversy, it is stated : " Now we know that God heareth not sinners : but if any man is a worshipper of God, and doth His will, him He heareth (John ix : 31). " These verses give us a clear conception of the Jewish belief. No sinner can perform a miracle, nor does Almighty God hear a man unless he " doth His will. " Had the Jews regarded their prophets as sinners, they could not have attributed miracles to them whereas the books of the Old Testament are full of the most wonderful miracles performed by the prophets of God. Even the Christians are bound by this conclusion, for the man spoken of in John ix accepted the claim of Jesus on the ground that he performed miracles, and that miracles could not be performed by one who was a sinner. If he erred in accepting the claims of Jesus on this ground, others who accepted him might also have erred in a similar manner, and therefore the followers of Jesus on this supposition were all misled. Nor can it be said that the prophets need not be sinless, on the ground that the performance of miracles can also be effected by false prophets and by the assistance of the Devil; for the prophets whose miracles are recorded in the Bible were not false prophets, and they did not work miracles by the insinuations of the Devil. This fact is admitted both by the Jews and the Christians.

Besides this, the words and phrases from which the sinlessness of Jesus is inferred are also applied to other prophets in the Bible, and therefore either Jesus is not sinless or the others are equally sinless with him. Of Noah it is said : " Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. " (Gen. vi : 9.) To Abraham the Lord said : " Walk before me, and be thou perfect. " (Gen. xvii : 1). To Moses he said : " Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. " (Deut. xviii. 13). And again : " Now the man Moses was very meek " ( Num. xii : 3). Again, David thus speaks of

the holy ones of God: "Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord. Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek Him with the whole heart. They also do no iniquity: they walk in His ways." (Ps. cxix: 1—3.) And again, "The mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom, and his tongue talketh of judgment. The law of his God is in his heart: none of his steps shall slide." (Ps. xxxvii: 31). Again of Levi, Almighty God says: "The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity." (Mal. ii: 6.) The words of Luke regarding Zacharias that he walked "in *all* the commandments and ordinances of the law *blameless*;" and those of Mark concerning John that he was just and holy, have already been quoted. We can give many more quotations of a similar nature from the Bible, but those already given will suffice for the present. From all this it would be clear that the Bible regards others equally, if not more, righteous, just, holy, blameless, harmless and perfect, and that the doctrine of the sinlessness of Jesus, to the exclusion of all other prophets, is a mere innovation introduced to support the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus. A great majority of Christians still believes that there are others equally sinless with Jesus. Whether the other sinless person is Mary, "the mother of God," or any one else, is quite immaterial. If there is a single other sinless person, the uniqueness of Jesus is completely destroyed. The argument of the Roman Catholics is simple enough. If original sin is hereditary, Jesus must have inherited it through his mother, unless she is also sinless. Therefore the sinlessness of Mary is a necessary condition for the sinlessness of Jesus. But then the question would be raised that Mary should also have sinless parents, and so on to Adam. If one link is broken, the whole chain is useless. The difference between the absurdity of those who, while admitting the doctrine of hereditary sin, make Jesus alone sinless, and those who along with him consider Mary also to be sinless, is simply a difference of one degree, and either party may claim to be more reasonable, or rather less unreasonable, than the other, the one in having taken the sinlessness of Jesus one step further, and the other in having given up the absurdity one step sooner.

The next question discussed by A. M. is that relating to the nature of sinlessness. What the writer alleges to be our "definition

of sinlessness" was simply a statement as to the Divine source of the words and deeds of the prophets of God. If A. M. is unable to comprehend it and raises objection to it, it is no surprise at all. The height of spiritual perfection to which Islam carries a man, cannot be conceived by Christians, because their spiritual faculties have been deadened by the false belief in the god-head of a man and by the false trust in his blood. They are dead not only in actions but also in faith, and hence the light is extinguished within them. Verses abound in the Holy Quran in which it is stated that the prophets of God are completely lost in His love so that everything besides God, even their own existence, is naught to them. A death comes upon all their desires and passions and therefore it is not with their own desires and passions that they speak or act. This is the final stage of spiritual perfection, and in this state being perfectly filled with the Holy Ghost they act under its influence. Virtue becomes their very nature, and their will is so perfectly under Divine control and in submission to Divine will that all their words and deeds are in obedience to that will. The Holy Quran amply bears testimony to it. For instance, it says of the Holy Prophet: "وما ينطق عن الهوى ان هو الا وحى يوحى" And he doth not speak out of his desire, but it is a revelation that is revealed to him." And again "وما رميت اذ رميت ولكن الله رمى" "Whatever thou didst cast, thou didst not cast it but it was God Who really did it." In these verses the words and deeds of the Holy Prophet are plainly described as proceeding from a Divine and not a human source. The Holy Quran describes, in plain words, three different states. The lowest state is that of the predominance of physical passions and is called the *Nafs-i-Ammara* by the Holy Quran. The next higher to this is the state in which a man is able to do good deeds by overcoming the evil nature. There is a strife between the good and evil attractions in this state, but the good ones overcome the evil tendencies. The man stumbles sometimes, but soon recovers his position. But this is not the goal of spiritual progress. The man who is satisfied with this state and thinks this to be the end of his strivings is deceived. The light of the Holy Spirit has not yet taken entire possession of his heart, nor has the devil despaired of him. He is not yet in a state of perfect submission to Divine will, nor are his own desires and passions completely annihilated. Men

who are unaware of the true God, and who cannot therefore bow before His majesty and glory, as they ought to do, may be satisfied with this partial progress in morality; but true connection with God, which is the aim and end of true religion, is yet far from being obtained. When a man reaches this stage of spiritual perfection, the evil attractions are perfectly subdued, Divine lights illumine the whole nature of man, and the Holy Ghost is in constant company with him. His will works in perfect obedience to the Divine will, and therefore there is no harm in saying that he is, as it were, a tool in the hands of God, because he is perfectly under Divine control. It is a strange objection, but not so when it comes from the mouth of a Christian, that if a man's will acts thus in perfect obedience to Divine will, he cannot be said to act with a free will. It is a sad misunderstanding of the workings of the Holy Ghost, and a failure to realise the attainment of spiritual perfection. The blessed name of the holy religion of Islam conveys this whole idea in one word. Ah! that the Christians had been able to see the sad errors in which they are involved and the noble truths which the religion of the Holy Prophet teaches. How can they be said to have attained salvation when they are so ignorant of the real state of salvation, which a man attains to in this very world, as to put forward objections against it. For what is salvation but the state of perfect rest and tranquility of mind when a man is freed from sin and the power of evil, and enjoys perfect bliss and happiness in complete submission to the will of God. But the Christians are as ignorant of this as of the true God and there is no wonder they should object to it. They can of course readily understand how the sins of the whole world are taken away by one man, and how, notwithstanding their sins and their obedience to their passions, they have attained a salvation; but the true salvation which is freedom from sin and the power of evil, they cannot comprehend. As regards the challenge to quote the verses of the Holy Quran, instead of wasting our time by repeatedly quoting the same verses over, and over again, we may only point out that verses in support of what we stated are amply quoted even in the article upon *istighfar*, and A.M. while making a quotation from it intentionally omits the verse given in the original. (See the article on *istighfar* vol. II pp. 73-4.) It may be added here that the *istighfar* of the prophets is in perfect consonance with this state, for this state is in fact a state of constant recourse

to *istighfar* or Divine protection. When a person submits himself to the Divine will, he really considers himself too weak to do anything with his own power, and therefore throws himself at the Divine threshold to seek the protection and power of the all-powerful One. He is then fed from the source of all strength, and the might of God, not his own mortal power, then works in him.

We have now to consider the principle which should be observed in the interpretation of the words occurring in the Holy Quran. The principle stated by us in the July Number of the *Review* has been distorted by A. M. We never said that the Holy Quran never used a word in more than one sense. We said: "The Quran is to be read as a whole.....Regarding any particular word we shall adopt the interpretation which is in consonance with other parts, and which is supported by the Holy Quran itself." This is the principle taught by the Holy Quran. If the same word is used in two different places, and it is susceptible of different meanings, we shall have to determine its significance by various considerations. For instance, in the Holy Quran the following words are put in the mouth of Satan; لا غويينهم اجمعين (All of them will I surely lead astray save thy servants among them, the pure.) The word in Arabic for leading astray as used here is from the root غوى which means: He erred, or deviated from the right course or way, or from the way which was right, and was disappointed or failed of attaining his desire, etc. (See Lane.) And the causative form of the root, اغوى, is similarly explained to mean to cause him to err, etc. Now there cannot be the least doubt that لا غويينهم in the verse quoted above means only "I will lead them astray or cause them to err." But there is a particular class of people which is specified as not included among those whom Satan says he will mislead, and this is the class of the servants of God, the مخلصين which Lane explains to be "chosen by God and pure from pollution." It is therefore clear that the latter class cannot be made to err by Satan. In accordance with this conclusion is the response of Almighty God: هذا صراط على مستقيم ان عبدى ليس لك عليهم سلطان "This is the right way with me; verily over none of My servants shalt thou have power." It is therefore clearly established from the Holy Quran that there is a certain class of God's chosen servants free from pollution, over whom Satan has no power, and whom he cannot cause to



err or deviate from the right course. That the prophets are pre-eminently included in this class is too evident a fact to be discussed. Now comes another verse :.....*ان الله اصطفى آدم ونوحا*..... "Verily God has chosen Adam and Noah.....," from which it follows that Almighty God considers Adam as one of the chosen ones whom Satan cannot mislead. These conclusions are as clear as daylight, and the words can bear no other interpretation. This verse is therefore one of the *محكمات* and furnishes the guiding rule for explaining many other verses, regarding whose meaning a doubt may arise, *i. e.*, whether they bear one interpretation or the other. Now we have another verse *فغوى آدم ربنا فغوى* which seems to contradict the above conclusion, if the same meaning is to be attached to the word *غوى* as in the above verse. But the Holy Quran does not contradict itself, and the word *غوى* is capable of a different signification. That is what is meant by the Holy Quran explaining itself, *viz.*, that different parts of it must be in perfect agreement. One part must support another and not contradict it. If the meaning of *غوى* is taken to be the same in both places, it amounts to saying that the Holy Quran contradicts itself, and this is just the opposite of the principle we stated on the authority of the Holy Quran itself. The first verse settles undeniably that the word *غوى* cannot have the meaning of going astray or erring in the second verse. Almighty God could not have meant to say first that Satan could not lead astray His chosen servants, and then that Adam who was one of His chosen servants was led astray. Now the word *غوى* as explained by Lane also means "His life became evil to him, or he was disappointed," and therefore we may attach this signification to the word *غوى* in the second verse, remembering at the same time, that in this sense the word does not convey any idea of going astray, because such idea is opposed to the plain import of the first verse. Thus does one part of the Holy Quran throw light over another. This evidence as to the meaning of the word is so strong that the opinions of a thousand commentators cannot shake its validity. Since A. M.'s objections are based upon an admission of the truth of the Quran, therefore he is bound like a Muslim not to adopt any interpretation of a verse which should make one part of the Holy Quran contradict another.

The verse quoted above لا غوينهم اجمعين (الا عبداً كمنهم المخلصين) leads to other consequences of importance. It establishes conclusively that the chosen servants of God cannot be led away by Satan from the right course. Had there been no other verse in the Holy Quran establishing the sinlessness of the prophets, this one verse would have been sufficient to rebut all conclusions to the contrary. Whatever inference may be drawn from any words spoken of a prophet, it is certain that they cannot be made to bear a significance by which a sinful deed may be ascribed to any prophet of God. We cannot, in consonance with the teachings of the Quran, attach any significance to the words of the verse, except that a certain class of God's servants can never be led astray by Satan. It should also be noted that the words used by Almighty God to denote this class are عبداً (المخلصين) and عبداً كمنهم. We would first consider what عبد means. It is derived from the root عبد which means obeying with humility and submissiveness or rendering humble and submissive obedience. The idea of submissive obedience is therefore a necessary element in the meaning of the word عبد. عبداً كمنهم (the form used is plural, and this we say lest A. M. should infer that Jesus alone is meant here), therefore means the servants of God who obey Him with humility and submissiveness. Whether Satan had said so or not, the very form عبداً كمنهم tells us that Satan cannot have any power over them, because they obey God and cannot therefore obey Satan. Those who obey Satan are called the عبداً (الطاغوت) in the Holy Quran. Just as the latter obey Satan and reject the commandments of God, so the former obey God only and cannot be misled by the insinuations of Satan because he has no power over them. Further light is thrown upon this point by the use of the qualifying word المخلصين which is derived from the root خلاص which means to be or become pure, clear, free from admixture, or to become safe or secure or free. The mukhlasi'n are therefore those who are purified from every dross of insincerity or hypocrisy, and made safe or secure from Satan, the destroyer. Thus خلاصاً لله (العمل) means "he was pure or sincere towards God in works" and خلاصنا هم بخالصة ذكركم (الار) in the Holy Quran means "we have rendered them pure by a pure quality." The use of the word المخلصين to qualify عبداً كمنهم is suggestive of the fact that the obedience to God which is implied in عبد is an obedience solely and only for the sake of God, and free from every

mixture of obedience to any one besides God. Thus is their obedience to Satan clearly contradicted by the use of the qualifying word (المخلصين), *Mukhlas*, of which *mukhlasin* is the plural, is explained by Lane as already stated to mean "chosen by God and pure from pollution," and it also means pure towards God in what he says or does. It is easily conceivable that Satan cannot have power over those who have been purified by the hand of God and rendered safe, or rather who have been endowed with essential purity of nature and whose hearts are preserved against evil. Satan never has any power over them, and they are pure from their birth. From all this it follows that sin is perfectly inconceivable in the case of those who are declared to be the *عباد الله* and *mukhlasin*, especially when it is plainly stated that they are never subject to the power of Satan.

What has been stated above not only settles conclusively that the word *غوى* in the case of Adam does not bear the signification that he went astray, but demonstrates clearly the sinlessness of the prophets of God, who are pre-eminently included in the *مخلصين*. The sound principle that the *مخلصين* are not subject to the power of Satan has incalculable importance in settling many doubtful points. The interpretation of every verse, in which the prophets are spoken of, is to be governed by this undeniable principle which the Holy Quran lays down in unequivocal terms. It is thus that the Holy Quran explains itself. But A.M. distorts this principle of interpretation in a curious manner. The principle of interpretation which he follows was not laid down by us, nor would any reasonable person agree to it. The sense of a word in different places can be determined by different considerations. We may multiply instances of this, but it would suffice, for the present, to finish with one more. It is in connection with the word *zalim*. In the first *sura* of the Holy Quran we find the following verse : *وان ابنتلى ابراهيم ربه : بكلمات فاتمهن قال انى جا علك للناس اماما قال ومن ذريتى* "When his Lord made trial of Abraham by commands which he all fulfilled, the Lord said : I will make thee an *Imdm* (a Prophet) for mankind. Abraham submitted : Lord ! wilt Thou also raise prophets of my offspring ? The Lord replied : My covenant does not embrace the *zalimin*." We have left the word *zalimin* untranslated in the above, as the word is susceptible of different interpretations, and we have to see what significance is applicable

here. From the context we learn that Almighty God favored Abraham with *Imdat* or prophethood on his fulfilling all the Divine commandments. Abraham asked for a similar favor for his offspring and was told that the favor would be extended to such of his children only as deserved it on account of their not being the *zalimin*. But how did Abraham make himself deserving of this favor? By fulfilling the commandments that were given to him by God. Therefore his children could make themselves deserving of a similar favor if they also fulfilled the Divine commandments, which is otherwise expressed by saying, if they were not *zalimin*. We can therefore clearly see that *zalimin*, in the verse quoted above, means those who do not fulfil or observe the Divine commandments. On referring to the dictionary we find that acting wrongfully is one of the many meanings of *ظلم*, and therefore we see that this is the meaning applicable in the above verse. Now when thus interpreted, this verse lays down a principle of importance. Abraham is told that of his children none who acted wrongfully or disobeyed the commandments of God would be made a prophet. In answer to Abraham's question Almighty God states a general principle, saying *لا ينال عهدى الا للذين* "My covenant does not embrace the wrongdoers," and this is stated as a general rule. It is not meant that Almighty God used to confer prophethood previously on wrongdoers, but that of the posterity of Abraham He would not make a person a prophet who disobeyed His commandments. Even Abraham was made a prophet after Almighty God had tried him and seen that he obeyed all His commandments. Therefore, when Almighty God has stated a general law that He confers prophethood upon none but such as obey all His commandments, we are not entitled to give to the word *zulm* the significance of doing wrong or disobeying Divine commandments, if we find it used of a prophet in the Holy Quran. In such a case we shall have to attach to it any of the other meanings which it can bear. Not only this, but this verse is, like the previous verse dealt with in this article, a conclusive testimony of the 'Sinlessness of Prophets.' This verse therefore furnishes us with another guiding rule in interpreting not only the verses where the word *ظلم* occurs of any prophet of God, but also every verse from which our opponents infer the sinfulness of the prophets of God. The word *zulm*, for instance,

is susceptible of different meanings, and in giving it any particular interpretation, when it is used concerning any prophet of God, we shall have to adopt one which is in consonance with the verse لا ينال عهدى (لا ينال عهدى). It is folly to assert that it should always have the same interpretation. It is our duty to interpret the Holy Quran in such a manner that its various parts should be reconciled to one another. If this principle is kept in view, no difficulty arises in the interpretation of words on whose basis sinfulness is attributed to the prophets of God. It should be made the guiding principle that the Holy Quran does not contradict itself, and when it has once said that the prophets of God are pure from pollution, that they are not made to swerve from the right path by Satan, and that a disobeyer of the commandments of God is never made a prophet by Him, no word or phrase can be so interpreted as to lead to a contrary conclusion. Had this principle been kept in mind by the objectors, not a single objection would have arisen. In fact, richness in the meaning of words is the great beauty of a language, and this it is at which our opponents stumble. The Arabic language far excels every other language in this respect, and we do not think that the objectors are unaware of it, but they think it a part of their duty to keep up this trade. They read in their own books that Peter was called Satan by Jesus, and they do not see any harm in it; but the use of the word *zulm* regarding Adam appears to them objectionable, notwithstanding that the Holy Quran tells them that the prophets of God are never guilty of wrong-doing, and in spite of the fact that the word *zulm* has other significations in consonance with the general principle of the sinlessness of prophets laid down by it. Thus they strain at a gnat but can easily swallow a camel.

These arguments afford a sufficient refutation of what A. M. or Mr. Upson has written, but we would devote a few more pages to the minor points raised by them. Mr. Upson opens the controversy in the following words: "It has been recognised on all sides that by the question of infallibility of the prophets stands or falls the intercessorship of Muhammad." We plainly stated in the last issue while commenting upon the introduction written by A. M., that since the intercessorship of the Holy Prophet is an established fact, the question of the sinlessness of

prophets is virtually set at rest. There is a shorter way to end the controversy if the Christians mind it. Sinlessness is one of the elements of intercessorship, so if the latter is proved, the former is *a priori* demonstrated. On the other hand, mere sinlessness is not sufficient for intercessorship, at least according to the Muhammadan conception of these terms. We pointed out instances of the Holy Prophet's intercession and required of our opponents some clear example of the same sort regarding the intercession of Jesus. The Christians, however, take the opposite course, and therefore we take up the question in the form in which it is put. Mr. Upson then takes up the cases of Adam and David and makes the whole question depend upon their sinlessness. "If Adam and David be sinful, the sinner must look elsewhere for salvation." Perhaps Mr. Upson has not well thought out the question. If the Christians cannot attack the sinlessness of a single person besides Jesus, their case is lost. We have shown that the Holy Quran regards the prophets generally as sinless, because it says that Satan has no power over them, and that a disobeyer of the commandments of God is never made a prophet. In the face of this undeniable fact the Christians cannot attack the sinlessness of the prophets in general by taking one or two cases. They ought either to show that the Holy Quran regards the prophets in general as a class of sinful persons, or, at least, that all the prophets spoken of in the Holy Quran are treated as sinful, so that there may be a ground for inferring the sinfulness of all, but they are unable to make out any of these propositions. Does it never strike the Christian controversialists, if they are carrying on the controversy with the least degree of fair-mindedness and honesty, that the Holy Quran speaks, again and again, of the prophets as a class who do not go against the Divine commandments in the least, praises them in the most laudable terms and speaks of their words and deeds as proceeding from a Divine source, whereas it does not in a single verse describe them to be sinful or disobedient to God? If it is true, then it is the duty of all honest and impartial critics to interpret the particular actions of certain prophets subject to the general description of them, as given in the holy Word of God. It is therefore the first duty of the Christian controversialists to point out any verse of the Holy Quran speaking of the prophets as a class of sinful persons, and unless that is done, to attack this or that prophet upon the basis of words susceptible of a double meaning, is to evade the most

important and the weightiest issue in the whole controversy. It is strange to notice that notwithstanding we have pointed this out several times and even refutations of our articles have been written by our opponents, this point is ignored very carefully by every disputant.

We will now consider the objections against Adam's sinlessness put forward by Mr. Upson and since there is much common to the two gentlemen (Upson and A. M.) and these and similar objections have already been dealt with in answering Mr. Monro, we will not refer to A. M. unless any point of importance has been raised by him which Mr. Upson has failed to raise. Mr. Upson discusses first of all the verse occurring in the chapter entitled *Tahhd*, which runs as follows: ولقد عهدنا الى آدم من قبل فأنسى ولم نجد له عزما. For the particular translation of this verse, which Mr. Upson adopts, he quotes Razi as his authority. Now in the place from which Mr. Upson quotes, both Imam Razi and Kashaf give two meanings for the word نسيان viz., الذکر (*i.e.*, forgetting) and ترك (neglecting), and both indicate by giving the former meaning first that they give a preference to it. Imam Razi even quotes under the former that Hasan used to say: "By God, he, *i.e.*, Adam, never disobeyed except through forgetfulness." Had not even this preference been given, we could have easily seen that the acceptable meaning was that which was in consonance with the verses which describe the sinlessness of the prophets. And when these commentators give ترك as the meaning of نسيان they do not thereby indicate that Adam was guilty of neglecting the commandment like the sinners, but that he did it under a misapprehension as to the nature of the commandment. Now Mr. Upson ignores the meaning to which preference is given and quotes only the other and thus misleads his readers. Moreover, where Imam Razi gives the two meanings of نسيان he simply quotes two different opinions. For information he refers us to his commentary on the *Sura Baqra*. There he discusses these two opinions at length. He first takes the opinion that Adam did the deed in forgetfulness and likens his case to that of one who keeps a fast but forgetting that he is fasting he eats, which does not at all fall within the definition of the term sin. He then considers two objections advanced against this opinion and refutes them both,

thus denying their validity. From this it clearly appears that he favors this opinion. This is simply to show the misrepresentations of Mr. Upson, otherwise even if Imam Razi had not favored it, the arguments are so weighty for the acceptance of this interpretation that no fair-minded person would reject them. In refuting the first of the objections to the above meaning Razi says: "We do not admit that Adam and Eve accepted the word of Iblis, nor that they considered him truthful. .... There is nothing in the verse indicating that Adam and Eve did this deed when they heard the words of Iblis or afterwards. And as to our statement that Adam was aware of the enmity of Satan, the authority is the verse *ان هذا عدوك* "Verily this is thy enemy .....". After this Imam Razi considers the second opinion according to which Adam did the deed intentionally and *ان نسيان* is therefore taken to mean *ترگ*. Of this opinion four different aspects are stated, and the two which ascribe sin to Adam are rejected as worthless.

We are sorry that we have had to devote so large a space to an unimportant discussion, but the misrepresentations of the opposite party compel us to take this course, for, if unexposed, they may be taken as correct. Next follows the objection as to the meaning of *عزم*. It has been answered at length in answer to Mr. Monro, and it is unnecessary to repeat all those remarks here. There we quoted authorities for the explanation we gave of *عزم* and the reader may refer to the February number for information on the point. Some remarks of A. M., however, deserve consideration. He says that the verse shows that Adam was not one of the *اولوا لعزم* prophets. This is again a misconception. The word *عزم* is not in the two cases taken to mean the same thing. Regarding the verse *فا صبر كما صبر اولوا لعزم من الرسل* there have been two opinions. Some consider that all the prophets are meant here and that *من* is simply explanatory. This opinion is preferable to the other which considers some of the prophets as *اولوا لعزم* and the rest not as such. There are various reasons for giving this preference. In the first place the Holy Quran does not name all the prophets and so no one can say that only such and such prophets are *اولوا لعزم* because he does not know all the prophets. The Holy Quran says: *من قصصنا عليك ومنهم من*



الم نقصص عليك thus showing that there have been prophets who are not spoken of in the Holy Quran at all. Secondly, such a supposition is contradicted by the general description of the prophets. Thirdly, different names are proposed as falling within the definition of the term, and there being no agreement as to what prophets are *اولوا العزم*, the only safe supposition is that all the prophets were *اولوا العزم*. For the Christians there would be another difficulty, for in the briefest of these lists Jesus is not included at all, and so he too shall have to be considered like Adam as one of those who did not determine upon doing what God enjoined them. This list includes according to one authority the names of Noah, Abraham, Moses and Muhammad, and according to another the names of Noah, Hood, Abraham and Muhammad, and in neither of these is Jesus included, who, according to the strange conclusions drawn by A. M. from certain traditions, is the only sinless man. The Muslims do not give him a place even among the *اولوا العزم* prophets and thus many of those who deny *عزم* in the meaning given by A. M. in the case of Adam deny it also in that of Jesus. There is also another important conclusion which follows from the words of A. M. According to him Adam disobeyed the commandment of God, and therefore, he was not regarded as one of the *اولوا العزم* prophets. Therefore the *اولوا العزم* prophets did not disobey the commandments of God. As the Holy Quran speaks of the *اولوا العزم* prophets, therefore it regards some of them, if not all, according to the assertion of A. M. as sinless prophets. But as the Holy Quran does not allow any such distinction to be observed between various prophets, hence according to A. M.'s own showing, the Holy Quran regards the prophets to be sinless.

Mr. Upson then discusses the meaning of the verse : *وعصى آدم* *ربه فغوى*. That *عصيان* means disobedience, we never denied. We only said that Almighty God excused Adam on the ground that he forgot. The Holy Quran has kept a clear distinction between forbidden articles of food and other forbidden deeds. The former are spoken of in the Holy Quran in four places with an exception in each place. In two of these the exception runs thus : *فمن اضطر غير باغ ولا* *عاند فان الله غفور رحيم* "But whoever is driven to the necessity of partaking of it, if it be without desiring it and not in transgression,

to him verily the Lord is *Ghafur*, Merciful." In the third place, to the above exception are added the further words "فلا اثم عليه" "Then no sin shall be upon him." We have left the word غفور untranslated to direct the reader's attention to it. The Holy Quran tells us that there is no sin upon the man, and God is *Ghafur*. Now if the word *ghafr* means, as is asserted, nothing more than pardoning of sins actually committed, the word *Ghafur* must mean nothing more than the pardoner of sins actually committed. But we are plainly told that the man commits no sin and, therefore, the word *ghafr* is quite inconsistent if it conveys no other meaning. If there is no sin actually committed, what will God pardon? This shows the absurdity of the assertion that *ghafr* does not mean the protection and support of God against human frailty and weakness, for what could Almighty God mean by saying that He is *Ghafur* to a man who commits no sin at all. This throws light upon the meaning of *istighfar*, which however we do not wish to discuss here. In the fourth place in which certain articles of food are forbidden, the exception similar to that in the above three places is couched in the words: فمن اضطر في مخمصة غير متجا زف لاثم فان الله غفور رحيم "Whoever then without wilfully leaning to sin is forced by hunger to partake (of the forbidden food), to him God will certainly be *Ghafur* and Merciful. The conclusion which we have already arrived at regarding the meaning of *istighfar* may also be drawn from the words of this verse. Our object here is however to point out that this exception which is repeated every time the forbidden articles of food are spoken of, is not given regarding any other forbidden deed in the whole of the Holy Quran. This shows that Almighty God has allowed a certain latitude in the case of food which he has not allowed in any other case. Now the commandment to Adam was to refrain from eating a certain fruit and therefore it was a commandment of the nature of forbidden food. Now in the latter case, anyone who under compulsion partakes of forbidden food, disobeys the commandment to refrain from it but is not guilty of a *sin* as the Holy Quran plainly says. Forgetfulness is at least as good an excuse as, if not better than, compulsion, and therefore Adam's deed cannot according to the Holy Quran be described as sinful at all. Adam is nowhere described as عا د or باغ (doing the thing out of desire or transgressing). The words of Adam's prayer are in exact accordance with the attributes of the Divine Being mentioned in the exception. Adam says: ان لم تغفر لنا

و ترجمنا, the first part of the prayer corresponding to the attribute غفور (Ghafur) and the second to the attribute رحيم of the Divine Being, thus showing that Adam's deed falls within the exception, and is therefore not a *sin* at all.

The second part of the objection relates to the meaning of غوى and here we must again refer the reader to the February number. Mr. Upson however thinks that we have not given a correct translation of فسد عليه عيشه which is given in the Lisan ul Arab as the meaning of غوى in the verse under discussion. The meaning of فساد as the opposite of purity is given but has Mr. Upson the honesty to say that other meanings are also given and one of the meanings is "a state of disturbance?" He may consult Lane for this. Mr. Upson says the words mean that "his life became corrupted." Does he mean by this that Adam began to lead a corrupt life in the sense of immorality? The Holy Quran condemns such a conclusion and Mr. Upson's proposed meaning yield no other. Why did we say that the words meant that "his peace was disturbed?" The Holy Quran describes Adam's life in the garden in which he was placed as follows: انك لا تخزع فيها ولا تعرى وانك لا تظمؤا فيها ولا تضحى granted that thou shalt not hunger therein, neither shalt thou be naked; and that thou shalt not thirst therein, neither shalt thou parch with heat." This was the عيش (life of peace) which Adam led in the garden and it was this state that was disturbed. It has no concern with the purity or impurity of the soul, it is simply a particular state of life and there was a change in it after Adam had eaten of the fruit, for he had to leave the garden. But outside the garden the advantages of not feeling hunger or thirst or heat or nakedness could not be granted him. Thus the immediate effect of the eating of the fruit is described thus in the Holy Quran فبدت لهما "their nakedness appeared to them." To the same effect Satan Almighty God says to Adam "فلا يخرجكما من الجنة فتشقى" "Satan may not cause you to go out of the garden, for the effect of this would be that thou wouldst be unhappy, or in a state of distress or difficulty, or suffer or experience fatigue" (see Lane for the authority of these meanings). This is what God had forewarned Adam of and this is what Adam admits in the words: ربنا ظلمنا انفسنا after eating of the forbidden fruit. This was not a punishment but a natural consequence of the deed though done through forgetfulness. What else follows from this except that the peace which Adam enjoyed in the garden was disturbed on his eating of the forbidden fruit?

To be continued.