

*Vol. III.*

*No 5.*

# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

*(MAY 1904.)*

Digitized by Khilafat Library

---

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
SACRIFICE AND SALVATION                   ...	159
UPSON AND A. M. ON SINLESSNESS                   ...	173
THE TOMB OF JESUS AT SRINAGAR                   ...	186

---

QADIAN,

DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

---

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



# THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

Vol. III.]

MAY, 1904.

[No. 5.]

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

## Sacrifice and Salvation.

We do not mean to discuss under this heading how sacrifice has occupied a place in the world's history, which is closely connected with the idea of salvation or forgiveness of sins. Our object is to show what kind of sacrifice Islam requires of us for our salvation, and whether there is any other form of sacrifice which can lead to the attainment of that end. The external act of sacrifice in Islam is regarded as a deed done in obedience to the will of God, for His pleasure, and to attain His nearness. It is in commemoration of the wonderful obedience shown by Abraham to the commandments of God, and is a symbolical act showing that the doer of it submits himself completely to the Will of God, and is, like Abraham, ready to sacrifice everything for His sake. The Holy Quran says expressly with regard to sacrifices : *لَنْ يَنَالَ اللَّهُ لُحُومُهَا وَلَا دِمَاؤها وَلَكِنْ يَنَالُهُ التَّقْوَىٰ مِنْكُمْ* (الحج) "Their flesh will never reach to God, nor yet their blood, but the piety from you will reach Him." That sacrifice in Islam has this double significance, *viz.*, that it is an external act of worship with the deeper significance of the inward submission of the soul, is apparent from the words used for sacrifice in the Arabic language. Thus one word for sacrifice is *qurban* قربان (derived from *qurb*, meaning nearness), because it brings into the nearness and presence of God the man who sacrifices with sincerity, faith and true obedience to Him. Similarly sacrifice is termed *nasika* نسيكة, which is derived from the root *nasika* نسيك meaning to worship and to obey. The use of such words



for sacrifice as denote actually and primarily obedience, worship and nearness of God, is clearly suggestive of the fact that the true worshipper of God is the man who sacrifices his own self, all his faculties and the objects of his love and desires in the way of God and to seek His pleasure, and whose passions and desires are all crushed down and swept off so as to be completely annihilated. Any one who reflects over the double significance of these words, cannot fail to see that according to Islam the essence of sacrifice is worship and true worship requires a sacrifice, the slaughtering of the *nafs-i-ammara* or the disobedient soul which leads a man away from God, the cutting off of all connections besides the connection of God and a submission to the hardest trials. Unless this sacrifice is performed by a person, he cannot be called a true worshipper of God, and is not delivered from the death of reissness. Such is also the significance of *Islam*, viz., a complete submission to the Will of God, which requires a sacrifice of all besides. The true *Muslim* is, therefore, the person who submits himself wholly to God, and whose passions and desires are all subjected to death. Sacrifices in Islam are, in short, a symbol of the sacrifice of self, a reminder to keep this object fresh in the mind, a step to lead men to it, and a preparation for the attainment of the spiritual reality which is hidden under it.

Such is the sacrifice which Islam requires of a person for the attainment of salvation. It teaches us that true purity of life cannot be attained except by the sacrifice of a man's own self—a sacrifice which is cleansed with the water of sincerity and purged with the fire of faith and perseverance. The Holy Quran expresses it in the following words: *بلى من اسلم وجهه لله وهو محسن فلا اجره عند ربه* i.e., "the person who submits his ownself to God and devotes his life to His ways and the deeds of righteousness, shall be granted his reward from the fountain of the nearness of God, and they have no fear or grief." This is the sacrifice of self which the Holy Quran teaches us. The person who devotes all his faculties to the way of God, and whose words, deeds and movements are all for the sake of God, is deemed to have attained salvation, for he is spoken of as having got his reward from God and as having been delivered from every fear and grief. The idea which is conveyed here in the word *Islam* is expressed elsewhere in the



Holy Quran by the word *istiqamat*. Thus in the *sura fatiha*, the Muslims are taught to pray as follows: اهدنا الصراط المستقيم اهدنا الصراط المستقيم, i.e., "Make us firm in the path of *istiqamat* (perseverance), the path of those who have received blessings from Thee, and to whom the doors of heaven have been opened." It should be borne in mind that Almighty God has created man for Himself, and therefore since obedience to, and the worship of God, is the object of his creation, he cannot be said to have attained to *istiqamat*, or to be on the right way to the attainment of this object, unless he makes himself wholly for God; and when he does it, Divine blessings are then certainly granted to him, which is, in other words, a life of purity. If a window is opened towards the sun, the rays of light will at once find their way into the room. So also with man. When he makes himself wholly for God and walks straightly in His path, so that every screen is removed which hides God from him, a flame of light at once descends upon him, which illumines his heart and purges it of every internal dross. He is then a new man and undergoes a mighty transformation. Such a person is said to have attained a life of purity and it is in this world that such a life commences. The Holy Quran says: "The person who remains blind in this world and to whom no light is granted to see God here, shall also be blind in the next world." The senses with which God is recognised are granted in this world, and the person who remains destitute of them here, shall remain in eternal darkness, for his faith is based on hearsay and not on sure and solid facts. In short, there is only one way to purity of life and actual salvation, and that is, as the Holy Quran has taught us, that we should make ourselves wholly for God and bow down, with true submission and perfect sincerity, at the Divine threshold, and not deviate a step from the path of God though we should be cut to pieces. In fact we should be willing to seal our faith in the true God with our blood. It is for this reason that Almighty God has called our holy faith by the name of Islam, so that it may signify our complete submission and resignation to God, which is, in other words, a sacrifice of our own self.

Such is the relation between sacrifice and salvation according to the teachings of the Holy Quran. Against this the Christians have set up another sort of sacrifice, which they think to be necessary for



the salvation of man. According to the Christian doctrine, a man's salvation does not depend upon the sacrifice of his own self, which is, in other words, his complete submission to the Divine Being; but all men are saved by the sacrifice of Jesus whom they suppose to have taken away the sins of the whole world. God sacrificed His only son for the sake of the sinners, and the value of this sacrifice was enhanced by the consideration that Jesus was an only son. This was the crowning deed of God's love towards mankind, and this is the only way of salvation. The question before us is, therefore, to judge the comparative value of the two sorts of sacrifice. For this, we should first consider the nature of sin and its remedy. Sin is, in fact, a poison which is generated in the human heart when it is devoid of the sincere love and loving remembrance of God and remiss in obedience to Him. When a tree is rooted out from the ground, it begins to wither and its greenness begins to vanish away, for it is no more supplied with the juice which afforded it nourishment. The person whose heart is rooted out from the love of God, begins in a like manner to wither away spiritually and is affected with spiritual aridity which is a sinful state of mind. The laws of nature point out to us three sorts of remedy; viz., (1), the love of God; (2), *istighfar*, which means a desire to hide and cover, for so long as the roots of a tree are covered under ground, there is hope of a flourishing growth of it; and (3), *tauba* (repentance), i.e., a turning to God with humility and submission to draw the water of life, to bring one's self nearer to Him, and to tear out the veils of disobedience with the help of deeds of virtue. *Taubā* does not consist in the utterance of certain words with the tongue, but it is made perfect only when a man turns away from the course of vice to the path of virtue. In fact every righteous deed is a step for the perfection of repentance, for the object of it is to attain a nearness to God which, in the terminology of the Holy Quran, is called *tauba*. Our prayer to God is also *tauba*, because through it also we seek the nearness of God. Almighty God having created the soul of man called it *ruh* (lit., joy or happiness and relief from grief or sorrow), for its true happiness and rest from grief and sorrow lay in the confession of God and in His love and obedience. He also called it *nafs* (lit., a thing's self), for He endowed it with a capacity to attain oneness with God. The man that has true connection with God is like the tree that is firmly rooted in the ground.



Such deep connection with the Divine Being is, in fact, a paradise for man. As the growth of the tree depends upon the nourishment which it draws from the earth by means of its roots, so the spiritual progress of a man depends upon the close connection of his heart with God, which being fed from the source of love, is granted strength to cast off the poisonous matter of sin. Thus being in God, it grows in purity and freedom from corruption, ramifies in pleasant greenness and verdure, and yields goodly fruit. But the heart that is not connected with God, is not fed from this source of nourishment and gradually withers away until all the leaves having fallen down, it has an ugly aspect. Since the dryness of sin arises from the absence of connection with God, therefore the natural and certain remedy for it is a firm and deep connection with the Divine Being, as the laws of nature point out. With reference to this same connection Almighty God says in the Holy Quran: يا ايها النفس المطمئنة ارجعي الى ربك راضية مرضية فادخلي في عبادي وادخلي جنتي  
 "O thou soul that art at rest and restest fully contented with God, return to thy Lord, thou being pleased with Him and He pleased with thee, so enter among my servants and enter into my paradise."

In short, sin is the result of separation from God, and therefore the only remedy for it, as every sensible person must see, is connection with, and love for, God. How the suicide of one person can have the effect of doing away with separation and bringing about the connection with God, is beyond the comprehension of human understanding. It is risibly absurd that a person should knock out his brains out of pity for another who is suffering from headache, or commit suicide because another is dying. No sensible person would ever consider such suicide to be an act of genuine human sympathy, for it only brings to end the life of one without so much as doing a particle of good to the other. Even if taken out of sympathy, such a step only shows that the person has not the power to assist the other out of the difficulty and therefore puts an end to his own life in despair. Sympathy with our fellow-beings is, no doubt, a praiseworthy and noble quality, and to suffer pains and face difficulties for the good and benefit of others is truly the business of great and magnanimous men, but the way in which Jesus committed suicide, cannot be regarded as



sympathetical by any sane person. Had Jesus refrained from the commission of suicide, and suffered for his people in a reasonable manner, like other great men, he would, no doubt, have laid humanity under a deep obligation by his magnanimous and sympathetic deeds. For instance, if a poor man stands in need of a house and has not the wherewithal to build it, it would be a supremely sympathetic deed on the part of a mason to build it for him without being paid, and the poor man would, no doubt, be under a deep obligation to him for his having taken so much trouble for his comfort; but, what would it avail the poor man if moved by pity and sympathy for him, a person were to knock his head against a stone. Ah! there are very few in the world who are guided by reason in doing alleged deeds of virtue and in exercising their compassion and sympathy for their fellow-beings. If it is true that Jesus really committed suicide under the misconception that others would be delivered by his death, he is to be pitied, and this event instead of being made public, must be kept secret.

The question of the sacrifice of Jesus may be discussed from another point of view. It is admitted that Jesus bore the curses of numerous sinners. We are sorry to say that by the recognition of this principle the Christians are guilty of a gross attack upon the righteousness of the prophet whom they follow. It is the Christian belief that Jesus was actually subjected to the *la'nat* (curse) of God, and the severity of this blasphemy against him is hardly palliated by the excuse that the curse was removed after three days. The sacrifice of Jesus is useless if he was not really subjected to curse, and therefore curse is the foundation-stone of the superstructure of Christian belief. But the Christians have formulated this doctrine without considering the results to which it naturally leads. Curse (*la'nat*) is not a meaningless word. It has a certain effect; and when curse is attributed to a person, that is to say, when it is stated of him that he is subject to the curse of God, it is really meant that the effect of curse is upon him, for otherwise the word would not convey any significance at all; as a matter of fact, curse (Ar. *la'nat*) is an expression of a particular state of mind. A person is said to be subject to curse when his heart is turned away from God so as to become an enemy of the the Divine Being. Hence Satan is called *la'in*, or the accursed one.



*La'nat* conveys the idea of casting out from one's presence or nearness, and the word is, therefore, applied to a person whose heart is removed farthest off from the love and obedience of God, and in which instead of love a hatred of the Divine Being is generated. Such a person is hateful to God, and is under His wrath. If, as asserted by the Christians, Jesus was subjected to Divine curse—though it were for three days, or even a shorter period—it must follow, as a natural consequence, that the curse carried with it its effect and that consequently Jesus actually incurred the wrath of God, that his heart became quite foreign to the love, obedience and knowledge of God, that he became the enemy of God and God became his enemy, that he became hateful to God and God became hateful to him, and that being cast out from God's presence, he was devoted to destruction. According to the Christian doctrine then, we must entertain the abhorrent belief that Jesus, a righteous prophet of God, did not actually believe in God, nay hated and abhorred God and became an enemy of Him, and a friend of Satan for the three days that the curse remained in force. Nor can this conclusion be escaped so long as the sacrifice of Jesus is interpreted in the Christian sense, *i.e.*, as a sacrifice for sinners, whose sins were borne away by him. Sin means the disobedience of God and curse, *i.e.*, hatred and wrath of the Divine Being, is a consequence of it. God denounced his curse against the serpent which seduced Eve, which means that He hated him, cast him out from His presence, and turned in wrath against him. Cain was also cursed by God, because he had been guilty of the sin of shedding the blood of his brother, Abel; in other words, "he was devoted to destruction, cast out from God's presence,.....and wandered.....by reason of the trouble and perplexity of his conscience," so say the Christian interpreters. Accordingly, if Jesus took away the sins, he took the consequences of the sins also; for otherwise the taking away of sins is meaningless talk. In fact this is admitted by the Christians in the formula of their faith that Jesus was cursed for the sake of the sinners. But the consequences of sin, as already stated and as admitted on all hands, are the wrath, displeasure, hatred and enmity of God, being cast out from Divine presence, and being in association with Satan. According to the Christian conception of Jesus' sacrifice therefore, Jesus' mind must be supposed to have experienced all these states. But such an ascription to a righteous servant of God is the



most hateful idea, and no God-fearing Christian would propose for Jesus the abhorrent appellations of the enemy of God and friend of Satan, though such enmity and friendship may have lasted for three seconds, to say nothing of three days. If therefore Jesus did not take the consequences of sin, he did not take away the sins, and the supposed sacrifice is without any effect at all.

From the above it would appear that since the heart of Jesus was never actually subjected to curse, therefore his supposed sacrifice is simply an innovation of ignorant men; ignorant because they invented a doctrine highly derogatory to the dignity and sanctity of their own prophet inasmuch as it makes him a hater and an enemy of God. Cursed is the salvation which cannot be attained unless a righteous servant of God is subjected to curse and believed to be an enemy of God and a friend of Satan. It should have been far better for the Christians to have preferred to go to hell rather than propose the ignoble title of Satan for a righteous servant of God. With such impurities in their heart, it is strange to find them crying for salvation. A person is first raised to the height of being called a son of God, and is described as one with God and proceeding from Him, and is then brought down to the disgraceful depth of being designated as Satan. For, it should be borne in mind that the effect of subjecting Jesus to curse is nothing less than make him partake of Satanic qualities and hence make him as Satan himself. The idea that one has taken away their sins, may, no doubt, be pleasing to men who are ignorant of the true purity of life, but its grotesqueness becomes only too evident when it is considered that to accept it as true, is really to condemn a righteous servant of God as disobeying, hating and denying God. And we are asked to believe that the mission of Jesus fulfilled this hateful idea. Mark the mighty difference between the purity of the noble Islamic doctrine which requires that, in order to attain salvation, every man should obey and love his God with his whole heart and soul and completely resign himself to His will, and the impurity of the Christian doctrine, which not only rejects the requirement of the internal purity of soul, but requires in addition that a holy man of God and one of His righteous servants should be considered as an enemy of God and accursed like the Archfiend, that common enemy of the human race. A deplorable



error has arisen in Christianity ; but it seems to be too deeply rooted to be plainly rejected when its harm and mischief are pointed out. It is sad to find that the whole scheme of salvation has been made by the Christians to hang upon this fatal error, and therefore it has become the more difficult for them to repudiate it now. We do not, however, despair of its correction, for thinking minds within the pale of Christianity have already seen the absurdity of the "limitations and impediments" which have been imposed upon modern Christianity and are trying their best to get rid of them. We are certain that as soon as they realize the harm and mischief which follows from the doctrine of the sacrifice of Jesus, they would not hesitate in the least to condemn it as an innovation of ignorant men.

Historically the doctrine of the sacrifice of Jesus is without any foundation at all. It is admitted even by the Christians that the true principles of salvation had been taught to the Israelites by revelations granted by Almighty God to their prophets. These principles are further, according to Christian admission, safely preserved in the books of the Old Testament. The sacrifice taught to them as necessary for salvation agrees every whit with the teaching of Islam, though, owing to the immature development of the human faculties at that early age, the sublime conception of sacrifice, which is to be found in Islam, was not revealed to the Jewish people. But still it is a difference of degree and not a difference of kind. The principle is the same, only in Islam it is developed to the highest stage. Had Almighty God appointed the one way of salvation for man which is preached by the Christians, *viz.*, that He should have a son who should bear the sins and curses of all sinners and then be crucified, it is evident that this principle should have been taught to the Jews and the revelations of the prophets of God as preserved safely according to Christian belief, in the books of the Old Testament, should have contained it in plain words. Almighty God could, of course, have told the Jewish people that though His son being yet in his infancy, was not sufficiently grown up and powerful to bear the burden of sins, yet he would, no doubt, appear later on and take away their sins. For it cannot be supposed that Almighty God pointed out one way of salvation to the Jews, a second to the Christians, a third to the Muslims, and numerous other ways to other



prophets appearing in other countries at other times, thus changing His plans every time that He granted a revelation. But one would in vain turn over the pages of the Old Testament books and other Jewish writings to find the slightest trace of the Christian doctrine. The Jews never entertained the belief, nor did their prophets ever teach them, that a son of God was to be crucified in order to enable them to secure salvation. In this point the Jewish code agrees in all points with the Muslim law. They both condemn the doctrine of atonement and require that every person who seeks salvation should turn to God with sincerity and zeal, seek pardon for, and protection from, sins from Him, subdue the evil desires and passions and do deeds of virtue to seek the pleasure of God, and walk in perfect obedience to the laws and commandments of God, and sacrifice all one's interests in His way. The Jewish doctors hold this to be the means of salvation to this day, and this belief on the fundamental doctrine of salvation gives the lie to the Christian innovation that salvation depends on the sacrifice of the son of God.

We will now consider briefly the genesis of the idea of sacrifice, as entertained by the Christians. There is one important point which determines how this idea came in. Not only did the earlier prophets never teach the Christian doctrine of salvation, but Jesus himself throughout his whole life, including his ministry, had the same idea of sacrifice as was taught by the Jewish law. The Gospels bear ample testimony to this. The offering of his mother after child-birth, Jesus' going to Jerusalem with his parents to observe the Passover and his keeping the Passover with all his disciples the night before his death, are all matters related in the Gospels and prove conclusively that from his birth to his death Jesus observed the law of sacrifice as taught by Moses and the prophets, and did not formulate any new doctrine on the point. Not only did he himself observe the Jewish law of sacrifice, but he taught the same, not entertaining for a moment the idea that his sacrifice had replaced the old law of sacrifices. He heals a leper and then tells him to go to the priest and offer for his cleansing "those things which Moses commanded." (Mark I: 44). Evidently the man who was so healed believed in him. And still more plainly in his famous sermon on the mount, he enjoins his followers: "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there



rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." (Matt. V: 23-5). There is, moreover, not a single word in the Gospels recorded as a saying of Jesus, which can be considered as a development of the Jewish idea of sacrifice. It is an error to suppose that the Jews at all times entertained a crude idea of sacrifice. Their prophets had revealed to them its deep spiritual meaning. Under the heading "Atonement Idea Spiritualized," the Jewish Encyclopædia says: "In Mosaic ritualism the atoning blood thus actually meant the bringing about of a re-union with God, the restoration of peace between the soul and its maker. Therefore, the expiatory sacrifice was accompanied by a confession of the sins for which it was designed to make atonement. . . . or as Philo says, 'not without the sincerity of his repentance, not by words merely but by works, the conviction of his soul which healed him from disease and restored him to good health.' And again: "Yet, while the sacrificial rites were the only means of impressing upon the people God's holiness and the dreadful consequence of man's sinfulness, the idea of atonement assumed a far deeper and more spiritual aspect in the lives and teachings of the prophets. Neither Hosea, Amos and Micah, nor Isaiah recognizes the need of any means of reconciliation with God after estrangement by sin, other than repentance." (Vol. II, 276). "Take with you words, and turn to the Lord: say unto Him, Take away all iniquity and receive us graciously: so will we render the calves of our lips." (Hos. XIV: 2). "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (Micah VI: 6-8). These words clearly explain the Jewish doctrine and Jesus did not add to or take away any thing from it. The early Christians followed in the footsteps of their master and continued to worship in the temple and sacrifice their offerings like other Jews. Paul himself who later on saw it convenient to desert



the old Jewish faith, adhered, in the beginning of his career as an apostle, to the Jewish customs. He stated in his defence before Felix that he came to Jerusalem to worship and make offerings (Acts 24).

It is thus clear that the Christians had not formulated for themselves any new belief regarding salvation until some time after the crucifixion of Jesus. It was not even immediately after his crucifixion that his sacrifice was regarded as annulling the effect of previous modes of salvation. If Jesus actually believed that his death had any such effect, it was his duty first of all to inform his disciples that the law of Moses would be abrogated by his death, and the Christians should have from the beginning entertained this belief. As a matter of fact, this belief was gradually formulated as difficulties arose. At first it was couched in figurative language while a literal significance was attached to it later on. The apparent death of Jesus so soon after he had entered upon his ministry, was not so great a difficulty as the mode of that death. The law of Moses provided that crucifixion brought a person under the curse of God. The Jews, therefore, plotted to get Jesus crucified, so that they might convince the masses that being under the curse of God, he could not be a true prophet or even a righteous person. In this object they were apparently successful, and therefore, the Christians were obliged to seek some explanation for the crucifixion of Jesus, as they were taunted by the Jews that their master was under the curse of God. That explanation was suggested to some ingenious brain in the assertion that Jesus was sacrificed for others and cursed for their sake, and once started the plan worked excellently. The idea was taken from the Old Testament from the description of the sufferings of the prophets for the sake of their people. The prophets made atonement for the sins of their people, not by committing suicide but by fasting, praying and interceding for them. Thus did Moses intercede for his people when Almighty God was wrath with them because of their having taken the calf for their God. The wrath of God was so provoked against the people that He was going to consume them but Moses, the Prophet of God, interceded for them, and they were saved because of his entreaties (Ex. 32: 30). This was the idea of the sufferings of the righteous for the sake of their people and it is easily intelligible to all men of common sense. But the Christians when confronted by difficulties of a serious nature worked it into the grotes-



que idea of the suicide of one man for all the sinners of the world and loaded him with their curses, so as to make him suffer all the consequences which a sinner must suffer, *viz.*, estrangement from, and hatred and enmity towards, God, and association with the spirit of evil.

We have now to see whether the Christian doctrine has been productive of any good. If the sacrifice of Jesus has any effect in procuring salvation, it must either consist in keeping back the sinners from sins or in pardoning them as they continue their transgressions. As regards the first alternative, there is not the slightest proof. Even the apostles were guilty of disgraceful sins after they believed in Jesus. No one who for a moment casts a glance at the impurities and iniquities of Christian countries will ever entertain the opinion that the atonement of Jesus has the least efficacy in saving men from sins. As regards the other alternative the idea is horrible, because it permits every licentiousness under the cloak of religion. A thief, a murderer or an adulterer may do all the harm in his power and still be saved because he trusts in the blood of Jesus. If this is true, the believers on this doctrine would be dangerous enemies of society. Moreover the doctrine of atonement is not logically connected with any of these results. It is simply a supposition that because a man thinks that Jesus died for him, therefore he would either not sin at all, or if he sins, he would not suffer any punishment. We have already discussed the nature of sin and its remedy, from which the reader can see the absurdity of atonement.

In short, there is not the slightest proof that a belief in the sacrifice of Jesus leads to a solution or brings about purity of life in a man, but a man can attain the nearness of God only by sacrificing his ownself and his desires. We do not mean to say that Christianity is totally devoid of good men, but that the imperfect goodness practised by some Christians is not the result of the belief in atonement. There are good men among every people, however low the form of the religion they profess, but they are inclined to goodness more by their nature than their religion or training. The existence of such individuals who are not certainly free from every kind of evil, does not show that the religion they profess is true, for their goodness may not be at all due to their religion. To judge the truth of a religion from its beneficial effect on a people we must see whether there are individuals in it, who



are perfect in their goodness and in whom accordingly such spiritual excellences are manifested as are not to be witnessed in any other people. This criterion is satisfied only by one religion in the world, *viz.*, Islam. Islam has made thousands attain the perfect purity of life in which it may be said that the spirit of God lives within them. The light of Divine acceptance is so kindled within them as to make them manifestations of Divine glory. Perfect individuals of this type are present among the Muslims in every century, and the purity of their life is not a mere assertion with which there is no proof, but Almighty God testifies to it by heavenly signs which He shows in their support.

The Holy Quran gives us to understand that the man who reaches the stage of perfect purity of life is recognised by certain signs. Heavenly signs are shown at his hands and his prayers are accepted by God, and he is informed beforehand of their acceptance. Almighty God speaks to him, reveals to him deep secrets of the future and gives him His assistance. There have been in Islam men in every age answering to this description and even now there is Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, Chief of Qadian, the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, to whom all these blessings are granted in their perfection. But among the Christians there is not a single man who can prove the truth of his faith and the purity of his life by the signs which the Gospels give as the signs of the truly faithful and the pure in life. Everything is to be recognised by its signs as a tree by its fruit. A mere assertion that a religion brings about the purity of life without the necessary signs must be condemned as groundless. The Gospels in the hands of the Christians mention certain extraordinary signs which are beyond the power of ordinary mortals as the signs of the truly faithful, and therefore it is the duty of every seeker after truth to judge the claims of Christianity by these signs, and unless these signs are shown, every Christian who claims the purity of life by virtue of the atonement must be taken to be an impostor. The truth is that so far as spiritual light and Divine acceptance are concerned, the richest clergyman—for the greater a clergyman, the richer he must be—cannot cope with a poor Muslim. The Promised Messiah has many times invited the Christian Missionaries to this decision, but no one has



come forward to prove the truth of his religion by this easy criterion. True faith and purity of life are in fact obtained only through Islam and their existence in it is testified by heavenly signs, for without heavenly testimony no such assertion can be accepted. Many men may partake in the outward purity of life but still be impure from within. When however heavenly testimony shows that a certain religion has men of perfect purity of life, its other members who lead outwardly pure lives, will also be taken to be free from internal impurities, for a people must be considered as a whole, and the only proof that is needed is, that a pure and heavenly life is granted to one who professes that religion.

---

## Upson and A. M. on Sinlessness—

*Continued.*

We have so far considered the objections of Mr. Upson and A. M. on our article upon Adam's eating of the forbidden fruit, and will now reply briefly to their other objections concerning Adam and David. The charge against the former of these two prophets is, that he was guilty of *sh.rk* and that against the latter that he was guilty of adultery and murder. We have fully refuted these charges in the July and August numbers of this journal and neither Mr. Upson nor A. M. has answered or even attempted to answer any of the arguments furnished in these articles. For instance we gave ten arguments in support of our assertion that Adam and Eve were not spoken of in the verse of *Sura Araf* which is under discussion, but neither of the two Missionary gentlemen who announce that they have refuted all our arguments, make the slightest attempt to handle a single one of these arguments. Perhaps we do not err in saying that they are intentionally imposing upon the public as refuters of our articles whereas they are conscious of the fact that they have not answered our arguments. Of course if the controversy is carried on in this style, it can never end. As we do not wish to needlessly lengthen these articles, we would not repeat the arguments advanced in the previous articles and would request our readers to peruse the two articles together for a full comprehension of the subject.



A. M. stumbles at every step in spiritual matters. One should think from his mode of carrying on the controversy that he was made for some other occupation. He thinks it to be impossible for a man to walk in the path of Divine pleasure. He is surprised to find that we regard the *salihin* to be free from sins along with the prophets. Had he seen the meaning of *salihin* in a dictionary, he would not have brought forward such a foolish objection. *Salihin* means the good, incorrupt, just, righteous and virtuous men, and the Holy Quran describes the prophets as of the *salihin*. Nor is Jesus an exception, because he also is particularly described as *الطاهر*, i.e., one of the righteous. In fact, it is surprising to find an objection to the *salihin* being called sinless, when that word means nothing else. Had he limited his views to those within the Christian circle, we would have had no objection. The estrangement of Christians from the living and powerful God is so great that they are unable to understand that a man can ever be drawn out of the impurities of sin and placed on the firm rock where Satan cannot have any access to him. Their conception of the moral nature of man is so low that they do not like that a man should ever be delivered from the power of Satan. On account of his ignorance of the perfection which man can attain to, A. M. cannot understand that other men besides the prophets can reach the eminence of sinlessness. If this were not true, religion were not at all needed. For if the aim and end of religion is to make man partly good, that object is fulfilled without it. A. M. may deny if he likes but no sensible person would deny that even athiests, idol-worshippers and fetish-worshippers cannot be designated as devoid of all good qualities. But the object of religion is to take men to the height of perfection, and if it cannot do that, it is doomed to death, sooner or later. Perhaps A. M. knows and is certain that Christianity cannot take men to this height and we also know it to be true and are certain of it. But we further give him the glad tidings that this object can be attained through the Holy religion of Islam. He has tried Christianity and seen, as appears from his surprise at others than prophets reaching the height of sinlessness, that it fails to fulfil the object of the true religion. This he could have seen in the beginning, for the signs of the righteous as stated in the Gospels are nowhere to be met with among the Christians. Our claim for Islam is not a mere



assertion devoid of proof. From the beginning Islam has taught that it can take men to the height of perfection. Nay its very name indicates that it can fulfil this object. The path which it points out for the Muslims is that indicated in the verse: *بلى من اسلم وجهه لله وهو محسن فله اجره عند ربه ولا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون* "He who submits himself completely to God and does that which is right.....his reward is with God and for them is no fear, nor shall they be grieved." The word *اسلم* which is used here to denote a complete submission to the will of God, means also professing Islam. Thus the true professor of Islam is required to resign himself to God. Now we ask A. M. to point out if there is any higher stage of perfection for man to reach than submitting himself completely to God. What is sinlessness but not going against the Will of God, and the person who walks in complete submission to the Will of God is certainly sinless. Of Abraham Almighty God says: *اذ قال له ربه اسلم قال اسلمت لرب العالمين* "When his Lord said to him, 'submit to God,' he said, 'I have submitted myself to the Lord of worlds.'" This submission on the part of Abraham was a fulfilment of all the Divine commandments as appears from the verse: *واذ ابلى ابراهيم ربه بكلمات فاتمهم* To the same purport Almighty God says: *ابراهيم الذى وفى* i.e., "Abraham who completely fulfilled the covenant of God." All this shows that a complete submission to the Will of God is the highest stage of perfection which a man should try to attain to, and when a man reaches this stage, he walks in complete obedience to the Will of God. It is moreover clear that it is this stage to which Islam takes a man. Regarding the perfection of this stage the Holy Quran itself says: *ومن احسن ديناً ممن اسلم وجهه لله وهو محسن واتبع ملة ابراهيم حنيفاً واتخذ الله ابراهيم خليلاً* "And who is better in obedience and submissiveness to God than he who resigns himself completely to God, and does that which is right, and follows the faith of Abraham, the sound in faith; and God took Abraham for His friend." We do not know if all this can satisfy a Christian of the type of A. M., but we are sure that no man of common sense will reach any other conclusion from this except that Islam can take a man to the highest stage of obedience, the stage which Abraham, the *Haneef*, reached and for which Almighty God honored him with the



title of being His friend. This is the stage which the true Muslim reaches but the path is closed to those who do not follow the living religion of Islam. The Holy Quran directs every Muslim to seek this path. In the prayer which every Muslim has to repeat in his five daily prayers, he is taught to say : *اهدنا الصراط المستقيم صراط الذين* ( *نعمت عليهم* ) "Show us the right path, the path of those upon whom have been Thy blessings." It is evident that the path sought here is the path of the holy prophets and righteous servants of God, for they were the recipients of the heavenly blessings. If Almighty God teaches us that we should ask for such blessings, the natural conclusion is that He grants these blessings to such as He thinks to be worthy of them. Had it been the Will of God to keep them back from all besides prophets, why should have every Muslim been taught to pray for them, and why should such prayer have been made obligatory upon all Muslims. Nor can it be said that the blessings spoken of in this prayer, are not the blessings granted to the prophets of God, for worldly blessings cannot possibly be meant here. Moreover the next clause *غير المغضوب عليهم ولا الضالين* tells us that we should pray for the path which is free from every error. So we are not to be satisfied with being partially in the right and partially in the wrong. The path which is pointed out to us is the path of the righteous, the path by walking in which we should not excite the wrath of God, the path which is free from every error. If we cannot be safe from Satan by walking in this path, would we be so if we accept the general Christian maxim of going on sinning and trusting in the blood of Jesus? The latter might seem to A. M. the easier way, but it is the way to destruction. The path of safety is that pointed out by the Holy Quran, let him who will walk in it.

There is another point which A. M. cannot understand. We had advanced the argument that since Divine punishment is a necessary element of sin, and since the Prophets of God are declared in the Holy Quran to be eternally free from all such punishment, therefore they cannot be regarded as sinful. A. M. says that this argument does not prove that they were protected from sins but proves only that they were protected from the punishment of sin. This is queer logic. It should be noted that the general principle proclaimed by the Holy Quran *ومن يعمل شرا يجز به* "Whoever does an evil deed, shall be



punished on account of it." But of a certain class of the faithful servants of God, it tells us that for them the good reward and freedom from punishment have been promised beforehand (ان الذين سبق لهم) (ان الذين سبق لهم) Had there been any possibility of sin in their case, they could not have been declared to be free from punishment beforehand. Since, therefore, there is no possibility of punishment in their case, there is no possibility of sin, and this overthrows A. M.'s contention. Again, consider the two verses وما للظالمين and واللة لا يحب الظالمين, the former meaning that "God does not love the *zalim*," and the latter that "there is no helper of the *zalim*." Again the Holy Quran says: "قل ان كنتم تحبون الله فا تبعون الله" "Say if you love God, then follow Me, that God may love you," showing that one who follows the Holy Prophet is loved by God, and therefore by the previous verse he cannot be a *zalim*. If therefore a true follower of the Holy Prophet can by walking in his footsteps reach the stage at which he cannot be called a *zalim*, it requires no demonstration to prove that the Holy Prophet himself is perfectly free from every kind of *zulm* or disobedience to God. In another place the Holy Quran says: "انا لنصر رسلا والذين امنوا في الحيرة الدنيا" "Verily We give assistance to Our messengers and the true believers in this life." But such assistance, we have already seen, cannot be granted to the *zalim*, and, therefore, the holy prophets of God and the true believers in God cannot be included among the *zalim*, for to them Divine assistance is clearly promised. One thing is clear from this, *viz.*, that even if the word *zulm* has been used of any prophet of God in the Holy Quran, it is not used in the sense in which it is used of the unbelievers, *viz.*, disobedience to God. For if they were *zalim* in that sense, they should not have been loved or assisted by God according to the plain text of the Holy Quran. From this it follows that their *zulm* is not *zulm* in the sense of disobedience to God, the ordinary sense of that word.

What we have thus demonstrated from the words of the Holy Quran, also appears from other considerations. The Holy Quran says (الله اعلم حيث يجعل رسالته) "God knows best whom to charge with His message," in answer to those who denied the revelations of the prophets, because they themselves were not granted revelations like them. The answer given here shows that Almighty God does not charge



any one at random with His message, but through to His deep knowledge He sees the man who is fit for it, and who has the capacity to bear the heavy burden of prophethood. He is sent to preach a doctrine which is hated by the world and to denounce the beliefs which it dearly cherishes. The whole world therefore hates him, and his dearest friends and nearest relatives become his bitterest enemies. He is opposed, tortured and persecuted in every way. Every thing that lies in the power of the world is done to extirpate him and the doctrine he teaches. But he sets the whole world at naught, and does not care in the least for its threats and machinations. On the one side are arrayed all his interests and mortal desires, the ties of blood and friendship and the attractions of wealth and comfort, and on the other, simple obedience to the commandments of God. But he sacrifices all his interests and desires, willingly incurs the hatred and enmity of the whole world, cuts off all connections, forsakes every pleasure and comfort, meets every hardship, undergoes all persecutions and sufferings, and in fact faces death itself, but does not for a moment entertain the idea of turning away from obedience to God. So strong is the connection of his heart with the Divine Being that no power of the world can break it. Is it not a disgraceful lie then to say that the person who has passed through all these trials, borne all hardships and persecutions, sacrificed all interests, spurned all comforts as a trifle, and cut off all worldly connections, without swerving a hair's breadth from obedience to his Master, is guilty of intentionally disobeying Divine commandments for the satisfaction of his sensual desires? Has he not shown that no desire, no interest, no comfort, no tie, can have the least attraction for him as against obedience to God? If there was the least weakness in his heart which could make it swerve from Divine obedience under the strongest desire, it must have been displayed at a time when opposition raged high against him, when persecution knew no end, and when a care for his interests and obedience to his desires would have had the effect of quenching all opposition and saving him from persecutions. But he is cast into the fiery furnace of trials and purged in the crucible of sufferings to prove that there is no such weakness in his heart, and that nothing can lead him away from obedience to God. Had he not possessed such extraordinary perseverance and faithfulness in showing obedience to God, he would not have been suited for the office of a prophet, and Almighty God could not have bestowed







cluding words of *Kashshaf* deserve the special attention of Mr. Upson. He should see carefully whether "the great Muslim commentaries" do not uphold the view advanced by us, and whether they do not reject his contention instead of admitting it. As regards Razi, when interpreting the verse in dispute, he rejects the view which Mr. Upson attributes to him as قول فا سد *i.e.*, wrong, and gives his reasons for regarding it as such. After making all these misrepresentations, Mr. Upson with his Christian arrogance includes Adam among the wicked Mushriks." Himself a *mushrik* and taking a Jew for his God, he has the boldness to call a righteous Prophet of God a "wicked Mushrik," the very person of whom Almighty God says : *ثم اجتباه ربه* : "Then God distinguished him by His abundant bounty and turned to him in mercy and guided him in the right path."

Having done with Mr. Upson, we will now consider a few remarks of A. M. He lays stress on the point that the form *هو الذي خلقكم* points out Adam exclusively as the person spoken of here, and mentions in his support the equivalent form *هو الذي خلقكم من نفس واحدة* and *وخلق منها زوجها* used elsewhere in the Holy Quran and understood generally to be with reference to Adam, a tradition relating to the creation of Eve from the side of Adam, another tradition relating that Adam and Eve named their son Abdul Haris, and the opinion of the author of *Jalalain*. As regards the opinions of commentators we are not, in the first place, bound by them, and in the second place no commentator holds Adam to be actually a *Mushrik*, as Upson and A. M. would have the public to believe. As regards traditions, no Muhammadan has ever considered their authority on a par with the Holy Quran, and we reject every tradition which contradicts the Holy Quran. Thus only the words of the Holy Quran are left for discussion. We have already pointed out the principle of interpretation which should be observed in interpreting the words of the Holy Quran. Because a certain word or phrase has been used in a certain place to indicate a certain significance, it by no means follows that the same word or phrase used in quite a different connection bears exactly the same significance. The important rule that should be borne in mind is, that the various parts of the Holy Quran should be in perfect agreement. Words and phrases often allow of various



significations, and our choice is to be determined by the rule that the interpretation chosen should not clash with other parts of the Holy Quran, not that it should not be different from the meaning attached to the same word or phrase elsewhere. The latter rule if adopted, as A. M. would have it, would not only divest the language of its richness but also set parts of the Holy Quran against one another.

We have therefore to see whether the Holy Quran allows us to attribute *shirk* to a Prophet of God. Consider a few verses: ان الله لا يغفر ان يشرك به "Verily God never forgives that other gods should be set up with Him;" ومن يشرك بالله فقد "And whoever is guilty of *shirk* with God, has erred with far-gone error," and further on: "Verily they invoke a rebel Satan.....He who taketh Satan rather than God for his patron, is ruined with a palpable ruin.....These their dwelling is Hell, and no escape shall they find from it;" ان من يشرك بالله فقد حرم الله عليه الجنة وما والاها وما "Verily he who is guilty of *shirk*, to him God has forbidden paradise and his abode is fire, and no one will assist the *zâlimin*;" ثم اعظميا "Verily he who is guilty of *shirk* with God, is guilty of the fabrication of a heinous crime." We earnestly ask A. M. to state whether he regards any one of these verses to be applicable to Adam, the Prophet of God? We wonder what is the Christian conception of a prophet? According to these verses, a *mushrik* is an impostor to whom paradise is forbidden and whose sin is not forgiven. It is sheer impudence to assert that Adam was a *mushrik*. It is for this reason that whatever interpretation the commentators may have adopted no trustworthy commentator has ever asserted that Adam was in fact a *Mushrik*.

The truth seems to be that on account of the weakness of their faith which is based on untrustworthy stories and is devoid of every sign of the true faith, the Christians are unable to comprehend the strong and living faith and the unbounded trust which the Prophets have in God and the close connection which they have with Him. We sometimes think that their abuse of the Holy Prophets may not be so much based on spite as on ignorance, for even the man whom they



think to be their God is not left out. For their salvation they have not only deemed it necessary to consider the Prophets of God to have sinned against Him, but they also believe that the heart of Jesus was subjected to curse and remained in a condition of estrangement from, and hatred and enmity to, God, for three days. They little understand what the connection is which the Prophets of God have with their Master, and therefore speak out in ignorance what they like. If they had the remotest idea of the close connection which the righteous servants of God have with Him, and which every man should try to have, they would not have dared to make such blasphemous and impudent assertions. In fact, all those who have stumbled at certain deeds done by prophets, have done so because of their ignorance and their own estrangement from God. Those who have any connection with Him know the immeasurable superiority of the connection of the Prophets with God, through whom they have received the blessing. When a person can by following a Holy Prophet of God attain to the high stage of spiritual perfection, reaching which he finds himself delivered from the power of Satan and under the control of God, how can he entertain the idea that the Holy Prophet whom he follows, and of whose blessings he has received only a mite, remained in the power of Satan and that against the plain teaching of the Holy Quran which says that Satan has no power on the righteous servants of God (ان عبادى ليس لك عليهم سلطان). The crime that is attributed to Adam is of such a heinous nature that no ordinary Muslim who has any certainty in the existence of God—we do not speak here of Christians, for their faith with all its weakness is not in God but in a weak mortal—would ever be guilty of it, to say nothing of a Prophet of God who is sent to proclaim the unity of God upon earth and whose connection with God is so strong as not to be broken by any power in the world. The first and most important message of every prophet in the world has been to obliterate *shirk* from the face of earth, the most heinous crime which is looked upon by God with the greatest disfavor, and it is truly a Christian idea to look upon the prophets as indulging in *shirk*, for they look upon their own prophet as setting up *himself* with God. The Holy Quran teems with verses showing that the first message which every prophet had to deliver to his people was the Unity of God. Thus قوم اعبدوا الله ما لكم من الة غيره "O my people, worship God, besides Him there is no God for you."







prove effectual.....: And in what other book will they believe who reject the Quran?.....They ask thee of the hour (when punishment will come down upon them)....." Perhaps A. M. will admit that the persons addressed here are the *Mushrik* Arabs, the opponents of the Holy Prophet. They are sometimes spoken of in the third person and sometimes in the second, as in لا تأتیکم الا بغتة "The punishment will not overtake you but suddenly." The next *ruku* begins with the verse under discussion, the address remaining unchanged, and runs as follows: "He it is who has created you from a single person, and of the same kind made He his wife that he might dwell with her.....yet when God had given them a perfect child, they joined partners with Him in return for what He had given them. But high is God exalted above the partners *they join* with Him. Will they join those with Him who cannot create anything and are themselves created, and have no power to help them or to help themselves. And if ye summon them to the guidance, they will not follow you. It is the same to you whether ye summon them or whether ye hold your peace. Truly they whom ye call on, besides God, are servants like yourselves. Call on them and let them answer you if what you say of them be true.....Say, call on these joint gods of yours, then make your plot against me, and give me no delay. Verily my protector is God who has sent down the Book, and He protects the righteous. But they whom ye call on beside God can lend you no help, nor can they help themselves."

Anyone who reads the above lengthy quotation will at once see that there is only one subject dealt with in the whole of it and that is the *shirk* of the opponents of the Holy Prophet and the consequent punishment which God would send down upon them. Was Adam one of the opponents of the Holy Prophet that his *shirk* (supposing for the sake of argument that he was guilty of *shirk*) is spoken of here? The Holy Quran mentions two classes, the prophets and their opponents. The prophets appear as the preachers of the Unity of God and of righteousness, and their opponents oppose them and do not listen to their admonitions. Consequently when the prophets are much persecuted and hindered in the progress of their work, Divine punishment, of which the prophets have forewarned their opponents,



overtakes the latter while Divine assistance is granted to the prophets. The story of every prophet that is related in the Holy Quran is related as an illustration of this general rule, and thus the opponents of the Holy Prophet are forewarned of the punishment that must overtake them. In the verses preceding and following those under discussion, the same is indicated more plainly. Their falsifying the signs of God is first mentioned, and they are told that Divine punishment would overtake them gradually, and that the hour is not far off. They ask when would that hour come, and are told that the exact time is known only to God, but it will certainly come and punishment will certainly overtake them, and then the idols would not give them any help nor would the idols be saved from destruction. This is clearly a prophecy relating to the destruction of the idols and the victory of the Holy Prophet, and it is the sheerest folly to thrust in Adam here. Adam belongs to the class of prophets and not to the opponents of the prophets that his *shirk* should be spoken of here. A. M. says that Imam Razi has admitted the truth elsewhere where he had no fear of the objections of the opponents. We ask, has Razi admitted anywhere that Adam was guilty of *shirk*? Not at all; he simply makes a passing remark in another place that Adam and Eve are meant in the verse: *هو الذي خلقكم من نفس واحدة* *واجعل منها زوجا* but there he does not discuss the arguments for and against it, and it is simply an *obiter dictum*. When he comes to the verse itself and considers the arguments for and against different significances, he favors the one we have stated. Moreover, the view has been taken by some that Adam is meant by the words, *نفس واحدة* but then they put a different interpretation upon the latter portion of the verse, which we have suggested in quoting Kashshaf. It is no wonder that there may be different views regarding these words, because there are also different views regarding the interpretation of the same words in the beginning of Sura Nisa, and it is the ignorance of A. M. which does not allow him to see the truth.

A. M. quotes a tradition, but we have already said that a tradition contradicting the Holy Quran must be condemned. When the Holy Quran puts in the mouth of the Holy Prophet the words *يا ايها الكافرون لا اعبد ما تعبدون* "O unbelievers, I do not worship what you worship," it really gives a description of every prophet, and the



words are as well true of Adam as of the Holy Prophet. Similarly when Joseph addresses the two prisoners saying : *ما كان لنا ان نشرك* "It does not become us (*i.e.*, the Prophets of God) that we should set up other things with God," he gives a description as well of himself and his ancestors as of Adam. The prophets are but one class and the Holy Quran gives a description of every prophet in the description of one. Where the Holy Quran describes the *عباد الرحمن* (the servants of the Merciful), it mentions one of their qualifications to be *والذين لا يدعون مع الله الها اخر* "And those who do not set up with God any other god." Now the Prophets of God are primarily included in the servants of the Merciful and, therefore, Adam being one of them, did not call upon any other god besides God. We do not think any sensible man will still hold in face of all these plain texts of the Holy Quran that Adam was guilty of *shirk*.

## The Tomb of Jesus at Srinagar.

To

THE EDITOR OF

*The Review of Religions.*

DEAR SIR,

In your number for November and December I referred to some false statements made by a Rev. Gentleman of Lahore (Mr. Weitbrecht), concerning the sacred shrine of Jesus Christ at Srinagar. He had tried to impose upon the public by applying a wrong name to the tomb of Yusasaf. In his first letter in the *Epiphany* he himself wrote: 'Within this are two tombstones. He (a venerable old man in charge of the shrine) said that the larger one at the north end was that of prophet Yusasaf, and that the smaller tombstone was that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din.' But he soon made a shift. He announced in his second letter that the name Yusasaf was impressed upon the people by Mirza Sahib's emissaries, who had recently visited the place, thus insinuating that this name was formerly unknown to the people of Srinagar, and that



they were taught this name by Mirza Sahib's followers, and that the name of the buried prophet (whom he called not a prophet but a saint) was most probably Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. This was an intentional misrepresentation on the part of the Missionary gentleman. He saw that it was impolitic to admit that the occupant of the tomb at Srinagar was prophet Yusasaf, for not only the name was, to all appearance, a Hebrew name, but many things were told of this Yusasaf, which identified him with Jesus. He very shrewdly saw that the admission that the tomb belonged to prophet Yusasaf involved a partial, if not total, admission of the fact that he was no other than Jesus of Nazareth. So he thought it expedient to give the occupant of the tomb a modern and Muslim name. Hard by the tomb of Prophet Yusasaf he noticed a small tombstone said to belong to one Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. He thought that if he should only transfer the name of the occupant of this small tombstone to that of the larger tomb, his object was achieved. He might have argued that the course he was going to adopt was not strictly fair, yet the cause which he sought to support was a noble one, and the end would justify the means. Being a staunch believer in the blood of Jesus, he might have also consoled himself with the idea that the blood of Jesus would wash away the sin, especially when it was committed with a view to uphold his cause. He might have also felt encouraged by the thought that in doing so he was only walking in the footsteps of the sainted early fathers of Christianity. Encouraged by these or like considerations, he declared that the tomb most probably belonged to Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. He wrote: "The only name connected with it which the neighbours readily gave us, is that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. Without, therefore, accepting their testimony as unimpeachable, I have used this as the most probable name of the buried saint." It is pity that our evangelists should permit themselves to make such misrepresentations. The neighbours plainly told him that Sayyad Nasr-ud Din was the name of the saint that lay buried in the smaller tombstone. But this smaller tombstone, Mr. Weithrecht knew full well, was not the subject of discussion. It was the larger tomb which we contended, belonged to Prophet Yusasaf, and the neighbours did tell him that the larger tombstone contained the remains of Prophet Yusasaf. Why did he then pervert their evidence? In the November



and December number of your *Review*, I called upon him to explain why he intentionally gave a wrong name to the person lying buried in the sepulchre under discussion. When he knew that Sayyad Nasr-ud Din lay buried in the smaller tombstone, how had he the face to assert that according to the testimony of the neighbours, the person that rests in the larger tomb, *viz.*, the tombstone which forms the subject of the present discussion, is Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. Had such a statement been made by us, he would have termed it a shameful lie. Mr. Weitbrecht once more appears in the *Epiphany* with a reply to my letter, but as to why he intentionally gave a wrong name to the occupant of the tomb under discussion, he observes discreet silence. He has made no response to my demand. He has not explained as I called upon him to do, for what reasons he preferred to call the occupant of the tomb in question Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. The charge against him was so clear that it was impossible for him to clear himself of it. But he had to face another difficulty. He had to put some name of the tomb at the head of the letter. The heading of his last letter was 'The Srinagar Tomb of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din.' If this time some other name had stood at the head of his letter, this would have been an open admission on his part that in his last letter he had been guilty of wilful misrepresentation. So though he was unable to say even a single word as to why he misapplied the name Nasr-ud Din to the Prophet lying buried in the larger tomb, and though in the body of his letter he did not even a single time speak of the tomb as that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din, yet we see that the name Sayyad Nasrud-Din forms still the heading of his letter. It appears that the habit of misrepresentation is so deeply ingrained in the nature of the Christian controversialists that however severely they may be censured for it, they cannot break themselves of the habit. The persistence of this Christian gentleman in applying this name to the tomb under discussion, in spite of his knowledge that the name really belongs to the other tombstone, is indeed surprising. As these two persons lie side by side, therefore perhaps he did not see any great harm in giving the name of the one to the other. Next time, however, I hope this name will not appear at the top of his letter, or if it does, the writer must also state his reasons for transferring the name of the smaller tombstone to that of the larger one. He must also explain why he perverted the neighbours' evidence.



So much for the heading of Rev. Weitbrecht's letter I now turn to the subject-matter of his letter. He discusses two points. Firstly, he states that if the name of Yusasaf's book was Bushra or Injil, and if he used parables similar to those of the Gospel, he might be a disciple of Jesus rather than Jesus himself. Secondly, he attempts to identify Yusasaf with Buddha. He argues that as the events related about Yusasaf in the romance of Barlaam and Josaphat are similar to certain events of Buddha's life, the name Yusasaf becomes susceptible of explanation and must be another form of Bodisatva. I will take the second point first. Had the romance of Barlaam and Josaphat been the only source of information, had we known nothing of Yusasaf except what is told of him by the writer of the Romance, we would have been inclined to accept as correct the view that Yusasaf was only Buddha in disguise. As the story of Yusasaf, as related in the Barlaam Romance, bore some resemblance to that of Buddha, and as the critics had no means to ascertain whether Yusasaf was an original character, it was natural for them to entertain the idea that Yusasaf was no other than Buddha. But now new things are revealed concerning Yusasaf. We no longer depend on what Mr. Weitbrecht calls a folk-lore romance for our information regarding Yusasaf. We now learn from quite a different source that Yusasaf was an independent and historical personage, and not Buddha in a new garb as some were disposed to believe. The Mirza Sahib is not indebted to any version of Balaam and Josaphat romance for his information regarding Yusasaf. He had known him long before he came across any version of the Barlaam story. Srinagar was his original source of information. It was from the inhabitants of Srinagar that he first learned of Yusasaf. He was told that a Nabi Sahib lay buried in the Khan Yar Street of Srinagar. The word 'Nabi' excited his curiosity. The word showed that he was a Semitic prophet; for the term Nabi is applied to Semitic prophets only. Further inquiry confirmed this view, for we were told that this prophet, who was also known as Yusasaf, was a stranger to this land, and he came here from a distant country in the west some 1900 years ago. The claim of the Afghans to be the representatives of the lost Israelite tribes, and the remarkable similarity in the features of the Afghans, the



Kashmiris and the Jews on the one hand and the escape of Jesus from the accursed death of the cross, his leaving the sepulchre in which his body was laid, and his appearance in his physical body to his disciples after the event of the crucifixion, on the other, led us to conclude that this prince and prophet Yusasaf was Jesus of Nazareth, who having escaped the accursed death on the cross came to India to preach the Gospel to the scattered sheep of his fold, for the two tribes of Israel that survived in Syria, did not constitute the whole of his fold to which he was sent as a shepherd. The very name Yusasaf also supported the conclusion. Asaf, we saw, was a Hebrew name, and meant the assembler of the people (in this case, of the lost tribes of Israel) and Yus was evidently a shortened form of the Hebrew name Yasu (Jesus).

Mr. Weitbrecht may see now that our information regarding Yusasaf is not derived, in the first place, from the romance of Barlaam and Josaphat, or any of its oriental versions. We learned of Yusasaf from quite an independent source. The western critics were disposed to identify Yusasaf with Buddha, because they knew nothing more of Yusasaf than what they were told of him in the Barlaam romance. They did not care much for the name Yusasaf, and gave out that Yusasaf was the same as Gotama, and took Yusasaf for a corruption of Bodisatva. If they had had access to this new source of information, they would not have ventured to dispose of the name of the hero so easily. They would have, then, seen that the name Yusasaf does not occur only in the Barlaam romance, but that there are other sources also which give us some information regarding him, and that therefore Yusasaf is a character of independent existence. The fact that we learn of Yusasaf through two separate channels, attaches great importance to the character of Yusasaf, and we cannot lightly set aside the name of the hero and identify him with Buddha merely on the basis of a similarity of certain events in the lives of both. Now the name of the Hero has become more important than the events of the story, and if the events and the story of Yusasaf, as narrated in the Barlaam romance, bear resemblance in certain details to those of the life of Buddha, this similarity of events is no longer a sufficient evidence to show that the two names really belong to one and the



same person. We have now learnt from quite a different quarter that Yusasaf was a character distinct from Buddha.

The erroneousness of the details, which are ascribed to Yusasaf in the Barlaam romance, and on the authority of which attempts are made to identify Yusasaf with Buddha, has been proved by the local traditions from which we learn that Yusasaf was a Hebrew prophet, who came to this land from a distant country in the west 1900 years ago. Now the point at issue is this. If the tomb, which lies in the Khan Yar Street of Srinagar, really belongs to Yusasaf, then Yusasaf is not Buddha. If it does not actually belong to Yusasaf, then we have no reason to object to the theory that Yusasaf was Buddha. This is the point upon which hinges the whole question. We are quite prepared to prove that the tomb really belongs to Yusasaf. If Mr. Weitbrecht still sticks to the theory that Yusasaf was no other than Buddha, he is bound to prove that the tomb does not belong to Yusasaf. There is the clearest evidence to show that this tomb belongs to prophet Yusasaf. The old man at the tomb told Mr. Weitbrecht that it belonged to Prophet Yusasaf. We possess written testimonies of the people of Srinagar, which testify that the name of the prophet, who lies buried in the Khan Yar tomb, is Yusasaf. Not only this but the annals of the country too attest to the fact that the occupant of the tomb bears the name of Yusasaf. In my previous contribution, I quoted from the *Tarikh-i-Aazami* of Kashmir to show that the tomb is known as that of Prophet Yusasaf. Referring to this book Mr. Weitbrecht makes a false statement. He, misleads his readers by asserting that the *Tarikh-i-Aazami* does not give the name Yusasaf in connection with the tomb in question. The original words of Rev. Weitbrecht are as follows: 'That the name Yusasaf (*uncnnected with this tomb*) is mentioned in a modern history of Kashmir is nothing to the purpose of Mirza's brochure.' To show that the author of the *Tarikh-i-Azami* gives the name Yusasaf *expressly in connection with this tomb*, and that Mr. Weitbrecht is guilty of misrepresentation, I once more quote the words of the *Tarikh*. They run thus: 'The tomb *next to that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din* is generally known as that of a prophet. He was a prince who came to Kashmir from a foreign land. He was perfect in his piety, righteousness and devotion. He was made a prophet by God and was engaged



in preaching to the Kashmiris. His name was Yusasaf.' Rev. Gentleman! did you not say, in your first letter in the *Epiphany*, that within the building there are two tombstones, and that the venerable old man in charge of the tomb told you that the larger one belonged to Prophet Yusasaf and the smaller one to Sayyad Nasr-ud Din? Now the writer of the *Tarikh-i-Aazami* also remarks that *the tomb next to that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din* belongs to Prophet Yusasaf. You knew also that the tomb in question was the one which lay next to that of Sayyad Nasr-ud Din. Why do you say, then, that the *Tarikh-i-Aazami* does not give the name Yusasaf in connection with the tomb under discussion? Is it not a serious misrepresentation? How will you account for this?

In short, not only the local tradition ascribes the tomb to Prophet Yusasaf, but even the annals of the land speak of the tomb as belonging to Prince-prophet Yusasaf. It is curious to note that certain versions of the Josaphat story also contain clear references to this tomb. We have on page 359 of the *Ikmal-ud Din*, written about 1000 years ago, the following passage:—"He (Yusasaf) wandered about in several lands and towns until he reached a land called Kashmir. So he moved about in the land and lived and stayed therein until death overtook him, and he left his body of clay and ascended to the Light; and before he breathed his last, he summoned a disciple of his named Yabid, who used to serve him and wait on his person and was perfect in all matters, and addressed him thus: 'My departure from this world hath drawn nigh; so you must perform your duties and must not swerve from the truth and should observe all rites.' Then he bade the disciples to build him a tomb and stretching out his legs turned his head to the west and his face to the east and yielded up his ghost." In the above passage, it is plainly told that Yusasaf died in Kashmir, and before he died he ordered a disciple of his to build him a tomb. Joseph Jacobs, who has written a critical review of the various versions of the story of Josaphat, and whose work was published in 1896, says on page 105 that according to one version of the story of Josaphat he died in Kashmir. His original words run as follows: "And at last he reaches Kashmir, where he puts his head to the west and his feet to the east and dies." Now not only the local tradition and the



annals of Kashmir state that Yusasaf lies entombed in Srinagar, but even the ancient versions of the Josaphat romance contain clear references to this tomb and corroborate the fact that Yusasaf died in Kashmir. All these facts combine to prove conclusively that the Srinagar tomb belongs to Yusasaf. This being established, we must now reject as false the theory of the identity of Yusasaf with Gotama Buddha. If the tomb lying in the Khan Yar Street of Srinagar belongs to Yusasaf, then certainly Yusasaf is not Buddha. If Rev. Weitbrecht wishes to adhere to the old theory, he must disprove the arguments mentioned above. But Rev. Weitbrecht has an authoritative way of refuting arguments. He will say that the evidence furnished to prove the identity of the Srinagar tomb with that of Prophet Yusasaf is worthless and will flatter himself with the thought that by so doing he has refuted all arguments.

I have shown that local tradition, the annals of Kashmir, and even the old versions of the Josaphat story, prove the tomb to be that of Yusasaf, and that therefore Yusasaf must have been a different person from Buddha. I will now add a few words as to the manner in which the name Yusasaf has been identified with the word Bodisatva. Critics have wondered at the occurrence of Syriac names in a story of which the scene is India and consequently attempts have been made to identify these names with Indian names. The forms of the letters of the Arabic Alphabet have rendered them great service in this respect. Most letters of the Arabic Alphabet resemble each other in form, the distinction lying only in the number of dots. To illustrate this I will take the initial letter of the word *يوزا سف*. If we ignore the dots, the same letter can be read as *ba, ta, sa, nun, ya, lam*, viz., in six different ways. In Persian Alphabet which is based on the Arabic Alphabet, the initial letter of the word *يوزا سف* can be read in eight different ways, i.e., as *ba, pa, ta, ta, sa, nun, lam* and *ya*. The same is the case with almost all the letters of the Persian and Arabic Alphabets. This similarity in the forms of Arabic as well as Persian characters has much facilitated the task of the identification of names. The name Yusasaf has been identified with the name Bodisatva by following the same principle. Leaving out the vowels, the two words have only a single letter in common, viz., *sin* or *s* and thus Bodisatva is the last word with which Yusasaf can be identi-



fied. But ignore the dots and the task of identification is rendered easy. Neglect the dot of the third letter and Yusasaf is changed into Yudasaf. The initial letter has two dots under it, leave out one dot and Yudasaf is converted into Budasaf. Substitute (v) for (f) and Budasaf is turned into Budasav. But one difficulty still remains. There is nothing in Bodasaf corresponding to the letter *t* of Bodisatva. This difficulty has been removed by Mr. Weitbrecht by inserting an additional *t* in Bodasaf before the final letter. This he does perhaps on the authority of some English writer, who had no access to original Arabic versions and possessed only second-hand information. But the question is, are these alterations warrantable? On what authority are all the dots of the word يوزاسف neglected in order to turn it into Bodisatva? The dots are the only marks of distinction between most letters of Arabic Alphabet, and we cannot ignore them at will. The assertion that Yusasaf was originally Bodisatva, and that the scribes erred in marking dots, cannot be accepted as true unless some original copy in Arabic or Persian is produced which contains the correct form of the word Bodisatva. If such a copy cannot be produced, there is no reason to assert that the scribes made a mistake in marking dots. A scribe is more apt to omit dots rather than mark unnecessary dots. If there was any error at all, it ought to have lain in the omission of dots, and not in supplying dots where none were needed. Again, the word يوزاسف contains three dotted letters, and all of them must be admitted to have been erroneously dotted, if the correct form was Bodisatva and not Yusasaf. This circumstance also shows that the scribes did not commit any error in marking the dots. They might have possibly erred in dotting one letter. How can it be imagined that they erred in dotting all the three letters, which are the only dotted letters contained in the word. Again, the scribes might have erred once or twice in copying the word, but how did it come to pass that they stuck to this error throughout their manuscripts without becoming aware of their mistake. Moreover, the mere omission of the dots is not sufficient to identify Yusasaf with Bodisatva. Some other changes must be made to prove that Yusasaf is the corruption of Bodisatva. The Arabic versions are only translations. The same is the case with other versions now extant. The original story was, according to Mr. Weitbrecht, written in Pali, Sanskrit or some



other Indian language. If he desires to prove that Yusasaf is a corruption of Bodisatva, he is bound to show that in the characters of the language from which the story was translated into various other languages, the word Bodisatva might also be read as Yusasaf, and that the translator was likely to err in deciphering the word. the word Bodisatva and might have mistaken it for Yusasaf. That Yusasaf and not Bodisatva is the original form cannot be denied. The various Arabic versions give the name as Yusasaf (and not Yudasatf as the Rev. gentleman asserts). The other forms Joasaf or Josaphat contained in other versions are simply variations of Yusasaf and do not bear the slightest resemblance to Bodisatva. The ~~ancient records of Kashmir give Yusasaf and not Bodisatva as~~ the name of the prophet that lies entombed in the Khan Yar Street. The people of Srinagar too state that it is prophet Yusasaf and not Bodisatva that lies buried in their midst. All these testimonies coming from different quarters prove that the correct form of the name is Yusasaf and not Bodisatva. Besides, Bodisatva is not identical with Buddha. It is a title much inferior to the title of Buddha.

This being shown that Yusasaf is a different person from Gotama Buddha and that the name cannot be a corruption of Bodisatva, I have now to show that Yusasaf is no other than Jesus. We learn from the Gospel that Jesus' career on earth did not terminate with the event of crucifixion. No doubt, he was placed in a tomb, which consisted of a small chamber, hewn in a rock and spacious enough to admit a number of men. But the stone was found rolled away from the mouth of the tomb and the body of Jesus was not there. The tomb lay in a garden and belonged to Joseph, a wealthy disciple of Jesus. We are told that when Jesus left the tomb he disguised himself as a gardener. He must have received the garment from the servants of Joseph who acted there as gardeners. He travelled in disguise to Galilee and walked for some distance in company with two of his disciples, with his face closely wrapped lest he should be recognised and given over to the Jews. He met his disciples in secret and assured them that he had escaped the accursed death of the cross. The following account of his secret interview with his disciples is very interesting: 'But they were terrified and affrighted and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And he said unto them: Why are ye



troubled? And wherefore do reasonings arise in your heart. See my hands and my feet that it is myself; handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having; and when he had said this, he shewed them his hands and feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat and they gave him a piece of broiled fish and he took it and did eat it before them.

Similarly we have other passages which show that Jesus did not die on the cross. For instance, take the 22nd and 23rd verses of Chapter XXIV Luke's Gospel, where it is written: "Moreover certain women of our company amazed us having been early at the tomb, and when they found not his body, they came saying that they had also seen a vision of angels which said he (Jesus) was alive." The words 'he was alive' are very significant. The angels appeared to the women when Jesus still lay in the tomb, and hence the words of the angels show that he was alive when he was lying in the tomb. If we say of a person that he is alive, this means that he has not experienced death as yet. In the same manner we have the words 'Why seek ye the living among the dead.' This also supports the conclusion that Christ was alive when he was placed in the tomb. The Christians hold that Jesus had breathed his last on the cross, and that he was dead when he was placed in the tomb; but that life was again breathed into him and he rose again on the third day. But this is all absurd. What evidence is there to show that he was re-animated. Why not say that he was not dead, and that he only revived after having fallen into a swoon? The events which occurred previous to his being laid in the tomb favour the latter conclusion, *viz.*, that he had not died on the cross. His suspension on the cross lasted only for a few hours—a period admittedly insufficient to bring about death. When Joseph went in to Pilate to ask for the body of Jesus, Pilate 'marvelled if he were already dead.' The two thieves that were hung up, one on the right hand and the other on the left hand of Jesus, came down alive and were perfectly conscious. The bones of the thieves were broken, but the bones of Jesus were left unbroken. Now this Jesus, who remained nailed to the cross for a few hours, of whom Pilate marvelled if he were already dead, whose bones were left unbroken, whose body was given over, to a friend of his who must



thave lavished care on him, we find that this Jesus left the tomb on the third day, disguised himself as a gardener, travelled a distance from Jerusalem to Galilee, met his disciples in secret and assured them that he was alive, ate fish and showed the prints of the nails on his hands. Under these circumstances the only conclusion is that he did not die on the cross. Many are known to have been found alive after they had remained nailed to the cross for days, but Jesus remained on the cross only for 3 hours. Why should we then accept the unnatural conclusion that he had died but resuscitated again. There are other circumstances also which show that Jesus did not die on the cross. We learn that Pilate wished to save Jesus. So he might have given secret instructions to his officers. The soldiers at the tomb might have also received similar directions. This idea is strengthened when we find the soldiers abstaining from breaking the bones of Jesus. Pilate's desire to spare Jesus is further apparent from the fact that he gave over the body to a friend of Jesus and not to the Jews. Again the fact that Jesus borrowed a garment from the gardener also shows that a secret plot was formed to save him. One wonders why Jesus disguised himself as a gardener. He ought to have risen in all glory, dressed in a shining garment like the angels. His resurrection ought to have been also accompanied by the music of angels in the air just as it is alleged that there one when he was born. We disbelieve his resurrection, because every thing about it was done in perfect secrecy. He dressed himself as a gardener, hastened to leave Jerusalem, met his disciples only in secret, and ascended to heaven also in secret. The circumstances of the case are so clear that if they be laid before an impartial judge, his decision would certainly be, not that Jesus had died on the cross and revived again, but that he was alive when he was laid in the tomb.

In asserting that Jesus was dead when he was placed in the tomb the Christians not only make an unwarranted statement but also deny a miracle of Jesus. When asked to show a sign of his truth, Jesus said that he would show no other sign except that of prophet Jonas. Now Jonas was alive when the fish swallowed him up, he was alive in the belly of the fish, and he was alive when the fish vomited him out. The similarity of Jesus' fate with that of Jonas requires



that the former should have also gone into the tomb alive and come out of it alive. The appearance of an angel to Pilate's wife also showed that God's purpose was to save Jesus. In short, the Gospels furnish the clearest proof of the escape of Jesus from the accursed death of the cross. But this is not all. A large number of medical works state unanimously that an ointment named the Ointment of Jesus or the Ointment of the Apostles, was prepared for Jesus. The apostles lived with Jesus only for a short period, during which Jesus is not known to have received any wounds other than those which he received when he was nailed to the cross. So th is testimony of the medical works also shows that the cross did not kill Jesus.

Against this concurrent testimony, adduced from the Gospels and medical works, there is nothing in the hands of the Christians to show that Jesus was dead when he was laid in the tomb and that there he was restored to life. This is a mere foolish assertion for which there is not the slightest proof. Who was there in the tomb to see Jesus when his body was being reanimated? Though the Christians do not admit that Jesus was alive when he was laid in the tomb, yet it is gratifying to learn that, according to Christian belief, it was with an earthly body that he met his disciples after he had left the tomb. This admission on the part of the Christians proves two things. Firstly, it proves that Jesus was laid in the tomb alive. His being found alive, after he had been laid in the tomb, shows but too plainly that he had not died on the cross at all. It is not seldom that persons are given up as dead, and when they are found to be alive afterwards, it is concluded that it was only an apparent death which was mistaken for actual death. Why should we then think differently in the case of Jesus? Secondly, it proves that Jesus did not ascend to heaven. Can anything be more absurd than to assert that Jesus, with his flesh and bones, with the prints of the nails still visible on his hands and feet and with a spear wound in his side, soared up to heaven. Flesh and bones cannot rise to heaven even if it be the flesh and bows of a God. We are required to believe that Jesus, with his body of clay, rose up to heaven simply because the evangelists say so. If he ascended to heaven, why was his ascension only witnessed by the disciples and



not by other men? Rev. Weitbrecht with all his intelligence would say that Jesus rode on the wings of a cloud which took him up: 'a cloud received him out of their sight' (Acts I: 9). But I would ask him, where did that cloud deposit its holy burden. Heaven cannot receive flesh and bones. The rays of the sun must have dissipated the cloud, and the body must have fallen down and been drowned in the same sea—perhaps the Dead Sea—just as they melted the wax which cemented the wings of Icarus, who fell down and was drowned in the sea, which being known after his name has made him immortal. In short, the Christians must seek for him a home on this very Earth, where he passed the remaining days of his life, for no one is going to believe the assertion that he with his flesh and bones was lifted up to heaven. The admission that it was with an earthly body that Jesus met his disciples after the event of crucifixion has indeed ruined the cause of the Christians, for now they must admit that he passed the remaining days of his life on this Planet and that he could not ascend to heaven with his flesh and bones. The fact that it was on this earth that he moved about for 40 days after crucifixion also shows that he must have likewise passed his remaining days somewhere on this earth. Jesus was a prophet not only for any particular section of the Israelites, but for the whole house of Israel. But the Jews that lived in Syria did not represent the whole house of Israel. They represented only two tribes of Israel. The remaining ten tribes were carried away in captivity and had settled in eastern lands. That they had settled in Afghanistan and Kashmir cannot be denied. The Afghans unanimously claim to be the representatives of the lost tribes of Israel. Their features as well as those of the Kashmiris bear a remarkable resemblance to Jewish features. Their geographical names, the names of their tribes, their character, their manner of dress, their customs, all point to their Israelite origin. Even to this day we notice a general prevalence of Israelite names among the Afghans and the Kashmiris. The story of the wise men going from the East to Syria, at the time of Jesus' birth, also shows that there were men in the East who expected the appearing of a Messiah, and they must have been Israelites, for no other nation was given the promise of a Messiah. Jesus' work would have remained unfinished if he had left this world without delivering his message to the tribes



that had settled in the east. The eastern tribes had not ceased to be Israelites by living in a foreign land. It was not safe for Jesus to live any longer in the land of Syria. So he must have left Syria for the east. Let us now see whether there is any evidence to show that Jesus actually came to these Eastern Israelites. The person who lies buried in the Srinagar tomb is unanimously said to be a *Nabi* and *Shahzada*, who came to India from a western land. On the one hand we learn that Jesus, who was at once a *Nabi* and *Shahzada* (prince), came out of the tomb alive and left his native country, and on the other hand we are told that a *Nabi* and *Shahzada* came to Kashmir, some 1900 hundred years ago, and that he lies buried in the capital of Kashmir. This at once suggests to our mind that this *Nabi* and *Shahzada*, who came to Kashmir, was the same *Nabi* and *Shahzada* who left the land of Syria for fear of the Jews and to preach the word of God to the lost Israelite tribes. Even the people among whom he lies buried are believed to be the representatives of lost tribes, like their neighbours, the Afghans. But this is not all. We further learn that this *Nabi* and *Shahzada* called his book *Bushra* or Gospel, and spoke the same parables which Jesus spoke when he was in the land of Syria. Mr. Joseph Jacobs, who has written a critical review of the various versions of the Josaphat story, is compelled to admit that the parable of the sower existed in the original, and is not a Christian interpolation. What further proof does Mr. Weitbrecht require for the identity of this *Nabi* and *Shahzada* with the *Nabi* and *Shahzada* whom he superstitiously worships as his God. If he cannot accept him on this evidence as the Prophet Jesus, the onus lies on him to show that any of Jesus' disciples was known both as *Shahzada* and *Nabi* like Jesus, and represented the teachings of Jesus as his own and called them his own Gospel. But such a proof is beyond the power of this Christian gentleman, for none but Jesus of Nazareth was known as *Shahzada Nabi*.

Yours truly,

SHER ALI.

