

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

THE LIGHT.

EDITED BY MUSTAFA KHAN B. A.

Vol. II. No. 20.

OCTOBER 16, 1923.

Annual Subscription Re. 1.
For Students As 8.
Foreign Countries, 2s.

The Light is published twice a month, on the 1st and 16th.

All business correspondence and applications should be addressed to THE MANAGER of The Light, Ahmadiya Buildings, Lahore. The subscription is strictly payable in advance, would-be subscribers are requested to send their subscription with their applications. The paper is not sent per V.P.P. Subscription may kindly be remitted by M. O. or postage stamps.

The object of The Light is to disseminate Islamic doctrines and to repudiate charges against Islam but the expenses incurred in getting out the paper being very heavy and the subscription being only a nominal one, we respectfully appeal to our Muslim brethren to send donations to help the Anjuman in making a free wide circulation.

Students who cannot afford to pay the subscription, may send their applications for free copies to the Manager.

A number is assigned to each recipient. In all communications please quote that number.

Receipts of the subscriptions are not sent to senders but they are acknowledged in the columns of the Light. Subscribers are requested to see that list and if the remittance of any subscriber is not acknowledged therein he may kindly communicate with the Manager.

Correspondence of literary nature may be addressed to the Editor. Short articles, letters and questions will also be welcome. Non-Muslims are also invited to send questions to be answered.

NOTES.

The Muslim mode of worship.

We read the following in *the Islamic Review* :—

Some free-thinkers object to our mode of worship and our adoring God. They do not see the necessity of doing so, if such, they say, is the Muslim conception of God. The Muslim conception of worship is, however, quite different from others. Islam literally means submission to the Law. With us the forces of Nature are the laws of God, and in this sense of the word every free-thinker is admittedly a Muslim.

The Arabic word for worship is *Ibadat*, which has various meanings, the first being obedience, subordination to another's will. Secondly, it means some prescribed way or path, which, when pursued, brings a person to his destination. Lastly, it means the form which a person uses in order to express his willingness to follow that way—a form of worship.

In our prayer we make various gestures and movements. Do not physical movements intensify our feelings? Sometimes, indeed, the feelings

themselves actually create physical movements; while on other occasions physical movements give birth and mould to special kinds of ideas; and if ideas and feelings are the mainspring of action, the object of our movements in prayer is obvious.

Kh. Kamal-ud-Din,

A correspondent says :—

The "*Alfazel*," Qadian writes that Khawaja Kamal-ud-Din has declared himself *Hanfi* in Egypt and has announced that he has no connection with the Ahmaddiyya movement founded by the late Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadian. Will you kindly enlighten me on the subject through *the Light*."

The statement ascribed to Khawaja Sahib is in fact based upon the report of a missionary of the Qadian section, in Egypt and is *prima facie* incorrect, because Kh. Kamal-ud-Din has repeatedly announced in speeches and writings that he is a follower of the late Hazrat Mirza Sahib. Only two years ago he declared himself an *Ahmadi* in Rangoon in a large meeting consisting of thousands of Muslims. Again in his recent vernacular work "There is no sect Islam," he has openly confessed that he believes the late Mirza Sahib to be the *Mujaddid* and the Promised Messiah. In face of these facts we can only assume that if he made any statement in Egypt, he meant only that he had nothing to do with beliefs of the Ahmadis of the Qadian section, and it is a fact. It may also be noted that all *Ahmadis* in a way are *Hanfi*, because the late Hazrat Mirza Sahib also belonged to the *Hanfi* School of thought, as is clearly mentioned in a letter of Hazrat Maulvi Noor-ud-Din published in the *Paigham-i-Sulh* 13th October 1923.

The Case Against the Paigham-i-Sulh

On 6th October Saturday Maulvi Mustafa Khan B. A., Editor Master Faqirullah publisher, Maulvi Abdul Haq Vidiarthi, and Lala Ram Rup printer of the *Paigham-i-Sulh* were arrested under section 153 A;

the reason being that M. Abdul Haq wrote an article in reply to an objection of Shuddhi Sabha Agra to the effect that Musalmans take their sisters *i. e.* the daughters of uncles and aunts as wives. This article which is deemed objectionable was published in the *Paigham-i-Sulh* of the 25th of September.

The accused were produced before the court, of Lala Shanker Das city magistrate. Maulvi Ghulam Muhyied-Din, B. A. LL. B. Vakil High Court, and Shaikh Azimullah applied for their release on bail. But the court postponed the question till the Public Prosecutor came. When he came it was 3-35 P.M., and the court said that the question of the bail could not be decided now, it would be decided on Monday after the perusal of the file. The accused therefore were taken to the lock up of the Central Jail. They were allowed to use their own beds and eat their own food. On 8th the four accused were released on bail. The next date of hearing the case is 1st November.

The accused have applied for the transfer of the case to a European magistrate because it involves a religious question.

All the Muslim Brethren are requested to pray for these brothers in faith who are in trouble for the cause of Islam.

REPORTER.

THE LIGHT.

DATED THE 16TH OCTOBER 1923.

The Crucifixion of Jesus.

II

One great mistake in the interpretation of Mr. E.E. Elder is that while he credits the event of the cross as narrated in the Holy Quran, he ignores the Quranic expression *ما قتلوه وما صلبوه* *i. e.* "They (the Jews) neither killed nor crucified him." These words of the Quran leave no doubt as to the fact that the enemies of Jesus were not successful in bringing about his death. The explanation of Mr. Elder, that the death of Jesus was caused by the action of the Roman soldiers and not by that of the Jews, is simply begging the question when he himself admits that the responsibility was of the Jews. His assertion that the Quran "does not

say that Jesus was not killed nor was he crucified: it merely states that the Jews did not kill him nor crucified him" is due to gross misunderstanding. The Quranic words, *فلمَّا يُرْفَعُنِي* "when Thou didst cause me to die" clearly show that Jesus died a natural death and, therefore, was "neither killed nor crucified." The Muslim theologians have taken great pains to show that Jesus was not crucified; because the Quran does not admit it; that is why they invented a story that another person was crucified instead of Jesus. Had there been the slightest possibility of the crucifixion of Jesus from the Muslim point of view, there would have been no necessity of inventing such a far-fetched story. There is not a single Muslim who admits the crucifixion, nor a single verse in the whole of the Quran which recognises it; and yet Mr. Elder attempts to prove the "crucifixion" from the Quran. Such an attempt will surely provoke a smile from every thinking man. The most important point in this connection, which should always be remembered is that the Muslims *do not think* for a moment that a true prophet can die a cursed death. The Christians on the other hand openly admit that Jesus died a cursed death; and if they believe in the crucifixion they are bound to believe in the cursed death as well, according to the old scriptures. The Jews argued that, as they had succeeded in crucifying Jesus, he was an imposter. It is this assertion which is contradicted by the Holy Quran to establish the truth of Jesus. I will quote here the full verse on the subject.—"And their (Jews') saying, surely we have killed the Messiah Jesus, Son of Mary, the Apostle of Allah, and they did not kill him nor did they crucify him; but (the matter) was made dubious to them, and most surely those who differ therein are only in a doubt about it, they have no knowledge respecting it, but only follow a conjecture and they have not killed him for sure."

I think these words are clear enough to dispel the wrong notion that the "Quran does not say that Jesus was not killed nor was he crucified." The words, that they follow a *conjecture*, and that they *killed*

him not for sure, are conclusive and leave no doubt.

Mr. Elder lays great stress on the Qur-
anic words *كشك* and interprets them as the
crucifixion was made 'a perplexity' to Jews.
The Christian faith is, indeed, full of per-
plexities, and inconsistencies; but we do
not know if Jews have got any perplexity
with regard to the crucifixion. Histori-
cally, if the Jews have any misunderstand-
ing or "perplexity" with regard to the cruci-
fixion it is whether Jesus actually died on
the cross or not, because we read the
following in the Gospel:—

"Now the next day the chief priests
and pharisees came together unto Pilate
saying command that the sepulchre be
made sure lest his disciples come by night
and steal him away and say unto the
people he is risen from the dead *so that the
last error shall be worse than the first.*"
(Italics are mine).

What is the "first" error referred to
here? Evidently it refers to the event of
the cross; there must be some error in it.
We can also trace the nature of error from
these words. The chief priests and phari-
sees were not sure that Jesus had died on
the cross, because they entertained the
doubt "lest his disciple come by night and
steal him away from the dead and say
unto the people, He is risen from the dead."
The Jews could never think that Jesus
could rise from the dead miraculously
as they took him as a liar. There-
fore, their apprehension about Jesus
rising from the dead was based upon
the fact that Jesus did not die on the cross
and was taken down alive in a state of
swoon. They were anxious to make the
"sepulchre sure," so that Jesus may die in
it of hunger and wounds. In short the
passage of the Gospel quoted above conclu-
sively proves that Jews were not sure of
Jesus' death on the cross. The following
points narrated in the Gospel also lend
support to the same conclusion:—

1. Jesus remained on the cross for a
few hours only; but death by
crucifixion was always tardy.
2. The two men crucified with Jesus
were alive when taken down from

the cross, therefore Jesus also should
have been alive.

3. The breaking of legs was resorted to
in the case of the two criminals but
dispensed with in the case of Jesus.
4. The side of Jesus being pierced blood
rushed out and this was a sure sign
of life.
5. Even Pilate did not believe that Jesus
died in such a short time (mark
15-44).
6. Jesus was not buried like the two
criminals; but was given into the
charge of a wealthy disciple of his
who lavished care on him and
put him in a spacious room hewn
in the side of a rock.
7. When the tomb was seen on the third
day the stone was found to have
been removed from its door, which
would not have been the case, if
there had been a supernatural
rising.
8. Mary, when she saw him, took him
for the gardener (John 20:15),
which shows Jesus has disguised
himself as gardener.
9. Such disguise would not have been
necessary if Jesus had risen from
the dead.
10. It was the same body of flesh that
the disciples saw Jesus and the
wounds were still there deep enough
for a man to thrust his hand in.
11. Jesus still felt hungry and ate as his
disciples ate (Luke 24:39).
12. Jesus undertook a journey to Galilee
with two of his disciples walking
side by side with him which shows
that he was flying for refuge. If
his object had been to rise to heaven
he would not have undertaken a
journey to Galilee.
13. In all post crucifixion appearances
Jesus is found concealing and hiding
himself as if he feared being dis-
covered.
14. Jesus prayed the whole night before
his arrest to be saved from the death
on the cross; and also asked his
disciples to pray for him; and

it is a divine law that the prayers of a righteous man in distress and affliction are always accepted. He seems to have even received a promise from God to be saved and it was to this promise he referred when he cried out on the cross: "My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me?"—Heb 5:7 making the matter still clear, for there it is plainly stated that the prayer of Jesus was accepted: "When he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him Who was able to save him from death and was heard in that he feared."

All these circumstances conclusively prove that Jesus did not die on the cross.

Now the Quranic words *شبهه له shubbiha lahum*, which are inaccurately translated by Rodwell, "They had only his likeness;" and by Palmer "But a similitude was made for them," literally mean "He was made a resemblance to them." The pronoun "he" clearly refers to Jesus; because there is no other antecedent to which it may refer. Therefore, the meaning is that Jesus was made a resemblance *i. e.* he was likened to *one crucified*. This interpretation is clearly borne out by the description of crucifixion given in Gospels; and is quite in keeping with the reverence which a Muslim is bound to show to the holy prophet Jesus. Mr. Elder's explanation: "His crucifixion perplexed them; they saw the event but failed to appreciate its inner meaning" is grammatically incorrect and averse to the Quranic words; *ما قتلوه وما صلبوه*, *i. e.* "They did not kill him nor crucified him;" and *ظلمنا نرفيقنا*, "When Thou didst cause me to die" *i. e.* by a natural death.

Thus the Holy Quran does not support the theory that Jesus expired on the cross. It, on the other hand, says that he was saved from this death through divine intervention because he was a divine teacher and a righteous servant of God. I think that the Bible too supports the same view.

I remember to have read a small treatise on the subject which was given

to me by a Christian friend in England. The writer therein explained the crucifixion exactly in the same manner as is narrated in the Holy Quran, although he had no knowledge of the Quran and based his conclusion on the Bible only.

Questions and Answers.

Mr. Tawab Ali B. A. :—

Q. 1. How would you logically define a Kafir?

A. Literally *Kafir* means one who denies; a non-Muslim is a *Kafir* because he does not believe in Islam.

Q. 2. Did Mirza Sahib marry; if so how could you say that he was in Jesus' spirit?

A. Yes, he married and has got children. His resemblance to Jesus does not lie in marriage but in other things. Our Holy Prophet also resembled Jesus, did he not marry? Moreover, you suppose to think on the testimony of the Gospel that Jesus did not marry. But Gospels do not give an accurate and authentic account of Jesus life. It is possible that he might have married. As a matter of fact marriage is compulsory for every Muslim, because it is the natural state of life.

Mr. Raziud Din Ahmad :—

Q. 1. Is it permissible for a Muslim to marry a non-Muslim lady without converting her to Islam?

A. Yes, marriage with the people of Book is permissible.

Q. 2. What is the simplest way by which one can learn to write correct English.

A. There is no royal road. Practice makes a man perfect. Please read newspapers; especially the editorial of the Times of London.

Q. 3. Is it permissible to (a) play with dolls or to (b) play at chess?

A. (a) Girls can learn much, by playing with dolls, and hence it is permissible.

(b) Such plays should as far as possible be avoided.

JUST-OUT.

ANNUBUVVAT-FIL-ISLAM.

OR

PROPHETHOOD IN ISLAM.

BY

AHMED BACHA, B.A.,

A small booklet, dealing with the important subject, the principle of the finality of prophethood. Price annas 6, Postage one anna.

APPLY TO

THE MANAGER,

DAR-UL-KUTAB ISLAMIAH,

Ahmadia Buildings, LAHORE.