THE DIVINE ORIGIN

OF THE

HOLY QURAN,

A REPLY TO

THE SOURCES OF ISLAM.

BY

MOWLVI MOHAMMAD ALI, M.A.,

PUBLISHED BY

THE MOHAMMADAN TRACT AND BOOK DEPOT,
PUNJAB, LAHORE.

PRICE PER COPY TEN ANNAS.

PRINTED AT

THE PUNJAB STEAM PRESS, LAHORE.

THE MOHAMMADAN TRACT AND BOOK DEPOT, PB.

(Kutub Khana-i-Islami, Punjab). Lahore.

This Depot was opened after long and careful consideration. Its main object is the publication of such books the study of which would not only be a source of pleasure, but also afford moral and spiritual benefit, teaching men to hate vice and love virtue; to bear a good moral character; to shun evil company; to regard the Supreme Being with due awe and reverence; to kindle a desire for piety, to fulfil the duties laid upon man by God; to practice mutual sympathy and good will; to put away prejudice, malice, enmity, annoyance, irreligiousness, bigotry, disobedience, &c.; and especially to become perfectly acquainted with the Tenets of Islam, in order to be able to successfully cope with its opponents; and lastly to have a true and complete knowledge of our illustrious predecessors and their glorious deeds.

Though hundreds of valuable books and tracts treating on the above subjects have already been published from time to time, the majority have the disadvantage of being bulky volumes, dealing with subtle points, in pure Persian or pure Arabic and being very high priced. The general public can neither afford to buy them nor do they possess ability sufficient to master them or have time to search out important, facts therefrom. In plain words, there are few books to be found in simple Urdu or simple English suitable to the tastes of the young educated gentlemen and the public at large desirous of nobly cultivating their pious sense of mind. The promoters have, therefore resolved to undertake the task of propagating such books as are capable of meeting the aforesaid wants; several of these having been translated into English for the benefit of those who possess a special taste for that language; and this plan will in future, always be observed. The books that are both in English and Urdu will, it is hoped, be of considerable help to students and those who desire to improve their English. Another advantage expected from the works in English is that such Christians and members of other creeds as are desirous to learn the principles of Islam and reasons for it, and can read no language besides English, will study them, which while satisfying them will serve the purpose of promulgation.

KARAM BAKHSH,

MANAGER,

Mohammadan Tract and Book Depot, Pb.,

Lahore.

THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF THE HOLY QURAN.

A reply to 'The Sources of Islam.'

"*They have only produced the deceit of an enchanter, and come where he may, ill shall the enchanter fare.*" (*xx*, 72).

'Yanabi-ul-Islam,' or the Sources of Islam, is a Persian book written by one Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, Missionary, C.M.S., Julfa, Persia. This book was translated into English by William Muir. The object of the book is to show that the Holy Quran is not a revelation from heaven but a fabrication of the Founder of Islam (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). The Holy Prophet is represented as collecting material for his religion from diverse sources and giving out the result of his labours as revelation from the Divine Being. Whatever he happened to hear from the Jews and the Christians of Arabia, he embodied, it is alleged, in the Quran and recited to his followers as a Divine Message on high. He is represented to be so simple as to take for the very truth everything which the Jews and the Christians told him and incorporated it in his religion. The Jews often deceived him, it is said, but such was the depth of his faith in the people whom he called 'the People of the Book,' that he took every word of theirs for an oracle and believing it to be the revelation which God had sent to Moses, gave it a place in the Book which he said was being revealed to him direct from God. Thus of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) the Reverend gentleman says on page 113 of his book. "He thought that whatever he heard from the Christians was written in the Gospel of Jesus or in the writings of the Apostles." Again, on page 98, this champion of the Christian faith observes—"I regret to say that (the Jews) deceived him." Even the Muslims, like their Holy Prophet, are described as simple and not having intelligence enough to understand even the plain words of the Gospel. Thus on page 158, the learned missionary observes that the Muslims borrowed the title 'Prince of the World' from John xiv, 30, and applied it to their Prophet, not knowing it was a name of the devil. I need not add that this is only one of the many pious lies which the saintly evangelist has freely indulged in his precious work.

The Holy Prophet, says the Christian writer, was not content with what he heard from the Christians and the Jews, but he eagerly seized at every teaching and every story that came in his way without pausing to consider whether it came from a

pure or an impure source. The source from which he, according to the Christian writer, drew his inspiration lay not only in Arabia, but also in Egypt, Syria, Armenia, Babylon, Persia and even India. The book has been greatly applauded in missionary circles and has been offered to the Muslim world as a book which defies refutation. William Muir who translated the book into English, reviewing it in the *Nineteenth Century*, observes:—"The *sources* (Yanabi) is a noble work and reflects high distinction on the writer. Hitherto much labour has been spent in showing the falsity and errors of Islam, as has been ably done by Pfanders and others. It has remained for our author not only to conceive a new, and perhaps more thorough and effective, mode of treating the so-called divine and eternal faith, but also in doing so to prove its sources to be of purely human origin; and that in so masterly and effective a way that it seems impossible for good Muslims to resist the conclusion drawn. And for al lthis the thanks of the Christian world are eminently due to the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall." The same writer remarks in his preface to the English translation of the Yanabi:—"The Church Mission is to be congratulated on this memorable treatise—bringing as it does so wonderfully to light, the earthly sources of the Quran, in contradistinction to the Muslim belief in its heavenly and eternal origin; and, in a very special manner, on its having come from the hands of one of their own distinguished missionaries. And the hope may be warmly expressed that the work will be widely distributed throughout the east, and lead many an earnest reader in Muslim lands, to the faith of his father Abraham, and the living sources of the Gospel of our Saviour." Such are the praises which have been bestowed on this work by a friend of the author and an enemy of Islam, and I have quoted them here to awaken in the heart of the reader an increasod desire to know what 'good Muslims' have to say in reply to such a wonderful work. I beseech the reader to peruse carefully the contents of the following pages, and when he will have read the views of both sides regarding this book, he will be in a position to form his own opinion regarding the value of this 'noble work.' I am ready to admit that the author has displayed great cleverness in imposing on ignorant people, and for this reason he eminently deserves the thanks of the missionary world, but when the work is subjected to the searchlights of criticism it turns out to be a huge fraud, the exposure of which is sure to make the author (if he still lives) blush, if missionaries can blush, for his shameful attempt to deceive ignorant folk. It is not only the author that is guilty, but the blame also lies on the shoulders of the translator who has acted the part of an abettor by translating

into English a work, the frauds of which were too transparent even for the jaundiced eye of Muir. I will show in the course of this article that the book, which Muir calls 'a noble work,' contains many statements, of the falsehood of which the author of the Life of Mohammadan cannot for a moment be supposed to have been ignorant, but he neither points to their untruth, nor omits them in his 'partial and compressed translation;' on the other hand, he lets them stand as they are and thus bears an indirect testimony to their truth. Nay, he even approves of the book and bestows on it an unqualified praise, and if the author of the book has been guilty of making false statements and thus wilfully deceiving ignorant people, as I will show he has been, the translator who, owing to his acquaintance with the history of Islam, could not be ignorant of their falsehood and who permits himself to translate these falsehoods into English, and speaks of the book as the best work that was ever written by Christian Missionaries in refutation of Islam must be held to be equally guilty of falsehood with the author. I have already said the Reverend Missionary who wrote the *Yanabi* has indeed displayed great cleverness in deceiving not only ignorant Muslims but also the Christian public, and only those that are well-acquainted with the history of Islam and the true teachings of the Holy Quran can discover all the traps that this clever Missionary has so adroitly set to ensnare ignorant people. He has indeed proved himself to be a Missionary well-skilled in the art of his profession and has justly won the applause of the great brotherhood of Christian preachers for his clever exploit He has admirably acted the part of the Pharaoh's magicians and may even be said to have beaten, 'the wise men' of Egypt in his enchantments and as the Holy Quran says, has produced the deceit of an enchanter,' but the Christian Missionaries should remember that 'come where he may, ill shall the enchanter fare.' He has cast his rod and has 'enchanted the peoples' eyes,' but the Holy Quran is a rod mightier than the rod of Moses and it will surely 'devour his lying wonders.' Truth shall be confirmed and that which he has wrought shall prove vain. He shall be vanquished on the spot and shall return back humiliated. I now proceed to an analysis of the book and expose its real worth to the public gaze. God is my patron both here and hereafter and his aid do I implore.

The Basis of the Book—The author erects a false building on a foundation of sand. There is no need to go into any details in order to refute his book, for the very basis on which he proceeds to raise an edifice is hollow and unsound In order to demolish the building which he has taken so great pains to erect, we do not stand

in need of aiming our blows at its walls and its gates. A mere pull will suffice to bring the whole fabric to the ground, for it stands on a false foundation. The pivot on which hinges his whole argument lies in the foreword with which he introduces his book to the reader and which, forming as it does the ground-work of his book, I give below.

" Now, as to the fact that the Quran is not a human composition and that, on the other hand, the whole of it was revealed from God to Prophet Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) through the angel Gabriel, all Muslims are, and have ever been, unanimously agreed. (Here the author proceeds to quote testimonies to the truth of this statement and then concludes,) If we accept this statement, we must admit that the only source of the Quran and of the whole religion of Islam is God Himself. Therefore if it be possible that a man, after making sufficient research and investigation, should make it more clear than the sun that most parts of the Quran and many of the doctrines of Islam have been selected from other creeds and other books which existed in the days of the Prophet and exist even now, the whole edifice of Islam will crumble to dust." (page 9—11). The following is the brief summary of the above in the words of Muir:—" *Muslims hold that their Faith came direct from heaven. The Quran and all their tenets were sent down by Gabriel from God Himself to Mohammad. . . . . Thus God alone is held to be the " Source " of Islam ; and if so, then all efforts to find a human origin for any part of it must be vain. Now if we can trace the teaching of the Quran, or any part of it, to an earthly source, or to human systems existing previous to the Prophet's age, then Islam at once falls to the ground.*" From the foregoing quotations it appears that in the opinion of both these intelligent Christians, the mere tracing of its teachings to other books and other creeds is enough to crush the Muslim faith. It is this idea which forms the ground-work of the book under review and which has prompted the learned servant of the Church Mission to rummage the pages of antique books and ancient scriptures in order to find 'a human origin' for the teachings of the Quran. Now a Muslim 'should make it more clear than the sun' that the very idea which forms the foundation of Mr. Tisdall's work is false, will not the reverend gentleman admit that his whole superstructure which has cost him perhaps the labour of years, falls to the ground in an instant ?

A Muslim fails to see the logic of the argument contained in the foregoing quotations. How the tracing of the teachings of the Holy Prophet to other creeds and other books can make Islam fall to the ground is beyond the comprehension of a Muslim. Far from demolishing the Muslim faith, it will only bear witness to the truth of its claims. The Holy Quran does not claim to bring teachings

that were never revealed before, and the Holy Prophet never claimed to be the only Prophet that was ever raised for the guidance of mankind. On the other hand, the Holy Book of the Muslims plainly teaches that prophets were never confined to one country or to one people, but that they were raised in all countries and among all nations. This is clear from the following verses of the Holy Quran:—

(*a*.) "O children of Adam! if there come to you apostles from among yourselves, rehearsing my signs to you, then whoso feareth God and doeth good works, no fear shall be upon them, neither shall they be put to grief." (vii, 33).

(*b*). "Already have We sent Our apostles with clear evidences, and We have caused the Book and the balance (laws of equity) to descend with them, that men might observe fairness." (lvii, 25).

(*c*). "How shall it be then when We bring up against all peoples *witnesses* from among themselves and when We bring thee up as a *witness* against these." (iv, 45).

(*d*). "Of some apostles We have told thee before; of other apostles We have not told thee." (iv, 161).

(*e*). "I am no apostle of new doctrines." (xlvi, 8).

(*f*). "We have sent thee with the truth; a bearer of good tidings and a warner; not hath there been a people but there hath passed among them a warner." (xxxv, 22).

(*g*). Thou art a warner only.—And every people hath its guide." (xiii, 8).

Many more verses might be cited to show that the Holy Quran recognises the divine mission of all the prophets and warners that have appeared in different countries and in different ages, and that it plainly says that the Holy Prophet of Arabia was not an apostle of new doctrines, but the few that have been cited above are more than sufficient.

Similarly God says that the Holy Quran corroborates the previous scriptures. A few verses to this effect may be quoted here:—

(*a*.) "Say, 'Whoso is the enemy of Gabriel—For he verily it is who by God's permission hath caused the Quran to descend on thy heart, *the confirmation of previous revelations*, and a guidance and good tidings to the faithful." (ii, 91).

(*b*.) "In truth hath He sent down to thee the 'Book,' which confirmeth those that precede it." (iii, 2).

(*c*.) "These are they to whom We gave the Scripture and Wisdom and Prophecy . . . . . These are they whom God hath guided; follow therefore their guidance." (vi, 98, 90).

(*d*.) "And this Book which We have sent down is blessed, confirming that which was before it." (vi, 92).

Such are the claims which the Holy Quran makes with regard to itself and with regard to the Holy Prophet. The Holy Prophet, to

whom the Holy Quran was revealed, was 'no apostle of new doctrines,' and the Book that was revealed to him claimed to be 'the confirmation of previous revelation' Such being the claims of the Holy Quran, one wonders at the folly of Rev. Tisdall and his translator, Sir William Muir, who say that as 'God alone is held to be the source of Islam, all effort to find a human origin for any part of it must be vain' and that 'if we can trace the teaching of the Quran, or any part of it, to an earthly source, or to human systems existing previous to the Prophet's age, then Islam at once falls to the ground.' They are either deplorably ignorant of the attitude of the Holy Quran towards other religions which they are pleased to call 'human systems,' and of its teachings with regard to the prophets of the world, or they purposely deceive ignorant people. I, for my part, am inclined to take the latter view, though in the case of the Rev. Tisdall, one may, with reason, take both views. That he has spared no pains in deceiving his readers is apparent from every page of his book, yet if he has displayed great skill in the art of deception, he has also on several occasions displayed shameful ignorance of facts —a circumstance which makes his performance eminently ludicrous and leads one to suspect 'the wonderful learning of the author.'

Can there be anything more foolish than to say that as 'God alone is held to be the source of Islam, all effort to find a human origin for any part of it must be vain'? Does not the Holy Quran represent the Holy Prophet as saying, 'I am no apostle of new doctrines.' Therefore the teachings of the Holy Prophet must be traceable to other systems, and one who thinks that the tracing of the teachings of the Holy Quran to systems existing previous to the Prophets age will make Islam at once fall to the ground only betrays an utter ignorance of the teachings of the Holy Book. The Holy Quran says of the Holy Prophet. "A messenger from God reciting to them the pure pages wherein are true scriptures." (xcviii, 2). Again, it says :—"God desireth to make this known to you, and *to guide you into the ways of those who have been before you.*" (iv, 31). Such is the claim of the Holy Quran, and if Messrs. Muir and Tisdall are able to trace its teachings to previous systems, they, far from dealing a death-blow to Islam, as they suppose they have done, only support its claim and bear an unconscious testimony to the truth of its teachings. If Rev. Tisdall has traced the teachings of the Holy Prophet to those of Zoroaster, if he has shown certain doctrines of Islam to be in conformity with the antiquated scriptures of ancient Egypt, if he has found certain dogmas of the Muslim faith to be identical with the now extinct religion of the Sabeans or with the ancient scriptures of Hinduism, we are grateful to him for the service he has rendered to the religion of Islam, for this only shows that all the ancient religious systems of the world, as the Holy Quran informs us, are of divine origin and that the Holy

Quran guides us into the ways of those that were before us.

There is a great difference between the attitude of Islam and that of modern Christianity towards other religions. The Christian god is a very niggardly and narrow-minded god. According to the Christian belief, he chose only one people for his favour of revelation and confined this gift only to that people. But such is not the teaching of the Holy Quran. It teaches that just as the physical gifts of God are universal and are not limited to any one people or to any particular age, similarly His spiritual gifts have never been confined to one race or to one period. Hence, as the Holy Quran informs us, prophets and spiritual teachers have been raised, not only among the children of Israel, as the Christians would have us believe, but also among other people. Just as prophets appeared among the Beni Israil, similarly they appeared among the Egyptians, the Iranis, the Hindoos, the Chinese, in fact, among all the races of the world, though tradition may not have handed down their names to posterity. A Muslim regards Zoroaster, Krishna Buddha, the *rishes* of ancient India, Confucius and other great teachers of the world as good men that were raised by God for the guidance of their respective people, just as Moses, Jesus and other prophets of Israel were raised by God to be the spiritual instructors of the children of Israel. A Muslim makes no distinction between Moses and Zoroaster, between Jesus and Krishna, for the Holy Quran says:—"We believe in God and what hath been sent down to us, and what hath been sent down to Abraham and Ismail and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and in what was given to Moses and Jesus and to all the prophets from their Lord; *We make no difference between them*—And to Him are we resigned." (iii, 78). In being the Messengers of the Divine Being they were all alike, though some of them were greater than others, for God says: "Some of the apostles, We have endowed more highly than others." (ii, 254). Thus, unlike the Christians, we believe not only that prophets appeared in lands other than Palestine, but that there may have been prophets much nobler and far greater than Jesus, whom his followers have taken for a God, just as many a people before them took their teachers for gods. As the Christians do not believe that prophets appeared in other lands, therefore William Muir is pleased to speak of other religions as 'human systems,' and says that the teachings of the Holy Quran are traceable to "earthly sources." But Islam looks upon all the great religions of the world as originally based on revelation. They have indeed become corrupt and many errors have undoubtedly found their way into their teachings, but this does not show that they are devoid of all traces of true doctrines. Being originally based on divine revelation, there still exists many a noble gem of truth in their teachings, and there may still be found many a fragment of inspiration in their scriptures,

and if the Christians can point to certain teachings of other systems that bear striking resemblance to the teachings of the Holy Quran, that does not show that the illiterate Prophet borrowed them from creeds, but that both the teachings of the Holy Quran and those of other teachers emanated from the common origin of Divine revelation.

Rev. Tisdall, for instance, while endeavouring to trace the teachings of the Holy Quran to ancient sources, finds the origin of the Quranic teaching with regard to the weighing of good and evil deeds of man on the Judgment Day in an ancient Egyptian book, some copies of which have been discovered in the sepulchres of ancient Egyptians. Muir, translating Rev Tisdall, says—

"But what is there mentioned above the Balance belongs to a far earlier source, namely, to a book called "The Book of the Dead." Many copies of this primeval work have been found in the sepulchre of the ancient idolatrous Egyptians, placed there because supposed to have been written by one of their gods called Thoth, and with the notion that they would be read by the dead buried there. In it is a strange picture illustrating the Judgment Hall of Osiris, of which our author (Rev. Tisdall) has given an interesting copy. There are in it two deities on opposite sides of a Balance. One of these is weighing the heart of a good man placed in a vessel on the scale, and in the corresponding scale opposite is an idol called *Ma* or Truth. The great god is recording in ancient Egyptian the fate of the departed—'Osiris the justified is alive; his Balance is equal in the midst of God's palace; the heart of Osiris the justified is to enter into its place. Let the great God, Lord of Hermopolis, say so. Over some of the idols are their names, and above a savage figure, the words, 'Conqueror of his enemies, God of *Amentt* (Hades)'; several times also are repeated the words.' To this account adds Tisdall, "From what has been said above, it is clear that what is written in the Quran about the balance is taken from this source."

Rev. Tisdall cannot prove, as I will show later on, that the Holy Prophet borrowed the teaching with regard to the weighing of the deeds on the judgment day from any Egyptian source. On the other hand, the resemblance of the contents of 'The Book of the Dead' with the Quranic teaching shows that what is written therein above the balance was originally the teaching of an inspired teacher which subsequently received a slight tinge of idolatry, but which in spirit is the true teaching of a prophet. *Thoth*, to whom the book is attributed, may have been a prophet whom posterity exalted to the dignity of a god, just as Christians have added to the number of the heathen gods by deifying the son of Mary. The labours of Rev. Tisdall only serve to show the truth of the Quranic teaching that there was not a nation but there had passed

among them a warner, and we are grateful to him for the testimony he has unconsciously borne to the truth of the Quranic teaching. It should, however, be borne in mind that the Quranic teaching does not signify that actually scales will be placed before the Lord and the good deeds of man will be weighed against evil deeds as we weigh material things. It only signifies that those whose good deeds will outweigh or preponderate evil deeds will enter paradise and those whose evil deeds will outweigh good deeds will enter Hell. God says, "He whose balances shall be heavy will lead a pleasing life, he whose balances shall be light will have hell for his mother." (ci, 5, 6). I have already quoted a verse which says. "Already have We sent our apostles with clear evidences, and We have caused the Book and the *balance* to descend with them." The word *balance* in this verse is evidently used figuratively. Similarly, the weighing of deeds on the Day of Judgment is not to be done with material scales, for the deeds of man are not material.

Similarly, Rev. Tisdall traces the Quranic verse, "In the name of Allah, the most Compassionate and Merciful" to old Zoroastrian books. He says: "There is a work, called "The Dasatir-i-Asmani" believed by the Zoroastrian to have been written in the language of Heaven, and, about the time of Khusrau Parwez, to have been translated in the Dari tongue. It comprises fifteen books said to have descended upon fifteen prophets, the first of whom was Mahabad, and the last, Sasan, Zoroaster being the thirteenth. The Book has been published both in the original and in the Dari translation. The second verse in each of these books opens with *In the name of God, the Giver of gifts, the Beneficent*; similar to the words at the opening of all the *suras* of the Quran,—*In the name of God. the Merciful and Gracious.* We also find the first words in another Zoroastrian book to be very similar, namely, *In the name of Ormazd, the Creator.*"

No Christian in the world can prove, not even Rev. Tisdall and William Muir as I will show later on, that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed the verse referred to above from the fifteen scriptures of the Zoroastrians which are believed by them to have desceded on fifteen different prophets, the thirteenth of whom was Zoroaster, and if the opening verse of every chapter of the Holy Quran coincides with the second verse of each of the fifteen scriptures, it only shows that latter books also originally came from the same source from which the Holy Quran came; and that common source could be no other than Divine Revelation. Rev. Tisdall, or his spirit, if he is dead, will be sorry to learn that the weapon he had used to demolish Islam has recoiled against him, and far from causing Islam to fall to the ground, as he hoped to do by tracing its teachings to other

sources, his researches have only served to strengthen its claim to divine origin.

Of the Book which the Zoroastrians believe to have been written in the language of heaven, Rev. Tisdall says "But this Book is a forgery" or as Muir says "These books no doubt are ancient forgery." How does Rev. Tisdall or William Muir know that all the five books are an ancient forgery? They make this statement without the slightest proof. But Rev. Tisdall is a clever missionary. He does not stand in need of any proof for his statements. His object is only to impress his views on the minds of his readers, and he has his own way of achieving this object. When he wants his readers to take a statement for a fact, but has no proof of its truth, he just declares it authoritatively, as if it were an established fact, a fact which was admitted on all hands. There is no faltering, no hesitation in his tone and the result is that the reader is easily deceived. The simple reader takes his authoritative utterances for established facts and is put on the wrong track. He seems to have had a long experience as a missionary, and his practice of this profession has made him an adept in the art of imposing on simple folk. He has resorted to this stratogem many times in his *Yanabi*, as the reader will see by and by. The readers of books written by missionaries of the type of Rev. Tisdall should always be on their guard against the authoritative statements made in them, for it is not unoften that the most positive statements of theirs are the falsest. They most often base their arguments on false foundations, as Rev. Tisdall has done in the book under review. They very cleverly hide their weak points in their arguments and gloss them so skilfully that the reader passes on without suspecting that the reverend gentleman has been guilty of foul play. Let the reader mark the positive way in which Rev. Tisdall declares all the fifteen books of the Zoroastrians to be pure forgery from beginning to end. A simple reader who is not well acquainted with the arts of the missionary controversialists may take this statement for positive truth, but the fact is that the reverend gentleman cannot prove that all the fifteen books are pure forgery. He says so merely on his own authority, and he is so positive in the expression of his verdict that William Muir has only spoiled the force of his declaration by introducing the words 'no doubt.' Rev. Tisdall does not stand in need of such props to support his statements. He simply makes a declaration and that is enough. According to him, to qualify a statement with such phrases as 'no doubt' only detracts from its force: for, he thinks, such phrases imply the possibility of doubt, but he does not wish that the reader should entertain any doubt and consequently his utterances are so worded as have no room for any misgiving. The books may have been tampered with, as the Bible has been tampered with, but no body is prepared to

accept the sweeping statement of Rev. Tisdall that they all are a forgery pure and simple, unless he furnishes some incontrovertible evidence as to their having been forged, which, however, he does not.

The Zoroastrian tradition that the books were written in the language of heaven only means that they are revealed books. 'Language of heaven' does not mean that the language was spoken, not on the earth, but on the heavens; for if it had been so, who could have understood them and how could they have been translated into Dari, as they have been?

To revert to the Holy Quran, one may ask what need there was for the Holy Quran when it was only to confirm the revelation that was before it. The Holy Quran itself answers the question and I will let it speak for itself.

Firstly, it refers to the religious condition of the world at the time of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). It says—'Corruption hath appeared both by land and by sea,' *i.e*, the whole world had become corrupt. '*Sea*' has been explained to mean the people that still retained heavenly books, in fragments or in whole, and thus possessed some of the heavenly *water* which God has sent down for the spiritual welfare of the people. And '*land*' is understood to signify the people who had utterly forgotten the Word of God that was once sent to their forefathers, and who had all the heavenly teachings effaced from their memory and did not now possess even a drop of heavenly water, and were in fact like dried up land. Both classes of people, are, however described to have become corrupt by the time the Holy Prophet, (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) made his appearance. This statement of the Holy Quran is corroborated by history and no body will deny that at the advent of the Holy Prophet, all the religions of the world had become corrupt. The friends of Rev. Tisdall will admit, with regard to all other religions, that they had become corrupt, and as to the corruption of Christianity, I cite the testimony of William Muir, the translator of Rev. Tisdall's work. He says in his Introduction to the 'Life of Mohammad,' "*The Christianity of the 7th century was itself decrepit and corrupt. It was disabled by contending schisms, and had substituted the puerilities of superstition for the pure and the expansive faith of the early ages.*" Thus, according to the Holy Quran, it was the universal corruption prevailing in the world that demanded the advent of a new prophet, for it has been a divine law to raise a new prophet when the world has gone astray from the teachings of the earlier prophets. But the prophets that were raised in earlier times were raised for particular people, for circumstances did not permit the raising of a prophet for the world at large. But at the advent of the Holy Prophet the barriers that

had separated one nation from another had begun to be removed, and the time was fast drawing night when the whole world should become like one nation. Therefore God raised one prophet for the whole world gave him a complete law, which supplies all the needs of mankind. This subject has been discussed at length elsewhere and therefore I need not dwell on it here. In short, the whole world had become dead spiritually by the time the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) made his appearance and God raised a prophet to breathe life into it. Thus the Holy Quran says: " Know that God shall quicken the earth after its death " (lvii, 16).

God compares the Divine revelation to water that rains from above, and fertilises the dried up earth. Speaking of the revelation which He sent to the Holy Prophet. He says, " And God sendeth down water from Heaven and by it giveth life to the Earth after in hath been dead. Verily in this is a sign to those who hearken." (xvi, 67). The verse means, as its context will show, that just as the physical water raining down from heaven, breathes life into the dead earth, similarly the spiritual water of divine relevation which is descending on the Holy Prophet in the form of the Holy Quran will quicken the earth that is spiritually dead.

Secondly, it says that as a long time had elapsed after the advent of the former prophets, people had become both hard-hearted and wicked and demanded a new Messenger to revive their faith and turn them to righteousness. Thus it says of the former people of the book, " Those whom the scriptures were given heretofore, a long time hath passed over them and their hearts have become hardened and many of them are evil doers." (lvii. 15). Again it says, " O people of the Book, now hath our Apostle come to you to expound to you (doctrines) *after the cessation of Apostles*, lest you should say, " There hath come to us no bearer of good tidings, nor any warner " (v. 22). Prophets had ceased to appear long before the Holy Prophet made his appearance, the latest prophet before him being Jesus, who was born about six centuries before. Thus, considering that a long interval had elapsed since the advent of former prophets, and that the darkness of ignorance had spread over the whole world, every impartial man will admit that it was high time that a prophet should have appeared to draw men out of darkness into light, and this need was fulfilled by the advent of the Holy Prophet. Thus, the Holy Quran says: " This Book have We sent down to Thee that by their Lord's permission thou mayest bring men out of darkness into light, into the path of the Mighty, the Glorious." (xiv, 1).

Thirdly, the Holy Quran states that even the people of the Book were split up with dissensions, had forgotten most of the revelation that was given them, misinterpreted what was left with them

of the Word of God, concealed portions of it from the people, had ceased to follow their scriptures and followed only false hopes and false desires; and these circumstances called for a new revelation which should settle the differences that had sprung up among the people of the Book, reclaim from oblivion the teachings they had forgotten, bring to light the truths which they concealed, combine in itself all the truths and all the teachings that had theretofore been revealed to the apostles of the World and thus give the nations of the Earth a complete book which should be a light for the world, and a remedy for all the spiritual diseases that may afflict mankind. Following are some of the verses of the Holy Quran, bearing on the aforenamed points :—

(*a.*) " And We have sent down the Book to thee only that thou mightest expound to them what they differ about, and as a guidance and mercy to those who believe." (xvi, 66).

(*b*) " Verily We have sent down the Book to thee with the truth, that thou mayest judge between them according as God hath shown to thee." (iv, 106).

(*c.*) " O people of the Scriptures ! Now is Our Apostle come to you to clear up to you much that ye concealed of those scriptures, and to pass over much. Now hath a light and a clear Book come to you from God, by which God will guide him who followeth after His good pleasure, to paths of peace, and bring them out of the darkness to the light by His will ; and guide them to the right path." (v, 18).

(*d*) " And to thee have We sent the Book with truth, confirmatory of previous scripture, *and its safe-guard.* Judge therefore between them by what God hath sent down, and follow not their desires, after the truth which hath come unto thee." (v, 52). The above is the rendering of Rodwell, and the word which he renders *safe-guard* is which also signifies comprehension and which therefore represents the Holy Quran as comprehending the previous scriptures - a rendering which is in harmony with another verse which speaks of the Holy Quran as 'pure pages wherein are true scripture.' (xcviii, 2). But it makes little difference even if we follow the rendering of Rodwell, for the word 'Safe-guard,' includes the idea of comprehension. In order that the Holy Quran may serve as a safe-guard for the true teachings contained in the previous scriptures, it must include in itself all such teachings. The verse shows that the previous scriptures were no longer the safe custodians of true teachings and that therefore the teachings were again sent down to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and were embodied in the Holy Quran which is thus the safe-guard of the teachings that were once revealed to the previous prophets. But the Holy Quran could never be the safe-guard of the previous scriptures, if it had been as subject to alterations and

interpolations as the previous scriptures were. Hence the Holy Quran has been exempted from the fate of the former books. God does not entrust its protection to its followers, as he had entrusted the protection of the Torah to the Jews. On the other hand, He Himself undertakes to protect the Holy Quran, since it was to be the law for all ages and all peoples. The promise of divine protection which has been vouchsafed to the Holy Quran is contained in the following verse—"*Verily We have sent down the 'Warning," and verily We will be its guardian.*" (xv, 9). And the whole world is a witness that the promise has been amply fulfilled. It is not only the text of the Holy Quran which God has preserved in its purity, He has also guarded it from the attacks of its enemies, both internal and external, by raising successors to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) in every century who expounded its true teachings and repelled the attacks that were directed against it. The promise of protection also implies that the language of the Holy Quran will never become a dead language, as has been the fate of all the languages in which the previous scriptures were revealed. As the previous books were meant only for particular people in a particular age, God has caused them to die, as a sign that the Holy Quran is now to be the only book for all nations and for all times to come. The Holy Quran now stands without a rival, being the only revealed book in a living language, and the only scripture, the purity of whose text has remained intact.

(*e.*) "Thus then as a rule of Judgment in the Arabic tongue have We sent down the Quran; and truly, if after the knowledge that hath reached thee, thou follow their desires, thou shalt have no guardian, nor protector against God." (xiii, 37).

(*f.*) "O people of the Book, overstep not bounds in your religion; and of God speak only the truth" (iv, 169).

(*g.*) "So for their breaking their covenant, We have cursed them, and have hardened their hearts. They shift the words *of scripture* from their places, and have forgotten a large portion of what they were taught." (v, 16).

(*h.*) "And of those who say, 'Verily we are Christians,' have we taken the covenant. But they *too* have forgotten a portion of what they were taught." (v, 17).

(*i.*) "O people of the Book! outstep not bounds of truth in your religion; neither follow the desires of those who have already gone astray, and caused many to go astray, and themselves gone astray from the evenness of the way." (v, 81).

(*j.*) "Woe to those who with their own hands transcribe the book and then say, 'This is from God." (ii, 73).

(*k.*) "And some truly are there among those who pervert the scriptures with their tongue, in order that ye may suppose it to be

from the scripture, though it is not from the scripture. And they say, 'This is from God'; yet it is not from God: and they utter a lie against God, and they know they do so."

Such was the deplorable condition of the people that claimed to be the people of the Book. These verses clearly state that there had grown up differences among them which required that a new revelation should come down to judge between them, and the Holy Quran claims to be the judge. These verses also show that not only the Jews and Christians of the day of the Holy Prophet had gone astray, but also their ancestors had gone astray from the path of evenness. The Holy Quran clearly states that both the Jews and the Christians had forgotten a portion of what they were taught. Such were the needs that demanded a new and complete law.

Fourthly, the Holy Quran claims to explain many things that were either unknown or only partly known to the people of the previous scriptures. Even Jesus, who was the latest of the prophets that had preceded the Holy Prophet said that he could not teach the people the whole of truth, for the time was not yet ripe for it, but that the one that was to come after him would tell them the whole truth. (John xvi, 12, 13). The Holy Quran claims that prophecy was fulfilled in the Holy Prophet and that he was the prophet, the glad tidings of whose advent were given by Jesus and who had come to teach men the '*all truth.*" (lxi, 6). The Holy Quran claims religion to have been completed in Islam, (v, 5)—a claim which was never made by any other scripture. A remarkable instance of what was little explained by the Torah and the Evangel but was detailed at length in the Holy Quran is an account of the next world. So little was said about the life to come in the Torah that there were many among Jews who even denied that there was any life after death, and among many questions put to Jesus, one was concerning the resurrection of the dead. The reply which Jesus gave to Sadducees, who denied resurrection, shows that the scriptures of the Jews contained little information about life after death. The verse which Jesus quoted from the scriptures in order to prove resurrection runs thus: "*I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,*" and from this he inferred that there was a life after death, for, as Jesus argued, 'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' This was the best verse which Jesus, inspite of his thorough acquaintance with the scriptures, could cite to prove resurrection. But the verse, as the reader will see, is but a poor proof of the life to come. The terms, 'The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob' hardly prove that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are still alive, for the verse only means, "I am the God who raised Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and whom these righteous men worshipped when they lived on this Earth." But if Jesus cited this verse as a proof of resur-

rection, the fault does not lie with him, for he could not find a better verse to prove the life to come. The citing of such a verse by Jesus shows only too clearly that the scriptures were silent on the subject. But it is a pity that Jesus also did not throw any further light on this subject which is of paramount importance in religion. The only description which the Christians can give on the authority of their scriptures is that 'Abraham's breast or bosom' constitutes the heaven of the faithful. Rev. Tisdall says, " For the truly faithful there is a resting place that is called ' Abraham's breast ' or heaven." But one may ask where the righteous men of per-Abrahamic times rested after death, for ' Abraham's breast' came into existence only after the death of the great patriarch.

Rev. Tisdall argues that as the descriptions of the life to come that are to be found in the Holy Quran are given neither in the Torah nor in the writings of Apostles, therefore they are false. Such queer logic only befits Rev. Tisdall. But one may retort by saying that as no trace of the Christian description of heaven which is described as Abraham's bosom is to be found in the Torah' therefore it is false. If Rev. Tisdall's argument holds good in one case, it must also hold good in the other case. The truth is that the silence of the Torah and the Gospel on the subject of the life to come only shows that they are not complete books. They do not contain the *all truth* as is apparent from Jesus' own confession. He said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear then now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into *all truth*, for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsover he shall hear, that shall he speak: *and he will show you things to come.*" (John xvi, 12, 13)

Another distinguishing feature of the Holy Quran is that it not only contains perfect teachings but also explains their wisdom by means of arguments. It does not give bare doctrines and articles of faith as other books do ; on the other hand, it demonstrates their truth with reasons and arguments. God says: " *This is* a book whose verses are established in wisdom and then set forth with clearness " (xi. 1). Again, " O men, now hath a proof come to you from your Lord, and We have sent down to you a clear light." (iv, 174). Every one who will carefully read the Holy Quran will find that it is not content with mere statements, but establishes them with proofs and arguments.

The Holy Quran states in clear words that it is beyond the power of mortals to prepare a perfect book like the Holy Quran which is ' a cure and a mercy for the faithful.' It says : Say :— Assuredly, if mankind and the Djinn should join together to

bring the like of this Quran, they could not produce its like, though the one should help the other." (xvii, 91). The reason is apparent. Why all mortals are unable to make a book like the Holy Quran will become clear from the following verses in which the Word of God contained in the Holy Quran is compared (*a*) to the water that rains down from heaven, (*b*) to the milk that is yielded by cattle, (*c*) to the fruits that the trees bear, and (*d*) to the honey that is furnished by the bee. The verses run thus—

"And We have sent down the Book to thee that thou mightest expound to them what they differed about, and as a guidance and mercy to those who believe.

"And God sendeth down water from heaven, and by it giveth life to the Earth after it hath been dead: verily, in this is a sign to those who hearken.

"And ye have teaching from the cattle. We give you drink of the pure milk, between dregs and blood; which is in their bellies; the pleasant beverage of them that quaff it.

"And among fruits ye have the palm and the vine, from which ye get wine and healthful nutriment :—in this, verily, are signs for those who reflect.

"And thy Lord hath sent inspiration to the bee: 'Provide thee houses in the mountains, and in the trees, and in that which men erect. Feed moreover on every kind of fruit, and walk the commodious paths of thy Lord.' From its belly cometh forth a fluid of varying hues, which yieldeth medicine to man. Verily in this is a sign for those who consider.' (*Vide Sura Nahl or the Bee.*)

These verses show that it is only in the power of God to send down a book like the Holy Quran, which may act like heavenly water on dead earth, which may serve as a nutriment for those who need spiritual food, which may be a pleasant beverage for the thirsty, and which may serve as a medicine for the sick. As it is impossible to give life to the dead earth unless God sends down rain from heaven, similarly it is impossible for mortals to make with the aid of the earthly materials, a book which may breathe life into the spiritually dead. It is only the Word of God which descending from above acts like heavenly water and quickens the earth after it has been dead. Similarly as mortals cannot produce milk out of grass and stand in need of a living machine that God has prepared for the purpose, so for the spiritual milk they need the living machines which God has appointed for this purpose, *viz.*, the Prophets, who being inspired by God furnish mankind with spiritual milk. And again, as man cannot get honey from flowers except through the agency of the bee which acts under divine inspiration, similarly he cannot get the spiritual honey that serves as a cure for his spiritual diseases, except through the medium of the prophets.

It is easy to say that such and such teaching of the Holy Quran is traceable to such and such a source, as a chemist says that such and such elements enter into the composition of milk. But the question is, can a chemist make a fluid like milk with the same properties ? Similarly, a critic like Rev. Tisdall may tell us that the Holy Quran is composed of such and such elements, but we ask him, as we ask a chemist, can we make a book like the Holy Quran with all its properties and powers. It is for this reason that the Holy Quran says that even if all the mortals join together and help each other, they will not be able to produce a book like the Holy Quran. Just as mortals cannot produce milk, fruits, etc., similarly they cannot produce a book like the Holy Quran which may possess all the properties and virtues which the Holy Quran possesses. This is an argument of the divine origin of the Holy Quran and no mortal can answer it. The Holy Quran claims certain powers and properties and the results have shown that it does possess them in a pre-eminent degree. It claims, for instance, to be a light, a guidance, a cure, a mercy, a book which draws men out of darkness into light; and the wonderful transformation which it has wrought in the world has proved its claims. It has worked such a powerful change that even the blind can feel it. Even Rev. Tisdall who calls the book human fabrication and represents the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) as the greatest impostor that ever trod on this earth has been compelled to admit the might of this wonderful book, for he speaks of it as a 'vast stream which has overflowed so many nations of the east.'

From what has been said above, it is clear that Rev. Tisdall has toiled to no purpose. He starts with the assumption that as 'God alone is held to be the source of Islam, all effort to find a human origin for any part of it must be vain,' and that 'if we can trace the teachings of the Quran, or any part of it, to an earthly source or to human systems existing previous to the prophet's age, then Islam at once falls to the ground.' But the Holy Quran regards all the great religions of the world to have been *originally* based on divine revelation and claims to confirm the truth that is still to be found in them and points out the errors that have crept into them owing to the lapse of time. Thus, if Rev. Tisdall can trace its teachings to what he calls human systems, he does not do any injury to the faith of Islam; on the other hand, he only proves the claim of the Holy Quran to be a book which confirms all that is true in the previous scriptures. Thus the very basis of the book which has cost Rev. Tisdall so much time and labour is false, and consequently the huge superstructure which he has raised on a false foundation 'at once falls to the ground.'

Having shown that Rev. Tisdall has been building on a false foundation, it was needless to enter into any detailed refutation of

his work. But the pity is that it is not only the foundation that is unsound, but even the materials which he has employed for raising a huge fabric on a false foundation are equally unsound, and therefore it is meet that after exposing the falsity of the foundation, I should proceed to expose the worthlessness of the materials which he has employed.

Rev. Tisdall as a Judge.

Rev. Tisdall adopts a peculiar course in the treatment of his subject. He does not take the position of a critic; on the other hand, he poses as a judge between Islam and its critics. At first he states an objection which he says the critics bring forward against the Holy Quran and then proceeds to inquire whether their objection is correct. This is the course which he follows throughout his book. When he has stated an objection, he introduces his pretended inquiry with such words as the following:—

"As it is not proper to accept this objection of the critics without any reason, we should, call upon them to produce their reasons for their statement." (page 180). Really, he himself is the critic, and the so-called arguments which he pretends to give on behalf of the critics are his own arguments, which have cost him the labour of years, and for which Muir bestows upon him so much praise. But Rev. Tisdall had a purpose in taking the double role of a critic and a judge, which was to impress on his readers an idea of his impartiality and justice. Such sentences as "It is not proper that we should accept their objection without reason" are introduced only to make the readers believe that critical and impartial enquiry forms the sole aim of the author. This is one of the artifices which he employs to give a tone of plausibility to his so-called arguments. William Muir represents Rev. Tisdall's work as an *original* book, gives him the cridit of having conceived 'a *new* mode of treating the so-called divine and eternal faith,' and pays him a tribute for his 'wonderful learning and research.' This shows that the arguments which he has adduced in his book are the result of his own research and are, to quote the words of Muir, 'a proof of the wonderful learning of the author.' But Rev. Tisdall does not claim this credit for himself. On the other hand, he puts his arguments in the mouth of others, reserving for himself the privilege of pronouncing a judgment on the evidence produced by the supposed critics. Thus while tracing the teachings of the Holy Quran to the Zoroastrian and the Hindu scriptures, he introduces his discussion with the following words: "They (the critics) say in response to this demand, 'let us examine some of the verses of the Holy Quran and some of the traditions and compare them with what is written in the ancient scriptures of the Zoroastrians and the Hindus," (page 180). If the reader desires to know in what words the reverend missionary pronounces his judgment, I may

refer him to the concluding words of the fourth chapter which run thus :—

"In short, the claim of the critics who say that the Gospel and other books of the Christians, particularly some of the spurious writings of the ancient heretics form one of the sources of Islam is altogether beyond question." (page 175).

But though Rev. Tisdall has donned the robe of a judge, yet one regrets to find that he has sadly failed to do justice to his assumed character. He has sat as a judge between the Muslims and their Christian critics. The point at issue is whether the Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings from other sources. The Christian critics contend that the teachings of the Holy Quran have been borrowed from the Jews, the Christians, the Zoroastrians, the Sabeans, the Arabs, the Hindus and others, while the Muslims believe that the Holy Quran is the Word of Him who knows all that is in the heavens or in the earth, who has been raising prophets in all countries and who at last raised the Holy Prophet in Arabia and gave him a complete book which claims to contain all the teachings that were revealed to former prophets. Now Rev. Tisdall comes forward to judge between these two parties. He pretends to be an impartial judge and would not accept the assertion of the critics of Islam without critically examining the evidence which they bring forward in support of their claims. For this purpose, he takes great pains in examining the records which are alleged to be the sources of Islam. So great is his desire for justice that he is not content with mere translations of the books from which the contents of the Holy Quran are alleged to have been borrowed. He places before the reader the original documents in their original language. He gives a large number of quotations (with Persian translation) in Hebrew (pages 38-40, 52-55, 57, 64-74, 84-88, 92-93, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 109-10, 112, 118); Greek (pages 105, 124-25, 126-31, 133-36, 139-42, 161-64, 168-73, 174, 175, 198-99); Latin (pages 149-150); Armenian (pages 87, 157, 209-10); Pehlvi and Zend (pages 192-95, 197-98, 204, 205, 206-8, 211-14, 216-17, 219); Babylonian (89-90 : Copic (pages 132, 155); Abyssinian (page 94) : Ancient Egyptian (pages 165, 166, 167); Chaldaean (page 100); Sanskrit (pages 91, 203), all of which, he says, contributed to the formation of the Holy Quran, as it now exists. The Rev. gentleman also asks the reader to accompany him to the land where the Nile flows, lays open the sepulchers of the ancient dead and taking out an antiquated work which he calls the Book of the Dead, offers it to the reader as a work which served as a source for the teachings of the Holy Quran. Similarly he takes us to the ruins between the Euphrates and the Tigris, and pointing with his finger to the primeval tiles, asks us to decipher the inscriptions in ancient Babylonian on the said tiles, saying

'Here also we find a source of the contents of the Book of the Muslims.' In short, in his search for the sources of the Holy Quran he has led the reader from the Pyramids of Egypt and the land of Greece on the west to the fertile plains washed by the sacred waters of the Ganges in the east. By the by, I wonder why he has stopped short on the banks of the sacred river of the Hindus, for if he had crossed the Himalayas and sought for the sources of Islam in the writings of the ancient Chinese teachers and Buddhistic writings. he would have certainly found there much that was identical with the teachings of the great Prophet of Arabia (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him).

The long quotations in ancient languages which have been long dead will lead a cursory reader to think that the author, by laborious and learned research, has proved beyond question that the books referred to by him form the sources of the teachings of the Holy Quran. But I warn the reader against a hasty conclusion. Let not the very fact that he has given tediously lengthy quotations from ancient books lead us to conclude that he has acquitted himself of the self-imposed duty of a judge. Before we come to any conclusion, let us pause and think whether he has considered all the sides of the questions. He had to disprove the claim of the Holy Quran to revelation, and in order to do this, he had to establish two things. Firstly that the contents of the Holy Quran are traceable to previous books. Secondly, that the Holy Prophet *actually* borrowed them from those books or learnt them from people who knew those books

If the belief of the Muslims had been that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) *invented* the teachings of the Holy Quran and that whatever is written in the Holy Book was not known to the people of the previous ages, then the mere tracing of the contents of the Holy Quran to previous books would have been sufficient to show the error of the Muslims, But such is not the case. They believe the Holy Quran to be the word of the Omniscient God, from whom nothing is hidden, Therefore if Rev. Tisdall wants to prove that it is not the Word of God, he should not merely trace its teaching to the previous books, but he should also show that the Holy Prophet *actually* borrowed the contents of the Hely Quran from those books. If he succeeds in proving both these things, then, of course, the whole fabric of Islam falls to the ground. Therefore in judging the merits of his book, what we have to see is whether he has established both these things satisfactorily. We should not allow ourselves to be overawed by the long quotations in antique and fantastic characters with which he has loaded his book, but we should see, firstly whether the contents of the Holy Quran which the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon

him) announced to be the Word of the Divine Being correspond with the contents of the quotations he has given, and secondly whether he has succeeded in proving that the Holy Prophet *actually* borrowed his teachings from these sources. These are the two criteria with which we have to test his book, and if it can stand both these tests, then we shall have no hesitation in admitting that his book is really worthy of the praise which his friends have bestowed on it and that it is really a wonderful and noble work as Muir represents it to be.

Do the contents of the Holy Quran correspond with Rev. Tisdall's quotations ?

When one applies the first of the two afore-mentioned tests to Rev. Tisdall's book, a startling revelation is the result. When we begin to compare his quotations with what Muslims believe to be the Word of God, we are startled to discover that Rev. Tisdall has been guilty of foul play. The aim of his work was to show that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God and therefore he ought to have confined himself to the Holy Quran alone, for it is this book and none else that the Muslims believe to have been sent down to the Holy Prophet through the angel Gabriel. But it is very rarely that he traces the contents of the Holy Quran to other sources. Leaving the text of the Holy Quran, he takes up the words of the commentators and identifying them with the divine revelation which the Holy Prophet received from God, traces their origin to Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian and other sources, and when he has concluded his comparisons, he declares, with the authority of a judge, that it was not God who sent down the Holy Quran to the Holy Prophet, but that the Holy Prophet borrowed it from such and such sources, as if the stories given by the commentators were idential with the Holy Prophet. No Muslim ever believed that the Word of God ever descended on the commentators and that the stories which they have given in their books are divine revelation. But Rev. Tisdall compares the stories of the commentators with the contents of the previous books and when he has pointed out their similarity, he concludes most logically that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God but a fabrication of Mohammad. For instance, Muir, translating Tisdall, says on page 50, " We read also in Beidhawi and other commentators that Imran's wife, who was aged and barren, one day saw a bird feeding its little ones, and at once longed for a child herself." Having given this story of Beidhawi and other commentators, Rev. Tisdall proceeds to trace it to a Christian source. " To prove this," continues the translator on page 52, " we now give full and satisfactory evidence. In the Protevangelium of James the Less, written in Hellenic Greek, we have the follow-

ing :—' Anna (Mary's mother) looking upwards to the heavens, saw a sparrow in its nest, and sighed, saying, O me ! O me ! Would it were the same with me, O me ! to what thing am I alike ? not like unto the birds of heaven, for the birds of heaven, are fruitful before thee O Lord," etc. Though Rev. Tisdall gives ' full and satisfactory evidence' to show that the story of the sparrow given by " Beidhawi and other commentators," is traceable to a Christian source, yet we forget to say that the story mentioned by ' Beidhawi and other commentators' is not to be found in the Holy Quran, and therefore the trouble which Rev. Tisdall has taken to find a Christian source for this story is of no avail, for it does not prove that the Holy Prophet borrowed the contents of the Holy Quran from Proteuangelium of James the Less or any other Christien source.

Again, Rev. Tisdall says, in the words of his translator. " Jelal-ud-Deen (a commentator of the Holy Quran) also tells us that..... he (Zacharias) placed her in a chamber shut off from any one else to enter. But the angels came there to nourish and tend her," (page 50, 51) Rev. Tisdall again finds the source of this story in the Protevangelium of James the Less, who says, " And Mary remained like a dove in the Temple of the Lord, and received food at an angel's hand." (page 53). Rev. Tisdall indeed deserves credit for the pains he has taken to find a Christian source for Jalal-ud-Din's story, but I am again sorry to add that the labour which this research has entailed on him is to no purpose, for Jalal-ud-Din's story is not to be found in the Holy Quran. The Holy Quran nowhere states that Mary, when a child, was shut up in a room, to which nobody could find access and that the angels fed and nourished her. On the other hand, it states that she was reared by Zacharias. It says, " So with goodly acceptance did her Lord accept her, and with goodly growth did He make her grow ; *and Zacharias reared her.*" (iii, 32). Sometimes, however, the commentators turn the verses of the Holy Quran from their natural significance and so interpret them as to make them accord with the stories current among the Christians and the Jews. Such has been the fact of a verse which speaks of Mary, mother of Jesus. The Holy Quran mentions an incident which prompted Zacharias to pray for a child. When he visited the young girl in her chamber and asked her, whence she had received the food that was with her, she replied. " It is from God ; verily God supplieth whom He will, without reckoning !' " There did Zacharias call upon his Lord, O my Lord, vouchsafe me from Thyself good descendants ; Thou verily art the hearer of prayer." (iii, 32, 33). These are the verses commenting on which Jalal-ud-Deen has drawn upon the Christian story of angels supplying Mary with food. But the verse in question do not contain even the remotest reference to the

said story. The question of Zacharias. "Oh Mary, whence has thou this ?" does not show that the existence of food with Mary excited his curiosity and that he did not know whence she had received the food. He only lovingly put this question to her, as men often put such questions to little children in order to know what reply they will make. There was nothing extraordinary in the question. Nor does her answer show that the food that was with her had been supplied to her through some supernatural agency. Many verses may be quoted from the Holy Quran which contain similar expressions and where no supernatural agency is referred to. For instance, the Holy Book says, "God supplies whom He will without measure," (ii, 208). Again, "Say, O God, possessor of all power, ... Thou givest sustenance to whom Thou wilt without reckoning." (iii, 25-26). Again Abraham is represented as saying, "The Lord of the worlds . . . . . who giveth me food and drink." In all these instances God is represented as supplying sustenance to the people of the world without reckoning, but these verses do not imply any extraordinary way of providing for them. Similarly, the words of Mary do not signify that she received food through some supernatural agency, and it is an error to say that angels are referred to there. All things which we have, we receive from God. The prayer of Zacharias supports this interpretation. When he heard such a wise reply from a girl of tender years, his heart was touched and there was roused in his mind a yearning for a good child like Mary : hence his prayer.

That she had eatables with her at every time is not a thing to wonder at seeing that she lived in the Temple, where the Jewish men and women that visited the temple must have been fond of the tender girl that had been dedicated to the temple and must have been always bringing her things to eat. In short the Holy Quran makes no mention of the fact that she had been shut up in a chamber where no body could find access and that it was the angels that brought her food and drink.

But the pity is that it is not only the commentaries that Rev Tisdall identifies with the Holy Quran, but also books of wild and romantic stories which have been written only for the entertainment of the readers and which, far from being identical with the Holy Quran cannot even be called religious books. These books are (1) The *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* (or the tales of the prophets) (2) *The Arais-ul-Majalis* (or the chess-boards of the assemblies) (3) *The Rauzat-ul-Ahbab* (or the garden of friends), (4) *The At-Tawarikh-ul-Qadeema* (or the ancient history of man.) These books were written to serve the same purpose for which the Arabian Nights Entertainments were written : but Rev. Tisdall, instead of tracing the contents of the Holy Quran to other sources,

traces the tales of these story-books to Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian and other sources and presumes to think that by doing so he has proved the Holy Quran to be a fabrication, as if the Moslems believed that it was the *Qisas-ul-Ambiya*, the *Arais-ul-Majalis*, the *Rauzat-ul-Ahbab* and the *At-Tawarikh-ul-Qadeema* and not the Holy Quran that were sent down by God as a Revelation to the Holy Prophet. Can any thing be more foolish than to assert that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God because the stories recorded in the *Qisas-u'-Ambiya*, the *Arais-ul-Majalis*, the *Rauzat-ul-Ahbab* and the *At-Tawarikh* are traceable to the Jewish and other sources ? These stories, which he traces to the books of Jewish and Christian tradition, are not to be found in the Holy Quran: for as an intelligent reader can see, if these tales had been given in the Holy Quran, the reverend missionary would not have stood in need of referring to these story-books. Still, the logical missionary argues that as the tales recorded in these story-books are traceable to other sources, therefore one should believe that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God. These books have been frequently quoted throughout the work. In particular the reader is referred to the following pages which have been exclusively devoted to quotations from these books and a discussion of the sources from which the contents of these books are said to have been drawn :—41-58, 79-95, 107-112, 156-158, 206-215. So copious are the quotations from these books that one may say with justice that the author of the Yanabi has written his book to trace the sources not of the Holy Quran but of the *Arais* the *Qisas* and the *Rauza*. We give below a few specimens of Rev. Tisdall's quotations from each of these books so that the reader may see that the stories which the reverend gentleman traces to Christian and other sources are not to be found in the Holy Quran. The reverend missionary identifies them with the contents of the Holy Quran merely because the books which contain these stories happen to be written by presons that followed the Muslim faith.

The following are a few of the quotations from the book named *Qisas* or the Tales :—

(*a*) Rev. Tisdall says on page 107 :—The *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* (Tales of the Prophets) says on page 3, 4, with reference to the *Lauh-i-Mahfuz* (the Preserved Table) :—' At that time God created a pearl under His Throne and created the Preserved Table out of that pearl. The table was 700 years' journey in length and 300 years' journey in breadth. Its edges were decorated with rubies. Then God, with Divine power, spoke to the pen, saying, ' Write down (on this table) what I know about My creation and what is to take place to the Day of Resurrection, ' etc. . . . . The origin of this story is to be found in Jewish books," etc. Let the reader note what sort

of foolish stories are represented as the teachings of the Holy Quran and of the illustrious Prophet of Islam and it is by tracing the origin of such idle tales that the reverend missionary hopes to demolish Islam.

(*b*) Again, The Tales (*Qisas*) says page 5:—" One day, Abdullah bin Salam, asked the Prophet Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), 'What is the highest point of the Earth ?' 'Mount Qaf, replied the holy prophet. 'What is the mount Qaf made of ? 'Of green emeralds. The greenness of the sky is also owing to the mount Qaf.' 'Thou art right, O Prophet of God,' exclaimed the inquirer 'What is the height of mount Qaf'? Five hundred years' journey. 'What is the circumference of the mount ? 'Two thousand years' journey.' The origin of this story is to be found in a Jewish book, named Hagigah." (page 111). I need not add that the whole story is a lie, fabricated with no other purpose save to entertain wonder-loving people. It is neither founded on the Holy Quran, nor on any tradition of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), yet Rev. Tisdall represents it as one of the cardinal teaching of Islam; and gives it a place in his book as a story by which Islam must either stand or fall.

(*c*). Again, "The *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* says on page 9:—God created Azazeel, who in the seventh hell worshipped the Almighty for a thousand years; he, then, ascended, worshipping God for a similar term at each stage, till he reached the Earth," (206).

(d) And again, " The *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* says on page 2:—The Holy Prophet Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him said, ' God parted my light into four sections, from which He made. (1) the heavens, (2) the pen, (3) paradise, and (4) the believers ; each of these four He again divided into four ; from the first, He formed me, who am the prophet ; from the second, He formed reason placed in the believer's head; from the third, modesty within the believer's eye; and from the fourth, love within his heart." (210-11). This story too like the previous ones, is not founded on any authentic saying of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and is only one of the fable invented by story-tellers for the entertainment of the unlettered masses.

(*e*) Rev. Tisdall quotes another story from the 'Tales' on page 208-9. He says,—" It appears from Traditions of the Prophet that the peacock had a connection with the Azazil (Satan). The *Qisas* (or the Tales) says:—Azazil kept sitting at the gate of paradise, anxious to enter. The peacock also was there seated on a pinnacle, when he saw one repeating the mighty names of God. Who art thou? asked the peacock, 'I am one of the angels of the Almighty;'—'But why art thou sitting here? 'I am looking at paradise and wish to enter.' The peacock said, ' I have no command to let

any one enter as long as Adam is there.' 'If thou wilt let me in,' said the other, 'I will teach them a prayer which, if any one repeat, three things will be his—he will never grow old, never be rebellious, nor will any one ever turn him out of paradise.' Then Iblis (Satan) repeated the prayer. The peacock also from his pinnacle did the same and forthwith flew up to the serpent and told him what he had heard from Iblis. We also learn that when God cast down Adam and Eve with the devil from paradise, the peacock was also with them." The story is very interesting indeed, but we are sorry to add that it is not to be found in the Traditions of the Prophet, (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and Rev. Tisdall has only wasted his time in tracing this fairy tale to a Zoroastrian source. It is stories like these which the learned servant of the Church Mission quotes from the *Qisas*, and representing them as the very teaching which God revealed to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and tracing their origin to earlier books, he wishes his readers to believe that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God. Such are the materials of which he has raised a huge fabric on a foundation, which, as I have already shown, is not less false than the materials employed. More specimens of Rev. Tisdall's quotations from the *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* might be given, but those that have been given are more than sufficient to enable the reader to form an idea of the sort of arguments by which he has made it 'more clear than the sun' that the contents of the Holy Quran were borrowed from other sources.

I now give a few of his quotations from the *Arais*, or the Chess-board, and the reader will see that the quotations from the *Arais* are of a piece with those taken from the 'Tales':—

(*a*). On page 79—80 of the Yanabi we have the following quotation from the *Arais*:—" The Commentators say that when the angels saw the evil doings of mankind ascending up to heaven (and that was in the days of Idris), they were distressed and complained thus to God against them: thou hast chosen these to be the rulers upon earth, and lo, they sin against Thee. Then said the Almighty: 'If I should send you upon the earth, and treat you as I have treated them, you would do just as they do. . . . . Choose two (and according to Kalbi, three) angels from the best of you, and I will send them down to the earth' . . . . . Catada tells us that before a month had passed, they fell into temptation; for Zohra, one of the most beautiful of women (who Ali tells us was queen of a city in Persia). . . . . came holding a cup of wine. . . . . They drank the wine, and becoming intoxicated fell upon her, and committed adultery: and one saw it and they slew him. And it is said that they worshipped an idol, and the Lord changed Zohra into a star." Having given the above story, Rev. Tisdall proceeds to trace its source. "Now, if we search for this story in the Talmud of the Jews, we

find it in three places," (page 83). He may find it in the Talmud of the Jews in more than three places, but the question is: Does he find the lustful story related above in the Holy Quran or in any of the sayings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). Or should we think that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God, because *Arais-ul-Majalis* or 'The Chess-boards of the assemblies' borrows a love-story from the Jews. Such are the arguments by which the Christian author of what Muir calls a 'noble' and 'wonderful' book proves that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God, but that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) composed it with the aid of the Jews and the Christians of the day. Indeed, he has made it 'more clear than the sun' that the contents of the Holy Quran are traceable to Jewish and Christian sources, and indeed he has dealt a deathblow to Islam by tracing the entertaining stories of the Chess-board to the Jewish scriptures!

(*b*) Rev. Tisdall also corroborates his story of the mount Qaf by quoting the *Arais* (or the Chess-boards) as his authority. The words of the 'Chessboards, (Arais) as quoted by the learned missionary run as follows:—" The Lord almighty formed a great mountain from green chrysolite,—The greenness of the sky is from it,—called mount Qaf, and surrounded the entire earth therewith and it is that by which the Almighty swore and called it Qaf." The author of the 'Chess-boards' has beaten the writer of the 'Tales' in his description of the wonderful mountain called mountain Qaf which is said to surround the whole earth, for while the latter ascribed it to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), the former has advanced a step further and has found a reference to the strange mountain in the alphabetical letter (Q) which stands in the beginning of the 50th chapter of the Holy Quran. But the author of the 'Chess-boards does not tell us, if the letter Q refers to imaginary mountain Qaf, to what mountains the other alphabetical letters which stand at the head of many suras of the Holy Quran refer. According to Rev. Tisdall, such books as the 'Chess-boards' and the 'Tales' contain the true teachings of Islam, and the foolish tales which these books contain are the very Islam which the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) taught mankind. It would have been better for Rev. Tisdall if he had lived some centuries before our time, for then he could have easily imposed on credulous, but now, unfortunately for Rev. Tisdall, the world is too well-informed of the teachings of the Holy Quran and of the Holy Founder of Islam (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) to be deceived by the reverend missionary and take the foolish tales of books like the 'Chess-boards' for the very teachings of Islam as the pious servant of the Church Mission represents them to be. But it grieves

one to see that even Muir, who was too well-acquainted with Islamic literature not to see the glaring misrepresentations of Rev. Tisdall, has permitted himself to translate into English a book which represents the myths of the Chess-boards' as the teachings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.)

(*c.*) Let us hear another little story of the 'Chess-boards' (*Arais*) which the Rev. gentleman represents as a saying of the Holy Prophet and which he traces to a Zoroastrian source. "It is written on page 43 of the Chess- boards (*Arais*)," says the author of the Yanabi. on page 206, "Iblis waited at the gate of Paradise for 3,000 years in the hope of doing injury to Adam and Eve., for his heart was full of envy." I need not add that it is not a saying of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him.)

(*d.*) One more little anecdote from the 'Chess-boards' (*Arais*) which the reverend missionary traces to a Jewish source in the hope of demolishing the Muslim faith. 'When the Queen of Sheba uncovered her legs, Solomon looked at them and found that her legs and feet were very comely, but they were covered with hair. So he turned his eyes from her in disgust.' Rev. Tisdall says that this story is to be found in the *Ahadees* (the Traditions of the Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) (page 74). I am agam sorry to add that the story is not to be found in the Traditions.

I will not tire the reader with more quotations from the 'Chess-boards.' I now turn to the *Rauza* or the 'Garden of Friends' and the *At-tawarikh* or Ancient History of Man, and give a few of Rev. Tisdall's quotations from these books, so that the reader may see that what the learned missionary quotes from these books also is not to be found either in the Holy Quran or in the Traditions of the Holy Prophet, I shall first take the *Rauza* or the Garden of Friends:—

(*a.*) Rev. Tisdall says on page 136 that the story of the birth of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) as given by the author of the 'Garden of Friends' is drawn from the Christian stories relating to the birth of Christ which he has quoted at length in the original language. Assuming that what he says is true, one is tempted to ask, what in the world has this to do with the teachings of Islam, and how can he hope to raze Islam to the ground by tracing the stories of the 'Garden' relating to the birth of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) to Christian or other sources?

(*b.*) Again, "Is is written in the 'Garden of Friends' (the *Rauza*," says the Rev. Missionary on page 220, "that when God created Adam, God placed the light of Mohammad in the forehead of Adam and said, 'This is the light of him who is the best of your progeny and the greatest of the Prophets that will be raised for the guidance of mankind. This may have been written in the

'Garden of Friends,' but the question is whether this is also written in the Holy Quran or any of the recognised collections of the sayings of the Holy Prophet.

I now turn to the book called the 'Ancient History of Man' the contents of which our learned missionary represents as identical with the teachings of Islam, which, therefore, being traced to other sources will cause Islam to fall to the ground. The following quotation from this book also will show that Rev. Tisdall has been guilty of misrepresentation. "Azar, Abraham's father, used to construct idols and hand them over to his son to sell. So Abraham would go about crying. "Who will buy that which will hurt and not benefit him." Now this beautiful little story is not to be found in the Holy Quran, but Rev. Tisdall represents it as a story of the Quran and presumes to think that by tracing it to a Jewish source, he is dealing a death-blow to the religion of Islam.

That the stories contained in these books are drawn neither from the Holy Quran nor from the sayings of the Holy Prophet but from Jewish, Christian and other sources is a well-known fact. But Rev. Tisdall represents the contents of these story-books to be identical with the teachings of Islam.

The worth of Rev. Tisdall's book depends on the worth of these books whose contents he has taken so great pains to trace to earlier sources. If these books are trustworthy books and really represent the true spirit of Islam and may be taken as giving the very teaching which the Holy Quran and the Holy Prophet gave to the world then indeed, Rev. Tisdall's book is a noble book, and he may be said to have been successful in the task he had undertaken. But if such is not the case, if the books he has so frequently and copiously quoted do not represent the teachings of the Holy Prophet then it is the book of Rev. Tisdall, and not the Holy Quran that falls to the ground. In short the Yanabi stands or falls by these books. But that the books from which the author of the *Yanabi* has drawn a large part of his material do not represent the teachings of Islam is apparent from the very quotations that have been cited from them. They are not only not based on the Holy Quran and the sayings of the Holy Prophet, but they contain foolish myths which cannot for a moment be ascribed to the Holy Prophet. Therefore the only conclusion to which one can arrive is that Rev. Tisdall has been only wasting his time and that the *Yanabi* is an unfortunate book, which has the ill-luck of being stuffed with matter that is all rubbish.

Rev. Tisdall's Truthfulness.—It is not only his taking recourse to books like the 'Chess-boards,' the 'Tales' and the 'Garden' that brings the greatest discredit on the author. He has been guilty of

a far more serious misrepresentation. His desire to impose upon ignorant people has led him to take recourse to a shameful stratagem which cannot be too strongly condemned. The word *Ahadees* (pl. of hadees) is a well-known word in Islamic literature; it is also one of the most sacred words among the Muslims. *Ahadees*, as I believe, is well-known to every reader, are the traditional sayings of the Holy Prophet These are to be found in the well-known collections of traditions of which Rev. Tisdall himself refers in the beginning of his book. "The faith of Islam," says he "stands on four things:—(1) The Holy Quran, (2) Traditions, (3) Concensus of opinion among the learned, (4) Inference. We may ignore the latter two, for they can not contradict the Quran and Traditions. Hence the foundation of Islam really lies on the Quran and the Traditions. Then he gives the six collections of traditions in vogue among the Sunnies and the five others that are in vogue among the Shiahs. The former are (1) Muatta, (2) Bukhari, (3) Muslim, (4) Abu Daood, (5) Tirmizi, and (6) Ibn Majjah, while the latter include three compilations by Abu Jaafar, and two by Sheikh Ali and Syed Razi respectively. Now this statement by Rev. Tisdall shows the importance of traditions in the Islamic law. This statement also shows the reason why the reverend gentleman traces the teachings not only of the Holy Quran but also of the traditions to earlier sources. The Holy Quran gives the word of God, while traditions give the words of the Holy Prophet and since the Muslims not only follow the Word of God, but also the sayings of their Prophet, or what are known as Traditions, therefore Rev. Tisdall, in order to demolish Islam completely traces both of them to Jewish and other sources. In dealing with the former, he also takes the commentaries, and by tracing the stories given by the commentators to earlier sources, he desires his readers to conclude that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God, as if the stories of the commentators also formed part and parcel of the Holy Quran and were revealed to the Holy Prophet just as the Holy Quran was revealed to him. But in dealing with the traditions, he has committed himself to a misrepresentation of a startling nature. Throughout the book, he represents as *Ahadees* or sayings of the Holy Prophet things which are certainty not his sayings and which he as well as his translator Muir knew are not his sayings. Read the book from beginning to end and you will find that wherever he uses the word *Ahadees*, he applies it to books which are anything but tradition in the sense in which he himself explains the term in the Preface. Thus on page 52, he says:—"Now that we have read this story *according to the Quran and the Traditions of the Moslems*, let us now turn to the books of the Jews and compare this story with Jewish tradition." But when we turn back to see what are the books which he has been quoting, we find that they are the same

entertaining story-books to which I have already introduced the reader, *viz* , the 'Chess-boards of the Assemblies,' the 'Tales of the Prophet' and the 'Ancient History of Man.' These are the books which our reverend author is pleased to call the *Ahadees*—a word which, as I have already pointed out, is understood to signify the sayings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him)—and to which he assigns the highest place of honour next only to the Holy Quran. Of the worth of these books the reader must have judged by the quotations already given. They are no better than the Arabian Nights Entertainments, but Rev. Tisdall represents them as the books on which depends the very life of Islam. I have already shown that the stories and fables contained in the books which Rev. Tisdall traces to the Jewish and other scriptures are not to be found either in the Holy Quran or in the sayings of the Holy Prophet. Not a single sect of Islam recognises them as collections of the sayings of the Holy Prophet. Consult any list of books, and you will not find them among the books of Muslim tradition. The name of a book is always designed to serve as an index to its contents So, if any body wants to form an idea of the contents of these books, he need only look at their names and see what they signify. *Qisas-ul-Ambiya* means the *Tales of the Prophets;* the *Arais-ul-Majalis*, the *Chess-boards of the Assemblies;* the *Attawarikh-ul-Qadeema*, the Ancient History of Man; and the *Rauza-tul-Ahbab*, the Garden of Friends These are, as their names signify, books designed merely for the entertainment of the readers and contain all sorts of foolish things which Rev Tisdall represents as the *Ahadees* or the sayings of the Holy Prophet. Though here and there in these books one may come across a story which is ascribed to the Holy Prophet, but these stories are so ludicrous that even a just-minded Christian will not attribute them to the Holy Prophet. The story of the Mount Qaf, already quoted, is an example. It is the highest injustice to treat these stories as the sayings of the Holy Prophet and then criticise Islam on the basis of these stories. These are mere myths and are treated as such not only by the Muslims but even by the Christians. Missionaries of the type of Rev. Tisdall alone being excepted. But such stories as are ascribed to the Holy Prophet are very rare. The books are almost wholly devoted to stories which are ascribed to others than the Holy Prophet and Rev. Tisdall freely applies the word *Ahadees* even to these—a falsehood more astounding than which was never uttered even by a Christian missionary. I have already given many quotations from these books which are not attributed to the Holy Prophet, but the truthful servant of the Church of Christ calls them *Ahadees* or sayings of the Holy Prophet. A Christian may come to the assistance of Rev. Tisdall and say that when the reverend gentleman applies the word *Ahadees* to stories

which are not attributed to the Holy Prophet by the authors of the books, he does not use the word in the sense in which it is generally taken, but that there he uses it in the sense of traditional stories that are to be found in books written by Muslim writers, without any regard to the source from which they have been drawn. The explanation, however, is hardly satisfactory. For there is nothing in the book which may lead the reader to conclude that the author uses the word *Ahadees* in a peculiar sense. On the other hand, he plainly tells us that by *Ahadees* he means the traditions which form a basis of Islam which plainly shows that he takes *Ahadees* in the ordinary sense of the word, *viz*, the sayings of the Holy Prophet. Again, he uses the word *Ahadees* along with the Holy Quran, which again shows that by the word he means only the sayings of the Holy Prophet. In short, there is no doubt as to the fact that he uses the word in the ordinary sense of the word, *viz*, the sayings of the Holy Prophet. As he does not tell us that he is using the word in some extraordinary sense, though he applies it to books which can not be called *Ahadees* in the universally accepted sense of the word, the conclusion is inevitable that he wants his readers to take the word in its ordinary sense and thus purposely imposes on them.

To illustrate further how he represents as *Ahadees* stores which are not the sayings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). I give a few more quotations from his "memorable treatise."

(*a.*) On page 90—91, he says:—"Let it be known that the story of the ascent of the lady called Zohra to heaven is to be found in the old Babylonian story just as it is found in the *Ahadees* of the Muslims and the Jewish Commentary already referred to." The Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) never told the story of Zohra. It is indeed found in the book called 'the Chess-boards of Assemblies,' but Rev. Tisdall piously enough calls it a saying of the Holy Prophet. According to him every thing that is told us by Muslim story-tellers is a veritable *Hadees* or a saying of the Holy Prophet, no matter from whatever source the writers may have drawn the story.

(*b.*) Again on page 44, he quotes his favourite book, the 'Chess-boards' which says—"*They say* that his (Abraham's) father was an idol-maker," etc. Now the words of the author of the 'Chess-boards' clearly show that his story is not based on any saying of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), for he introduces the story with the words or *they say* but Rev. Tisdall represents this story also as a saying of the Holy Prophet and tracing it to the conclusion that the Muslim belief in the divine origin of the Holy Quran is a false belief for the simple

reason that the story given in the 'Chess-boards' is Jewish story.

(*c.*) On page 107, the learned author of the *Yanabi*, says:—"If one ask what the Muslims learn about the *Lauh-i-Mahfuz* from the *Ahadees* the answer to this question may be found on pages 3 and 4 of the *Tales* (*the Qasis-ul-Anbiya*) which says, (Then he proceeds to rehearse the story already quoted, which states that at first God created a pearl out of which He made the Preserved Table, which is 700 years' journey in height, and 500 years' journey in width, and whose edges are decorated with rubies). The author of the *Tales* does not ascribe this wonderful account of the Preserved Table to the Holy Prophet (though even if he had done so, it would have made little difference), yet Rev. Tisdall represents this as what the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) himself taught and thinks that as these stories are traceable to other sources, therefore the whole fabric of Islam falls to the ground. The world has found in Rev. Tisdall the most consummate critic as well as the most truthful missionary.

(*d.*) Referring to *Sura* xxvii, 44, the reverend gentleman says:—"What the Holy Quran says about the legs of the Queen is incomplete, therefore, we must turn to the *Ahadees* for a complete description of her legs," (page 74). But the *Ahadees* to which he turns to find the fuller description of the legs of the queen are not the sayings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) as he wishes his readers to infer, but he only quotes the Chess-boards, which tells us that the legs of the queen were covered with hair. The verses of the Holy Quran, the reverend gentleman declares, are incomplete unless this description of the queen's legs is introduced to complete them. The verses in question run thus—It was said to her, 'Enter the Palace,' and when she saw it, she thought it a lake of water, and bared her legs. He said, "Lo! it is a place smoothly paved with glass." This is incomplete according to Rev. Tisdall and after the words, 'bared her legs,' we should read as follows—"Then Solomon looked at her legs and feet: they were very beautiful, but were covered with large hair. When Solomon saw this he turned his eyes from her in disgust and said, "Lo, it is a palace smoothly paved with glass." Rev. Tisdall represents the Holy Quran as incomplete and represents the description of the queen's legs as given by the author of the 'Chess-boards' as supplementary to the Holy Quran only to impress upon his reader the false notion that contents of these story-books form part and parcel of the Holy Quran, and that Islam falls to the ground even if one traces the contents of these books to Jewish and other sources.

Instances might be multiplied in which the reverend servant of the Christian Church speaks of the myths contained in the Chess-boards and the Tales, etc., as *Ahadees* and represents those books as

the bul-works of Islam on which is founded the whole fabric of the Muslim faith. The reader is particularly referred to the following pages of the *Yanabi* where he will find the reverend gentleman calling the entertaining tales of these story books *Ahadees* or sayings of the Holy Prophet—41, 52, 74, 78, 91, 101, 107, 111, 156 206, 208, 221. Never a greater untruth was told and never a more disgraceful attempt was made to impose on ignorant masses.

'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you, is what the Christians call the Golden Rule. I wish he had observed this rule in dealing with Islam. In tracing the teachings of Islam, he identifies the stories of the commentators with the Holy Quran and the myths of the Muslim story-tellers with the *Ahadees* or the sayings of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). But when he comes to the Bible and the religion of Christ, he repeatedly cautions the reader against taking the comments of the Jewish writers and the books written by Christian authors as true. All that is not to be found in the Pentateuch and the books of the Prophets, and all that is not to be found in the four canonical Gospels is a fable in the eyes of the learned missionary. On page 28, he styles the Jewish commentaries of the Old Testament as 'imaginary.' On page 35, he speaks of the stories current among the Jews as 'false tales.' Again, on page 136, he refers to 'false myths of the Jews.' On page 56, he speaks of the well-know Jewish commentator Jonathan ben Uzziel as 'an ignorant commentator.' The same sweet epithet he applies to the author of Targum of the Book of Esther on page 77. On page 92, he describes all the Jewish writers as 'fond of fables' and 'credulous.' On page 93, they are described as 'seekers of wonders.' On page 96, he speaks of the 'false ideas of the Jews.' He also cites concrete instances in which the Jewish commentators blundered in interpreting the Bible and points out how false interpretations gave birth to false stories. The following verses of the Bible are said to have been misinterpreted by the Jewish commentators:—Gen. i, 2; vi, 2 4; xi, 23: xv, 7, iv, 10; Ex. xxiv, 12; xxxii, 19; and Ecclessiastes, ii, 8. He also tells us that the Jewish exponents of the Word of God introduced many stories to supplement or illustrate the verses of the Bible and warns us against taking these supplementary stories as part of the Bible. But he thinks differently of the Muslim commentators and Muslim writers. Every story which the Muslim commentators have given is held to be a part of the Holy Quran and every tale with which the Muslim story-tellers have entertained their readers is represented to be a saying of the Holy Prophet and by tracing these to the Jewish and other sources the reverend missionary declares that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God. If the Jewish writers told stories which were not of the Bible, the Muslim writers could also tell tales which did

not form part of the Holy Quran, and if Rev. Tisdall had been an honest writer, he would not have treated tho tales by Muslim writers as a part of divine revelation and would not have wasted his own time as well as that of his readers by tracing them to Jewish and other sources hoping that by doing so he will cause Islam to fall to the ground. In his book he also refers to many Christian works among which there are some which he unhesitatingly declares to be spurious. But when he comes to Islam, he declares any book which is written by any Muslim writer not only as representing the true faith of Islam but as giving either the Word of God or the saying of the Holy Prophet. All commentaries, according to him, give the Word of God and such story-books as the *Chess-boards* and the *Tales* are the authentic records of the sayings of the Holy Prophet. It is very painful to find that Christian Missionaries lose all sense of justice when they are engaged in criticising Islam. If this missionary had the slightest regard for truth, he would have never represented the foolish tales of the *Chess-boards*, etc., as sayings of the Holy Prophet. The Christian missionaries seem to have inherited from their Christian fathers the habit of telling pious lies, of which he himself gives numerous examples. He knew that he would be called upon to explain why he misrepresents the stories of the commentators as the Word of God and the tales of the *Chess-boards*, &c., as the sayings of the Holy Prophet and therefore he offers an explanation for the course he has taken.

The commentators, he says, supplement the Holy Quran, hence his resort to them in tracing the contents of the Holy Book. But if the Muslim commontaries supplement the Holy Quran, the Jewish commentaries supplement the Bible. If he does not think it right to identify, Jewish commentaries with the Bible, and desires his readers to differentiate between the two, he ought to have drawn a similar line of distinction between the Muslim commentaries and the Holy Quran.

As to why he does not refer to the recognised collections of *Ahadees* or the sayings of the Holy Prophet his reason is that the collections of traditions recognised by the Sunnies are not recognised by the Shiahs, while those recognised by the Shiahs are rejected by the Sunnies, and therefore he will refer to neither. This is an excellent apology for not refering to any recognised work of tradition. Such an excuse, far from revealing the sincerity of Reverend Tisdall's intentions, only reflects on his honesty. If all traditions become untrustworthy, merely because the collections of traditions recognised by the Sunnis are rejected by the sect known as the Shiahs, no one should attempt to write a history of Islam or its Founder, for it is the traditions that supply the main material for such a history. Did Muir, who wrote 'The life of Mohammad' and

The Caliphate, chiefly on the basis of traditions, undertake a foolish task ? An enquirer after truth will not abandon all traditions merely because one sect through sectarian animosity rejects the writings of the other sect. William Muir, in his Introduction to the 'Life of the Mohammad' pays a tribute to the honesty of the compilers recognised collections of traditions. He says on page xxxix:— "There is no reason to doubt that the collectors were sincere and honest in doing that which they professed to do. It may well be admitted that they sought out in good faith all traditions actually current, inquired carefully into the authorities on which they rested, and recorded them with scrupulous accuracy." Now it is the highest injustice not only to Islam but also to the collectors to reject the traditions because one sect rejects the collections recognised by the other sect merely from sectarian considerations. As to the comparative value of the collections recognised respectively by the Sunnis and the Shiahs, I need only quote here the verdict of Muir, who says: "The six standard *Sunni* collections were compiled exclusively under the Abbaside Caliphs, and the earliest of them partly during the reign of Mamun. The four canonical collections of the *Shia* were prepared somewhat later and *are incomparably less trustworthy that the former because their paramount object is to build up the divine Imamat or headship of Ali and his descendants.*' (page xxxvi) such is Muir's estimate of the *Shia* collections of traditions and it was utterly uncritical and even unjust on the part of Rev. Tisdall to reject the standard collections of the *Sunnis* because they were not recognised by the *Shiahs* merely for sectarian reasons. But whatever we may think of Rev. Tisdall's rejection of the *Sunni* standard collections of traditions, one wonders why he substituted such story-books as the 'Chess-boards' and the 'Tales for the standard collections Are the stories contained in the 'Chess-boards' more authentic than the sayings of the Holy Prophet embodied in books like the *Sahih Bukhari* and the *Sahih Muslim.* If he rejected such standard books merely because the *Shiahs* did not accept them, was he justified in taking recourse to the foolish tales of the 'Chess-boards.' On the one hand he pretends to be so scrupulous as even to reject books like the *Sahih Bukhari* because the *Shiahs* did not accept them, and on the other, he stoops to such fabulous writings as the 'Chess-boards' to draw his material from. And he adds to his guilt by represinting every foolish story contrived in these books as a saying of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). Nay more, he even represents these books as more authoritative than any other book of tradition, for he speaks of them as books whose authority is admitted both by the *Shiahs* and the *Sunnis* and thus gives them a place higher than even the standard collections. These foolish books, according to him, are not only collections of the sayings of the

Holy Prophet, but they are books whose authority is not questioned by any sect of Islam. Is it possible to imagine a greater untruth than this? No sect of Islam regards them even as collections of the sayings of the Holy Prophet to say nothing of their being the most authentic collections of traditions. If all sects had been agreed on the authenticity of these books as repositories of the sayings of the Holy Prophet, they ought to have taken them as their standard books. The most authentic books according to each sect, are these which they have unanimously chosen as their standard books. As to the Chess-boards and the Tales, no sect has ever treated them as *Ahadees*, to say nothing of choosing of them as standard works of *Ahadees*. But Rev. Tisdall represents them as books of *Ahadees* whose authority has never been impeached by any sect of Islam and thus assigns them a place next only to the Holy Quran. If these books were really as trustworthy, as Rev. Tisdall represents them to be, one wonders why William Muir did not base his Life of Mohammad on them. If he had done so we would have had in his work a lot of stories about the Peacock, the Preserved Table and Mount *Qaf*. In the following passage, the reverend missionary expresses his resolution to quote only those *Ahadees* or traditions that are universally admitted as authentic by all sects of Islam—This statement follows that passage in which he expresses his regret that the collections of traditions regarded as standard books by one sect are rejected by another. "As our purpose is to be brief," says he on page 9, " we have made a firm resolution to mention only those beliefs and teachings of Islam which are traceable to the Holy Quran itself and which are explained by such *Ahadees* as have full currency among all the Muslims, whether *Shiahs* and *Sunnis*, for our object is to make this book useful both for the *Sunnis* and the *Shiahs*." This is an excellent plan, but I regret to say that this was not meant to be followed. He makes this statement only to put a good face on his own delinquencies. He promises to strictly adhere to two things. Firstly, he makes a solemn promise never to refer to any belief or teaching which is not traceable to the Holy Quran itself. Secondly, he declares his firm resolution to give only those *Ahadees* which have full currency both among the *Sunnis* and the *Shiahs* so that his arguments may appeal to all Muslims alike. These were good principles, only if he had truthfully adhered to them. How far he has adhered to these two principles is apparent from the quotations already given from his book. The numerous stories he gives in his book he represents as the teachings of Islam. I have given a good number of these stories and every one who has the slightest acquaintance with the Holy Quran will at once see that they are not traceable to it. But Rev. Tisdall has his own way of tracing stories to the Holy Quran. Two or three instances will

suffice to illustrate his method. On page iii, he gives two stories about mount *Qaf*. The first speaks of it as surrounding the Earth and the second gives its length and height as so many hundred years' journey and describes it as composed of green emeralds which have given their hue to sky. These stories have already been quoted. The source of these 'teachings of Islam' he finds in the letter *Qaf* with which begins the 50th *Sura* of the Holy Quran. Many other *Suras* also begin with Alphabetical letters and following Rev. Tisdall's explanation, we may take them all as names of mountains, rivers or lakes. If a Muslim story-teller entertain us with a beautiful account of a wonderful mountain and say that it is to that mountain that such and such letter of the Holy Quran contains a reference, this does not show that roally the said *Sura* begins with the name of a mountain. If Rev. Tisdall follows this method of tracing stories of the Holy Quran, he can similarly trace many foolish tales of the Jewish commentators to the Bible. Eminent authorities among the Muslims hold that the letters standing before many of the *Suras* of the Holy Quran stand for the names of God or contain a reference to the subjects discussed in those *Suras*, but no recognised authority ever held that they stand for the names of mountains, rivers, lakes, or islands. On page 75, he tells us on the authority of the 'Chess-boards' that the legs of the queen of Sheba were covered with long hair and finds a source of this story in the verse which says : 'And she bared her legs.' As the verse speaks of the legs of the queen, therefore, every tale which the Muslim story-tellers tell us about her legs is traceable to the Holy Quran. Many more instances may be given of the queer way in which Rev. Tisdall traces many strange teachings to the Holy Quran, but the two given here will suffice to enable the reader to form an idea of what Rev. Tisdall means by tracing a teaching to the Holy Quran.

Now as to his resolve to quote only such *Ahadees* as have full currency among all the Muslims, whether *Shia* or *Sunni*, so that his arguments may convine all sects. I have already pointed out that the *Ahadees* which he quotes in his work, far from being recognised by all sects of Islam, cannot even be called *Ahadees* in the sense in which he wishes the word to be understood. They are no better than the tales that are to be found in ordinary story-books, and it is a great untruth to represent them as the sayings of the Holy Prophet which every good Muslim obeys and follows just as he follows the Holy Quran. The Rev. Missionary does not quote *Sunni* works because they are rejected by the *Shiahs*. But the commentaries he quotes are *Suni* commentaries and he ought not to have quoted them if he was true to his principle. But he quoted them because they served his purpose. The reason why he

abandons the authentic works of traditions and takes recourse to foolish tales of Muslim writers is not far to seek. The authentic sayings of the Holy Prophet could not supply him with sufficient material to be traced to Jewish and Christian tradition, but there were certain story-books written by Muslim writers who largely drew upon Jewish and Christian tradition for their material. Hence the Rev. Gentleman preferred the latter and these stories having been chiefly drawn from Jewish and other traditions he gave them the name of *Ahadees* which the Muslims apply not to Jewish and other traditions, but to the traditional sayings of the Holy Prophet, thus giving his readers to understand that these story-books were the collections of the sayings of the Holy Prophet. The next step was to connect these stories with the contents of the Holy Quran. This he did not find very difficult to accomplish. The letter *Q* standing before the 50th chapter was sufficient proof of the fact that every thing which the story-tellers have told us about the imaginary mountain which they call *Qaf* is a commentary of the said letter. That Abraham used to sell idols in the streets is a Quranic story, because the Holy Quran speaks of his preachings against idolatry. Following such methods he is able to connect every story with some or other verse or letter of the Holy Quran. Then he traces these stories to the Christian sources and concludes that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God. This is the method which Rev. Tisdall has followed in his 'wonderful treatise' in which he claims to have made it as clear as the sun that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God. But in spite of all this he claims to have mentioned only those teachings which are traceable to the Holy Quran and quoted only such traditions as are admitted by all sects of Muslims to be the true words of the Holy Prophet. Can any Missionary show that a servant of Christ ever told greater untruths than those which Rev. Tisdall has told us in his 'noble book'? If he was sincerely desirous of writing a book, the arguments of which should appeal to all sects alike, he ought to have strictly followed the text of the Holy Quran, avoiding all reference to the stories given by the commentators or Muslim story-tellers. There was nothing to compel him to resort to books other than the Holy Quran. If he had truthfully followed the text of the Holy Quran he would not have felt the necessity of telling many an untruth and his arguments also would have appealed to all.

DID THE HOLY PROPHET BORROW HIS TEACHINGS FROM OTHER SOURCES?

"*And the unbelievers say, 'Verily this Quran is a mere fraud of his own devising, and others have helped him with it.' But they utter an injustice and falsehood. And they say, 'Tales of the ancients that he hath put in writing! and they are dictated to him morn and even.' Say, He hath sent it down who knoweth the secrets that are in the Heavens and of the Earth. He truly is the Gracious, the Merciful.*" (*xxv.* 57).

I pointed out in the last article on the subject that the mere tracing of an analogy between the teachings of the Holy Quran and the contents of other books does not show that the Holy Quran is not a revelation from God, and that if it is sought to prove that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God, the Christian critics should not be content with the mere tracing of its contents to other sources, but they ought to show that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) *actually* borrowed those teachings from those sources. But when we look into Rev. Tisdall's work in order to see how far he has succeeded in proving that the Holy Prophet *did* borrow his teachings from earthly sources, we find that the reverend gentleman has been a failure. His book, far from making it 'more clear than the sun' that the Holy Prophet *borrowed* his teachings from the Jews, the Christians, the Parsees, and others, only shows that he did *not* borrow but that his book was a revelation from on high.

Let us first glance at a list of the books and authors which he says formed the source of Islam.

I Jewish books :—

1. Rabbi Yahuda (98).
2. Targum of Jerusalem (37).
3. Pirke Rabbi Eleazer (39, 98).
4. Mishnah Sanherdin (39, 103).
5. Midrash Rabbah (41, 52).
6. Genesis (112).
7. II Targum of the Book of Esther (59).
8. The First Book of Kings (15).
9. Chronicles (75).
10. Midrash Yalkut (83, 95).
11. Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel (37, 57, 93).
12. The Book of Enoch (93, 193).
13. Abdah Sarāh (97).
14. Hagigah (100, 103, 112).
15. Zohar (100).
16. Jewish Midrash (102).
17. Otiot de Rabbi Akiba (103).

18. Rosh Ha Shanah (103).
19. Mishnah Berakhoth (104, 109).
20. Psalms (104).
21. Deuteronomy (109).
22. Rabbi Simeon (109).
23. Exodus (97, 110).
24. I Kings (109).
25. Pirke Aboth (110).
26. A Jewish work, not named (99).
27. Jewish Rashi (101).
28. Another Jewish work not named (118).
29. Numbers (117).

II Christian Books.—

30. Glory of Martyrs, a Latin work, by Gregory of Tours (115).
31. Matthew (105, 145, 174, 200).
32. Hebrews (109).
33. Protevangelium of James the Less, written in Hellenic Greek (124, 134, 136).
34. 'History of our Holy Father the Aged, the Carpenter' (126, 130, 155).
35. Coptic History of the Virgin (132).
36. Story of Joseph's Dream.' (133).
37. History of the Nativity of Mary and the Saviour's Infancy (137, 139)
38. The Gospel of Thomas the Israelite. (139).
39. Gospel of the Infancy. (142, 143).
40. Mark (145, 159, 200).
41. Luke (145, 173, 200).
42. John (145, 200).
43. Acts (145, 152).
44. Irenaeus (149).
45. Revelation (153).
46. Story of Mary's Sleep (155).
47. Marcion (157).
48. I Corinthians (159, 174).
49. The Testament of Abraham (160, 164, 167, 199).
50. Visio, Pauli (199, 200).

III Zoroastrian, Hindu and miscellaneous works—

51. Arta Viraf Namak (181).
52. Zerdashtnama (196).
53. Indra Loka Gamnam, a Sanskrit, work (197).
54. Avesta (102, 197, 202, 205, 206).
55. Bundahishnib (205).
56. 'Against Heresies' by Eznik, an Armenian writer (159, 209).

57. The Minukerad (211).
58. Yesht (101, 211).
59. Dasatir-i-Asmani (215, 218, 219.
60. Dinkarat (217).
61. Mahabharata (91).
62. The Book of the Dead, ancient Egypt (165).
63. An ancient Armenian historian, not named (87).
64. The tiles of ancient Babylonia (89).
68. Eusebius, an ancient Greek historian (56).
66. Ancient idolaters of Syria (102).
67. A Sanskrit work not named (97).
68. Another Sanskrit work, not named (197).
69. Vandedad (197).
70. Manu the Hindu legislator (203).
71. Nalaupakhiyanam, a Sanskrit book (203).

The above is a list of the sources from which, says Rev. Tisdall, the Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings. The numbers within brackets refer to the pages of the *Yanabi* where the books have been quoted. This catalogue, long as it is, is only fragmentary; for under each head Rev. Tisdall informs us that these are only a few of the many sources which contributed to the formation of Islam, and that if he gave all the sources, his book would grow out of all proportions. Thus, having given the so-called Zoroastrian sources of Islam, he winds up as follows, in the words of his translator—"Many other things might have been added common to the two systems, (*i.e.*, Islam and Zoroastrianism); but it would have swelled our pages beyond reasonable dimensions; and we must be content with what has been given." (*Yanabi*, page 217, and Muir's Translation, page 89). Similar remarks have been made with regard to the Jewish and Christian sources. These remarks show that if Rev. Tisdall had given *all* the Jewish sources, *all* the Christian sources, and *all* the Zoroastrian, Hindu and other sources of the teachings of Islam, the list of his sources would have been far larger than that already given. It is very regrettable that he has not given *all* the sources of the teachings of Islam, for if he had done so, it would have become 'more clear than the sun that the Holy Prophet did *not* borrow his teachings. But even the fragmentary list of the alleged sources of Islam is sufficient to show that it was not possible for the unlettered Prophet of Arabia to borrow directly or indirectly from so widely different and such numerous and withal obscure sources as those from which our Missionary here has so copiously quoted. To illustrate this, I will take some of his so-called sources and show that it is impossible for a Christian to prove that the Holy Prophet borrowed directly or indirectly from these sources :—

(*a*). The Holy Quran, says Rev. Tisdall, gives *Azar* as the name,

of Abraham's father, but he did not learn it either from the Jews or from the Christians, to whom the name was unknown. He borrowed it, says the reverend gentleman, from an ancient Greek historian called Eusebius. But how did the Holy Prophet come to have access to this Greek writer ? Rev. Tisdall answers this question by saying that the work of Eusebius was translated into Syriac and that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) learned this name during his visit to Syria. What a convincing and conclusive proof ! The learned missionary has indeed made it 'more clear than the sun' that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed this name from the Greek historian, Eusebius. The Holy Prophet visited Syria twice, firstly at the age of twelve in the company of his uncle, Abu Talib, and secondly, at the age of twenty-five in charge of Khadeeja's venture. Both times he did not go beyond Bostra and there is no evidence of his having made any inquiries about Abraham's parentage or even about Jewish or Christian religion. He paid his first visit when he was only a boy of twelve, and second time he stayed there only for a few days and came back having bartered Khadeeja's goods to advantage in the market of Bostra. And if we suppose that he did hold long conversations with the Christians and Jews of Syria and interrogated them as to the parentage of Abraham he ought to have given Terah and not Azar as the name of the great Patriarch's father, for both the Jews and the Christians called him Terah. In short, the assertion of Rev. Tisdall that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed the name Azar from a Greek historian Eusebius is utterly unfounded.

(*b*). Again Rev. Tisdall tells us that the names *Haroot* and *Maroot* are not to be found in Jewish, Christian or Zoroastrian books, and that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed them from ancient Armenians who had gods called *Horot* and *Morot*. Thus, he says on page 86—"But if we search whence the names in the Quran and Tradition came, it will be seen that *Harut* and *Ma'rut* were two idols worshipped far back in Armenia. For in writers of that country they are so spoken of, as in the following passage from one of them :—'Certainly, Horot and Morot, tutelary deities of Mount Ararat and Aminabegh, and perhaps others not now known, were assistants to the female goddess Aspandramit. These aided her and were excellent on the earth.'" We are indeed grateful to Rev. Tisdall for the pains he has taken in tracing the names *Harut Marut* to an ancient Armenian book which he has been kind enough to quote in its original tongue—namely, ancient Armenian, but we regret to say, he has refused us the pleasure of knowing how the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) came to know that the ancient

Armenians had two deities which they called *Horot* and *Morot*. He cannot prove that the Holy Prophet *actually* borrowed these names from ancient Armenian writers and his entertaining us with original quotations from nameless Armenian writers is of no avail, unless he also tells us how the Holy Prophet came to have access to the nameless writers of ancient Armenia.

(*c*). Among the sources of the Holy Quran, Rev. Tisdall also mentions the inscriptions on the primeval tiles in the ruins between the Tigris and the Euphrates. Here too he gives the inscriptions in original Babylonian characters. But they serve no other purpose save of embellishment for Rev. Tisdall's work, for it is inconceivable that the Holy Prophet should have borrowed from the inscriptions on the primeval tiles of Babylonian ruins.

(*d*), On page 102, Rev. Tisdall tells us that the Holy Prophet borrowed the name *Malik* (xliii, 77) from the ancient idolaters of Palestine. 'The Prophet, says Rev. Tisdall, 'borrowed the name of the Angel of Hell (Malik) from the ancient idolaters of Palestine who had an idol called Molech which was supposed to have control over fire.' But he does not tell us when and how the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed this name from ancient Palestinian idol-worshippers. The idol was not worshipped in Palestine in the days of the Holy Prophet nor is it certain that the ancient Palestinian idol-worshippers had a god called Molech. The only evidence on which it is supposed that Molech was an Ammonite deity lies in passages of the Bible which speak of the Israelites offering their children as a sacrifice to Molech, but the view now generally held by critical scholars is that it was not a heathen god but to Yhwh (Jehovah) that the sacrifice was offered. This is clear from the following quotation from the Jewish Encyclopædia, Vol. VIII, page 653—

"The name Molech, later corrupted into Moloch, is an intentional mispointing of Melech . . . . . From Jeremiah vii, 31 and Ezek. xx, 25, 26, it is evident that both prophets, regarded there human sacrifices as extraordinary offerings to YHWH. Jeremiah declares that Yhwh had not commanded them, while Ezek. says Yhwh polluted the Israelites in their offerings by permitting them to sacrifice their first-born, so that through chastisement they might know that Yhwh was Yhwh. The fact, therefore, now generally accepted by critical scholars, is, that in the last days of the kingdom, human sacrifices were offered to Yhwh as *King* or *Counsellor* of the nation, and that the prophets disapproved of it and denounced it because it was introduced from outside as an imitation of a heathen cult and because of its barbarity. In course of time, the pointing of Melech was changed to Molech to still further stigmatise the rites."

The learned authors of the Jewish Encyclopædia also give

the reason why the Israelites committed themselves to the practice of sacrificing their first-born to their Melech or king Yhwh. According to them a verse of the Bible itself is responsible for their resort to this practice. "The motive for these sacrifices," they continue, is not far to seek. It is given in Micah vi, 7: 'Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?' In the midst of the disasters which were befalling the nation, men felt that if the favour of Yhwh could be regained, it was worth any price they could pay. Their Semitic kindred worshipped their gods with offerings of their children, and in their desperation the Israelites did the same . . . In connection with these extraordinary offerings the worshippers continued the regular Temple sacrifices to Yhwh (Ezek. xxiii, 39)."

From the foregoing quotations it is apparent that it was not to any heathen deity but to Jehovah that the Israelites offered the fruits of their bodies as sacrifices, and it was the pleasure of Jehovah and not that of any heathen deity that they sought by those sacrifices. But even if we suppose that there was an idol called Molech, it had ceased to exist many centuries before the Holy Prophet and no trace of it nor that of its worshippers was to be found in his time. And even if the idol had been worshipped in the time of the Holy Prophet in Palestine, he could not have borrowed its name from its worshippers. Not only there was no occasion of his doing so, but it is highly unreasonable to suppose that he who was so great an enemy of idol-worship, stooped to the borrowing of the names of heathen deities and representing them as beings that were in charge of heaven and hell. That would have been a direct encouragement of idol-worship and the Holy Prophet could not commit himself to such a course. In short, no sensible man will accept as true the statement of Rev. Tisdall that the Holy Prophet borrowed the name of the angel spoken of in xliii, 77; from the ancient idolaters of Palestine.

(*e*). On page 197, Rev. Tisdall tells us that the Quranic description of the streams of paradise was borrowed from Sanskrit writings. "It is written in Hindu Scriptures," says he, "that in the heaven there are eternal streams which water fresh and green vegetation." But as to how the Holy Prophet borrowed the Quranic description of the streams of paradise from the Hindu scriptures, Rev. Tisdall does not say a word. He seems to think that the Holy Prophet borrowed the teachings of Hindu scriptures through the medium of Zoroastrian scriptures, but he does not quote any Zoroastrian work containing the description of the heavenly streams as given in Sanskrit books. But even if he had shown that what is said in the Sanskrit scriptures about the streams of paradise is also said in the Zoroastrian writings, it would have been no proof of the Holy Prophet having borrowed the description from the

Sanskrit or Zoroastrian sources, for he had no access either to the one or to the other.

(*f*). Similarly he tells us on page 203 that the Holy Prophet borrowed the idea of the *Gilman* (youths) of paradise from Sanskrit scriptures and quotes Sanskrit authorities in his support. Here too, he does not name any Zoroastrian book containing similar idea (though even if he had done so, it would have been of little avail) and I need not add that the Holy Prophet had no means of borrowing from Sanskrit works.

In connection with the Quranic descriptions of paradise, it must always be borne in mind that the descriptions are only symbolical. "God hath prepared for the righteous," said the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) "what, the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man" (*Mashkat*, page 417). The Holy Quran also says in plain words that its descriptions of paradise are only emblematical. Thus it says: "A symbol (*masal*) of paradise which God hath promised to them that fear Him—the rivers flow beneath its *bowers*; its food and shades are perpetual," etc., (xiii, 35). God introduces the description of paradise with the word *masal* which means *symbol* or *likeness* which shows that the descriptions of paradise as given in the Holy Quran are not to be taken literally but only as symbolical. The words of human speech only pertain to things which we see, hear, touch or perceive in this world, but what has been prepared for the righteous in the next world is, to quote the words of the Holy Prophet, what the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man, therefore the words of human speech cannot exactly express things heavenly, and what the Holy Quran says about the blessings of heaven is only a *likeness*,' to quote the expression of the Holy Quran, 'of the paradise which God hath promised to them that fear Him.' Thus the milk and honey of Paradise are not the milk and honey of this world, but of all things of this world, milk and honey bear the greatest likeness to the heavenly boons which have been designated as 'milk' and 'honey,' hence the selection of the words to express the said boons. Strictly speaking, however, what has been designated as heavenly milk and heavenly honey is quite different from and incalculably superior to the milk and honey of this world. The honey of this world every one of us has tasted, but the honey of paradise is to quote again the words of the Holy Prophet, 'what the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard nor hath entered into the heart of men. The same is true of other blessings of paradise. Another verse of the Holy Quran which shows that the Quranic description of paradise is not an *exact* description, but only a *likeness* of paradise may be quoted here. It runs thus—"*A likeness of the paradise which is promised to the God-fearing*—therein are rivers of water which corrupteth not; and

rivers of milk whose taste changeth not : and rivers of wine delicious to those who quaff it ; and rivers of honey clarified : and therein are all kinds of fruit for them, and forgiveness from their Lord," (xlvii, 16). All these boons are only so many *likenesses* of the real boons that are in store for the righteous. The words of human speech could not exactly describe the boons of paradise, and they have been designated by the names of things which bore some *likeness* to them, though that likeness is really insignificant. The Quranic description of paradise is the most clear picture of paradise that one can draw with the aid of human vocabulary, and the words of human speech do not permit of a clearer representation of heaven, but the reader is warned against interpreting the words of the Holy Quran too literally and mistaking the heavenly bounties for physical boons.

To revert to Rev. Tisdall's so-called sources of Islam, the six instances already cited will suffice to enable the reader to form an idea of how he traces the teachings of Islam to earlier sources. He takes great pains to find in other books names and teachings contained in the Holy Quran, but does not concern himself much with the way in which those names and teachings found their way into the Holy Book. He seems to be labouring under the false notion that all he has to do is to show that many of the names and teachings of the Holy Quran are also found in other books and that it forms no part of his duty to show how and when the Holy Prophet borrowed them from those books. His only care is to search out as many words and ordinances of the Holy Quran as he can elsewhere, and when he has hit upon a book or an inscription containing something analogous to any part of the Holy Quran, he triumphantly declares that he has discovered a source of the Holy Quran. It matters little whether his alleged source is the book of a Greek author, or an Armenian writer, or whether it is an inscription on the primeval tiles in the Babylonian ruins or the decayed leaves of an old Sanskrit work. The thought how it was possible for the Holy Prophet to have borrowed from these sources does not seem to have troubled him in the least. It will tire the reader if I discuss each of Rev. Tisdall's hundred and one sources of Islam separately and show that there is no proof of the Holy Prophet having borrowed from those sources, therefore instead of taking these sources one by one, I will discuss them generally, dividing them into three groups. The first group will comprise the Jewish sources, the second, the Christian sources, and the third, the Zoroastrian and Hindu sources.

The Jewish sources.—Rev. Tisdall states that it was through the Jews of Arabia that the Holy Prophet had a knowledge of the Jewish works named above, and of the other Jewish writings which he has omitted to mention. To prove this he makes the following

observations :—

(*a*). "That the Jews of Arabia knew little or nothing of Hebrew, yet they were familiar with the stories of the Talmud and other foolish tales. These stories they had heard from their ancestors and as they could not understand the Torah and other inspired books, therefore, they often recited these baseless stories in place of the inspired teachings of the heavenly books." (page 32).

(*b*). "As the Prophet was resolved to lead his people to the faith of Abraham, it was very probable that he should have turned to the Jews and inquired of them as to the beliefs, ordinances and religious observances on which the Abrahamic faith was founded . . . . . This idea receives support from the fact that the Quran bears repeated testimony to the faith of Abraham as well as to the truth of the Jewish religion and the heavenly origin of their scriptures." (page 33).

(*c*). "The Prophet was called *Ummi* not because he was unlettered, but because he belonged to *Ummatha* (*i.e.*, non-Jewish people). But even if we suppose he was not learned, was it not possible for him to inquire from others about the beliefs, teachings, and notions of the Jews ? Certainly it was. Particularly because there were some among his companions (such as Abdullah bin Salam Habib bin Malik, and Waraqa) who were either themselves Jews or had been followers of Judaism for some time before they embraced Islam. These men, though they had but an imperfect knowledge of Old Testament scriptures, yet well knew the foolish tales current among the Jewish nation.' (pages 34—35).

(*d*). The Prophet had implicit faith in whatever the Jews told him and he recorded in the Quran whatever he heard from them. "It is pity," says Rev. Tisdall, "that they deceived him." (page 98).

Such is the *proof* which the author of the *Yanabi* has furnished of his assertion that the Holy Prophet borrowed many of the contents of the Holy Quran from the Jews. These statements of his only show that he cannot *prove* that the Holy Prophet actually borrowed from the Jews. I have carefully perused his book and have in vain searched for any evidence which he may have given in support of his assertion. All his so-called proofs are no more than baseless conjectures which cannot stand examination. It is said that as the Holy Prophet wanted to lead his people to the faith of Abraham, therefore he diligently and assiduously inquired from the Jews the beliefs and obligations on which the Abrahamic creed was founded. In support of this assertion reference is made to the verses of the Holy Quran which bear testimony to the faith of Abraham and to the truth of the Jewish religion and the heavenly origin of their scriptures. But these verses hardly lead to the conclusion which Rev. Tisdall draws from them. On the other hand, they plainly show that in order to attain salvation,

one need neither be a Christian not a follower of Judaism. A careful reader of the Holy Quran will find that the faith of Abraham has been referred to in it for two purposes. On some occasions an appeal has been made to the Abrahamic faith with a view to convince the idolaters of Arabia of their error in worshipping idols, and in setting up gods beside the one God. It has been repeatedly pointed out to the Meccan idolaters who were proud of their descent from Abraham through Ishmael, and whose faith they professed to follow, that they had gone astray from the pure monotheistic creed of their great ancestor, Abraham. On other occasions, an appeal has been made to Abraham in order to show the error of the Christian and the Jewish belief that one who was not a follower of their creeds could not be saved. Thus the Holy Quran says: They say, 'Become Jews or Christians, that ye may have the *true* guidance.' Say, nay! the religion of Abraham, the sound in faith and not one of those who join gods with God *is our religion.*" (ii, 129). This verse clearly shows that it was as an argument against the Christians and Jews that reference was made to the creed of Abraham. Both the Jews and the Christians believed him to be a righteous man who followed the true path. But he lived long before the law of Moses or the so-called new Dispensation of Jesus came into existence, and therefore, he was neither a follower of Moses nor a Christian and yet he was saved. Here is another verse to the same effect—"Will ye say, Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes were Jews or Christians? Say: Who knoweth best, ye or God, And who is more in fault than he who concealeth the witness which he hath from God?" (ii, 134). The following verses are even more plain :—

"Oh people of the Book! Why dispute about Abraham, when the Torah and the Evangel were not sent down till after him? Do ye not then understand? . . . Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian; but he was sound in the faith, a Muslim, and not of those who add gods to God . . . . . A party of the people of the Book would fain mislead you: but they only mislead themselves, and perceive it not . . . . . Oh People of the Book, why clothe ye the truth with falsehood? Why wilfully hide the truth?" (iii, 58—64).

The foregoing verses sufficiently indicate the purpose for which reference was made to the faith of Abraham. It was repeatedly pointed out that in order to learn what the faith of Abraham was, one did not need turn to the Law of Moses or the Gospels, for these books were not revealed till long after him, Nay, they had no existence even in the time of Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and others. Is it not, then, highly unreasonable on the part of Rev. Tisdall to say that in order to learn the faith of Abraham, the Holy Prophet turned to the Jews and inquired from them the obligations and the observances

on which the religion of Abraham was founded He refers to the testimony which the Holy Quran bears to the faith of Abraham as an evidence of the truth of his assertion, but the testimony which the Holy Quran bears to the Abrahamic faith only shows that the Holy Prophet did not turn to them and the verses of the Holy Quran already quoted belie his assumption. Add to the foregoing passages the following verses which further show that the Holy Prophet never trusted the Jews and never turned to them for guidance in religious matters :—

(*a*). "Neither did they (*i.e.*, the children of Israel, spoken of in the previous verse) differ, through mutual envy, till after they had become possessed of the knowledge; verily thy Lord will judge between them on the day of Resurrection, as to the subject of their disagreements. Afterwards We put thee in the right way concerning the faith : *follow it then, and follow not the wishes of those who are devoid of knowledge, (i.e., the Jews).*" (xlv, 16, 17, Mecca).

(*b*). "Hast thou not remarked those to whom a part of the scriptures hath been given ? Vendors are they of error, and are desirous that ye go astray from the Way, But God knoweth your enemies ; and God is a sufficient patron, and God is a sufficient helper. Among the Jews are those who displace the words of their scriptures." (iv, 48, 49).

(*c*). "Oh People of the Book ! overstep not bounds in your religion ; and of God speak only the truth." (iv, 109).

(*d*). "They shift the words of scripture from their places and have forgotten a part of what they were taught. Thou wilt not cease to discover the treacherous ones among them except a few of them." (v, 16).

(*e*). "Oh People of the Scriptures ! now is Our apostle come to you to clear up to you much that ye concealed of those Scriptures." (v, 18).

Many more verses might be quoted to the same effect. These verses clearly show that the Holy Prophet looked upon the Jews as treacherous people who desired to lead him astray and he could never turn to them for religious instruction.

Moreover, no mystery hangs over the life and doings of the Holy Prophet. Even the minutest details of his life have been handed down to us and are well known to every student of Islam. But there is not even a shadow of evidence to show that he ever turned to the Jews and sought instruction from them; and the assertion of Rev Tisdall that he inquired from the Jews the obligations and religious duties which constituted the Abrahamic creed is utterly unfounded. And the wonder is that Rev. Tisdall still claims to have made it clearer than the sun that the Holy Prophet borrowed the major part of his teachings from the Jews.

Rev. Tisdall's derivation of the word *Ummi* is also very amusing

According to him the words *Ummi* does not mean *illiterate but one who is not a Jew.* That is a queer interpretaion of the word and Rev. Tisdall deserves the sole credit for it, for it is an interpretation of which he alone is the author. He derives it from a word *Ummatha*, which, he says, means all people that are not Jews. In the first place, *Ummatha* is not an Arabic form ; the Arabic form is *Umam* (sing. *Ummat*). *Ummatha* is a Persian and not an Arabic plural, and in giving the derivation of an Arabic word, he ought to have given the Arabic form if he knew it. But perhaps he had not knowledge enough to distinguish between an Arabic word and its Persianised form. But the queerest thing about his philological research is the meaning which he attaches to the word *Ummatha.* According to him, it means all people that are not Jews. Now this is a revelation ! Never before Rev. Tisdall wrote this did any person know that *Ummatha* meant people that were not Jews. Where Rev. Tisdall learnt this meaning is a mystery. He makes many startling revelations in his book and this is one of them. No Arabic Dictionary gives this meaning and no Arabic writer ever used this word in the sense which he gives it. The word *Ummat* occurs many times in the Holy Quran and is used in the sense of *people* and not *people that are not Jews.* Take for instance the verse " Nor hath there been a people unvisited by its warner." (xxxv, 92). If we take the word *Ummat* in the sense which Rev. Tisdall gives to it the verse will signify that the warners had appeared among all people other than the Jews and that the only people who were not visited by a warner were the Jews. But such an interpretation is evidently false. Rev. Tisdall, however, presumes to know more than the Arabic scholars. He gives many Arabic words which, he says, have puzzled the Arabic lexicographers and of which he pretends to offer an easy solution. We hope to be able to refer to some of these puzzling words in the course of this article. His derivation of the words *Ummi* from *Ummat* further shows that he has not the slightest acquaintance even with the rudiments of Arabic Grammar. Every person who has some knowledge of Arabic will see that the adjective form of *ummat* is *ummati* and not *ummi.*

Even if it be supposed that the words *ummi* does not mean illiterate, as Rev. Tisdall suggests and that the Holy Prophet was a learned man, he certainly did not know the languages of the Jewish and the Christian scriptures.

Even if it be supposed, says Rev. Tisdall, that the Prophet was not a learned man, was it not possible for him to inquire from the Jews the observances and obligations on which the Abrahamic faith was founded ? But the question is not whether it was possible for the Holy Prophet to make inquiries from the Jews, but whether he actually made any inquiries from them. There is no evidence of his having made any inquiries from them. On the other hand, there

is every reason to believe that he never turned to them for guidance. The Christian critics possess no evidence of his having approached the Jews or the Christians with the object of learning from them the details of their history or the doctrines of their religion. J. N. Rodwell says in the Introduction to his English translation of the Holy Quran that it was in " secrecy " that the Holy Prophet "received his instructions from the Arab Jews and from his Christian informants." This is clear admission of the fact that there is not the slightest proof of his having taken recourse to the Jews or the Christians for religious instruction. To say that it was done in *secrecy* is equivalent to saying that there is no historical evidence of his having done so. " The secrecy, in which he received instructions from the Arab Jews and his Christian informants," says Rodwell, "enabled him boldly to declare to the ignorant pagan Meccans that God had revealed those Biblical histories to him." This means that even the contemporaries of the Holy Prophet did not know that he received instructions from the People of the Book. It further shows that not only the opponents of the Holy Prophet but also his followers had never knew him receiving secret instruction from the Jews or the Christians, for if he had received secret instructions from the People of the Book and any of his followers had been aware of this act of his, he could not have so boldly and so repeatedly made the declaration that every verse of the Holy Quran was revealed to him directly from heaven and that he had no human instructors. It is an undeniable fact that his followers were sincere believers in his revelation, and those who knew him most intimately were among his most devoted followers, which could not have been the case if they had known that he received secret instructions from the Jews and the Christians and then gave it out as divine revelation.

The following remarks of Muir will enable the reader to form an idea of the strength of the faith which the companions of the Holy Prophet had in his revelations. Speaking of the mosque at Medina, Muir says : " Here the Prophet and his companions spent most of their time ; here the daily service with its oft-recurring prayers, was first publicly established : *and here the great congregation assembled every Friday, listening with reverence and awe to messages from heaven.*" (Life of Mahomet, page 170). Speaking of the return of the Muslim pilgrims from Hudaibiya after the conclusion of the Memorable Treaty, Muir says, "At the close of the first march, the pilgrims might be seen hurrying across the plain, urging their camels from all directions, and crowding round the Prophet. 'Inspiration hath descended on him,' passed from mouth to mouth throughout the camp. Standing upright upon his camel, Mohammad recited the Sura entitled the 'The Victory'" (page 848). Speaking of the first two Caliphs, he says, " The simplicity and

earnestness of Abu Bakr, and of Omar also, the first two Caliphs, are strong evidence of their belief in the sincerity of Mohammad; and the belief of these men must carry undeniable weight in the formation of our own estimate of his character, since the opportunities they enjoyed for testing the grounds of their conviction were both close and long-continued." (page 493).

The fact that men who enjoyed close and long-continued intimacy with the Holy Prophet had such firm faith in his revelations is a clear evidence of the fact that they never even suspected that he received secret instructions from Jews and Christians. And the fact that those who lived with him day and night never so much as suspected him of receiving instructions from the people of the Book is a conclusive proof of the fact that he had no Jewish or Christian informants, for if there had been any, their existence could not have remained a secret to men who enjoyed a close and life-long intimacy with him. Not only his companions but even his wives had a deep faith in the divine origin of his revelations, and it is highly unreasonable to suppose that throughout his ministry, he managed to receive instructions from the Arab Jews and his Christian informants with such secrecy that not only his companions but even his wives and daughters remained ignorant of it. "It is impossible," says Rodwell, "for us at this distance of time to penetrate the mystery in which this subject is involved." Indeed, it must be impossible, for it was impossible even for those that had the closest intimacy with the Holy Prophet in his day. But Rev. Tisdall is possessed of extraordinary powers of penetration, for what seems to be an impenetrable mystery to Rodwell, appears to Rev. Tisdall to be "clearer than even the sun." The mystery, however, which Rodwell declares to be impenetrable is one of his own creation or more correctly one created by Christians themselves. It is a mystery like the mystery of trinity. They have made an unfounded allegation regarding the Holy Quran and when they have failed to find any evidence in support of their allegations, and, when they have found an overwhelming mass of evidence against their allegation, they have declared it to be a mystery which it is impossible for them to penetrate at this distance. The truth is that the Holy Prophet never borrowed his materials from any earthly source and he taught only what was revealed to him from on high. In his last address to his followers at Medina, which he delivered only a little while before his death in the courtyard of his mosque, near the door of Ayesha's apartment, he said, according to Muir's report of the parting words: "By the Lord! as for myself, verily, no man can lay hold of me in any matter. I have not made lawful anything excepting that which God hath made lawful, nor have I prohibited aught but that which God in His book hath prohibited." (Life of Mahomet, page 478). Such were the last words which he addressed

to his assembled followers at a time when he was about to depart from this world and Muir tells us that 'he spoke with emotion, and with a voice still so powerful as to echo beyond the outer doors of his mosque.' That was no time of imposing upon the people and what he spoke then must have emanated from the inmost recesses of his heart. Those where his dying words and they bespoke a firm belief in the Holy Quran being "Ais" book. He swore by the Lord saying that he had taught his people only what God had spoken to him and that he had prohibited only what God in His book had prohibited. He also boldly told them that no man could lay hold of him in any matter. These words which were addressed by him to a large gathering of men who had been on terms of closest intimacy with him for long years, are alone sufficient to exonerate him from any charge which the Christians may bring against him, for these words could be addressed to bosom friends and intimate acquaintances only by a person who was conscious of his spotless character and of his having worked with consistent honesty throughout his career. It was not his companions alone who formed the audience at the time of that memorable speech, but there were also his wives, his daughter Fatima and other women, sitting close by. When he had finished his address to men, he turned to the women and said, "O Fatima, my daughter, and thou Safia, my aunt! work ye out that which shall gain acceptance for you with the Lord, for verily I have no power with him to save you in anywise." But nothing can surpass the cruelty of the Christian critics who accuse such a man of receiving secret instructions from the Jews and the Christians and then having recast it in his own mind and with his own words, reciting it before his wives, daughters and companions as the actual words of God "To acquire so minute a knowledge of considerable portions of Jewish Scripture and legend," says Muir, "to assimilate these to his former materials, and to work them up into elaborate and rhythmical Suras, was a work that no doubt required much time and patience . . . . . For this and many a midnight hour must have been stolen from sleep." (Life of Mahomet. Page 100). If that was the way in which he composed the Quran, the fact could not have remained unknown to his intimate associates and to his wives and daughters. But the Christian critic cannot deny that they were all firm believers in the divine origin of the Holy Quran. Not only his companions but also his own wives and his own daughters believed that every verse of the Holy Quran was a direct revelation from God. And he did nothing either by day or by night, but was closely watched by them all. If he spent so much time and labour in obtaining so minute a knowledge of considerable portions of Jewish Scripture in assimilating these to his former materials and working them up into elaborate portions

and stole many a midnight hour from sleep for this purpose, no sensible man will think that he could keep all this a secret from his wives, and daughters as well as from his companions. The minutest details of what he did and said not only during the day but also during the night have been handed down to us and there is not the slightest evidence of his having spent any part of his time in acquiring minute details of a considerable portion of the Jewish Scriptures and of assimilating the information so gained with what he had already taught and of working it up into elaborate and rhythmical Suras in the dead of the night. Rodwell also suggests the same method of the composition of the Holy Quran as that suggested by Muir, and says, "There can be no doubt that to assimilate and work up his materials, to fashion them into elaborate Suras, and to fit them for public recital, must have been a work requiring much time, study and meditation." These statements are alone sufficient to show the absurdity of the allegation, for no one who has the slightest acquaintance with the way in which the Holy Prophet led his life and the closeness with which his followers watched every act of his, will think that the Holy Prophet could do all that is ascribed to him without being detected by his companions and his wives. In order to see the folly of the assertions made by Muir and Rodwell, one need only look into the traditions from which it appears that not only his companions but even his wives minutely observed every act which he did during the day or by the night and if the Quran, instead of being a revelation from God, had been composed by him in the way described by the Christian critics, the facts could not have remained a secret to his intimate and watchful friends. But the fact that the companions and the wives and the daughters of the Holy Prophet who had strong faith in the divine origin of his Revelations and who, moreover, were always watching every thing which he did at any time during the twenty-four hours, had never had an occasion to suspect that he obtained secret information from the followers of other faiths, and stole many a midnight hour from his sleep to assimilate the information so obtained and work it up into elaborate Suras is a convincing proof of the fact that he never did such a thing. But Muir and his friends profess to see more even from this distance than even the most intelligent and watchful of his wives, and companions could do by living in close contact with him day and night.

The absurdity of the assertion that the Holy Prophet borrowed a great part of his teachings and most of the stories of the Holy Quran becomes still more apparent when we come to consider the said stories and teachings. The following is a list of the subjects which, among others, says Rev. Tisdall, the Holy Prophet borrowed from the Jews:—

1. Cain and Abel (Sura v, 30-35).
2. Abraham.
3. Solomon and Queen of Sheba (Sura xxvii).
4. Harut and Marut (Sura ii, 96).
5. Sura vii, 172.
6. The Golden Calf (Sura xx, 90).
7. Sura xv, 44 (seven heavens).
8. Sura xvii, 46 (seven storeys to hell).
9. Sura xliii, 77 (The Angel of Hell).
10. Sura vii, 44 (Haraf, a place between paradise and hell).
11. Sura xv, 17 and 34 (Satan being driven away).
12. Sura xxxvii, 7 ditto.
13. Sura lxvii, 5 ditto.
14. Sura xi, 9 (God's Throne above the waters).
15. Joseph (xii).
16. David (Sura xxi, xxviii, xxviv, xxxviii).
17. Saul (ii).
18. The words Taghut, Garden of Eden, Furcad, etc.
19. Sura 1, 29 (On the day we shall say unto hell, Art thou full ? and it shall reply, Is there yet any more ?).
20. Sura xi, 42 ('The oven boiled over').
21. Sura xxiii, 27 ditto.
22. Sura ii, 183 ("Eat and drink until ye can distinguish a white thread from a black thread by the day break, then fulfil the fast").
23. Sura xxi, 105 ("Verily We have written in the Psalms after the reminding that My servants the righteous shall inherit the Earth").
24. Sura lxxxv, 21 and 22 ("Truly it is the glorious Quran on a preserved Table").
25. Sura i, 1.

To the above list I may add the following from the Jewish Encyclopædia, Vol. vii, page 559 :—

26. The Creation.
27. Noah.
28. Ishmael.
29. Jacob and his sons.
30. Moses.
31. Aaron.
32. Isaac.
33. Job.
34. Jonah.
35. Lot.
36. Adam.

To these we may further add the following four from Professor Noldekee's article in the Encyclopædia Brittanica, Vol. xvi,

page 600 :—

37. Sura i, 5 (corresponding with Ps. xxvii, 11).
38. Sura v, 35 (corresponding with Mishna *Sanh* iv, 5).
39. Sura ii, 183 (corresponding with Mishna *Ber* i, 2).
40. Sura iv, 46 (the regulation as to the ablution by rubbing with sand, where water cannot be obtained, corresponding to an ordinance contained in *Ber.* 15 *a*).

The reader, who knows that there was not a single Jew or a single convert to Judaism at Mecca, will be startled to learn that most, if not almost all, the above subjects, of which I have tried to give a comprehensive list, belong to the Meccan period. Nos. 1, 4, 17, 22, 38, 39 and 40 are the only subjects that belong exclusively to the post Meccan period, while the remaining thirty-three are the subjects of the Meccan Suras. I have given the numbers of the Suras and the reader can easily verify my statement by referring to any copy of the original Arabic Quran or to any English Translation of it. Of the words in No 18, the words *Eden* and *Furqan* occur in Meccan Suras. The former occurs, among other passages in xiii, 23 : xviii, 30; xxxv, 30; which belong to the Meccan period. The latter is found in Suras xxi, 49 ; xv, 1. These are both Meccan and the very title of the latter Sura is *Furqan*. The stories of all the Prophets are to be found in full detail in the Meccan Suras. For the account of David, see Suras xxi, xxvi, xxxiv and xxxviii, which are all Meccan. For Moses, see Suras, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 51, 54, 73, 80, etc, which are all Meccan and in many of which the story of Moses is told at great length and with the minutest detail. The story of Aaron (Harun) is also mentioned along with that of Moses in some of the Suras above named. For the story of Noah, *vide* Suras vii, x, xi, xxi, xxiii, xxv, xxvi, xxix, xxxvii, lxxi and many other Suras of the Meccan period. For Jacob and his sons, see Surah xii (Mecca). For Job, see Surahs xxi and xxxviii (both Meccan) For Jonah, see Surahs x, xxi xxxvii and lxviii (all Meccan). For Lot, see vii, xi, xv, xxi, xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxix, xxxvii, etc, (all Meccan). For Adam, *vide* Surahs vii xv, xvii, xviii, xx and xxxviii (all Meccan). For Abraham, Ishmael and Issac, *vide* Surahs 6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 29, 37, 38, 43, 51, and 87 (all Meccan). For Edris, see Sura 19 and for Elias, see Sura 37, both Meccan. For the account of creation, *vide* xvi, 3 ; 1, 37 ; xiii, 3, 4; xxxv, 1, 12 ; xli, 8—11 (all Meccan). Thus most of what the Holy Prophet is alleged to have borrowed from the Jews was revealed to him at Mecca, where could not be found even a single Jewish soul. If these subjects had been only found in the Suras revealed at Medina where a few Jewish tribes where settled, the Christian critics might allege it to be as an evidence of the Holy Prophet's having borrowed them from the Jews. But, unluckily for them, they had

been revealed to him before he left Mecca. And not only there was no Jew or convert to Judaism at Mecca, but there is also no evidence of any Jews visiting him at the Holy city. Muir concludes his 5th chapter, dealing with the events of the life of the Holy Prophet from the fifth to the tenth year of his mission, by saying. "About this time Mohammad must have found means of communicating with the Jews, or at least with some persons acquainted with the Jewish lore." From these it appears that Muir is very certain of the Holy Prophet's having been in communication with the Jews at this period and must have made that statement on very strong evidence, but when we come to the latter part of the sentence, it becomes apparent that the Christians do not possess even a shadow of evidence to show that the Holy Prophet received any communications from the Jews at this time. How did Muir come to have this certain knowledge ? This he tells us in the remaining part of the sentence. "For," continues he, "his revelation begins now to abound with narratives taken, often at great length, from their scriptures and legends." This is the only proof which Muir can give of the Holy Prophet's having held communications with the Jews or with men learned in the Jewish lore, but the statement only amounts to saying that there is no actual evidence of the Jews or men learned in the Jewish lore visiting Mecca at this period and of their holding long conferences with the Holy Prophet on the subjects revealed in the Meccan Suras, but that since these Suras contain subjects of Jewish history, therefore it follows that Jews or men learned in the Jewish lore must have visited him at Mecca and instructed him in the said subjects. Thus it is clear that the Christian critics cannot produce any evidence to show that the Jews or men learned in Jewish scriptures visited the Holy Prophet at Mecca. And it is in connection with the subjects of the Meccan Suras that Muir observes that the Holy Prophet devoted a great part of his time to the acquiring of 'so minute a knowledge' of Jewish scriptures and assimilating it to his former materials and working them up into elaborate and rhythmical Suras (Life of Mahomet, page 99). Nothing can equal the soundness of Christian criticism! Not having even a shadow of evidence to show that any Jews ever visited the Holy Prophet at Mecca and there not being even a single Jew or a single convert to Judaism resident at Mecca, they have the audacity to declare that the Holy Prophet devoted a good deal of his time to the acquiring of so minute a knowledge of a considerable portion of Jewish scriptures from Jewish visitors. Rev. Tisdall names three persons who he says, were either Jews or had been converts to Judaism and who afterwards embraced Islam. These are Abdullah bin Salam, Habib bin Malik and Waraqa. Of these only the last named was a resident of Mecca, but unluckily for Rev. Tisdall, he was neither a Jew nor a convert to Judaism. All that is said of him

is that he forsook idolatry and became a Christian. But even he died before the Holy Prophet announced himself to be a Prophet. Indeed, when he heard of the appearance of the Angel to the Holy Prophet at the Cave of Hira and of the first divine message which had come to him, *Waraqa* declared that what he had heard was the Word of God and that he was a Prophet for his people, but he died soon after. Thus he was among the first to believe in the Divine Mission of the Holy Prophet but this does not show that it was he from whom the Holy Prophet acquired so minute a knowledge of a considerable portion of Jewish scriptures.' There is no evidence of the Holy Prophet going to Waraqa with the object of acquiring from him Jewish scriptures. Moreover, according to Muir, it was during the latter part of the Meccan period that the Holy Prophet "found means of communicating with the Jews or at least with some persons acquainted with Jewish lore; for his revelation begins now to abound with narrative taken, often at great length from their scriptures and legends," but by this time Waraqa had long been dead and it was impossible for the Holy Prophot to find means of communicating with him, even if it be supposed that he was learned in Jewish lore.

Besides, the minute detail with which the stories of prophets are given in the Meccan Suras and the close agreement between many Quranic verses and certain passages of Jewish scriptures belie the assumption that tha Holy Prophet learnt them from certain unknown Jews that are supposed to have visited him at Mecca. I cannot give here thedetails of the stories, but I will refer the reader to certain passages of the Jewish books which are said to have been borrowed almost word for word by the Holy Prophet. Here is a list of them as given by Rev. Tisdall.—

(*a*) The letter *kaf* standing in the beginning of Sura L 50 was borrowed from the following comment of the Jewish writing called Hagigah on the word *thohu* in Genesis i, 2, "Thohu is a green *line* (cav or caf) which surrounds the whole world, and hence comes darkness." (*Yanabi*, page 112).

(*b.*) " But the meek shall inherit the earth" (Psalm xxxvii, 11) corresponding word for word with Sura xxi, 135,—" Verily We have written in the Psalms after the reminding that my servant the righteous shall inherit the Earth." (*Yanabi*, page 106).

(*c.*) " The people of the Flood were punished with boiling water' (Rosh Ha Shanah and Sanherdin) corresponding with Suras xi, 42 and xxiii, 27, " Then oven boiled over." (*Yanabi*, page 103).

(*d.*) " The Prince of Hell shall say, day by day, Give me food that I may be full." (Otiot de Rabbi Akiba) corresponding with Surah L, 29, " On the day we shall say unto hell, Art thou full? and it shall reply, Is there yet any more?" (*Yanabi*, page 103).

(*e.*) The idea of Satan listening stealthily (Suras xv, 17 and 34;

xxxvii. 7 ; lxvii, 5) was borrowed from Hagigah where it is said of the Genii, that they listened behind the curtain' in order to gain knowledge of things to come. (*Yanabi*, page 103).

(*f*.) In Sura vii, 44, says Rev. Tisdall, there is mention of a wall or partition called *Aaraf* as separating Paradise and Hell, so there is mention of a 'wall' between heaven and hell in Jewish Midrash. (*Yanabi*, page 102).

(*g*.) "In Surah xi, 9, we are told of God's *throne being above the waters* ; and similarly the Jewish Roshi, commenting on Genesis 1, 2, says : ' the glorious throne stood in the heavens and moved over the face of the waters.' " (*Yanabi*, page 101).

(*h*) The Angel of Hell spoken of in xliii, 77, corresponds with the Prince of Hell of the Jews. (*Yanabi*, page 102)

(*i*) "I raised the mount to be a covering on you" (Abodah Sarah) corresponding with Surah vii, 172. *Yanabi*, page 97).

(*j*) Psalm, xxvii, ii, "Teach me Thy way, O Lord, and lead me in a plain path, because of mine enemies,' corresponds with Sura i, 5, "Guide Thou us on the right path.' (Professor Noldeke's Article, Encyclopædia Britanica, Vol XVI, page 600).

Now all the Quranic passages in the foregoing instances, which have been shown by Christian critics to correspond almost word for word with certain passages of Jewish writings belong to the Meccan period. Of these it is said that the Holy Prophet borrowed them from the Jews. Do the circumstances warrant this statement ? Can the Christians produce sufficient evidence to prove their allegation ? The answer to these questions must be given in the negative. The Holy Prophet could have borrowed them from the Jewish Scriptures only if he had access to these books But no Christian, however prejudiced, will have the face to assert that the Holy Prophet had access to these books at Mecca Nay, he connot be shown to have had access to these books even at Medina. These are not merely stories, which may be said to have been communicated to him orally. They are passages most of which strikingly coincide with certain passages in the Jewish writings and the Holy Prophet could have borrowed them from those writings only if he had either read those books with his own eyes or had those passages read to him from the said books. Take for instance Surah xxi, 105,—" Verily we have written in the Psalms after the reminding that my servants the righteous shall inherit the earth ; " and compare it with Psalm xxxvii, 11—"But the meek shall inherit the earth." Now according to the Christians the verse was not revealed to him, but he borrowed it from the Psalms of David. Well ! We will quite willingly accept their allegation as true only if they let us know how he borrowed it. Is he known to have ever himself studied the Hebrew Psalms so that he may be said to have selected the passage in question ? Is it known that the book in

question was brought to him at Mecca and its verses were rehearsed in his presence ? Is it known that certain Jews visited him at Mecca that they were learned Jews' well versed in their scriptures and that they, at his request, recited to him the Psalms from the first to the last or at least the particular Psalm in which the passage in question occurs ? But neither Rev. Tisdall, nor his admirer and translator Sir William Muir, not even Professor Noldeke of Encyclopædic fame can answer these questions in the affirmative. Nay, far from showing that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) had the Psalms read to him by learned Jews who visited him from their settlements at Medina they cannot even show whether any Jews, learned or unlearned with the Psalms of David or without them, visited him at all at Mecca. And when we add to the Psalms of David, other Jewish books whose passages are said to correspond almost word for word with certain passages of the Meccan Suras, it becomes still more evident that the Holy Prophet did not borrow them from the Jewish sources for it is inconceivable that he should have had access to these passages that lie buried in obscurity in the leaves of certain Jewish books And add to these the minute details of Jewish history which abound in the Meccan Suras and you will be convinced that it was impossible for the Holy Prophet to have borrowed all these details and all these passages from Jewish books when there was not to be found at Mecca even a single illiterate Jew at a time when no Jews are known to have been in communication with him even from outside Speaking of the passages which are said to bear a direct resemblance to the text of the Jewish Scriptures Professor Noldeke says that they 'might readily have been picked up in conversation with any Jew'. With due deference to his scholarship, I beg leave to ask, firstly, are the passages quoted above such as might be supposed to be at the tip of every Jew's tongue so that the Holy Prophet can be said to have picked them up in conversation; secondly, were there any Jews at Mecca that were well versed in their scriptures, or is there any evidence of learned Jews frequently visiting him from outside and being on intimate terms with him so that it may be supposed that the Holy Prophet learned from them all the details of Jewish history and even the wording of many passages of their scriptures and their commentaries ? A glance at the passages cited above will convince the reader that the passages are not such as might be picked up in conversation and every student of the history of Islam will admit that the Holy Prophet did not have intimate acquaintance with any Jew, whether learned or unlearned, at Mecca.

Now as to the subjects and passages of the Medinite Surahs that are alleged to have been borrowed from the Jews. Now that we have shown the baselessness of the Christian allegations with reference to the subjects and passages of the Meccan Surahs, it becomes

unnecessary to examine their allegations with reference to the contents of the Medinite Chapters, for when Jewish subjects could be revealed to him in full detail at Mecca nothing could hinder their being revealed to him at Medina. I have already shown that most of the subjects which are alleged to have been borrowed from the Jews belong to the Meccan period, and those that belong to the Medina period are very few in number. And when, with regard to the majority of the subjects, it has been shown that they could not have been borrowed from the Jews and that they were revealed to him from Him who knows what is hidden in the heavens and in the earth, it is needless to discuss the few that are not included in the Surahs of the Meccan period. Still it will not be quite without interest to make a brief reference to the few subjects of the Medina Surahs alleged to have been borrowed from the Jews.

It is indeed true that after the *Hijra*, a change was made in the surroundings of the Holy Prophet At Mecca, there was not a single Jew about him, while in the vicinity of Medina. there were many Jews. But in order to see how far the allegation that he borrowed many subjects from the Jews at Medina is true, it is necessary for us to realize the relation in which they stood to each other. Did the change of the surroundings produce any change in the claims of the Holy Prophet (my peace and the blessings of God be upon him)? The answer to this question is, No. Just as at Mecca, he claimed to be a Prophet raised for all nations alike, similarly he, at Medina, claimed to be a Prophet for all people alike He called upon the Jews to accept him as a Prophet just as he required the idolaters to accept him as a Divine Messenger. Similarly he continued to claim to be a recipient of Divine Revelation at Medina just as he did at Mecca. He told the Jews that God spoke to him just as He had spoken to Moses at Mount Sinai, and that every letter and every word of the Holy Quran was a Divine Revelation and that it was not the word of man but the Word of God. In short he addressed the Jews not with the humility of a Pupil who is desious of learning something from his master, but he spoke to them with the authority of a Divine Teacher, who had come to give them a new Law, to settle the differences that had sprung up among them, to explain many things which they had concealed and teach them many things which they had forgotten. Now, can it be said of such a person that he, as Rev. Tisdall tells us, inquired from the Jews the doctrines of their faith and the details of their history, and then working them up into elaborate Surahs, gave them out as Divine Revelation. Nothing can be more foolish—than to say that he who claimed to be an inspired Messenger put himself in the position of a pupil and sought instruction from those very people to whom he claimed to have come as a Prophet.

Now let us look at the attitude of the Jews towards him.

Every person who has studied the history of Islam will admit that it was an attitude of bitter hostility and hatred from the very beginning. Even Muir admits that they were "a standing cause of annoyance," to him "a constant cause of trouble and anxiety," and "they plied him with questions." (Life of Mahomet, page 179). Can it be said, then that they instructed the Holy Prophet in the details of their sacred history ?

The claim of the Holy Prophet to be an inspired guide for the Jews as well as for other people and the bitter hostility of the Jews towards him are two circumstances which have been totally ignored by the Christian critics. Supposing the Prophet was unlearned asks Rev. Tisdall, could he not make inquiries from the Jews? Certainly, he could not, because such a course was inconsistent with his claim to inspiration and because the Jews of Medina were a people from whom he could expect nothing but mischief. Besides, we find that the Medina Surahs abound in verses which strongly condemn the evil ways, not only of the Jews of the day but also of their forefathers. He could not have done so, if they had laid him under obligation by furnishing him with useful information. And who supplied him with the stories of their forefathers' disobedience, folly and idolatry which are re-counted at great length in the Holy Quran ? Did they themselves relate to him the stories of the transgressions and the wickednesses of their great ancestors ? And did they tell him these stories in public or private ? Is there any evidence of their having related these stories in his presence ? When the Holy Prophet having assimilated the information obtained from the Jews and having worked it up into elaborate Surahs, recited it to his companions as a divine revelation, what hindered the hostile Jews from standing up and saying that what the Holy Prophet had just proclaimed as a revelation from God was only what they had taught him ? It may be urged in reply that his informants were not the hostile Jews that had embraced his faith and therefore they refrained from publicly exposing his revelations. But his explanation is hardly satisfactory. If he had obtained secret information from his few Jewish followers and then having worked it up into elaborate Suras, had given it out as his revelation, the few Jews who had believed in would have certainly renounced his faith in him and gone back to the faith of their forefathers. The very fact that they continued to believe in him as a true Prophet shows that they never acted as his secret informants.

Moreover, most of the Medina passages which are alleged to have been borrowed from the Jews, bear, like the Meccan passages resemblance to the text of the Jewish Scriptures and the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) could not have borrowed them, unless we had access to the text of the original sources. The following are the passages of the Jewish Scriptures

which are said by Rev. Tisdall and Professor Noldeke to have been borrowed almost word for word by the Holy Prophet at Medina—

(*a.*) Mishnah Sanherdin, commentary on Gen iv. 10, "So that he that kills an Israelite is counted as if he had killed the world at large; and he who saves a single Israelite is counted as if he had saved the whole world," corresponding with Surah, v, 30.

(*b.*) Mishnah Berakboth—' The beginning of the day is at the moment *when one can but distinguish a blue thread from a white thread*" coinciding with Surah ii, 183—"Eat and dring *until ye can distinguish a white thread from a black by the day break*," then fulfil the fast.

(*c.*) Ber 15*a* corresponding with Surah iv, 46. (The regulation as to the ablution by rubbing with sand, where water cannot be obtained).

Passages of the type given above could not have been borrowed by the Holy Prophet unless he had studied the books or had these books read to him by Jews versed in those books. But there is no evidence to show that he ever read the books named above or that any Jew ever read these books to him. Nay, it is not even known whether the Jews of Medina were familiar with the contents of these books, and Rev. Tisdall tells us that they did not know even Hebrew. The verse referred to in (c), which contains the regulation as to the ablution by rubbing with sand, where water is not available deserves particular mention. The verse was revealed during an expedition, when Ayesha accidently lost her necklace and the Holy Prophet and his holy companions were forced to halt at a place in the desert where no water was to be found. It was the time of prayer and many said their prayers without performing the ordinary ablution. There the verse in question was revealed, permitting them to perform the ablution by rubbing with sand (Sahih Bokharee). Thus the circumstances under which the said verse was revealed clearly show that is was not borrowed from Ber 15*a*, as Professor Noldeke tells us. The occasion was quite unforeseen and it is unreasonable to suppose that the Holy Prophet had already studied the Jewish book or had learned its contents from any Jew. All his companions were ignorant of this regulation as appears from a perusal of the tradition quoted in the Bokharee, which could not have been the case if the regulation had been taught him by any Jews in public. And it is merely foolish to assert that he had learnt it from any Jew in secret.

As to the story of Saul and the passage speaking of Harut and Marut, I ask Rev. Tisdall why it was that the passages in question, instead of giving names that were known to the Jews, give names of which no trace is to be found in Jewish Scriptures. Rev. Tisdall himself tells us that the names Harut and Marut are not to be found in any Jewish book, and the Holy Quran does not give the name

Saul and these two facts are sufficient to show that it was not the Jews from whom the passages in question were borrowed.

I believe what has gone above will convince every impartial reader that none of the contents of the Meccan or the Medina Suras were borrowed from any Jewish source In the next article, I will discuss the so-called Christian and Zoroastrian sources of Islam.

In the last portion on the subject, I dealt with the so called Jewish sources of Islam I will now discuss the Christian sources. Rev. Tisdall names 21 Christian books which he says formed the sources of Islam, and adds that this number represents only a fraction of the total number of Christian writings from which the Holy Prophet borrowed many passages of the Holy Quran. According to him, the Christians of Arabia "were not only an ignorant People, but belonged to heretical sects" "They had hardly any acquaintance" says he, "with the Gospels or the Apostolic writings, but were conversant with heretical books and the extravagant tales they contained." He does not leave us in darkness as to how the Holy Prophet had access to these Christian sources. "The critics say," says he, "that as the Prophet was not fully acquainted with the Gospels and lived in close intimacy with the Christians of the type described above he thought that whatever he heard from them was written in the Gospels or the writings of the Apostles," and it was thus that he was led to incorporate in the Holy Quran whatever he learned from his Christian informants. Such is the argument of Rev. Tisdall, and when we analyse it, it resolves itself into the following propositions :—

(*a.*) The Christian Arabs of the time of the Holy Prophet belonged to the heretical sects of Christianity.

(*b.*) They were ignorant of the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, but were conversant with heretical literature.

(*c*) The Holy Prophet lived in the midst of the Christian heretics, constantly visiting them and being constantly visited by them, for such is the import of his words already quoted in original.

(*d.*) The Holy Prophet had full confidence in the Christian heretics whose words he took for the very word which God had revealed to Jesus or to his Apostles and consequently incorporated them in the Holy Quran as divine revelation.

(*e.*) The Quranic account of Christianity coincides with the contents of the writings of heretical Christians.

Such are the propositions into which Rev. Tisdall's argument resolves itself, and if these propositions are based on facts, there is no room to doubt the truth of his allegation that many of the contents of the Holy Quran were borrowed from Christian sources. But if these propositions turn out to be unfounded, his whole argument falls to the ground. So let us examine his propositions in order to see how far they are correct.

Three witnesses against Rev. Tisdall.

Nothing will shatter Rev. Tisdall's propositions more completely than quotations from Christian writers flatly contradicting him in every detail. The first Christian writer whom I call to witness is J. M. Rodwell, M. A, Rector of St. Ethelburga, London, and translator of the Holy Quran. Rev. Tisdall names two heretics, Marcion and Basilides, whose teachings, he says, were incorporated in the Holy Quran by the Holy Prophet. Both these men were prominent leavers of the Gnostic school of Christian heretics. Thus, according to Rev. Tisdall, it was the Christian heretics of the Gnostic sects who greatly influenced the notions of the Holy Prophet with regard to Christianity. Now let us hear what Rev. J. M. Rodwell has to say on the subject. In his preface to his English translation of the Holy Quran, he says :—"It has been supposed that Mohammad derived many of his notions concerning Christianity from Gnosticism, and that it is to the numerous Gnostic sects the Quran alludes when it reproaches the Christians with having 'split up their religion into parties.' But for Mohammad thus to have confounded Gnosticism with Christianity itself, its prevalence in Arabia must have been far more universal than we have reason to believe that it really was. In fact, we have no historical authority for supposing that the doctrines of these heretics were taught or professed in Arabia at all. It is certain, on the other hand, that the Basilidans, Valentinians, and other Gnostic sects had either died out, or been re-absorbed into the orthodox Church, towards the middle of the fifth century, and had disappeared from Egypt before the sixth."

The second Christian gentleman whom I call in to bear witness against Rev. Tisdall is Sir William Muir, the author of the Life of Mahomet.

"Gnosticism," says he, "had disappeared from Egypt before the sixth century, and there is no reason for supposing that it had at any time gained a footing in Arabia." But according to Rev. Tisdall, the disciples of the famous heretics Marcion and Basilides were not only to be found in abundance in Arabia in the days of the Holy Prophet, but they were also his immediate neighbours, constantly visiting and being visited by him. The heretical sects who according to Rev. Tisdall, acted as the informants of the Holy Prophet 'were,' to quote the words of his translator, 'all around him.'

Rev. Tisdall also refers to certain apocryphal writings and Gospels as the sources of Islam. The heretical sects of Christianity, says he, who were all about the Holy Prophet though ignorant of the true Gospels and the writings of the apostles, were fully conversant with the apocryphal. Let us hear what Sir William Muir has to say on this subject :—

"By some again," says he, "it has been attempted to trace the Christian element in the Quran to certain apocryphal gospels supposed

to have been within the reach of Mohammad. But though some few of its details do coincide with these spurious writings, its statements as a rule, in no wise correspond. Whereas, had there been a ready access to such books, we cannot doubt that Mohammad would have borrowed largely from them. Others believe that Mohammad acquired his knowledge from no written source, but from Christian tradition in the Peninsula. As his sole source of information, however, the indigenous tradition of Arabia was altogether insufficient for the purpose, There is no ground for believing that either at Mecca or Medina there existed anything of the kind from which could have been framed a narrative agreeing, as that of the Quran does in many particulars and even in some of its expressions with the Gospels, both genuine and apocryphal, (pages 149—150.) On page 119, Sir William Muir says: "In point of fact, if we except one or two campaigns against distant Christian tribes, and the reception of embassies from them, he came throughout his life into little personal contact with the professors of the faith of Jesus." Speaking of the number of Christians in Arabic in the time of the Holy Prophet, Muir says: "After five centuries of Christian evangelisation, we can point to but a sprinkling here and there of Christian converts; the Bani Harith of Najran; the Beni Hanceefa of Yemama; some of the Beni Tay at Tayma, and hardly any more.' (lxxxiv).

I may also call in a third witness, Professor Noldeke, to bear witness against Rev. Tisdall On the Christians of Arabia, the Professor says, that they 'knew next to nothing' (Ency. Brit., vol xvi. page 600), while Rev. Tisdall says that they were conversant with the doctrines of the heretical sects and the apocryphal writings which he quotes in the *Yanali* and many more that he does not quote.

Now three eminent witnesses stand against Rey. Tisdall to contradict him in every particular. Rev. Tisdall says the Christians and other heretics of Arabia were conversant with the doctrines of Marcion, Basilides and though destitute of all knowledge of the true Gospels, had thorough acquaintance with the apocrypha, but the forenamed gentlemen say that the heretical teachings never obtained a footing in Arabia, that the apocryphal writings were not accessible to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and that the Christians of Arabia, far from being conversant with apocryphal or other writings, knew next to nothing. Rev. Tisdall does not say that the Christians of Arabia knew certain stories handed down by tradition, but he says that they possessed many apocryphal writings, which they read and whose stories they recited, (*Yanabi*, page 113). It is a pity that a reverend gentleman should not hesitate to say things for which he does not possess the slightest proof and which he knows to be false. But this is not all. Not only the Chris-

tians of Arabia were thoroughly grounded in the apocryphal writings but they also, according to him, lived in close company of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), for, says he:—'Prophet Mohammad lived among the Christians of the sort described above and had frequent intercourse with them, (page 113). The falsity of this statement is too apparent to need exposure. I have already quoted the words of Muir, who says, that the only Christians in Arabia were "the Bani Harith of Najran, the Bani Haneefa of Yamama, some of the Bani Tay at Tayma, and hardly any more." From this it is apparent that if there lived any Christians well-versed in the apocryphic lore, they were not to be found either in Mecca or in Medina. Muir plainly says:—"In point of fact if we except one or two campaigns against distant Christian tribes and the reception of embassies from them, he (the Holy Prophet) came throughout his life into little personal contact with the Professors of the faith of Jesus." Such is the testimony of Muir, but Rev. Tisdall pretending to know more than Sir William Muir, says that the Christians lived all about the Holy Prophet, and that the latter held frequent personal intercourse with them. Either Rev. Tisdall is deplorably ignorant or takes recourse to deliberate falsehood. It is a pity that such a person should presume to trace out the earthly sources of the Holy Quran!

Rev. Tisdall's learning.

Rev. Tisdall gives proof of his crass ignorance, if not deliberate untruthfulness at every step. In the course of his inquiry, he refers to certain Coptic writings as the sources of the Quranic teachings and the way in which he makes them accessible to the Holy Prophet is highly amusing. One of the books to which he refers is the Gospel of Infancy, and having given an extract from the said book, he adds:—"Now, if we compare the above, taken from this ancient Arabic work on the Infancy of our Saviour, with the Quran, it will be at once apparent that Mohammad has adopted the story, with its very words, changed only so far as to bring them into accord with his own belief and teaching; and doubtless it was all taken from this ancient apocryphal treatise. Should any one ask, how could this have been?—the answer is that this book of the childhood was translated into Arabic from the Coptic original and must have been known to the Prophet's Coptic hand-maiden, Mary. From her he must have heard the tale, and believing it to have come from the Gospel, adopted it with some little change and so entered it in the Quran." All this may appear to be very convincing to ignorant Christians and they may even applaud their missionary brother for the startling discovery he has made, but any one who has some acquaintance with the history of Islam will not help laughing at the author of this wonderful discovery. In the first place, there is no evidence to show Mary the Copt was acquainted with the content,

of the Gospel of Infancy and that she repeated them to to the Holy Prophet who taking them to be the words of the true Gospel, entered them almost word for word in the Holy Quran. But even if we take it for granted that she knew the apocryphal treatise, the idea that the Holy Prophet borrowed the passage in question from the Gospel of Infancy through Mary the Copt will be held as extremely ludicrous by any one who has some knowledge of the history of Islam. The passage which Rev. Tisdall traces to the Gospel of Infancy occurs in Surah xix. Every student of Islam must be aware of the fact that the whole of the Holy Quran was not revealed at once. It was revealed piecemeal so that most of the Surahs of the Holy Quran were revealed at Mecca and the remaining Surahs were revealed at Medina. Now the Surah named above (Surah *Maryam*) belongs to the Meccan period, and the readers may verify this by referring to any copy of the Holy Quran or to any translation of it. And even at Mecca, it was revealed at a very early period, for we find Jafar, one of the Muslim emigrants to Abyssinia reciting this very Surah, nay even the passage in question, before Negus, the Christian king of Abyssinia (*Vide* Muir's Life of the Holy Prophet, page 89). Now the first and the second emigrations to Abyssinia took place in the 5th and the 6th years of the Holy Prophet's mission respectively, therefore, it is evident that the said passage must have been revealed prior to the 6th year of the Holy Prophets mission or more than 7 years before the memorable Flight to Medina. Hence, if it is true that the Holy Prophet was indebted to Mary the Copt for the said passages, Mary must have been with the Holy Prophet at Mecca more than 7 years before the Flight. Bnt when the Holy Prophet was at Mecca, Mary was not there. She was sent to him at Medina by Muckukas, king of Egypt, about 7 years after the Flight, *i.e.*, at least 14 years after the verse in question was revealed to the Holy Prophet. But the learned missionary of the Church Mission informs us that it was Mary the Copt to whom the Holy Prophet was indebted for a passage which is known to have been revealed to him at least 14 years before she set her foot on the Arabian soil. Such is the critical research on the strength of which Rev. Tisdall claims to have made it more clear than the midday sun that the Holy Prophet did not receive any revelation from God but that whole of the Holy Quran is composed of materials that were borrowed from earthly sources. It is evident that either Rev. Tisdall is too ignorant to be aware of the fact that it was at Medina that Mary the Copt was sent to the Holy Prophet while the chapter entitled *Maryam* is a Meccan Surah, or he wilfully imposes on readers ignorant of the history of Islam by garbling facts.

If the readers desire to have more specimens of Rev Tisdall's critical enquiry here is one more. In my first article on the subject

I referred to an ancient Egyptian work called the Book of the Dead, which Rev. Tisdall informs us, forms one of the sources of the teachings of the Holy Quran. The book speaks of the weighing of deeds on the day of Judgment, and according Rev. Tisdall, the verses of the Holy Quran which speak of the weighing of deeds owe their origin to this book. Rev. Tisdall suggests a circuitous way in which the teaching of the Book of the Dead—a few copies of which have been dug out of ancient Egyptian sepulchres—found its way into the Holy Quran. The teaching was first borrowed by the author of the Testament of Abraham; Mary the Copt read the Testament of Abraham, she was sent to the Holy Prophet and the Holy Prophet learned the teaching from her and taking it to be the teaching of the Gospel gave it a place in the Holy Quran. This appears to be an excellent argument, but unfortunately there is one circumstance which Rev. Tisdall has not taken into consideration, and the neglect of which has spoiled his whole argument. We may take it for granted, out of deference to Rev Tisdall, that Mary the Copt was a learned woman, that she had read the Testament of Abraham, that she told the Holy Prophet what she had read in the said Testament and that whatever he heard from her he took to be the very word of God which had been revealed to His servant Jesus the Christ; we may take all this for granted, but there is one difficulty which cannot be surmounted and which compels us to reject Rev. Tisdall's theory as simply foolish. Rev. Tisdall refers to two verses, xlii, 16 and ci. 5, 6; and it so happens that both these verses belong not to the Medinite, but to the Meccan period, and thus these verses had been revealed to the Holy Prophet long before Mary came to him. It is simply puzzling to see Rev. Tisdall committing such glaring blunders. If he does not possess knowledge enough to distinguish between Meccan and Medinite chapters, and if he does not know when it was that Mary was sent to the Holy Prophet by the Christian King of Egypt, he is not qualified to take part in this discussion. And if he wilfully garbles facts in order to deceive men that have not thorough acquaintance with Islamic history, his cleverness may commend itself to the approval of his missionary fellow-workers, but outside his great fraternity his conduct will be deemed as worthy of the strongest condemnation.

If the conduct of Rev. Tisdall is regrettable, that of Sir William Muir is even more so. Ignorance may have blinded the former to his foolish blunder or he may have deemed it his duty as a missionary to wilfully misrepresent facts; but neither of these two pleas can hold good in the case of the latter. He knew too much of Islamic history not to see the flagrant error of Rev. Tisdall, nor was he a Christian missionary so that wilful suppression of truth might be said to form

part of his duty. It is a grievous insult to the author of the Life of Mohammad to say that he failed to see the shameful blunder of Rev. Tisdall but it is very disappointing to find that he translates these statements word for word without pointing out their error. Not only this, but he eulogises the author for his wonderful researches and congratulates the Church Mission on its having among its workers a man like Rev. Tisdall. If Rev. Tisdall has betrayed his ignorance or has been guilty of intentional misrepresentation, Sir William Muir has allowed his reputation as a historian, and I may add, his character as an Englishman of eminent distinction, to be tarnished by not only translating word for word silly statements of Rev. Tisdall which he knew to be false, but also commending them to the public as specimens of sound enquiry and styling the book which contains such untruths as a 'wonderful' and a 'noble' work, which deserved to be widely distributed in Muslim countries.

Rev. Tisdall seems to have devoted himself more to the task of tracing out the human sources of Islam than to the study of the Bible. When the Holy Quran speaks of sins and righteous deeds set against each other in the scales of justice, he finds fault with the teaching as a doctrine borrowed from the ancient idolaters of Egypt through Mary the Copt, but poor fellow he does not know that even the God of the Bible teaches the same heathenish doctrine. If the Holy Quran speaks of the weighing of deeds, the Bible contains the identical teaching for in the First Book of Samuel. ii, 3, we read :— "Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the Lord is a God of knowledge and by Him actions are weighed." Would Rev. Tisdall say that the God of the Bible also borrowed the teaching from the Book of the Dead? Rev. Tisdall seems to have ransacked the pages of Talmud in his search for the sources of Islam, and it is strange that he did not come across the following passage in Pesik. xxvi, 167*a*: "Whenever there are sins and righteous deeds set against each other in the scale of justice, God inclines it towards mercy." The Holy Quran does not contain any new teaching with respect to the weighing of deeds. It teaches just what the prophets of God had taught before it. It is, however, idle to say that the Holy Prophet borrowed the teaching from the writings of ancient Egypt or from the Jews of Arabia, for the verses containing the said teaching were revealed to him early at Mecca, when no communication existed between him and the Jews or the Egyptians. Could not the God who had revealed the teaching to earlier prophets reveal it also to the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him)?

Rev. Tisdall's wonderful investigations.

Rev. Tisdall's book indeed is a wonderful book, though not in the sense in which Sir William calls it wonderful. His manner of dealing with the

subject is all his own. Whenever he desires to prove a thing, he never lacks facts to prove it, for when there is no evidence actually existing, he can bring it into existence with a touch of his wand. He never feels the need of looking about him for facts, for he possesses the power to create them. And it is his power of bringing things into existence out of non-existence which he has brought into full play when dealing with the question of the origin of the Holy Quran. He wishes his readers that the Holy Prophet borrowed many of the contents of the Holy Quran from Christian scriptures and in order to achieve this purpose he sees it necessary to make certain books and doctrines accessible to the Holy Prophet. He states on his own authority that these doctrines and these books were well-known to the Christians of Arabia. They were conversant with every one of the books to which he traces the teachings of the Holy Quran and with many more which he omits to mention for want of space, and they were fully grounded in the doctrines of Basilides, Marcion and other heretics. These Christians, again, were on friendly terms with the Holy Prophet and the latter had daily intercourse with them. To crown all, the Holy Prophet had full confidence in the Christians and every story which they recited and every doctrine which they taught, he regarded as the actual word of God which had been revealed to Jesus and his disciples and therefore, he freely entered it in the Holy Quran and announced it as the revelation which had descended on him direct from heaven. Such is the argument of Rev. Tisdall which is all his own invention. There is not the slightest proof that the Christians of Arabia had even heard of the books and doctrines with which he represents them as conversant. Again, it is a known fact, as Sir William Muir informs us, that the Holy Prophet came, throughout his life, into little personal contact with the Christians. Nothing, again, is more absurd than to say that everything the Holy Prophet heard from the ignorant Christians, he took for the revelation which had been sent to Jesus and the apostles and therefore he entered it in the Holy Quran, giving his followers to understand that it was the Word of God that had come to him direct from God. Even if it be supposed that the Holy Prophet had daily intercourse with Christians both at Mecca and Medina, no sensible man will admit for a moment that he was so simple as to take everything which he heard from ignorant Christians of Arabia for the Word of God which had come to Jesus or the apostles, so much so, that he gave it a place in the Holy Quran as divine revelation. The very notion is ridiculous and yet Rev. Tisdall boastfully says that he has made it clearer than the sun that the Holy Prophet borrowed many of the contents of the Holy Quran from the Christians. The Holy Prophet said. "One who reports everything which he hears may, with justice, be called a liar." In this saying, he cautions us against

taking for truth everything which we may hear from others and holds the reporting of everything which one hears from others as equivalent to lying. Can it be then said of a man who gave such directions that he treated as divine revelation every tale which he heard from the Christians and took for divine doctrine every tenet which they taught? And when we consider the attitude of the Holy Prophet towards the Christians, it becomes still more apparent that he could not put any confidence in them in religious matters. When he was asked to whom the closing words of the first Surah of the Holy Quran, *viz*, "those who have gone astray," referred, he said they referred to the Christians. This shows that he looked upon the Christians as a people that had gone astray from the right teachings of the prophets, and that he looked upon them as such from the very outset, for the said Surah was one of the earliest revealed at Mecca. Mark also the following verses of the Holy Quran which throw further light on the attitude of the Holy Prophet towards the Christians and which clearly show that he could not expect any guidance from them:—

(*a*.) "And of those who say, 'verily we are Christians,' have We accepted the covenant. But they too have forgotten a part of that which they were warned . . . . . O people of the Scriptures now is Our Apostle come to you to clear up to you much that ye concealed of those scriptures, and to pass over much. Now hath a light and a clear Book come to you from God, by which God will guide him who followeth after His good pleasure, to paths of peace, and bring them out of the darkness to the light by His will, and guide them to the right path." (v. 17, 18).

(*b*.) "Surely now are they unbelievers who say, 'God is the Messiah son of Mary;' for the Messiah said, 'O children of Israel worship God, my Lord and your Lord.' . . . . . They surely are unbelievers who say, 'God is a third of three.' . . . . Say. O people of the Book! outstep not bounds of truth in your religion; neither follow the desires of those who have already gone astray, and caused many to go astray from the evenness of the way." (v. 76—81).

(*c*.) "Judge, therefore, between them by what God hath sent down, and follow not their desires after the truth which hath come unto thee." (v. 52)

(*d*.) "And truly, if after the knowledge that hath reached thee, thou follow their desires, thou shalt have no guardian, nor protector against God." (xiii, 37.)

(*e*.) "Woe to those who with their own hands transcribe the book and then say, 'This is from God'." (v. 81.)

The foregoing verses falsify the assertion that the Holy Prophet put full confidence in the ignorant Christians of Arabia and believed every word of their mouth as the very word which was

revealed to the prophet of Nazareth.

Nothing can be more foolish than the assertion that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) borrowed the contents of the Holy Quran from the Christians or the Jews. If he borrowed his materials from the Arabian Jews and Christians and then gave them out as divine revelation which had been brought to him by the Angel Gabriel, why did not the Christians and the Jews raise their voice against him and publicly denounce his revelation, saying that it was they who had supplied him with the material which he had now worked up into elaborate Surahs and given out as divine revelation. But never a single Jew or a Christian raised his indignant voice against him and never did any of them say that what he gave out as divine revelation he had learnt from him. Both the Jews and the Christians were among his opponents, and if they had been his informants, they could not have remained silent, when he claimed a divine origin for his utterances. The fact that they remained throughout silent, in spite of their bitter hostility to his mission, conclusively proves the fact that he was not indebted to them for any portion of his revelations.

Christian missionaries often refer to the Meccan verse, "And indeed we know that the unbelievers (of Mecca) say, verily a certain man teacheth him," as an evidence of the fact that the Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings from the professors of other faiths. The very fact, it is asserted, that the Quresh of Mecca accused him of receiving secret help from a certain man shows that there was some ground for suspicion. This verse, however, is an argument against the Christian critics rather than an evidence in their favour. The verse clearly leads to the following conclusions:—

Firstly, it shows that there was no open communication between the Holy Prophet and the Jews or Christians. The idolaters did not say that he received information from the Jews and the Christians that visited him at Mecca, which shows that there were no such visits and no recital of Jewish and Christian stories before him by Jewish or Christian visitors.

Secondly, it shows that it was neither the Jews nor the Christians that accused him of receiving instruction from them It was the idolaters of Mecca, and not the people of the book, that brought this charge against him and if the latter had been his informants, they could not have remained silent, seeing that they were as hostile to Islam as the former.

Thirdly, it shows that even the most intimate followers of the Holy Prophet were not aware of his receiving any secret instructions from any Jew or Christian. The Holy Prophet publicly and repeatedly denied that he received any secret help, which he could not have done if the charge had been true and his followers had been aware of it. Again it was not his own utterance, but what

he gave out to be a revelation from God that contained the denial, and if he had taken secret help and his followers had been aware of it, they could not have continued to be believers in his revelation. Thus it is certain that his followers never even suspected him of receiving any kind of help from others. But if he had taken secret help, the fact could not have remained a secret to his followers who lived in closest intimacy with him and continued to be firm believers in his sincerity to the end of their lives. And the fact that even the most intimate followers of the Holy Prophet continued to be staunch believers in his sincerity is a strong evidence of the fact that he never took any help from others either before the revelation of the said verse or after it.

Fourthly, according to Muir, the person who was suspected of giving secret help to the Holy Prophet was *Suhaib;* but the history of Suhaib is itself a sufficient refutation of this charge. It is thus given by Muir:—"A more important convert, styled by Mohammad 'the first fruits of Greece,' was Suhaib son of Sinan. His home was at Mosul or some neighbouring village in Mesopotamia. His father or his uncle, had been the Persian Governor of Obolla. A Grecian band having made a raid into Mesopotamia, carried him off while yet a boy to Syria, perhaps to Constantinople. Bought afterwards by a party of Bedouins, he was sold at Mecca to the chief, Ibn Jodaan, who gave him freedom and protection. . . . . By traffic, he acquired considerable wealth at Mecca; but having embraced Islam, and being left by the death of his master without a patron, he suffered much at the hands of unbelieving Coreish . . . . . At the general emigration to Medina, the people of Mecca endeavoured to prevent Suhaib's departure; but he bargained to relinquish his whole property that they might let him go free, Mohammad when he heard of it, exclaimed. 'Suhaib, verily, hath trafficked to profit." (page 61). I have quoted the above history of Suhaib from Muir's Life of the Holy Prophet in order to show the strength of his faith in him whose religion he had embraced. Can anything be more unreasonable than to say that a sincere believer who bore all sorts of troubles for his faith and even relinquished his hoarded wealth for the sake of his religion secretly helped the Holy Prophet by furnishing him material for the Holy Quran and even a pretended revelation denying the assistance he had rendered failed to shake his faith in the divine origin of the Holy Book?

The remark that the suspicion of the idolaters that the Holy Prophet received secret instruction from a Christian must have had some foundation is highly regrettable. The enemies of Islam not only accused the Holy Prophet of receiving secret help from others, but they also called him a sorcerer, a magician, a soothsayer, a maniac and the possessed. If so much weight is to be attached to every assertion of the opponents of Islam, and important conclusions

are to be based on the charges which they brought against the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), then we should also hold all other charges to be true and believe that the Holy Prophet was (God forbid) really a sorcerer and a soothsayer. But no sensible Christian believes him to be so. Why not apply the same principle to Jesus and believe that there must have been some truth in the charges which the Jews still bring against Jesus and his mother? Would Rev. Tisdall like to see this principle applied to Jesus and the holy virgin? If not, then he should do unto others as he would that others should do unto him.

I may here refer to a strange story told by a respectable Christian Journal called the "Calcutta Review." The April number of that Review for the year 1902 came out with the announcement that the Holy Prophet kept a Syrian Christian in concealment who was his angel that inspired him with revelation, and that when the Holy Prophet no longer needed his aid, he put him to 'a sudden and compulsory death.' I will not insult the intelligence of my readers by attempting to refute this foolish story. I have given it here only as a specimen of the falsehoods which pious Christian Missionaries spread about Islam and its holy founder. The article in which this announcement appeared was reprinted and circulated broadcast but the world has grown wiser and therefore the falsehood failed to find favour with the people.

Rev. Tisdall not only says things which are historically untrue, but he also says things which are so extremely foolish as to lead one to suspect that there was some thing wrong with his brain. He gives a curious account of the origin of the Quranic verse which says: "And when Jesus son of Mary said, O children of Israel, I am the apostle of God unto you, confirming that which was delivered unto you in the Tourat, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, named Ahmad," (lxi, 6) Tracing the word *Ahmad* in the above verse to the Greek word Paraklete in the Gospel of John, he says: "The origin of the misapprehension in the Quran came from the Arabs not knowing the meaning of Paraklete, and fancying it to signify Ahmad or the praised one, while the real sense of the name is the comforter. But there is in Greek another word which to the ear of a foreigner would have a nearly similar sound, namely Periclete (praised or celebrated); and it is extremely probable that the people of Arabia not familiar with Greek, mistook its meaning thus and named the promised one Ahmad, or the praised," Thus according to Rev. Tisdall, the word *Ahmad* in the Holy Quran is a mistranslation of the Greek word Paraklete. How did the Holy Prophet come to know the Greek word Paraklete? The question is answered by saying that as Arabs were not familiar with Greek, they mistook the word Paraklete for Periclete, which means 'the praised.' Now, the

mistaking of one word for another may denote want of thorough familiarity with the language, but it also implies a certain degree of acquaintance. Rev. Tisdall's argument leads us to infer that the Arabs of the day of the Holy Prophet knew enough of Greek to know that Periclete meant the praised, which shows that they had a fairly good knowledge of Greek. And it was the Greek-knowing Arabs who told the Holy Prophet that Jesus the Christ had predicted the advent of an Ahmad which led him to claim the prophecy for himself and fabricate the verse already quoted. And these Arabs were most probably his own followers who had accepted him as a prophet and who therefore applied the prophecy of Jesus to him. But will not even a child laugh at the idea that there were among his followers or among his contemporary Arabs men who had a fairly good knowledge of Greek? Can a sane man say such absurd things? The Christians were ignorant men, who, as Rev. Tisdall says, did not know even the four Gospels, but the Arabs had, according to him, sufficient knowledge of Greek to know the meaning of such difficult words as *periclete*. Was Rev. Tisdall in his senses when he wrote these things?

Rev. Tisdall's inconsistency.

It is strange that on the one hand Rev. Tisdall represents the Christians as totally ignorant of the true Christian scriptures, and on the other his researches show that they had thorough acquaintance with these books. He traces many teachings of the Holy Prophet to the books of the New Testament, and if it was through the Christians of Arabia that he obtained a knowledge of the New Testament passages quoted by Rev. Tisdall, it follows that his Christian informants had close acquaintance with the contents of the New Testament books. To illustrate this, I will refer to some of the passages which, Rev. Tisdall says, the Holy Prophet borrowed from the Christian Scriptures.

One of the passages quoted by our author as having been borrowed by the Holy Prophet is Rev. xix, 7—9, which runs thus: "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." It was this passage, says our learned author, which made the Holy Prophet prophesy that the Messiah of the latter days would live 40 years on earth and become married.

Another passage which Rev. Tisdall says, was borrowed by the Holy Prophet from the New Testament is: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." (Matthew xix, 24).

A third passage which, according to Rev. Tisdall, the Holy Prophet borrowed from the New Testament books is from the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Now if it is true that the Holy Prophet borrowed these and similar passages from the Christian

scriptures, it follows that his Christian informants had intimate acquaintance with these books, but the fact is, as Christian Missionaries themseves admit, that the Christians of Arabia did not possess that intimate acquaintance and therefore the Holy Prophet could not have borrowed these teachings from them.

The second coming of the Messiah.

Among the teachings which Rev. Tisdall says, he Holy Prophet borrowed from the Christians is the prophecy relating to the coming ot the Messiah in the latter days. But they will be unpleasantly undeceived when they learn that the Prophecy contains many internal evidences to show that it was an original Prophecy based on revelation from God.

The first internal evidence falsifying the Christian allegation is to be found in the words of the prophecy which say that the Messiah of the latter days shall appear in an age which will be marked by the predominance of the religion of the cross and that his first and most important work will be to break the cross. This one statement alone is sufficient to show that the Prophecy was not borrowed from the Christians.

The second internal evidence of its being an original and not a borrowed prophecy lies in the fact that the Messiah of the latter days was spoken of by the Holy Prophet as a leader of the Muslims from among themselves.' (*vide* the Sahih Bukharee). Such a Prophecy certainly could not come from a Christian source.

The third internal evidence of its being an independent prophecy is to be found in the fact that it not only contains predictions which are prejudicial to the interest of the Christian preachers, but also prophecies that the Christians never dreamt of. For instance among the signs of the advent of the Messiah it is stated that there will come into existence a conveyance which will lead to the abandonment of the camel which mean that the camels shall be abandoned so that no body will ride them. This, said the Holy Prophet, shall be a sign of the Massiah in the latter days and the whole world will be a witness to the fulfilment of this prophecy. In short, nothing can be clearer than the fact that the prophecy was revealed to the Holy Prophet and that he did not borrow it from any Christian or Jewish source.

Mary's parentage.

One wonders at the blindness of those who say that according to the Holy Prophet Mary mother of Jesus, was the sister of Moses, the Law-giver. Any one who reads the Holy Quran will see that it recognises the long distance of time which separates Jesus from Moses, yet it is asserted that the Holy Prophet regarded Jesus as the nephew of Moses. Noting can be more absurd ! This error, it is said, probably arose out of a Jewish legend that 'the angel of death had no power over Mary, Moses' sister, that she died with the kiss of the Lord, and

that no insect or worm could touch her person.' This story, it is assumed, led the Holy Prophet to think that Mary, mother of Jesus, was the same Mary over whom the angel of death had no power and that she lived down to the Christian era to become the mother of Jesus. The absurdity of this explanation is too gross to need any comment.

The Christians assume that the Holy Prophet did not know even this that more than one person could bear the same name and that when he heard that Jesus' mother was Mary, which was the name of Moses' sister, he did not know how to solve this problem except by supposing that Moses' sister, Mary, must have survived to the Christian era But what did he think of Mary the Copt, who was sent to her by Muckoukas, the Christian king of Egypt ? Did he think her also to be Moses' sister, that had survived to his own time ?

Really, the ignorance which they impute to the Holy Prophet reverts to their ownselves. The verses on the basis of which it is asserted that according to the Holy Prophet, Mary, mother of Jesus, was Moses' sister are the following : In Surah *Mariom* we are told that after the brith of the Holy Child, the people came to her and said, " O Sister of Aaron, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a wicked woman." Elsewhere she is spoken of as Mary, daughter of Imran. These verses have led the Christian critics to conclude that the Holy Prophet regard Mary the sister of Moses, brother of Aaron. So great is the prejudice of the Christian critics against Islam that while attacking the Holy Quran, they become forgetful even of their own scriptures 'daugter of Imran' and 'sister of Aaron' are open to objection, there are similar expressions in the Gospels which must also be held as objectionable. In Matt. I, 20, we read : "Behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him in his sleep, saying: *Joseph son of David*," &c. In chapter ix, 27 of the same Gospel, we have : "And as Jesus passed from thence, there followed him two blind men crying out and saying, Have mercy on us. *O son of David.*" Again, " And all the multitudes were amazed and said : *Is not this the son of David ?*" (Matt. xii, 23). Many more expressions of this type might be quoted but type foregoing three will suffice. Now what would the Christian think of the man who, on the score of these expressions, should accuse the Gospel writers of making grossly inaccurate statements by representing David as the father of Joseph and Jesus and representing the latter two as brothers, being the sons of one and the same father ? The Christians would certainly call such a man a fool. The multitudes called Jesus son of David because it was a custom among the people to call a man after the name of a distinguished ancestor. For the same reason Mary was called sister of *Aaron* and daughter of *Imran*, and if it is foolish to object to the term, 'son of David,' when used with

reference to Jesus and Joseph, it is equally foolish to object to the expressions 'daughter of Imran,' and 'sister of Aaron,' when used with reard to Mary. If the people addressed Mary as the sister of Aaron, they only followed their national custom and it is as foolish to say that the Holy Quran confounds Mary, mother of Jesus, with Mary, sister of Moses, as to say that the Gospels represent Joseph husband of Mary and Jesus son of Mary, as brothers, both being spoken of as sons of David, king of the Jews. Though almost all Christian critics have blindly objected to the use of these terms with regard to Mary, the true explanation given above has suggested itself to some of the Christian writers. Rodwell says in a foot-note on page 113. "If Aaron the brother of Moses be meant, Mary may be called his sister, either because she was of the Levitical race, or by way of comparison."

Besides, the Christians would have had come right to object to the terms 'daughter of Imran' and 'sister of Aaron' used with regard to Mary, if they had known who the parents of Mary were. They themselves are in absolute darkness as to the parentage of Mary but when the Holy Quran speaks of her as 'daughter of Imran,' they take an exception to it, if they knew who her father was. Being themselves ignorant of the name of Mary's father, they had no right to object to the Quranic expressions, even if they were taken too literally, unless they showed that among the Jews there was only one Imran (Heb. Amram) and only one Aaron and they were the father and the brother of Moses, the law-giver, respectively. When they cannot show this, when, as a matter of fact, both these names were common among the Jews, and when they themselves are ignorant of Mary's parentage, is it not foolish for them to object to the use of these expressions, even if the expressions be interpreted in the way in which they interpret it? To quote once more from the Gospels, in Matthew I, 16, we read "And Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." From this quotation it appears that Mary mother of Jesus, was the wife of Joseph and that Joseph was the son of Jacob. Should we then conclude that this verse represents Mary, mother of Jesus, as the wife of that Joseph that was cast into a well and sold as a slave in Egypt, and should we say that this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Joseph, husband of Mary, is spoken of as the son of Jacob? If it is foolish to draw such a conclusion from the verse quoted above, it is equally foolish to say that wherever the names Aaron and Imran (Amram) occur as the names of a son and a father, they must be taken as referring to the Aaron and the Amram who were respectively the brother and the father of Moses. In the verse quoted above the names Joseph and Jacob are mentioned as the names of a son and a father, but they do not refer to the Joseph and the Jacob that were great-grandson and grandson of Abraham respectively. Thus the objection of the Christian critics

must be rejected as foolish even if we interpret the words of the Holy Quran in the way in which the Christian critics interpret them. That the Christians are ignorant of the parentage of Mary, mother of Jesus, is apparent from the following quotation from the Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol xv, page 590 :—" Of her (Mary's) parentage nothing is recorded in any extant historical document of the first century, for the genealogy in Luke iii, (cf. i, 27) is manifestly that of Joseph."

The readers have seen the absurdity of the Christian objection which has been just discussed and it is pity that almost all Christian writers (and among them are such eminent men as Professor Noldeke) who have dealt with the subject, have fallen into this deplorable error. From this the reader may judge the worth of their other objections against Islam. They may be otherwise eminent critics, but they behave like children when they deal with Islam. Disappointing as the conduct of these critics of Islam is, we believe that among those who now judge of Islam and its Holy Founder (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) by the portraits drawn by ignorant Christians, there will be many that will welcome the truth when they learn it.

THE STORIES OF THE HOLY QURAN.

Rev. Tisdall and other Christian critics have made a serious blunder with regard to the stories contained in the Holy Quran. The stories of the former prophets and the earlier people have been spoken of in the Holy Quran as anbáulghaib or, to quote the translaition of Rodwell, "the announcements of the things unseen." These words and similar other expressions used in connection with these stories have been misunderstood by the Christians They seem to think that the Holy Prophet, by calling these stories announcements of the things unseen, meant that these were secret stories which were not known to him, and that the very fact that he recited to the people these secret histories was a clear proof of his being an inspired prophet of God. Though it is true that most of these histories were not known to him and he was not indebted to any Christian or Jew for the knowledge of these histories, yet it is not to this circumstance that the Holy Quran refers when it speaks of them as the announcements of the things unseen. The Holy Quran nowhere states that the Holy Prophet should be accepted as a true prophet, because he was a teller of secret stories. No doubt the stories of the earlier prophets and the earlier generations have repeatedly been referred to in the Holy Quran as 'signs' of the Holy Prophet's truth, but one who thinks the sign lay in the fact that the Holy Prophet told stories which were not known to him, betrays a deplorable ignorance of the Holy Quran. Rodwell, in a footnote to the story of Joseph says, "Mr. Muir thinks that

Mohammad must at this period, while recasting and working up these materials, have entered upon a course of wilful dissimulation and deceit in claiming inspiration for them." One can not sufficiently condemn the impudence of Christain critics in so hastily accusing the Holy Prophet of wilful dissimulation and deceit. They pretend to be very intelligent critics, but one wonders at the stupidity which they betray in criticising Islam. It requires no great amount of intelligence to understand the reasons for which the stories of the earlier prophets were revealed to the Holy Prophet and why they were referred to as signs. From the Holy Quran it plainly appears that most of the stories of the earlier people and their prophets were meant as prophecies I draw the attention of the reader to the following verses which indicate the purpose for which most of these stories were revealed :—

(*a*). "And before thee We have only sent men, chosen out of the people of the cities, to whom We made revelation.....Until when the appostles lost all hope, and (people) deemed that they were deluded Our aid reached them, and We delivered whom We would ; but Our vengeance was not averted from the wicked. *Certainly in their histories is a lesson for men of understanding.*" (xii,109—111).

(*b.*) Hath not the story reached you of those who were before you, the people of Noah, and Ad and Thamood, and of those that lived after them ?" None knoweth them but God. When their prophets came to them with proofs, they laid their hands on their mouths, and said 'In sooth, we believe not your message ; and in sooth of that to which you bid us, we are in suspicions doubt.'...And they who believed not said to their apostles, 'Forth from our land will we surely drive you, or, to our religion surely shall ye return.' Then their Lord revealed to them, 'We will certainly destroy the wicked doers, and We shall certainly cause you to dwell in the land after them. This, for him, who dreadeth My judgment seat and who dreadeth My menace.' Then sought they (*i.e*, the prophets) help from God, and every proud rebellious one perished. (xiv, 9—18).

(*c.*) Now know We that what they speak vexeth thee..... Before thee have apostles already been charged with falsehood : but they bore the charge with constancy, till Our help reached them, and none can change the decrees of God. *And verily the history of the apostles has already reached thee.*" (vi, 33—34),

(*d.*) "And all that We have related to thee of the histories of these apostles, it to confirm thy heart therewith, and by these hath the truth reached thee, and monition and a warning to those who believe : (xi,—121).

For the foregoing verses it is apparent that the stories of the Holy Quran are not meant to serve as a proof that the Holy Pro-

phet could tell secret stories so that the mere revelation of such hidden tales might serve as an evidence of his being an inspired prophet. They were revealed with a purpose. In these histories there was a lesson for men endued with understanding. They were revealed so that the heart of the Holy Prophet might be confirmed thereby. The Holy Prophet was laughed to scorn, and if he was himself weak and helpless, the prophets before him were also laughed to scorn, and their enemies said to them, 'Forth from our land will we surely drive you, or to our religion surely shall ye return.' but God revealed to His apostles, 'We will certainly destroy the wicked-doers, and we shall certainly cause you to dwell in the land after them.' Who can be so blind as not to see in this a prophecy to the effect that God would certainly destroy the enemies of the Holy Prophet and would cause him and his followers to dwel in the land after them? When God said "And verily the history of the apostles hath already reached thee," He did not mean that He had told him hidden stories which he and his people did not know before. These words evidently meant that in the history of the apostles, there were prophecies for him and his people. It is not then foolish to think that when the Holy Prophet spoke of the stories of the former prophets as "announcements of the things unseen," he did not mean that he was telling the people certain tales which they did not know before. If he claimed inspiration for these histories and if he called them announcements of the things unseen, he never referred to the fact that the stories were before unknown to him, but he meant that they contained prophecies relating to him and his adversaries which it was beyond his power as a mortal to predict. That he never based his claims to prophecy on the circumstance that he was a teller of secret stories is apparent from the fact that among the prophets whose histories are to be found in the Holy Quran, we also find the prophets with whose stories the Arabs were well acquainted. Such are for instance, Salih, the apostle of the Thamood, and Hud, the prophet of the Ad. But the Holy Quran relates the stories of these prophets just as it gives the histories of Noah, Abraham, Moses, &c. Nay, it even refers to the stories of Salih and Hud as signs, just as it refers to the histories of other prophets as signs, (*vide* Surah xxvi). From this it is clear that the Holy Prophet did not call these histories signs because they were secret stories which had been revealed to him by God. He called them signs, because they embodied prophecies which being fulfilled were to serve as signs of his truth.

The purpose for which the histories of the former prophets and the stories of the previous generations were revealed to the Holy Prophet becomes still more apparent when we consider the warnings given to the opponents of Islam to learn a lesson from

the fate of the previous people whose histories were rehearsed to them in the Holy Quran. The reader is requested to note the following verses of the Holy Quran.

(*a*). "There have been apostles before thee laughed to scorn: but that which they laughed to scorn encompassed the mockers among them! Say: Go through the lands: then *see what hath been the end of those who treated them as liars.*" (vi, 9, 10).

(*b.*) "But how many generations have. We destroyed" ere the days of these (the Meccans), mightier than they in strength! Search ye then the land—was there any escape! Lo! herein is warning for him who hath a heart, or lendeth the ear, and is himself attentive." (L, 35, 36).

(*c.*) "They who preceded them accused *their prophets* of falsehood, so a punishment came upon them whence they looked not for it, and God made them taste humiliation in this present life. ... Now have We set before men in this Quran every kind of example that haply they might be monished." (xxxix, 26—28).

(*d.*) "And if they (the Meccans) turn away, then say: I warn you of a punishment like the punishment of Ad and Thamood," (xli, 12).

(*e.*) "They swore by God with their mightiest oath that should a warner come to them, they would yield to guidance more than any other people: but when the warner came to them, it only increased in them their estrangement, their haughtiness on earth and their plotting of evil! But the plotting of evil shall only encompass those that make use of it. Can they, then, expect aught but God's way of dealing with the peoples of old! Thou shalt by no means find any change in the way of God—yea, thou shalt not find any variableness in the way of God. Have they never journeyed in the land and seen what hath been the end of these who flourished before them, mightier in strength than they! God is not to be frustrated by aught in the Heavens or in the Earth; verily He is the all-knowing, the all-mighty." (xxxv, 40—43).

(*f*) "This, from the histories of the cities which We relate to thee. Some of them are standing, others mown down. And We dealt not unfairly by them but they dealt not fairly by themselves, and their gods on whom they called beside God availed them not at all when thy Lord's behest came to pass, and they did but increase their ruin. Such was thy Lord's punishment when He punished the cities that had been wicked, verily His punishment is afflictive, severe! Herein truly is a sign for him who feareth the torment of the latter day." (xi, 102—105).

(*g.*) "Before thee indeed have apostles been mocked at—and I bore long with the unbelievers; then, I chastised them;—and how severe was my punishment." (xiii, 32).

(*h.*) "Are they (the enemies of the Holy Prophet, better than the people of Tobba and those who flourished before them, whom We destroyed? Of a truth, they were evil-doers." (xliv, 36, 37).

(*i.*) "And how many cities were mightier in strength than the city which hath thrust thee forth! We destroyed them, and there was none to help them." (xlvii, 14)

(*j*) "Truly they who oppose God and His apostle shall be brought low, as those who were before them were brought low. And now have We sent down demonstrative signs, and for the unbelievers is a disgraceful chastisement." (lviii, 6).

(*k.*) "Have they never journeyed through the land, and seen what hath been the end of those who were before them? Mightier were they than these in strength; and they broke up the land and cultivated it more than these have cultivated it; and their apostles came to them with proofs of their mission: and it was not God who would wrong them, but they wronged themselves; then evil was the end of the evil-doors, because they had treated the signs of God as lies, and laughed them to scorn." (xxx, 8, 9).

These verses of the Holy Quran sufficiently indicate the purpose for which the histories of the former generations and their prophets were revealed to the Holy Prophet, said the Holy Quran, was a warner like the warners that had preceded him and it was the law of God that He destroyed the enemies of the prophets and gave His servants victory over their opponents. That was an unalterable law of God and the Holy Prophet being a true Prophet, his enemies were to be dealt with in the same way in which the enemies of the former prophets had been dealt with. "Verily," proclaimed the Holy Quran "they who oppose God and His apostle shall be amongst the most low. God hath written this decree, 'I will surely prevail, I and My apostle.' Truly God is Strong, Mighty." (lviii, 21). It was to illustrate this law of God that most of the histories of the former prophets and their people were repeatedly rehearsed to the enemies of Islam. The purpose of these histories becomes still more apparent from the histories themselves. When one reads these histories one feels that the object of the narrator is, not to tell a story, but to teach a lesson. To illustrate this, I will take certain concrete instances.

The story of Noah.

Let us begin with Noah. Read the story of this prophet in chapter X of the Holy Quran. It begins thus: "Also recite to them the history of Noah." These words with which the story is introduced clearly indicate its Purpose. God oommands the Holy Prophet to recite to his people the story of Noah. Why? Because there was a lesson

in it for them. Then follow the words of Noah which he addressed to his people and which run thus:—"If O my people! My abode with you and my reminding you of the signs of God be grievous to you, yet in God is my trust. Muster, therefore, your designs and your false gods, and let not your design be carried on in the dark: then come to some decision about me, and delay me not." Does the reader think that these were mere words of a story? The Holy Prophet was not telling the story of Noah; it was as much his own story as it was the story of Noah and the words which the latter addressed to his People were really addressed by the Holy Prophet to his own people. The Holy Prophet said to his People in the words of Prophet Noah "In God is my trust. Muster your designs and your false gods and let not your design be carried on in the dark: then come to some decision about me and delay me not.' These were bold words and they contained a challenge to the people of Mecca and their allies to do all that lay in their power to destroy the Holy Prophet if they could. Instead of destroying him, it was announced they would only destroy themselves, like the people of Noah. Then after relating how God saved Noah and destroyed his enemies, the Holy Quran concludes the story with the following words which are very significant "See, then, what was the end of these warned ones!" meaning that similar would be the fate of the warned ones of the days of the Holy Prophet. In chapter XI, the Holy Quran quotes the words which the people of Noah addressed to him. It says: "Then said the chiefs of the People who believed not, 'We see in thee but a man like ourselves; and we see not who have followed thee except our meanest ones of hasty judgment, nor see we any excellence in you above ourselves: nay, we deem you liars." But this was actually what the proud chiefs of Mecca, such as Abu Jehl, Otba, Shaiba and others, said with regard to the Holy Prophet and his followers and therefore in the story of Noah and his people there was a lesson for them. Noah and his followers were deemed weak by their proud foes and were even treated with contempt, but God assisted those that were accounted weak and destroyed their haughty enemies. And the Holy Prophet was a Warner from God, just as Noah was a Warner and his enemies were to be brought to naught, as the opponents of Noah were brought to naught. Note the words with which the story of Noah as narrated in Chapter XI concludes. "This is one of the secret histories" says the Holy Quran, "We reveal it unto thee, neither thou nor thy people knew it ere this, be patient then, verily there is a Prosperous issue to the God-fearing," Why is the story of Noah called a secret history? It is so called not because the story of the deluge was unknown to the Holy Prophet and his opponents, but because it was really the future history of the Holy Prophet and his people themselves. The words which have been translated as 'secret histories' literally mean

'announcements of the things unseen.' "Neither thou nor thy people knew it ere this." This does not mean that the facts of the story of Noah were not known to them. It was their own future history foretold in the story of Noah that was unknown to them. The chiefs of Mecca did not know that they were destined to meet with destruction. They were a powerful people who regarded the poor followers of the Holy Prophet with contempt. They had never even dreamt of their woeful end which was foretold to them in the story of Noah and his people. The Holy Prophet also did not know this until it was revealed to him by God. God says, "Be patient then; verily there is a prosperous issue to the Godfearing." These words coming at the end of the story of Noah clearly indicate the purpose for which the story was revealed. They mean that just as there was a prosperous issue to Noah and his followers, and God assisted them against their enemies, similarly He would assist the Holy Prophet and his poor followers against their powerful enemies and would lead the haughty chiefs of Mecca to a disastrous end. Thus the story of Noah was a secret history inasmuch as it predicted triumph for the Holy Prophet and ruin for his enemies. It is to this fact that the Holy Quran refers when speaking of Noah and his People in Chapter XXIII, it says, "verily in this are signs." (xxiii, 31).

Shuaib. Moses and other Prophets.

What is true of the story of Noah is also true of the stories of the other Prophets. Read these stories carefully and you will find that they are so many prophecies relating to the Holy Prophet in every thing which is said about the former Prophets there is a lesson for those who reflects. What the Prophets said to their people was also applicable to the People of the Holy Prophet. In Sura *Ewl* for instance we have the following account of what the people of Shuaib said to their Prophet and what he said to his people, and these words applied with equal force to the Holy Prophet and his people. They (the people of Shuaib) said, "O Shuaib! we understand not much of what thou sayest, and we clearly see that thou art Powerless among us. Were it not for thy family we would surely stone thee, nor couldst thou prevail against us." Now this was exactly what the people of Mecca said to the Holy Prophet and the following reply which the Prophet Shuaib gave to his people was clearly meant as a reply to the chiefs of Mecca :—

"He said" continues the Holy Quran, "'O my people! does my family stand higher in your esteem than God? Cast ye him behind your back, with neglect? Verily, my Lord is round about your actions. And, O my people, act with what Power ye can for my hurt: I verily will act: and ye shall know on whom shall light a punishment that shall disgrace him, and who is the liar. Await ye; verily I will await with you.'" In these words, the chiefs of

Mecca were told by the Holy Prophet that they might act with what power they could do hurt him, that their efforts to ruin him would be of no avail, for his trust was in God, and that they would soon know who would be punished by God; and they were asked to wait for the fulfilment of this divine promise.

Space does not allow me to go on quoting instances of how the stories of the previous Prophets serve as prophecies which foretell the success of the Holy Prophet and the destruction of his enemies. I will only quote here a few more verses to show that the people of Mecca were repeatedly warned to take a lesson from the fate of the people whose histories were rehearsed to them in the Holy Quran. The reader is requested to note the following verses :—

(*a.*) " Before them the people of Noah, Ad, and Pharaoh the lord of the stakes, treated their Prophets as imposters; and Thamood, and the people of Lot, and the dwellers in the forest (the people of Shuaib); these were the confederates; all verily did naught but charge the apostles with falsehood, just therefore was my retribution, (xxxviii, 11—13).

(*b.*) " To the people of Pharoah also came the threatenings; all our signs did they treat as impostures; therefore punished We then as He only can punish who is the Mighty, the Strong. Are your unbelievers, *O Meccans*, better men than these ? Is there any example for you in the sacred books ? " (liv, 41—43).

(*c*) " Verily, We have sent you an Apostle to bear witness to you even as We sent an apostle to Pharaoh : but Pharaoh rebelled against the apostle, and We laid hold on him with a severe chastisement. So, how, if you believe not, will ye screen yourselves from the day that shall turn children grey-headed ? " (lxxiii, 15.)

(*d.*) " Their state is like that of the people of Pharaoh and of those before them who believed not in the signs of God : therefore God seized upon them in their sin ! Verily, God is mighty, severe in punishing ..... Their state is like that of the People of Pharaoh and of those before them who treated their Lord's signs as lies. We therefore destroyed them in their sins, and We drowned the People of Pharaoh ; for they were all doers of wrong." (viii, 54, 56).

(*e.*) " Verily, in this present life We assuredly succour Our apostles, and those who believe and We will assuredly succour them on the day when the witnesses shall stand forth." (xl, 54).

The foregoing verses clearly lead to the conclusion that the stories of the Prophets and their people that are to be found in the Holy Quran are not related therein without a purpose. They are meant to serve as warnings for the enemies of Islam, who are over and again spoken of as expecting only the fate of the previous generations. The histories of the former Prophets contain a solace for the Holy Prophet, promises of assistance to him and his follow-

ers and threats of punishment to their enemies. Some of these histories not only contain a general prediction of the success of Islam and the complete annihilation of its enemies, but they also foretell many events in the life of the Holy Prophet. I have already quoted verses from the Holy Quran which liken the Holy Prophet to Moses and warn his enemies of a fate similar to the one which befell Pharaoh and his hosts. The Holy Prophet is spoken of as the like of Moses and we find many striking parallels in the lives of these two illustrious Prophets. It was to point out this similarity between himself and his great predecessor Moses, that the Holy Prophet called Abu Jehl the Pharaoh of his people. And just as Moses fled from Egypt with his followers, so did the Holy Prophets. And just as Pharaoh and his hosts enraged at their flight pursued Moses and his people in order to destroy them; so did Abu Jehl and his followers issue from Mecca to destroy the small band of the Muslim emigrants, but they met with the same fate at the field of Badr which had befallen Pharaoh and his followers in the sea. On that day were fulfilled the words of the Holy Quran which said, "Their state is like that of the people of Pharaoh and of those before them who treated their Lord's signs as lies. We, therefore, destroyed them in their sins and we drowned the people of Pharaoh; for they were all doers of wrong."

The story of Joseph.

Of the stories of the Prophets the longest is that of Prophet Joseph, and it is meet for us to see whether that lengthy story is narrated in the Holy Quran merely for amusement or whether it has a purpose similar to the one for which other stories are given in the Holy Book. Rodwell refers to this story as a clear proof "that Mohammed must have been in confidential intercourse with learned Jews," while Muir infers from it that the Holy Prophet must at this period have entered upon a course of wilful dissimulation and deceit in claiming inspiration for such stories. Thus according to these pious Christians, the Holy Prophet borrowed his materials for this story from certain learned Jews with whom he was in confidential intercourse and then gave it out as a revelation from God and as a proof of the fact that he was a true Prophet. Such base imputations only reflect on those that make them.

Read Chapter XII of the Holy Quran which gives the story of Joseph, and also go through that portion of Genesis which deals with this subject and you will find that the former is the Word of God while the latter comes from the hand of man. The author of Genesis tells us merely a story; he aims at nothing higher than this. He tells us a tale merely for the sake of the tale. Read the story of Genesis from beginning to end and you will find that there is not a word in it to show that the author had any object higher than the mere telling of a story. His object is not to instruct, but to amuse.

He nowhere desires his reader to draw any lesson from it. Christians may draw a hundred lessons from it, but they may likewise draw a hundred lessons from a Sanskrit romance. This does not show that the story was written to teach us any lesson or to impress on us any truth. There is nothing said by the author to show that he wants us to draw any lesson from it. On the other hand there is enough of evidence in it to show that his object is only to tell us a story. He does not pretend to be more than a story-teller or at best a historian. It is really like a tale with which a grandfather amuses his grandchildren that climb his knees to hear from him an amusing story. Christians of to-day may point to many things in it which may teach us some lesson, but they cannot point to any word of the writer to show that he wrote expressly with the object of reading us a lesson. But such is not the case with the story of Joseph as related in the Holy Quran. It is not related there merely as a story or to serve as an evidence of the fact that the Holy Prophet could tell hidden stories. It is meant to teach us many lessons and attention is drawn to those lessons in express words. Mark for instance the words with which the story is introduced. They run thus:—"Assuredly in Joseph and his brethren are signs for the inquirers." Thus at the very outset, it is pointed out that what follows is not related merely as a story, but that it contains many signs for those that seek after truth. Again mark the words with which the story concludes. As soon as the story comes to an end, God says:—"This is of the announcements of the things unseen which We reveal to thee." Thus according to the Holy Quran the story contains "announcements of the things unseen" or in other words, many future events were announced in the story which were to serve as signs for the inquirers. This is also clear from the next verse which says. "Thou wast not present with Joseph's brethren when they concerted their design and laid their plot." This verse hinted at the fact that just as the brethren of Joseph had concerted their designs and laid their plots against Joseph, similarly the Quresh of Mecca who were brethren of the Holy Prophet would concert their plans and lay their plots to destroy him. The next verse says that though people would see the sign of deliverance from the plots of the brethren, "yet the greater part of men, though thou ardently desire it, will not believe."

The verses which follow also corroborate the conclusion that the story was meant as a lesson for those who would reflect. They speak of other Prophets that had appeared before the Holy Prophet and it is said that 'certainly in their histories is a lesson for men of understanding.' Thus there was a lesson in the story of Joseph also because he was also one of the previous prophets.

Before, however, I show what were 'the things unseen which were announced in the story of Joseph and what were the signs for the inquirers to which God refers in the beginning of the Sura, I

wish to draw the attention of the reader to some of the points which differentiate the story as told in the Holy Quran from that of Genesis.

In the first place there is the declaration at the very outset that "in Joseph and his brethern are signs for the inquirers" This announcement shows that the story is not going to be related merely for its own sake or as a proof of the fact that the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) could repeat unknown stories, but that it is related because it contains not one but many signs for those who inquire. The addition of the word 'brethren' to 'Joseph' is significant. It shows that 'the things unseen' which have been announced in the course of this story concern not only the Holy Prophet but also his brethren, the Quresh. In the third verse of this Sura it is stated that the things unseen that are going to be announced in this Sura are such as even the Holy Prophet was yet ignorant of. The verse says, "In revealing to thee this Quran, we relate to thee the best narration, and verily thou wast unaware, (*i.e.*, of the future events which are going to be announced in this story).

Another peculiarity of the Quranic narrative of Joseph is that it is so told as to impress upon the reader a consciousness of the knowledge and power of God. When the boy Joseph is cast by his brethern into the pit, there in the bottom of the well when destruction yawned at him from all sides, the Word of God came to him saying, "Thou wilt assuredly tell them of this their deed, and they will be heedless of it." And what follows is a fulfilment of this Divine promise. As God traces the way in which this powerful promise was fulfilled' He requires the readers at every stage to pause and ponder over the course of events which finally led to the realisation of that wonderful promise. Thus after narrating how He rescued Joseph from the well and gave him an honourable abode in the house of an Egyptian, God says, "Thus did We give Joseph abode in the land that We may instruct him in the interpretation of sayings, for God is equal to His promise, but most men know it not." Again when he was finally invested with the high dignity of a viceroy by the king of the country, God once more draws the attention of the reader to His wonderful works by saying. "Thus did We establish Joseph in the land that he might house himself therein at pleasure. We pour down our mercy on whom We will, and suffer not the reward of the righteous to perish."

Then we have the pathetic scene of the sons of Jacob standing like humble servants before a prince who in no other than the whilom boy whom they had cast into a pit in the wilderness of Canaan. The prince asks these vistors "Know ye what ye did to Joseph and to his brother in your ignorance." Then the truth suddenly lights upon the brethren who recognise in the prince their

brother Joseph when they had cast into the pit and they ask "Art thou indeed Joseph ?" "I am Joseph" replies the prince, "and this my brother. Now hath God been gracious to us. Verily whose feareth God and endureth—aye verily God will not suffer the reward of the righteous to perish!" The brethren struck with shame confess their guilt by saying, 'By God! surely now hath God chosen thee above us, and verily we have been sinners," to which Joseph gives the kind reply, "No blame be on you this day. God will forgive you, for He is the most Merciful of those that show mercy." Thus was fulfilled the word of God which he had spoken to Joseph when the latter was in the bottom of a desolate well. "Thou wilt assuredly tell them of this their deed and they will be heedless of it."

Then comes the concluding scene of this significant drama when the parents of Joseph and his brethren prostrate themselves on the ground as a token of their gratitude to God for His bringing about a meeting between them and Joseph. There does Joseph remind his father of his vision which saw its fulfilment on that memorable day, saying, "O my father, this is the realization of my dream of old. My Lord hath now made it true and hath dealt graciously with me, since He took me forth from the prison, and hath brought you up out of the desert, after that Satan had stirred up strife between me and my brethren, verily my Lord is gracious to whom He will ; verily He is the Knowing, the Wise." Thus the narrative of Joseph as given is the Holy Quran begins with a wonderful promise made to the boy when he was in the pit, and in the course of the story attention is repeatedly drawn to the means which God employed to carry out His will, so that it clearly appears that the object of the narrator is not to tell a story, but to show how He fulfilled the wonderful promise which He made to the boy Joseph at a time when the latter lay in the bottom of a pit in the wilderness of Canaan. But such is not the case with the narrative as given Genesis. There the object of the story-teller is merely to tell a story.

Another distinguishing feature of the Quranic narrative is that in it Joseph is cleared of the charge for which he was cast into prison. He was falsely accused by his Master's wife and sent to prison. Thus a slur was cast on his character, but the story in Genesis does not clear his name of this spot. Indeed it represents him as innocent, but it states nothing to show that his character was cleared in the eyes of his contemporaries. The charge for which he was sent to the prison was known to the people and in the story he is not given any opportunity to clear his character and prove his innocence. It is inconceivable, however, that a person like Joseph should have been accused of a heinous crime and should have done nothing to clear himself of that false accusation. Hence

in the Holy Quran we find it stated that when the king sent a messenger to Joseph in the prison, he refused to quit the prison until the king investigated his case and ascertained for himself whether the charge for which he was cast in prison was true. He would not leave the dungeon until he had vindicated his character. The inquiry was held by the king in person and Joseph did not leave the prison until his conduct was publicly cleared of all blame and the woman that had solicited him, and had been instrumental in having him sent to the jail admitted her guilt, saying, "Now doth the truth appear. It was I who would have led him into unlawful love, and he is assuredly one of the truthful." The other women also said, "We know not any ill of him." Joseph is then reported to have said that he had caused that inquiry to be held "that my Master may learn that I did not in his absence play him false and that God guideth not the machinations of the deceivers." In short it was only after he had been proved to be innocent that he left the prison. Every respectable man in his position would have done that, for no honourable man can bear it for a moment that he should be falsely accused of such a heinous charge and he should do nothing to clear his name even when he is afforded an opportunity to do so. God who is always jealous for His holy servants could not allow such a stain to remain on his character and it was necessary that He should have afforded him an opportunity to clear himself of that heinous charge. The story in Genesis, however, does not allow any such opportunity to Joseph which is a clear proof of its being a defective story. In this there is also an evidence of the fact that the story in Genesis was not written to be a lesson, for a tale which represents a holy man as falsely charged with a heinous crime and allows him no opportunity to vindicate his character is anything but an instructive story.

There are many other points which show the inferiority of the tale in Genesis and even prove its erroneousness, but space does not allow me to dwell at greater length on this comparison here. So I will turn to the prophecies contained in this important Sura. God says the story contains the announcement of the things unseen, so let us see what were the things unseen which the story announced. It does not require any great effort on our part to discover them. "Assuredly," said God "in Joseph and his brethren are signs for the inquirers." Joseph evidently represented the Holy Prophet and Joseph's brethren represented the Quresh who were brethren to the Holy Prophet. And the analogy between the events in the life of the Holy Prophet and those in the life of Joseph is so remarkable that one feels not the slightest doubt as to what were foretold in this Sura. The words 'Joseph and his brethren,' as I have already pointed out, show that the events that were predicted in this Sura concerned both the Holy Prophet and his brethren the

Quresh. And nothing is more striking than the parallelism which exists between the relations of the Holy Prophet and the Quran and those of Joseph and his brethren. The Sura tells us that Joseph saw a vision which was interpreted by his father to signify that the Lord would take him as his elect and teach him the interpretation of sayings and perfect His favours upon him and upon the family of Jacob as aforetime He had perfected them on his fathers, Abraham and Isaac. Similarly, the Holy Prophet received revelations from Heaven which foretold glory for him and promised the perfecting of favours on him as He had perfected His favours upon his fathers Abraham and Ishmael. And just as the brethren of Joseph, being roused to envy by these promises of exaltation and by the favours which their father bestowed on him conspired to slay him or to cast him forth to some distant land so that they might get rid of him once for all, similarly the brethren of the Holy Prophet being enraged at the Holy Prophet's prophecies of future greatness and the favour with which he was regarded by their Heavenly Father who, to their utter mortification, granted him greater and greater success every day plotted to get rid of him by means similar to those adopted by the sons of Jacob.

Again as, thanks to the intrigues of his brethren, Joseph had to live for some time in the bottom of the pit, similarly, the Holy Prophet was driven by the bloody conspiracies of the Quresh to take refuge in the interior of a dark cave. And just as the Word of God came to Joseph to comfort him in the pit, similarly we find the holy occupant of the cave, who had unshakeable faith in the word of God which had promised him victory over his enemies, saying to his illustrious companion, " Fear not, for God is with us."

Again, just as God gave Joseph an honourable abode in the new land, similarly He granted the Holy Prophet an honourable abode in the new city.

In the story of Joseph, God dwells at great length on the famine that visited the land and on the resort of the people to Joseph for succour. Exactly the same thing happened in the case of the Holy Prophet The *Sahih Bukharee* gives the following account of the famine that visited Arabia in the days of the Holy Prophet, " When the Holy Prophet saw that the people had turned their backs on God, he prayed 'Let there be seven years of famine like the seven years of drought in the time of Joseph' (so that the people might turn to God). Thereupon they were afflicted by a famine which was so severe that it consumed everything until they ate hides, dead bodies and carrion. When one of them looked towards the heaven, he saw a mist before his eyes on account of hunger." Part I, page 114. This was a fulfilment of the prophecy which was revealed to the Holy Prophet at Mecca and which ran thus :—" Wait until the day when the Heaven shall give out a

palpable mist which shall enshroud men : this, an afflictive torment." (xliv, 9, 10).

And just as people sought relief from the terrors of famine by taking recourse to Joseph, similarly, the Arabs of the desert betook themselves to the Holy Prophet to seek refuge from the terrible drought with which their land was striken. Joseph, however, relieved men by supplying them with corn from the granaries of the land, but the Holy Prophet drew not upon any earthly treasure, but upon the heavenly treasure of Him who is the Lord of both heaven and earth. Read the following account of the way in which he relieved the people from distress. The *Sahih Bukharee* says, on the authority of *Ans* and others, " The Holy Prophet was delivering a sermon on Friday, when a person came from the desert, entered the mosque by the door which was opposite the pulpit and standing before the Holy prophet, said, ' O Apostle of God, the cattle have perished and the roads have been abandoned (on account of robbers), so pray to God that He may send us rain.' Thereupon he raised his hands and prayed thrice saying, 'O God ! send us rain.' By God, says Ans, not a bit of a cloud was visible on the heavens. But when he prayed, there suddenly appeared a cloud from behind Mount Sila before our eyes which was like a shield in appearance. When it reached the middle of the sky, it spread and it began to rain while the Holy Prophet was yet on the pulpit. By God, continues Ans, it continued to rain from that Friday to the next Friday so that we did not see the sun during these days. When the Holy Prophet ascended the pulpit the following Friday, that man or some other man entered the mosque from that very door and said, 'O Apostle of God, the cattle have perished and the roads have been abandoned and houses have fallen (on account of excessive rain), so pray to God that rain may cease.' The Holy Prophet smiled and raising his hands said, 'O God (cause it to rain) about us and not upon us. O God, (cause it to rain) on hills and mountains, on rocks and valleys, and on the places where the trees grow.' Thereupon, says Ans, it ceased to rain, so that it was in sunshine that we went back to our homes. But it continued to rain all about Medina, so that, says Ans, the city was like a diadem set in a ring." Such signs of the Holy Prophet were so often witnessed by the people that the italicised words in the following couplet of Abu Talib were applied to him in their literal sense. The verses from which this couplet is taken were composed by Abu Talib to describe the noble character of his illustrious nephew and the purport of the couplet in question runs thus :—

"He is pure and *the clouds take drink from his face*. He is the helper of the orphans and the support of the widows. And like the brethren of Joseph, even the Quresh were compelled by long drought to seek help from their brother, the Holy Prophet. For in

the Sahih Bukharee we are told that Abu Sufian, being constrained by the terrible famine that prevailed in the land, visited the Holy Prophet at Medina, and said, O Mohammad, thou hast come to bid men to show affection to kindred. Thy people have perished (on account of famine), so pray to God for them." For this sign of the Holy Prophet see Bukharee, Part I page 114—116. In short, the famine, the turning of the people and of his own kith and kin to him for assistance and the relief which God sent to them by hearing his prayers constitute another remarkable analogy between Joseph and the Holy Prophet.

Again, just as the sojourn of Joseph in the strange land led to his glory and he became a prince in the country where he was sold as a slave, similarly the Holy Prophet of Arabia, attained to power and glory in the land of his exile, so that when he, eight years after his flight from Mecca, was about to enter his native city as a conqueror, his greatness and power so struck Abu Sufian, the chief of the Meccans, that he could not help exclaiming while speaking to Abbas, the uncle of the Holy Prophet, "Great is the kingdom of thy nephew."

Again, just as the brethren of Joseph were at last humbled before him and had to confess their guilt, saying: "By God ! surely now hath God chosen thee above us, and verily we have been sinners," similarly the Quresh were after eight years of hard fighting humbled before their brother, the Holy Prophet, and when the latter entered Mecca as a conqueror and asked them, "O descendants of the Quresh, how do you think I should act towards you," they gave the humble reply, "With kindness and pity, gracious brother and nephew !" But nowhere is the parallelism between the story of Joseph and that of the Holy Prophet more marked than in the answer which the latter gave to his brethren. "I shall speak to you" said the merciful Prophet, "as Joseph spoke to his brethren 'No blame on you this day, God will pardon you; He is the most merciful of those that show mercy.'" By saying 'I shall speak to you as Joseph spoke to his brethren,' the Holy Prophet bore testimony to the fact that his case was like that of Prophet Joseph, that he had received the same treatment at the hands of the Quresh as Joseph had received at the hands of his brethren and that God had given glory to Joseph after he had been cast forth from his native land.

The reader must have seen by this time what were the things unseen which were announced in this Sura. He must also have learned the nature of the signs to which God referred when He said "Assuredly in Joseph and his brethren are signs for the inquirers." I will refer here only to one more sign and then I shall have done with this chapter. Joseph had a false charge brought against him, but God afforded him an opportunity to clear himself

of it. Similarly the Holy Prophet was accused of imposture, but God showed mighty signs in his support until his truth became clearer than the midday sun. Thus God cleared him of the false charge by Himself bearing testimony to his truth. If he had been a false prophet, he ought to have met the common fate of imposters, for it is an eternal law of God that in order to distinguish the true prophet from the false, he destroys the false claimants to prophecy. But God dealt with him as He had been dealing with the former prophets and He dealt with his enemies as He had dealt with the enemies of His former apostles so that it became clear that he was a true prophet just as the prophets that had preceded him were true prophets. Thus it was that God cleared him of the false charge of imposture His success saw its consummation on the day when he entered Mecca as a conqueror and this victory was in accordance with the prophecies that he had announced years before in that very city. So that victory cleared him of all the charges which had been brought against him by his enemies and which are still reiterated by Christian missionaries, for such a unique success could be granted only to a true prophet. Thus success covered the sin of imposture and other sins which were and are still imputed to him by his malicious enemies and it is to this fact that God refers when He says :—"Verily, We have granted thee an undoubted victory so that God may cover thy former and latter sins (*i.e.*, the sins that have been imputed to thee in the past and the sins that will be imputed to thee in the future) and that He may complete His favour upon thee."

These are a few of the signs which were disclosed in the story of Joseph and his brethren and of which the Holy Prophet himself was unaware until they were revealed to him in the Holy Quran.

The Inmates of the Cave.

I now turn to another story, *viz.*, the story of the Inmates of the Cave. A study of this story also clearly leads to the conclusion that it was revealed to serve as a prophecy. The story begins with the words : "Dost thou think that the Inmates of the Cave and Er-Rakeem were one of Our wondrous signs." These words clearly imply that the Holy Prophet did not need to wonder at the youths that took refuge in a cave, for he was to make a similar experience in his own person. 'They were youths who believed in their Lord, and in guidance had We increased them ; and we made them stout of heart when they stood up and said, 'Our Lord is the Lord of the Heavens and of the Earth ; by no means will we call on any other god than Him, for then we had said a thing outrageous. These our people have taken other gods beside Him, though they bring no clear authority for them.'" Similar were the beliefs and teachings of the Holy Prophet, who like the Inmates of the Cave, stood up and said 'There is no god beside God' and who like them denounced the false deities

of his people. But the greatest similarity between him and the inmates of the cave was that he too, accompanied by his faithful companion, Abu Bakr, took refuge in a cave just as the youths had done. So in the story of the Inmates of the Cave there was a prophecy to the effect that he too and a devoted companion of his were to become the inmates of a cave. But there was one great difference. They were not to dwell long in the cave as the Inmates of the Cave are said to have done. Hence towards the end of the story God says. " And say not thou of a thing ' I, will surely do this to-morrow,' without ' If God will ' And when thou hast forgotten, call thy Lord to mind ; and say, 'Haply, my Lord will guide me to a nearer path.'" These verses show that the Holy Prophet was also to do thing like unto the one which they (*i e.*, the Inmates of the Cave) had done, in other words, he had also to fly and take refuge in a cave, but as to when the flight was to take place, the H ly Prophet is enjoined to promise nothing and to leave his affairs to be guided by God. The words " Haply my Lord will guide me to a nearer path " signify that though he will, like the Inmates of the Cave, take refuge in a cave, but he will not be left to lie there long, but that God will enable him to leave his hiding place soon and guide him to a path which will soon lead him to success. God does not tell us how long they lived in the Cave or how many they were, but only says that He ' best knoweth how long they tarried' and that He ' best knoweth the number.' This clearly shows that the object of God was not to tell a tale. It was meant as a prophecy and the words "My Lord best knoweth how long they tarried" and "My Lord best knoweth the number" indirectly hint at the fact that the number of the persons who will take refuge iu the cave and the number of days they will tarry there are secrets of the future which are known to God. In short in the story of the Inmates of the Cave we find a clear prophecy to the effect that the Holy Prophet had to experience in his own person what is related of the Inmates of the Cave, but that He was not to tarry there long but that God was to guide him to a nearer path of success.

In short, most of the stories of the former people and the former prophets are not told in the Qnran as tales, but they are meant to serve as prophecies. This is clear not only from the stories themselves but also from the fact that they are expressly spoken of as announcements of the things unseen. Another very strong evidence of their being meant as prophecies is to be found in the fact that these histories all belong to the Meccan period. Mecca was the birthplace of Islam and the converts at Mecca were not only weak but they were also subjected to the fiercest persecution. Under such circumstances and at the very birth of Islam, while the faith was yet a secret shrouded in deep mystery, God announced to the Holy Prophet through the histories of the former prophets and by means

of direct prophecies that his cause would triumph, and that his enemies would be destroyed and that the land that was then inhabited by the idolators would be peopled with the followers of Islam. These prophecies were announced by God before there was any sign of their fulfilment. The histories of the prophets and of the former people announced events which occurred long after the revelation of the said histories. The story of Joseph, for instance, was revealed at a time when no mortal could predict the momentous events which it foretold in clear words The same was the case with other histories referred to above. Thus the very fact that these histories were revealed long before the occurrence of the events foreshadowed by them corroborates the conclusion that they were not revealed as mere tales or as evidences of the fact that the Holy Prophet could tell unknown histories, but that they were revealed as "announcements of the things unseen."

That these histories were so many prophecies is also apparent from the reply which God gave to the unbelievers who gave them the contemptuous designation of "tales of the ancients." "And they say," says the Holy Quran, "Tales of the ancients that he hath put in writing! and they are dictated to him morn and even.' Say, He hath sent it down who knoweth the secrets that are in the Heavens and of the Earth. He truly is the Gracious, the Merciful." In this reply it is plainly stated that these histories are not tales of the ancients but that they announce secrets that are in the Heavens and in the Earth, *i.e.*, they foretell future events which have been ordained in the Heavens and which are to be manifested on the Earth.

In short, any one who reads the Holy Quran carefully and ponders over the repeated exhortations of God to the enemies of Islam to learn a lesson from the fate of the former generations whose stories have been rehearsed to them in the Holy Writ, will have no doubt as to the fact that the stories of the former prophets, such as Moses, Noah, Joseph, Shuaib, Salib, Hud, Lot and others that have been narrated at length in the Holy Quran have not been related to serve as proofs of the fact that the Holy Prophet could tell secret tales, but that they have been narrated to serve as examples and that they foretold many future events of which both he and his people were ignorant. The purpose of these histories has been repeatedly pointed out in the Holy Quran itself and nothing can be more absurd than the statement that the Holy Prophet only collected as many tales as he could and gave them out as divine revelations, and that the only purpose he had in view was to show that he could tell unknown tales.

It being established that the stories that have been narrated in the Holy Quran are not related there as mere tales, but that they were given out as prophecies foretelling great events of the unseen

future, it is not difficult to see whether they were the fabrication of the Holy Prophet or whether they were really the word of Him who knows the secrets that are in the Heavens and of the Earth. If they had been given merely as tales, it might have been difficult to tell whether they were fabrication or revelation. But now we have a sure criterion to test them. These histories claimed to be prophecies and therefore, we can easily see whether they are revelation or not. We have to consider the following points—

(*a.*) Whether the histories claiming to foretell future events were actually revealed before the occurrence of the events which they foreshadow.

(*b.*) Whether it was within the power of a mortal to foretell those events.

(*c.*) Whether the events foretold in the histories came to pass.

(*d.*) Whether the fulfilment of the prophecies embodied in those histories could really be a sign of the truth of the Holy Prophet.

The answers to these questions are plain. The histories *were* revealed before the occurrence of the event which they claim to foretell. And any body who reads these prophecies carefully will have no hesitation in declaring that it was beyond the power of a mortal to make such powerful prophecies under such unfavourable circumstances. The answer to the third question is that the events foretold came to pass exactly as they were foretold and the answer to the fourth and the last question is that only a true prophet could make such powerful prophecies and that their fulfilment was really a clear proof of the truth of the Holy Prophet.

The above answers are so clear that no intelligent man will doubt their truth. Read the prophecies, consider the time when they were announced and the circumstances under which they were published and then read them in the light of the events that followed and you will not have the slightest doubt as to the fact that they witnessed as remarkable a fulfilment as they themselves were remarkable. Can there then be any doubt that these histories were not a fabrication but the powerful word of the Lord of the Heavens and of the Earth from whom nothing is hidden. Here is a true criterion for you, kind reader. If you desire to ascertain whether these histories are a revelation or a fabrication, judge them by this criterion.

IF THE HOLY QURAN IS A FABRICATION, THE BIBLE IS FALSE.

The most surprising feature of the criticisms of Islam by the Christian writers is that they, while attacking Islam are not only strangers to reason, but they seem to have effaced from their memories all that is written in their Bible. They write volumes to

prove that the Holy Quran is not the Word of God and that the Holy Prophet is not a true prophet. But it is strange that their so called arguments are not only unreasonable but they also belie the Bible. One wonders why they carry about with them their big Bibles, when it is not to furnish them with any guidance. They call it the Word of God, but do not seem to have even a semblance of faith in its teachings. Christ said he had not come to destroy the law, but his followers have not only demolished it, but have come to regard every truth revealed in the Holy Writ as no longer true. The Word of God is no longer a Word of God, but a dead letter which they discard with contempt. This is apparent from their discussion of the origin of the Holy Quran and the mission of the Holy Prophet. They say things about Islam which when judged by the standard of the Bible are wrong. It cannot be said that they are ignorant of the contents of the Bible. They know the truths that were revealed to Moses and to other prophets, and yet knowing them they discard them when they support the claims of the Holy Prophet. The question of the divine origin of the Holy Quran and the Divine mission of the Holy Prophet was one which could be easily settled by making reference to the Bible, yet they not only do not test the truth of Islam by means of the criteria given in their scriptures, but they adopt a course which gives the lie to their own books. Their Bible contains a long series of books, which. they say, were written by inspired writers. They call these books not the word of men, but the Word of the Almighty God. If these books are the Word of God, the contents of which were revealed to a long chain of prophets, they ought to furnish us with criteria to know a true prophet from a false one and to distinguish a true word of God from a fabrication. If these books cannot guide us even in this matter, they are not worth a straw. If the prophets that appeared from time to time in Israel did not even tell us how to know a true Word of God and a true prophet, they taught us nothing. If the books of the Old Testament which are above forty in number do not even teach us the way by which to recognise a true prophet, they were all revealed to no purpose. But the way in which the Christian writers discuss the question of the Divine origin of the Holy Quran and the Divine mission of the Holy Prophet leads one to conclude that their own scriptures tell us no way by which one may know a true prophet from a false pretender. If those books really teach us no sure means of recognising a true prophet, their followers have no right to question the truth of any prophet. The books in which they believe and which they profess to follow give them no light. How can they then that are devoid of light see ? They are blind themselves and it is merely presumptuous on their yart to say that such a prophet is a false prophet. But if their books do give certain criteria to know a true

prophet from a false one, they are bound to abide by those criteria. If they want to judge the truth of a prophet, let them apply the tests given in their sacred scriptures. If we turn to the Christian scriptures, we find that they do give clear tests by means of which one may easily see the truth of a claimant to prophecy. and if the Christians are faithful to their scriptures, let them apply these tests to those claimants whose truth they desire to judge.

A few clear tests are given in the prophecy of Moses which the Holy Prophet claimed to have fulfilled in his own holy person. One of the tests is to be found in the following line of Deut, xviii : "But the prophet, " says the Word of God revealed to Moses, " which presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, even that prophet shall die." In these words, God gives a sure criterion to test a prophet. We are told here that God shall destroy any prophet who is presumptuous enough even to fabricate a single revelation. The wrath of God is kindled so furiously against a false pretender that he is consumed, to ashes even if he speak a single sentence, nay a single word, in the name of God which He had not commanded him to speak, Nay, it even appears from the verses quoted above that the prophet may have spoken a thousand true revelations, but if he fabricate even a single word and speak it in the name of God while God has not bidden him to speak that word, he will be brought to naught even for the utterance of that single word. Now I ask the Christians, is not the verse quoted above a true Word of God ? Do they not believe it to be a true revelation from God to Moses the Prophet ? If it is a true revelation, the test given therein must be infallible and every prophet who presumes to speak even a word in the name of God which He has not bidden him to speak, must speedily be brought, for such is the import of the verse already quoted. Now let the Christans, if they are sincere believers in the Word of God revealed to Moses, test the claim of the Holy prophet by this criterion. The Holy Prophet spoke not word but hundreds of thousands of words in the name of God. Every word which we find written in the Holy Quran, he claimed to have received direct from God. He gave out every verse of the Holy Book as the actual Word of God, a wordwhich the Almighty God had spoken to him. This revelation extended not over one day, or one week or one month or even oneyear, but over about a quarter of a century --over three and twenty long years. And the Prophet who spoke these words in the name of God and who continued to do so for twenty-three years, far from being brought to naught, prospered every day. Every morning brought him new success and every year brought him new glory. And he did not pass away from this world until his mission was firmly established in the land The seed which he sowed grew and prospered until it became a thriving tree in his own life-time and bore fruit in abundance. He

won a success which is admittedly unique in the annals of history. So according to the Word of God already quoted, he was a true prophet, in fact the truest prophet if degrees of comparison are admissible in the case of prophets. If Christians believe that it was God who spoke to Moses and that the criterion given in the Word of God is a true criterion, they must also believe that the Prophet who rose at Mecca was not brought to naught like a false prophet. On the other hand he won a glorious success such as was never won before him by any claimant to prophethood. Nay, not even by Moses to whom the Word of God already quoted was revealed. Hence the Christians, and the Jews as well, can not escape either of the two conclusions :—Either they must accept the Holy Prophet as a true Prophet, or they must reject the word of God revealed to Moses as false. Let them choose between the two alternatives. They can not call the Holy Prophet false and believe the revelation of Moses as the true Word of God. But no reasonable man, even if he be not a believer in the revelation of Moses, will question the soundness of the criterion given in the verse of Deuteronomy quoted aleady. That God should destroy evey false pretender and vouchsafe His assistance to every true claimant is a criterion which will commend itself to every reasonable man. Do not the earthly governments seize, and inflict exemplary punishment on every person who tries to impose upon the people by falsely pretending to be a govenment official ? Why should not God similarly seize and inflict exemplary punishment on every person who poses to be a vicegerent of God on earth while he is not so ? If God should not do so, and if the false pretenders should be as successful as the true prophets, what criterion would there be by which men should be able to distinguish between the true prophets and the pretenders ?

This law of God becomes very apparent when we read some of the chapters of Jeremiah. Mark how vehemently God inveighs against the false prophets of the time of Jeremiah : " The prophets prophesy falsely in my name : I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, nor have I spoken to them : they prophesy unto you a lying vision, and divination and deceit, and the seduction of their own hearts.

" Therefore saith the Lord concerning the prophets that prophesy in my name, whom I did not send, that say, sword and famine shall not be in this land : By sword and famine shall those prophets be consumed." (Jeremiah xiv, 14, 15).

Again, " Thus saith the Lord of hosts : hearken not to the words of the prophets that prophesy to you, and deceive you. They speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. Behold the whirlwind of the Lord's indignation shall come forth, and a tempest shall break out, and come upon the head of the wicked. I did not send the prophets, yet they ran, I have

not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in My name, and say, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets, that prophesy lies, and that prophesy the delusions of their ownheart ? Are not My words as a fire, saith the Lord, and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces ? Therefore behold I am against theprophets, saith the Lord, who steal My words every one from his neighbour. Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, who use their tongues, and say, the Lord saith it. Behold I am against the prophets that have lying dreams, saith the Lord, and tell them and cause My people to err by their lying, and by their wonders, when I sent them not, nor commanded them, who have not profited this people at all, saith the Lord " (Jer. xxiii, 16—32) When the Lord is always against false prophets and His wrath is kindled against them and consumes them, as fire consumes chaff, why was it that His wrath was not similarly kindled against the Holy Prophet of Islam if he was not a true prophet. Was the law of God changed in the time of the Holy Prophet. Was the God of the days of Jeremiah different from the God of the days of the Holy Prophet ? Did God forget His original law according to which He destroyed every false prophet ? Did He make a new law in the days of the Holy prophet, by which He gave His succour to false prophets and destroyed their enemies ? Perhaps Jesus after his ascent to heaven and after taking his seat on the right hand of God persuaded His father to reverse His former laws and, instead of bringing to naught false prophets, to aid them and grant them a glorious success, such as He had never granted even to His elect in days gone by. Attention may also be drawn to the fate of the false prophet Hananiah, a contemporary of Jeremiah. When Hananiah spoke a false prophecy in the presence of the priests and of all the people, " then said the Prophet of Jeremiah unto Hananiah the Prophet, Hear now, Hananiah, the Lord hath not sent thee, but thou makest this people to trust in a lie. Therefore thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will cast thee from off the face of the earth, this year thou shalt die, because thou hast taught rebellion against the Lord, So Hananiah the prophet died the same year in the seventh month." When such used to be the fate of the false prophets, it is indeed wonderful that the divine law should have been reversed in the time of the Holy Prophet and that in the sixth century after Christ, a Prophet whom the Christians call false, should have received an assistance from God which was not granted even to true prophets before him !

From the Old Testament I now pass to the collection of booklets and epistles which the Christians call the New Testament. The wonder is that here too we find the same law given with regard to the false prophets which we find given in the books of the Old

Testament. Jesus, comparing false prophets to evil trees which bring forth evil fruit, says, Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." From this it is apparent that even according to the teachings of Jesus, a false prophet is hewn down like an evil tree and is cast into fire. Thus he also gave the same criterion which was given in the Word of God revealed to Moses and in the revelation sent to Jeremiah. But alas, the Christian Missionary will not apply this criterion. The Prophet of Islam they say, secretly collected his materials from the Christians, the Jews and other sources, then spent many a midnight hour in working up this material into elaborate Surahs and then gave them out as the words of Divine revelation which had been spoken to him by God. This he continued to do from day to day until twenty-three long years were passed and during this time his mission was firmly established, his enemies that had sought to destroy him were themselves destroyed and the land which was once peopled by his bitterest enemies was at last converted into a land of devoted followers. With every new revelation he received new assistance from God and as his revelations gained in volume, his glory increased until it saw its consummation on the day when the revelation was completed. Yet the Christians say that this man was a false prophet and that what he gave out as revelation was not the word of God but his own fabrication. We say, if such a prophet was a false rophet, it follows as surely as day follows night that the word which God is said to have spoken to Moses and to Jeremiah after him is a lie and that Jesus told a lie when he said that a false prophet is hewn down like an evil tree. Christians can not call the Holy Prophet a false prophet, believing in the revelation of Moses and Jeremiah as a true Word of God. It is strange that a person, who has not been sent by God should every day fabricate new revelations and should tell every morning now dreams, while God has sent him no revelation and has shown him no vision, and that he should continue to do so for about a quarter of a centnry but God, far from visiting him with His consuming wrath, should grant him greater and greater success every day until he reaches the highest pinnacle of glory to which no prophet ever attained before. If even false prophets can prosper like true prophets and God grants His assistance to false pretenders as He grants His assistance to His true messengers, where is then the criterion to distinguish a true prophet from a false one. If the criterion given in the revelations to Moses and Jeremiah is a sound criterion—and every reasonable man must admit its soundness—the Holy Prophet is pre-eminently a true prophet. If the Christians cannot admit his truthfulness, they must reject the revelations to Moses and Jeremiah as lying and deceitful words.

It is a pity that the Christians have not even as much sense as he Pharisees of the time of the Apostles. When the high priest

and the chief priests took counsel to slay the Apostles, " then stood there up," says the author of the Acts, "one in the Council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people, and commanded to put the Apostles forth a little space ; and said unto them, ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men. For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody ; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves, who was slain, and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to naught. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him, he also perished ; and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed. And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught, but if it be of God, ye can not overthrow it ; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God. And to him they agreed." (Acts v, 34—40).

Alas ! the Christians who ought to have known more than Gamaliel, the Pharisee, do not know even as much as he did. And what is worse, they do not even profit by his words which they read to others from the pulpit and the platform. The priests that listened to Gamaliel, we are told understood what he told them and agreeing to his advice let the Apostles go. The Jewish priests profited by the words of wisdom spoken by Gamaliel, and refrained from persecuting the Apostles, but the Christian priests, in whom the Holy Ghost itself is said to dwell, are too dull even to profit by the advice of others. The words are on their tongues, but they do not pass down their throats. They have not the sense to see the great truth taught by Gamaliel, the Pharisee. It is apparent from the words of Gamaliel that a false prophet can never prosper and that he is sure to be brought to naught even if no man should raise his hand to destroy him, but that a true prophet always prospers, that no human exertion can overthrow him and that the person who seeks to destroy him fights against the Lord and is himself destroyed. I wish the Christian priests possessed as much understanding as Gamaliel or as much justice as the Jewish priests who complied with Gamaliel's advice when they saw that he was right. The Christians, if they have any understanding, must see that according to the criterion given in their own scriptures, the Holy Prophet was a true prophet, yet they persist in calling him false. Nothing can surpass Christian ignorance, Christian prejudice and Christian blindness. They set aside the truths taught in their own scriptures merely because by following them they must admit the truth of the Holy Prophet.

Their bigotry becomes the more apparent when we see that though the Holy Quran itself calls upon them to test the truth of the Holy Prophet by the very criterion which was given in the

revelations to Moses and Jeremiah and in the words of Jesus himself, they refuse to apply that criterion in his case. As a proof of the Holy Prophet the Holy Quran says :—

" I swear by what ye see, And by that which ye see not, That this verily is the word of an Apostle worthy of honour ! And that is not the word of a poet—how little do ye believe ! Neither is it the word of a soothsayer—how little do ye receive warning ! It is a missive from the Lord of the worlds. *But if Mohammad had fabricated concerning us any sayings, We had surely seized him by the right hand, and cut through the vein of his heart, nor would any one of you have withheld us from him.* But verily it (the Quran) is a warning for the God-fearing ; And of a truth, we well know that there are of you who treat it as a falsehood ; but it shall be the very despair of infidels, for it is assuredly the truth of sure knowledge. Praise, then, the name of thy Lord, the Great."

(lxix, 38--52.)

I draw the attention of the reader to the italicised words in the above quotation. Therein God refers to His eternal law with regard to the imposters. The Holy Prophet was a true prophet for if he had been otherwise, God would have destroyed him as He destroys every imposter. Nay, it is said that even if he had fabricated some of the verses, his would have been the fate which has been decreed from beginning for every imposter. Herein we have an argument which appeals to every thoughtful man. In fact God refers here to the same law which He laid down in His revelations to Moses and Jeremiah. But such is the prejudice of the Christians that while considering the claims of the Holy Prophet they leave this proof of his truth out of consideration. Herein they have a proof the denial of which involves the rejection of the revelation which was sent to Moses and of the revelation which was sent to Jeremiah. Even if God had not referred to this law in the Holy Quran, they, being believers in the revelations of Moses and Jeremiah and being followers of the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles, were bound to test the claims of the Holy Prophet by this criterion. But the pity is that they refuse to test them by this criterion even when the Holy Quran calls upon them to do so. This criterion really consists in the testimony of God Himself in favour of or against a claimant to prophecy. Every false pretender is, according to this law, brought to naught so that his destruction may serve as an evidence of his falsehood. But every true prophet receives the assistance of God and is made to triumph over his opponents so that his success may be a proof of his truth. In the revelation to Jeremiah, God says :—" Behold I am against the prophets who use their tongues and say -- The Lord saith it. Behold I am against the prophets that have lying dreams, saith the Lord, and tell them, and cause my people to err by their lying, and by their wonders, when I sent them not, nor commanded them." God is *against* false

prophets and hastens them to destruction, but He is *with* His true Messengers and grants them His own assistance and destroys those that oppose him. This is the testimony of God by which He exposes the falsehood of the imposter and establishes the truth of his righteous servants. The Holy Quran repeatedly draws the attention of the readers to this divine testimony which proved the truth of his Holy Prophet. Let the reader note the following verses :-

(*a*.) " Do they say, ' This Quran is of his own devising '? Say, On me then by my own guilt, if I have devised it ; and I am clear of that whereof ye are guilty," (xi, 37).

(*b*.) " And who more wicked than he who hath lied of God" ? (xxix, 33).

(*c*.) " Say : God is witness enough between you and me. His servants He verily scanneth, eyeth." (xvii, 99.)

(*d*.) " And be not grieved about the infidels, and be not troubled at their devices ; verily God is with those who fear Him and who do good deeds," (xvi, 128).

(*e*). " O our Lord ! Decide between us and our people with truth ; for the best to decide art Thou." (vii, 87.)

(*f*). " Say : Call on these joint gods of yours ; then make your plot against me, and put me not off with delay. Verily, my protector is God, who hath sent down the Book ; and He protecteth the righteous." (vii, 194, 195.)

(*g*) " And God shall succour thee with a mighty succour." (xlviii, 3)

(*h*) " God hath written this decree : ' I will surely prevail, I and My apostles.' Truly God is Strong, Mighty." (lviii, 21.)

(*i*). " Verily, in this present life will We assuredly succour Our Apostles and those who have believed, and on the day when the witnesses shall stand forth." (xl, 54.

(*j*) " And We have passed our decree with regard to Our Servants, the Sent Ones, that they should surely be succoured and that verily Our folk they are the succoured ones." (xxxvii, 171.)

(*k*.) "Is not God all-sufficient for His servant." (xxxix, 37.)

The Holy Quran teems with verses of this class. It is these verses that the Christian Missionaries totally ignore. They furnish that argument of the truth of the Holy Prophet by which we recognise the truth of all the prophets. These verses show that he was a true prophet because God assists all true prophets. This is an argument which the Christians cannot deny, unless they reject their own scriptures as false.

The relevation sent to Moses gives also another criterion to judge the truth of a prophet, and the Christians must acknowledge our Holy Prophet as a true prophet even according to this criterion.

"And if thou say in thine heart," say Deut. XVIII, 21, 22, " How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken ? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing

follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously : thou shalt not be afraid of him."

If we test the claim of the Holy Prophet by this criterion, he proves to be a true prophet. In my last article on the Divine Origin of the Holy Quran, I showed that the stories of the prophets and former generations that are related in the Holy Quran are so many prophecies. These prophecies were all announced at a time when there was no prospect of their fulfilment, when, on the other hand there was every prospect of their turning out failures, but they were fulfilled in their time, and their fulfilment showed that they were the Word of God. So even according to this second criterion the Christians must admit that the Holy Prophet was a true prophet.

Besides the prophecies that were announced to the Meccans in the shape of histories, there were also many direct prophecies which fulfilled as clearly as the prophecies of the former class. Many of these direct prophecies which by their fulfilment bore testimony to the truth of the Holy Prophet have been already given under the head of " An Unsurpassed Miracle " in the course of the articles on the Spread of Islam. A few of them may also be given here to show how mighty prophecies were announced by Holy Prophet both at Mecca and Medina and how remarkably they were fulfilled. But before mentioning more prophecies, I will draw the attention of the reader to the verses already quoted. These verses promised divine assistance, divine protection and success to the Holy Prophet and his companions, and the Christians themselves will testify to the fulfilment of these promises. God protected the Holy Prophet, He assisted him and He granted him success. To these prophecies I will add a few more.

I.—When the Holy Prophet was weak and helpless, the Word of God came to him with the followiog messages of consolation—

(*a*) " The Lord hath not forsaken thee, neither hath He hated thee. And surely the future shall be better for thee than the present, and thy Lord shall surely be bounteous to thee and thou be satisfied" (xciii,3—5.)

(*b.*) " Is not God all-sufficient for His servant ?" (xxxix, 37).

(*c.*) " Verily difficulty is to be followed by ease." (xciv, 5.)

(*d*) " Think then not indeed that God fails in His promises to His apostles; verily God is Mighty the Lord of vengeance." (xiv, 48.)

II.—When the Muslims were being tortured at Mecca for their faith in Islam, God sent His Word saying that if they left their homes for the sake of God He would reward them with ease in this world and heavenly blessings in the world to come. The Holy Quran says .—

(*a.*) " And as to those who when oppressed flee their country for the sake of God We will surely provide them a goodly abode in this world and greater the reward of the next life, did they

but know it—they who bear ills with pretence and put their trust in the Lord !" (xvi, 43—44.)

(*b.*)—"Whoever flieth his country for the cause of God, will find in the earth many refuges and abundant resources." (iv, 101).

III—The Holy Prophet prophesied that his religion would prevail and that falsehood would vanish. These prophecies were made at a time when the enemies were determined to nip the new propaganda in the bud. The following are some of the verses which foretold that falsehood would be supplanted by truth.

(*a*) "And say : Truth is come and falsehood is vanished. Verily, falsehood is a thing that vanisheth." (xvii, 84)

(*b.*) "Nay, We will cast the truth over falsehood, and it shall smite it and lo, it vanisheth." (xxi, 18.)

(*c.*) "Fain would they put out the light of God with their mouths ! but though they abhor it, God will perfect His light." (lxi, 8)

(*d*) "Fain would they put out God's light with their mouths; but God only desireth to perfect His light, albeit the unbelievers abhor it."

IV.—When the Holy Prophet was helpless and weak at Mecca, such was his trust in God that he challenged his enemies to spare no pains to destroy him telling them at the same time that all their efforts would be of no avail, for God was his support and guardian. Let the readers note the following verses :—

(*a.*) "Say : O my people ! Act as ye best can : I verily will act my part, and soon shall ye know whose will be the recompense of the abode ! Verily the ungodly shall not prosper." (vi, 36,37).

(*b*) "Will they say, 'We are a victorious host' ? The host shall be routed, and they shall turn the back." (liv, 45).

(*c.*) "And when Our clear signs are rehearsed to them, the unbelievers say to those who have believed : 'Which of the two parties is in the best plight, and which is the most goodly company ?' But how many generations have We brought to ruin before them, who surpassed them in riches and splendour !" (xix, 74, 75.)

(*d.*) "Until when they see the vengeance with which they were threatened, they shall know which of us was the weaker in a protector and the fewer in number." (lxxii, 25.)

Let the reader note that these powerful prophecies were announced at Mecca when the enemies of Islam were at the height of their power and when the Muslim party was extremely weak.

V.—When the Holy Prophet was surrounded by his enemies, who were thirsty of his blood, God promised that He would proctect his person against their murderous designs. The promise was given in the following words :—

"O Apostle ! proclaim all that hath been sent down to thee from thy Lord : for if thou do it not, thou hast not proclaimed His message at all. And God will protect thee from evil men." (v, 71.)

The life of the Holy Prophet was endangered not only in the time of war when he was the special object of the enemy, but it was in danger also at other times, for both at Mecca and Medina many attempts were made to put an end to the Muslim propaganda by slaying the prophet himself. But God always shielded his holy person from his bloody enemies in accordance with His promise.

VI.—The Holy Prophet prophesied that the idolaters would disappear from the land and that their place would be taken by his followers. This prophecy also was made at Mecca while the handful of Muslim converts were being bitterly persecuted by the idolaters. The prophecy, among other verses, is to be found in the following Meccan revelations :—

(*a*.) "And already have We written the Psalms after the reminder that '*the earth shall My righteous servants inherit.*'" (xxi, 104, 105.)

(*b*) " We will certainly destroy the wicked doers, and We shall cause you to dwell in the land after them." (xiv, 16.)

VII —The Holy Qurau also clearly foretold the events that were to follow the death of the Holy Prophet. God was to raise successors to the Holy Prophet as successors, had been raised to Moses, and through those successors, He was to re-establish security after formidable dangers had threatened the very existence of Islam. This prophecy is contained in the following verse:—

" God hath promised to those of you who believe and do the things that are right, that He will make them successors in the land as He gave succession to those who were before them, and that He will establish for them, their religion which He hath chosen for them, and that after their fears He will give them security in exchange," (xxiv,54.) The verse predicted that at the death of the Holy Prophet, the Muslim propaganda was to be once more put to a severe trial but God was to re-establish security for the Muslims after their fears and religion was to thrive and prosper under the Holy Prophet's successors even as it had prospered in his life- time.

VIII—With regard to the Holy Quran, God promised that He would protect it for ever and that it was not to share the fate of the previous scriptures God says ; " Verily, We have sent down ' the Warning,' and verily We will be its guardian." (xv, 9.)

IX.—When the Greeks who were the people of the Book sustained defeat at the hands of the Persians who were idolaters, the idolaters of Mecca rejoiced at it, taking it as a foreboding of their own victory over the Muslims. Hereupon the Holy Prophet inspired by God, prophesied : " The Greeks have been defeated in a land hard by : but after their defeat they shall defeat their foes in a few years. First and last is the affair with God. And on that day shall the faithful rejoice in the aid of God." (xxx, 1.) This verse contained a double prophecy. It predicted not only that the Christain Greeks would be victorious, but also that the Muslims

would on that day receive an aid from God in which they would rejoice. And it came to pass exactly as it was foretold. When the news of the defeat of the Persians spread in Arabia, the Muslims were rejoicing in their victory over the Quresh in the field of Badr.

Many more prophecies might be quoted from the Holy Quran, but space does not allow me to quote more. The prophecies of the Holy Quran were not confined to the time of the Holy Prophet but many events that related to succeeding generations were also foretold therein. Many prophecies of the Holy Book have been fulfilled in our own day. The predictions, however, which have already been given are sufficient to show that the Holy Prophet was a true prophet even according to the second criterion. He made powerful prophecies at a time when no mortal could foretell the event predicted and everything came to pass exactly as he had foretold it. Hence if the criterion given in Deut. xviii,21,22, is a true criterion, the Christians are to accept the claims of the Holy Prophet as true.

The prophecy in Deut. xviii also contains a third criterion, and the Holy Prophet must be acknowledged as a true prophet even according to that criterion. The fifth Book of the Old Testament, (*viz.*, Deuteronomy) speaking of the prophet whose advent it foretells says : " And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." This sign was so clearly fulfilled in the Holy Prophet that even the Christians can not deny it. And what is even more wonderful the Holy Prophet foretold the destruction of his enemies at a time when the latter were at the height of their power and he himself was weak and forlorn. Even if there had been no prophecy in the Holy Quran foretelling the destruction of the enemies of the Holy Prophet their destruction would have constituted a clear sign of his truth, but he foretold their ruin and annihilation repeatedly and forcibly and that in the very beginning of his career, I can not give here all these prophecies, still I would give a few so that the reader may see how powerful were the prophecies which foretold ruin to his enemies :—

(*a.*) " Disgrace with God and a vehement punishment shall come on transgressors for their plotting." (vi, 124)

(*b.*) " Verily, that which is threatened you shall surely come to pass, neither shall ye frustrate it." (vi, 134).

(*c.*) " But as for those who treat Our signs as lies, We will gradually bring them to punishment by means which they know not. And though I lengthen their days to them, verily, My fighting is mighty." (vii, 181,—82).

(*d.*) " Ye have called the Apostle a liar, but it shall be a punishment which ye can not shake off." (xv, 75.)

(*e.*) " O my people ! act with what power ye can *for My hurt* : I verily act : and ye shall know on whom shall light a punishment

that shall disgrace him; and who is a liar. Await ye ! verily, I will await with you." (xi, 95;96).

In fact, the truth of the Holy Prophet is so apparent that no sensible man can deny it. Test him by every criterion by which you test a true prophet and you will find that he is pre-eminently a true prophet. Apply to him every sound criterion which you find written in your sacred scriptures, and his truth will become apparent. If you deny him, deny also your own scriptures. The Word of God revealed to Moses says that He destroys a prophet even if he fabricate a single word, but you say that the Holy Prophet fabricated a whole book. Why was he not then brought to naught like a false prophet ? Why did he prosper and succeed as all true prophets prosper and succeed? If he prospered and succeeded in spite of being the fabricator of a whole book, why don't you reject as false your own scriptures which say that a prophet who fabricates even a single word is brought to naught? If this book, which the Muslims call the Holy Quran, and which has wrought a transformation, such as was never wrought by any revealed book before it is a fabrication, the Bible is false

The Truth of the Quranic narratives.

It has been shown above that stories of the Holy Quran were meant to serve as prophecies and that those prophecies were clearly fulfilled. The fulfilment of the prophecies embodied in the Quranic histories is an undeniable proof of their being true revelation. The said histories foretold events which no man could predict under the circumstanees. They, for instance, predicted the destruction of the enemies of Islam, the success of the Holy Prophet the establishment of Islam in the land, and the replacement of the idolaters by the followers of the One God. One may be inclined to think lightly of these prophecies, viewing them from this distance after their accomplishment. But in order to make a true estimate of these prophecies, the reader must transplant himself in imagination to the times when the Holy Prophet lived at Mecca and must try to picture to himself the circumstances under which these prophetic stories were revealed. A study of the Holy Quran will convince him that they were revealed at a time when the Holy Prophet was extremely weak, and a reference to the history of the time will bring home to him the fact that when the said prophecies were revealed, the enemies of Islam were at the height of their power, and the few poor followers of Islam were being bitterly and mercilessly persecuted. At that time, did the Holy Prophet being inspired by God, announce to his proud persecutiug enemies that the time was not far when God would punish them for their cruelties, as He had punished the enemies of the former prophets, that they would be destroyed by God and that the very Muslims whom they were then trampling under their feet would be their successors in the land. In short, if

you wish to form a true idea of these Meccan prophecies, try to recall the history of the times and it will be then that you will see the true grandeur of these prophetic announcements. How unfavourable were the circumstances under which these promises and these threats were published at Mecca, and how utterly vain and idol they appear to the Mecca may be judged from the fact that they, far from taking any warning from these threats, only received them with derision, and treating them as empty words repeatedly called upon the Holy Prophet to hasten their fulfilment. These prophecies, again were not expressed in weak or ambiguous words. They are characterised by a power and force which convince every sensible reader that they are not the words of helpless, forlorn creature, but the mighty words of him who had power to bring about their fulfilment. The power of the Meccan prophecies forms a strange contrast to the weakness of the Holy Prophet. Imagine to yourselves, on the one hand, the helpless condition of the Muslim converts at Mecca and consider, on the other hand, the power of such Meeca prophecies as the following :

(*a*) "Do they say, 'We are a victorious host'? The host shall be routed, and they shall turn their back." (liv, 45).

(*b*) "And when Our clear signs are rehearsed to them, the unbelievers say to those who have believed, 'Which of the two parties is in the best plight? And which is the most goodly company! But how many generations have We brought to ruin before them, who surpassed them in riches and splendour!" (xix, 74, 75.)

There are many prophecies of this kind in the Meccan Surahs and it was beyond the power of a helpless, persecuted creature to make such threatening announcements to his powerful enemies unless he had been inspired by God and unless he had firm faith in the truth of the word that was revealed to him. But if these prophecies were wonderful their fulfilment was even more wonderful. Who could say that the great lords of Mecca with their numerous idolatrous followers would in no distant future be routed and put to flight by the very converts whose very lives were at their mercy ? Strange, nay impossible, as these things appeared, they came to pass exactly as the Word of God had foretold them. Many were the prophecies that were announced at Mecca, and their fulfilment bore a convincing testimony to the fact that the Holy Quran was not the word of the Holy Prophet but the Word of him Who had raised him and Who had power to assist him and to destroy his enemies. How, for instance, can we believe the Christians when they say that the verse : "And already have We written in the Psalms after the reminding that *the earth shall My righteous servants inherit*," xxi 104, 105 was borrowed from the Psalms of David ? The verse was revealed at Mecca. It was a heathen city then. There were a few converts to Islam but they

were insignificant. And there swelled all around the city a surging sea of idolatry. Then did the Holy Prophet announce to the idolaters that his followers would inherit not only the city of Mecca, but also the whole land of Arabia. At the very outset, he proclaimed "Say, 'Truth has come, and falsehood has vanished! verily, falsehood is vanishing,'" (xvii, 83) Again, "Nay, We will cast the truth over falsehood and it shall smite it and lo, it vanisheth" (xxi, 18). The words "The Earth shall My righteous servants inherit" were announced as a prophecy foretelling the destruction of the idolaters and their replacement by the followers of Islam. Though such an announcement at the time when it was made appeared to be absolutely absurd and excited the ridicule of the proud idolaters, yet it came to pass, thus showing that was not a plagiarised piece of rhetoric, as the Christians would have us believe but a Word of God foretelling the most wonderful event in the history of man. If it was possible for him to borrow passages from the Psalms at Mecca, it was not certainly in his power to clothe them with a prophetic character and bring about the fulfilment of the events that those passages were made to foretell. Supposing he found access to the Psalms, it is the duty of the Christians to show how this verse which was published by the Holy Prophets a prophecy turned out to be true. If it was possible for him to borrow a line from David it was not possible for him to select such a line as might serve as a powerful prophecy which should set a seal to his truth. The very circumstance that this verse was meant as a prophecy which turned out to be true is an incontrovertible proof of the fact that the verse is a Word of God and not a line borrowed from the Psalms. The whole of the Holy Quran is full of prophecies and all those prophecies are true prophecies, and this is an indisputable evidence of the fact that the Holy Quran is a true revelation. There can not be the slightest doubt as to the fact that the Holy Quran is the Word of God. That the Holy Book is a true revelation is not a mere assertion. It itself furnishes very strong proofs of its being a revelation. Read the book ponder over its verses, weigh its prophecies recall to yourself the circumstances under which these prophecies were announced contrast their vigour and their force with the forlorn condition of the Holy Prophet and the helplessness of his holy companions at the time when these prophecies were proclaimed and then see how wonderfully they were all fulfilled. If you do this conscientiously you will have no doubt as to the fact that the Holy Quran is the true Word of God. No book on the face of the earth has proved its claim to divine origin so conclusively as the Holy Quran has done. Nay, the Holy Quran is the only book which stands in need of no external aid to show its divine origin, for its own verses display the power and knowledge of God. Its very stories are prophecies which have already borne witness to their divine origin by their fulfilment

And when it is established that the verses of the Holy Quran and its histories are the Word of God, all objections of the Christian critics vanish. Not only the existence in the Holy Quran of numerous powerful prophecies which turned out to be true explodes the charge that the Holy Prophet borrowed his materials from other sources, but it also refutes the charge brought by Rev. Tisdall that its narratives are sometimes inaccurate. His standard to test the accuracy of a story is the Protestant Bible. According to him, every thing which accords with the Biblical narratives is true, but every thing which differs even slightly from it is false. Nay, he goes even a step further. According to him the Bible is not only a perfectly correct book but it is also comprehensive so that every story of the Holy Quran which is not to be found in the Holy Bible is false for the simple reason that his Bible does not give it. Thus he objects to the stories of Moses and Abraham as given in the Holy Quran on the ground that they contain many details which are not given in the Christian Bible. Thus the Protestant Bible is the sole criterion by which he tests every narrative of the Holy Quran. But he does not tell us how he came to know that the Protestant Bible is free from all inaccuracies and that there is no Jewish or Christian narrative that is not given in full detail in it so that everything which does not coincide which the Biblical account or is not given in the pages of the Protestant Bible must be held as inaccurate. Does he not know that the Bible itself has been shown to be untrustworthy and that it abounds with inaccuracies, contradictions and absurdities? He says the stories of the Holy Quran are inaccurate because they do not harmonise with Biblical accounts. But what of the Biblical books themselves which do not accord with each other?

Will Rev. Tisdall like to know some of the contradictions of the Bible? Here are some of them. I will first draw his attention to only a few out of the many passages of the New Testament which contradict those of the old.

Old Testament.	New Testament.
1. And Aphaxad lived five and thirty and begat Salah. Gen. XI, 12.	Sala, which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, Luke III, 35, 36.
2. And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran... And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years, and Terah died in Haran (Gen, XI, 26, 32).	And Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran. Gen. XII. 4. ("when his father was dead," Acts VII, 4.) Thus after living 135 years, Abraham was only 75 years old.
3. It shall be a statute for	But now we are delivered

ever. Lev. XXIII, 14, 21, 31, 41.

4. And it came to pass in the *four hundred and eightieth year* after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, which is the second month that he began to build the house of the Lord. I Kings VI, 1.

from the law. Rom. VII, 6

And about the time of 40 years suffered He their manners in the wilderness..... And after that He gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet. And afterwards they desired a King; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years. And when He had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their King. Acts XIII, 18—22.

Thus, according to the Acts, it was not in the 480th year, but in the year 595 after the Exodus that the house of the Lord began to be built [40+450+21 (Samuel's reign) + 40 (Saul's rule) + 40 (David's reign) + 4 = 595].

5. And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. 2 Kings II, 11.

By faith Enos was translated that he should not see death. Hebrews XI 5; Gen. V, 24.

No man hath ascended up the heaven, but he that came down from heaven: even the son of man which is in heaven. John III, 13.

6. Then came David to Nob to Ahimelech the priest..... So the priest gave him hallowed bread! for there was no bread there but the shewbread, that was taken from before the Lord. And one of the sons of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, named Abiathar, escaped, and fled after David. I Samuel, XXI, 1, 6; XXII, 20.

And he (Jesus) said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need and was an hungered, he, and they that were with him? How he went into the house of God *in the days of Abiathar the high priest*, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priest and gave also to them which were with him? Mark II, 25—26.

7. Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord. Deut. VI, 4.

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. I. John V. 7; 1 Cor. VIII, 6.

Rev. Tisdall may also like to know some of the contradictions between the different books of the New Testament itself. These are numerous, but I will give here only a few :—

1. Jesus, the *son* of Joseph, which was the son of *Heli*. Luke III, 23.	And *Jacob* begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus. Matt. I, 16.
2. And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into *Galilee*, to their own city, Nazareth. Luke II, 39.	When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt ; and was there until the death of Herod. Matt. II, 14, 15.
3. Now, *after that John was put into prison*, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God. Mark I. 14. (This was followed by the conversion of Peter and Andrew ; see verses 16, 17 and 18).	After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea ; and there he tarried with them and baptised. And John also was baptising. For John was not yet cast into prison. John III, 22—24. Peter and Andrew had already been converted. See I, 40—42)
4. Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptised of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon him. And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan. Mark I, 9—13.	And the third day (after Christ's baptism and the descent of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove) there was a marriage at Cana of Galilee. And both Jesus was called and his disciples to the marriage. John II, 1, 2.
5. There met him *out of the tombs a man* with *an* unclean spirit. Mark v 2. There met him *out of the city* a certain man, which had *devils* long time, Luke VIII, 27.	There met him *two* possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce. Matt. VIII, 28.

6. Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, Matt. V, 17—19.	All that ever came before me, are thieves and robbers. John X, 8. Having abolished in his flesh the enmity even the law of commandments contained in ordinances. Eph, II, 15.
7. Then all the disciples forsook him and fled. Matt. XXVI, 56.	That the saying might be fulfilled, which he spoke, Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none. John XVIII, 9.
8. And it was the third hour, and they crucified him. Mark XV, 25.	About the sixth hour they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him, John XIX, 14, 15.
9. Now this man (Judas) purchased a field with the reward of iniquity ; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. Acts I. 18.	And he (Judas) cast down the pieces of silver in the temple and departed and went and hanged himself. Matt XXVII. 5.

10. Christ ascended from Bethany (Luke XXIV, 50, 51), from Mount Olive (Acts I, 9, 12), from a house in Jerusalem (Mark XVI, 14, 19), and apparently from Galilee also (Matt. XXVIII, 16—20).

Rev. Tisdell may be disposed to think that although the New. Testament books contradict one another and also the Old Testament yet the books comprising the latter are free from such errors. In order to banish such an idea from his mind, I will quote here a few out of many instances in which the Old Testament books also contradict each other.—

(*a*). And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh, as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen. Gen. XXII. 14.	And God spoke unto Moses and said unto him, I am the Lord, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of the God Almighty. but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them : Ex. VI, 2,3.
(*b*). And they removed from	And the children of Israel

Kadesh, and pitched in mount Hor, in the edge of the land of Edom. And Aarom the priest went up into the mount Hor at the commandment of the Lord, and died there.....And they departed from the mount Hor, and pitched in Zalmonah. And they departed from Zalmonah. and pitched in Punon. Num. XXXIII, 37—42.

took their journey from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera, there Aarn died and there he was buried.....From thence they journeyed unto Gudgodah ; and from Gudgodah to Jotbath. Deut. X. 6, 7.

(*c*) Again, Jesse made *seven* of his sons to pass before Samuel. .....And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children? And he said, There remaineth yet the youngest, and behold he keepeth the sheep. I Sam. XVI. 10, 11.

And Jesse begat his first born, Eliab, and Abinadab the second, and Shimma the third Nethaneel the fourth, Roddai the fifth, Ozem the sixth, David the seventh. I Chron. II, 13—15.

(*d*) Wherefore Saul sent messengers unto Jesse, and said, Send me David thy son...And, David came to Saul, and stood before him ? and he loved him greatly ; and he became his armour bearer. And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, Let David, I pray thee, stand before me, for he hath found favour in my sight. I Sam, XVI, 19—22.

And when Saul saw David go forth against the Philistine, he said unto Abner, the captain of the host, Abner, whose son is this youth ? And Abner said, As thy soul liveth, O King, I cannot tell. And, the King said, inquire thou whose son the stripling is.
I Sam. XVII, 55, 56.

(*e*) And there went out a champion out of the camp of the Philistines, named Goliath, of Gath, whose height was six cubits and a span....And the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam....So David prevailed over the Philistine with aling and with a stone and smote the Philistine and slew him. 1 Sam. XVII, 4, 7, 50.

Elhanan, the son of Jaare oregim, the Beth-lehemite, slew Goliath, the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam. 2 Sam. XXI, 19. (Gittite = of Gath).

(*f*) And when they came to Nachon's threshing-floor, Uzzah put forth his hand to the Ark of God. 2 Sam. VI. 6.

And when they came to the threshing floor of Chidon, Uzzah put forth his hand to hold the ark. 1 Chron. XIII 9.

(*g*) And David slew the men of seven *hundred* chariots of the Syrians, and forty thousand *horsemen* and smote Shobach &c. 2 Sam. X. 18.

And David slew of the Syrians seven *thousand* men which fought in chariots, and forty thousand *footmen* and killed Shophack. 1 Chron. XIX. 18.

(*h*) And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel. 1 Chron. XXI. 1.

And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel and He moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah. 2 Sam. XXIV, 1.

(*i*) And the King said unto Araunah, Nay ; but I will surely buy it of thee at a price.....So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen for *fifty* shekels of *silver*. 2 Sam. XXIV, 24.

So David gave to Ornan for the place *six hundred* shekels of *gold* by weight. 1 Chron. XXI, 25.

(*j*) Therefore Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child unto the day of her death. 2 Sam, VI. 23.

The five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she bare to Adriel. 2 Sam. XXI. 8.

(*k*) And Jehoram (the son of Ahab) reigned in his stead in the second year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah. 2 Kings I. 17.

And in the fifth year of Joram (Jehoram) the son of Ahab King of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then King of Judah, Jehoram, the son of Jehoshafat King of Judah began to reign (2 Kings VIII, 16).

(*l*) And Rehoboam loved Maachah, the daughter of Absalm, above all his wives... And Rehobrom made Abijah,

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam began Abijah to reign one Judah. He reigned three years in Jerusalem. His

the son of Maachah the chief, to be ruler among his brethren. 2 Chorn. XI, 21, 22.	mother's name also was Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. 2 Chron. XIII. 1, 2.
(*m*) Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign. 2 Chron. XXXVI, 9.	Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign. 2 Kings XXIV, 8.
(*n*) So Baashah slept with his fathers, and was buried in Tirah, and Elah his son reigned in his stead....In the twenty and sixth year of Asa, King of Judah, began Elah the son of Baasha to reign over Israel. 1 Kings XVI, 6, 8.	In the six and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, Baasha King of Israel came up against Judah, and built Ramah. 2 Chron. XVI, 1 (Thus Baasha built a city ten. years after his death).
(*o*) Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign. 2 Kings VIII, 26. So he (Jehoram, the father of Ahaziah) died of sore diseases. Thirty and two years old was he when he began to reign, and he reigned in Jerusalem eight years and departed. And the inhabitants of Jerusalem made Ahaziah, his youngest son, King in his stead. 2 Chron. XXI, 19, 20 ; XXII, 1.	Forty and two years old was Ahaziah, when he began to reign. 2 Chron. XXI, 20 ; XXII, 2. (These verses show that Ahaziah was forty-two when he came to the throne on his father's death at the age of 40. In other words, the father was two years younger than his son).

The foregoing contradictions will suffice to show that the Bible can hardly be taken as a standard for testing the truth of the Quranic stories. If any Quranic story varies in certain details from the same story given in the Bible, this does not show that the former is false. The latter, being itself full of contradictions, errors and absurdities, has no title to be taken as a standard work. Its books contradict one another and if they also contradict any details in the Quranic narratives, that is no evidence of the latter being erroneous. There are certain books in the Protestant Bible nay, in the Old Testament itself, whose exclusion from the canon has often been urged chiefly on account of their apparent untrustworthiness. The authors ot the Jewish Encyclopaedia say : " There were controversiness concerning the admission into the canon of the Book of Ezekiel, Solomon's three books (Proverbs, Ecclesi-

astes, Songs of Solomon), and Esther. The opposition to Ezekiel was only temporary : owing to its contradictions of the Pentateuch, many wished to hide it away ; but Hananiah ben Hezekiah ben Garon spent three hundred jars of oil to release it. The opposition to Proverbs, because they contained contradictions, was very slight. For the same reason, it was contended that Ecclesiastes ought not to be read. Others wished to prohibit the reading of Ecclesiastes on the ground that it expressed heretical ideas."

Speaking of Esther, the Jewish Enyclopaedia says : "It is evident from many sources that the canonicity of this book was not certain."

Rev. Tisdall's chief reason in taking these books as standard books is that they are inspired books, or the Word of God. But the pity is that not only the books do not claim divine origin for their histories, bnt with regard to many of them, it is not even known who the so-called inspired writers were who wrote them. I will take the most important book in both the New and the Old Testaments, *viz*, the Pentateuch, as an example. Rev. Tisdall says it was Moses who wrote the Pentateuch. The tenacity with which the Christians stick to old errors is surprising, "At an early date" says the Encyclepaedia Biblica, "doubts suggested themselves as to the Mosaic authorship, but it was not till the seventeenth, century that these became so strong that they could not he suppressed. It was observed that Moses does not speak of himself in the first person, but that some other writer speaks of him in third—a writer too who lived long after. The expression of Gen. 12 : 6 'the Cananite was then in the land' is spoken to readers who had long forgotten that a different nation from Israel had once occupied the Holy Land : the words of Gen. 36 : 31, 'these are the Kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any King : over the childern of Israel, have no prophetical aspect ; they point to an author who wrote under Hebrew monarchy. Again, the 'book of the wars of Yahwe' (Nu. 21 : 14) cannot be possibly cited by Moses himself, as it contains a record of his own deeds ; and when Dt. 34 : 10, (Cp. Nu. 12) says that there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, the writer is necessarily one who looked back to Moses through a long series of later prophets. At the same time attention was drawn to a variety of contradictions, inequalities transpositions, and repetition of events in the Pentateuch, such as excluded the idea that the whole came from a single pen," Vol. II, columns 2,045 and 2,046).

What value is to be attached to the history of the Pentateuch and other books of the Bible may be seen from the following quotations from the Encyclopaedia Biblica :—

Speaking of the time when the Hebrew people began to write their history, the Encyclopaedia says : " The making of history precedes the writing of history and it is often found that the impulse to write history is first given by some great achievement which exalts the self-consciusness of a people and awakens the sense of the memorable character of what it has done.. In Israel, the national history begins with the consolidlation of the tribes and the throwing off of the Philistine yoke...Internal evidence makes it highly probale that the earliest Hebrew historians wrote in the regin of Solomon (middle of the 10th century B. C.) and wrote first of the great events of the preceding half-century. The beginning having thus been made, the Israelite writers naturally turned to the earlier history of their people." (Vol. II, " Historical Literature.)"

Speaking of the sources from which the Jewish writers drew their material, the Encyclepaedia says :—" Their sources...were poems, genealogies, tribal and local traditions of diverse kinds ; the historical traditions of sanctuaries ; the sacred legends of holy places...; laws ; myths of native and foreign origin ; folk-lore and fable—in short everything which seemed to testify of the past...To us the greater part of this material is not historical at all; but for early Israelite it was otherwise."

Speaking of the first six books of the Old Testament, the Encyclopaedia says :—" A considerable part of this oldest Hebrew history is preserved in the stratum of the Hexateuch which critics designate by the symbol J, and in the parts of Judges Samuel that are akin to J. It has not indeed come down to us intact or in its orignal form ; redactors, in combining it with other sources, have committed parts, and additions to it of divers character and age have been made."

" The early Hebrew historians did not affix their names to their works ; they had, inded, no idea of authorship. The tradition and legends which they collected were common property and did not cease to be so when they were committed to writing : the written book was in every sense the property of the scribe or the possessor of the roll...Only a part of the great volume of tradition was included in the first books. Transcribers freely added new matter from the same sources on which the original authors had drawn. Every new copy was thus a fresh recension... Scribes compared different copies, and combined their contents according to their own judgments or interests For the period down to the time of Solomon the sources of the historians were almost exclusively oral tradition of the most varied character and contents of records and monuments there are but few traces, and these for the most part doubtful."

Such are the views held by the most enlightened and impartial

Christian writers with regard to the most important book of the Bible, *viz.*, the Pentateuch. Yet Rev. Tisdall says that its history is not only unimpeachable but also complete. He repeatedly refers to the testimony which the Holy Quran bears to the Torah as proof of its trustworthiness, but this testimony is not of the slightest use to him. In the first place, he does not believe in the truth of the Holy Quran. He regards the Holy Quran as a fabrication, yet quotes verses as an evidence of the reliability of his scriptures. If the Holy Prophet was what the Christians call him, they have no reason to be proud of the tastimony which he bore in favour of their scriptures on the other hand, they should be ashamed of referring to his words as a proof of the divine origin of their books If weight is to be attached to his testimony this can be done only on the admission that he was a true prophet. But if we regard him as a true prophet, we must also believe in his revelation which is the Holy Quran. It is in vain that they so repeatedly draw the attention of the Muslims to the Quranic testimony to the Torah. It is difficult to understand what they mean by this. If they mean that the Muslims should forsake the Holy Quran and allow the Torah, the latter cannot do so for the same book which bears testimony to the Torah also bears witness to its own revelation and to its being the final law If its testimony in favour of the Torah is to be trusted, there is no reason to reject its other claim which represents it as the final law. The Holy Quran bears two testimonies one to the divine origin of the Torah and the other to its own revelation ; and it is illogical to take one testimony and reject the other. If the Holy Quran is a fabrication and if the Holy Prophet is what the Christian missionaries represent him to be, it mattered little whether they admitted or denied the divine origin of the Torah, for in that case their testimony was of no account. But if the Christians want to attach weight to their testimony in favour of the Torah, they must start by admitting their truth, for in that case only can their testimony be worthy of consideration. But when once their truth is admitted, the claim of the Quran that its the final Law, must also be acknowledged. Nor can the Christains establish the historical accuarcy of their books by referring to the testimony of the Holy Quran, for whatever testimony the Holy Book of the Muslim bears to the Torah, it pertains not to history but only the law. It is only the law of Moses which is declared to be divine of origin by the Holy Quran. Not a word is said as to the accuracy of the tales that are to be found in the five books ascribed to Moses or other books of the Old or the New Testament. But if we admit that it was Moses who founded the Law and that he was an inspired prophet, it by no means follows that every tale that is to be found in the Genesis, or the Exodus, &c., was written by Moses

himself, and that the books that are ascribed to Moses by Jewish tradition were really written by him. From the Holy Quran it does not appear whether Moses ever wrote a book or a history. The following passage from the Encyclopaedia Biblica may be quoted here to show that the Quranic testimony to the divine origin of the Torah or the Law of Moses does not involve the admission that Moses was the writer of the books generally ascribed to him. Under the heading " Antiquity of Torah, ' the Encylopaedia says : " Moses may have been the founder of the Torah, though the Pentateuchal legislation was codified almost a thousand years later " (Vol. II. column 2055). And what is true of the testimony of the Holy Quran with reference to the Torah is also true of its testimony with regard to the Evangel The Holy Quran does not attest the history of the Pentateuch or the stories of the Gospels ; it is only the law, the prophecies and the teachings that it testifies to. With reference to these also, it only declares that they were originally based on divine revelation. When it speaks of the Torah, it refers to the law and the predictions, and when it speaks of the Injil, it is the prophecies and the teachings of Jesus that it refers to. In neither case does it attest the incidents and the tales that are said to have been written by Matthew, John, Luke and Mark, or the histories that are recorded by the nameless writers of the Old Testament. It only says that it was God who revealed Torah to Moses and taught Gospel to the Messiah. The utmost one can infer from the words of the Holy Quran is that Torah is embodied in the Pentatench and that some of the true teachings and prophecies of Jesus may still be found in the large number of books that go by the name of the Gospels. Rodwell says in a footnote on page 450 of his Translation : We are not to understand by the word Evangel (in the Holy Quran) the actual volume of the New Testament, or any one of its component parts, but rather the revelation made to Jesus by God Himself. Similarly, by the word Torah, as used in the Holy Quran, we are not to understand the Old Testament or any one of its component parts, but rather the revelation made to Moses by God Himself. Nor does it appear from the Holy Quran that these revelations still exist in their entirety in the pages of the Old and the New Testaments. The Holy Quran, on the other hand, plainly says that both the Jews and the Christians 'have forgotten a portion of what they were taught.' (v. 16,17). It also accuses them of claiming inspiration for books which are written by the hands of men, (ii, 73). It also accuses them of concealing portions of divine revelation (v,18) and also of tampering with their books, (iv.49; v.16) But whatever we may tnink of the testimony of the Holy Quran with regard to the *Torah* and the *Injil*, it is plain that not a single syllable of the Holy Quran bears testimony to the truth of the stories and the

histories that are given in the big volume which goes by the name of the Bible.

To revert to the question of the trustworthiness of the Bible from the critical point of view, it is plain that the history of the Bible is not free from errors and that no history can be rejected as false merely on the ground that it disagrees with the Bible in certain details. Hence the unreasonableness of Rev. Tisdall's argument that the Quranic histories are untrue because they disagree with Biblical narratives in many details. The mere circumstance that the Quranic histories differ in detail from the Biblical narratives is no proof of the inaccuracy of the former, for the accuracy of the latter is not an established fact. On the other hand, it is a known fact that the Biblical histories do contain errors. Hence the disagreemont of the Holy Quran with the Bible is an evidence of the truth of the former, for a true book could not wholly agree with a book which is known to contain errors.

Another reason of Rev. Tisdall for rejecting the Quranic narratives is that many of their details resemble such Jewish and Christain traditions as are not recorded in the Biblical books. But just as a Jewish or a Christian story can not be relied on as perfectly true merely because it is given in one or other of the many books comprised in the Bible, similarly no Jewish or Christian story can be rejected as totally false merely because it is given in non-canonical or apocryphal works. Just as the Biblical books abound in errors, fiction and myth, similarly the Jewish and the Christian traditions that are not comprised in the Bible may contain much that is true. Just as the Old and the New Testament books can not be said to be free from errors similarly the Jewish and the Christian traditions contained in other than Biblical books can not be said to be wholly devoid of truth. Truth and fication are inseparably mixed in both classes of books, and as no story can be declared as false merely because it disagrees with Biblical accounts, similarly no book can be rejected as erroneous only because certain of its contents resemble the Jewish and Christian traditions recorded in some of the apocriphal and other writings.* There is truth as well as falsehood both in the canonical and the outside books. If there is any difference, that may be of quantity, *i. e.*, there may be less falsehood and more truth in the Bible than in other Jewish and Christian books, but truth and falsehood are there in both. Hence as disagreement with the Bible in certain details is no proof of a Quranic story being false, similarly a certain degree of conformity between certain passages of the Holy Quran and the Jewish and

* Speaking of the similarity between the Quranic stories and the Christian apocryphal books Muir says : " Though some few of its details do coincide with these spurious writings, its statements, as a rule in no wise correspond."

Christian tradition is no evidence of the former being erroneous. There is truth both *in* the Bible and *outside* it, as there is falsehood both *in* the Bible and *outside* it, and if some parts of the Holy Quran agree with the books that are outside it, it does not show that the Holy Quran is not a true book. Again, there are many true histories that are not to be found either in the Bible or in any other Jewish and Christian writing, hence if the Holy Quran contains a narrative which is not to be found in any Christian or Jewish writing, we can not declare it to be false merely on the ground that the Jewish and Christian writings do not give it.

Rev. Tisdall thinks even a slight conformity with an apocryphal writing a sufficient proof of the falsity of a Quranic passage. He seems to have forgotten the fact that these writings "have been at sometime or in some quarters regarded as sacred scripture." (Jew. Enc., Vol. II, page 2). Besides a very large number of books that were excluded by the early Church, there is a number of books that have been regarded as the Word of God by the whole Christian Church for many centuries and which are still held as sacred by many Christians. Does not Rev. Tisdall know that in the Greek and the Latin Bibles there were many books which have now been excluded from the Bible by the Protestants, while the Catholic Church, in the Council of Trent, formally declared these books to be canonical. These are (*a*) I Esdras ; (*b*) II Esdras ; (*c*) Tobit ; (*d*) Judith ; (*e*) The Rest of the Chapters of the book of Esther ; (*f*) Wisdom of Solomon ; (*g*) Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus (*h*) Baruch with the Epistle of Jeremiah ; (*i*) Song of the Three Holy Children ; (*j*) History of Susanah ; (*k*) Destruction of Bel and the Dragon ; (*l*) Prayer of Manasses ; (*m*) I Maccabees ; (*n*) II Maccabees. These with the exception of *a b*, and *l* are canonical in the Roman Church. The Bible on which the Kings of England still take their oaths at their coronation contains books which the Church of England rejects as apocryphal.

If Rev. Tisdall rejects the Holy Quran because it contains certain passages which appear to him to resemble the contents of the Apocrypha, he should also reject the New Testament bacause the New Testament writers have also quoted or used as authorities a number of books which are not found even in the Greek Bible. These are "Jeremiah the Prophet" (Matt. XXVII, 9). "The wisdom of God" (Luke XI, 49), Enoch (Jude 14—16), Assumption of Moses (Jude 9), the Apocalypse of Elijah (Eph. V. 14 ; 1 Cor II; 9), the Martyrdom of Isaiah (Heb. XI, 37). Christian apologists have used for controversial purposes those books of the Greek Bible which are now rejected as apocryphal.

It is, however, neither the Bible nor the Apocrypha, on which the Holy Quran rests for authority. We do not defend its histories by pointing out similarity between them and the Biblical or

apocryphal writings. We do not say that such and such history of the Holy Quran is true, because such and such book of the Bible or such and such tradition of the Jews supports it. On the other hand, the Holy Quran is itself an authority for the truth of its contents. It has proved itself to be the Word of God, by means of mighty prophecies which turned out to be true. There is hardly a Sura of the Holy Quran, but contains prophecies the truth of which is beyond dispute. It is a revelation and therefore every story it gives is a true story. In order to show the truth of its histories, we need not turn to this or that book of the Jews or the Christians. All that we have to show is that it is the Word of God. I have shown above that the Holy Quran itself furnishes the surest proofs of its being the Word of God. The Christians cannot deny that it is a revelation, for it satisfies the criteria given in their scriptures. The Jews cannot deny that it is a revelation, for it satisfies the criteria given in their scriptures. No rational man can deny that it is the Word of God for it has proved itself to be so by means of mighty prophecies which it was beyond the power of a mortal to predict and which proved their truth by their fulfilment. The very histories, as I have already shown were prophecies, which bore witness to their divine origin by their wonderful fulfilment. Such being the case, what doubt can there be as to their being true histories. They have proved themselves to be the Word of God and therefore there cannot be the slightest doubt as to their truth. It is foolish on the part of the Christians to say that such and such story of the Holy Quran is erroneous because the Bible contradicts it or because it resembles such apocryphal writing. The Bible, as I have shown above, has no title to be taken as a standard, nor the mere resemblance with an apocryphal writing can be a proof of erroneousness. Truth is mingled with fiction both in the Bible and in the Apocrypha and in other Christian and Jewish traditions and we have no means to sift their truth from their falsehood. Before they use their Bible as a standard to test the truth of a story, let them first prove that it contains pure truth and no fiction. But they can not do so. Truth and falsehood are so inseparably mixed in the Bible that it is now beyond human power to separate them. Only a new revelation could sift what is true from that which is false. This has been done by the Holy Quran. So it is not wise on the part of a Christian to argue that because such and such story of the Holy Quran is contradicted or omitted by the Bible, therefore it is false. The Bible, I have said, *cannot* be taken as a standard to test the truth or falsehood of a story. If he is really a seeker after truth, let him demand from us proofs of the divine origin of the Holy Quran. When it is proved that the Holy Quran is a revelation, no doubt will remain as to the truth of its histories. But I have already shown that the Holy Quran has itself furnished

proofs of its being a revelation. So let him ponder over these proofs and if he finds them indisputable evidences of its being the Word of God, as they really are, he must take the histories of the Holy Quran as true histories.

I have already discussed the so-called Christian sources of Islam. I will now show that even among the Christians there is conflict of opinion as to the way in which the Holy Prophet is supposed to have borrowed his teachings from the followers of Jesus Rev. Tisdall makes the following statement :—

Rev. Tisdall William Muir, Mr. Rodwell and Professor Noldeke at war with one another.

(*a*). The Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings from heretical Christians (*Yanabi*, page 113), such as the followers of Marcion and Basilides, *i. e.*, the Gnostics (page 157, 149).

(*b*). These heretical Christians of Arabia were conversant with apocryphal writings. " Some of the apocryphal books were among them ; they *read* them and recited the tales which they contained, (page 113),

(*c*), The Holy Prophet lived in close intimacy with these heretical Christians, (page 113).

As I showed in the previous portion each of these statements has been flatly contradicted by Rodwell, Noldeke and Muir The first statement of Rev. Tisdall is contradicted by Rodwell who says in his Preface to the English Translation of the Holy Quran : "In fact, we have no historical authority for supposing that the doctrines of these heretics were taught or professed in Arabia at all. It is certain, on the other hand, that the Basilidans, Valentinians and other Gnostic sects had either died out, or been re-absorbed into the Orthodox Church, towards the middle of the fifth century, and had disappeared from Egypt before the sixth.

The second statement of Rev. Tisdall is contradicted by Professor Noldeke, who speaking of the Christians of Arabia says that they ' knew next to nothing.' (Ency. Brit. Vol. XVI page 600.)

The third statement is contradicted by Muir who says that ' in point of fact, if we except one or two campaigns against distant Christian tribes, and the reception of embassies from them, he came throughout his life into little personal contact with the professors of the faith of Jesus."

According to Rev. Tisdall, the Christians of Arabia *possessed* Apocryphal and other Christian writings and used ts *read* them and thus the Holy Prophet who is said to have been surrounded by these Christians, could, through his neighbours, have access to these writings. Rodwell and Professor Noldeke on the other hand hold the view that the Holy Prophet acquired his knowledge from no written source but from Christian tradition in the Peninsula. " We have no evidence," says Rodwell, " that Mohammad had access

to the Christian Scriptures." The opinion has already been expressed," says Noldeke, that Mohammad did not make use of written sources." The opinion of Rodwell and Noldeke is, in its turn, rebutted by Sir Wiliam Muir who says : " Others believe that Mohammad acquired his knowledge from no written source, but from the Christian tradition in the Peninsula. As his sole source of information, however, the indigenous tradition of Arabia was altogether insufficient. There is no ground for believing that either at Mecca or Medina there existed anything of the kind from which could have been framed a narrative agreeing as that of the Quran does in many particulars and even in some of its expressions with the Gospels both genuine and apocryphal." Thus the statement of Rev. Tisdall that the Christians of Arabia *possessed* and *read* Apocryphal and other Christian books is rejected by Rodwell and Noldeke, and the view expressed by the last named two gentlemen that the Holy Prophet acquired information from the Christian tradition in Arabia is rejected by Muir as unfounded. This disagreement among the Christian critics clearly shows that they possess no evidence of the fact that the Holy Prophet borrowed directly or indirectly from Christians. The statement made by one is contradicted by another, which would not have been the case, if they had possessed any sure proof for their allegations. They do not have even the shadow of the proof in their hands and their statements stand on the sandy foundation of mere conjecture. Some of them come forward with the statement that certain Gospels were within the reach of the Holy Prophet but others finding this statement to be totally unfounded deny it, and say that he acquired his information from Christian tradition prevalent in the Arabian Peninsula. But Muir rejects this view also. He tells us that the Holy Prophet had neither any access to any Gospels, nor did he acquire his information from the Christian tradition in the peninsula which according to him was too scant. 'Apocryphal Gospels' says he, 'were not accessible to Mohammad' and 'he came throughout his life into little personal contact with the professors of the faith of Jesus.' Thus he practically refutes the allegation generally made by the Christians that the Holy Prophet was indebted to the Christians of Arabia for the so-called Christian element in the Holy Quran. Sir William Muir has thus spared us the trouble of refuting the Christians by himself rejecting them as unfounded. He does not endorse the view that certain Christian writings were within the reach of the Holy Prophet nor does he accept as true the statement that there was sufficient tradition in Arabia to furnish material for the Holy Quran. Thus he deals a death blow to the theory that the Holy Prophet acquired his knowledge of Christian history and Christian religion from the Christians of Arabia. He also denies that there were Christians of

the Gnostic school in Arabia. He, thus, rejects all the different views that have been held by Christian writers as to the origin of the Holy Quran that have a bearing on Christianity and we heartily thank him for this service.

Yet though he justly rejects the views held by other Christians he advances a new theory, which I regret to say even beats the other theories in absurdity. He does not see his way to endorse the views held by other Christians because they are not based on facts, but the pity is that his own view is not supported by the slightest evidence. After rejecting the view that the Holy Prophet had access to Christian Scriptures or that there was sufficient Christian tradition in Arabia to furnish material for the Holy Quran Muir expresses his own opinion on the subject in the following words :—" But tradition, quite sufficient for this end, survived in the southern confines of Syria, and from thence no doubt reached Mohammed through some Jewish medium." But the learned writer seems to have overlooked the fact that just as there is no evidence to support the views of other Christians which he rejects as unfounded, similarly there is not even the semblance of an evidence to show that Christian tradition was imported into Mecca by the Jews. The mere circumstance that there was sufficient Christian tradition in the southern confines of Syria does not show that it was communicated to the Holy Prophet at Mecca. Muir must have been well aware of the fact that it is mostly the Mecaan Surahs that contain subjects which have a bearing on Christian history and belief, and, as I pointed out in discussing the so-called Jewish sources of Islam, there is no evidence to show that the Holy Prophet was visited either by the Jews or Christians who discoursed with him on religious topics and communicated to him information about their history and creed Muir himself, in spite of his knowledge of Islamic history, has not been able to produce any evidence to show that Jews from Syria or Medina paid the Holy Prophet visits at Mecca and gave him information about Christian or Jewish history and religion. If he rejects the views expressed by other Christians because they are not supported by facts, we are bound to reject his view also, because this too lacks the support of facts. If it is absurd to suppose that the Holy Prophet had access to Apocryphal or other Gospels or that there was sufficient Christian tradition in the peninsula to furnish material for the Holy Quran, it is even more absurd to suppose that Christian tradition was brought by the Jews from Syria to the Holy Prophet, at Mecca. Muir has no evidence to support his assertion. He makes the same mistake which Rev. Tisdall has committed in his book the *Yanabi*. He, like the said reverend gentleman, thinks it no part of his business to produce any *evidence* for his assertions. The very circumstance that what is given in the Holy Quran existed somewhere outside

it is, according to both these gentlemen, a sufficient proof of the fact that the Holy Prophet borrowed it from that foreign source. How and when are questions with which they seem to have no concern. Rev. Tisdall quotes a Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian or Sanskrit book and having pointed out the similarity of the passage quoted with certain of the Holy Quran at once jumps to the conclusion that the Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings from that source. Similarly, Muir thinks that it was the Christian tradition in the southern confines of Syria that furnished material for the Holy Quran, and the only reason for this assertion is that "tradition, quite sufficient for this end, survived" in that country, while in the Arabian peninsula, the Christian tradition was too scant to serve this purpose. Tradition, 'quite sufficient for this end,' may have survived in the southern confines of Syria, but the question is not whether sufficient Christian tradition existed anywhere but whether there is any *evidence* to show that the Holy Prophet drew upon that source. From Syria, says Muir, the tradition 'no doubt reached Mohammad through *some* Jewish medium." But is there any proof that the Jews actually served as a medium to convey the Syrian tradition to the Holy Prophet ? There is only one answer to this question and that is, no. The very *some* of Muir ("*some* Jewish medium ") clearly points to the conclusion that he had no proof for his statement. He had no knowledge of any Jew having actually gone to the Holy Prophet at Mecca, laden with Christian tradition from the southern confines of Syria. Speaking of the birth of Jesus he says :—" It is also possible that some one may have repeated from memory, or read to him from a manuscript, the narrative in the Gospel containing these details," and adds, " but this is mere conjecture." But the truth is that not only this, but everything else which Muir and other Christian critics have said with regard to the sources of Islam is "mere conjecture." If the statement that some one read to the Holy Prophet the chapter from the Gospel of Luke giving the story of the births of Jesus and John is a mere conjecture, the other statement that the Christian tradition in the southern confines of Syria reached the Holy Prophet at Mecca through some Jewish medium is also a mere conjecture. Muir has no proof either for the one statement or for the other. Muir has no right to differentiate between these two statements by calling one a mere conjecture, but is supported by facts. Both statements are equally unfounded and deserve to be rejected as worthless.

The very portions of the Holy Quran which deal with the Christian creed and history clearly falsify the idea that the Holy Prophet obtained them through some Jewish medium. If they had reached him through Jewish hands, they ought to have borne some

marks giving evidence of their transmission through Jewish medium. But they bear no such marks. No sign of Jewish animosity and hatred towards Jesus is visible in the Quranic account of the Jewish Messiah and his religion. On the other hand, every thing that is said of Jesus is markedly anti-Jewish. He has been cleared of all the charges that have been brought against him aud his holy mother by the Jews. His mother has been declared to be a pure woman and he himself has been described as a righteous prophet. Again, it has been denied that he died the accursed death of the cross. Even the description of his followers is not such as a Jew would describe them to be. In short, the whole story of Jesus belies the assumption that it reached the Holy Prophet through some Jewish medium. It is foolish to think that the Jews, who are supposed to have visited him at Mecca, instead of giving him their own picture of Jesus, his mother, his followers and his religion, read to him the Gospel of Luke or some other Christian writing. They were the last persons to do so. If they had been his informants, they would have depicted to him the Jesus of the Talmud. For instance, instead of reciting to him from memory or from a book, the first chapter of Luke, as they are supposed to have done, they ought to have described the birth of Jesus in the way in which it is described in the pages of the Talmud. The inability of the Christians to name an earthly father to Jesus would have confirmed their malicious reports, and we would have had then an account of the birth of Jesus different from the one which we now find in the Holy Quran. They could also produce Christian scriptures, nay Christian Gospels, in support of their allegations. That certain Christian scriptures also endorsed lying statements made by the Jews with regard to the character of the Holy Virgin and the birth of Jesus is apparent from she following quotation from the Riddle of the Universe by Ernst Haeckel. On page 335 the author says :—

" To return to the particular question of the impregnation of Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, we are referred to the Gospels for testimony to the fact. The only two Evangelists who speak of it, Matthew and Luke, relate in harmony that the Jewish Maiden Mary was betrothed to the carpenter Joseph, but became pregnant without his co-operation and indeed 'by the Holy Ghost.' As we have already related, the four canonical Gospels, which are regarded as the only genuine ones by the Christian Church, and adopted as the foundation of faith, were deliberately chosen from a much larger number of Gospels, the details of which contradict each other sometimes just as freely as the assertions of the four. The Fathers of the Church enumerate from forty to fifty of these spurious or apocryphal Gospels ; some of them are written both in Greek and Latin—for instance, the Gospel of James, of Thomas,

of Nicodemus, and so forth. The details which these apocryphal Gospels give of the life of Christ, especially with regard to his birth and childhood have just as much (or on the whole just as little) claim to historical validity as the four canonical Gospels. Now, we find in one of these documents an historical statement, confirmed, moreover, in the Sepher Toldoth Jeschua, which probably furnishes the simple and natural solution of the 'world riddle' of the supernatural conception and birth of Christ. The author curtly gives us in one sentence the remarkable statement which contains the solution....." (The sentence quoted by the author of the Riddle of the Universe contains a villanous attack on the chastity of Mary, and therefore I refrain from reproducing it here). Ungrateful Christians! The Holy Quran has laid them under a deep obligation by declaring the mother of Jesus to be a pure and righteous woman and has thus acquitted her of the charges which are so obscene that our pen shrinks from reproducing them. If the Holy Quran had not cleared Mary of all blame, and had endorsed the charge which is brought against her, not only by the Jews but also by many Christians, the whole Muslim world would have not regarded the mother of Jesus as a chaste woman. Still the ungrateful Christian tells us that the Holy Prophet was not an inspired prophet, but that he acquired his information from the Jews. If the Holy Prophet had derived his information from the Jews, he could not have regarded him as a righteous prophet. They represented him as one that was accursed, both in his birth and death. An ordinary man, with such a representation, could not have taken him as a prophet. The Christians also could do nothing to remove the impressions which the Jewish representation of Jesus left on one's mind. They could not name an earthly father of Jesus, and fully endorsed the Jewish story of his cursed death. Under such circumstances, if the Holy Prophet had not been guided by the light of revelation, he could not have taken Jesus as a true prophet. It was not through any Jewish or Christian medium that he learned of the chastity of Mary. The Jews did not represent her as a chaste woman and the Christians could not prove her to be such. He had no earthly means of knowing that Mary was a pure woman. It was revelation which gave him that knowledge, and if now millions of men believe her to be a chaste woman, and her son as a righteous servant of God, it is because the Holy Quran, which has proved itself to be the Word of God, has borne testimony to her chastity and to the righteousness of her son. Yet ungrateful Christians call it a fabrication, and represent the Holy Prophet as collecting his materials from the Jews. The Holy Prophet told the truth about Jesus and discarded the errors both of the Jews and the Christians, which he could not have done if the light of revelation had not been his guide.

In short, there is nothing more absurd than the assertion of Muir that the Holy Prophet acquired his knowledge of Christianity and its founder from the Jews. Muir has settled this question once for all. He rejects as untenable all the various theories that have been advanced by other Christian critics and has thus spared us the trouble of refuting them. When a Christian writer like Muir says that the views held by other Christian writers with regard to the so-called Christian sources of Islam are not supported by facts, there is hardly any need left for us to refute them. Our part is done by Muir and we are thankful to him for this. All we have to do is to consider Muir's own theory, and I have shown that his view also lacks the same support of facts which other theories do, and therefore we are bound to reject it as he rejects the other theories. Thus our task is accomplished and we can say with reason that the Christians have not the slightest evidence to show that the Holy Prophet bowed anything either from the Jews or from the Christians. The very divergence of opinion among Christian critics is itself a sufficient evidence of the fact that they do not possess in their hands any proof worth the name for their allegations, for if they had possessed any certain evidence, they would not have differed among themselves.

ZOROASTRIAN SOURCES.

Having now discussed the so-called Jewish and Christian sources of Islam and having shown the baselessness of the allegations of the Christian writers, I now proceed to examine the statements of Rev. Tisdall with regard to the alleged Zoroastrian sources of the Holy Quran. Following is the list of the subjects which according to Rev. Tisdall were derived from the Zoroastrian Sources :—

(*a*). The *Miraj* of the Holy Prophet, *i.e.*, his ascent to heaven in a vision.

(*b*). The description of paradise, the Houries, the Gilman, &c.

(*c*). The angel of death.

(*d*). The Azazil coming out of hell.

(*e*). The *Nur* (Light) of the Holy Prophet.

(*f*). The *Sirat*.

(*g*). The teaching that each prophet gives notice of the next to follow.

(*h*). The verse, 'In the name of God, the Giver of gifts, the Beneficent.'

(*i*). The *Jinn*.

(*j*). Existent motes (*Zarrat-i-Kainat*).

Of these subjects, *d*, *e*, *g* and *j* are not found either in the Holy Quran or in any authentic saying of the Holy Prophet and therefore it will be mere waste of time and space to give them any

consideration. Of the rest, the subject *f* is given in authentic traditions and the others are given in the Holy Quran itself. Subject *a* occurs in Surah xvii (1) ; subject *b*, among other Surahs, in lvi (12), lv (46), xxxvi (54), and xxxvii (38) ; subject *c* in vi (61), vii (35), xvi (35), and xxxii (11) ; (*h*) before all the Surahs, whether revealed at Mecca or Medina, with the single exception of a Medina Surah, and also in Chapter xxvii (30) ; and *i* in many Surahs, none of which belongs to the Medina period, for instance, in vi, (100, 128), xli (24, 29), xv (27) lv (14), &c.

Now all the Surah that have been named above are Meccan and thus the subject which are alleged to have been drawn from. Zoroastrian sources all occur in Surahs of the Meccan period. Some of them may have been repeated in a Medina Surah, but such repetitions are very rare. I wish the reader to note this fact, for it will be of great help to us in investigating the truth of Rev. Tisdall's allegations. Having shown that the all subjects of the Holy Quran which Rev. Tisdall traces to ancient scriptures of the Zoroastrian religion occur in the Surahs revealed at Mecca, I now proceed to consider the means by which these subjects are said to have reached the Holy Prophet "Some may hold it difficult to understand how Mohammad could have obtained such stories and matters as we find in the Quran and tradition from Zoroastrian sources ; and further, how it was possible for the 'unlearned' prophet to have become informed of them." To these questions, he gives four answers which I will consider one by one.—

"Firstly," says Rev. Tisdall, "it is written in the Rauzatul-Ahbab that it was his practice to converse in their own tongue with people of every nation who visited him ; and hence the introduction of some Persian words into the Arabic language." Thus, according to Rev. Tisdall, it was easy for the Holy Prophet have borrowed materials from Persian sources, for he could converse not only in the language of the Persians, but also in the languages spoken by other nations. But the question is, is this a fact ? Does Rev. Tisdall really believe it to be true ? Does he think that the Holy Prophet was a polyglot who could speak many languages ? Does he put faith in the statement that the Holy Prophet "conversed in their own tongue with people of every nation who visited him." If Rev. Tisdall is an honest man, he will tell us plainly that he has no faith in this statement. There is no doubt that he regards this statement as no better than a fable. Yet he produces this statement as a *proof* of the fact that the Holy Prophet could easily borrow from Zoroastrian sources.

There is no reliable tradition showing that he could speak foreign languages, but Rev. Tisdall has no concern with the reliability of a tradition. He always voraciously seizes every assertion, no matter however fictitious it may be, when it serves his

turn. Muir and many other Christian writers have written biographies of the Holy Prophet but none of them have recorded anything showing that he knew other languages than his mother tongue. But such is Rev. Tisdall's love of truth that he advances this very thing as a *proof* of the fact that he learnt many things from the Persians. But for Rev. Tisdall's sake, we may take it for granted that the Holy Prophet could speak the langnages of many nations and among them, that of the Persians. Does this show that he borrowed many things from the Persians ? I have already shown that the subjects which Rev. Tisdall claims to have traced to Persian sources belong to the Meccan period. Now it is the duty of Rev. Tisdall also to show that the Holy Prophet was visited at the city of Mecca by many Persians who were well versed in their religious literature. But unfortunately for the Rev. Tisdall, no Persian, learned or unlearned, ever came to Mecca while the Holy Prophet was there. If there came any, let Rev. Tisdall or any of his Christian friends prove this. In order to show that the Holy Prophet borrowed many of his teachings from the Zoroastrians, he represents him as familiar, not only with the language of the Persians, but also with those of many other nations. Really he does not believe this to be a fact, He quotes the *Rauzat-ul-Ahbab*, not because he thinks the statement to be true, but only to deceive simple Muslims. But I regret to say, he has made, only a fruitless attempt, for even if it be supposed that the Holy Prophet was conversant with Persians, it does not show that he learnt the teachings in question from the Persians, unless it is shown that the people of Persia were wont to visit him at Mecca where the said teachings were revealed.

The second answer which Rev. Tisdall gives to the question "how it was possible for the unlearned Prophet to have become informed" of these subjects is as follows: "Again," says he, "as the Prophet introduced Jewish tales, and also the stories and customs of the Arabian heathen, into the Quran, what wonder that he should do so likewise with Persian tales." I have already shown the baseleasness of the charge that the Holy Prophet borrowed any thing from the Jews or the Christians. The stories of the Holy Quran are not related there as stories but as prophecies which bore witness to their divine origin by their fulfilment. Even the stories of such people as Ad, and Thamood, &c., with which the people of Arabia are said to have been already familiar are told in the Holy Quran to serve as warnings. I have already discussed this subject at some length. But even if, to please Rev. Tisdall, we take it for granted that the Holy Prophet did borrow certain subjects from the Jews and the Christians, this can be no answer to the question, how it was possible for the unlearned prophet to have become informed of Zoroastrian teachings. Following this

line of argument, Rev. Tisdall might with equal reason, or rather with equal unreasonableness, assert that the Holy Prophet borrowed his teachings from the Red Indians or the Maories of New Zealand.

Now comes the third answer of Rev. Tisdall which, in his opinion, is the strongest of all. "In the Sirat-ul-Rasul, says he, "we learn that Mohammad had among the Companions a Persian called Salman, who at the siege of Medina advised him to surround the city with a trench, and when fighting with the Thackif helped the Muslims with a Catapult. Now it is said that some of the Prophet's opponents spoke of this person as having assisted him in the composition of the Quran, an accusation noticed in Surah xvi, 150.....Hence even from this history it is clear that the Zoraostrian writings formed one of the Sources of Islam." To expose the absurdity of the supposition that it was through Salman the Persian that the Holy Prophet learned the subjects in question, I need only point out the fact that it was at Medina that Salman the Persian joined the Muslims while the subjects referred to by Rev. Tisdall belong to the Meccan period. Rev. Tisdall is a very unfortuuate critic. He always leaves the element of time out of consideration. He tells us that such and such teaching reached the Holy Prophet through such and such person, but never takes into consideration the fact whether the said teaching was published by the Holy Prophet before the arrival of that person or after his arrival. Thus he speaks of three passages of the Holy Quran, which, he says, were brought to the Holy Prophet by Mary the Copt from Egypt. One of them occurs in Sura *Maryam* (xix) and the other two in Suras xlii and ci, respectively. Now it so happens that all these passages belong to the early Mecean period, while Mary was sent to the Holy Prophet while he had lived for about seven years at Medina. One of these Suras was revealed to him at least 14 years before Mary arrived at Medina. Yet Rev. Tisdall tells us that it was from Mary that he acquired these passages almost word for word. Similarly the subjects of the Holy Quran which Rev. Tisdall traces to Zoroastrian sources all belong to the Meccan period, while Salman whom he described as the medium through which the Holy Prophet acquired knowledge of Zoroastrian scriptures joined him at Medina. It is strange that the Holy Prophet should have acquired knowledge of many subjects from Mary the Copt and Salman the Persian long before he came in contact with them and before he had any knowledge of their existence. The world has, indeed, found a past master of criticism and research in Rev. Tisdall ! How justly indeed does he deserve the praise which his translator, Muir, bestows on him, when speaking of his book, he says : "The *Sources* is a noble work, and reflects high distinction on the writer." This is a book, which reflects 'high distinction'

not only on its author but also on its translator, who, in spite of his acquaintance with Islamic history, has permitted himself to give an English garb to a book which represents the Holy Prophet as acquiring knowledge of many teachings from persons who come to him years after he had published those teachings both among his friends and foes. This high distinction, however, is not the sole property of Rev. Tisdall and his translator, Muir, for a third eminent Christian writer also comes in for a share. This is J. M. Rodwell, M. A., Rector of St. Ethelburga, London, and Translator of the Holy Quran. He also makes the same foolish blunder which Rev. Tisdall has made. Speaking of Salman the Persian, in his Introduction to the Translation of the Holy Quran, he says that to him the Holy Prophet "may have owed the descriptions of heaven and hell which are analogous to those of Zendavesta." It is indeed regrettable that men who have so poor a knowledge of Islam should presume to pose as critics and should mislead the world by their ignorant judgments. Rodwell has arranged the Suras of the Holy Quran in chronolgical order and he must have seen that the very earliest Suras of the Meccan period contain descriptions of heaven and hell which he says are analogous to those of Zendavesta, and if he had possessed even a faint acquaintance with Islamic history, he would not have committed himself to the ridiculous error of representing the Holy Founder of Islam as borrowing these Quranic passages from Zoroastrian sources through a man who joined him long after he had published the said passages.

In order to support his allegation that it was from Salman, the Persian, that the Holy Prophet acquired the knowledge of many Zoroastian teachings, Rev. Tisdall says: "Some of the Prophet's opponents spoks of this person as having assisted him in the composition of the Quran, an accusation noticed in Surah xvi, 105, as follaws :—

'And verily, we kuow that they say, Truly a certain man teacheth him ; but the tongue of him unto whom they incline is a foreign one, while this is the tongue of perspicuous Arabic." I have already noticed this verse in a previous article and therefore it is needless to repeat the same remarks here. I may only point out here that this verse also belongs to the Meccan period and therefore it cannot refer to Salman, and the assertion of Rev. Tisdall that the verse in question refers to Salman throws further light on his ignorance. Besides the verse does not speak of assistance in the form of furnishing materials for the Holy Quran. The words of the verse clearly show that it is literary assistance, *i.e.*, helping in the style of the Quranic composition, that is meant here.

There is one circumstance which has completely demolished the whole criticism of the Christian writers. It is a curious fact

that the subjects of the Holy Quran which are alleged to have been borrowed by the Holy Prophet from the Jews, the Christians or the Zoroastrians occur almost wholly in the Surahs revealed at Mecca, while there was not a single Jew, not a single follower of Jesus, and not a single Zoroastrian in that city, nor is there any evidence of these people having visited the Holy Prophet at Mecca. Indeed there were one or two Christian slaves, who were among the earliest converts to Islam. But these had been carried off in boyhood and no reasonable man will think them for a moment to have been familiar with the histories which we find detailed at length in the Meccan Suras. One of them, for instance, was Zaid, of whom Muir says : "Zaid was still a *child* when, journeying with his mother, the company was waylaid by a band of Arab marauders, who carried him away captive, and sold him into slavery." (Life of Mohammad, page 33). So it is foolish to think that these *children* furnished the Holy Prophet with materials. The Christian writers recognise this fact, hence their resort to other theories. In short, the occurrence of almost all the subjects traced by Christian writers to Jewish, Christian or Zoroastrian sources in Meccan Suras, is a very unfortunate circumstance from the Christian point of view, for it destroys all their theories. It is *Simply impossible* for them to show that the Holy Prophet had found means of communication with the Jews, the Christians or the Zoroastrians at Mecca. Unfortunately for the Christian writers, neither the Jews, nor the followors of Jesus, neither Salman the Persian, nor Mary the Copt were with the Holy Prophet at Mecca, nay, they are not even known to have paid him occasional visits and narrated before him their histories. So this single circumstance, *viz.*, the occurrence of the subjects in question in Meccan Suras, is a decisive blow to the various Christian speculations as regards the origin of the Holy Quran.

To return to the so-called Zoroastrian sources, Rev. Tisdall may say that at least the teaching regarding the *Sirat* which is found in authentic traditions may have been learnt by the Holy Prophet from Salman the Persian. True, the teaching with regard to the *Sirat* is not given in the Holy Quran in express words, but the commentators see a reference to it in the verse :—

This verse occurs in Surah Maryam, which, again, is one of the earlist Meccan Suras. But even if we suppose that this verse contains no reference to the *Sirat*, then also it does not follow that the Holy Prophet learned this teaching from Salman. In order to show that the Holy Prophet learned this teaching from Salman, let Rev. Tisdall first show that this teaching was *not* given at Mecca and then quote some *evidence* to show that the Holy Prophet actually learned this teaching from *Salman*. If the Holy Prophet could give other teachings alleged to have been borrowed from Zoroastrian sources, without the aid of Salman, he could give

this teaching also without his aid. It is simply absurd to represent the faithful followers of the Holy Prophet as instructing him in the histories and teachings of Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian religion, and then continuing to believe in him as an inspired prophet when he published those very histories and teachings as divine revelations.

The fourth answer which Rev. Tisdall gives to the question, how it was possible for the Holy Prophet to have acquired a knowledge of the subjects in question is as follows :—

"We learn from Arabian and Greek historians that previous to Mohammad's birth, and during his life, many parts of the Peninsula were ruled over by Persian Kings. For example, Kesra Nousherwan having sent an army to Hira, put down Harith the king, and in his room placed the sub-servient Maudzar on the throne. He, also sent an army to Yemen and having expelled the Abyssinian invaders, restored the old king, whose progeny followed him in the government of the land..... It is clear then that both in the time of Mohammad and previously, the Persians had constant intercourse with Arabia ; and being incomparably more learned than its ignorant people, must have had an important influence on their religion, on their customs and on their knowledge at large."

The only parts of Arabia over which the Persians had control were Yemen and Hira. The two invasions referred to by Rev. Tisdall took place not previous to the time of the Holy Prophet but in his life time. The province of Yemen was originally governed by descendants of Kahtan and Himyar (the dusky). They are said to have reigned for about twenty-five hundred years. Their sovereignty was at last overthrown in 529 A. D., *i.e.*, only about 40 years before the birth of the Holy Prophet) by an Abyssinian invasion, but was re-established in 608 A. D. as a dependency of the Persian empire. Thus the event referred to by Rev. Tisdall took place in 603, *i.e.*, when the Holy Prophet was between 30 and 40. The kingdom of Hira or Heera was abolished by Chosroes or Kesra seven years later, *i.e*, in 610, after the Holy Prophet had entered his career as a prophet. Now the following considerations give the lie to Rev. Tisdall's conclusions :

Firstly, the invasions referred to by him took place on dates which were almost identical with the date of the commencement of the Holy Prophet's career. Now, the subjects in question, such as the descriptions of heaven and hell, the formula *Bismillah*, &c, occur in the very earliest Suras of the Holy Quran, and it is inconceivable that the two military expeditions of the Persians resulted in the immediate transmission of these subjects to the Holy Prophet at Mecca.

Secondly, the two provinces were not *occupied* by the Persians and there was no settlement of the Persian people. In the case of

the one the rule of the old dynasty of Himyar which had been expelled by the Abyssinians was re-established, while in the other, Rev. Tisdall himself tells us that the Persian army only put down the old king and in his room placed another king named Mandzar. There being no settlement of Persians in these provinces, the doctrines and teachings of the Zoroastrian religion could not disseminate themselves so rapidly in Arabia as to reach the Holy Prophet at Mecca in a year or two.

Thirdly, both these provinces lay on the extremities of Arabia and at a great distance from Mecca. There was little or no intercourse between these provinces and the city of Mecca. The province of Yemen formed the south-west corner of the Arabian peninsula, while Heera was situated in the north easterly province of Arabian Irac.

Fourthly, Rev. Tisdall speaks of the influence of the Persians on the customs, the religion and the knowledge of the Arabs, but he can not quote any evidence of that influence among the people at large. He cites the example of Nadhr son of Al Harith, who, one day after the Holy Prophet had left an assembly of the Quresh in the Ka'aba, came in and told the Quresh stories of the great Rustem and of Isfandiyar and the kings of Persia and then said, "I swear by the Lord, the stories of Mohammad are no better than my own ; they are nothing but tales of the past which he hath written out, just as I have written mine out." If one or two Persian tales were known to a certain opponent of the Holy Prophet who had been to foreign lands, this does not show that the two military expeditions of the Persians against two remote provinces had exercised an enormous influence on the religion, customs and knowledge of the Arabs. On the other hand, the tradition, if true, only shows that the said stories were at that time known only to the son of Al-Haris and that they were strange stories for the rest of the Quresh.

Fifthly, a mere glance at the subjects which have been traced to ancient Zoroastrian scriptures will suffice to show the absurdity of Rev. Tisdall's assertions. They are subjects which can not be supposed to have diffused themselves among the Arabs merely through one or two military expeditions, so that traversing the deserts of Arabia, they at last reached the ears of the Holy Prophet. I request the reader to go through the passages which he quotes from ancient Zoroastrian books and then consider whether it is imaginable that their contents were so widely diffused among the Arabs that they at last even reached the Holy Founder of Islam who gave them a place in the Holy Quran as divine revelation I will give here a few instances of these passages :—

(a.) "There is a work," says Rev. Tisdall on page 219, "believed by Zoroastrians to have been written in the language o

heaven, and, about the time of Khusrau Parwez, to have been translated in the Dari tongue. It comprises fifteen books said to have descended on fifteen prophets, last of all came the sixteenth, Zoroaster himself . . . The second verse in each of these book opens with :—*In the name of God, the Giver of Gifts, the Beneficent*; similar to the words at the opening of all the Suras,——'In the name of God, the Merciful and Gracious.' We also find the first words in another Zoroastrian book, *Dinakart*, to be very similar, namely, *In the name of Ormazd the Creator.*"

(*b.*) The teaching with regard to *Sirat* is supposed by Rev. Tisdall to have its source in the following passage of *Dinakart*; "It is good for me to abide in the Bright way, lest I arrive at the severe punishment of Hell, *that I may cross over Chinavad* and may reach that blessed abode, full of odour, entirely delightful and always bright."

(*c.*) The description given by the Holy Prophet of his spiritual ascent to heaven was, according to Rev. Tisdall, borrowed from the following passage of *Arta Viraf Namak*, a Pehlvi book written in the days of Ardashir, some 400 years before the Hejira ; "Our first advance upwards was to the Lower heaven . . . . . and there we saw the Angel of those Holy Ones, giving forth a flaming light, brilliant and lofty." We are then told that Arta extended similarly to the second and third heavens and to many others beyond. "At the last," says Arta, "my Guide and the Fire-angel having shown me paradise took me down to hell."

These three instances will suffice to show the absurdity of Rev. Tisdall's statement that the subjects which he traces to Zoroastrian sources must have been current among the Arabs, owing to the invasions of Yemen and Heera by the victorious armies of Kesra Nawsherwan. There is no evidence to show that the Persians had exercised such influence on the religion, customs and knowledge of the Arabs that the latter had become familiar even with such contents of their scriptures as those above. Is there any evidence, for instance, to show that the Arabs possessed knowledge enough of Zoroastrian scriptnres as to know that certain of these scriptures commenced with a formula like the one which stands at the head of each Sura. In short it is simply unreasonable to assert that the Persian expeditions against Yemen and Heera had exercised such an enormous influence on the whole of Arabian Peninsula that in a few years the very contents of their old scriptures were diffused throughout the Peninsula until the Holy Prophet obtaining their *knowledge* gave them a place in the Holy Quran as divine revelation.

The truth is that God has been raising prophets in all land. They brought the same teachings and they had similar experience. Hence if certain passages of the Holy Quran correspond to certain

contents of the ancient Zoroastrian scriptures, and if the Holy Prophet of Arabia had experiences similar to those of an ancient Prophet of Iran, this does not show that the Holy Prophet had found access to ancient Zoroastrian scriptures or had found means of communicating with men learned in Zoroastrian scriptures. On the other hand, such parallelisms and such analogies, in the absence of there being any means of communication, are a clear proof of the fact that all these books had originally come from a common source, and that all these teachers were the messengers of the same Being. These parallelisms are not confined to Islam and Zoroastrianism alone, they exist in all the great religions of the world. These similarities exist not because these prophets borrowed their teachings from the same sources. They appeared in different times and in countries ; but they all gave the same teachings and had different similar experiences and this is an undeniable proof of the fact that they all received their inspirations from a common source. Thus, Rev. Tisdall, by pointing out similarity between the teachings and experiences of the Holy Prophet and other great teachers of the world, far from showing the Holy Prophet to be a fabricator, only establishes his truth.

Rev. Tisdall not only traces the teachings of the Holy Prophet to Zoroastrian, Christian and Jewish sources, but he also tells us that the Holy Prophet was also indebted to the Arabs, the Hanefites, and the Sabaeans for many of his teachings.

Speaking of the Arabian sources, he says: "It came to pass that (excepting the worship of idols, a plurality of gods, the killing of daughters and other such evil practices), many of the ideas and customs subsisting among the Arabs from the time of Abraham were retained by the Prophet, and form part of his religion . . . . . Some tribes were descended from Joktan, others from Hagar, Ketura and Ishmael. Among the latter was the tribe of the Quresh, itself among the descendants ot Abraham . . . . . The dwellers in the North and the West of the Peninsula retained a certain knowledge of the Unity divine . . . . . The term Allah itself is repeatedly found in the seven Moallaqat, whose authors lived before the ministry of Mohammad, and also in the Dewan of Labid . . . . . The Unity of God was never forgotten by the Arabs . . . . . There still survived throughout Arabia the consciousness of One true God . . . . . Circumcision also was practised from of old, as we learn from the Epistle of Barnabas written about two centuries after Christ . . . . In conclusion, then, we find that the first source of the Quran and Tradition consisted of the notions, customs, and religious beliefs, existing around Mohammad." I fail to understand why Rev. Tisdall takes so great pains to show that certain of the tecahings of the Holy Prophet such as the existence of Allah, the practice of circumcision, some of

the family restrictions in marriage, ablution and several minor matters, were already known to his countrymen. His object is to make it 'clearer than the sun' that the Holy Quran is not a revelation. But if the Arabs were already aware of the existence of Allah, observed certain of the relations, and many other minor things taught by Islam, does this show that the Holy Quran is not a revealed Word of God and that the Holy Prophet was not an inspired prophet. Does he mean to say, that the new revelation sent to the Holy Prophet ought to have contained no teaching with regard to the Unity of God and other doctrines which were already believed in by the Arabs? Does he mean to say that the Holy Prophet of Arabia was not a true prophet because he enjoined circumcision, which was already practised by his countrymen? Does he think that a divine revelation sent to an Arabian Prophet ought to have said nothing with regard to the Unity of God or that it ought to have substituted some new teaching instead of divine Unity, because divine Unity was already recognised by the people of Arabia? If the new revelation to the Arabs ought to have inculcated divine Unity, why does he find fault with the Holy Quran for doing so? And if a prophet sent to the Arabs ought to have enjoined circumcision on his followers, why does he find fault with the Holy Prophet for the sanction of that practice? The mere circumstance that the Arabs already believed in divine Unity, that they already practised circumcision and observed certain other injunctions of Islam can not be cited as an evidence of the fact that the Holy Prophet was not an inspired prophet and that the Holy Quran is not a revealed book, unless it is shown that a true book ought to have taught something different. When a true prophet would, according to Rev. Tisdall, have given exactly the same teachings, notwithstanding that they were already known to the Arabs, it is merely absurd on the part of Rev. Tisdall to say that since these teachings were already known to the Arabs, therefore they were borrowed from them by the Holy Prophet. When a true revelation ought to have contained identical teaching even if it were already known to the people, it is ridiculous on the part of Rev. Tisdall to refer to that teaching of the Quran as an evidence of its not being a revelation, because the teaching was known before the advent of the Holy Book. To make the matter clearer, I will refer him to the Ten Commandments. He believes them to be the Word of God which He revealed to His chosen prophet Moses. But does he think that none of these commandments were alredy known to Moses, Aaron and their companions? Were the followers of Moses more ignorant of God than the Arabs? Did they think it lawful to kill, to steal, to bear false witness against the neighbour, and to desire his wife or anything that was his? Did they think it right to insult their fathers and their

mothers ? Yet Rev. Tisdall thinks these commandments to be the Word of God. The circumstance that Moses and his followers already new these commandments does not debar him from taking them as divine inspiration. But when he comes to the Holy Quran, he says that it can not be a revealed book, because the doctrine of divine unity which it inculcates was already believed in by the Arabs.

Besides, it should be remembered that if the Arabs were conscious of the existence of the Supreme Being, they were strangers to the God as represented in the Holy Quran. If the Arabs had an idea of the existence of God, it could be of little help to the Holy Prophet I fail to understand what Rev. Tisdall means when he says that the Holy Prophet borrowed the idea of the existence of God from his contemporaries. Does he mean to say that the Holy Prophet himself had no innate knowledge of the existence of God and that but for his idolatrous contemporaries, he would have for ever remained ignorant of the existence of the Supreme Being ? The mere existence of God was not a subject for which he needed the aid of his contemporaries. This idea is implanted in the very nature of man and it must have been implanted in the nature of the Holy Prophet as in those of other mortals. It is the character and attributes of God that can not be fully comprehended without the aid of divine revelation. The Arabs may have had some idea of the existence of God but they were strangers to the power, knowledge, holiness, and other attributes of the Divine Being So in order to see whether the Holy Prophet borrowed anything from his contemporary Arabs, we should consider not merely the idea of the existence of God, but His attributes and His character, His relation to man and the duties which men owe to Him. In these matters the Holy Prophet could look for little guidance from his contemporary Arabs. Let the reader consider the representation of the Supreme Being as given in the Holy Qnran. How true, how noble, how perfect is the picture of God as drawn in the Holy Book of the Muslims ! It is free from all blemishes and defects, it possesses all the beauties and excellences. It has been rightly said by a great Christian, General (Chinese) Gordon, 'I like the Musalman, he is not ashamed of his God.' A Musalman is not ashamed of his God because His character is not sullied by any impurity, and a Muslim is proud of his God because He possesses all the good qualities. "It must be acknowledged, too," says Rodwell, "that the Quran deserves the highest praise for its conception of the Divine nature, in reference to the attributes of Power, Knowledge, and Universal Providence and Unity ; its belief and trust in the one God of Heaven and Earth is deep and fervent."

The only conclusion to which the Quranic representation of the Divine Being leads is not that is was borrowed from Arabian

or any other earthly source, but that it emanated from the Divine Being Himself : such a perfect and harmonious description of the Supreme Being can not be but divine.

THE BLACK STONE.

"While so many of the ancient places, rites, and customs were maintained," says Rev. Tisdall, only one *quasi*-idolatrous practice has "been kept up, namely, the kissing of the Black stone, which was then worshipped as of heavenly descent ; the habit was so loved by the people, that it could not be forbidden, and indeed is still observed." Nothing is more wrong than the statement that the Holy Prophet retained the practice of touching or kissing the Black stone because the habit was so loved by the people that it could not be forbidden. Those who make such a statement ignore the miraculous transformation which was wrought by the teachings of the Holy Prophet. So great was the change brought about by his teachings that the old love of idolatry was turned into bitter hatred for it, and if the Holy Prophet had not himself set the example by kissing the stone, his followers would have certainly quitted this practice, even if there had been no express commandment enjoining its abandonment. Omar expressed the sentiments of the whole Muslim nation, when, after kissing the Black-stone, he said :—

"I know, thou art only a stone ; thou canst neither injure nor benefit. And if I had not seen the Apostle of God kiss thee, I would have never kissed thee." (*Sahih Bukharee*). Thus if the followers of the Holy Prophet kissed the Black stone, they did so against their will, not through any love for the stone, but merely to imitate the example of their Master. Rev Tisdall says, the habit was so loved that the Holy Prophet could not forbid it. But the facts show that even though he had wrought such a change among the people that they would have abandoned it of their own accord, only if he had not set them an example, yet he did not forbid it. He did not retain the practice because his followers would have disliked its abolition. On the other hand, he retained it, even though his followers would have liked to see it abolished Thus there is no truth in Rev. Tisdall's statement that he did not abolish the practice of kissing the Black stone because it was so loved that he could not forbid it.

Now as to the meaning underlying this practice. The stone was a prophecy in symbolical language of the appearance in the city of Mecca of a prophet in whom was to be fulfilled the prediction which asid : "The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner," (Psalm 118 : 22 ; 23). The Arabs were ignorant men who possessed no scriptures. Therefore instead of a written prophecy, a stone was laid in the foundations of the Ka'aba to serve as an emblem of the prophet whose advent was foretold by Isaiah in Chapter xxviii, 16, 17 ; by the Psalmist

in Psalm 118: 22, 23, and by Jesus in Matt. 21 : 42—44. The stone formed a corner of the building in allusion to the fact that the stone which the builders rejected was to become the head of the corner. In short, the stone that had lain at Ka'aba and had formed a corner of the building from time immemorial pointed of the advent to the self same prophet of whom the Psalmist and Jesus spoke in the words : " The stone which the builders refused is become the head of the corner " and to whom Prophet Isaiah referred in the words : " Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a precions corner stone : he that believeth shall not make haste." Nay, it was the very stone which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his famous vision, *viz.*, the stone that smote the image and became a great mountain. In ancient times ideas were expressed by symbols,—a custom which is in vogue even in modern times. Hence the verbal prophecy given by the Psalmist, Prophet Isaiah and by Jesus was represented by the Black stone at Mecca. A stone placed in the corner of a sacred temple in the very city from which the promised prophet was to make his appearance was a true picture of the words : " A stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. "The stone was called *Yomin-ur-Rahman* or "the Right Hand of God" and the touching or kissing of the stone symbolised the fact that the people were to plight fealty to him by touchiug his hands—an action known as *baiat*—and that those who touched or kissed his hands as a token of fidelity touched, as it were, the Hand of God. Reference is made to this fact in the following verse of the Holy Quran : " In truth, they who give their hands in thy hand as a pledge of fealty, really do so with God ; the hand of God is over their hands." (xlviii, 10). Prophecies in symbols and pictures are recognised even by the Christians. The sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. Nay, according to them, even the covenant of circumcision was an emblem of that sacrifice. In the waving of the sheaf spoken of in the following passage of Leviticus, they see an emblem of the resurrection of Jesus : " And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest unto the priest ; and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you : on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it." (xxiii, 10). In I Corinthians xv, 20, Paul says : " But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." *i.e.*, just as the first fruits, under the law, sanctified the whole crop, similarly Christ has, by his death and resurrection, sanctified the whole body of believers. Again, the 12 stones spoken of in the following passage of Joshua are held by them as symbolising the twelve apostles of Jesus

" Then Joshua called the twelve men whom he had prepared of the children of Israel, out of every tribe a man : and Joshua said unto them, Pass over before the ark of the Lord your God into the midst of Jordan, and take you up every man of you a stone upon his shoulder, according unto the number of the tribes of the children of Israel : that this may be a sign among you, that when your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, what mean ye by these stones ? when ye shall answer them, That the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord : when it passed over Jordan, the waters of Jordan were cut off ; and these stones shall be for a memorial unto the children of Israel for ever." (iv, 5—7).

Christians have the habit of applying every prophecy to Jesus and therefore they apply the prophecy of the corner stone also to him, But Jesus himself thought otherwise. From his words given in Matthew and Luke it is apparent, that when he spoke of the stone that was to become the head of the corner, he was referring to a prophet that was to come after him. In the parable of the vineyard, he first speaks of the servants whom the lord of the vineyard sent to the husbandmen that they might receive the fruits of it. These were maltreated by the husbandmen, and the lord of the vineyard sent unto them his son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir, come let us kill him. And they caught him and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. The Lord of the vineyard in the parable is God ; the husbandmen, the children of Israel ; the servants, the prophets sent to the children of Israel ; and the son is Jesus Christ. The Beni Israel maltreated the prophets and laid their hands on the son to slay him. Thus they proved themselves to be rebellious husbandmen. What was to be the punishment of this rebellion ? The vineyard was to be taken from the rebellious labourers and given to other husbandmen, who were to render to the lord of the vineyard its fruits in their seasons. " The kingdom of God," says Jesus to his people, "shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." The words 'a nation' are important, for they furnish a clue to the true interpretation of this parable. Jesus speaks not of nations in general, but of 'a nation.' This evidently shows that he was referring to a particular nation to which the vineyard was to be given after the death of the son. The children of Israel were to be turned out of the vineyard for their rebellion and another nation was to be given the inheritance thereof. This second nation was not to be like the first nation. It was to render to their Lord the fruits of the vineyard in their seasons. And this transference of the vineyard was to take place after the death of the son. The original husbandmen were to lose

the inheritance after they had slain the son of their lord. And just as the transference of the vineyard was to take place after the murder of the son, similarly the prophecy relating to the corner-stone was to be fulfilled after his death. Which is that second nation and who is that stone ? Of that second nation which was to inherit the kingdom of God, it is said that they shall render to their Lord the fruits of the vineyard in their seasons. This nation was evidently the nation of the children of Ishmael, who were given a new law after Jesus. And when they were made the trustees of the new Law, they did not act like their predecessors, the children of Israel. They played their part with credit. They were husbandmen who rendered to their Lord the fruits of the vineyard in their seasons. Of the stone it is said, "And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken : but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." This stone was evidently the prophet that was raised at Mecca about 600 years after Jesus. It was a stone of which it may be said with strict accuracy that whosoever fell on it was broken to pieces and on whomsoever it fell it ground him to powder. Is not this description literally true of the Ishmaelite Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him)? This cannot be said of Jesus, for when the rebellious husbandmen fell on him, he was broken to pieces. They caught him, to use the words of the parable, cast him out of the vineyard and slew him. So the description of the stone in the prophecy cannot apply to him. Compare his case with that of the Holy Prophet of Arabia (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). When the Jews fell on the former, they almost broke him to pieces. If Jesus escaped death on the cross, it was only a hair breadth escape. They reduced him to such a condition that they might be said to have literally slain him. But such was not the case with the latter. Whenever any enemy fell on him, he was literally broken to pieces, and whenever he fell on his enemies, he actually ground them to powder. When Abu Jehl and other grandees of Mecca issued forth from their city, full of pride and determined to annihilate the prophet and his followers, they fell to pieces on the field of Badr. Oh ! This reminds me of the famous vision of Atika, sister of Abu Lahb, which she saw on the eve of the battle of Badr. In that vision she saw a stone fall on the city of Mecca and there was not a house in the whole city but a particle of that stone fell on it. This vision was fulfilled in the wailing which followed the disastrous battle of Badr. Muir speaks of it in the following words:—"At Mecca the news of the defeat was received with consternation. Burning shame and thirst for revenge stifled for a time all outward expression of grief. . . . . A month elapsed thus ; and then they could refrain no longer. The wild cry of long stifled

grief burst forth at last from the whole city. In almost every house t here were tears and wailings for the captive or the dead. And this lasted an entire month. One house alone was silent. 'Why sheddest thou no tears,' said they to Hind, the wife of Abu Sufian ; 'why weep not for thy father Otba, thine uncle also and thy brother ?' 'If tears,' replied Hind, 'could wipe the grief from off my heart, I too would weep as ye; but it is not, thus with Hind.'"

What stone was it which Atika saw falling on the city of Mecca ? It was the stone of which Jesus spoke as one that ground to powder every one on whom it fell.

Similarly, when the Jewish tribes of Medina sought to destroy the prophet and his party by their wicked intrigues, they were themselves destroyed in fulfilment of the prophecy of Jesus. When he alighted before Khaibar, he cried "Kharibat Khaibar, *i.e.*, Khaibar is undone ! Allah Akbar ! Great is the Lord ! Truly when I light upon the coast of any people, woe unto them in that day." It was so, because Jesus had spoken of him as a stone which ground to powder every one on whom it fell.

The truth of this prophecy of Jesus was also witnessed in a remarkable way in the case of Chosroes, the Emperor of the great Persian Empire. When a letter of the Holy Prophet was handed to him, he contemptuously tore it to pieces without looking at its contents. When the Holy Prophet, heard of this, he said, "Even so will his empire be torn to pieces." The truth of this prophecy is printed in indelible characters on the pages of human history. The "King of kings," as the Persian Emperor styled himself, enraged at this act of the Holy Prophet of Mecca and incited by his intriguing enemies, the Jews of Medina, sent orders to his Governor at Yemen to have the prophet arrested and sent to his capital. But when the soldiers deputed by the Governor to execute the imperial mandate arrived at Medina, the Holy Prophet told them that his Lord had caused their lord to be murdered that very night by his own son, Siroess. When the Governor of Yemen learned the truth of the prophet's words, he, with many of his courtiers, accepted the faith of Islam. That one miracle converted him. In short, if there ever appeared a prophet on this earth, after the prophecy was announced by the Psalmist and Prophet Isaiah, of whom it can be said with truth that whosoever fell on him was broken and on whomsoever he fell he ground him to powder, that prophet was he who made his appearance at Mecca. And it was at his time that the kingdom of God was taken from the house of Israel. Hitherto the prophets had been raised from among the children of Isaac. But the prophet that was to become the head of the corner was not raised from among the Beni-Israel. He was raised in the house of Ishmael.

Thus the kingdom of God was taken from the Israelites and given to the Ishmaelites. The last Israelite prophet, *viz*, Jesus, though the son of an Israelite woman, had no Israelite father. God did this so that this person may be a token of the transition of prophethood from the house of Israel to that of Ishmael. The next prophet that came had neither an Israelite mother nor an Israelite father. He was an Ishmaelite both on the side of his father and his mother. The birth of Jesus among the Israelites without the instrumentality of a father was a warning to them that prophethood was about to be taken from them. It was a sign of divine displeasure, for it showed that they had become so corrupt that God did not think it proper to raise among them a prophet with an Israelite father. They had ceased to be deserving of the savour of prophethood and the advent of Jesus who was born without the co-operation of an Israelite father, was a signal to them of the departure of prophethood from their house. Jesus gave that warning not only by his birth without a father but also by the parable of the vineyard. The children of Israel had proved themselves to be rebellious husbandmen. They had maltreated the servants of their Lord, *i e*, the previous prophets, and they were now about to lay hands on the son of their Lord to slay him. Therefere the time was come that the kingdom of God should be taken from them. Hence no prophet was to be raised from among them in the future. And so it happened. The next prophet that was to be the corner-stone was raised from among a nation, which had been hitherto despised by the children of Israel, *viz*., the Beni-Ishmael. The proud Israelites had always looked down with contempt upon their brethren, the children of Ishmael. The house of Isaac had hitherto been favoured with prophets, but no prophet had yet risen among the Ishmaelites. This led the Israelites to regard their brethren, the seed of Ishmael, with disdain. But God raised the greatest of the prophets, the fullest and the most glorious mainfestation of prophethood, among these despised people, and thus, to quote the words of the Psalmist and Jesus, the stone that the builders rejected, the same became the head of the corner. The Israelites had never dreamed of this, but, again to quote the words of Jesus and the Psalmist, "This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes." The Jews and the Christians might not have expected it, but the kingdom of God was taken from the house of Israel and given to the children of Ishmael. That prophet proved himself to be the very stone of which Jesus speaks, for whosoever fell on him was broken to pieces and on whomsoever he fell, he ground him to powder. And his followers also proved themselves to be true to the description which Jesus gave of the nation to whom the vineyard was to be given, for they were a people who rendered

to their Lord the fruits of the vineyard in their seasons. They were not rebellious like the Jews.

From the prophecy of Isaiah it further appears that it was to be fulfilled after a very long time, for he says: "He that believeth shall not make haste." These words mean that those who believe in the truth of this prophecy should not be in a hurry about it. Let them not grow impatient, for the promise is to be fulfilled after a long time. Let them wait patiently until the promised stone makes its appearance. And actually the promised prophet was long in coming. He did not appear until full six hundred years had elapsed since the advent of Jesus. The interval between these two prophets was not marked by the appearance of any inspired teacher. The believer had indeed to wait long before the promised time. And it was to this long interval that Prophet Isaiah referred when he said "He that believeth shall not make haste."

I may also mention here that the Holy Prophet himself claimed to be the promised stone. Bukharee and Muslim narrate the following saying of the Holy Prophet:—

"My case and that of the probets is like a house which was well built, but in which the place of a brick was left vacant. That place has been filled by me. I am that brick."

The parable of the vineyard also shows the vast superiority of tbe Holy Prophet over Jesus and other prophets. The prophets that came after Moses are represented as servants of the Lord, while Jesus is spoken of as the son of God. But the advent of the Holy Prophet is spoken of as the coming of the Lord Himself. This does not show that Jesus was literally the son of God or that the Holy Prophet was actually the Lord of Heavens and Earth. The terms 'servants,' 'son' and the 'lord' are used only to denote the relative degrees of these prophets of God. The successors of Moses that preceded Jesus were to God as servants are to their master. The spiritual relation in which Jesus stood to God was higher than that of a servant and hence he is spoken as be son. But the spiritual union which the Holy Prophet enjoyed with God was far higher than that of Jesus. So close was this relation that the term 'son' could not express it. Hence his advent is spoken of as that of the Lord Himself This shows that the union of the Holy Prophet with God was the most perfect and the most intimate that can be imagined. Hence it is that we meet with such verses in the Holy Quran as the followiug:—"Those who give their hands in thy hands as a pledge of fidelity, really give their hands in the Hand of God." Again "Thou didst not cast when thou didst cast, but God cast." (viii, 17).

In the parable in question the rebellious husbandmen are represented as slaying the son of the lord of the vineyard. This

however, does not show that Jesus had actually expired on the cross. The Jews had done all that lay in their power to slae Jesus and he did look one slain. But God saved his life, for such a righteous person as Jesus could not die the death of the accursed. Yet what happened justified the expression used by Jesus in the parable. " And they caught him and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him."

In short, the prophecy of the Psalmist, of Isaiah, of Daniel and of Jesus relating to the stone was fulfilled in the Holy Prophet and the Black stone that had lain at Ka'aba from times immemorial was a picture of the same prophecy and it was laid at Mecca as a token of the fact that the prophet that was to be the corner-stone was to rise from that city. It was known as the " Hand of God " and people were required to kiss or touch it. This was an allusion to the fact, that when the ' corner-stone ' makes his appearence, people should perform *baiat* on his hand, *i. e.*, pledge their fidality to him by touching his hands and that to pledge one's faith on his hand was to pledge faith on the Hand of God. The existence of this corner-stone at Ka'aba, was also an evidence of the fact that the prophets referred to a prophet that was to appear from Mecca and not to any other prophet. The Holy Prophet of Arbia without knowing that there was any prophecy in the former scriptures relating to a ' corner stone ' claimed to be the cornor stone, which is a further evidence of the fact that the prophecy referred to him.

THE HOLY PROPHET IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

" *Hath not a plain evidence come unto them, of that which is contained in the former scriptures ?*" (xx, 133).

In the above article on the Divine origin of the Holy Quran, I referred to the fact that the stone in the famous vision of Nebuchadnezzar, the stone which being cut out without hands, fell on the feet of the image, broke it to pieces, became a great mountain and filled the whole earth, was no other than the Holy Prophet of Arabia, In this article it is my purpose to discuss the subject at some length. The vision of the king of Babylon and conqueror of Judah as revealed by Prophet Daniel is as follows:— The king saw a great image, whose head was of gold; whose breast and arms, of silver; whose belly and thighs, of brass; whose legs, of iron, and whose feet, partly of iron and partly of clay. Then he saw that a stone was cut out without hands, which somte the image upon its feet and broke them to pieces. Then the whole image was broken to pieces; the iron, the brass, the silver and the gold became like the chaff of the summer

thereshing-floors and were carried away by the wind, so that no place was found for them. The stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. This is the dream, and then follows the interpretation thereof by Daniel. The head of gold was Nebuchadnezzar or the kingdom of Babylon. After him there was to arise another kingdom inferior to his kingdom, and another third kingdom of brass, which was to bear rule over all the earth. The legs of iron represented a fourth kingdom which was to be strong as iron. The feet and toes, part of petter's clay and part of iron signified the divisions of the fourth empire. When the fourth kingdom shall have become divided, "the God of heaven shall set up a kidgdom which shall never be destroyed." This last kingdom which was to consume the previous kingdoms, was signified by the stone which was cut out without hands, and which falling on the feet of the colossal image broke them to pieces. This is the interpretation of the dream by Daniel. Nexs comes the fulfilment of the dream. When the king of Babylon lay upon his bed, the thought came into his mind, what should come to pass hereafter, and He that revealeth secrets made known to him by means of that dream the future destiny of his grest kingdom. The various parts of the image represented the various kingdoms which succeeded one another. The head of the image as Daniel tells us, was Nebuchadnezzar, or the kingdom of Babylon. The breast and arms of silver denoted the kingdom of Medo-Persia; the belly and thighs of brass, the Grecian Monarchy under Alexander the Great, who like a hurricane, went conqueror over Asia to the East Indies and wept that there was no other world for him to conquer; and the legs of iron, the Romau Empire, hardy and strong to tread down the nations. Only those kingdoms are mentioned with which Nebuchadnezzar, the seer of the dream, was directly concerned. These were the kingdoms which were destined to occupy his dominions in succession. The kingdom of the conqueror of Jerusalam was conquered in its turn by the Greeks under Alexander the Great and the territory which once formed part of the kingdom of Alexander was won by the arms of Romans. Each of these kingdoms incorporated its predecessor.

Every Christian will endorse what has been said so far. But when we come to the remaining part of the dream, *viz.*, the stone which brake the image, the vision becomes a puzzle to our freinds, the Christians. All have followed one line down to the establishment of the fourth kingdom, spoken of by Daniel, but when they come to the toes of the image and the stone which fell on the feet of the colossal figure, they lose their way. From this point onward there is no unity of opinion among them.

Different theories are put forward, but the views of one party are contradicted by another. This is not because there is anything puzzling in the latter part of the dream; on the other hand, it is as clear as the former. It is their vain desire to apply every prophecy to the prophet of Nazareth that has turned the latter part of the vision into an inexplicable riddle for them. The whole vision referred to great kingdoms—visible kingdoms, kingdoms 'under heaven,' and not in heaven, but the person to whom they want to apply the concluding part of the vision did not establish any kingdom 'under heaven.' The only kingdom he is said to have established lies somewhere in the heavens, for says he, "My kingdom is not of this world." Indeed it had been the long cherished hope of the Jews that when the Promised Messiah came, he would come as their king, to deliver them from the yoke of the Romans and to establish a kingdom upon the earth. Even Jesus himself seemed to have entertained the fond hope of founding a kingdom, such as the Jews desired to see established, and on one occasion he even ordered his followers to sell their garments and buy swords, but he soon saw that he was hoping against hope and therefore relinquished the idea once for all. His followers, however, continued to stick to that hope to the very end and when they saw that instead of being crowned with a diadem, their king was made to wear a crown of thorns, and instead of being enthroned, he was nailed to the accursed tree of the cross, they were sadly disappointed. It appears that some of them at least regarded themselves as having been deluded in taking him for the Promised Messiah. This is apparent from what two of them said to the supposed stranger on their way to Emman on the third day after crucifixion : "But we trusted that he had been he which should have redeemed Israel." These words show that they had been expecting that their master would deliver Isreel from the Roman yoke and establish the kingdom of Israel on earth, but the events of the few days previous had sorely disappointed them. Their faith in him was evidently shaken and they were blaming themselves for having taken him so hastily for the promissed king. In short, Jesus of Nazareth did not establish any kingdom. So it is a difficult task to apply to him a prophecy which speaks of a kingdom in the ordinary sense of the word. The first difficulty which encounters a Christian in claiming the concluding portion of the vision for Jesus lies in the fact that he appeared long before the breaking up of the Roman Empire into toes. Luke tells us that he was born in the reign of Augustus Caesar, the first emperor of Rome, and thus he was ushered into this world at a period when 'Rome, with its disciplined warriors, its able generals, and immense wealth was the master of the world

was daily growing more powerful.' The authors of the Critical Commentary explaining the verse, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," say, "'*In the days of these kings*' *answers to* '*upon his feet*' (v. 34), *i.e.*, the ten *toes* (v. 42), or the ten kings, the final state of the Roman empire. For 'these kings' can not mean the four successional monarchies as they do not co-exist as the holders of power; if the fourth had been meant, the *sing*, not the *plur*, would have been used.' The division of the Roman empire began a few centuries after Jesus, it commenced some 1500 years ago, and the stone that was to fall on the feet and toes of the image could not come into existence before the disruption of the empire. Hence Jesus who appeared while Rome was the mistress of Judea and the world can not be the promised stone.

Another difficulty which a Christian has to face in applying the vision of Nebuchadnezzar to Jesus lies in the fact that, as I have already said, it evidently speaks of a succession of earthly kingdoms. The king, while lying on his bed, was meditating on the future fate of his vast kingdom, and it was the fate of his kingdom that was revealed to him in the dream. One earthly kingdom was to be followed by another earthly kingdom. Just as the kingdom of Babylon was succeeded by that of Medo-Persia by the Grecian Monarchy, and the Grecian Monarchy, in its turn, was succeeded by the Roman empire, similarly this last empire was to be destroyed, not by any invisible heavenly kingdom, but by an earthly kingdom, and this earthly kingdom, like its predecessors, was to conquer the land which once formed the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, for it was the fate of his own kingdom on which the conqueror of Jerusalem meditated on his bed. And this fifth kingdom was to be the last kingdom in the succession. It was not to be destroyed by any other earthly power. It was destined to hold the empire of the conqueror of Jerusalem in its possession for ever. Now, we ask our Christian friends. Did Jesus establish any such kingdom? Did he destroy the fourth empire and establish in its place his own kingdom? The answer must be in the negative? Though the Jews had been expecting that their Messiah would deliver them from the Roman yoke and establish a Jewish kingdom in Jerusalem, yet their hopes were not realised. The followers of Jesus also entertained this hope but all their hopes were dashed to the ground when their recognised king was seized by the very people whom he was supposed to have come to deliver from the iron yoke of the Romans and hanged on the cross. Christians tell us that though he did not establish any earthly kingdom, yet he established a heavenly kingdom which is invisible to our eyes. We say, he may have established an invisible kingdom, but we are not concerned

with anything of that sort at present. What we want here is a visible kingdom, an earthly kingdom like its predecessors, which should have destroyed the Roman empire. Some of the Christians tell us that this prophecy was fulfilled by the gradual evangelisation of the Roman empire. but the Christianisation of the empire can not be said to be tantamount to its destruction. Besides, it should be remembered that the vision is mainly concerned with the country which was ruled by the conqueror of Jerusalem. Therefore in interpreting the dream, we should never lose sight of that land. The lands that lie outside this territory do net, properly speaking, fall within the range of the vision under discussion. We have to consider them only in their relation to the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, and as soon as they cease to stand in any relation to that kingdom, they cease to have any claim on our attention. There have been many kingdoms and many empires besides the four represented by the image, but they have not been mentioned in the vision because they had little tc do with the future fate of the empire of Nebuchadnezzor. But what was it which gave importance to the empire of Nebuchadnezzar so that it was made by God the subject of so important a vision ? So important, in fact, was the vision that the events which were disclosed to the king by means of that famous vision were also revealed to Prophet Deniel a second time, for the vision of Daniel recorded in Chapter VII of his book is only an amplificatiou of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. This repetition of the dream points to its importance. If only the city of Babylon had been concerned, such impertance could not be given to its future fate. The future fate of the kingdom ef Babylon drew its importance from the fact that it included in itself the city which gave its ruler the proud title of the conqueror of Jerusalem. If the vision mentions of Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome, it is because they became successively the mistresses of Jerusalem. So in seeing how the various parts of the vision were fulfilled, we should not lose sight of the holy land which is graced by this sacred city, and any interpretation which excluded this sacred city, the central object in the vision, must be held as false. But when we test the Christian interpretations of the dream by this criterion, their falsity bccomes apparent. They say that that part of the vision which pertains to the stone was fulfilled by the gradual evangelisation of the Roman empire. Let us test this interpretation with reference to Jerusalem. Indeed the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the land in which this city is situated embraced Christianity, but did the religion of Christ continue its hold on that city and that land. History tells us that when the arms of the followers of the Arabian Prophet, conquered the land, their religion too conquered the religion of its people and the country which was once Christian

become Muslim and it is so to this day. But if the Christianisation of the land had been a fulfilment of the dream, Christianity ought to have continued to hold its sway in the land for ever and ever, for the words of the prophecy are, "*and it shall stand for ever.*" Christianity may still be the religion of Rome, it may be the religion of the whole of Europe and the two Americas, it may be the one religion in Australia and many other lands, its prevalence in all these lands can not be said to be a fulfilment of the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, for it is not the prevailing religion in the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, or more properly the holy land where Jerusalem stands. Here it has been supplanted by a religiou which the Christians are pleased to call pagan. If there existed at any time in Syria what the Christians call the kingdom of Christ, it does not exist there now, for it is the kingdom of Mohammad that holds its sway there both externally and in the hearts of the people that were erstwhile the followers of Christ. There are many among the Christians that hold the prophecy to have been fulfilled in Popery, but Popery too, like the kingdom of Christ, exercisef no authority in the holy land, nor did it ever exercise any authority here in the past. In the West, also its authcrity has long been on the wane and only recently it has received blows from which it is impossible for it ever to recover.

The prophecy represents the stone *falling* on the feet of the image and *breaking* them to pieces. This shows that the fourth empire was to be *destroyed* by the kingdom indicated by the stone and not gradually evangelised 'by grace.' This falsifies the idea that by the last kingdom which was to destroy the fourth empire, is meant the 'hidden' kingdom of Christ or the Church of Rome.

There are others among the Christians who understand that the last portion of the vision has been fulfilled neither by the gradual Christianisation of the Roman empire, nor by the power once wielded by the bishop of Rome, nor even by the unseen kingdom of Christ. They admit that "the falling of the stone on the feet of the image can not refer to Christ at his first advent, for the fourth kingdom was not yet divided, no toes were in existence." The fulfilment of prophecy relating to the destruction of the fourth empire, is, according to them, yet in abeyance, and it is in some unknown future time that the prediction will be fulfilled by the appearance of Christ in glory. "The destroying judgment" say the advocates of the futurist theory, "can not be dealt by Christians, for they are taught to submit to the powers that be, so that it must be dealt by Christ himself at his coming again. Christ's kingdom is not *now* of this world, and only at the second advent becomes an external power of the world. Daniel, whose province it was to prophesy of the

world-powers, does not treat of Christianity until it becomes a world-power, *viz.*, at the second event. The kingdom of God is a hidden one, till Jesus comes again. Rome was worldly whilst heathen, and remains worldly, though Christianised. The New Testament views the present æon or age of the world essentially heathenish, which we can not love without forsaking Christ."

The above view settles the question as far as the first advent of Christ is concerned. It states clearly that the prophecy of the stone smiting the feet of the image was not fulfilled by Christ at his first advent, in other words, *the Christ that has already come* was not the promised stone. From this it follows as a self-evident corollary that Jesus was not referring to himself when he said the Jews,' "And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." (Matt. 21. 44) ; for the stone in the above verse is admitted to be identical with the stone represented as smiting the image in the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. If Jesus did not destroy the fourth kingdom, he can not be called 'the stone,' for if he had been the stone, he ought to have destroyed the fourth empire. It is an error to call him 'the stone' when he has not smitten the image. The advent of the stone of which Jesus speaks is closely connected with the transfer of the kingdom of God from the Jews to another people. That the transfer has already taken place, every Christian will admit, and since that transfer was to follow the advent of the stone. it follows that the stone has already come. And as Jesus is not the stone, seeing that he destroyed not the Roman empire, the stone must be sought somewhere else.

That he will come again to destroy the kingdoms that now exist where the Roman empire once existed is only a delusion. Christians have been expecting his return ever since his supposed ascension to heaven but to no purpose. There has been no age in which the expectant Christians have not looked heavenwards, vainly hoping to see their Lord come in clouds. Various dates were fixed for the personal second advent of Jesus, but he never appeared, and that for the simple reason that he is not sitting on the right hand of his Father as he is supposed to be doing.

. . . . . .

But if it be supposed that Jesus will come back in person, it does not show that the prophecy relating to the stone refers to his second advent. He nowhere says that though his kingdom at his first advent is not of this world, it will be a worldly kingdom at his second advent. So it is merely ridiculous to suppose that when he comes back to this world, he will come as a worldly king, and wage war against the kingdoms of the day. How long will the Christians continue to build castles in

the air ? A remarkable evidence of the fact that the prophecy of the second advent does not represent Jesus as coming to establish an earthly kingdom is to be found in their circumstance that by many the prophecy is believed to have been already fulfilled. According to these the activity and zeal with which the Chritian Missionaries are working to-day in all parts of the world is a fulfilment of the same prophecy. They now believe the spirit of Christ to be present with them and to be inspiring and directing the Christian Church. If there had been a plain prophecy that Christianity would become a world-power at the second advent of Jesus, they would not have regarded the prophecy as already fulfilled.

Another circumstance which shows the absurdity of the assertion that the prophecy is to be fulfilled at the second coming of Jesus is that the stone was to destroy the fourth empire *before* it became a mountain, but the supposed kingdom which Jesus is to establish on earth at his second coming is to be a kingdom of glory which can not be compared to a small stone. Jesus did not fulfil the prophecy at his first appearance, for he did not establish any world-power which should have smitten the fourth empire, nor can he be said to fulfil the prophecy at his second advent, for then his kingdom is supposed to be a kingdom glory and not a small kingdom which may be compared to a stone.

Besides, many centuries have elapsed since the Roman empire became extinct, but the prophecy shows that the stone should have appeared while the kingdom was yet existent, for it says that at the time when the stone appears, "the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly weak." These words have no doubt as to the fact that the stone was to apyear and smite the image *before the fourth kingdom had become extinct.* Henee it is absurd to apply the prophecy to the supposed personal re-advent of Jesus in some unknown future time, not only because his supposed kingdom will then be too glorious to be compared to a small stone, but also because it is long centuries since the fourth kingdom became extinct.

The useless struggle of the Christians to apply the last part of the prophecy to Jesus is an evidence of the fact that they are applying the prophecy to the wrong person. There is no divergence of opinion among the Christians so far as the first four kingdoms are concerned. But when they come to the fifth kingdom, their desire to apply every prophecy to Jesus leads them astray from the right path, and the result is that there is confusion and groping in the dark. If they had faithfully followed history throughout, they would have experienced not the slightest difficulty in seeing which the stone was which being cut out without hands fell on the feet of the image and broke it to pieces.

I have already quoted the view of the advocates of the futurist theory who say that the vision contains no reference to Christ or Christianity at all.

When we turn to history and seek in it the stone spoken of in the vision, keeping in view the fact that the holy city of Jerusalem forms the nucleus of the dream, we find that that stone was the Prophet of Arabia (on whom be peace and the blessings of God).

Under Augustus Cæsar, the Roman republic became an empire, of which Rome was the metropolis. Constantine I (306-337), removed the capital of the empire to the old Greek City of Byzantium, which he called New Rome, but which has been better known ever since as Constantinople or the city of Constantine. Theodosius I (392-395), was the last emperor who ruled over the whole Roman empire. On his death, the empire was divided between his two sons, Honorius and Arcadius, the former ruling in the West, and the latter in the East. From this time, the history of the Roman empire is divided into two distinct histories, that of the Western or Latin Empire and that of the Eastern or Byzntine empire. We shall not be greatly concerned with the affairs of the Western empire, because Jerusalem lay not there, but in the East. The Western empire went all to ruins, and finally passed into the hands of the barbarians. It ceased to exist in A. D. 476, when "the phantom assembly that still called itself the Roman senate, sent back to Constantinople the tiara and purple robe in sign that the Western empire had passed away." From this time onward, the Eastern Empire represented the whole Roman Empire and the emperors at Constantinople claimed to rule over all the dominions of their predecessors. In 553, Italy was reduced to a Byzantine province and was governed by rulers appointed from Constantinople and called the exarchs of Rovenua. These exarchs continued to rule Ravenna, Rome, Naples, a portion of the coast line and most of the southern part for 300 years. Thus we see that the Eastern empire upheld its title in the peninsula of Italy long after the downfall of the Latin or Western Empire. It was in the days of the Eastern empire when the promised stone made its appearance. Heraclius was then the emperor of the Romon empire. That stone was Prophet Mohammad (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). This stone was cut out without hands,' because he did not *inherit* a kingdom, but himself established one where was none before. In this sense it was different from the four preceding kingdoms. Of Jesus it has been said that his kingdom *now* is not of this world, but that he will establish what is called a 'world-power' at his second advent. But it was not so with the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him). He established both

kingdoms at once. He wos a king in the sense in which Jesus is said to be a king, as well as a king in the ordinary sense of the word. He became a king in the latter sense not because he aspired to be so, but because kingdom was forced on him by the circumstances.

History tells us that when the Roman empire still existed, when it was 'partly strong end partly weak' the followers of the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and the blessings of God) fell on that kingdom and broke it to pieces. It is beyond the scope of the present article to give the cause of their attack on the provinces of the Roman empire, and therefore I will not enter into that discussion on this occasion. It will suffice here only to state that the kingdom which the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) established at Medina, while it was yet insignificant like a small stone, smote the provinces of the Roman empire and broke them to pieces. Then the kingdom in a very short time spread from east to west, and the kingdom which was at first insignificant, like a small stone, grew into an extensive kingdom which filled the earth like a great mountain. Thus was fulfilled the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. In the reign of Abu Bekr, the first successor to the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and the blessings of God), Syria and Mesopotamia were subdued by Arabian armies. Under Omar, the second Caliph, Egypt was conquered and Northern Africa was over-run. In 710, 'a host of turbaned Arabs, with unsheathed scimitars, under Tarik-bin-Zaid, crossed the narrow strait into Spain, and landed on the rock which commemorates the name of their leader." In the conrse of a few years, they were masters of nearly the whole of the Peninsula. They also conquered Sicily and a part of Southern Italy. All these lands formed the provinces of the Roman Empire. Even the capital of the Byzantine Empire was at last conquered by a follower of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him), *viz.*, Mohammad II. It may be added here that the conquest of Constantinople forms the subject, not only of the visions recorded in the Book of Daniel, but also of a prophecy by the Holy Prophet himself (on whom be peace and the blessings of God). He predicted in plain words that Constantinople, the capital of the Roman empire would be, taken by a follower of his who would bear a name identical with his own, *i.e*, Mohammad) and that he will be a Mahdi or guided) in the eyes of God. The prediction also speaks of the campanions of the conqueror of Constantinople. This prophecy was published in the collectians of the sayings of the Holy Prophet centuries before Constantiuople was taken by Mohammad II. The existence of this prediction is an additional evidence of the fact that the stone which had to smite the fourth kingdom was no

other than the utterer of this prophecy. It is a curious fact that the conqueror of the ancient capital of the Roman empire was called after the name of the Holy Prophet, as if to remind us of the fact that the prophecies in Daniel, which spoke of the destruction of the fourth kingdom by a stone, were fulfilled in the Prophet whose name was MOHAMMAD.

Of the fifth kingdom it is said that it will fill the whole earth. This does not mean that the kingdom will actually extend over both the hemispheres. Similar words have been used in the same prophecy with regard to the third kingdom, *i.e.*, the Grecian monarchy, which did not literally extend over the whole earth. These words only signify the vastness of the empire, and Mohammadan empire was far vaster than that of Alexander. Again, it is said of the fifth kingdom that it shall stand for ever. I have already pointed out that the whole dream of Nebuchadnezzar centres round Jerusalem and there the Muslim kingdom has stood for the past 1300 years. During this time the whole of Europe has strained every nerve to re-conquer the Cradle of Christianity, but its efforts have not been crowned with success. Peter, the hermit, set the whole of Europe ablaze with, fire of fanaticism, and kings and princes responded to his call by coming down from their thrones and attacked the Holy Land at the head of formidable armies. Eight times torrents of Christian warriors swept over Syria, and threatened to engulf the whole country. Yet they failed to occupy Jerusalem permanently, because it was written that the kingdom of Mohammad should stand for ever in the land of promise.

The Horn that Made War with the Saints.

The seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel gives a vision of the Prophet Daniel which is identical in import with that of Nebuchadnezzar which we have already discussed, It is not necessary therefore to discuss this vision here at any length, for what has been said of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar is also true of the vision of Daniel. There is, however, one thing new in the second vision which is not to be found in the first. That new thing is the reference to Christianity and this introduction of the little horn which had eyes, and a mouth that spoke very great things and which made war with the saints. There is nothing corresponding to this horn in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and therefore it is necessary to say a few words about it. Daniel describing the fourth beast, which signifies the fourth kingdom, says: "I considered the horns (of the fourth beast), and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots, and behold in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth

speaking great things." The angel of whom Daniel asked the interpretation of this horn, said to him, "He shall speak great things against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times and the dividing of time. But the Judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it unto the end." Now Christians differ greatly as to who is meant by this little horn. I need not give here their varying opinions. The 'little horn' must be sought among the other horns, for it is said 'there came up among them another little horn.' That little horn was Heraclius. He rose among the other horns, for he was the son of the exarch of Egypt. He was a little horn because at first he was not himself the Governor of a province, but only the son of a Governor. But he became a great horn by destroying three other horns. In 610, he headed a successful revolt against Phocas, the murderer and successor of the emperor Mauritius, and himself ascended the usurper's throne. This was the first horn which was plucked up by this little horn. Chosroes II had conquered Syria, Egypt and the provinces of Asia, and Heraclius, "in a series of brilliant campaigns that place him side by side with the greatest generals of the world, overthrew the pride of that empire, drove its monarch a fugitive from his throne and enriched his exulting troops with untold wealth." This was the second horn plucked by Heraclius.

On the west, he was menaced by the fierce tribe of the Avars, who pillaged the whole country from the confines of Istria to the long wall of Thrace. Once he was so encompassed by these implacable enemies that he had to fly for his life on his fleet horse with his diadem wrapped round his arms. In 620, Heraclius made a treaty with them and "interposed a human barrier against their further encroachments by inviting the Serbs and Croats to settle in the intervening regions, which they have never since left." In the course of the war with the Persians, Chosroes 'ratified a treaty of alliance and partition with the Changan (Chief of the Avars) and sent a formidable army to assist him in the siege of Constantinople. The capital was besieged by the Avars and their haughty chief said to the trembling messengers of the senate, "Your absent prince, even now a captive or fugitive, has left Constantinople to its fate; nor can you escape the arms of the Avars and the Persians, unless you could soar into the air like birds, unless like fishes you could dive into the waves." Heraclius detached to their relief a body of 12,000 cuirassiers. "The Avars were repulsed; a fleet of Sclavonian Canoes was destroyed in the harbour; the vessals of the Chagan threatened to desert, his provisions were exhausted, and after burning

his engines, he gave the signal for a slow and formidable retreat. The devoted citizens ascribed the deliverance of the city from the combined forces of the Avars and the Persians to the intercession of Mary. The Chagan was the third horn plucked by Heraclius.

Of the 'little horn,' it is said, "And he shall speak great words against the Most High . . . . and think to change times and laws." These words contain a reference to the religion which the little horn professed. Speaking great things against the Most High refers to the blasphemous innovations of Christianity, notably its doctrine of the sonship of Jesus, of which the Holy Quran says, "A great saying it is which proceedeth from their mouth: they speak no other than a lie," (xviii, 4). Christianity has also altered many ordinances of the Jewish law, for instance the covenant of circumcision and the prohibition with regard to the flesh of the swine. It also arrogated to itself the divine prerogative of altering times by shifting the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. Jesus says, "Think not I am to come to destroy the law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Yet in spite of this emphatic injunction of their Master not to break even the least of the commandments and in spite of the example which he himself set them by yielding a personal obedience to the law, there is not a single commandment of the law which the Christians have not broken and not a single precept which they have not set at naught. They have gone so far as to call the law a curse, while Jesus calls it righteousness and describes it as the only door through which one can enter the kingdom of heaven.

If the reader desires to know how Heraclius made war with the saints, let him read the account of the battle fought at Muta. It was the persecution of the Muslims on the frontier of Heraclius' kingdom and by his governors that led to the war which resulted in the conquest of Syria and other provinces of his kingdom by the 'saints of the Most High.'

I may mention here also the story of Farwa, a Syrian Governor who sent a letter to the Holy Prophet announcing his conversion to Islam. He also sent several presents,—a white mule, a horse,

ass, and raiment inwrought with gold. Heraclius, hearing of this, summoned him to his presence and after making a fruitless attempt to bring him back to the Christian faith, ordered him to be crucified. Farwa when asked to relinquish Islam, said "I will not quit the faith of Mohammad. Thou knowest well that Jesus prophesied of him before, but the fear of losing the kingdom deterreth thee."

This persecution of the faithful did not last long. They were "given into his hand until a time, and times and a dividing of time," *i. e.*, for a period of 3½ years, as the Christians interpret the phrase. It was during the autumn of the year 628 A. D. that a despatch from the Holy Prophet was placed in his hand, and from that time to the death of the Holy Prophet, a period of about 3½ years, the faithful continued to be harassed by Heraclius and his representatives near the Syrian frontier. It was not long after the letter of the Holy Prophet was handed to Heraclius that a Muslim envoy was murdered in cold blood by a representative of Heraclius at Maab or Muta. The following year, a party of 15 Muslims was cut to pieces by the Christian subjects of Heraclius, one man only surviving to tell the tale. At Muta, many of the beloved companions of the Holy Prophet were killed by Heraclius's own troops. But this persecution ceased with the death of the Holy Prophet which occurred in June 632, for immediately after this, began the conquest of Syria by the saints of the Most High.

If Heraclius was deterred from accepting Islam by the fear of losing his kingdom, he did not pass away from this world without seeing his dominions passing into the hands of the Muslims. Before he retired to Constantinople, relinqishing the fairest and the best loved provinces of his empire to 'the Saints of the Most High,' he ascended an eminence and casting a rueful glance at the sunny plains of Syria, bade farewell in the follow, ing word: "Peace be with thee, Holy and Blessed land, Syria-fare thee well! There is for me no more returning unto thee: neither shall any Roman visit thee for ever, but in fear and-trembling."

In short, if we seek in history the stone, which smote the feet of the image, and the saints to whom dominion was given over Jerusalem, we find that they were the Holy Prophet of Arabia and his holy companions, may peace be on them and the blessings of the Most High. The prophecy has already been fulfilled and the hope of the Christians that it will be fulfilled at the second coming of Jesus, when Christianity will become a world-power, is only a delusion.

It may be pointed out here that it is not only in the vision of Daniel that the Holy Companions of the Holy Prophet are described as 'saints of the Most High.' They are called 'saints' in another

prophecy of the Bible also which applies to the Holy Prophet as clearly as do the two visions in the second and seventh chapters of the book of Daniel. That prophecy is as follows :—" The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them ; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints, from his right hand went a fiery law for them." *The ten thousand saints were the companions of the Holy Prophet who were exactly ten thousand in number when they made a triumphant entry into the city of Mecca which they had been compelled to flee eight years before. The prophecy speaks of three different manifestations of God, first, through Moses at Mount Sinai, secondly through Jesus at Mount Seir and lastly through Mohammad Paran. Paran is the name given to the wilderness where Hagar and her son Ishmael dwelt after their separation from Abraham. The uninterrupted tradition of the children of Hagar and Ishmael, their practices and usages which have come down from times immemorial, the well of Zamzam which represents the well of water spoken of in Genesis 19, *i.e.*, and many other evidences fix the valley of Mecca as the wilderness where Hagar dwelt after her separation from her husband. These standing evidences are far stronger than the Israelite tradition recorded in the book of Genesis. Thus it was from Mount Paran that God beamed forth for the third time through a child of Hagar and the ten thousand saints were the ten thousand saintly followers that swarmed round his standard when he entered the city of his birth as a conqueror after eight years of exile

The prophecy of Daniel says, " And the kingdom under the whole heaven, *shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High* ; for it was the companions of the Holy Prophet that conquered the promised kingdom. It was not till after the death of the Holy Prophet that Syria and other dominions of the Roman Empire were taken by the Muslims, and hence the kingdom is very appropriately represented as being given to the people, (*i.e.*, nation) of the saints of the most High. But as they were but the representatives of their Master, the same prophecy speaks of the kingdom as being given to one of the likeness of man ; *i.e.*, the Holy Prophet who is so called in contrast to the previous kings who were represented under the figures of animals. The Holy Prophet is represented under the figure of man in order to signify that in him the divine ideal of manhood was manifested most faithfully.

THE END.