The

Islamic Review

FOUNDED BY THE LATE AL-HAJJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

Vol. XXXI

SHAWWĀL, 1362 A.H. OCTOBER, 1943 A.C. [No

nnual Subscription 10s. or Rs. 7/8/-

Single Cop

CONTENTS

					Page
A Thought for 'Id-al-	Fitr	• •			289
The Logos and the Examined. By Pr					290
The Religion of Human	ity. By	Rabi'al-l	Karim,	M.Sc.	308
Islam and Modern So		vements.	Ву М	aulvi	
Aftab-ud-Din Ahn	ıad	• •	• •	• •	313
The Lord's Supper	••	• •	••	• •	318
What is Islam?	• •	• •	••		327

Published by

THE WOKING MUSLIM MISSION AND LITERARY TRUST,

THE SHAH JEHAN MOSQUE,

· WOKING, SURREY, ENGLAND.

(All Rights Reserved)

Kindly quote your Subscriber's Number when corresponding.

BOOKS BY THE LATE AL-HAJJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

It cancels all previous prices.

It cancels all previous prices.			
		Rs.	
Introduction to the Study of the Holy Q	ur-an	3	0
Islam to East and West	• •	3	0
The Ideal Prophet		4	0
Charms of Islam	••	2	8
Sources of Christianity	••	3	0
Threshold of Truth		3	0
Secret of Existence		3	0
Islam & Zoroastrianism		3	0
Islam & Civilization		. 3	0
Islam and the Muslim Prayer	• •	. 1	8
Message of Islam		. 1	4
The Religion of Jesus & Traditional Chri	stianity	1	0
Islam My Only Choice	•	0	8
Sayings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad	ı	0	8
Islam & Christianity		1	8
BOOKS BY MAULANA MUHA	MMAD ALI		
Holy Qur-an Series, Part I		0	15
Holy Quran Series, Part II		0	15
Muhammad the Prophet		3	12
Early Caliphate	•••	3	12
Muhammad & Christ	••	1	14
Religion of Islam		12	8
BOOKS BY DIFFERENT AU	THORS		
Muhammad: The Holy Prophet. By Ha			
Sarwar Sarwar	nz Gnulam	6	8
The Prophet of the Desert		4	8
Umar the Great (English Translation		_	Ū
Shibli's Al-Faruq)	or rinama	.5	8
Islam At the Cross-Roads. By Muhamma	od Aend	.3	0
Towards Understanding Islam. By			
Maududi. Translated by Dr. Abo			
Ex-Director of Public Instructions, A			0
	-	•	0
The Mujaddid's Conception of Tawhid		4	0
Philosophy of Faqirs. By Sir Amin Jun	g nar	1	12



THE

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Vol. XXXI] SHAWWAL, 1362 A.H. OCTOBER, 1943 A.C.

[No. 10

A THOUGHT FOR 'ID-AL-FITR

We wish our readers a happy 'Id, which comes off probably on the 1st of October, 1943. The external chaos prevailing at the moment will depress any one but a Muslim. A Muslim knows that all that happens is only to fulfil the will of God. More than thirteen centuries ago, He had revealed His will in spoken words. As the Creator of the human nature, He knew its needs in this age. He had provided for these needs in His revealed guidance. The world. however, relied too much on its own resources. It did not pay the regard due to the guidance from Heaven. The present chaos only shows the failure of man's scheme and opens the way for the acceptance of the Divine scheme. The first revelation of this scheme took place in this holy month, of which the 'Id-al-Fitr marks the termination. So with all the hardships of life-death and destruction, searcity and starvation. a Muslim finds cause for rejoicing at the very memory of the incident of Quranic revelation. May His name be glorified at all costs!

Editor.

THE LOGOS AND THE KENOTIC THEORIES STATED AND EXAMINED

By Professor M. Y. K. Salim Chishtie.

"And warn those who say: Allah has taken a son. They have no knowledge of it, nor had their fathers; a grievous word it is that comes out of their mouths; they speak nothing but a lie."

(The Holy Qur-án, 18: 4-5.)

This dissertation, of which the first instalment we publish in this issue, is the first one of its kind. The writer has worked hard to understand with sympathy the Christian mataphysical thoughts on a fundamental belief of current Christianity, viz., the Incarnation, and if he has failed to appreciate the logic of Christian arguments in support of this theory, it is because with all his sympathy with the Christians, love for his religion he could not find any true logic in them. Our Christian friends may contend that the doctrine of incarnation, like the other basic doctrine in Christian theology-the Trinity-is a mystery and cannot be examined on the crucible of reason. But we are not to blame either if we enter the list in this controversy. Such an examination has been attempted and attempted with a vengeance so to speak, not only by Christian philosophers and metaphysicians but even by the Church-fathers, the custodians of Church-mysteries. We only do them justice in trying to receive what they want to impart to us. The fact is that all communications, unless it be the silent vibrations of the soul, must be set forth in some form of logic. It is a different matter whether the logic employed is good or bad, acceptable or unacceptable to an unbiased mind. So long, therefore, as our Christian friends consider it necessary to canvas for their religion by words, spoken or written, they cannot help taking the help of logic. And once you start this game of logic, you cannot consistently bring in the plea of mystery anywhere. Professor Chishtie, the writer of this series, occupies, however, a doubly advantageous position in this respect. He patiently follows the divergent attempts of the Christian writers to unravel the mystery of the Incarnation and, by implication, shows that these attempts have made a confusion worse confounded. On the basis of indisputable evidences he proves that not only the philosophers but even the Gospel writers differ widely as to the exact nature and implications of this alleged phenomenon. It is only occasionally that he applies his own reasoning to show the utter hollowness of the doctrine.

The fact is that the task of carrying the prophetical traditions of Judaism into the pagan minds of Greece and Rome was a stupendous one, to which the first disciples of the Master were not equal. What is more, the Master's cry was literally in the wilderness. His was the last flicker of genius in a people doomed thenceforward to an abiding spiritual stagnation. The disparity between the teacher and the taught was too great. All that the latter appreciated in the Master was that he had a message to give, but they were not quite clear about the message itself, not having anything like the realization which the Master had. Nor did they care to realize that

the Master's message was not meant for the non-Jewish people. Thus when they were required to give an intellectual interpretation of the half-understood message to a people that were strangers to the traditions of Judaism, they made a mess of the whole thing. No doubt they struggled hard to convey the idea of prophethood, of which Messiahship was a mere offshoot, to the gentiles, whose only conception of the revelation of God was through the supposed phenomenon of incarnation. The idea of social, moral and historical changes taking place through the spoken words of God, communicated silently to chosen human beings, was absolutely incomprehensible to these prospective converts. They had, however, heard of such a phenomenon and their philosophers had tried to comprehend it intellectually as best as they could. But having no experience of their own and the subject being not a matter of the brain, they failed to grasp the real import of the phenomenon. Our Christian-Jewish preachers, on the other hand instead of straightening the confused process of gentile thinking in this matter, themselves fell a victim to the tangle and lost for themselves the real concept of prophethood of which the term "word" stands forth as a relic to this day. It was one of the greatest calamities in the history of religion.

We take this opportunity of saying a few words about the distinction made in modern times between the pagan and the non-pagan and between the Semitic and the Aryan in matters of religious attitude and ideologies. From the Islamic point of view, no nation in the world has been absolutely pagan. The phenomenon of prophethood has taken place in every nation. A nation becomes pagan when this phenomenon is not repeated for it for a long time and as a consequence it loses all memory of it. That the Jews stuck to the tradition of prophethood to the last is due to the persistent and frequent recurrence of this phenomenon in their national life and to the preservation of its record, however much imperfect that might have been. The same fact accounts for the Semitic people in general sticking more or less to the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead and the Aryan being pantheistically or polytheistically inclined. But for the strong personality of Abraham and his powerful prayer as recorded in the Qur-án, the Semitic people would have fared no better than their sister races. The fact is that the moment one loses the grasp of the phenomenon of prophethood, one is sure to incline to the doctrine of incarnation and other kinds of polytheism. It is an irony of fate that, with the most brilliant intellectualism the world has ever seen, the present is an age of the most perverted form of thinking in all matters pertaining to religion. Thus the idea that the Semitic people are not mystic-minded whereas the Aryans are is as mischievously wrong as pernicious. It is against all canons of reasoning to think that a people that is remarkably gifted with the genius of prophethood and with revelation is not mystical. One fails to see what else mysticism consists in. The fact is that the bounty of revelation is universal in its operation. And, rather than being behind others, the Semitic people seem to have had an extra share of it. And if, for the last two thousand years or so, a large number of individuals belonging to the Aryan races have

exhibited this gift in some striking measure, it is, again, it should be remembered, in fulfilment of the Divine words:

"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Genesis, 22:18.)

It is the Semitic Jesus and Muhammad (peace be on them!), particularly the latter, that have inspired their numerous Aryan followers to have a glimpse of the high regions of existence.

Indeed, it is difficult to see how the Aryans are more gifted with mystical tendencies than the Semites, unless mysticism is confused with abstract metaphysical thinking, an activity of the brain which, having no relation with actual experience, has always led people to the dangerous doctrine of incarnation, the starting point of all polytheistic cults, including that of pantheism. It would seem that the tragedy of Christianity lies in its falling an early prey to this confusion. It was not through the purified heart and the higher light of reasoning that dwells therein, but through the brain that the Gentile converts to Christianity tried to grasp the phenomenon of the Messiahship. It was, thus, the want of true mysticism in the Aryan mind of Greece and Rome that was mainly responsible for the strange and absolutely irrational dogma of Trinity. The present article makes this point amply clear. We recommend it to the careful study of all seekers for truth in Christendom.—Ed., I.R.]

Y. Of the many Christological inconsistencies found in the New Testament, the most glaring one is to be met with between the Logos doctrine of St. John and the Kenotic theory of St. Paul, which has baffled the master minds of Christendom from the Nestorian Controversy to the Oxford Movement and St. Athanasius to Dr. Newman. It is obviously outside the scope of this short essay to give even a bare outline of the fierce controversy that has raged over this most irrational doctrine of the New Testament during the Patristic and the post-Nicene periods in ecclesiastical history. All I can possibly do is to state the doctrine and the theory as it is found in the New Testament and then demonstrate the palpable inconsistency which, when driven to its logical conclusions, not only strikes at the very root of the alleged divinity of Jesus but also makes a short work of the whole superstructure that has been reared upon that irrational dogma. I may also add in passing that both the Logos doctrine and the Kenotic

theory, even if each is treated quite separately and independently of the other, are against all canons of logic and ratiocination, *i.e.*, utterly illogical and absurd; and that is why all the dignitaries of the Church, from Tertullian and Ireneus down to our own times have invariably taken shelter under the convenient term "mystery;" but every serious student of Christianity knows it full well that the Dogmatic theology of this religion is in reality not mysterious but irrational.

Let us now begin with the "Johnine" doctrine of the Logos as found in St. John, 1:1:

"In the beginning was the Logos; and the Logos was with God; and the Logos was God."

Both in the authorised and the revised versions the term "Logos" has been translated as "word," but this English word does not convey the sense implied in the Logos. I admit "Logos" is derived from the Greek λ_{ℓ} ver (Legein)—to speak, but here this word is employed by St. John not in its literal sense, but as a term connoting something quite different, as will presently be made clear in this essay; hence the original word used in the Greek manuscript has been retained.

Jesus Christ, as depicted in the New Testament knew nothing about the Logos doctrine; he is reported to have uttered not a single word about it and we do not come across this term anywhere in the whole of the New Testament. If the 'writer of the fourth Gospel is the same John who was the beloved disciple of Jesus,' the question naturally arises, "whence did John borrow this term?" as his master never used it during his ministry, though it was short-lived. The term is non-Biblical, non-synoptical, non-evangelical and non-ecclesiastical; where, then, did John get it from?

The earliest trace of this term is to be found in the philosophic writings of Heraclitus* who lived during

^{*}According to Dr. Burnet, he was born in 544 B. C.

the fifth century before Christ and in my opinion it was he who gave a technical colour to this simple Greek word.

- "Heraclitus* stressed the teaching that out of all things is produced the inner harmony of the world, with which the beauty of the visible world cannot compare. The same universal order, conceived as efficient force, is called world-ruling wisdom—the Logos."
- "Heraclitust sometimes speaks of it (order of things) as the work of Fate. In the midst of all changes the only thing that persists is this law; it is the reason in things—the Logos."
- "The flux unveils by no other law than a rule of sufficient reason. This orderliness Heraclitus called the "Logos," the meaning of which incorporates the notion of rationality. The thinker may discover the Logos-the law of change—in the flux, if he exercises his reason. an achievement the senses alone are unable to consummate."İ

From the above quotations, it is clear that Heraclitus coined this term to indicate the orderliness and the beauty visible in the universe. This idea remained in abeyance in the realm of thought till the Stoics revived and emphasized it in their writings.

§" Fate or Destiny $(\hat{\eta} \epsilon i \mu \alpha \rho \mu \epsilon \nu \eta)$ rules the world. The activity being rational, may be described as the reason of the world, sometimes called the generative reason (Logos spermatikos') i.e., the creative and forming force in nature."

^{*}Walshe—The Quest of Reality, p. 14. †Thilly – History of Philosophy p. 25. ‡Burgess—Introduction to the History of Philosophy p. 28. Walshe-p. 148.

- "*The forces in the universe form one all-pervasive force and this principle is rational, the active soul of the world. It must be one, because the universe is a unity. It is reason, because the universe is a cosmos: all life and movement have their source in it. It is the soul of the universe—the Logos."
 - "†As man learns the ways of nature and orders his life accordingly, he strengthens his ability to avoid the pitfalls of private passion because he has achieved an adequate understanding of them, which enables him to see them in their true context. This gives perspective to his life, for reason achieves order and guides life in accordance with the divine Logos or law of the universe."

Thus we find that the Stoics used this term to express law and order in the universe, and the attribute of Reason in God.

The Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists, who came into prominence in the realm of thought in the second century before Christ were confronted with the most important cosmogonical problem of the day which can be stated in the following words:

"God is pure spirit and good; matter is dark, dreary and evil; how then, could God create this material universe—the very contact with which would make Him impure and ugly?"

This difficulty was solved by making use of the Logos, who is the first emanation from God and is the active principle in this universe. He is the creative agency of God. He is co-eternal with God as regards time but is a created being as regards his own being or substance; *i.e.*, he is not self-subsistent as God is,

by His very essence or nature. God created this Logos and the Logos, in turn, created this universe of matter.

This theory, defective and fraught with grave consequences as it was, met with general approval in the leading philosophical schools and, by the end of the third century, it had come to be universally acknowledged as the last word in Cosmogony.

The Jews living in Alexandria, in the home of learning and culture in the first century before Christ took a fancy to the study of Neo-Platonism and one of their protagonists, Philo (born in 30 B.C.) laboured hard to align Judaism with Greek thought in order to make this religion acceptable to the educated classes. In his quest for finding some philosophic basis for Judaism, he happily came upon the Logos theory and elaborated it to suit his own purpose.

- "The word Logos came from the Greek Pantheists, Heraclitus and the Stoics. To the Stoic, Logos koinos, Logos spermatikos was the Divine Force, the *anima mundi*. His conception of the Logos was fourfold:
 - (a) In relation to God, the Logos was wisdom; the spirit of the Lord filling the whole universe.
 - (b) In relation to other powers, the Logos was their creator, the sum of the Ideas.
 - (c) In relation to the world, the Logos was the Pilot of the universe.
 - (d) In relation to us, the Logos was Mediator, Saviour, Supplicator and Sustainer of the people.

Bishop Westcott maintained that the Logos of St. John was derived not from Philo but from the Palestinian schools. In all probability, St. John

acquired from Alexandria, that conception of the Logos which first brought Christian theology within the sphere of metaphysics."*

- "Philo conceived the Logos as God's agency to be everywhere present; and suggested that the Logos as Divine Reason was the first-born son of God through whom the affairs of Creation are regulated."
- ‡"God is too exalted to come in contact with impure matter. In order to explain His action on the world, Philo assumes intermediate powers and combines them into one, the Logos, the Divine Reason. It is the highest of the angels, the first-born Son of God, the image of God and the second God."
- §" Philo teaches that God is not in contact with matter; if He were, He would be defiled. is present in the world only by His operations, not by His essence. The Logos, a being intermediate between God and the world, dwells with God as His wisdom (Sophia). The Logos does not exist from eternity, like God, and yet its genesis is not like our own and that of all other created beings; it is the first-begotten Son of God, and is for us, who are imperfect, a god. Through the agency of the Logos, God created the world and has revealed Him-The Logos is also the representative self to it. of the world before God, acting as its high priest, intercessor and Paraclete."
- "This sum-total of the Divine activity in the world Philo designates by the Stoic conception of the Logos. It is, on the one hand, the Divine

^{*}Walshe—The Quest of Reality, p. 182. †Burgess—Introduction to the History of Philosophy, p. 171. †Thilly—History of Philosophy, p. 124.

[§]Ueberweg—History of Philosophy, p. 224.

Wisdom resting within itself (Logos endiathetos) and the producing rational power of the Supreme Being; and on the other hand, Reason as coming forth from the Deity (Logos Prophorikos) the first-born Son who is not, as is God, without origin; nor yet has he arisen, as have we men; he is the Second God."*

This is the testimony of some of the well-known philosophical writers regarding the origin and conception of the term "Logos." Now let us turn to the theological writers and see what they say on this subject.

- "The shadow of God is His Logos or reason, which he used as an instrument or organ, when he made the world It is by His Logos that God is governor and good. Logos preceded all things and is conspicuous in all things. Logos is the design by which God acted in the creation and government of the world."†
- "Philo speaks of the Logos as if he were a person distinct from God—Second God."I
- "Philo's doctrine of the Logos is the immediate prelude to the Christian idea of the Logos. He makes a distinction between God and the Logos, whom he also calls deuteros theos (Second God) even Theos (God) directly, but without the definite articles,—the only begotten son of God, the first-born, the image of God, the knowledge of God, the Paraclete. The Logos is the mediator of the revelations of God, the theophanies were possible only through him."¶

^{*}Windleband—History of Philosophy, p. 241.
†Rev. Dr. Morgan—The Trinity of Plato and Philo., p. 76 and 82.
†Dr. Dorner—System of Christian Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 349.
§Philo designates God as ho Theos (the God) and Logos as plain Theos (God)
•Dr. Hagenbach—History of Christian Doctrine, p. 157.

Philo uses this word (Logos) in its two-fold sense of reason and speech. As the Logos endiathetos (immanent word) it abode in God. When God manifested Himself in creation, the Divine Logos went forth and became the revealed He speaks of the word (Logos prophorikos). Logos as a being distinct from God under the figure of a son and also as a Second God."*

Thus it is quite evident that Philo borrowed this term from the Gnostic thinkers, and John (if it can be proved that it was he who wrote the fourth Gospel) in turn, borrowed from Philo. Mr. Kellet also arrives at the same conclusion in his Short History of Religions. "It was," he says, "mediately or at first hand, from Philo, that the Johnine conception of Jesus as the incarnate Logos was derived."†

John has, as already stated, used this term without any qualification; thus we are in a position to infer that he accepted the then current connotation of this term. Consequently, if Jesus is the Logos, he is:

- "Theos" (God) but not "ho Theos" (The God), i.e., his godhead is derived from the (tod.
- Dependent for his being on God, i.e., he could not come into being if there were no God.
- Subordinate to God (inferior in status).
- Second God; begotten of God; His firstborn.
- The Son of God, but not the Father: co-equal in divinity but distinct in personality and inferior in authority.

These conclusions are irresistible and St. John has also admitted them by designating the Logos as

^{*} Rev. Dr. Jackson—The History of the Christian Church, p. 155. † Kellet—Short History of Religions, p. 95.

plain "Theos" and the Father as "ho theos" (the God).

Moreover, the verse in question can have some meaning (though that meaning is open to grave logical objections) only if it is interpreted in the light of these conclusions.

Let me illustrate my point by quoting the verse ain:

"In the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was with God and the Logos was God."

"In the beginning" is the translation of the Greek phrase "en archee." "Archee" literally means, beginning or origin, a first principle, power, dominauthority and sovereignty: it - does - not imply the idea of eternity. Hence the meaning first clause is that the Logos existed in the beginning of the world, and the interpretation that the Logos is eternal is not warranted by the text. The utmost that can be predicted of the Logos is that it existed before the creation of the world. But the existence of a being before the creation of the world does not imply that that being is eternal; or is a necessarily existent being or an uncreated being. Now take the second clause:

"And the Logos was with God."

This clause introduces two distinct beings, viz., the Logos and the God (ton Theon) who existed side by side as two persons. "With" is the translation of the Greek word 'pros.' This word, like archee, has a host of meanings, e.g., from, on the side of, side. In the presence of, before (as before the gods), near, at, with, etc. In short, pros denotes relation and not identity or equality. This being, the Logos, was existent along with God before the creation of the world.

3. "And the Logos was God."

The Greek text here has *Theon* without the article. Now, if this Logos was really the God, the question naturally arises, who, then, was with the God? The only way out of this difficulty is to admit in the plainest terms possible, that the Logos is a being "other than the God." If not, the clause in question will stand thus:

"And the God was the God."

And this statement is, *prima facie*, absurd. It conveys no sense at all. Hence, if this clause is to convey any meaning at all, it should be interpreted like this, *viz.*—

"And the Logos was also a divine being, or a second God (deuteros theos) subordinate to the God (the Father)."

Count Leo Tolstoy and Swedenborg are both in agreement with me on this point. Let me quote from Tolstoy's translation of the Gospels:

- "The Church translation of the first verse has no meaning whatever. No sense results from it and each separate word is invested with a mystic and arbitrary gloss."
- "The second part of the verse is still more hopelessly incomprehensible in the Church translation."
- "If we accept that in the beginning was the word and that the word was with God, it is certainly impossible to go on and say that it was God. If it was God, it could stand in no relation to God."*

Tolstoy then offers his own translation which runs thus:

"The comprehension of life became the beginning of all; and the comprehension of life stood for God; and the comprehension of life became God."

Here I am not concerned with the relative accuracy

301

^{*}The four Gospels translated and harmonised by Tolstoy—Boston—1904, pp. 24, et seq.

or the superiority of the translation offered by Tolstoy; all I want to emphasize is that he is also in full agreement with me that the Church translation, as it is found in the authorised or the revised versions, conveys no sense at all. If, I repeat, the Logos is himself God, he could stand in no relation to God.

Now I will quote some of the ante-Nicene Church Fathers to support my contention that the Logos is subordinate to the God, is second God and is other than the God; in short, that the Logos verse was understood by them in the same sense as expressed by me in the foregoing pages.

- "God was in the beginning; and by His simple will the Logos springs forth and becomes the first-begotten work of the Father. Him we know to be the beginning of the world. But he came into being by participation, not by abscission for what is cut off is separated from the original substance but that which comes by participation does not render him deficient from whom it is taken. Just as from one torch many fires are lighted, but the light of the first torch is not lessened by the kindling of many torches; so the Logos, coming forth from the Logos-power of the Father, has not divested of the Logos-power Him who begot him."*
- "Justin's emphasis is on the divine Logos subordinate to God the Father, yet His son, His agent and one with him in some true, though rather indefinite, sense."
- "Origen believed that God, the uncreated perfect spirit, is the source of all. From Him the son is eternally generated. Yet Christ is a "Second God"a creature. Christ's position, as Loofs has pointed out, was viewed by Origen as the same as that of the nous -mind or thought—in the Neoplatonic system."†

^{*}Tatian's address to the Greeks pp. 9-10-The writings of Tatian and Theophilus.

- "In their anxiety to smooth the way for the acceptance of Christianity by many who came as near to the Truth as unaided human reason would allow, the early Christian writers mixed up too much of the earthly element with the heavenly and laid the foundat'on of future heresies.
 - "In one passage Justin not only calls the Logos a "Second God" but seems to insinuate that this Plotinistic Logos dwelt in Jesus only in a more perfect way than in other men."
 - "Theophilus says that the Logos was continually laid up in God's heart (endiatheton en kardia Theon). But when God willed to make as many things as He chose, He beget this Word in Expression, first-born of all creation."
 - "John Damascenus says, "So also the word of God who is the Son, in his subsisting by himself, is distinguished with respect to Him, from whom he has his generation personally; but, in that he exhibits the same things in himself, which are seen concerning God, he is the same in nature with Him." *

N.B.—John in this passage has taught Ditheism plain and simple.

- 4. †(a) In a manner almost identical with what we find set forth in the other apologists, this writer teaches the subordination of the Logos to the Father.
- (b) "The father sends the Son, consequently whatever divinity the Son possesses is secondary to the Father. Since the Logos is "God" and the Father is "the God" there must be a difference in the significance of the term as applied to the Son in the one case and to the Father in the other."I
 - (c) "Though a possible source for the Apologists'

^{*}Nogmatic Theology by Robert Owen, pp. 135—140.
†The Christology of the Apologists, by V. A. Spence Little.
†—"This writer" refers to the author of the famous "Epistle to Diognetus" whose identity is totally unknown. This document was written between 135 and 150 A.C.

Christology has sometimes been sought in the Fourth Gospel, the difficulties connected with the interpretation of certain terms contained in the Prologue makes this suggestion almost valueless. For instance, besides uncertainty both as to the date and authorship of this work, we cannot be sure of the precise meaning and significance of those mysterious expressions, in the early verses of the Prologue. Confessedly, then, it would be futile to attempt to find in St. John the source of the Christian Logos doctrine. It should also be borne in mind that Justin never* quotes the Fourth Gospel though he does quote some of the Synoptists."

- "The term 'Logos' was adopted by Justin from current philosophy, as being the only expression which suitably represented the metaphysical elements in the nature of the Son'"
- (d) "That the Logos, in some sense, began to be, is the universal Christian belief in the second century. The Apologists are unanimous in ascribing to the divine Logos a beginning in a definite sense."
- (e) "The very fact that the Logos is generated, being the 'first-born to the ingenerate God,' places him in striking contrast with God Who is entirely uncaused, both as to personality and essence."
- (f) "The generation of the Logos, according to Justin, was therefore not of necessity, nor was it fortuitous, nor automatic, but only by the free volition of the Father."
- (g) "If the Father is "agenetos" (uncreated) and the son "prototokos" (first-born), then conceivably in the order oft hought, fuit tempus cum Filius non fuit, † i.e., (there was a time when the Father had no son)."

^{*}Critical research as well as historical evidence goes against the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. I think this gospel was not written by St. John (being compiled by some unknown person in the 3rd century) nor was it known to Justin or Tatian.

[†]Tertullian, Hermog., 3.

(h) "The problem, then, resolved itself into the task of proving a plurality of persons in the Deity. That is to say, it devolved upon Justin to show that, besides the Father, there was a rightful place within the Godhead for a second person who, in one sense, would be truly divine and yet in another sense inferior to the Supreme God and never His rival; in a word, a place for Theos (God) who is not ho Theos (the God). In order to effect this distinction Justin uses the term Theos for the Logos without the article."

"But in the time of Justin, the term *Theos* (without the article) was of uncertain meaning. He himself instances Simon who claimed to be a god and examples of the use of the term in general literature are numerous, e.g., Apollonius, and the Roman Emperors were designated as gods (*Theoi*). Epictetus states that "Diogenes and Heraclitus are justly called gods."

Dr. Harnack (in his History of Christian Dogma, Vol. I, p. 118) referring to the use of Theos in early Christian times says, "The genius, the hero, the founder of a new cult, the Emperor, the sage and the philosopher . . . the man, in so far as he is inhabited by nous (mind), can all be considered somehow theoi (gods) so variable was the term."*

- (k) "But when Logos operates in the world as the Father's agent and is found in a "place" upon the earth, then personally, economically and officially He (the Logos) is less than the supreme God and subordinate to Him."
- (l) "From the above passages Justin concludes that it must be admitted that some other (Being) is called "Lord" in the Old Testament besides the maker

305

^{*}This proves conclusively that the term "theos" without the article was used for persons other than God, who was known as 'ho Theos' (the God). And St. John has used the term 'theos' (God) for Jesus, and 'ho theos' (the God) for God in order to differentiate one from the other. Thus the Logos is, according to St. John himself, second God, inferior in rank though equal in nature to the God who is uncaused.

of all things. There are, therefore, two divine beings, two Gods in the Godhead, existing in perfect moral union and identical in essence, though both are not equally God."

- (m) "Tatian ascribes the generation of the Logos entirely to the Father's volition. Consequently after the generation of the Logos, the simple, undivided divine nature is shared or distributed between the two hypostasis, viz., God the Father and the Logos." p. 183
- (n) "In the writings of Tatian, the whole relationship of Logos to the Father is suggestive of the secondary position of the former."
 - "The Logos, identical in essence with the Father, is subordinate in an economic sense, since he was prolated by the will and the initiative of a Senior Divine Person." p. 191
- (o) "The theory of the subordination of the Logos in Theophilus is based upon similar grounds to those in Justin, viz., that he is the son, a generated being, having a secondary place in the Trinity, that he fulfils the Father's will as creative agent and that being the Logos of God, he is thus not the whole personality of God, but only His mind, which is subject to His will." p. 207
- (p) "Athenagoras states that Christians acknowledge "one God, uncreated, eternal, invisible, impassable, incomprehensible, illimitable, who is apprehended only by the intellect; and that they also recognize a son of God, who is the Logos of the Father, in idea and actuality, being His mind and reason." "The Logos is given second place in the Trinity and the three hypostases are in essential union with each other. But the Godhead is one, a unity which is constituted by the peculiar inter-relation of the Persons composing it. If envisaged under one personality, the Godhead is the Father. From Him the son proceeds who, identically with the father, is called "God."

- "How then does the apologist avoid ditheism? Though Athenagoras supplies no plainly-expressed statement, sufficient may be inferred to furnish a reply . . ." p. 215
- "Since the son is God's Logos, the whole divine efficiency is subject to His direction and since Logos is a part of God's Personality, all the potency of the Logos is necessarily also God's. Therefore, these two hypostases are, as to being, one."
- "There is, therefore, one Godhead in which the son, the second member in order of seniority and dignity, is divine equally with the Father as to His essence,† but differs from the Father economically, being subject to His will." pp. 216—17.

Summary of the Apologists' Christology.—It will be seen that all these early Church Fathers (Tatian, Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus and Origen) agree with me in that the Logos is:

- (i) Subordinate to God;
- (ii) Dependent for his existence upon God;
- (iii) A creature;
- (iv) Brought into being by the Will of God;
 - (v) Theos (Divine) but not ho Theos;
- (vi) The Agent of God;
- (vii) Second God;
- (viii) First-born Son;
 - (ix) Inferior in rank and dignity; and
 - (x) Begotten son of the Father.

These attributes go to prove that the Logos is *not* identical with God, the Father.

†Here starts the clear deviation from true mysticism and a consequent lapse into polytheism. The merged drop is magnified into and mistaken for the ocean, the red hot piece of iron is mistaken for fire it elf. It is here that mysticism runs amuck and loses itself in barren metaphysical speculation.

—Ed., I. R.

^{*}Here we find religious mysticism struggling hard with the onrush of polytheistic ideas. The hold on true mysticism is not altogether lost, but it is found slackening. The prophet or God-realised person having totally merged his will in the will of God, reflects His glory and power. The Divine will uses the personality of the man so transformed for its own manifestation in the world of humanity. The Prophet and God is one in so far as the former has no will apart from the latter. This is "Submission" or Islam, of which Abraham was an outstanding example. The identity is owing to the total surrender of one of the parties, but the creature is all the same a creature. This is where all polytheistic cults stumble.

—Ed., I. R.

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY

BY RABI'AL-KARIM, M.Sc.

(Continued from page 263 of the last issue.)

This is why the Holy Prophet Muhammad passed his life so simply and in poverty though he was the most powerful and wealthy monarch of his nation and had the greatest control over people that was ever given to a leader. He at whose commands royal crowns and sceptres tumbled down had at times to press stones against his belly to check the burnings of hunger inside caused by a whole week starvation—had even to suffer once at the hands of a Jew in the course of his daily labour with him that brought only two dates as wage. The great leader of Muslims Hazrat Abu Bakr Siddiq, his first successor gave away his all in the Lord's When the great, wealthy and mighty Roman General came to see the great Hero-leader Hazrat Umar Faruq the second Caliph at his tent to entreat for peace after their defeat at the hands of the Muslims, the invincible Muslim Commander could not choose for himself a better place to sit on than the bare earth. The greatest Muslim Jurist Imam Abu Hanifa was requested time and again by the then Caliph Mansur of Baghdad to accept the respectable post of Justice of Baghdad but he strongly refused that and for that refusal he had had to die in prison-yet he did not yield to the Caliph's wishes.

Rank, riches and honours have not been able to bring Muslims under their sway, greed for wealth and luxury has failed to captivate their minds. The doctrine of their life was "La ilaha illallah" ("There is none to be worshipped save Allah) and this is why they have denounced every other power and authority. All their cravings, all their desires merged into the love of the Omnipotent. They have thought God enough for them in life and, as a consequence, all other earthly

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY

attractions have evaporated like steam. Subduing all the merry rhymes of the songs of life only this one psalm of life has been sung throughout: "Oh My Lord! Oh my King—Thou art my all—My dearest! Thee do I want and none or nothing else. Islam is my religion and 'La ilaha illallah' is my belief."

"Bismillah" (with the name of God) the working formula of the Muslims vibrates with the rhythm of Islam; "Allah u Akbar" (God is the greatest) the conquest-slogan of the Muslims expresses the rapture of the same Islam; "Subhanallah" (All glory to God). the note of admiration of Muslims gives voice to that same spirit of Islam; and "Alhamdulillah" (All praises to God) the expression of joy in the Muslim mind is inspired with this *Islam*. The ins and outs of a Muslim's life are filled with the same love of God. In triumph or defeat, in wonder or mirth, only this has come out of his heart—"My Lord! Thou art all. Thou art everything." At the beginning of his work he says "Bismillah." Oh Thou greatest Worker! With Thy name I begin my work and to Thee I dedicate the results. Thou art my might and strength in my work. If I win and be able to reach the zenith of success My Lord !—it is Thy mercy. And if I fail in my endeavour and fall down to dust-it is still Thy blessing."

In the field of battle when the enemy has been completely routed by the charge and attack of the Muslim swords, he has not admired his own prowess nor has he praised the sharpness of his sword along with the dexterity of his arms, nor yet has he shouted the triumph of his king or general—the words that have come out of him rolling like thunderbolts—the triumphant proclamation that has reached the firmament is "Allahu Akbar. Thou art the greatest. Thou art the Most High. Thou art the Almighty. Oh Thou

Lord of all the Worlds—it is Thy conquest. Victory is Thine. Thine is the triumph."

The charming view that is presented when the rays of the sun are reflected back in all the radiant colours of the rainbow on the wavy milk-white restlessly rushing waters of a thundering waterfall fills the human mind with wonder and it gets puzzled to think of the marvellous skill exhibited in the machinery of creation, again when sceptres and crowns tumble down at the feet of the peasants and the same mind is filled with an ecstacy and emotion and the wondered, puzzled, bewildered Muslim loses his ownself, he does not experience any swelling of his own self, but forgets his own existence and from the depth of his heart comes out "Subhan Allah" "Oh Thou Creator, Thou art Glorious, All holiness is Thine." When frail man with his extraordinary working capacity and ability transforms impossibilities into possibilities and gives shape and perfection to his fancy and imagination in reality even then the Muslim says "Subhan Allah." "Oh Thou Most Glorious. Thine is all holiness." When weak man wins and even surpasses the sun, in radiance and glow by sacrificing his life in the service of mankind—when his nobility even crosses the heavens in height, even then these very words come out from him "Subhan Allah," "Oh Thou All-Merciful-Thou art the Most Holy." No other force is felt in his bewildered heart—no other light is reflected in his gazing eyes-the only word that runs through his veins, the only flow that courses in his body, is "Subhan Allah, Subhan Allah." In all the forces he sees His force, in all glories His glory and in all the varieties of the universe His unity.

"Alhamdu lillah." "All praises to Allah" is the expression of admiration and happiness and satisfaction with the Muslim. In his weal the Muslim smiles and

THE RELIGION OF HUMANITY

utters "Alhamdu lillah," in his woe he weeps and pronounces "Alham'du lillah." In happiness as well as in distress he offers all his praises to Allah. When fortune smiles and favours him, when affluence and happiness are full to the brim, when the mind soars in regions of blissful security and sees everything bright in nature, and the heart is filled with an ecstatic joy the Muslim bows down his head and in the most earnest voice says "Alhamdu lillah" "My Lord! I praise Thee alone—Thou art Glorious—Thou art Excellent. Thou art Beautiful. This life is but Thy gift, this happiness is only Thy blessing, this joy is Thy mercy alone. I am lowlier even than the grass. Oh Thou most glorious—Thy mercy has watered the roots of my existence. Thy blessings have bedewed my body and with dew drops of Thy gift I am alive and beautiful. I am a small grain of sand but Thy rays of affection have brightened me, have made me more sparkling than the brightest jewel, nay even than the sun."

Again, when black clouds of sorrow overhang the firmament of life—when the last ray of hope becomes fainter and fainter and, at last, is lost in darkness, when waves after waves of distress, persecutions and torments shatter and overpower fortune in front, behind or on sides the Muslim utters: "Alhamdu lillah" "Oh Thou Merciful there is no limit to Thy mercy." When persistent blows of mishap choke the breath, when objects of affection wither like autumn flowers, the same words "Alhamdu lillah" come out of him. He falls in the dust weeping and says: "My Lord! I have no power to understand Thy glory. I am too insignificant, how shall I speak of Thy affection? I was sinking to the depth of degradation, Thou art kind enough to lift me up; I was getting entangled in the net of passion and lust; Thou hast freed me. The darkness that has veiled my fortune is Thy affection

solidified and its touch has given me back my own self. The lightnings of dangers and perils all around have blinded my eyes, but my inner eyes are now all aglow with Thy infinite beauty."

This all-enveloping radiance has thus illumined every phase of the Muslim life. This Light of all lights glow in the eyes of the Muslims in his afflictions and troubles. When the human mind is filled with overwhelming grief and sorrow at the demise of his near and dear ones. When devastations and destructions try to rend the heart from its very core-the Muslin, has not learnt to lament bitterly—this message comes out of him astounding the whole world, "Inna lillahi wa inna ilaihi raj'iun" "For Thee we are and to Thee is our return." "My Lord! Our creation and existence, our life and death, all are at Thy will. We are not of wealth or fame, nor of relations or peoples. We are Thine and to Thee is our journey. That is why we are not afraid of "death," we are not perturbed at anybody's demise; we are not sorry for any loss. In this, our limitless journey to reach Thee we have made many acquaintances; we have seen many charming pictures of love, we have smelt many fragrant flowers of affection—but all of them have receded behind only Thou art constant. Nowhere had we leisure to stop or stay, as our goal is with Thee, we had no right to be allured as we are destined for Thee alone."

Thus all the tunes that have been produced by the strings of the Muslim life have harmonised into one pitch—"Islam"—In all his beliefs and actions he has manifested Islam—that complete surrender and submission to the Divine Will, that earnest and sincere craving to obey His Command, that keenest and eternal longing to merge and give up his all in Him Who is the Fountain of all Glory, Might and Mercy.

ISLAM AND MODERN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

By Maulvi Aftab-ud-Din Ahmad

(Continued from page 268 of the last issue.)

Again running through all the professed aims of Nazism will be found the recognition of another main idea of Socialism—equal opportunity for all. This is made noticeably explicit in its education policy which is expressed in the following significant passage in clause 20 of the Nazi programme:

"We demand development of the gifted children of poor peasants, whatever their class or occupation, at the expense of the State."

No doubt, private property is recognised in Nazism, yet for all practical purposes, the main principles of Socialism are accepted as the basis of Social organisation. As we have said, the very term "National Socialism" is very significant in this connection.

Whether Hitler really meant to stick to these principles or not, is open to question. It seems, however, that he was obliged to adopt them in his programme to catch the popular imagination of Germany he wanted to lead.

People have different and conflicting theories about the ready response with which his proposals were hailed. Whatever spontaneous response he received, however, if viewed with an unprejudiced mind, would appear to be due to a lamentable lack of national enthusiasm consequent upon the insistence of Communism on an international outlook. And it is here that we find the explanation of the effective use made by Hitler of an otherwise glorious term "international", in an abusive way. The term "Jewish international" has almost an electrifying effect in rousing the Germans to fury. The psychological explanation is simple. The international outlook proposed by Bolshevism of the Lenin's

days had a very disintegrating effect on the minds of

people in Germany. The success of the cult in Russia was due to a background of intolerable oppression and exploitation, that fostered a spirit of rebellion in the poor against the rich. Some other countries had experienced similar outbursts, with this much of difference that state organisation on socialistic lines came to stay in Russia, however temporarily it might be I say 'temporarily' advisedly for I have always regarded and still regard the Russian outburst as nothing more than a juvenile enthusiasm for a new and changed state of affairs. As far back as 1935, I could say that before long the Russian movement would settle down as a national constitution, at the best, satisfying the peculiar psychological and social needs of its people. To claim for it a universality of application, so far the privilege of religion, could be nothing more than a fantastic dream. And that I was not at all wrong in my reading of the situation is finally proved by a recent declaration from Moscow (May 21, 1943) winding up the Communist International and forcing the Nationalist Communist Parties from obligations arising from statutes and decisions of the various Comintern Congresses. True, the father of this system of philosophy, Karl Marx, intended to make of it a religion, superseding all other religions that humanity has known so far and that recognise the spiritual destiny of man. At least he was understood by the vast bulk of his followers to have so intended. In any case every enlightened communist, conversant with writings, subscribes to this idea regarding his attitude towards religion in general. That is why the Marxists have coined slogans and composed songs breathing a spirit of internationalism. But like most of human sentiments it is destined to remain a sentiment, unrealisable amidst hard facts of life. In actual fact

MODERN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

man is not so low as Marx and Marxists think him to be. Economics does play a great part in determining his actions, individual and collective; the impulse it generates may appear irresistibly powerful to some philosophers, but the deeper and nobler emotions of man, though not so clamorous, have far more to do with his social behaviour than his economic impulses even at their worst. In actual application to life the economic sense has failed to generate as much heat for collective activity as nationalism has been doing. We leave aside the still higher impulses for the time being. It is evident, then, that in tapping the source of human energy, the economic sense in man, though of universal experience, far less to inspire the whole of humanity has not the power to arouse even a nation to necessary collective action. —

True religion appeals to a feeling of man which transcends the world of matter, and yet it is this which is of proved effective inspiration for the universalcollective activity of mankind. Some philosophers may ridicule the idea of solving man's social problems with reference to values that are intangible, but are not the objects of the physical world governed by laws that are more or less intangible? At least, the knowledge of science has obliged man to rise above the crude material philosophy of existence. And if the gross physical existence is controlled by forces that elude our intellectual comprehension, how much more is man, who has the intangible mind attached to him, expected to be governed by forces that elude comprehension by our physical senses and physical understanding of things! Like many other forces we must accept the power of religious emotion on collective human activity as a fact of supreme importance, through its effects if not through its rationale. At the same time we as scientific-minded people must reject once

for all the theory of the economic view of life supplying any greater incentive to human collective action, than the religious view. Experience has proved that too clearly within recent times. And this shortcoming of Communism must have been felt in the national life of Germany—a disappointment seized upon by Hitler for his own purposes. The German people must have felt as the Russians themselves have felt that the professed international outlook of communism is of no avail either this way or that, that far less from tapping the supposed reserve energy of collective human action on an international scale, it has helped the dissipation of what little energy for collective activity was still left in the German life. Determined believers in organised social life, the German intelligentsia must have sensed a danger in this state of affairs. This explains Hitler's rise to power. Clever that he was he knew where the shoe pinched. His success in rousing a whole civilized race to a frenzy of racialism, is thus due to a fundamental defect in Marxism. But however much we may understand the difficulties of German intelligentsia when they supported Hitler, we cannot forgive them for the resuscitation of grim racialism in this age where internationalism alone can assure any peace to the world. Thus even while accepting the Socialistic proposals in the main, Nazi Germany found it necessary to relapse into a feeling which would act like a thorn in the flesh of civilization, for how long it is difficult to say. What is the remedy then? Well, the remedy can be found if we can ascertain the malady. We must know the needs of humanity before we can hope to satisfy them. From what we have discussed above, the needs of humanity will appear to be threefold (a) certain changes in the social feelings of man and in his social behaviour (b) a real international outlook, and (c) a zest for collective

MODERN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

action in the midst of international life. Communism tried to satisfy all the three needs by a social system based on a certain philosophy of life. So far as the social programme is concerned, it has been accepted in bare bones by those whom it came to reform as well as by those who claim to reform it in turn. But in so far as it tried to inspire humanity with an international outlook on life and wake up its hidden energy for social action, it has miserably failed. The country which happens to be its official headquarters, has itself repudiated its international responsibilities. The most. disturbing thing about the Marxian proposals is its simultaneous appeal to the narrow instinct of self-preservation and the universal spirit of altruism. Even from the plainest logical point of view there is a paradox in the twofold demand, and hence it is that unsophisticated human nature has refused to respond to it. Indeed, when you think of it, it is surprising that its author should have possessed such enormous bean powers. But with all its faults, it had, as we have seen, a modicum of truth in it and this consisted in a just protest against Capital callously trampling under its feet the human rights of labour. And in so far as it represented that truth, it has achieved some amount of success, but nothing beyond this. And even here one may rightly say that the demands put forward have been grossly exaggerated.

ISLAMIC REVIEW THE LORD'S SUPPER

By S. MAQBOOL AHMAD, B.A.

It is remarkable that the two important Jewish festivals, the feast of Passover and the feast of Pentecost, which come at the interval of fifty days, have their counterpart in the Islamic festival of 'Id-al-Fitr and 'Id-al-Adzha which also come at the interval of little more than fifty days. A man of shallow knowledge and reasoning will at once jump to the conclusion that Muhammad simply imitated Jewish festivals and just changed their religious aspects and significance to suit his followers. It should, therefore, be pointed out that Muhammad, according to the traditional history of Islam, never introduced these festivals, neither did God do it as it finds no reference in the Holy Qur-án. It was already in vogue among the pre-Islamic Arabs and when the Arabs were converted to Islam, the Prophet allowed them to celebrate their festivals, only substituting Pagan rites for the open-air mass prayer. From this it can be reasonably deduced that the two festivals in the two sister Semitic religions have their origin in a remote antiquity and modern critics are probably right in regarding the festival of Passover as having no original connection with Egypt It was the feast of Spring and has naturally ariser. among a pastoral people like the Semitics. Religious significance was attached to it when, later, they became Jews or Muslims.

The feast of Passover among the Jews, as is well-known, was instituted to commemorate the providentia escape of the Hebrews in Egypt when God, smiting the first-born of the Egyptians, passed over the houses of the Israelites which were marked with the blood of the Paschal Lamb. It was celebrated on the first full moon of Spring from the 14th to the 21st of the month of *Nisan*. The Jews of Madina during the times of

THE LORD'S SUPPER

the Prophet Muhammad used to celebrate it by keeping the fast of Ashura or "ten days," before commencing the festival and a traditional report from Ibn-i-Abbas, as mentioned in Bukhari, adds that the Prophet was inclined to observe the fast himself and introduce it among his followers but was dissuaded from doing so by the revelation from God which imposed a fast of a few days (Ayyamam Ma'dudat) in the month of Ramadzan from the date the Holy Qur-án was first revealed in the Cave of Hira which was on the 21st of Ramadzan. fast throughout The Muslims observe \mathbf{a} month of Ramadzan in commemoration of that event and terminate it with the celebration of the feast of 'Id-al-Fitr. The feast of Pentecost is held after fifty days of the Passover. The Jewish tradition connects it with the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai and considers it as the birthday of Judaism. It is also called the "feast of weeks" because it was celebrated seven weeks after Passover. Among the ancient pastoral Semitics it was undoubtedly celebrated at the occasion of ingathering and thanksgiving for the harvest. The second festival of Islam, 'Id-al-Adzha, is connected with the commemoration of Abraham's attempt to sacrifice his first-born, Ishmael, the progenitor the Arabs, and Muslims kill a lamb and feast on it with their friends and relatives to celebrate this festival. So the lamb-killing, common among the Jews and the Muslims in one of these festivals, will compare the feast of Passover with 'Id-al-Adzha, and the feast to commemorate the revelation of the Qur-án would be compared to the feast of Pentecost which, according to Jewish tradition, was inaugurated to commemorate the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai.

The Christians, too, celebrate the feast of Passover and Pentecost; only they have changed the name and significance of both. The feast of Passover is called

"the Eucharist" or "the Lord's Supper" and the feast of Pentecost is called "Whitsuntide," which occurs fifty days after Easter and is celebrated to commemorate the descent of the Holy Ghost on the disciples. So the Passover in Judaism, Christianity and Islam was meant for the safety of the Children of Israel, Ishmael and Jesus from impending calamity, sacrifice and crucifixion, respectively, and of Pentecost for the descent of God's Holy Spirit on these three religions. The feast of Passover or the Lord's supper, which was celebrated by Jesus with his disciples on the night before his alleged crucifixion, is the subject of this article.

Before we give the versions of the Gospels on this event, let me introduce our readers to Frazer's "Golden Bough," a monumental research work of ancient cults and lores which this indefatigable author has unearthed from the homes of ancient races of Western Asia. It is a bulky and costly book and is not generally available, but a very important and useful dissertation of the book has been published by the Rationalist Press Association and can be had for a shilling. In this book the reader will find, to his amazement, that the eating of the body and drinking of the blood of god symbolically and sometimes actually when cannibalism prevailed, in a congregation of votaries, was an important pagan rite among the ancient races inhabiting Western Asia. The idea behind the eating was to assimilate the virtues of gods in the worshippers. Generally a dough of meal shaped like a god was filled with honey and This background must be kept in mind when reading these versions of the Gospels. As usual, there are two different and divergent versions; one is found in the three synoptical gospels of St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Matthew (most of the versions of these Gospels are identical as if one has been copied from the other, hence their name "Synoptical Gospels") and the other is the

THE LORD'S SUPPER

version of St. John. The reader will further note that these three synoptical Gospels give the birth story of Jesus Christ resembling the birth stories of ancient gods of Western Asia which has been ignored by St. John, as well as this story of the Holy Communion, echoing the ancient cult. One wonders to whom these Synoptical Gospellers might be indebted in introducing the pagan myths in the birth stories and Last Festival celebrated by Jesus Christ.

"Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples come to Jesus, saying unto him, where wilt thou we prepare for thee to eat the Passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them, and they made ready the passover. Now when the event was come, he sat down with the twelve, and as they did eat, he said, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, Is it I? And he answered and said, he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed. It had been good for the man if he had not been born. Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, Is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and took the cup, and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye

all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

—St. Matthew, XXVI: 17—28.

-St. Mark, XIV: 14-26.

--St. Luke, XXII: 7-23.

And following is the version of St. John:

"Now before the feast of Passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. The supper being ended, the devil having now put in the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him; He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments and took a towel, and girded himself. . . . So, after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, know ye what I have done to you When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake. He then lying on Jesus' breast, said unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped a sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And, after the sop, Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, What thou doest, do quickly . . .

-St. John, Chapter XIII.

For want of space and the need for economy of paper, I have not quoted St. John in full. The reader is advised to read the whole chapter and then question

THE LORD'S SUPPER

himself: "Why has St. John omitted to mention the breaking of bread and its offering to his disciples as his dissected body, though it appears from both versions that he did break the bread; yet, according to St. John, he administered the sop to Judas Iscariot only with the result that his heart was filled with Satan. St. John. with St. Peter and St. James, was admitted to a more confidential intercourse with Jesus than the other apostles and he is repeatedly spoken of as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Although his Gospel was written later than any of the others, some critics consider that it was written solely to refute certain particular heresies and contains greater details of Christ's conversations and discourses than the other Gospels. In fact, the person referred to in the 23rd verse of the chapter above quoted is no other than St. John himself.

St. John, therefore, among the four Gospellers, is more worthy of attention and his absolute silence over the phase of the Holy Communion is significant enough. Is it not, therefore, surprising that the practice which has undoubtedly been celebrated with certain differences since its institution and is still celebrated by all sects of Christians except the Quakers was never questioned by any thinking Christian on the strength of St. John's version, when it was proved beyond all reasonable doubt that such sacrament was in vogue among the ancient pagan nations and when, to refute the three Synoptical Gospels and prove their utter unreliability was so easy-just turn, for instance to St. Luke, Chapter XXI, verses 1-32; St. Mark, Chapter XIII, verses 1-31 and St. Matthew, Chapter XXIV, verses 1-31. Even the most stupid and perverse mind, steeped with Christian zeal and bigotry, would not accept all that is written therein when Jesus' next advent from the clouds in all his glory, preceded by those dreadful earthly and heavenly signs, was not only

never witnessed by the generation of his time but many hundreds of generations following it till our day. And

yet we see that, among the Christians, the chief controversies regarding the nature of the rite rest on the question of the real presence of Christ's body and blood and the doctrine of transubstantiation which was officially approved by the Council of Rome in 1079 A.C. and was solemnly confirmed in 1215 by the Fourth Latern Council. According to this doctrine, the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Christ, only the appearance of bread and wine remains, and the Roman Catholic Church further maintains that Christ is given wholly and entirely both in the form of bread and in that of wine and, this too, formed the principal subject of discussion between the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches even at the time of the Reformation. Luther took the words, "This is my body, etc.," in their literal sense and considered that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are united in a mysterious way with the bread and wine which, however, remained unchanged, so that the communicant received in, with and under the bread and wine the real body and blood of the redeemer. Zwingli, on the other hand, understood the words in a figurative sense and maintained that the Lord's supper was a mere commemoration of the death of Christ and a profession belonging to his church. The opinion advanced by Calvin, by which the spiritual presence of the body and blood of Christ is assumed in the communion by the partaking of which the faithful receiver is brought into union with Christ through the medium of the Holy Ghost, though it came nearer to the Lutheran doctrine than that of Zwingli, yet was essentially different. The Greek Church has not adopted the entire doctrine of transubstantiation; yet her doctrine, which was defined and sanctioned by the 324

THE LORD'S SUPPER

Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, comes nearer to this dogma than to that of the Reformed Church. The Anglican confessions incline more to the view of Zwingli. The 28th Article of the Church of England declares that "the body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." The doctrine adopted by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland in the main agrees with that propounded by Calvin.

And all this solemn scholastic hair-splitting on the figment of a casual and, very possibly, interpolated report in the Synoptical Gospels. One is tempted to wish nothing better than the sop which was administered to Judas Iscariot and which filled his heart with Satan for these Gospellers. Judas only betrayed the body of Jesus and these Gospellers or their interlopers betrayed the very spirit of Jesus and his sublime religion of Islam and reduced it to the level of Paganism.

So, you see, it was not enough for poor St. John to fight this pernicious heresy. The Holy Qur-án had to endorse it for it was one of the missions of the Holy Qur-án to purge the taint and dross of Paganism that had crept in to the Islam of Moses and Jesus and naturally, it has taken the trouble of going to the length of describing how Jesus Christ celebrated his last feast of Passover:

"When the apostles said, 'O Jesus, son of Mary, Is thy Lord able to send down to us food from heaven? he said, Fear God, if ye be believers, and they said, We desire to eat therefrom that our hearts may be at rest and that we may know that what Thou hast told us is the truth, and that we may be thereby amongst the witnesses. Said Jesus the son of Mary, O God our Lord, send down to us a table from heaven to be a festival—to the first of us and to the

last and a sign from Thee, and grant us provision for Thou art the best of the providers. God said, verily, I am about to send it down to you, but whose disbelieves amongst you after that, I will terment him with the terment which I have not termented any one within all the world."

-Ch. Al-Māida, 110-115.

Now consider that Jesus Christ and his disciples meet for the last time on a day which coincides with the feast of Passover. They want to celebrate it in an appropriate manner to commemorate their last meeting on earth, perhaps thinking that Jesus will be spared the tribulation that is facing him very much as the Israelites were saved in Egypt by the visitation of the Angel of Death. But poor and needy at all times, they were particularly handicapped in this respect when enemies were surrounding them. Where to obtain provision and the lambs? Of course, the Gospellers have answered it by saying that Jesus was supplied in the same mysterious manner as he used to get his transport animal when he went riding to Jerusalem and this comes to the same thing as the Qur-án saying that it was sent down from heaven at the special prayer of Jesus pressed by the importunities of his disciples, but that damaging heathen lore which crept into the Synoptical Gospels and which have so unfortunately turned some freethinkers away from Christianity itself, in which they have discovered only the old hash redished, a passion drama so often played among the heathers, must be ignored and contradicted and with it the revolting and repulsive idea that makes the Christians appear so many carrion dogs and vultures gorging the dead body of their Master and fighting over it.

WHAT IS ISLAM?

[The following is a very brief account of Islam, and some of its technique. For further details, please write to the IMAM of the Mosque, Woking, Surrey, England.]

ISLAM: THE RELIGION OF PEACE.—The word Islam literally means: (1) Peace; (2) the way to achieve peace; (3) submission, as submission to another's will is the safest course to establish peace. The word in its religious sense signifies complete submission to the Will of God.

OBJECT OF THE RELIGION.—Islam provides its followers with the perfect code, whereby they may work out what is noble and good in man, and thus maintain peace between man and man.

THE PROPHET OF ISLAM.—Muhammad, popularly known as the Prophet of Islam, was, however, the last Prophet of the Faith. Muslims, i.e. the followers of Islam, accept all such of the world's Prophets, including Abraham, Moses and Jesus, as revealed the Will of God for the guidance of humanity.

THE QUR-AN.—The Gospel of the Muslim is the Qur-án. Muslims believe in the Divine origin of every other sacred book, inasmuch as all such previous revelations have become corrupted through human interpolation, the Qur-án, the last Book of God, came as a recapitulation of the former Gospels.

ARTICLES OF FAITH IN ISLAM.—These are seven in number: Belief in (1) Allah; (2) Angels; (3) Books from God; (4) Messengers from God; (5) the Hereafter; (6) the Premeasurement of good and evil; (7) Resurrection after death.

The life after death, according to Islamic teaching, is not a new life, but only a continuance of this life, bringing its hidden realities into light. It is a life of unlimited progress; those who quality themselves in this life for the progress will enter into Paradise, which is another name for the said progressive life after death, and those who get their faculties stunted by their misdeeds in this life will be the denizens of the Hell—a life incapable of appreciating heavenly bliss, and of torment—in order to get themselves purged of all impurities and thus to become fit for the life in Heaven. State after death is an image of the spiritual state in this life.

The sixth article of Faith has been confused by some with what is popularly known as Fatalism. A Muslim neither believes in Fatalism nor Predestination; he believes in Premeasurement. Everything created by God is for good in the given use and under the given circumstances. Its abuse is evil and suffering.

PILLARS OF ISLAM.—These are five in number: (1) Declaration of faith in the Oneness of God, and in the Divine Messengership of Muhammad; (2) Prayer; (3) Fasting; (4) Alms-giving; (5) Pilgrimage to the Holy Shrine at Makka.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.—The Muslims worship One God—the Almighty, the All-Knowing, the All-Just, the Cherisher of

All the worlds, the Friend, the Guide, the Helper. There is none like Him. He has no partner. He is neither begotten nor has He begotten any son or daughter. He is indivisible in Person. He is the Light of the Heavens and the Earth, the Merciful, the Compassionate, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

FAITH AND ACTION.—Faith without action is a dead-letter. Faith by itself is insufficient, unless translated into action. A Muslim believes in his own personal accountability for his actions in this life and in the hereafter. Each must bear his own burden and none can explate for another's sin.

ETHICS OF ISLAM.—"Imbue yourself with Divine Attributes," says the noble Prophet. God is the prototype of man, and His Attributes form the basis of Muslim ethics. Righteousness in Islam consists in leading a life in complete harmony with the Divine Attributes. To act otherwise is sin.

CAPABILITIES OF MAN IN ISLAM.—The Muslim believes in the inherent sinlessness of man's nature, which, made of the goodliest fibre, is capable of unlimited progress, setting him above the angels, and leading him to the border of Divinity.

THE POSITION OF WOMAN IN ISLAM.—Man and woman come from the same essence, possess the same soul, and they have been equipped with equal capability for intellectual, spiritual and moral attainments. Islam places man and woman under the like obligations, the one to the other.

EQUALITY OF MANKIND AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF ISLAM.—Islam is the religion of the Unity of God and the equality of mankind. Lineage, riches and family honours are accidental things; virtue and the service of humanity are the matters of real merit. Distinctions of colour, race and creed are unknown in the ranks of Islam. All mankind is of one family, and Islam has succeeded in welding the black and the white into one traternal whole.

PERSONAL JUDGMENT.—Islam encourages the exercise of personal judgment and respects difference of opinion, which, according to the saying of the Prophet Muhammad, is a blessing of God.

KNOWLEDGE.—The pursuit of knowledge is a duty in Islam, and it is the acquisition of knowledge that makes mer. superior to angels.

SANCTITY OF LABOUR.—Every labour which enables man to live honestly is respected. Idleness is deemed a sin.

CHARITY.—All the faculties of man have been given to him as a trust from God. for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. It is man's duty to live for others, and his charities must be applied without any distinction of persons. Charity in Islam brings man nearer to God. Charity and the giving of alms have been made obligatory, and every person who possesses property above a certain limit has to pay a tax, levied on the rich for the benefit of the poor.

It cancels all previous prices.

	15	
The Secrets of Self. By Sir Muhammad Iqbal	Ks.	as.
Iqbal's Educational Philosophy	4	0
Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah	6	8
My Life a Fragment. An autobiographical sketch	·	Ŭ,
of Maulana Muhammad Ali	7	0
Philosophy of the Qur-an. By Hafiz Ghulam	•	·
Sarwar	1	8
Caliphate and Kingship in Medieval Persia. By	•	J
Dr. A. H. Siddiqi	5	8
Why We Learn The Arabic Language? By Sheikh	,	•
Inayatullah, M.A., Ph.D.	1	4
Geographical Factors in Arabian Life and History	-	•
by Sheikh Inayatullah, M.A., Ph.D.	6	0
Studies in the History of Early Muslim Political	Ū	æ 1
Thought and Administration by H. K.		₹. <u>.</u>
Sherwani, M.A	8	8
Pakistan A Nation. By El-Hamza	3	8
Life and Work of Ibn Khaldun. By M. A. Enan .	5	0
Decisive Moments in the History of Islam. By	_	
M. A. Enan	6	0
HOLY QUR-AN TRANSLATIONS		
English Translation of the Holy Our-an		
English Translation of the Holy Qur-an. Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana		
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana	31	4
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali—	31 25	4 0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding		_
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without	25	0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes—	25	0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without	25	0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes—	25 20	0 0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes— Full Cloth Binding	25 20	0 0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes— Full Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an With Essays on the Life of the Holy Prophet	25 20 6	0 0
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes— Full Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an With Essays on the Life of the Holy Prophet An authorised and most sincere presentation of th	25 20 6	0 0 4
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding Pluvinsin Binding Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an without Arabic Text with Introduction and brief notes— Full Cloth Binding English Translation of the Holy Qur-an With Essays on the Life of the Holy Prophet An authorised and most sincere presentation of th Qur-an in English. With a comprehensive and critical	25 20 6	0 0 4
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding	25 20 6 e Ho revien; tv	0 0 4
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding	25 20 6 e Ho revien; tv	0 0 4
Arabic Text, Commentary and Index by Maulana Muhammad Ali— Green Morocco Leather Binding	25 20 6 e Ho revien; tv	0 0 4

Price Rs. 9|6|-

PAMPHLETS

By the late Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din.

	•		As.	1		As.
1.	Riddles of Life		4	18.	The Creed of Progress	5
2.	Hell and Heaven		6	19.	With Difficulty is Ease	4
3.	Five Pillars of Islam		3	20.	Islam and other Religions	8
4.	Muhammad the Success Prophet	ful ••	4	21.	The Vicegerent of God on Earth	4
5.	Muhammad the Histori	ical		22.	League of Faiths	1
6.	Prophet Revelation a Necessity	••	4 2	23.	Muslim Prayer and its Text	4
7.	What is Islam?	• •	1	24.	Ethics of War	4
8.	Ramadzan		3	25.	The Excellent Names of	
9. 10.	Qur-an—A Miracle Muslim Conception Worship	of	2 2	26.	Allah Woman from Judaism to Islam	8 3
11.	Human Faculties and th Development	eir	8	27. 28.	Existence of God Study for an Atheist	4 2
12.	The Resurrection	••	3	29.	The Problem of Human	-
13.	Brief Notes on Islam	• •	4		Evolution	1
14. 15.	Unity of the Human Ra Modernization in is Islamic F o r m s	the	3	30.	The Greatest of the Prophets Hints to the Study of the	3
16.	Devotion Worship and Sacri	• •	4	91.	Holy Qur-an	
17.	cialism The Opening of the Her	••	3		Grand Total Rs	
	and opening of the field		*			

Those who will purchase a complete set of 31 pamphlets need only Rs. 5-0-0 (postage extra).

Other Pamphlets are in active preparation.

To avail of this offer hurry up $\,$ please. Procrastination $\,$ mag disappointment.

Manager, THE MUSLIM BOOK SOCIETY, Azeez Manzil, Bra LAHORE, Punjab (India)

Printed at the Press of The Civil & Military Gazette, Ltd., The by Khwaja Abdul Ghani, Secretary, The W. M. M. and L. True by him from Azeez Manzil, Brandreth Road, Lahore Editors—M. Abdul Majig, M.A. and M. Aftab-ud-Din