

MUHAMMAD IS THE APOTHEOSIS OF ISLAM AND HIS TEACHING IS THE HOLY QUR-AN, 33 : 40. "There will be no prophet after me."— MUHAMMAD.

The **Islamic Review**

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

Vol. XXXII

JUMADA'L-AKHIRA 1363 A.H.
JUNE, 1944 A.C.

[No

Annual Subscription 12s or Rs 7/8/-

Single Cop

CONTENTS

	Page
A Declaration	193
HOW I CAME TO ISLAM. By Thomas S. Tufton, B.A. (Cantab.)	194
THE FUTILITY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. By Dudley Wright (Mohammad Sadiq)	197
MUHAMMAD IN THE QUR-AN. By Syed Maqbool Ahmad, B.A.	202
PHARAOH'S MAGICIANS. By Maulvi Aftab-ud- Din Ahmad	208
THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION. By Prof. M. Y. K. Salim Chishti	212
CORRESPONDENCE	225
GLIMPSES FROM THE CHARACTER OF PROPHET MUHAMMAD	229
WHAT IS ISLAM?	231

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

MANAGING COMMITTEE

The Woking Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, Lahore.

1. Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib, M.A., LL.B., Author of the Translation of the Holy Quran with Commentary and Text. (Chairman of the Trust).
2. Maulana Sadruddin Sahib, B.A., B.T., ex-Imam, The Mosque, Woking, England.
3. Maulana Muhammad Yaqub Khan Sahib, B.A., B.T., Ex-Imam, The Mosque, Woking, England.
4. Maulana Aftabuddin Ahmad Sahib, B.A., Ex-Imam The Mosque, Woking, England, Editor, The Islamic Review.
5. Khan Bahadur Mian Ghulam Rasul Sahib, Retired District Superintendent of the Punjab Police, Jhang.
6. Maulvi Shamsuddin Sahib, B.A. Education Minister, Bahawalpur State, Bahawalpur.
7. Muhammad Aslam Khan Sahib, Barakhan Khail, Premier Rais and Hony Magistrate, Mardan, N.W.F.P.
8. Shaikh Muhammad Ismail Sahib, Premier Rais and Proprietor Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpore.
9. Khwaja Nazeer Ahmad Sahib, Barrister-at-Law, Lahore.
10. Haji Muhammad Ibrahim Sahib, Rtd. Assistant Superintendent, Punjab Irrigation Secretariat, Lahore, Punjab.
11. Mirza Masood Beg Sahib, M.A., B.T., Lahore.
12. Dr. Syed Tufail Husain Sahib, M.B., B.S., Asstt. Chemical Examiner, Punjab, Lahore.
13. Dr. Ghulam Muhammad Sahib, M.B., B.S., Late Civil Surgeon, N.W.F.P. (Financial Secretary).
14. Shaikh Muhammad Din Jan Sahib, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, High Court, Lahore (Acting President).
15. Khwaja Abdul Ghani, (Secretary).



THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

Vol.
XXXII]

JUMADA'L-AKHIRA 1363 A.H.
JUNE, 1944 A.C.

[No. 6

A DECLARATION

I, MR. JOHN CHARLES GERALD SPERNI,* of 36 Doughty Street, London, W.C. 1, do hereby faithfully and solemnly declare of my own free-will that I worship One and Only Allah (God) alone; that I believe Muhammad to be His Messenger and Servant; that I respect equally all Prophets—Abraham, Moses, Jesus and others, and that I will live a Muslim life by the help of Allah.

Lá iláha ill-Alláh Muhammad-un-Rasul-Alláh.

29th January, 1944.

(Sd.) JOHN SPERNI.

*Mr. Sperti is a person of note in the City of London. He is former Mayor of St. Pancras, the largest and the oldest of the Metropolitan Boroughs. During the tenure of office as Mayor, he had the privilege of meeting their Majesties the King and the Queen frequently at the St. Pancras Station.

Mr. Sperti, as his name signifies, is of Italian descent. The Imam of the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking, initiated him into Islam at the Royal Egyptian Club, London, on Saturday, January 29, 1944, and afterwards presented him with a copy of "Islam and the Muslim Prayer" and the booklet—"What is Islam"?

—ED., J. B.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

HOW I CAME TO ISLAM

BY THOMAS S. TUFTON, B.A. (CANTAB).

[The declaration of faith by this new-brother-in-Islam has already been published in our April issue.—Ed., *I.R.*]

My conversion to Islam has not been based on any extensive study of the Qurán nor of Islamic literature, nor from any personal experience of Islamic countries, nor even from any such experience, mediated to me by relations or close friends of mine. As a child, I believed that Muhammad was a Prophet of God in the Old Testament tradition. Under what circumstances I first heard of Muhammad I do not remember. The Prophets and peoples of the Old Testament had built up a tradition of the true religion, and this was eventually given to the world by Jesus and Muhammad ; Jesus Christ was the Prophet for the West and Muhammad was the Prophet for the East, and East and West each should admit the Prophet of the other : that roughly was my attitude. At the same time, I was convinced that the true religion had been known not only to the peoples of the Near East but also to other peoples widely separate, *e.g.*, the North American Indians. The true heroic figures of Greek, German Scandinavian and Celtic Mythology and early history, also, were close to it. Clearly, something was wanted to draw together all these spiritual traditions and produce a harmony in the world, instead of division. But the history of Protestant Christianity since the time of Reformation is a history of division and of contempt for traditions not its own. As for example it seems always to have been extremely antagonistic to Islam and has never admitted Muhammad to have been genuine ; in spite of the fact that Luther, the Keyman of the Reformation, the first to make Protestantism politically effective, almost certainly owed much to his studies of and contacts with Islam.

HOW I CAME TO ISLAM

I had the feeling that not only Islamic religion but Islamic culture and civilization have been preferable to European Christian, and that many European public figures have looked on Islamic organisation as something superior, and have secretly sought to copy it. As for example St. Thomas Aquinas, defender of the faith of the Catholic Church of Rome, who owed so much to the Arab philosophers Ibni Rushd and Al-Ghazali. Also, our own Charles II who with his (to 17th century Englishmen) revolutionary policies of experimental science and religious toleration was certainly an Arabist and an admirer of the Empire of the Moghals as well as of that of the Bourbons. Since his time, Europe (and in that term I include both European America and European Russia) has developed the industrial revolution, the perfections of bourgeois civilization, and an unbroken tradition of metaphysical atheism, and in so doing has become the thing for the rest of the world to copy, rather than itself the copier. What a pity! Most of it is better left uncopied. European Empires have sprawled themselves all over the globe, and have been almost invariably contemptuous and even brutal towards the cultures and traditions of subjugated peoples. The first was the Roman Empire, and it ended disastrously. Later European Empires, stupidly, have wished to copy it. Woe unto England if the British Empire is modelled on the Roman Empire! Protestant missionary effort has been associated with some of these Empires, and in the process seems itself to have grown not less divided but more so, not more magnanimous but narrower, and less adapted to current problems in its homelands.

During the years 1936—40 I met casually a few Muslims and was impressed with their confidence in

ISLAMIC REVIEW

their religion and its ability to stand up to all problems, old and new, social, intellectual, and scientific. I began to study Islam a little in 1942. I found that it is as I had always suspected ; though distinct and definite. Islam is at the same time broad and magnanimous, a mighty tradition within which other traditions can survive and flourish ; and which has always accepted Jesus as a Prophet and even allows him to be called " Kalimat Allah " or " Rûh Allah," " The Word of God " or " The Spirit of God " ;* point to exactly the same truth as whatever is the truth behind the phrase " The Son of God " current in Christianity (which phrase is I know abhorrent to Muslims), leaving room apparently for a kind of Christian Mysticism within Islam. What excuse then have Christians for remaining outside Islam ? Also, though Islam suffers divisions, those divisions are not like the divisions of Protestant Christianity. There is a unity in fundamentals and real brotherhood. So much was evident even from the outside.

In October 1943 I had the opportunity of meeting the Imam of the Mosque at Woking ; three conversations with him made it clear to both of us that I should accept Islam. I did so on the occasion of the 'Id-al-Adzha festival on 8th December, 1943. I know that this is the most important step I have ever taken. I do not pretend to a scholarly knowledge of Islam. I have approached it by what might be called a study of comparative religion, in which I shall remain interested. But first I must learn to live as a good Muslim, and be able to recite at least a few Suras of the Qur-án by heart. And I believe that the chief problems of the British Empire remain quite insoluble without the religion of Islam.

* The actual phrase in the Qur-án is " ruhmin hu " meaning a spirit from Him.

THE FUTILITY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS

BY DUDLEY WRIGHT (MUHAMMAD SADIQ)

[Mr. Dudley Wright needs no introduction to the old readers of the *Islamic Review* whose number it is sad to reflect, is gradually dwindling as the time passes. We are glad to see Mr. Wright taking up his powerful pen after a long silence. The world situation calls for such renewed vigour in our old fighters. May God accept his efforts in His cause.—ED. I. R.]

An important item in the British Calendar of events used to be what is known as "May Meetings," when the various Protestant societies held the annual gatherings, not to present a Profit and Loss accounts, not even a Balance Sheet, but to give a varnished statement of the work of the year. In recent years, however, national and international affairs have caused these meetings to fade into insignificance, even abandonment.

Two features in particular may be cited as the basis of missionary effort—one is the mistaken and foolish blunder of asserting that Christianity is the only true religion, forgetting or ignoring the fact that non-Christian religions have produced as noble, not infrequently nobler, examples of holy living and practical beneficence than has Christianity; and that he who is held to have been the founder of the faith professed by Christians, who is venerated by all Muslims, said: "other sheep I have who are not of this flock." Even during the present world warfare, leaders of Christianity have not been lacking in impertinence by maintaining, with nauseous iteration, that the present war is being waged for the establishment of Christian principles. Such a statement is in singular contrast to the appeal made for men and women of all nationalities and faiths, whether Christians, Muslims, Confucians, or Buddhists, to raise their banner and give their lives, if need be, for the extermination of the abhorrent creed of Nazism.

The other reason at the root of Missionary effort is commercialism. This, of course, would be denied

ISLAMIC REVIEW

by many, but the facts that can be quoted in its support are overwhelming.

It is not the practice of the Christian Missionary Societies to publish balance sheet detailing receipts and expenditure, which, when a public appeal is made for financial support by any organization, should be made compulsory by law. There is, however, sufficient evidence to demonstrate how intimate is the link between commercialism and the preaching of the Gospel, as well as proof of the unseemly manner in which the many denominations into which Christianity is divided, compete one with another (though often preaching conflicting doctrines) to secure adherents or "converts" and to produce the most favourable financial results. Rome Missions are not exempt from this charge. Witness, for example, the number of Societies in England alone devoted to Missionary works among the Jews. I record with regret, if only for my great respect for Judaism and the Jew, but I once knew a black sheep of the flock, who was "converted" by five different Societies, receiving a monetary grant from each. Roman Catholicism, however, may be regarded as exempt from the accusation, because no monetary payment is ever made by the only Catholic Society devoted to Missionary work among Jews to any who express desire to change their faith from Judaism to Catholicism. A Roman Catholic priest once said in my hearing that he was not anxious or even desirous of receiving any Jewish convert into the Church and would only do so on the persistent request of the convert, whom he would require to give unmistakable proof of the sincerity of his wish. Among Protestants, particularly Nonconformists, however, such proof is not demanded and to maintain the Missionary efforts, futile though its results may be and are, many thousands are poured annually into exchequer.

THE FUTILITY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS

Dr. Livingstone was a notable Missionary, regarded with general respect by all sections of the Christian church. His name is a household word. He was an honest man and was by no means reticent as to his aim in undertaking missionary work. In an address delivered in the Senate House before the members of the University of Cambridge, on December, 4, 1857, published in the Cambridge Lectures, 1860, he said (p. 163): "A proposal is now before us of opening Africa for commerce *and* the Gospel." Notice the importance by precedence given to commerce. Again, on p. 166 we read: "In going back to that country (lake Ngami) my object is to open up traffic along the bank of the Zambesi *and also* to preach the Gospel. . . . " These two pioneers of civilization—Christianity and commerce—should ever be inseparable.

In another lecture, delivered in the Town Hall, Cambridge on December 5th, 1857 (op., cit. p. 180) he said: "I propose, on my next visit to the Zambesi, to propitiate the different chiefs along its banks, endeavouring to induce them to cultivate cotton and to abolish the slave trade; already they trade in ivory and gold dust and are anxious to extend their commercial operations. There is thus a probability of their interests being linked with ours and thus the elevation of Africa would be the result."

A few years ago, a book was published entitled South Sea Bubbles. The authorship was anonymous being veiled under the title of "The Earl and the Doctor," but this anonymity was not difficult to pierce and the facts that the volume was under the sponsorship of so renowned a firm as Macmillan, enables it to be quoted as a reliable source of information. One chapter is devoted to a discussion on missionary efforts and the authors, though presumably Christian, at once

ISLAMIC REVIEW

reject the theory that Christianity is the only true and useful religion in the world, without which none can be saved. They ask, "is it not a bold thing to state that the religious belief of one portion only of humanity is a direct revelation of truths from God, while those of the rest of the mankind are mere inventions of man or of that humanly invented boggy, the devil?" In their view, which is not inconsistent with the teachings of Islam, "every religious system is a ray of light, more or less indistinct and imperfect, from the same great luminary."

Whitaker's Almanack publishes annually a list of the various denominations in the kingdom, but the list is a variable one, it changes from year to year—what are known as the great religions of the world. The religious systems, however, persist, as they have existed from the time of their foundation by the Prophets whom Allah sent. Corruptions may have crept in by human machinations from time to time but the reason for their persistence is to be found that they have Truth for their base and that at base, ignoring idiomatic expressions, they are practically identical. They have existed and still exist because of the truth in them, not because of the human accretions of error. Their base is the Unity of the Eternal and students of religion who believe in this Eternal Unity—none more rigidly than the Jew and Muslim—rejoice to observe the gradual shedding from all the religious systems of those human accretions. The clear clarion call: "The Lord our God is one" rings out daily from Synagogue and Mosque and is extending gradually to the pulpit and rostrum. This, however, is not the message of the Missionary. He is sent forth into foreign lands not to proclaim the Unity of the Eternal, adored and worshipped by the Muslims as Allah, but

THE FUTILITY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS

to emphasize those accretions to the faith which have been made by human hands and lips and, in the words of "The Earl and the Doctor," wasting "life, talents, energies, their own and other people's money, for the sake of making a few very doubtful Christians out of the same number of tolerably respectable Muhammadans or Hindus."

The missionaries teach not the Unity of Allah but, in both words and deeds, the disunion of Christianity.

But there is a sadder side to the question. The appeal of the missionary is, alas! very frequently backed up by the sword and rifle (and soon it will be tank and aeroplane) and the British flag, the flag of freedom, is bedraggled in the mire of warfare. Missionary effort has become, not without reason, the introduction of the Gospel, as is often said, "with the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other," but, sometimes, the Bible is replaced by a bottle of rum or gin.

It also often happens, not always owing to the failure of their efforts, that missionaries abandon the preaching of the Gospel for cotton planting or some other industry, which yields them a greater quantity of the "filthy lucre" they affect to despise than they can squeeze out of the societies which engage their services.

This applies also to home missionary effort. I knew personally some years ago a home missionary who was appointed to a well-known London Baptist Chapel. He was noted for that fervour which is generally associated with Welshmen. During his term of office, however, there sprang into existence one of the land booms which were prevalent some forty to fifty years ago when small inventors not infrequently "struck lucky." The Welshman was one of these and in a very

ISLAMIC REVIEW

short time he became a landed proprietor and abandoned his missionary calling. I do not know whether he continued to sing :

Nothing in my hand I bring,

Simply to the Cross I cling,

but if he did, he must first have emptied his well-lined pockets, while his banking account would have belied the words of his lips.

Yet people still support with large sums of money, as gifts, subscriptions and legacies, to maintain this wastage of power. There is one explanation and one only. Carlyle found it and gave expression to it when he said that the world is peopled with mostly fools.

(Copyright Reserved)

MUHAMMAD IN THE QURĀN

By SYED MAQBOOL AHMAD, B.A.

Muhammad in Madina

Despite the enthusiastic reception and warm welcome by the Madinites, the Prophet did not find Madina a haven of safety or his life a bed of roses. Among the "ready listeners" there were some who secretly wished his overthrow, these were known as Munafiqs or Hypocrites. Then there were the Jews, who, true to their tradition of inordinacy, had taken an attitude quite inconsistent with the objective which brought their forefathers to this place. Both these factions conspired with the Makkans and very soon Muhammad had to face a confederacy of his old external enemies with the internal ones. God now permits him to fight those who fight against him.

"Verily, God will defend those who believe; verily, God loves not any misbelieving traitor. Permission is given to those who fight because they have

MUHAMMAD IN THE QURAN

been wronged and, verily, God to help them. has the might, who have been driven forth from their homes undeservedly, only for that they said, Our Lord is God ; and were it not for God's repelling some men with others, cloisters and churches and synagogues and mosques, wherein God's name is mentioned much, would be destroyed. But God will surely help him who helps Him ; Verily, God is Powerful, Mighty." (XXII : 39-40).

The permission is followed by a command :

" Fight in God's way with those who fight with you but transgress not, verily, God loves not those who transgress. Kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out, whence they drove you out ; for sedition is worse than slaughter, but fight them not by the Sacred Mosque until they fight you there ; then kill them, for such is the recompense of those that misbelieve. But if they desist, then verily God is Forgiving and Merciful. But fight them that there be no sedition and that the religion may be God's, but if they desist, then let there be no hostility." (II : 186).

Then again :

" Prescribed for you is fighting, but it is hateful to you, yet peradventure that ye hate a thing while it is good for you, and peradventure that ye love a thing while it is bad for you ; God knows and ye, ye do not know. They will ask thee of the sacred mouth, of fighting therein. Say, Fighting therein is a great sin, but turning folks off God's way, and misbelief in Him and in the Sacred Mosque, and turning people out therefrom is greater in God's sight ; and sedition is a greater sin than slaughter. They will not cease from fighting you until they turn you from your religion if they can ; but whosoever of you is turned from his religion and dies while still a misbeliever ; these are those whose works are in vain in this world and next,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

they are the fellows of the Fire, and they shall dwell therein for aye." (II : 212—218).

Muslims hesitate, their rank is so thin and poor, but the command is inexorable.

"What ails you that you do not fight in God's way and for the weak men and women and children, who say, Lord, bring us out of this town of oppression and render for us from Thee a help? Do you not see those to whom it is said, Restrain your hands and be steadfast in prayer and give alms, and when it is prescribed for them to fight, then a band of men fear men, as though it were the fear of God, or a still greater fear, and they say, O our Lord, why hast Thou prescribed for us to fight, could Thou not let us abide till our near appointed time? Say, The enjoyment of the world is but slight and the next is better for him who fears, but they shall not be wronged a straw." (IV : 76—80.)

At last the three hundred and thirteen believers girdle their loins and meet the overwhelming forces of the Quraish on the plain of Badr in the second year of Hijra :

"And thy Lord caused thee to go forth from thy house, with the truth ; although a set of believers were averse therefrom. They wrangled with thee about the truth after it was made plain, as though they were being driven on to death and looked thereon ; and when God promised you that one of the two troops should be yours, and you would fain have had those who had no arms. God wished to prove the truth true by His words, and to cut off the hindermost parts of those who misbelieve to prove the truth true, and to make the vain the vain, although the sinners are averse. When ye asked for succour from your Lord, and He answered you, "I will assist you with a thousand angels, with others in reserve, God made it only glad

MUHAMMAD IN THE QURAN

tidings to quiet your hearts therewith ; for victory is only from God ; verily, God is Mighty and Wise. When drowsiness covered you as a security from Him, and He sent down upon you from the heavens water to purify you withal, and to take away from you the plague of Satan, and to tie up your hearts and to make firm your footsteps. When your Lord inspired the angels—verily I am with you ; make ye firm then those who believe ; I will cast dread into the hearts of those who misbelieve, strike off their necks then, and strike off from them every finger tip. That is because they went into opposition against God and His Apostle ; for he who goes into opposition against God and His Apostle, verily, God is keen to punish Ye did not slay them, but it was God who slew them ; nor didst thou shoot when thou didst shoot, to try the believers from Himself with a goodly trial ; verily God both hears and knows. There : verily, God weakens the stratagem of misbelievers.” (VIII : 5-15).

The host of Quraish reels back, seventy believers were killed and more than a thousand of the enemies, and :

“ If ye wish the matter to be decided, a decision has now come to you ; but if you desist, it is better for you ; and if ye turn back We will turn too, and your troop shall avail nothing, great in number though it be, since God is with the believers.” (VIII : 21).

The Quraish retire but are determined to annihilate the little force of opposition and avenge their discomfiture. They gather in greater force next year and the battle of Uhud is fought. Muslims meet a reverse.

“ God has truly kept His promise, when ye knocked them senseless by His permission, until ye showed cowardice, and wrangled and rebelled, after He had shown you what ye loved. Amongst you are those

ISLAMIC REVIEW

who love this world, and amongst you are those who love the next. Then He turned you away from them to try you ; but He has pardoned you, for God is Lord of grace unto believers, when ye went up and looked not round upon any one, although the Apostle was calling you from your rear. Therefore God gave you trouble on trouble that ye should not grieve after what ye had missed, nor for what befell you, for God is well aware of what ye do. Then He sent down upon you after trouble safety, drowsiness creeping over one company of you, and one company of you getting anxious about themselves, suspecting about God other than the truth, with the suspicion of the ignorant, and saying, Have we any chance in the affair ? Say, Verily the affair is God's. They conceal in themselves what they will not show to thee, and say, If we had any chance in the affair we should not be killed here. Say, " If you were in your houses, surely those against whom slaughter was written down, would have gone forth to fight even to where they are lying now ; that God may try what is in your breasts and assay what is in your hearts, for God doth know the nature of men's breast.

" Verily, those of you who turned your back on that day when the two armies met, it was not Satan who made them slip for something they had earned. But God has now pardoned them : verily, God is Forgiving and Clement..

" And if, indeed, ye be killed in God's way or die, surely forgiveness from God and mercy is better than what ye gather ; and if ye die or be killed it is to God ye shall be assembled. It was by a sort of mercy from God that thou didst deal gently with them, for hadst thou been rough and rude of heart they had dispersed from around thee. But pardon them, and ask forgiveness for them, and take counsel with them in the

MUHAMMAD IN THE QURAN

affair. As for what thou hast resolved, rely upon God ; verily, God loves those who do rely. If God help you there is none who can overcome you ; and if He leave you in the lurch, who is there that can help you after Him ? Upon God then let the believers rely.

“And what befell you the day when the two armies met, it was by God’s permission that He might know the believers, and might know those who behaved hypocritically for it was said to them, Come, fight in God’s way and repel the foe. They said, If we know how to fight we would surely follow you. They were that day far nigher unto misbelief than they were to faith. They say with their mouths what is not in their hearts, but God doth know best what they hid. Those who said of their brethren, while they themselves stayed at home, Had they obeyed us, they would not have been killed. Say, Ward off from yourselves death, if ye do speak the truth.

“Count not those who are killed in the way of God as dead ; they are living with their Lord ;—provided for, rejoicing in what God has brought them of His grace, and being glad for those who have not reached them yet—those left behind them ; there is no fear for them, and they shall not be grieved ; glad at the favour from God and grace, and that God wasteth not the reward of the believers. Whoso answered to the call of God and of His Prophet after sorrow had befallen them, for those, if they do good and fear God, is a mighty reward. To whom when men said, Verily, men have gathered round you, fear then them, it only increased their faith, and they said, God is enough for us, a good guardian is He. Then they retired in favour from God and grace ; no evil touched them ; they followed the pleasure of God, and God is the Lord of mighty grace.” (III : 151—173).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

PHARAOH'S MAGICIANS

BY MAULVI AFTAB-UD-DIN AHMAD

The Scriptures speak of the magicians in the court of Pharaoh who used their magic to keep the population awed by the majesty of Pharaoh. Pharaoh requisitioned the services of these magicians in his attempts to dismiss the claims of Moses to supernatural support and guidance. Under the patronage of Pharaoh they enjoyed great honour and prestige and wielded a great influence over people. A situation like this is likely to rouse the sense of pride in people so placed and proud they actually were. Appearances, however, so often deceive. Hidden beneath their swollen heads and underneath their surging pride they had a real humility of mind which could bow before Truth if and when it actually came. When they saw clear signs of truth attending the miracles of Moses, they bowed before the God of Moses the fury and threatened chastisement of Pharaoh notwithstanding. This was an indication of an element of fear of the Lord in the popular mind of Egypt. It was Pharaoh alone, intoxicated as he was with power, who was stubborn and obstinate in the face of repeated signs and respites. He it was who would not bow before the call of truth. He posed to be God himself and used these magicians as props of his power over people. A time, however, came when even these magicians deserted him and when this happened the doom of Pharaoh also overtook him.

Western civilisation has entered to-day in an unholy alliance with paganistic Christianity to repeat the history of Pharaoh in our times. In a very subtle and clever way it has overthrown the idea of Divine guidance of human affairs. The so-called New Testament is only a plea for this un-Godly attitude towards

PHARAOH'S MAGICIANS

life. God for all practical purposes has ceased to exist for social humanity. Prophet Muhammad, the modern counterpart of Moses, sounded a timely note of warning to these Christians against this dangerous drift. His representatives and followers have all these centuries been warning these misguided zealots against the folly of rejecting the Commandment of the Lord of the Universe. But instead of paying any heed to these friendly warnings prompted by utmost sincerity and love, they created a hierarchy of philosophers and social thinkers to play the rôle of magicians in combating the preachings of Islam. They did realise that the Scriptures of Christianity lacked in guidance in certain essential aspects of life. But instead of considering the programme of the Prophet of the age, they took refuge in the fascinating speculations of their philosophers and thinkers. Those who know in what veneration these philosophers and thinkers are held, will not be in the least surprised when we say that they mean more to their people than what the magicians meant to the then Egyptians. Western people devour greedily every word that falls from their lips. Their opinions assume a conclusiveness and finality for these people which even the word of God does not enjoy. In our efforts to Islamise Europe we have to cross swords with these powerful modern magicians as much as we have to combat the arguments of the Church leaders, old and new.

A Huxley, a Shaw, a Malthus, a Karl Marx, a Neitschze, a Wells, or a Russel, is as much an obstacle in the way of our ideas engaging the attention of the Western public, as a St. Paul, a Jerome, a Tartullian, an Augustine, an Athanasius, or a Luther. But where-as we are not sure if our arguments have moved the Church to any appreciable extent, we see signs of these

ISLAMIC REVIEW

magicians confessing the flimsiness of their own position.

A sign of this nature is provided by a recent utterance of Mr. G. B. Shaw. Writing in the *New Statesman and Nation* he says :

“ Being born a playwright I am also a born actor ; I was playing my part well enough to engage the hero-worship of the youth, and impose myself on the susceptible. I cannot impose on myself to the same pitch ; but every actor likes to have his histrionic swill flattered, though he knows that the effect it has made is mostly illusory. I purr when I am kindly stroked, like any other lion. I am not at all dashed by the fact that my preachings and prophetisings, like those of the many sages who have said the same things before me, seem to have produced no political change, that the world has been going from bad to worse since I gave tongue and pen . . . Whilst their world has been going from bad to worse, the circulation of my books and the vogue of my plays has been increasing.”

Three things are clear from this significant statement. Firstly, the motive power behind the reformation movements launched by these secular thinkers has something to do with their vanity. It is a reaction of some kind of disappointment or disgust somewhere. Their fury for reform may be traced to some mundane feelings and not to any spontaneous genuine feelings of altruism or philanthropy.

Secondly, their claims and assertions about the prospective changes invariably end in a fiasco. Things go from bad to worse, notwithstanding the uproarious denunciations of the existing conditions and golden

PHARAOH'S MAGICIANS

pictures of the millennium by these pseudo-prophets of our age.

Thirdly, the moral effect of their utterances and pronouncements is the exact reverse of their intellectual appreciation. In other words, these only have a magical effect on the people. People like to be fed on the sentimental outbursts of these people and are almost in love with them. They even adore them passionately. But this rather than helping the growth of any practical idealism, retards it. People are found more selfish and unruly in their conduct after the preachings of these well-meaning reformers than before them. The reason for this is not far to seek. The utterances themselves do not come from the deeper regions of emotional perceptions. Naturally, they fail to touch the deeper chords of human feelings. Their effect, as Shaw rightly remarks, is illusory.

All this shows that the task of reformation needs a set of people very different from these masters of intellectual speculation.

It is a matter of great relief and satisfaction to the Muslims that this realisation has come to the foremost of Western thinkers. He may be followed in this confession by other leaders of thought in the West. When this happens we may expect, as a next step, a phenomenon foreshadowed in the following words of the Qur-án :

“ So the truth was established, and what they did became null.

“ Thus they were vanquished there, and they went back abased.

“ And the enchanters were thrown down, prostrating (themselves).

“ They said, We believe in the Lord of the worlds

“ The Lord of Moses and Aaron.”

ISLAMIC REVIEW

As the times have changed we need only add the name of Muhammad in the last passage, and the picture of the prospective change will be complete. And this is quite a natural phenomenon.

Indeed, there is a world of difference between the Church leaders and these freethinkers of the West. Whereas the former base their thinking on makebeliefs and old superstitions, the latter proceed from the solid facts of human life and experience. And so far as they do so, they are much more amenable to the appeal of truth and reasoning than the other class. The statement quoted above shows that the day is not far off when the world will witness such a wholesale confession on the part of these pseudo-prophets, to the falseness of their own position. And when it so happens, the sun of truth will rise on the Western horizon in all its brilliance, so that the words of Prophet Muhammad may be fulfilled.

THE RIDDLE OF INGARNATION

BY PROF. M. Y. K. SALIM CHISHTI

Every pious Christian, when kneeling before the altar, invokes Jesus Christ as God—real God—equal to the Father in Essence and Nature, “God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God,” but St. Paul says that this second God—the Logos—the son of God, remained depotentiated and divested of Godhead throughout his earthly career. The Logos was totally emptied of godhead before it or he was joined to the physical body of Jesus. If this assertion is true, not only the fourth Gospel, the Nicene Creed, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Church, the whole Christian religion becomes meaningless, but also, all the Christians throughout all these twenty centuries are shown to have been

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

labouring under a huge delusion—*viz.*, they have been calling a being God who was not God, but devoid of all godhead. St. John says:—

“And the Logos became man” (John 1 : 14)

St. Paul says, before assuming human form the Logos emptied himself of godhead.

So the question arises—

1. What became of the godhead ?
2. Where did it remain for 33 years ?
3. What name should be given to the Logos after it had emptied itself of godhead ?
4. If the Logos was devoid of godhead how can the church affirm that God was crucified?
5. If the Logos was emptied of godhead what purpose did he serve by joining itself to the flesh of Jesus ?

Lastly if the Logos was totally depotentiated how could Jesus say “I and my Father are one?”

If St. Paul is right, St. John is certainly in wrong when he says:—

“We beheld his glory—the glory of the only Son sent from the Father” (John 1 : 14).

How could John behold the glory of the Son of God when the ‘son of god’ had been totally emptied of his godhead before being joined to the body of Jesus?

With these introductory remarks I will state the theory and then criticize it in detail.

THE KENOTIC THEORY

This theory is based upon the 6th and 7th verses in the 2nd chapter of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians which run as follows:—

“Who being in the *form* of God, counted it not a prize to be on equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.” (Revised version 1881).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The sense of these verses, according to Bishop Hall, is as follows :—

“Who being very God and knowing it to be no presumption in him to equalize himself to God the Father, yet voluntarily debased and humbled himself.”¹

According to St. Paul, Jesus emptied himself of Godhead and assumed the form of a human being. This self-emptying or ‘Kenosis’ of Jesus in order to assume the form of a servant has given rise to a host of questions—Logical, theological, ethical and metaphysical—none of which has ever been satisfactorily answered by the worshippers of Jesus. For instance, one notices the utter helplessness of Bishop Charles Gore, D.D., when he says—

“Thus, if we are asked the question—can the functions of the Son in the Godhead and in the universe have been suspended by the Incarnation? We cannot but answer with the theologians of the church from Irenaeus to Dr. Westcott, that it is to us inconceivable.”¹

Let us now draw logical inferences from the verses in question :—

1. The Logos or the second person, was really God. (John 1 : 1)
2. This very Logos became ‘flesh.’ (John 1 : 14).
3. In becoming flesh (man) this Logos ‘Emptied himself’ of his Godhead (Phil. 2 : 6).
4. This emptied Logos—no more God now—assumed the form of a servant and became man (Phil. 2 : 7).

INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND ST. PAUL.

St. John says that the Logos was God. St. Paul says that the Logos was not God but “in the form of God.”

¹ *Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation*, p. 93.

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

St. John says that this Logos, who was God, became flesh, *i.e.*, Jesus was God-incarnate. St. Paul says that this Logos, before being joined to the man Jesus, emptied himself (of Godhead), *i.e.*, depotentiated Logos, 'took the form of servant.'

OBSERVATIONS :

(a) Being God and being in the form of God—these two statements, logically speaking, connote two different objects. Moreover, it is nowhere recorded in the New Testament that the Father was in the form of God. The commentators interpret 'form' as meaning 'naturet.' Even so, the Logos, at best, can be taken as another God besides the Father.

(b) Even conceding Godhead to the Logos, one cannot reconcile St. John with St. Paul as the latter affirms that the Logos—the Son—divested himself completely of His divinity before assuming the form of a servant.

"Though existing before the worlds in the eternal Godhead, yet he did not cling with avidity to the prerogatives of his Divine majesty, did not display his equality with God, but divested himself of the glories of heaven and took upon himself the nature of a servant and appeared among men in the fashion of a man."¹

Leaving the Christians to reconcile these two contradictory statements at leisure, I now proceed to enumerate some of the questions that logically arise in this connection :

(1) Did the Logos empty himself of his divinity out of his own freewill or did somebody else, *e.g.*, the Father effect this depotentiation ?

(2) If the Logos (Son) and the Father both are one and the same Being, in other words,

¹Bishop Lightfoot's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Phillippians*, p. 108.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

if there is only one God without a second, was the Father also depotentiated automatically ?

- (3) If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, where did the Godhead go ? If in the negative, are there not proved two distinct Gods thereby, one retaining His Divine form intact ; and the other standing divested of His Godhead entirely ?
- (4) If the Logos is also God, is it logically possible for a God to become non-God and yet to retain his Godhead in such a way as not to disturb the economic Trinity ?
- (5) Self-emptying or Kenosis is a change not only in the form but in the essence ; and God is supposed by the Christians to be immutable.

“ The immutability of God is intimately connected with His immensity and eternity ; and is frequently included with them in the scriptural statements concerning His nature As an infinite and absolute Being, Self-existent and absolutely independent, God is exalted above all the causes of and even above the possibilities of change. Infinite space and infinite duration cannot change. So God is absolutely immutable in His essence and attributes. He can neither increase nor decrease. He is subject to no process of development.”¹

Now, if all this is true, certainly the second person in the Trinity, by emptying himself of his Divinity, did undergo a radical change, hence he is no more God, and if so the doctrine of the Trinity falls to the ground.

- (6) The Logos—the Son of God and the second person in the Trinity—when he emptied himself of his

¹Dr. Charles Hodge—*Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, p. 390.

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

Godhead and assumed the nature of a man thereby acquired human consciousness, as is evidenced by the Gospel records. He was neither omniscient nor omnipotent. This means that for 33 long years—the earthly life of the Logos—there were only two persons in the Trinity, the Father and the Holy Ghost. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity is thrown to the winds.

(7) The Logos was the son of God. This Logos emptied himself of his Godhead. Well and good. Now I ask, what name shall we give to this emptied being? God or non-God? If God, St. Paul stands condemned, as he says that the Logos emptied himself of his Divinity altogether. If non-God, then St. John is certainly in the wrong, as he says, that God became flesh.

(8) If the Logos, before assuming the form of a servant (before becoming man), divested himself of his Divinity completely as St. Paul would have us believe, St. Athanasius is certainly in the wrong when he says that Jesus Christ is perfect God plus perfect man. Jesus Christ, according to St. Paul, is just the reverse of perfect God, he is no more God.

(9) If the Logos is God and this Logos was joined to the man Jesus, the Divinity and the humanity must exist side by side; (a) If both the Divinity and the humanity underwent a fusion (as the Church believes) Jesus is neither man nor God but something else; (b) If both these attributes existed side by side, Jesus must be omniscient, but the Gospels state that He was not.

(10) The Logos is God, Jesus is man. Very well, but the fusion of the two into one whole is metaphysically impossible as God is a necessary Being and man a contingent being; and the amalgamation of the two is a metaphysical impossibility.

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

(11) St. John nowhere says that the Logos emptied himself of his Divinity, but St. Paul does so. The question is both cannot be right at one and the same time; hence the New Testament is not the revealed word of God.

(12) The Logos, according to St. Paul, divested himself of his Divinity. Did he ever afterwards regain his divine majesty? If he did, how? He was depotentiated and as such had no power left in him. If he did not, where was his divinity reposing? If the Father came to his help, when? And if so, are there not proved two Gods thereby, one in His majesty and the other in stark nakedness?

(13) The New Testament says that the Logos is the sustainer of the universe: as he is the son of God. But after the Kenosis, how could he exercise his Divine majesty as there was none left with him; and how could he control this universe?

If he could, he did not empty himself and if the Father performed the function in his stead, his being is proved superfluous. We can very well do with two Gods only—the Father and the Holy Ghost.

(14) All the church fathers (canonized by the church) affirm that Jesus is absolutely God. "We believe that Jesus is absolutely God".¹ But St. Paul says that the Logos joined himself to the man Jesus not as absolute God but as depotentiated God, which virtually amounts to no God at all. Certainly the Church has, throughout these twenty centuries, been groping in the dark.

(15) What is the relation between the depotentiated Logos and the man Jesus?

(a) Was this Logos a substitute for the human soul of Jesus? If so, Jesus cannot be styled 'perfect man'

¹ Dr. Liddon—*Our Lord's Divinity*, p. 226

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

for man is a mixture of body and soul and as such the Athanasian creed falls to the ground. If not, then there were two active principles in one man, viz., a human soul and a Divine Logos. How did they adjust themselves in one person? and what purpose cosmic, ethical or Divine did this depotentiated Logos serve? And what about the consciousness of Jesus? Was it human or Divine?

If it was human, was the Divine in him sleeping? And if Divine, why did Jesus say 'I do not know when the Hour would come?' There are many utterances of Jesus denoting his human consciousness. Consequently the Logos element served no purpose at all.

Jesus says, 'My father is greater than I.' If this statement is true, why did his Divinity not assert itself? If it was subordinated to his humanity, it is no divinity at all.

(b) The Logos before entering the corporeal body of Jesus divested himself of his Godhead, (if St. Paul is to be believed at all). If so, Jesus cannot be styled perfect God.

(c) If the Father and the Son both are one and the same being, did the former also join Himself to the body of Jesus?

(d) If humanity and Divinity both existed simultaneously in one person that person is neither God nor man but a different genus altogether.

(16) If the Logos became joined to Jesus in the place of human soul, Jesus is not a real human being and if he possessed a soul as well, this soul could not assert itself in the presence of the Logos.

(b) If the Logos existed side by side with the soul, the question is what relation did it have with Jesus? Moreover, in one man we have two personalities, human and Divine; and as a fusion of these elements

ISLAMIC REVIEW

is impossible, Jesus had a dual personality and the gospel records become an enigma.

(c) The Logos before being joined to Jesus had emptied himself of his Divinity, so it is quite wrong to say that Jesus Christ was God.

(17) When and how did this depotentiated Logos regain his 'Divine majesty?' If before the Crucifixion, please quote the chapter and the verse of the Gospels; and explain how could God die? God, as we know, cannot die.

If after the Crucifixion, then only a man was crucified and he being a sinner by nature could not atone for the sins of mankind.

(18) Is it logically possible for God to denude Himself of His Divinity? and can we conceive of a God who can empty Himself of Godhead? To call such a being God is certainly a misnomer—rather contradiction in terms.

(19) According to the Nicene creed, Jesus is very God and there is only one God; so can we say that this Kenosis is applicable to the Father as well?

(20) How did depotentiated Logos regain his consciousness? himself or through the agency of the Father? Please quote the New Testament in support of your suppositions.

(21) If the Kenotic theory is right, the Athanasian creed is absolutely wrong. For the latter teaches that "two perfect natures, i.e., the Godhood and manhood were joined together in one Person." Whereas, St. Paul teaches that the Logos emptied Himself of His Godhead before being joined to the man Jesus. Hence two perfect natures were not present in Christ.¹

These questions which can be still further multiplied have baffled the most acute intellects of Christen-

¹Gibson—*The Three Creeds*, p. 221.

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

dom from Iraneus down to our own times and the luminaries and dignitaries of the Church have expressed such contradictory views regarding this theory and its logical implications that their perusal is sure to baffle and bewilder even the ordinary student of church history or the history of the Christian doctrines. Below I quote a few of the well-known church fathers and teachers in support of my statement :—

(a) "The Logos is the mediator between God and the world"¹ says Origen, and "he is personal." Further "He is generated of the Father who is God in himself and of himself and the Logos (son) is the second God, a kind of repetition or "duplicate of God." He is of another substance.

Further, "Christ is possessed of a human soul in inseparable unity with the Logos." "The human nature of Christ is not unaffected by its indissoluble union with the divine Logos."

Observation.—If Origen is right, the whole superstructure built upon the Nicene creed—the whole Christian church—tumbles down like a house of cards.

(i) Father is the God—the Logos is god.

(ii) The essence of the Father is different from that of the Logos. Moreover, if the human soul of Jesus is inseparably united with the Logos, the mixture is neither human nor Divine. Christ is neither God nor man.

(b) Cerinthus rejected the miraculous conception and taught that the Logos was joined to Jesus at the time of baptism and left him at crucifixion.

(c) Sabellius says that the Logos and the Father are one and the same Being—God ; for there can be only one God. If the Logos is believed to possess a

¹Dr. G. P. Fisher—*History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 108.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

distinct personality, then there would be two Gods which is logically impossible.

(d) Arius held that the Logos (the Son) is inferior in rank to God the Father ; and his essence is different from that of the Father.

Observation.—Arius says exactly the same thing as Origen, but it is surprising to note that poor Arius was excommunicated and declared a heretic while his teacher (Origen) was not condemned by the Church, although Origen as, we know, is the author of the theory of subordination.

(e) Tertullian says that the Logos is not eternal; “there was a time when the son was not,” i.e., the Logos is a created being.--

(f) Mani held that the body of Jesus was a mere phantom, he had no human soul at all, as it is logically impossible to unite God with man.

(g) Apollinarius taught that Jesus had a real body and the Logos was a substitute for human soul, as two natures, human and Divine, could not exist side by side in one person.

(h) Nestorius believed that Jesus was mere man but had the spark of Divinity in his nature. He does not believe in the Logos theory at all.

(i) Eutyches was of opinion that Jesus had but one Divine nature, as he was one person, and two natures cannot subsist in one person.

(j) Clement says that the Logos was “very near to the supreme,” but he was not God in the real sense of the term.

(k) John Damascenus says that the Father and the Son (Logos) are one in knowing, feeling and willing ; and neither is conceivable without the other. In other words, both are interdependent.

(l) Justin, Theophilus and Tertullian, in conformity with the subordinationism of their doctrine of

THE RIDDLE OF INCARNATION

the Logos and with a view to preserving both the philosophical idea of God as supramundane and the reality of the Biblical theophanies, resolved the idea of God's becoming visible into the idea that the Logos was 'a second God' who was not equal to 'the uncaused Father.' Thus these Church Fathers affirm their belief in pure ditheism.

God the Father is God by His very nature ; He is uncaused ; God the Son is God through generation ; he is also God but owes his being to the Father.

(m) Iraneus says that the Logos in becoming man, imposed self limitation upon his Divinity as without this God could not assume the form of a man.

(n) Iraneus asserts that the Incarnation did not interrupt the cosmic activity of the Word.

"He was made man," he says, "while all the same existing in the world and invisibly sustaining all creation."¹ In other words this pious father would have us believe that though the Logos emptied himself of his Godhead yet he did not cease to be God ! Credulity—logical absurdity—can go no further.

(o) Eusebius says that "the Word became incarnate in order to present spiritual and rational realities to us ; but in doing this his own divine nature was subjected to no change."²

This is against the plain teaching of St. Paul, who affirms that the word in becoming man abjured his equality with God.

(p) Athanasius asserts "the incarnation did not limit the Word in himself. He was still in the universe and in the bosom of the Father."³

He too teaches something contrary to St. Paul, who affirms that the Word did impose self-limitation upon himself in becoming man.

¹ *Dissertations*, by Bishop Gore, p. 99.

² *Ibid*, p. 101.

³ *Ibid* p. 103.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

(q) Proclus says, "He, the same, was in his father's bosom and in the womb of the Virgin. He was being worshipped by the angels in heaven and he was supping with publicans on earth. Here (on earth) he was being maligned as a cheat while there (in heaven) he was being glorified as God."¹

Here we have a strange picture of Jesus! He was a human being on earth and a God in heaven at one and the same time. "There is nothing in the New Testament" rightly contends Gore "to justify this sort of language."

(r) Now listen to Origen.

"First that there is only one God. Secondly, that Jesus Christ, born of the Father before all creatures, emptied himself of His glory, became man and was incarnate, although God and while made man, remained the God which he was."

This "greatest church teacher of the East" indulges in logical absurdities which certainly ill become a theologian of his calibre. He says that the Son of God emptied himself of his Divine glory yet remained the God which he originally was! If this is admissible, we can as well say that this tumbler is empty yet full of water! If Jesus really remained God, how could he grow in wisdom as taught by St. Luke?

Bishop Gore is also confused at these divergent views and says "that there were different opinions and tones of thought on this great subject in the second century"²

¹ *Dissertations*, by Bishop Gore, p. 104.

² *Dissertations*, by Bishop Gore, p. 121.

CORRESPONDENCE

60, LONG STREET, MIDDLEBURG,
TRANSVAAL.

19th February, 1944.

To

THE SECRETARY,
THE WORKING MUSLIM MISSION AND
LITERARY TRUST, LAHORE.

DEAR BROTHER-IN-ISLAM,

Assalam-u-Alaikum !

The Working Muslim Mission and Literary Trust, is the only renowned and acknowledged Islamic institution in the West, whose work and sole aim is to acquaint people with the loftiness and beauties of our beloved faith, to remove misconceptions about this religion, to combat social vices, to disseminate Islamic ideals and culture and to put a stop to un-Islamic customs as practised by some ignorant Muslims. Surely, the whole Muslim world is proud to have such an organisation, unfurling the banner of Islam on the Western shores.

We, Muslims, are determined to be acknowledged by the so-called civilised world, as ours is a great faith, and the most practicable, useful and essential. So we pray to the Almighty to grant unto us such qualities as will prove our usefulness and importance in this globe as a community.

In conclusion I wish you every success in your undertakings.

(Sd.) DAWOOD HAJEE EBRAHIM
JOOMA.

c/o Jooma Brothers, General Merchants.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

To

THE EDITOR,

THE *Islamic Review*,

Aziz Manzil, Brandreth Road,

Lahore (Punjab).

SIR,

The thesis of the late Mushir Hussain Qidwai which you have reproduced in your *Review* (December 1943, January 1944) might cause some misapprehension in the mind of your readers particularly non-Muslim, if not explained. In the January number of the *Review* while discussing the choice of the Turks for Swiss Law, the writer says, "The only point of preference which a representative of Turkey in another country could point out to the author for the Swiss Law was that it has no law of Mahjūbul Irs* and that personally he would have suffered if Muslim Law had not been replaced by Swiss Law in Turkey. We advised our friend to study the latest interpretation of the Law of Mahjūbul Irs, and his complaint would disappear. Islam is self-sufficient."

It is a pity that the late Mushir Hussain Qidwai did not himself give the "latest interpretation," otherwise I would not intrude.

The Law of Mahjūbul Irs is not based on any Qur-ānic Law inductively, deductively or by any ruling of the Prophet and his Caliphs. On the contrary, the Qur-ān is so very insistent about the safeguarding of orphans' interests that it is unthinkable that Muslims should be advised to deprive an orphaned grandson of his rights if he unfortunately loses his father in the lifetime of his grandfather, as the Law of Mahjūbul Irs does. So this law has nothing to do with the Qur-ān.

*Meaning 'lapse of inheritance.' This is supposed to take place when a son predeceases his father. The grand-children in such a case are regarded as having no natural legal share in the property of the grandfather. But this is a wrong interpretation of the Muslim Law of Inheritance.

CORRESPONDENCE

One of the major misfortunes of Islam is that much of the national and cultural polity of a country and idiosyncrasy of a race has been confused with Islamic religion which is very disconcerting to a student of Islam and very disappointing to a prospective or enlightened Muslim. A religion which is international and world-wide at its very outset by the express command of God with complete freedom from dogmas, ritualism and priestcraft, has been encumbered with ideas and customs of nations and races that came to adopt it from time to time. This has, indeed, been a great hinderance in the way of its rapid progress among civilised humanity.

But when all is said, there is at least one redeeming feature in this bad law as it exists to-day. It does not close the door against the grandparent exercising his wisdom and natural love for the grandchildren. He is free to make a gift of whatever property he likes to the orphan of his son and nobody can question it.

Yours etc.,

SYED MAQBOOL AHMAD.

[We agree with the learned correspondent in what he says about some wrong juristic interpretations of the Qur-ánic Civil Laws. It is, however, a happy sign of the times that there is a universal demand in the Muslim world for a reconstruction of the Muslim Fiqh or jurisprudence. Even some able scholars have come forward to make a start in this much-needed task. The most outstanding of these, Maulana Muhammad Ali, has already laid very solid foundations for this new work. In his voluminous work "The Religion of Islam" he concludes his remarks on this particular question with the following illuminating words:

"The word of the Holy Qur-án may, however, be interpreted in a manner which will avoid all such

ISLAMIC REVIEW

inconsistencies. The issue of son or daughter would take the place of their father or mother, and would take what their father or mother would have taken if alive. Suppose a person has one daughter only, who is dead at the time of the death of her father, but who has got children; these would take the share of their mother, *i.e.* one half of the property. Again, suppose there are several children some of whom are dead and have left issue behind them, while others are alive. It is only an equitable principle that the issue of the dead offspring should take the place of parents and that is also the natural interpretation of the words of the Holy Qur-án. Moreover if this interpretation is adopted, the law of inheritance becomes very simple and free from all the complications and inconsistencies which juristic reasoning has in some cases introduced into it. All that is traceable to the Holy Prophet in this case is only a broad principle.

“ Give the fixed portions (faraidz) to those who are entitled to them, and remains should go to the nearest male ” (Bukhari 85 : 6).

This hadith does not show at all that the grandson is not entitled to inheritance, if there is a son living : though it is on this that the juristic principle of excluding grandson is based.” (pp. 705-6).—Ed., *I. R.*]

GLIMPSES FROM THE CHARACTER OF PROPHET MUHAMMAD

Ali reported that Abu Jahl (the leader of the opponents) said to the Holy Prophet : Verily we don't hold you as liar but we do not believe what you have brought. Then the Almighty Allah revealed about them : Verily they do not hold you as liar but the unjust deny the verses of Allah (Qur-án)—*Tirmizi*.

Jabir-b-Samurah reported : The Apostle of Allah used to keep prolonged silence.—*Sharhi-Sunnat*.

Ali reported : A Jew who was named so and so, a learned doctor, had some dinars due from the Apostle of Allah. He demanded (it) back from the Prophet but he told him : O Jew ! there is nothing with me which I can give you. He said : O Muhammad ! I shall not go away from you till you give me. The Apostle of Allah said : In that case I shall keep sitting with you. He sat with him. The Prophet prayed Zuhr, 'Asr, Maghrib, the last 'Isha and Fajr. The companions of the Messenger of Allah were threatening him and were about to drive him out. The Prophet drew attention to what they were doing with him. They said : O Messenger of Allah ! a Jew is detaining you ! The Apostle of Allah said : My Lord prohibited me to oppress a covenanted man or any one else. When the day dawned, the Jew said : I bear witness that there is no god but Allah and I bear witness that you are the Apostle of Allah, and half of my property is in the way of Allah. Behold, by Allah, I have not done with you what I have done with you but to examine your descriptions in the Torah : Muhammad, son of Abdullah, his birth place is Makka and his place of migration is Taibah, his kingdom is in Syria, neither unmannerly, nor harsh, nor wandering in the markets

ISLAMIC REVIEW

nor prone to indecency or word of treachery. I bear witness that there is no deity but Allah and that you are the Apostle of Allah. This is my property. Pass order about it as Allah gave you wisdom. The Jew had enormous wealth—*Baihaqi*.

‘Ayisha reported that the Apostle of Allah said : O Ayisha ! had I wished, the mountain of gold would have travelled with me. An angel came to me. His waist was equal to Ka‘ba (length). He said : Verily your Lord tenders you greeting and enquires whether you wish to be a Servant-prophet or you wish to be a King-prophet. Then I looked towards Gabriel who hinted at me : Humble thyself. *And in a narration of Ibn Abbas* : Then the Prophet looked towards Gabriel as if to consult with him. Gabriel hinted with his hand to be humble. I (the Prophet) said : A servant-prophet. She reported: The Holy Prophet after that would not take food leaning, saying : I shall eat as a servant eats, and I shall sit as a servant sits. —*Sharhi Sunnat*.

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 qualify 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 Pre-measurement. 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) Almsgiving; (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

ISLAMIC REVIEW

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 expiate 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 fraternal 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 men 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.

**Resolution No. 331, dated 31-3-1944 passed by the Managing
Committee of the Working Muslim Mission and Literary
Trust, Lahore.**

The Managing Committee of the Working Muslim Mission and Literary Trust heartily appreciates the timely contributions to the Deficit Fund of the Trust by the Muslims in India and abroad. It is extremely good of them to have realised the grave difficulties with which the Mission was faced. This is really an indication of a real anxiety and love in their minds for the propagation of Islam.

Evidently our brethren in faith are at one with us in believing that Islam is the one solution of all those difficulties that face the Muslim world as well as the rest of humanity to-day. Indeed it is through the proper establishment of the Islamic system of life that the sufferings of humanity can be ended and a new era of peace and security ushered in. Among the numerous movements and organisations in the Islamic World, it is this Mission alone that has been carrying on the work of the propagation of Islam in a systematic and effective way in the East as well as in the West. The results of its activities are there before the world, too patent to be pointed out. And if the past has been so encouraging, the future holds out prospects still more brilliant.

In view of the rising tide of Islam in the West which no discerning eye can miss, we venture to request our helpers to make some efforts in their circle of influence to popularise this most beneficial movement of the time, and persuade every well-wisher of Islam to participate in this sacred enterprise.

MEMBERS.

The Managing Committee,

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Woking Muslim Mission & Literary Trust, Lahore.

1. Maulana Muhammad Ali Sahib, M.A., LL.B., Author of the Translation of the Holy Quran with Commentary and Text. (Chairman of the Trust).
2. Shaikh Muhammad Din Jan Sahib, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, High Court, Lahore.
3. Dr. Ghulam Muhammad Sahib, M.B., B.S., Late Civil Surgeon, N.W.F.P. (Financial Secretary).
4. Khwaja Abdul Ghani (Secretary).
5. Maulana Sadruddin Sahib, B.A., B.T., Ex-Imam, The Mosque, Woking England.
6. Maulana Aftabuddin Ahmad Sahib, B.A., Ex-Imam, The Mosque, Woking, England, Editor, The Islamic Review.
7. Maulvi Abdul Majid, M.A., B.T., Imam, The Mosque, Woking.
8. Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, M.L.A. (Central), Calcutta.
9. Ismail De Yorke, Barrister-at-Law, Chairman, Muslim Society in Great Britain, London.
10. Shaikh Mian Muhammad Sahib, Proprietor, Muslim Flour Mills, Lyallpore.
11. Shaikh Muhammad Ismail Sahib, Premier Rais, and Proprietor Colony Flour Mills, Lyallpore.
12. Malik Sher Muhammad Khan Sahib, B.A., Ex-Secretary to the Revenue Minister, Jammu and Kashmir State.
13. Khwaja Nazeer Ahmad Sahib, Barrister-at-Law, Lahore.
14. Haji Muhammad Ibrahim Sahib, Rtd. Assistant Superintendent, Punjab Irrigation Secretariat, Punjab, Lahore.
15. K. S. Badruddin, B.A., Son of H. H. The Nawab Shaikh Jahangir Mia Sahib Bahadur of Mangrol State (Kathiawar), Manavadar State.
16. Mian Ahsanul Haq Sahib, Bar-at-Law, Rtd., Chief Justice (Bikaner), Jullundur City.
17. Hakeem Mohammad Jameel Ahmad Khan Sahib, son of the Late Hakeem Ajmal Khan Sahib of Delhi.