

Vol. IV.

No. 5.

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

MAY 1905.

Digitized by Khilafat Library

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
POLYGAMY	163
OBJECTIONS AGAINST POLYGAMY REFUTED ...	163
THE ARYA SAMAJ CONCEPTION OF MARRIAGE ...	175
A SHOCK OF EARTHQUAKE	182
THE 'RUPTURE OF HEART' THEORY OF THE DEATH OF JESUS	191
NEW TESTAMENT	194
A CHRISTIAN PRINCE ON CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION ...	198
REVIEW	199

QADIAN,

DISTRICT GURDASPUR, PUNJAB, INDIA.

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

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS.

VOL. IV.)

MAY 1905.

(No. 5.)

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
نَحْمَدُهٗ وَنُصَلِّیْ عَلٰی رَسُوْلِهِ الْكَرِیْمِ

Polygamy.

3. Objections against Polygamy Refuted.

My article on the Necessity of Polygamy published in the March number of this magazine has given rise to a misconception which I take up for consideration before dealing with other objections. A friend of mine who has been reading the series of articles on the alleged hinderances to Muslim progress with some interest, and who considers the first article on polygamy to be "well-reasoned," says: "But may I submit that according to your own showing the universal rule ought to remain monogamy. Further on may I draw your attention to the well recognised principle of legislation as laid down in Bentham's Theory of Legislation, that the best rule is that which aims at the greatest good to the greatest number. Nature itself seems to provide that considering the number of males and females and the slight excess of the latter over the former, the rule of universal application must be monogamy." I cannot say how this misconception has arisen. I never wrote that polygamy should be or can be a universal rule. On the other hand, it was expressly stated in that article that monogamy must remain the rule and polygamy an exception, and reasons were given in support of this assertion. I have further shown in the article on "Polygamy in Islam" that the Holy Quran only sanctions polygamy and does not make it obligatory. Unless it is shown that no reason exists for making polygamy an exception or that the reasons given are not valid, I need not reply to any criticism. The point at issue is no

whether monogamy or polygamy should be the rule, for no one has ever contended that polygamy can be the rule. The question to be decided is, whether taking monogamy to be the rule, there do not exist sufficient reasons for allowing polygamy to prevail as an exception. I have given the answer to this question and I wait for a reply to it from the detractors of polygamy. I may however suggest to my friend that in admitting the slight excess of the females over the males, he has admitted the necessity of polygamy as an exception.

NOT A BINDING RULE. The hostile critics of polygamy have all made the mistake to which I have referred above. Their attacks are directed not at polygamy as an exception, but at polygamy as a rule. Islam does not sanction polygamy as an institution against monogamy, but only as one that makes up for the defects of the latter. The Holy Quran nowhere says, as Mr. Dilawar Husain has supposed, that polygamy is a binding rule for all men and in all ages. It only permits polygamy and allows it to be practised when a necessity arises for it. Every rule should no doubt be based upon the consideration that it does the greatest good to the greatest number, but an exception to a rule aims at doing good to such as cannot benefit by the rule. Polygamy thus comes in to supply the need when monogamy fails to bring about the object of marriage. It is a kind of remedy and the only thing to be seen about it is whether it does good to those who stand in need of it. If the Holy Quran had ordained polygamy as an institution binding upon all Muslims, which it does not do, the question should then have been asked if it does the greatest good to the greatest number, or, whether monogamy is not the safer course. But the question under the present circumstances is whether polygamy would ever be needed and whether it would serve as the proper remedy, and I have attempted to answer these questions in the first two portions of this article.

UNIVERSALITY OF MONOGAMY. 'Why should polygamy be prohibited?' is a question which I have not as yet seen answered by any detractor of polygamy. Much stress is laid upon the universality of monogamy, when the object is to throw discredit upon polygamy, but is monogamy anywhere taken to be a universal rule without any exception. If any Christian or civilised state actually considers monogamy to be such a universal rule, then indeed it would be justified in prohibiting

polygamy. But no society in the world has ever taken or can ever take this view of monogamy. It is no doubt a rule but a rule subject to exceptions as all other rules are. For instance, nowhere in the world is celibacy considered a crime, though it is certainly an exception to the rule of monogamy, *i. e.*, to the union of one man and one woman in marriage. And yet the mischief which may be done and is done by celibacy is far greater than the alleged harms of polygamy. The man who having the power of manhood does not marry is likely to be the source of many evils in society, yet no law in the world compels him to marry and adopt monogamy. If any practice is to be prohibited on account of the harms to which it gives rise, then celibacy and not polygamy should be prohibited, for the evils arising from the former are of far greater consequence than the alleged evils of polygamy. Can any society or any country be pointed out in which polygamy has worked the evils which the celibacy of the priests, to take only one instance, has wrought? Of course that was compulsory celibacy while polygamy has never been compulsory. But even apart from this consideration, celibacy is productive of very serious mischief. Its harm extends to society inasmuch as it leads to promiscuous intercourse between the two sexes, while the evil of polygamy, if there is any, affects only the individual. If, therefore, monogamy is to be made a universal rule without any exception, the first duty of the state is to make celibacy an offence. Such a proposal would be looked upon as absurd, but is it not far more absurd to condemn polygamy on the foolish ground that it breaks the law of universal monogamy? There are men who really cannot or should not marry while there are others, and their number is rapidly growing in the civilized countries of Europe, who discard marriage simply on account of the obligations which it brings with it and who have the satisfaction of the sensual passions as their sole object. The existence of the latter is really a pestilence in society, but still to check them it would be unjustifiable to treat all members of the society as culprits who on reaching the age of majority do not marry. Similarly there may be men who are led only by sensuality to take a second wife, though their number must remain very small on account of the heavy obligations which are attached to this institution, and there are men who actually stand in need of polygamy. Would it, I ask, be justifiable to regard the latter as criminals simply to put a check upon the former? Whatever the

point of view from which the question of polygamy is discussed, there is not the slightest reason to prohibit it.

THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER. The truth is that the institution which aims at the greatest good of the greatest number is marriage and not monogamy. Monogamy no doubt generally brings about the object aimed at in marriage, but it does not do so always. This has been shown in the first part of this article. Polygamy is, therefore, supplementary to monogamy and makes up for the defects of that system. How can then the greatest good be said to have been done to the greatest number if polygamy is prohibited? The prohibition of polygamy excludes a very large class from the benefits of marriage, and this class is not limited to any particular country, people or time. Accordingly the benefit of a monogamy which disallows polygamy does not extend to the greatest number. Nor can the good thus done be termed the greatest good, for it is mixed with much evil which can be stopped with the permission of polygamy. The object of marriage is to stop promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, but the prohibition of polygamy brings it as a necessary consequence. So many have lamented the prevalence of adultery in Christian countries, but none has ever given a moment's reflection to the cause of it. And in spite of this it is said that monogamy does the greatest good to the greatest number.

DOES POLYGAMY EXCITE THE SENSUAL PASSIONS? The objections against polygamy which are considered below are for the most part taken from Mr. Dilawar Hussain's article, 'Is the day of Islam over.' Speaking of polygamy, he says: "Polygamy has the effect of too prominently directing men's minds to the sensual passions; and those who from their wealth, rank or position can afford, indulge in sensual pleasures only too willingly." Strangely enough the only illustration, the only fact on which this monstrous assertion is based, is the case of the Muslim peasantry in Bengal which on account of the prevalence of polygamy is, it is asserted, "rotten to the core, full of injustice, full of immorality and vice, full of crime." I am not aware for which of the three, wealth, rank or position, the Bengal peasantry is noted, so that it has thus entirely taken to polygamy. The Bengal peasantry, so far as I know, is not an exception to the whole peasantry of India whose poverty is well known even beyond the boundaries of

this country. As regards the moral degradation of that community, Mr. Dilawar Husain ought to have seen if the Indian or Bengal peasantry belonging to other religions was in any way superior to the Muhammadan peasantry. But in his misguided zeal he never pauses to reflect for a moment on what he is saying. Every good in the Muhammadan society is an evil in his eyes and every evil is due to *pardah*, polygamy and divorce. I do not think that he is unaware of the extent of the moral degradation of the poorer classes in India as well as in the civilised countries which he most admires where the poorer classes are admittedly worse than beasts and know no law of morality or chastity. I ask if the assertion that polygamy directs men's minds to sensuality is based on facts. The gentleman who makes this assertion does not quote a single fact. He refers to the moral degradation of the Bengal peasantry, but it is absurd to take it as the result of the permission of polygamy as I have shown. On the other hand, it is a fact that polygamous nations are comparatively free from drunkenness, adultery and other evils of a sensual nature. The testimony of eminent Christian writers including many church dignitaries who have admitted the superiority of Muhammadan people in matters of chastity and soberness has been quoted from time to time in these pages and need not be repeated. The beneficial influence of polygamy very clearly appears in the case of Mormons, a Christian sect living in the midst of Christians. The United States of America furnish us with facts which leave no doubt about the effect of polygamy. In one of these states the majority of residents are Mormons who are in all matters living under the same circumstances as the orthodox around them. Polygamy is the only institution in which Mormonism makes a practical departure from orthodox Christianity. Until recent times when the Mormons were stopped by severe persecutions from contracting polygamous marriages, they openly practised polygamy at least for half a century. On referring to statistics we find that the Mormon State, Utah, was almost free from brothels, public houses and gambling houses, while the neighbouring states where polygamy was prohibited were affected with these evils to an enormous extent. These statistics I have quoted at some length in a previous issue. I think no clearer proof is needed of the moralising influence of polygamy and of the demoralizing influence of its prohibition than that which is furnished by the case of this people who

while agreeing in all respects with their orthodox neighbours, made polygamy legal. Their education and surroundings and their social institutions are all the same as those of their orthodox brethren living with them, and the only difference in their development is that which arises from the sanction accorded to polygamy. Accordingly their higher morality and chastity is due only to this institution.

Apart from the facts referred to here, the proposition that the permission of polygamy directs men's minds to the sensual passions sounds very strange. Why not say that the institution of marriage directs men's minds to the sensual passions. If the first proposition is sound, the second must also be so. Polygamy, like marriage, instead of exciting the sensual passions puts a restraint upon them. If a man needs a second wife and the law allows him, nothing can lead him to sensuality unless his very nature be corrupt. He marries and he is as good a member of society as the man with one wife. Nothing would tempt him to commit adultery and disturb the peace of families. His sensual passions would be at once curbed because he has applied the right remedy. But if under such circumstances the law prohibits polygamy, his passions must certainly be directed to sensuality. He would seek illegal means of satisfying his desires. Let any sensible man think if the permission or prohibition of polygamy directs the mind of a man to sensual passions. What a wonder that a glaring error is taken to be the very truth. If it is objected that though polygamy may be a remedy to the individual who stands in need of it, yet the effect of its permission on those who do not need it would be pernicious, I answer that this is also an error. When laws are made, they are intended for thinking and conscientious human beings who know their obligations and understand their responsibilities. Polygamy is an institution which, as we have shown in our last, is by no means tempting. The obligations it carries with it are so many and so great that no one would ever like to try it as an amusement. Apparently the obligations of family life would seem only to be doubled by a man's taking a second wife, and the man who knows such obligations in a monogamous family can easily understand the increased responsibilities of a polygamous family, but really, besides the apparent increase, numerous other responsibilities are produced, which are never experienced in a monogamous family. These heavy

obligations are, besides other considerations, a sufficient check against a free resort to polygamy. Sensuality adopts the easier course, while polygamy chalks out for a man a course attended with deep responsibilities and heavy obligations. In a society where polygamy is permitted, adultery is viewed both by society and law with far greater horror than where it is prohibited. The whole moral force of such society would be directed against the man who in spite of the presence of legal means of the gratification of his desires has recourse to illegal means, and on the other hand, the responsibilities of a polygamous family would be a check against his unnecessarily contracting a plural marriage. Thus the institution of polygamy would curb the sensual passions of a man. That this is a fact is clear from the circumstance that adultery is visited with the severest punishment by nations among whom polygamy is sanctioned. But where polygamy is prohibited, the crime of adultery is much softened so much so that illicit intercourse between two unmarried persons is not an offence at all, while even adultery is looked upon in many cases as a civil wrong. Such softened views of this horrible crime, which has been condemned as the blackest evil by every righteous prophet of God, show clearly that society does not look upon adultery with much disfavour and consequently it is easier to break the rules of chastity there. This is a circumstance which directs men's minds to the sensual passions because it makes their satisfaction easier. This is the reason that in many countries where polygamy is prohibited, more than a fifth, fourth or third, and in some cases more than half, of the children born are illegitimate. Let Mr. Dilawar Husain and other detractors of polygamy consider if the prohibition of polygamy has not the effect of too "prominently directing men's minds to the sensual passions," and if figures and facts do not uphold this assertion. The apprehension, that in the case of the permission of polygamy, "those who from their wealth, rank or position can afford, would indulge in sensual pleasures only too willingly," is groundless, as the facts stated above clearly indicate. But I ask if those who can afford do not indulge in sensual pleasures in countries where polygamy is prohibited. Every one knows that they do but under a different name. In countries where polygamy is permitted such men take two or three wives and where it is prohibited they take as many or more mistresses. Mr. Dilawar Husain may see for himself which is the

better course even for such sensual men, and which is the safer rule.

THE POSITION OF THE WIFE IN A POLYGAMOUS FAMILY. Mr. Dilawar Husain's second objection against polygamy is that it "has the effect of converting the wife into a chattel and an article of personal comfort to be thrown aside, in reality even though not in form, when no longer capable of giving pleasure to her lord and master." What has already been said is a sufficient answer to this objection. These are not facts but mere speculations. If this is true reasoning, it may be applied with equal force to monogamous countries. It may be said that when the wife is no longer capable of giving pleasure to her husband, he would take a mistress for himself. What the objectors ought to show is that these circumstances often happen in countries in which polygamy is sanctioned and that they never or only rarely happen where it is prohibited. We have, moreover, to see not what evils may arise from any supposed system of polygamy, but what evils can arise from the polygamy to which Islam gives sanction. If this is borne in mind, the objection vanishes at once, for the Holy Quran clearly ordains that the wives must be treated with equality and justice, and none of them should be thrown aside as *كآلة*, literally, neither having a husband nor being husbandless, or, in Mr. Dilawar Husain's words, "thrown aside in reality though not in form." This objection, therefore, only arises from an ignorance of the ordinances of the Holy Quran. Practically it has no basis. The exceptional nature of polygamy and the heavy responsibilities attached to it would keep back a man from having recourse to it unless he has true need for it.

WEAKENING EFFECT. Mr. Dilawar Husain's generalizations are very amusing. To his jaundiced eye a mote seems a mountain. He says: "The result is that the body is weakened and the mind enfeebled, enervation of individuals is followed by enervation of classes, and eventually the whole community deteriorates." I cannot say what Mr. Dilawar Husain would think if he reads his words in a calmer moment. In the polygamy of two or three individuals out of every hundred, he sees the downfall of the whole community, while in the adultery of twenty or thirty or even fifty per cent. members of a society, he sees no harm, no degeneration, no deterioration of the community. The Arabs practised polygamy,

but it had no weakening effect upon them. Was it feebleness of mind which made them the depositaries and teachers of learning and sciences for centuries and the intellectual lights which illuminated the dark continent of Europe? Was it weakness of body which made them victorious over the brave Christian monogamists of the Roman empire, and which made them hold sway over a very large part of the world for many centuries? To his great bewilderment, I may further inform Mr. Dilawar Husain that these polygamists were the descendants of men among whom the institution of polygamy had been prevalent for as many generations back as history can lead us. At an earlier date the polygamous hordes from the North had conquered the Roman Empire, a powerful monogamic race. And as with nations, so with individuals. Polygamy has never weakened the body or the mind as Mr. Dilawar Husain thinks. Even now there are polygamous nations in no way inferior to the strongest of the monogamous nations, and even braver and stronger than some of them, as the Afridis, the Afghans and the Turks.

GOOD EFFECT OF THE INSTITUTION. The Mormons as I have already said afford the best illustration of the beneficial influence of polygamy. A sect of Christianity, living in a Christian country, have felt the need of polygamy and found it the only remedy for many of the horrible evils prevailing in Christian countries. In it they have found a remedy against sensuality and against the weakening influences of civilization. I here quote a few remarks made by George Q. Cannon in an address before a Mormon meeting in 1869 :—

“If we look abroad and peruse the records of every day life throughout the whole of Christendom, we find that crimes of every hue and of the most appalling and revolting character are constantly committed, exciting neither surprise nor comment. Murder, robbery, adultery, seduction and every species of villainy known in the voluminous catalogue of crime, in modern times, are regarded as mere matters of ordinary occurrence, and yet there is a hue and cry raised, almost as wide as Christendom, for the persecution by fine, imprisonment, proscription, out-lawry or extermination, of the people of Utah, because, knowing that God, the eternal Father, has spoken in these days and revealed His mind and will to them, they dare to carry out His behests. For years they have meekly submitted to this persecution and

contumely, by they appeal now, as ever, to all rational, reflecting men, and invite comparison between the state of society here and in any portion of this or any other country, knowing that the verdict will be unanimous and overwhelming in their favour. In every civilized country on the face of the earth, the seducer piles his arts to envelope his victim within his meshes, in order to accomplish her ruin most completely; and it is well-known that men holding positions of trust and responsibility, looked upon as honorable and highly respectable members of society, violate their marriage vows by carrying on their secret amours and supporting mistresses; yet against the people of Utah where such things are totally unknown, there is a continual and senseless outcry because they practise the heaven-revealed system of a plurality of wives. I have had it quoted to me many times that no great nations ever practised plural marriage. They who make such an assertion are utterly ignorant of history. What nations have left the deepest impress on the history of our race? Those which have practised plurality of marriage. They have prevented the dreadful crime of prostitution by allowing men to have more wives than one. I know we are dazzled by the glory of Christendom; we are dazzled with the glory of our own age. Like every generation that has preceded it, the present generation thinks it is the wisest and best, and nearer to God than any which has preceded it. This is natural; it is a weakness of human nature I heard a traveller remark a few days ago, while in conversation with him, 'I have travelled through Asia Minor and Turkey and I have blushed many times when contrasting the practices and institutions of those people with those of my own country,' the United States. This gentleman told me that among those nations which we call semi-civilized, there are no drinking saloons, no brothels, nor drunkenness, and an entire absence of many other evils which exist in our own nation. But is the entire sex in the United States thus honored and respected? No, it is not. Any person who will travel, and observe while he is travelling, will find that thousands of women are degraded and treated as something very vile, and are terribly debased in consequence of the practises of men towards them. Just think in the single state of Massachusetts, at the last census, there were 63,011 females more

than males. Brother Pratt, in his remarks on this subject, truly remarked that the law of Massachusetts makes these 63,011 females, either old maids or prostitutes, for that law says they shall not marry a man who has a wife. Think of this! And the same is true to a greater or less degree throughout all the older states, for the females preponderate in every one. Another good effect of the institution here is that you may travel throughout our entire territory, and virtue prevails. Our young live virtuously until they marry. But how is it under the monogamic system? Temptations are numerous on every hand and young men fall a prey to vice. An eminent Medical Professor in New York recently declared, while delivering a lecture to his class in one of the colleges there, that if he wanted a man, twenty-five years of age, free from a certain disease, he would not know where to find him. What a terrible statement to make! In this community no such thing exists."

No clearer evidence is needed of the healthy influence of polygamy on the morality and chastity of a people than is furnished by Mormonism. The detractors of polygamy are misled inasmuch as they think that the material advancement of modern civilized nations is due to the prohibition of polygamy, and dazzled by their advancement are unable to see the degraded state of their morality in one particular aspect. In fact, the good or evil effect of the permission of polygamy or of its prohibition must be judged from the morality of a people and not from the fact whether they are materially advanced or not. For there are many examples of nations who while occupying a high place in the stage of civilization have had their morality in a low condition. As regards the morality of Muhammadan people, it is an admitted fact that notwithstanding their intellectual backwardness they are in respect of sexual morality on a far higher level than Christian nations. It is often said that the position of Muhammadan women is very degraded and this is attributed to the institutions of *polygamy* and *pardah*. But this is a mistake. The backwardness of Muhammadan women is due to the causes which have brought about the degeneration of the Muhammadan people in general and these consist in their forsaking the principles of Islam. But I question even the boasted greatness of Christian women. That a few women may have appeared in the front of society, or written novels or shown

their possession of intellectual and moral greatness, I do not question, but I deny that all women in these countries are raised to this high position. On the other hand, there is a vast number which remains drowned in the depth of vice and immorality and whose degradation knows no bounds. If this is not due to a defect in the institutions governing the laws of marriage, why has civilization been unable to cure it. Wealth, education and advancement have all failed to free society of this evil. An institution is not perfect if it benefits only the chosen few and leaves the vast masses in a degraded condition. Polygamy is meant to raise the position of the entire female sex, to make all women honored wives and mothers. But its prohibition leaves out a large body as a class of outcasts and says to them : " There is no remedy for you, you may perish and in thus perishing, destroy others also." The narrow monogamic system which disallows polygamy expels vast numbers of humanity from its circle and thus makes them worse than beasts. It is an error to think that it raises the position of woman, for it really degrades her. It is an empty consolation that by the prohibition of polygamy, an equality is brought about between the two sexes. The practical effect of the prohibition of polygamy is the degradation of the female sex while that of its permission is her elevation. Moreover, I do not think that any woman would think herself degraded if her husband takes a second wife instead of a mistress. At the end, I may say a few words to Mr. Dilawar Husain. He is still making the mistake of instituting a comparison between monogamy and polygamy, and says again and again that monogamy is better than polygamy. I ask, is celibacy better than monogamy ? Whatever the answer to this question, one of the two, celibacy or monogamy, should be prohibited by adopting Mr. Dilawar Husain's mode of reasoning, for it is exactly in this manner that he is advocating the prohibition of polygamy. But though this gentleman has often been warned of the absurdity of his reasoning, he perversely holds to the position which he has taken simply out of an ignorance of the Islamic institutions. He should bear in mind that according to Islam monogamy is the rule, while polygamy and celibacy are two necessary exceptions, which, if prohibited, must bring about great mischief. If he has got any reason to attack this position, he is welcome to the discussion, but if he has got nothing but to repeat the old stories of Mr. Amir Ali and others, he should better assume silence.

The Arya Samaj conception of marriage.

MISREPRESENTATION OF THE *Arya Patrika*. I have always looked, and I think every man or woman who has any sense of honour or chastity, must look upon the Arya Samaj conception of marriage with great hatred and disgust. But this is not my justification for writing the present article. The Arya Samaj has every right to believe what it likes and to introduce any institution into its own society which it chooses, though there is no doubt, as the Brahma papers and lecturers remarked sometime ago, that the Arya Samaj institution of *Niyog* is a horrible doctrine which it is the concern of the public to have stopped, on account of the evil effect which it has upon the public morality of the country. This article has, however, been called forth by some indiscreet remarks made by an Arya Samaj organ, the *Arya Patrika* of Lahore, upon the objects of marriage in Islam. In its issue of April 15th, this paper comes out with an article on "Monogamy versus Polygamy" which is written as a reply to my article on the "Necessity of Polygamy." The very heading of this article shows that the writer has not got a true conception of polygamy as sanctioned by Islam. The mistake made by the adverse critics of Islam in this matter has been exposed at some length elsewhere and need not be referred to here. The wonder is that an advocate of the horrible doctrine of *Niyog* terms the defence of polygamy a reaction against advancement and speaks of the Ahmadiyya as a backward movement. How easy it has become in this age of hypocrisy to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel! But what grieves me most is the gross misrepresentation of my views by the *Arya Patrika*. The Arya Samaj seems, as a body, to possess the faculty, which every fair-minded critic must condemn, of picking out a sentence from a writing with no other object but to level objections at, and intentionally omitting parts which explain the writer's views. When writing on the necessity of polygamy, I wrote at the very commencement: "The institution of marriage is designed to guard the interests of human society. It is designed, for instance, to prevent the promiscuous mixing of the two sexes, to bring about the object of procreation

while preserving the knowledge of parentage, to preserve the happiness which a man can have in the company of woman and lastly to inspire holy feelings into a man and to prevent impurity from entering into his ideas." While writing upon the last-mentioned of these objects, I said: "The desire which man has for woman and *vice versa* is a requirement of human nature. It is this desire which fulfilled through the sacred institution of marriage becomes the holy feeling of love and the basis of the purest affections that spring in human heart, while the same desire fulfilled independently of the sacred tie of marriage is the root from which the basest evils spring. . . . Marriage then is an institution which provides for the legal gratification of the desire which man and woman have for each other." This last sentence is represented by the *Arya Patrika* to be my "definition of marriage." It is further asserted that according to the Islamic conception as stated by me, marriage is the "legal gratification of low desires," that it "is for the interests of the individual and not for those of the community," and that the loftiness of the Samajic conception of marriage lies in this that unlike Islam it looks upon marriage as an institution "for the propagation of the human species." And notwithstanding all these bold misrepresentations it is stated that "the writer stumbles at the very outset when he tries to lay down a definition of marriage." How kind of him to inform me of my errors, but how shameful to misrepresent me thus intentionally. I have nowhere given the definition of marriage ascribed to me. I leave it to the reader to consider if the statement made by this Samaj organ is a reasonable conclusion of my words.

GRATIFICATION OF INNATE DESIRES. The *Arya Patrika* terms the innate desires of men and women for each other as low and sensual desires. This view places too low a value upon human nature. The innate desire of man for woman is not a low or sensual desire. It has been placed there by the hand of God, and to call it a low desire shows the ignorance of the writer. Taking the object of marriage according to the *Vedic Dharma* what the *Patrika* states it to be, *viz.*, the propagation of human species and nothing more, the question still remains to be answered, and I hope the *Arya Samaj* will give a candid answer to it, *viz.*, do the members of this

body possess this 'low desire' or are they all devoid of it? If the latter, how can the object of the propagation of human species be effected? However excellent a society may be considered to be in which both men and women have lost the innate desire for each other, the question of its existence would not trouble the public for a long time. But if this desire which is termed low by the inconsiderate writer is still possessed by the Arya Samaj, what difference does it make whether the Arya Samajists marry for the gratification of this or some other desire. The fact remains that they do marry and gratify the desire which they call low through marriage, and sometimes by other means too, and are thus condemned out of their own mouth. As I pointed out in the article criticised by the *Arya Patrika*, it is a serious error to look upon the natural desire of man for woman as a low desire. It is a noble desire and some of the highest interests of humanity are bound with it. It is its abuse, its gratification otherwise than through the sacred tie of marriage, which makes it low. Opposition makes a man blind, and it is the opposition of the Samaj to Islam which makes it deny the plainest truths because they are found in Islam. I may bring the truth nearer home to the Samaj. It may make an enquiry whether those who take the lead in the Samaj do not possess this desire. Perhaps no name is held with greater honor by the Hindus than the name of Rama, yet he too was a married man and evidently possessed the desire which is termed low by the Arya Samajists. The possession of this desire by all the great men of the world whose lives were purified of every evil and purged of every dross shows clearly that it is a serious error to call the innate desire of man for woman a low or sensual or evil desire.

THE OBJECT OF MARRIAGE. The *Arya Patrika* condemns Islam because it holds that marriage is designed for other objects besides procreation, and itself gives such prominence to this object that it does not care for the means to be applied to attain to the end. I stated that procreation was one of the objects of the institution of marriage, but as mere procreation, as among the animals, could be continued without the help of marriage, *i.e.*, the union of a specified man and woman, it was necessary that procreation together with a preservation of the knowledge of parentage should be the object of marriage. The *Arya Patrika*, however, does not seem to consider the

latter condition necessary, as in stating this object it omits the words which I added. And in fact the knowledge of parentage cannot be preserved where, as in the Arya Samaj, the disgusting practice of *Niyog*, i.e., sexual intercourse of a married woman with another than her husband under certain circumstances, is not only sanctioned, but even enjoined. This is perhaps the reason that in the lofty conception of marriage which the Arya Samaj has, the preservation of the knowledge of parentage is not deemed to be a necessity. Another object of marriage stated by me was companionship, but this too finds no place in the *Vedic Dharma* of the *Arya Patrika* or the Arya Samaj. It is surprising indeed that such a noble object should be excluded. In the Holy Quran the husband is called the زَوْج , *zawj*, of his wife, and the wife the زَوْج , *zawj*, of her husband, by which it is meant that they are as parts of each other and neither is perfect without the other. Again the Holy Quran mentions it as one of the signs of God "that He hath created wives for you from yourselves so that dwelling with them you may be quiet in mind, and hath put love and tenderness between you" (xxx: 20). From this it is clear that the Holy Quran attaches the greatest importance to the object of companionship in marriage. But in the "grand and altruistic" Arya Samaj conception of marriage companionship is not an object of marriage, as is clear from the statement made by the *Patrika*. Really this object is sacrificed to the production of children, and this is evident from the practice of *Niyog* for it requires that the husband should require his wife to have sexual intercourse with some one else when he himself is unable to raise children. The *Arya Patrika* describes the "lofty purpose for which the institution of marriage is designed," as being that "we marry for others," and in one sense this is no doubt true, for by the *Niyog* a married woman becomes actually the wife of others than her husband though apparently remaining the wife of her husband. She is not the companion of her husband, but a child-producing machine who may seek the company of any man who is able to raise children if the husband fails to do it. Nowhere except in the most savage tribes has the wife been degraded to this extent. True love and affection for her husband can never spring in her heart so long as she must seek sexual connection with others. Another object of marriage as stated by me was that it serves to inspire holy feelings into the heart and to

keep away evil from it. The *Arya Patrika* does not admit even this, and the reason of this is again found in *Niyog* which keeps alive in the heart all those evil ideas which it is the aim of marriage to expel. I further stated that marriage aims at the extirpation of the promiscuous mixing of the two sexes, but this is also taken exception to by the Arya writer, and for this too the doctrine of *Niyog* is responsible.

Niyog is of two kinds, *Niyog* with a widow and *Niyog* with a married woman. *The essence of this practice is the sexual intercourse of a man with a woman other than his wife or that of a woman with a man other than her husband. This is the first essential difference between marriage and *Niyog*. The second important difference is that in marriage a woman can have only one husband, but in *Niyog* she has as many as eleven. Every widow and every widower must resort to *Niyog*, but a married woman should have recourse to it only in the following cases: "When the husband is unable to raise children, he should give permission to his wife, saying, O good woman, O woman desirer of good fortune! take another husband beside me, and have no hope of getting children from me, but remain firm in the service of this respectable husband who is thy husband through marriage. Similarly when the woman being sick is unable to give birth to children, she should give permission to her husband, saying: O Swami! forsake the desire of getting children from me and resorting to *Niyog* with some widow raise children for thyself." We are given even the names of the *Niyog* husbands. "The second husband through *Niyog* is called *Gandharb* the third husband is called *Agni*; from the 4th to the 11th, the *Niyog* husbands are called *Manash*." Thus a married woman will have the apparent husband or husband through marriage, and the ten or eleven husbands through *Niyog*. The sexual connections of the former with his wife cease once for all when the flock of new husbands comes in. For according to the Arya Samaj, sexual intercourse is prohibited unless it is done with the object of raising children. But when a man is unable to raise children, he must not touch his wife

*See Chapter iv, *Sattiyarath Parkash*, for what follows.

and must make her over to other men who may already be married. After this the husband through marriage remains only the nominal husband while the conjugal relations of the wife are carried on with strangers, called the *Niyog* husbands, until she gets ten living and strong sons from them. Thus actually she would pass her life with men other than her husband though she would remain in the house of the nominal husband. There in his own house he will be forbidden to approach her whom he wedded and whom he feeds while strangers would have easy access to her at any time they like. Is there not a single man in the Arya Samaj who should raise his voice against this savage practice. *Sexual intercourse by a married woman with another than her husband*, what would you call it? The one word equivalent for it in the English language is adultery. I state this on the authority of Webster. I hope there would be many conscientious Arya Samajists in whom repellent feelings would be aroused by this beastly practice. I admit that the Arya Samaj has introduced many reforms and abolished many of the evil practices prevailing in India, such as the worship of male and female organs and promiscuous sexual intercourse between the two sexes, customs prevailing to this day among certain Hindu sects, but at the same time I deem it my duty to inform the Samaj that the *Niyog* is a remnant of these savage practices, and true purity cannot be brought about unless it is abolished. Other circumstances under which the wife can seek sexual connection with another than her husband, are thus related in the *Sattiyarath Parkash* : "A married woman may resort to *Niyog* and beget children in the absence of her husband after waiting for him, for eight years if he is abroad for the sake of his religion, after six years if he is gone to study or to win fame, after three years if he is gone with a desire to earn wealth. When the actual husband comes back, then she should forsake the *Niyog* husband. Similarly if the husband gives trouble to his wife, it is proper for the wife to forsake him and resorting to *Niyog* with another man to raise children to inherit the property of her husband by marriage." Similarly, it is stated that "if the husband or the wife is unable to restrain himself or herself on account of not having sexual intercourse with a pregnant woman for one year, then by resorting to *Niyog* a son should be raised to another."

CHOICE OF THE
SAMAJ.

The necessity of polygamy is not admitted by the *Arya Patrika*, but the necessity of *Niyog* is admitted. It says: "Of course the Vedic Dharma makes a provision for those men and women who are incapable of procreation. They are enjoined to have recourse to *Niyog*. But there too the idea of the gratification of animal desires is wholly absent." It should be noted that whereas Islam only permits or sanctions polygamy, the *Niyog* is enjoined and, therefore, it is an obligation which must be fulfilled by every Arya Samajist whether he desires it or not. But the *Arya Patrika* conceals facts. It is not true that *Niyog* is enjoined only when the man or woman is incapable of procreation, but it is enjoined also for the gratification of "low desires." The writer does not seem to have read carefully even the *Sattayarath Parkash*. The founder of the Arya Samaj legalised *Niyog* even for the sake of the gratification of animal desires. In Chapter IV, 46, we read as follows: "Question.—In the married state when there is only one man for one woman and one woman for one man, and during this time the wife becomes pregnant or is perpetually sick or the husband is perpetually sick, and both are young people and cannot restrain themselves, what should they do? Answer.—We have answered this question when speaking of *Niyog*." This answer is sufficient to show that *Niyog* is meant as well for the gratification of "animal" desires as for procreation, for the question relates to the former object and in the answer we are referred to the *Niyog*. But Swami Dayanand has himself made the matter more clear further on in his answer: "If the husband, not having sexual intercourse with his pregnant wife during one year, or the wife of a husband who is affected with constant sickness, cannot restrain himself or herself, he or she should have recourse to *Niyog* with another and raise children." In these cases the express object of *Niyog* is the gratification of those desires whose gratification through marriage, or perhaps whose very existence, in the Arya Samaj, the *Arya Patrika* denies. However, the founder of the Arya Samaj saw some of the necessities of polygamy, but preferred *Niyog* to polygamy. In fact the necessity of polygamy is such a clear matter that no society in the world has failed to see it, though it may not have made any provision to meet the urgency. There are societies in the world which have from experience

seen the evils to which prohibition of polygamy gives rise, but still they have such a strong prejudice against it that they are preferring the prevalence of fornication to the permission of polygamy. But the Arya Samaj has adopted a strange course. On account of its prejudiced views against Islam, it apparently opposes polygamy and takes a course which is the most hateful of all. It introduces *Niyog* into society, a word which conveys three different ideas, *viz.*, polygamy, polyandry and adultery. It is polygamy because the *Niyog* husband has at least two different wives, the *Niyog* wife (she is called a wife though she is not actually a wife), and the married wife and sometimes hewould have as many as eleven different wives. It is polyandry because the *Niyog* wife has at least two different husbands, the husband through marriage in whose house the wife must remain to the end of her days and the husband through *Niyog*, who is not her husband really, but has connubial relations with her, and sometimes she would have as many as eleven different husbands. It is adultery because it is sexual intercourse by a married man with another than his wife, or voluntary sexual intercourse by a married woman with another than her husband. Thus we see that those who have rejected a true principle, the principle of polygamy which has been sanctioned and even acted upon by all righteous men of all countries and religions, have fallen into the most abominable evils. Of course no one can compel a person to choose the good course and refrain from the evil one, but one cannot help expressing regret at the choice of the Arya Samaj. May we hope that this society which lays claim to a high state of civilization would consider that the doctrine of *Niyog* deserves to be struck off from even the lowest code of morality?

A Shock of Earthquake.

So much has been written and said about the terrible seismic disturbance which affected this country on the 4th April last that very little, I should say almost nothing, is left for a periodical which takes thirty days to reach the public. From the wreckage of ancient buildings which had stood for hundreds of years, it is now pretty certain that within historical times the Punjab has not been visited with such a severe shock of earthquake. The famous Hindu shrine

of Kangra Bhawan which had been from very ancient times the resorting place of Hindu pilgrims from the most distant parts of India, lies now a mass of ruins. The fall of this temple is a certain indication that such a shock of earthquake has never before been felt in the Punjab. Mahmud of Ghazni plundered it some 900 years ago, but now the hand of the Almighty Himself has laid it low. The centre of the disturbance seems to have been Kangra, but frightful destruction of buildings and loss of life has been brought about even in distant parts of the plains. The appalling loss of life may be computed by thousands and the loss to property by hundreds of millions, but the fact is that at the time when the shock was felt there was not a soul within thousands of miles that did not consider it to be the last moment of its existence upon the rocking earth, nor was there a building which did not seem to be about to be pulled up from its foundations and thrown upside down. Facts and figures may be quoted, but who can describe the state of the millions who terror-stricken clung to the spot where they happened to be, believing that the end of the world had come.

Many cities in the Kangra District are a total ruin while in the villages the mortality is estimated from 10 to 20 per cent. The wreckage at Kangra is thus described by the special correspondent of the *Pioneer*, and a similar wreckage has been brought about at the hill station of Dharmsala and other towns:—

“Looking up from the camping ground to the low and beautifully wooded hill upon which the town and temple stood, one could not see any sign of buildings, but among the trees was a gleam of yellow light reflected from the roof of the Kangra Bhawan, or Golden Temple. On a ridge still higher some heaps of masonry showed where Mr. Seiston's house and the missionary buildings were lying wrecked, and following the road to the town one came within a hundred yards of significant signs of devastation. Immediately on the right was all that was left of the municipal dispensary and near by on the same side was the thana, with the treasury buildings on the left. The two last had been solidly built with cut stone walls and heavy beams, and the roofs had been literally shivered and the masonry distintegrated. The forces which wrecked them must have had as it were a winnowing motion, and this applies also to every part of the town and hill. The

old masonry bridge had been broken. It was little larger than a culvert, and was the first I had seen broken from Shahpur to Kangra. Following the road leading to the temple, I had evidence on every hand of the earthquake. Not a house was standing, and the flatness of the ruins was terribly impressive. Passing among the ruins I came out above the wreckage of the great temple itself. A confused mass of masonry lay below. The thick walls were rent, the small shrines broken up, and only one miniature temple was left. Even this had been partly thrown down, and was standing tilted over at a sharp angle. The golden roof and cupola were resting on the ruins, some of the gilded metal plates having been broken off by the shock, but the roof as a whole had not lost its distinctive shape. It had also been tilted over, showing that when the building collapsed beneath it there must have been a wrenching and twisting motion. The thickness of the walls was enormous, as the temple was most strongly built, and yet the masonry was shattered as if the structure had been weakly constructed. Here, as at Kangra Fort, the very solidity of the buildings and their resisting powers only made the wreck more complete. Below the temple I saw masses of ruins. These marked the site of houses used for the reception of pilgrims, and they have yet to yield up their dead. Those who perished there must have been killed at once, for the debris is even now almost an impenetrable mass. The very height of these houses caused their fall to be appalling. The town showed an utterly deserted appearance at the time I visited it, for the working parties were having their mid-day rest, while the survivors also desisted for a few hours from searching the ruins, but occasionally one met men carrying light beams and rafters to be used for rebuilding houses or making better shelter places.

“The Golden Temple may hereafter rise again, and a town cluster about it, but at present all is desolation. Treasure and jewels worth several lakhs of rupees are said to be under the ruins, and the recovery of these will be attempted later. The chief priest escaped uninjured, and, doubtless, offerings will flow in to him from pious Hindus all over India for Kangra Bhawan was a most sacred place, pilgrims even from distant Southern India coming to visit it. Ranjit Singh once came to the temple, it is said, while long before—900 years ago—it

riches attracted Mahmud of Ghazni, who plundered Nazarkote, as it was then called, carrying away a great idol and an immense store of treasure. From the site of the temple I passed upwards, still climbing among the trees until the broad pathway led us past the Araritsar Mission School. The houses and playground buildings were well constructed of stone, but they are now mere piles of debris. Then the crest of the hill was reached. Here lay the smaller temple of Devi utterly wrecked, and the remains of the Mission Church, with the bell lying among the shattered masonry. Church and temple had stood side by side, and the ruins were mingled. Lower down on the crest was the Mission House, where the Rev. Mr. Rowlands, Mrs. Deauble and Miss Lorbeer were killed. One can see the verandah where the two ladies were sitting at the time the earthquake occurred, and the suddenness of the shock is proved by the fact that they were unable to escape. Here on the crest can be seen long narrow fissures running east and west, big branches have been broken from the banian and peepul trees, while cactus plants also show signs of damage. Following the fissures upwards, it was found that they became more marked at the highest point of the ridge, where the Sessions House stood on a small plateau, but they were never more than four or five inches in width. The soil too is rather loose, so they may not extend to any depth. South-west on the lower spur Kangra Fort lies utterly wrecked, almost hidden among the trees. Great landslips have occurred along the road which winds down the hillside to Tally, obliterating the track in some parts, while other slips threaten, for these low hills about Kangra are made up of clay, rounded boulders and conglomerate rocks, easily displaced, and heavy rain would bring down masses of earth and trees."

The occurrence of earthquakes is one of the numerous signs of the second advent of the Messiah according to the most trustworthy prophecies accepted by the Christians and the Muhammadans. By earthquakes of course are not meant ordinary earthquakes which are always felt in all countries, for these could not serve as a sign of the appearance of the Messiah. It is evident that by earthquakes in the prophecies must be understood extraordinarily severe shocks of earthquakes, an instance of which is afforded in the recent earthquake in

the Punjab. Within the last twenty years India has been visited by three severe shocks of earthquake, but the present shock far surpasses the others in its severity. These are, firstly the earthquake which destroyed Cashmere and Srinagar some twenty years ago, secondly the earthquake which laid waste parts of Asam and Bengal and severely shook Calcutta in 1897, and thirdly the recent earthquake which has destroyed a vast part of the Punjab. This series of earthquakes, so against the previous history of India, marks them out as extraordinary earthquakes, and if it is not in these shocks that a fulfilment is afforded of the words of prophecy, one must be despaired of its fulfilment. There is another remarkable feature which makes the matter still more clear. It had been said that "there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes." (Matt. 24-7). In India we witness a clear fulfilment of all these signs. It was recently visited with a famine which has hardly been ever surpassed. For the last eleven years it is affected with a pestilence so severe that hundreds of thousands are being taken away every year and villages after villages are being laid waste. And just at this moment when this country is wailing under the clutch of these two evils, an evil severer than either of these has made its appearance which has destroyed thousands in an instant and laid waste populous towns in the twinkling of an eye so as not to leave any trace of the buildings. Has not the time yet come when people should open their eyes to see how clearly are the signs fulfilled which had been foretold hundreds, nay thousands, of years before? Do not these circumstances point out clearly that India is the land of the fulfilment of Divine promises?

But, it will be said, where is the promised one to be found? He is here among you, even calling out, but you would not listen to him. This is because you do not like God's choice but say, why has such and such a man been sent or why has not the promised one appeared in such and such a manner. I could point out many instances showing that it is always thus that Almighty God fulfils His promises, but the subject which I have in hand does not allow of such a digression. I would, however, point out one circumstance which has a relation to the subject in hand. Before this series of terrible earthquakes began, long before the present shock, the severest of all, one who claimed to be a messenger of God foretold of the appearance of these disasters

as a sign from God in his support to show that he was true in his claim and appointed by Him who ruled heaven and earth and held them under the sway of His powerful hand. I would take up here only the prophecy relating to earthquake. About 1882, the Promised Messiah received a revelation from God foretelling a disaster in the mountain-range and running as follows: *ولما تجلي ربه للجبل جعله دكا* "And when the Lord manifested Himself to the mountain, He crushed it down." This revelation was published in the *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya* which was then being written by the author. The terrible earthquakes that have shaken the Indian soil during the last twenty years mark the fulfilment of this prophecy, and none more markedly than the shock of 4th April. This last shock, not the last of all, for there is an apprehension of more shocks yet, but the last of the three mentioned above, was foretold in plainer prophecies more recently. In 1901, the Promised Messiah published a small poem in Urdu in which he wrote warning all men: "Show faithfulness and repentance very soon: Repent that mercy may be had upon you. An hour lies in wait for you, which will bring before your eyes the scene of the day of judgment. Of this the Lord has informed me: Praised be He for thus would He put my enemies to shame." In these lines it was foretold that an hour was approaching when the country would witness the scene of the day of judgment. So clearly was this prophecy fulfilled that there was not a soul within thousands of miles on the morning of the 4th April which did not feel that the terrible shaking of that morning was in fact the shaking which was destined to bring about an end of the world, and the fact was afterwards admitted in newspapers by the bitterest enemies of the Promised Messiah. So clear was in fact the fulfilment of the words of prophecy that nothing more clear can be expected. But this is not all. As the prophesied hour approached, the Divine revelations speaking of it became more distinct and more definite. In December 1903, the Promised Messiah published the revelation: *زلزله کا دھکا* "A shock of earthquake," and it is the words of this Divine revelation that I have taken for the heading of this article. In the beginning of May 1904, another revelation was published which spoke in the plainest words of the effect of the shock of earthquake. It ran thus: *عفت ال دیا ر محلها و مقاما* "No trace shall be left of the abodes: both permanent and temporary

abodes being laid waste." This was nearly eleven month before the shock came. No power in heaven or earth besides that of the Omniscent God could reveal such deep knowledge of the future. It is another thing to foretell that there would be an earthquake, for earthquakes are always felt in some one or other part of the country, but to state its devastating effect in the truest words eleven months previous to its occurrence is a thing altogether beyond human power, and that too in a country like the Punjab which has no previous history of such terrific shocks of earthquakes. If any one ponders over these circumstances with a mind free from prejudice, he would not but be struck with the amazing nature of this deep knowledge of the future. No better description can be given of the ruin wrought by this earthquake than that which is given in the words of this revelation. The first words of the *Pioneer's* special correspondant quoted above are, "Looking up from the camping ground to the low and beautifully wooded hill upon which the town and temples stood, *one could not see any sign of buildings.*" Yet one had said eleven months before, when the populous cities now lying in ruins were in a flourishing condition, that a catastrophe was in store for them which would leave no trace of the abodes. Sir Charles Rivaz thus described the ruin of Kangra district in a speech delivered in a meeting at Lahore for the organization of a relief fund: "All of you will have read in the newspapers the vivid accounts of the terrible catastrophe which literally, in the twinkling of an eye, overtook, three weeks ago, the most populous and flourishing portion of the fairest district in this province. It is impossible to exaggerate, or even to describe adequately by words, written or spoken, the state of absolute destruction and ruin at Dharmasala, Kangra and many other places When one begins to go through the country, it soon becomes only too evident what an unprecedented calamity has overwhelmed it: *Village after village is met with not a house left standing*, roads are broken, bridges damaged, on all sides ruin Within the seriously affected area which comprises some 700 square miles, and contains a population of about 250,000, every house and building with scarcely an exception has either collapsed entirely or been so badly damaged as to be uninhabitable." Even the earthquake of Assam in 1897 notwithstanding

its severity was nothing in comparison with the present shock, for the loss of life in the former was only about 1,500, while in the latter it is estimated at about 25,000. In short, the severity of this shock was foretold in a Divine revelation about an year before in the very expressive words quoted above. Now, I ask, who except the one who foretold all these strange occurrences long before can be the promised messenger of heaven. It will be admitted, it has in fact been admitted even by the Christians, that the earthquake was a sign, but whose sign could it be except of the one who claimed it as a sign long before it was felt. It is a matter of grave importance, and the Christians and the Muhammadans at least should deeply ponder over it, that there is one among them who claims to be the Promised Messiah, and who stated years ago that such a terrible disaster would be brought about as a sign in support of his claim. Earlier prophecies also state that extraordinary earthquakes would be a sign of the advent of the Promised Messiah. Do not these circumstances point out with sufficient clearness that the promised one is he for whom these signs are shown. False Messiahs must also no doubt appear, but does this mean that the true one would never appear? Were the prophesied signs to be shown for the false Messiahs? If so, the prophesier misled the people and deceived them. There must be some criterion which should distinguish the true Messiah from the false ones. This criterion is met with in the circumstance that the true Messiah not only foretold these occurrences long before but also claimed them as signs in support of his truth. Can any of the other claimants be shown to have done this? If this is not the true criterion, then certainly no other can be pointed out. The prophets foretell a thing as a sign of a claimant's truth; claimant foretells it too exactly at the time and claims it as a sign in support of his truth; the eye must be blind which fails to recognise him.

Though this proof is sufficient, yet there is another circumstance which places the matter in such clear light that even the most determined sceptic cannot have any doubt about it if he is guided by reason and not by prejudice. There is written testimony in the form of books to the effect that these prophecies were actually published beforehand and this testimony is sufficiently convincing. But after the earthquake of 4th April which brought about the fulfilment of earlier prophecies, Almighty God has now revealed another calamity, far

more terrible in its effect than the one already witnessed, which must overtake this country, and in accordance with the Divine commandment it has been published throughout the country by the Promised Messiah. On the one hand we have the assurances of the geologists and the astrologers that there is no apprehension of any further danger, and on the other the word of one who has this knowledge from God, the knower of all secrets, that a great calamity, the like of which this country has not witnessed, is yet in store for it, and in the Divine revelation it is named a terrible earthquake. It has been repeatedly revealed and with new revelation the Promised Messiah has also given it publication anew. Would that people had taken a warning? But prophets have always been laughed at and the Messiah is no exception. Like the earthquake, the plague had also been foretold long before its appearance in India. But the word of warning was not heeded. After its first appearance in the Punjab in 1897 and while its attacks remained limited to a very small area for about two years and the strong steps taken by the Government to combat it appeared almost successful, the Promised Messiah published his revelations foretelling a very serious outbreak and general prevalence of the plague in the Punjab. This announcement was received at that time in the same manner as the one regarding the earthquake now. He was abused and scorned in return for his sympathy. But later years have made this country have the sad experience that what seemed impossible at the time of the utterance of the prophecy has turned out to be too true a fact. Regarding the new calamity, the Promised Messiah has issued up to this time three different circulars on the 8th, 21st and 29th April respectively, and more than 50,000 copies of these have been distributed in the country. A letter has also been addressed to the Government of which the concluding words are: "The earthquake of which I have now been informed would be extraordinarily severe. In the Divine revelation the words in Arabic are زلزلة (الساعة) that is to say, a terrible shaking like the shaking of the hour of judgment. I have also been informed that this earthquake would bring about a terrible ruin of houses. The severity of the coming shock is apprehended to be so great that the recent shock would be nothing in comparison with it. This information I have received more than once and my sympathy for my fellow-beings has obliged me to give publicity to this fact. . . . But I wish that our

kind Government for which I have the deepest sympathy may also be informed of it. As I am fully certain of the appearance of this disaster, I consider it a sin to keep silence. Perchance my voice may be of some service in saving human life in general and the lives of British Officers in particular, if the Government makes any arrangement to keep away from the dangerous mountainous area for some time, say to the close of this year, the headquarters being changed temporarily. It is my humble request that some such step may be taken so that valuable lives might not be placed in danger."

The 'Rupture of Heart' theory of the death of Jesus.

The death of Christ has been one of the greatest perplexities of the Christian Church from the earliest times. The Orthodox have always assumed that Jesus really died though there is much diversity of opinion as to the actual cause of his death. It seems that the death of Jesus upon the cross was doubted at an early time and perhaps it was to answer such sceptics that the author of the Johannine Gospel had to introduce the episode of the spear thrust into the side. This episode has given rise to much discussion and has been made the basis of various theories, one of the most recent of these being that the flow of blood and water showed that Jesus had died of a broken heart. This theory was advanced some time ago in the *Epiphany* as an explanation of the death of Jesus upon the cross. A powerful refutation of it by a Doctor was published in these pages to which no reply has come forth yet from the Christian writer in the *Epiphany*.

The *Bibliothica Sacra*, a Christian Magazine, publishes in its issue for January 1905, an article upon the same subject from the pen of Edward M. Merrins, M. D. This article is headed, 'Did Jesus Die of a Broken Heart.' The first difficulty in the acceptance of Jesus' death by crucifixion is the same to every reasonable man. "From the standpoint of ordinary human experience," says the writer, "how was it that Jesus, a young man in perfect health of body and mind, died so quickly upon the cross after only a few hours' suffering, when other victims of crucifixion usually lingered for two or more days?"

To account for this, many commentators, from Tertullian onward, believe that Jesus did not die from the effects of the crucifixion itself, but that he voluntarily surrendered his life. As Tertullian tersely states it, Christ, 'when crucified, spontaneously dismissed his spirit with a word, thus preventing the office of the executioner.' Calvin and others like-minded to ascribe the death, rapid beyond all expectation, to the secret counsels of God. The naturalistic explanations are that our Lord, immediately prior to the crucifixion, was reduced to such a state of extreme weakness as to cause his early death upon the cross; or else, that the spear wound was inflicted before death and was therefore the immediate cause of his death. Rejecting these naturalistic explanations, nearly all Christian writers agree in holding that the death of Christ was, to some extent at least, supernatural; it was not wholly due to the crucifixion."

Mr. Merrins comes then to the discussion of the theory of the rupture of heart. "So matters stood until the middle of the last century, when there appeared a work by an English physician, named Stroud, on 'The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ.' This sought to harmonize all the perplexing facts of the crucifixion and to add to their theological significance, by advancing the theory that Christ died literally from a broken or ruptured heart, and that the effusion of blood through the rupture into the membrane surrounding the heart, and its separation there into clots and serum, would account both for the early death, and the subsequent flow of blood and water from the wound in the side." This theory was highly appreciated by the Christian world at the time as a reconciliation of facts with belief, but the work soon lost its prestige. "Advancing and more accurate knowledge has undermined its main position, and it no longer receives the same support from Christian scholars as heretofore. Thus the learned Bishop Westcott, in his commentary on St. John's Gospel, referring to Stroud's theory, says: 'But it appears that both this and the other naturalistic explanations of the sign are not only inadequate, but also inconsistent with the real facts. There is not sufficient evidence to show that such a flow of blood and water as is described would occur under the circumstances supposed.' Another recent writer rejects the whole theory, somewhat contemptuously, and offers, instead, the suggestion that the spear may have opened a large ball

or blister of the skin, the discharge of its contents being the flow of blood and water."

The writer then proceeds to show that rupture of the heart could not occur in the case of Jesus. "In the first place, it might be urged, if it were worth while, that there is nothing in the Gospel records to indicate it was the left side that was wounded, and not the right. If there is any value in rather late Christian tradition, the wound was on the right side. Even at the present time, as the writer ascertained by personal inquiry, nearly all the pictures, statues and crucifixes of the Roman Catholic Church have the wound in the right side." So far as to the wound. The writer then considers the theory "that profound grief and mental perturbation caused rupture of the walls of the heart." The opinion of the most recent medical authorities is cited as being against this view. "Spontaneous rupture does not occur in a heart whose muscular tissue is sound, and in all those cases where the opposite was maintained, the investigation could not have been made with sufficient care and accuracy." (Zeimmsen, *Cycl. of Practice of Medicin*, vi. 261). "Rupture of the heart is a rare condition occurring chiefly in patients past middle life, and only in those having previous degeneration of the myocardium" (W. G. Thompson, *Practical Medicine*, p. 618). "Spontaneous rupture never occurs in a healthy heart" (Russel, *system of Medicine*, iv. 786). Rupture of the walls may be said never to occur when the heart is healthy. Spontaneous rupture occurs in the heart when it is seriously diseased" (Quain, *Dictionary of Medicine*, i. 840). In short no recent medical authority could be found to uphold the view that rupture of the healthy heart may be caused by mental emotion and profound grief.

Jesus did not show a single symptom of the rupture of heart. "In the majority of cases, rupture of the heart if actually complete, at all extensive and instantaneous, kills instantaneously. The hand is suddenly carried to the front of the chest, a piercing shriek uttered, some convulsive twitches occur, and the patient expires; or sudden loss of consciousness from which recovery never takes place, marks the event." If the rupture is incomplete, the patient does not die instantaneously, and "the symptoms are those of collapse,—rapid, feeble pulse, restlessness, faintness, pallor, cold skin, vomitins

dyspnoea, and perhaps convulsions." The closing scenes in the life of Jesus do not disclose any of these symptoms. Instead of uttering a shriek, he uttered, with perfect calmness, the significant words: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." Then he did not become unconscious. "Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, exclaimed, 'I thirst.' When Jesus had received the vinegar, he said: 'It is finished,' and then after an uncertain interval, as he bowed his head and surrendered his spirit, he uttered the final words: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' Such quiet and perfect intelligence would not ordinarily exist between complete rupture of the heart and dissolution." The instances quoted by Dr. Stroud are then collated and the words of Sir James Simpson are quoted that even if the symptoms of a rupture of the heart be present, the conclusion would not be safe that death was caused actually by rupture of the heart. "To obtain positive proof that the rupture of the heart was the cause of death, a post-mortem examination of the chest would be necessary." Thus grew and thus died the theory of the rupture of the heart of Jesus. It is only an evidence that there is no proof in the hands of the Christians that Jesus died on the cross, and like the drowning man they catch at every straw. But the proof is now complete that Jesus did not die upon the cross, and the tomb at Khan Yar is a living witness of this fact, the truth of which would soon be seen by the world.

New Testament.

The ninth volume of the Jewish Encyclopaedia which has been recently published contains an interesting article on the New Testament. The name New Testament was, it is explained, given by the Christian Church to the Gospels and to other writings attributed to the apostles after about 200 years after the birth of the Christian religion. The adoption of this name was meant to indicate that by the advent of Jesus the Mosaic dispensation had come to an end, and that consequently the old covenant made through Moses had given place to a new covenant, or New Testament, in which Jesus was the

mediator. This theory as stated above grew very late in the history of the Christian religion at the time when the early generations of the Christians which observed the Mosaic law and went to synagogues along with the Jews had passed away and the new offshoot of Judaism in which Jesus was the moving spirit had made a total departure from the old faith. The writer of the article, however, warns the reader at the commencement of the article that "the names 'Old' and 'New Testament,' when used by Jewish writers, serve only as terms of identification, and do not imply acceptance of the principle implied." This change in the attitude of Christianity took place gradually. "The early church had no other sacred books than those in use in the Synagogue, and on these were based the claims of the Messiahship of Jesus as the 'fulfilment of scripture.' In the course of time, however, the custom adopted from the Synagogue of reading at the service epistles of apocalyptic or Messianic character not merely established the regular reading of the apostolic epistles in the church, but made the reading of the story of the advent and doings of Jesus as the good tidings or Gospel an essential part of the service; readings from the Old Testament were selected as containing the prophecy or preparation, and those from the new as showing the fulfilment."

The date of the four Gospels is fixed between 80 and 150 A. D. As to their authorship, the writer does not go beyond what thoughtful Christians admit. "The Gospels do not claim to have been written by any of the apostles, but only to have been transmitted orally as tradition emanating from them. Thus Luke i. 1-3 refers to the existence of many Gospels resting upon the report of 'eye-witnesses and disciples,' and Papias, an early second century authority, relates that Mark wrote down what he, in a rather disconnected way, heard from Peter, and that Matthew had made a collection of the sayings of Jesus in the Hebrew (Aramean) without the historical framework, which was given differently by each commentator." The fact that Matthew had made a collection of the sayings of Jesus in Hebrew is very important, but unfortunately that fragment is lost. But there are other criteria to ascertain the origin and authenticity of the Gospels. "A careful analysis corroborates the conclusion, assumed to be axiomatic by Jewish scholars, that the older and more genuine the records, written or unwritten, of the doings and teachings of Jesus,

the more they betray close kinship with and friendly relations to Jews and Judaism ; but that the more remote they are from the time and scene of the activity of Jesus, the more they show of hostility to the Jewish people and of antagonism to the Mosaic law. The changing attitude and temper of the new sect influenced the records at every stage, and this accounts for the conflicting statements found beside each other in the various Gospels and Gospel stories." This principle is illustrated in what is written in the Gospels for and against the Mosaic law. On the one hand, and this is apparently the older version for the early Christians acted upon it, Jesus declared that he had come not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law, *i.e.*, he had come to practise it, and in accordance with this saying of his, he acted upon the Mosaic law on many occasions. From this it will be seen that it was the abuse of the law which he preached against and not the law itself, because the Jews at that time were so ceremonious about the letter of the law that they did not care for its spirit. In accordance with this view are also the sayings of Jesus in which he showed a great regard for the Jews and a disregard for other nations and other people. Mark the significance of his words when he said that he had been "sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" and that it was "not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," by which approbrious term he evidently meant the non-Jews. But statements contradicting these are also to be met with in the Gospels, for we find it written that the Gospel should be preached unto all nations," and even more than this, *viz.*, that the kingdom of God be taken away from the Jews and given to another nation, though the reference is here plainly enough to the transference of prophethood from the house of Israel to the house of Ishmael which was brought about by Almighty God raising the Holy Prophet Muhammad from among the Ishmaelites. But the statement that the Gospel should be preached to all must undoubtedly be ascribed to the later proselytising tendency of the sect which took its birth in the energetic spirit of Paul, and must therefore be rejected.

We then come to the discussion of the question of the sayings of Jesus as reported in the Gospels. They were collected long before they were recorded in the Gospels, and "were handed down originally in the Aramaic language, traces of which are still preserved in Mark

(III. 17 ; v. 41 ; VII. 34 ; xv. 34).” Those who translated them into Greek were not men of learning, and many mistakes were therefore made. Many instances of mistranslation and misunderstanding are given. The sources are then described to which the sayings of Jesus may be traced. “ Many of the sayings attributed to Jesus have been literally taken over from the Didache ; others were Pharisaic teachings well known in the rabbinical schools, as has been shown by Lightfoot, Shottgen, Nork, Tipser, Wunche and others. It has been pointed out by Schriener that while Jesus’ sayings are simply assertions without the support of Scripture, the Rabbis show that they were derived from Scripture and thereby establish their claim to priority.” The sayings of Jesus are divided into four classes, *viz.*, Ethical teachings, Parables, Apocalyptic utterances, and Essene Polemics. Regarding the Ethical teachings it has already been stated that they are for the most part taken from the Talmud and other Jewish sources. The parables are ~~used to illustrate ethical truths, and are only imitations of the~~ rabbinical ‘ Meshalim,’ (Ar. *Masal*). Elsewhere in the article on “ Parable ” we are told that though the Old Testament contains only five parables, yet they are abundantly to be met with in the post-biblical literature, *i.e.*, in the Talmud and Midrash, where “ almost every religious idea, moral maxim or ethical requirement is accompanied by a parable which illustrates it.” Some of the parables of Jesus have, it is said, “ their parallels among the sayings of first century Rabbis. The apocalyptic utterances attributed to Jesus are for the most part “ taken over from Jewish apocalypsis and embodied in the Gospels as discourses of Jesus.”

After describing the peculiarities of the four Gospels, among which Matthew has the credit of standing “ nearest to Jewish life and the Jewish mode of thinking ” and of making use of an Aramaic original, while even the Gospel of John hitherto regarded as untrustworthy in all points in which it contradicts the Synoptics is credited with being based in certain points on older and more reliable tradition than the others, the writer proceeds to consider the value of the Acts of the Apostles. “ The Acts of the Apostles is a continuation of the Gospel of Luke, and relates the history of the spread of the Gospel in apostolic times.” The hero of the Acts is Paul who won over to Christianity from Judaism becomes a zealous supporter of the

new sect, and goes so far in his zeal as to make converts against the commandment of the Master. Peter at first opposes Paul, but is ultimately "won over by a special vision to the Pauline view disregarding the dietary laws." This vision permanently changed the course of the Christian religion, and though the Judæo-Christian sect struggled for some time for existence under the leadership of James, it ultimately came to extinction for the system of which Paul was the advocate was disencumbered of all obligations which the law imposed. Notwithstanding this the spirit of Jewish proselytism is clearly visible in the growth of Christianity. The progress of the Church was, we are told, "along the lines of the Synagogue and of Jewish proselytism. The apostles Barnabas and Paul engaged in the work of collecting gifts for the holy church at Jerusalem (xii. 25; xvii. 1,10), travelled as prophets and teachers wheresoever the holy spirit of the church, invoked through prayer and fasting, bade them go (xiii. 1-4), and preached the Gospel in the Jewish synagogue (xiii, 5, 14; xiv. i; xviii. 4, 19; xix, 8), addressing Jews and proselytes." What would the Christians think now of prayer and fasting?

A Christian Prince on Christian Civilization.

Prince Mumolo Massaquoi of Ghendimah, under the British Protectorate of Sierra Leone, contributes an article to the Century Magazine, in which among other things he tells the truth about Christian civilization. The Prince complains that the vices of civilization have been introduced into Africa. There is, we are told, a remarkable difference between the natives on the coast, demoralised by Europeans and the natives of the interior. The deadly evils of drink and adultery prevail wherever the Christians have gone. "Polygamy is practised just as much by Europeans as by natives, although against their own laws and code of morality. It is very common to find a European merchant with from two to five or even more native wives. Now, according to the still more degrading system which Europeans have introduced on the coast, the wives of a Caucasian are the wives of all his friend visitors. When the so-called husband returns to

Europe, these women are left unprovided for and scatter their evil lesson wherever they go." From this statement it is clear that the Prince has called it polygamy erroneously. It is not polygamy at all, but the promiscuous mixing of the two sexes like beasts. "From actual calculation I find that nearly one-half of the goods imported into my territory is in the form of liquor, and that of the very worst and most injurious kind. The native has an idea that everything the white man uses and exports must necessarily be good, and an essential element in civilization." Such is also the impression upon those who call themselves advanced here in India. "It is, therefore, common to find a man who is poor, and not able to get sufficient liquor on which to get drunk, rubbing a drop on his head or on his moustache in order that people may smell it and call him civilized. . . . The poison is fast doing its deadly work, and in a few years there will be none of us left to resist the oppressors. But our blood will be on their heads, and will cry to Heaven for vengeance." It is this state of morality to which Mr. Dilawar Husain and his supporters are making proposals to take the Muhammadans.

Review.

The *Mirat-ul-Jehad* (in Urdu) is an exhaustive writing on the doctrine of *Jehad* just issued from the press. Its author is Sayyid Wazarat Husain of Urain in the Monghyr district in Bengal. The Sayyid is to be congratulated on the success which has attended his efforts. The book supplies in fact a desideratum, for though numerous pamphlets have been written on *Jehad* in recent times, yet no work has been written with the exhaustiveness with which the *Mirat-ul-Jehad* is written. Besides throwing light on the Islamic view of *Jehad* the author has taken pains to ascertain the views of other religions, especially the Arya Samaj which is so clever in forwarding objections against Islam. The book contains ample refutation of the objections of Arya Samaj and Christianity and shows the circumstances under which permission was given by Islam to take up the sword in self-defence. The wars of the early Caliphs are also justified and it is shown how lenient were the regulations which the Muslims promulgated concerning the conquered people and conquered countries. The author has taken more than three hundred pages to finish the book. Printing and paper ordinary. Price Rs. 1-8. Can be had from the author or Alhakam Press at Qadian where it has been printed.