

# The Light

Weekly

Organ of the Ahmadiyya  
Anjuman Ishaat-i-Islam  
Lahore

Single Copy :  
Paisa 15

Telephone  
5 37 37

Vol. LVI—No. 3  
Life Membership Rs. 100

January 16, 1976 C.E.—Muharram 13, 1395 A.H.—Lahore

Annual Subscription  
Rs. 6 or £ 1 or \$ 2  
Student's Concession Rs. 4

## THUS SPOKE THE HOLY PROPHET

(peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)

Ibn Mas'ud reported God's Messenger as saying, "No life is taken unjustly without a portion of its blood being laid at the door of Adam's first son, because he was the first to introduce murder." (Bukhari and Muslim.) We shall mention the tradition from Mu'awiya, "A section of my people will continue..." in the chapter on the reward of this people, if God wills.

Kathir b. Qais told how, when he was sitting with Abu Darda' in the mosque of Damascus, a man came to him and said, "Abud Darda', I have come to you from the town of the Messenger for a tradition I have heard that you relate from God's Messenger. I have come for no other purpose." He replied that he had heard God's Messenger say, "If anyone travels on a road in search of knowledge God will cause him to travel on one of the roads of paradise, the angels will lower their wings from good pleasure with one who seeks knowledge, and the inhabitants of the heavens and the earth and the fish in the depth of the water will ask forgiveness for him. The superiority of the learned man over the devout man is like that of the moon on the night when it is full over the rest of the stars. The learned are the heirs of the prophets who leave neither dinar nor dirham, only know-

ledge, and he who accepts it accepts an abundant portion." Ahmad, Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, Ibu Majah and Darimi transmitted it, Tirmidhi calling him Qais b. Kathir.

Abu U nama al-Bahili said that two men, one learned and the other devout, were mentioned to God's Messenger, who then said, "The superiority of the learned man over the devout man is like mine over the most contemptible among you," adding, "God, His angels, the inhabitants of the heavens and the earth, even the ant in its hole and even fish invoke blessings on him who teaches men what is good." Tirmidhi transmitted it. Darimi transmitted it from Makhul in *mursal* form, but did not mention the two men. He said, "The superiority of the learned man over the devout man is like mine over the most contemptible among you." Then he recited this verse, "Only those of His servants who are learned fear God", then went on with the tradition to the end.

Abu Sa'id al-Khudri reported God's Messenger as saying, "People will follow you, and men will come to you from all regions of the earth seeking understanding about the religion; so when they come to you, give them good counsel." Tirmidhi transmitted it.

### WE BELIEVE

(1) After the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Allah has completely barred the appearance of a prophet, old or new.

(2) After the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Jibreel can never descend and bring Prophetic Revelation (وحي لئوت) to any person.

(3) If Jibreel were to descend with one word of Prophetic Revelation (وحي لئوت) for any person, it would contradict the two complementary verses :

اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم  
(This day have I perfected your *Deen* for you.) (5 : 3)

ولكن رسول الله وخاتم النبيين  
(He is the Messenger of Allah and the Last of Prophets). (33 : 40)

(4) The Holy Prophet (Allah's peace and blessings be upon him) also said: "I am Muhammad and I am Ahmad and.... I am *al'āqib* (the one who comes last) after whom there can be no prophet." (*Al-Bukhari : Kitābul Manaqib*)

(5) The Founder of Ahmadiyya Movement never claimed to be *Nabi*. He exhorted his people to refrain from using the word *Nabi* for him. He further directed them to regard the word *Nabi*, in his writings, as deleted.

(6) He named his followers 'Ahmad' after the Holy Prophet's *Jamali* (beatific) name 'Ahmad'.

(7) He proclaimed that no verse of the Holy Quran has been abrogated nor shall ever be abrogated.

(8) All the Companions of the Holy Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and the Imams are venerable.

(9) It is spiritually conducive to our Faith to revere the revivalist Islamic missions of all *Mujaddids*.

(10) He is a Muslim who recites the *Kalimah*, with sincere belief in *Tauhid* and *Khatm-i-Nubuwwat*.

# THE LIGHT

FRIDAY — JANUARY 16, 1976

## Religious Basis of Morality

Without the central figure of God, life ceases to be life and becomes a succession of vanishing sensations, "mere glimmerings and decays". Life without God must always be a frustration, an ache and an unfulfilled desire. It is the flagrant fallacy of modern times that Science and Religion are mutually antagonistic. Science becomes dangerous when it lays claim to omnipotence. But it then ceases to be science. Science, in the true significance of the term, admits that there is beside the knowledge of which she is the mistress, another species of knowledge, where she is helpless because it transcends the narrow-vedged boundaries of human reason and intellect. She does not ban its search or acquisition. She bids the human spirit to search out that knowledge as Herod bade the Magi to find child; and promises that when that adorable object is found, she will come and worship. Religion which is an orderly attempt to know what science confesses her inability to know, has no cause to quail before science. On the other hand it regards science as God's work in the fact of Nature. It is tyranny masquerading as Religion which shrinks and cowers before the grey eyes of science. The scientific spirit, cool and collected, realizes its handicaps and limitations. It is the pseudo-scientist who prefers self-conceit to God's grace by which we walk and breathe and which sustains us in our weary pilgrimage on the earthly planet. A bleary-eyed scientist betrays himself in a serious manner, by pretending to do much more than his credentials permit him. He 'gate-crashes' into the domain of ethics which is the by-products of Religion. In the height of his arrogance he wants to relieve Religion of the

guardianship of morals. He is audacious enough to question the religious basis of morality. The old morality, he scorns as unsuited to our times. He is perilously near calling it immorality. The danger is that he is letting feelings play far too great a role in his new laws and theories. Tied by good manners, he is breaking loose; oversophisticated, he dallies with barbarism and is making the glorious mistake of inventing a new morality out of a mood, without bothering at all to find out what man's nature is, what is the purpose of society and where lies its end. He, like philosophers, lives in the dark and is trying to mend the world in the dark. He is not true to himself, though he may be quite true to the atmosphere in which human dignity is suffocated by talk about glands and instincts and economic forces.

People believe in free will, or the soul or immortality or God in a very happy-go-lucky manner, because they think that such a belief makes no difference at all to asking the blind to lead the one-eyed while 'the soul goes out at elbow'. They think when religion quits stage, biology, instinct with self-improvement, will mount guard on our morals. They want to construct improved morality out of the mockery of biological theories. They, perhaps, forget that it is time to look at man and not at a jawbone of an ass or at the tooth of a Pittdown skull. They, again, forget to turn their lights inward and see what man really is—a being with a mind and body, a soul and will, with a flame of desire which can be fanned till it blazes across the whole sky with a light which will never be put out. Man has a purpose—a grim one, in life. It is this purpose which

makes the world a testing place, an examination-hall for heroism and love and an immortal destiny which makes us partake of the bliss of God.

A writer has beautifully pointed out: "To see man as he is we must contemplate the animal in him, the lair of passions, and the mind rising like the moon over troubled waters, the mind which as the *logos* sees far off an ideal and order to be accomplished. But even this is not enough—for only when that '*logos*' in turn is lit from within by the love and the wisdom of God can man's selfishness be conquered and men and women live truly and love truly and reach that peace which has been defined as the tranquility of order."

"Whence comes evil" is a problem most tempting and at once most intractable. It is a question which can arcuse the interest of the plain man as much as that of the philosopher, for it points to the fact that not a particular part of the world or epoch in its life, but the world itself is out of joint. The mystery of evil, though far from being a casual or transient element in the scheme of things, is thoroughly an irrational one. In the deep sense of the phrase it ought not to be there. It means a continual obstacle to man's well being—spiritual and secular. In one word it is the enemy of man. Yet at all times it owes its existence to him whose mortal enemy it is. Some one might adopt the Pauline way of distinguishing evil from man and say "So it is no longer I, but sin that dwelleth in me"; or deplore one's sinful existence like Shakespeare who said, "I am myself indifferent honest, but yet I could accuse me of such things that it were better that my mother had not borne me." But it again carries us nowhere. It is at best an analysis of one's sins. It is another way of saying "the evil that I would not, that I do".

It is the irrationality of evil which makes the problem at

Continued on page 6 col. 3

## WHO "KILLED" JESUS ? A NEW STUDY OF PONTIUS PILATE

BY COLIN CROSS

**Cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.**

**When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person : see ye to it.**

**Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.**

'Truth, what is that ?'

So, according to the New Testament, the Roman Governor of Judea, Pontius Pilate, questioned a strange Prophet brought before him charged with treason. The prophet was Jesus of Nazareth and Pilate condemned him to death.

Because of this episode, Pilate became the best-known imperial administrator the Romans ever employed. The words 'suffered under Pontius Pilate' have for nearly 2,000 years been recited by Christians. A snap decision in a minor case ensured that his name would live as long as history.

For Christians, Pilate's name is of more than ritualistic importance. This is because it provides the only evidence of the date of the crucifixion. The fact that Pilate was Governor of Judea from 26 to 36 AD helps to establish Jesus as a real person who taught and died at a definite time.

It is possible to deduce, in outline, the kind of person Pontius Pilate was. This can be done, in the first place, by looking at the organisation of the Roman Empire.

The outlying provinces, those run by the army, came under the direct authority of the Emperor at Rome. To each province he appointed a Legate, a rich man of Senatorial family who surrounded himself with considerable pomp. The Legates were aristocrats who entered government at the top without passing through subordinate ranks.

Pilate's territory, Judea, was part of the Province of Syria and came under the Legate for Syria, who lived at Antioch. Pilate held the subordinate rank of Prefect (his title was changed to 'Procurator' in 41 AD) and was answerable both to the Legate and directly to the Emperor. The fact of his existence was finally corroborated by a stone recently dug up at his capital, Caesarea: it is inscribed 'Pontius Pilatus Praefectus Provinciae Judaeae'.

For appointment as Prefect, family background was unimportant. Such a man had made his way on his merits and against rough competition. Prefects were selected from regimental commanders and these either belonged to the minor Roman gentry or in a few cases, had risen through the ranks from private soldier. Standards of efficiency were high and the success of the Roman Empire rested largely on such men. They were allowed absolute and arbitrary powers of life and death over all save Roman citizens.

Thus it can be assumed that Pontius Pilate was an able or even brilliant officer, trusted by the Emperor. The Gospels imply that he was a 'friend of Caesar'; this was an honorific designation conferred by the Emperor on favoured officers, and one which could be withdrawn.

According to relatively late legend, Pilate was not in origin a Roman at all but a German. It was said that he was the son of a petty German chief who had sent him to Rome as a hostage. (Further embellishments suggested he had been illegitimate and had murdered a legitimate half-brother so as to become heir.) Pilate, the story goes, joined the Roman army, fought well and was eventually promoted to govern Judea. Actually it is unlikely that at so early a date a 'barbarian' would have risen in the Roman service, and the name 'Pontius Pilate' fits best a natural-born Roman citizen from central Italy.

Judea was an important post because it contained Jerusalem, the religious capital of the Jews. Scattered over most of the Roman Empire and, according to some computations, forming as much as 10 per cent of the population, the Jews and their converts were dissenters against the Graeco-Roman religious system. Instead of frequenting the public temples to honour the gods, they gathered in their own synagogues to worship a single, invisible God and to teach the Law they believed that God had given them. At Jerusalem

they had a huge temple, staffed by 20,000 priests serving in rotation, to which they went on pilgrimages. Thus, the Prefect of Judea was responsible to Rome for the good order of the most troublesome religious cult in the Empire.

To make things yet more difficult for him, the Jewish faith had also political implications. The Jews were expecting their God to send them an inspired leader, the Messiah, who would free their holy land from alien rule. There were varying conceptions of what the Messiah would be like. Some thought he would merely lead them to political independence; others that he would enable them to conquer the world; yet others thought that the world, in its existing form, would be ended altogether. The whole complex of doctrine meant that the Jews, unlike other subordinate peoples in the Roman system, seethed with rebellious notions. Eventually they did twice mount armed insurrection in 66 and 132 AD.

### Pilate's gods get their marching orders

For a Roman official to govern such a territory effectively required a superhuman combination of energy and tact. Pilate appears to have been strong on the energy, weak on the tact. His trust, in a crisis, lay in his troops.

How much he knew about Judaism is not clear. Tradition says that he had a Jewish wife, Claudia, but it is impossible to establish whether or not it is true. According to Matthew's Gospel, she had a dream which resulted in her warning her husband to leave Jesus alone. It is certainly possible that Pilate's wife was Jewish and she could have advised him on religious matters. At any rate he must have had religious advisers. The difficulty was that Judaism was less a single, coherent religion than a complex of sects and teachers revolving around the central ideas of the invisible God and the Divine Law; the point of the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered from 1947 onwards, is that they show that Judaism in the first century AD was much more fluid than had previously been supposed. The arguments among the Jews were so involved that it was hard for the outsider to grasp what was going on.

In 26 AD, Pilate took up his residence at Caesarea, the administrative capital on the coast. This was a largely non-Jewish city. According to custom, he would move to Jerusalem for the major religious feasts so as to be on the spot if disorder arose among the pilgrims. He exerted control over the feasts by keeping the

(Continued on p. 4, col 1)

(Continued from page 3, col. 3)  
High Priest's vestments in Roman custody.

What appears to have been his first major act was a challenge to the Jews. He sent troops into Jerusalem carrying their standards, which were adorned with figures of the Roman gods. However much or little he knew about Judaism, he should have known that the proximity of such things to the Temple of the invisible God would cause the gravest offence. All the Jewish sects were united in hating idols.

The Jews sent a deputation to Caesarea to demand the removal of the standards. Pilate at first was obstinate. He said the demand was an insult to Rome, punishable by death, and called in his soldiers. The members of the deputation lay upon the ground and said they would rather be killed than sanction idols in Jerusalem. Pilate thus had overreached himself. He had either to slaughter the deputation, and thus provoke a serious Jewish uprising, or else climb down over the idols. He chose the latter course, and the pagan emblems were removed.

A few years later, Pilate attempted another trial of strength. It centred on the Temple. As the heart of a cult that spread right across the Empire and beyond, the Temple was an organisation of great wealth. There was a Temple tax paid by every devout Jew and there were freewill offerings from worshippers who came to make their ritual sacrifices. By Jewish law, the funds were to be used both to maintain the Temple and for general social purposes.

Pilate decided that Jerusalem needed an improved water supply. This was a typical scheme for a Roman administrator. The Romans believed in sewerage and piped water and many officials sought to make their names with engineering projects connected with water. Pilate decided on a gigantic plan for a 25-mile aqueduct to bring water to the city.

To pay for it, he arbitrarily seized some of the Temple treasure. He could argue that the treasure was intended for such a project and was better being used for an aqueduct than lying idle in the vaults. But the Jews regarded his actions as straight robbery. Bands of resistance fighters, supported by crowds of ordinarily peaceful people, sabotaged the project by getting in the way of Pilate's workmen. Pilate, angry, sent soldiers in plain clothes among the crowds with instructions to kill saboteurs. The soldiers got out of hand and the result was bloody slaughter of hundreds of Jews, many of them entirely innocent.

#### His prisoner: a man of compelling personality

In 36 AD, Pilate's term of office ended and nothing more is known of him save legend. He was remembered by the Jews as an unpopular and harsh governor.

At some time during his 10 years in office, according to the Christian Gospels, there came before him on trial the Galilean preacher Jesus of Nazareth. It is possible, by ingenious interpretations, to attempt to work out the exact year, but this cannot be certain.

Each Gospel has a slightly differing version of what happened, but there is a common outline. Jesus had been arrested by the Jewish governing assembly, the Sanhedrin, and convicted of blasphemy, for which the penalty was death. (The affair of Pilate's standards had shown how sticky the Jews were on blasphemy.) The Sanhedrin, it is said, lacked the power to execute a death sentence and so took the prisoner to Pilate, who was in Jerusalem for the Passover Feast, and accused him of treason against Rome. Pilate was by no means convinced of the guilt of the prisoner but, under pressure from the Jewish authorities, agreed to pass the death sentence. According to Matthew's Gospel, he disclaimed responsibility by washing his hands in front of a Jewish crowd, saying: 'I am innocent of this man's blood. It is your concern.'

For centuries, theologians, historians and lawyers have disputed over what really happened, but it is impossible to tell because the Gospel story is, plainly, incomplete.

What Pilate must have seen before him was a Jewish holy man from Galilee, a troublesome territory outside his jurisdiction. Such independent or semi-independent teachers, with their own groups of followers, were characteristic of the Jewish scene, especially in Galilee. It is unlikely that Pilate had ever heard of Jesus, whose public teaching, according to the Gospels, had lasted at most three years and probably only one year. Religion and politics were so intertwined that any religious teaching was potentially treasonable, especially such as that of Jesus, which referred to a new 'kingdom' and apparently stirred up the people.

One document, almost certainly a medieval forgery, gives a description of Jesus supposedly based upon that given in the warrant for his arrest.

He is, in stature, a man of middle height and well proportioned. He has a venerable face, of a sort to arouse both fear and love in those who see him. His hair is of the colour

of ripe chestnuts, smooth almost to the ears but above them waving and curling, with a slight bluish radiance, and it flows over his shoulders. It is parted in the middle on the top of his head, after the fashion of the people of Nazareth. His brow is smooth and very calm, with a face without wrinkle or blemish, lightly tinged with red. His nose and mouth are faultless. His beard is luxuriant and unclipped, of the same colour as his hair, not long, but parted at the chin.

That the prisoner before Pilate looked like that is improbable. The very earliest Christian traditions were to the effect that Jesus was an ugly, deformed person, but even they were based at least as much upon Old Testament prophecies as upon real memories. Even the age of the prisoner is uncertain. According to the Gospels it could have been anywhere between 30 and 50. It is reasonable to guess, though, that, in view of the exceptional devotion the prisoner had won from his followers, he must have been a man of compelling personality; so shrewd an official as Pilate would have recognised this instantly.

The tenor of the prisoner's teachings had been that he was heralding a spiritual 'kingdom'. Whether it was to come immediately or gradually is not easy to deduce from the recollections in the Gospels, but it was certainly a spiritual rather than a political idea. Thus on any straightforward interpretation Jesus could have defended himself against a charge of treason against Rome. Why, then, did Pilate condemn him to be crucified?

The Gospel accounts, which reached their present form many decades after the event, are not concerned with legal detail. They were written and edited at the time when Christianity was becoming a separate religion from Judaism and in constant controversy with orthodox Jewish rabbis. The Gospels sprang from Christianity, not Christianity from the Gospels. It is plain that the Gospel writers were eager to stress what Jewish role there was in the condemnation of Jesus and to minimise Pilate's role. They imply that Pilate acted unwillingly and under Jewish pressure. Jewish accounts have shown an opposite bias, minimising the role of the Jewish authorities and insisting that the crucifixion was a Roman form of punishment inflicted for an offence against Rome.

It is impossible to sort out the truth. But if the accuracy as well as the completeness of the Gospels be challenged, it is possible to ask interesting questions.

(Continued on p 5 col. 1)

(Continued from p. 4, col. 3)

**Were the Jews trying to rescue Jesus?**

For example, it is correct that the Jewish Sanhedrin had no power to inflict the death sentence. The only evidence apart from the Gospels, that it did not exercise such power is ambiguous. Certainly Jewish religious law specified death by stoning as the penalty for a variety of offences, including the graver forms of blasphemy. Chronology is difficult but it does appear, according to the Acts of the Apostles, that quite soon after the crucifixion the Sanhedrin condemned the martyr Stephen to death by stoning — without calling in the Roman authorities. The Sanhedrin certainly had power to execute people — even Roman citizens — who polluted the Temple.

Assuming that the Sanhedrin was exercising its full customary powers, why did it not use them against Jesus? The answer must be that either he did not appear before it at all or else he did appear and was found innocent.

But was the Sanhedrin procedure a trial at all? It took place at night, which would be an extraordinary time at which to hold a formal trial. Could it be that the Sanhedrin assembled in emergency session to inquire into the prisoner because he was already due for trial before Pilate in the morning?

Although official Jewish leaders may have found some aspects of Jesus's teaching uncongenial, they would not, in the ordinary course of events, have wanted him to be executed by the alien Roman Power. The crucifixion by the occupying Power of any Jewish preacher was bad for Jewish prestige.

Thus it was possible to construct a theory to the effect that the Sanhedrin was actually trying to rescue Jesus. Knowing that he was about to be tried for treason, the Jewish authorities seized him and held a special night time Sanhedrin session to probe his case.

Jesus irritated the Sanhedrin by claiming to be the Messiah. This was, under Jewish law, at most a minor blasphemy which should be dealt with either by a flogging or by being left to the judgment of God.

The point about the claim to be the Messiah was that, at least potentially, it was a capital offence against Roman law. By sticking to the claim, Jesus was risking his own execution and so discredit to Judaism. This was what the Sanhedrin became so heated and the High Priest tore his clothes, a Jewish sign of mourning which still continues

This theory stands up at least to the extent that nothing Jesus said, according to the Gospels, constituted grave blasphemy. He did not claim to be God but, at most, to be the Christ (Messiah) and the son of God. In Jewish terminology of the time 'Son of God' was a title applied to holy men. It was approximately equivalent to the modern Christian use of the word 'saint' and did not imply divine status. The suggestion in the Gospels that the Sanhedrin wanted to execute him because he had used such words is simply not in accord with Jewish practice of the time.

On the other hand, there is nothing inherently impossible in some Jews of that period being prepared to kill for religious reasons. Indeed, a disposition to settle religious difference by violence continued for many centuries in the Jewish-Christian tradition. In Jesus's own day members of the party of Zealots were certainly willing to kill fellow-Jews who did not adopt their religio-political ideas. Also some Jews were collaborators with Rome and it is not incredible that they might curry favour by finding a 'rebel' for Pilate to execute.

But on any interpretation it comes back to Pilate. The death sentence was his responsibility.

He was acting against the background of Judea being a troublesome province. He was accustomed to passing death sentences. Executions of rebels were a routine occurrence, which needed no precise legal framework.

Jesus appeared before him as a trouble-maker. It was the difficult season of the Passover when Jerusalem was overcrowded and liable to break out in disorder. The prisoner made little attempt, according to the Gospels, to deny the charges made or to plead for mercy. He talked of theological matters which to Pilate were abstruse and provoked from him the impatient question: "Truth, what is that?"

A dilemma that every modern executive knows:

Evidence for his guilt was weak and Pilate, for a moment, genuinely could not decide what to do. Then, although he liked the look of the prisoner, he decided to give the benefit of the doubt to the accusers rather than the accused. Politically it was the safest thing to do: it was better to carry out a doubtful execution than risk the idea getting around that he was tolerating an enemy Rome.

**The hand-washing?**

A parallel comes to mind of a scene in the executive wash-room of a modern business corporation, managing director and departmental head standing side by side. The departmen-

tal head asks the managing director for a decision on a long-service employee he has recommended should be sacked. The managing director is unconvinced of the justice of the sacking but is too busy to think about it properly. 'Oh well, if you want to get rid of him, he'd better go,' says the managing director, and gives his hands an extra sluice under the tap.

Perhaps Pilate, too, made such a remark while cleaning up after the trial of Jesus.

At the time, the episode must have seemed unimportant. Perhaps Pilate never thought of it again. Or he may have speculated about strange stories that Jesus had been seen alive by his followers after the execution. Pilate may well have died a proud prosperous self-made man without realising that one execution out of the hundreds he had ordered was going to make his name live down the ages.

Of course late legends do not let the story end so simply. In their most elaborate form, they tell of the Emperor Tiberius falling ill and being told of a miraculous healer Jesus, who could make him better. Tiberius wrote to Pilate to send Jesus to Rome. Pilate replied that he had just been crucified and sent a picture of him instead.

The picture cured Tiberius who, furious about the crucifixion, recalled Pilate to Rome. Pilate appeared before him wearing Jesus's seamless coat and the Emperor found it impossible to be angry with him. As soon as Pilate had gone, the Emperor's wrath boiled up again. He sent for Pilate, who again appeared in Jesus's coat and again the Emperor found it impossible to be angry. Then the Emperor realised it was the coat which was abating his anger and he had Pilate stripped of it and thrown into prison.

Pilate killed himself in prison and his body was thrown into the River Tiber. But his body was so evil that it caused storms in the water. He was pulled out, taken to Vienne and dumped into the River Rhone. Again, evil spirits disturbed the water. Eventually he was taken to Switzerland and put into Lake Lucerne, where he still is, though not at rest. Every Good Friday demons pull him out and put him on a throne, where he sits washing his hands.

Such legends are tenuous and confused. But they do have in common the assertion that Pilate died by suicide and that his burial place is Lake Lucerne. The jagged mountain overlooking the Lake is to this day named Mount Pilatus after him. Nowhere else has ever been claimed to be the resting place of Pontius Pilate.

(Continued on p. 6, col. 3)

## The Concept of Causality in Al-Ghazzali-II

BY PROFESSOR A. F. M. HAFZULIAH BHUYAN, B.A.

Again, says al-Ghazzali, we can hardly prove that one particular event is intrinsically or inherently connected with any other particular event, for the reason that any amount of assertions as to the occurrence of one event does not involve the occurrence of any other event; nor does the negation of one involve the negation of the other. That is to say, from the facts of observation what we can preferably hold is that one event is independent of any other event, so much so that "this event is not event, nor that event is this event" (this is wholly that).

Thus he asserts that the connection between cause and effect, though apparently universal, cannot logically be proved as necessary. The will of God is imminent in the world and is the efficient cause of all things. He is the efficient cause of all things and His will is the ground of all causality. Causality is thus reduced to a relation of time, a causally connected. Causality is nothing but the will of God, which ordains that two things should ordinarily follow one another. Laws of nature never exist, they are only the expression of an habitual fact.

Now it may be asked if God is the ultimate cause of all that happens, how can we account for the causal connection in the orderly succession of events? The answer to this question, says al-Ghazzali, lies in the correct understanding of the nature of causation. Nothing causes anything. Antecedents have consequents. All that is seen in experience is that one definite phenomenon is definitely followed by another phenomenon, known commonly as the cause and effect. God alone is the efficient cause in all causes. It is only the ignorant who have misunderstood and misapplied the world power in the succession of events.

In fact it is God Who links the antecedents of the consequents, and because there is a Divine purpose behind all activities, the existing succession of events is orderly and not chaotic with the least break or irregularity. Thus there is uniformity in nature. Surely there is a set purpose pervading the universe? The uniform succession of events is not at random. There is no such thing as chance. People who

are capable of seeing things through the light of intuition see the hand of God in all that happens.

*A comparative study between Hume and al-Ghazzali*

Thus al-Ghazzali virtually denied that there is a real causal connection in the events as experienced by us, and here he unmistakably anticipates Hume. So Duncan B. Macdonald has rightly remarked in an excellent article on the life of al-Ghazzali, with special reference to his religious experiences and opinions, in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol XX, Part I, that "Seven hundred years before Hume, he cuts the bond of causality with the edge of his dialectic and proclaims we can know nothing of cause or effect but simply that one thing follows another".

This discussion regarding the theory of causation might suggest that the position of Hume and al-Ghazzali is the same and that one should be put by the side of the other in the history of thought. So Macdonald has here sounded a note of warning. Al-Ghazzali's end is very different from that of Hume. We are thrown back on revelation; that given immediately by God to individual soul or that given through prophets. All our knowledge is derived from these sources.

This view of Macdonald is also shared by other authorities who point out that the position of al-Ghazzali and Hume are quite different. Al-Ghazzali's is that of theism and Hume's that of naturalism.

From Hume's point of view the necessity of causation is merely subjective. Whatever connection there appears to be between the cause and the effect is one between ideas and not between the events themselves. If we accept Hume's position our situation becomes rather serious. All our thought and actions, all scientific investigations and generalizations, are based upon our belief in the rigidity of causation. If facts are simply individual entities without any necessary connection, all knowledge, all science, will be a mere fraud and the progress of civilization based on the discovery of causal

relationship will be a mere probability.

Al-Ghazzali, on the other hand, has managed to save himself from such a predicament by bringing in the intervention of God, which links every phenomenon with another. And this linking of phenomenon is not at random. It has definite order and regularity in it. So there is the uniformity of nature which Hume's system could not provide.

The view of al-Ghazzali seems to gain added significance when compared with the modern scientific which again like Hume's, fails to establish any necessary connection between a cause and effect. In the words of Dr. George Thomas White Patrick: "...Science knows nothing of any such necessary connection..." and he substantiates this view by quoting GoP. Conger from "his New Views of Evolution": "It appears that our scientific knowledge at its very foundations is indefinite loose, based upon selection of certain radiations with accompanying neglect or ignorance of others. And our laws of causation must then carry with them something of this initial defect"

(Continued from page 2, col. 3)

once so fascinating and so interminable. It is this irrationality which ought to tell a rationalist why Reason grapples with it in vain. Reason—a popular synonym for science, may pursue planets in their courses, but it cannot track down the secret of evil, because, the secret is utterly offensive to Reason. Moreover Reason uses tools which break off short in this case. It is like measuring the depths of oceans by an inch-tape. Reason can expose the evil, but it cannot explain how evil comes to be, nor can destroy it. Evil, surveyed apart from faith in God, is of all studies the most depressing, especially when it is a man of science who is viewing it, since evil may then appear to be not only insoluble as a problem, but invincible as power.

(Continued from page 5 col. 3.)

The Ethiopian Church has canonised Pilate as a saint because he absolved himself from guilt in the crucifixion. Few others have allowed him absolution so total.

Pontius Pilate's personality flashes across history as that of a busy man who tolerated something that he thought to be wrong and then tried to disclaim responsibility. There have been many others like him.

(Courtesy: "Observer" (Colour Supplement) April 14, 1968.)