

**Gospel writers' unfitness**

I had also raised this objection against the Gospels that all the miracles mentioned therein, on the basis of which the Divinity of Jesus, on whom be peace, is sought to be proved without justification, are not established at all. For, the prophethood of the writers of the Gospel, which was the basis of the proof, has not been established. Neither did they claim prophethood nor show any miracle. As to the point that they were historians who recorded the miracles, then even the criteria of chronicle writing are not fulfilled in them. For, it is necessary for a chronicle writer that he should not make mis-statements. Secondly, that his memory should not be faulty. Thirdly, that he should be a profound thinker and not a man of superficial mind. Fourthly, that he should be a researcher and not be content with accepting matters at face value. Fifthly, whatever he writes should be his personal observation and he should not present just baseless stories. However, the chroniclers of the Gospels did not possess any of these qualities. It is an established fact that they have deliberately made mis-statements in their Gospels. For example, they assigned the wrong meaning to the word *nāṣirah*, and without any justification applied the prophecy about Immanuel to Jesus, and wrote in the Gospels that if all the works of Jesus were written, the books could not be accommodated in the world.<sup>19</sup>

As for memory, they made mistakes in certain references to earlier books. And by writing much baseless gossip, they proved that they were not in the habit of employing reason, thought and the faculty of enquiry. In fact, at some places in these Gospels there appears deplorable falsehood; for example, there is the saying of Jesus in Matthew, chapter 5, “You have heard it was said ‘Love your neighbour and hate your enemy’”, whereas this text does not appear in the earlier books. Similarly their writing that all the dead came out of the tombs of Jerusalem and went

---

19. John 21:25.

into the city,<sup>20</sup> how foolish is this statement! And none of the chroniclers of the Gospels has claimed, while relating a miracle, that he was an eye-witness to the event. Hence it is proved that they did not possess the qualifications of chroniclers, and their statements are not at all trustworthy. And notwithstanding this lack of trust, the creed towards which they invite is a very degraded and shameful concept and belief. Is this proposition acceptable to reason that a humble creature who possesses all the unavoidable traits of a human being, should be called God? Can reason accept that the creatures flog their creator, that those created by God spit at the face of their All-Powerful God, capture Him and crucify Him, and He, although God, is helpless to face them? Does it make sense to anybody that someone known as God, prays the whole night and still His prayer is not accepted? Can any heart feel satisfied with the belief that even God remains in the womb for nine months like helpless babies and feeds on the menstrual blood and finally, is born, crying, out of the female private parts? Can any wise man accept that after a limitless and eternal period of time without beginning, God becomes corporal, a part of Him appearing as a man and another as a dove, and this body becomes their adjunct forever?

### **Civil and penal laws**

There was another objection that I raised on the extant Gospels of the Christians, which caused the reverend gentlemen to face much shame. And it is that the Gospel cannot develop all the faculties of man, and whatever little it contains about morals it is taken from the Torah. On this some of the Christians had raised the objection that only moral teachings befit the Book of God, and penal laws are not suited to it. For, penalties for crimes should be in accordance with circumstances, which keep changing, and as there is no limit to these changes, it is not proper to have only one penal law for them.<sup>21</sup> Every penalty

---

20. Matthew 27:53.

21. This sort of objection has been raised on the Holy Quran by Marcoby and other English experts in law. — *Author*.

should be prescribed as demanded by the times and as is expected to be effective for the admonition and punishment of the culprits. Hence to keep them permanently the same will not be conducive to the reformation of morals. To thus limit the civil, criminal and fiscal laws will lead to adverse results in such new circumstances as fall outside the scope of those limited laws. For example, it might adversely affect a modern commercial practice which is based on the prevailing practices that cannot at all be avoided in that government. Or it affects modern matters of another type or influences some other condition of civilization. Or it proves to be ineffective in case of the established behaviour of criminals who have got habituated to a particular type of punishment or are no longer suited to that punishment. But I say these are the views of those who have never read the Holy Quran thoughtfully.

Now I explain to the seekers of truth that the commandments of the Holy Quran pertaining to civil, criminal and financial matters are of two kinds. Firstly those which contain the details of punishment or the procedure for justice. Secondly those in which those matters have been mentioned only as general principles and no specific procedure has been prescribed, the intention being that if a new situation arises, they should assist the jurist. For example, at one place the Holy Quran says, A tooth for a tooth, an eye for an eye. This is the detail. At another place there is the brief expression: "The recompense of evil is punishment like it".<sup>22</sup> So when we think over it we find that this brief expression has been stated for the purpose of extension of law. For, there are situations in which this law cannot be implemented. For example, a person breaks another's tooth, but has no teeth of his own because of advanced age or due to some other reason. We cannot break his tooth as a punishment for his breaking of the tooth, because he has no teeth at all in his mouth. So also if a blind man puts out someone's eye, we cannot put his eye out because he does not

---

22. The Holy Quran, 42:40.

have any eyes. To summarise, the Holy Quran has laid down general principles of this type to include such situations in the commandments. So how can its commandments and laws be subjected to objection? It has not just said so, but by putting forth such general principles it has encouraged everyone to interpret, to deduce and to select. But alas this encouragement and mode of education are not found in the Torah, while the Gospels are entirely deprived of this perfect teaching. A few morals have been described in the Gospels and even those are not organized in any system of regulation or law.

It should be remembered that this statement of the Christians that the Gospels have left the question of laws to the wisdom of human beings is not a matter of pride, rather it is a matter of shame and regret. For, every affair which is not described in the form of a general principle and as part of systematic laws, however good it may be from the point of view of its meaning, becomes evil and detestable through misuse. I have written a number of times that the Gospels do contain some moral teaching, borrowed from the Torah and the Talmud, but it is out of context and disorganized. Would that it had been regulated under some law, then how useful it could have been! But as it is, it is extremely abhorrent to the eye of wisdom. All this defect is due to neglecting the law, by which is meant being systematic and organizing the rules. It is the height of ignorance to think that religion consists of those few unconnected teachings which are recorded in the Gospels. Rather all those matters which are necessary for the perfection of mankind are included in religion. All the affairs which turn man from the animal stage and teach him true human behaviour, or promote him from an ordinary human life to a life of wisdom, or make him progress from a life of wisdom to one that is entirely absorbed in God, all these matters, in other words, are termed religion.

### **Mis-statements in the Gospels**

One objection that I had raised against the Gospels was that they contain mis-statements not only about the life of Jesus after

he became a public figure, but the writers of the Gospels have also lied deliberately about the earlier life of Jesus. They did not consider it expedient to disclose those incidents which pertain to his life before his claim. As a matter of fact, in respect of a man who had claimed Divinity, the earlier and greater part of his life was also worth being told. This period comprised almost his entire life, and according to the Christians, only three years of his life remained. This would have enabled one to know the kind of character with which he led his life for those thirty years, what was God's relation with him, and what types of wonders were worked by him. It is a pity that the writers of the Gospels have not mentioned this phase at all. It is true that Luke has written this much in the first chapter that the angel appeared to Mary, gave her the good tidings of a son and said "name him Jesus",<sup>23</sup> but this story appears to have been concocted by Luke himself. For, if this story had been true, why did Mary, his mother, who had seen the angel, and his brothers who were well informed about this angel, not believe in him? And why did this disbelief reach the extent that Jesus himself had to disown his brothers, and also his mother.<sup>24</sup>

I had also raised the objection that John, chapter 2, verse 20, says that the Jews told Jesus that the Temple had been built in forty-six years. But it has been written repeatedly in the Jewish books that only within eight years was the Temple completed. Those books are still available. So it is an utter falsehood that the Jews had said so to the Messiah. Nor is the statement plausible that such a small building which needed at most a few years to complete should have been under construction for forty-six years. So the Gospels contain such mis-statements and because of these, their writings are not creditable. For example, see John, chapter 13, verse 34, which says: "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another". The fact is this is not a new order, for the very same order is written in

---

23. Luke 1:31.

24. Matthew 12:46-50.

---

the Book of Leviticus, chapter 19, verse 18. So how does it become new?

It is surprising that these are the same Gospels about which it has been claimed that in point of credibility they are superior to the Hadith of the Holy Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah. It is evident that the books which contain such shameful mis-statements bear no comparison with Islamic books of Hadith. Mr. Ryland writes in his book entitled *Account of Muhammadanism*: “The miracles of Muhammad [on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah] have been written in their numerous books by famous, learned, pious and wise Muhammadan scholars. These scholars did not accept anything without a strict test and tremendous scrutiny. That is why their statements are not such as could be doubted. They are well-known throughout the whole of Arabia. Those incidents have usually passed on from father to son and from one generation to the next. All types of books of Islam bear witness to the miracles of Muhammad [on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah]. If the authority of such outstanding and learned scholars is not accepted then what else could be the proof for miracles? For, testimonies are the only source for the proof of incidents which happened before our times or are far from our view. If testimonies are rejected then all narrations of history become doubtful. Another reason why these miracles were actually true is that the Prophet of Islam [on whom be peace and the blessings of Allah] has severely cursed those who would falsely attribute miracles to him. Rather he has plainly said that whoever tells a lie about him, his punishment is hell. So how was it possible that, in the presence of such a strong prohibition, so many false miracles could be manipulated”.

The same author then writes: “The truth is that the amount of trustworthy testimonies and authorities that can be presented in favour of the Prophet of Islam, no Christian is able to present such testimonies in proof of the miracles of Jesus from the New Testament, or to bring more numerous or better testimonies”.

### **Living signs in support of Islam**

Thus the learned Christian has shown some fair-mindedness in writing this. Nonetheless, to explain the merits of Islam and the proof of its truth, there is not only what has been said above. For, despite the fact that the beliefs put forward by the Holy Quran appeal to the hearts, and every unsullied conscience accepts them, it has still not presented such miracles as would become like stories and fables in some future century. Rather, it has adduced many rational arguments in support of its beliefs, and there have been collected merits of such different types and kinds in the Quran that it became a miracle beyond human power. It gave the glad tidings for all time that perfect followers of this religion will always receive heavenly signs. So has it happened. We can prove to every seeker-after-truth, conclusively and definitely, that from the time of our master and leader, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, till the present day there have been, in every century, godly persons through whom God has shown heavenly signs to other communities to guide them [towards Islam]. There have been in Islam persons such as Sayyid Abdul Qadir Jilani, Abul Hasan Kharqani, Abu Yazid Bustami, Junaid of Baghdad, Muhy-ud-Din Ibn Arabi, Zul-Noon of Egypt, Muin-ud-Din Chishti of Ajmer, Qutub-ud-Din Bukhtiar of Kaki, Farid-ud-Din of Pak Patan, Nizam-ud-Din of Delhi, Shah Waliullah of Delhi, and Shaikh Ahmad of Sirhind — may Allah be pleased with them, and they were pleased with Him! The number of such persons runs into thousands, and so many miracles of these people are recorded in the books of the scholarly and the learned that even a prejudiced opponent, despite his great bias, has to concede finally that these people showed miracles and extraordinary signs.

I say truly that I have discovered after extensive, proper investigations, that looking at the whole history of mankind as far as one can, exactly this is proved that the heavenly signs that have appeared and are appearing in Islam through the saints of this *Umma* in support of Islam and in witness of the truthfulness of the Holy Prophet, on whom be peace and the blessings of

Allah, have no parallel at all in other religions. Islam is the only religion which has always been progressing with the help of heavenly signs, and its numerous lights and blessings have shown God to be close at hand. Be certain that Islam, because of its heavenly signs, has never been put to shame in any age. Look at this your own age! In it, if you like you can put forward the testimony of your own eyes in favour of Islam. Speak the truth; have you not witnessed signs in support of Islam in this age? Then tell us which other religion of the world possesses these fresh testimonies? These are the matters that broke the backs of the Christian clergymen. The man whom they call God, they have nothing in his support except a few incoherent stories and false reports. And the pure Prophet whom they falsify, the signs of his truth are raining down even in this age. For the seekers the doors of signs are open even now, just as they were open in the past. For those hungry for truth, the dish of blessing is available even now as it was in the past. The living religion is the one which is forever under the protective Hand of the Living God — and that is Islam. Two streams are flowing in the Quran till today: one the stream of rational arguments, the other that of heavenly signs. But the Gospels of the Christians have been deprived of both and remained dry.

“How can but a fool, worship someone who is a slave. So let every lamenter weep on their path. That Lord whose name is stamped on each leaf, whoever seeks that God, he indeed is a Muslim.”

I had also raised the objection that an eminent researcher from among the Christian clergymen, named Schimmler, says that apart from the Gospel of John, the remaining three Gospels are fakes. The famous scholar Dodwell writes after his researches that there was no trace in the world of the existing four Gospels till the middle of the second century. Somerill says that the existing New Testament, i.e. the Gospels, were written as a pious fraud at the close of the second century. And an English clergyman named Ewellson says that Matthew’s Gospel in

Greek was written in the second Christian century by someone who was not a Jew, the proof of which is that it contains many errors about the geography of that country and Jewish customs. The Christian scholars also admit that a Christian, in view of his religion, can neither lead a life in human society nor carry on trade, because the Gospels forbid the acquisition of wealth and *caring for tomorrow*. So also a true Christian cannot serve in the armed forces because of the commandment to “love your enemy”. Similarly, if he is a real Christian, he is forbidden from marriage also. From all this it appears that the Gospels were like a law meant for a particular time and a particular community, but the Christians, by declaring it to be of general utility, caused them to become the target of hundreds of objections. It would have been better if they had never asserted that there was some sort of perfection in the teachings of the Gospels. Because of this misplaced claim of theirs, they have had to suffer much disgrace and humiliation.

### **Is *Elohim* plural?**

Another point to remember is that the Christians want to show that the word *Elohim* which is the plural of *Eloah* and is found in the Book of Genesis of the Torah, points to Trinity. But this only proves their ignorance still more, for the Hebrew language confirms that although the word *Elohim* apparently is plural, yet everywhere it gives the meaning of the singular. The fact is that in the Arabic and the Hebrew languages the rule is well-known that sometimes the word is singular but gives the meaning of the plural, for example, the words *sāmir* and *dajjāl*, and sometimes a word is in the plural number but gives the meaning of the singular. Those learned in Hebrew know very well that this word *Elohim* is also one of those words which have the form of the plural but actually carry the meaning in the singular. That is why wherever this word has occurred in the Torah it has been used in accordance with this meaning. This claim is absolutely wrong that it has always been reserved for the Exalted God. In fact, sometimes this very word has been used for an angel, sometimes for a judge and sometimes for Moses. For example,

it appears from the book of Judges 13:22 that when Manoah, father of Samson, saw an angel of the Lord he said: “We shall surely die, for we have seen *Elohim*”. The Hebrew word here is *Elohim* which is taken to mean ‘angel’. In Exodus 22:8–9 *Elohim* is translated as a judge and in Exodus 7:1 Moses has been declared *Elohim* and told: “See, I make you as *Elohim* to Pharaoh”. In Deuteronomy 32:15 occurs the following text: “then he forsook *Eloah* who made him”. Note the word here is *Eloah*, not *Elohim*. Similarly in Psalms 50:22 the word used is *Eloah*. Thus in these books *Eloah* and *Elohim* have been used interchangeably, from which it is concluded that at both places singular is meant and not plural. So also in Isaiah 44:6 occurs *Elohim* and further on in verse 8 appears *Eloah*.

So it should be clear that the real object of using the plural number is to manifest God’s power and omnipotence. These are the usages of languages. For example, in English a person is addressed as *you* but in respect of the Exalted God, in spite of the belief in Trinity, always the word *Thou* is used. Similarly in Hebrew, in place of *Adonai* which means the Lord God, *Adonim* may be used. Hence, in fact, these discussions pertain to the usages of languages. In the Holy Quran on many occasions *We* occurs in the word of the Exalted God, for example, “We” did this, or “We” shall do this. No sensible person thinks that here “We” implies plurality of gods. But the case of the Christian clergymen is greatly to be pitied, that they forcibly want to make God out of a man by employing interpretations of deplorable types. It seems to me that ideas of the times of idol-worship compel them to make up polytheistic teaching. One should think how far removed from wisdom and sense are the artificial constructs that they have adopted. So much so that from the statement in the Torah, in Genesis 1:26, that God said: “Let us make man in our image”, the Christians draw the inference that the word *us* refers to Trinity. But it should be remembered that in Hebrew the word here is *na’aseh* which means *našna’*. This word, with a slight alteration, resembles this Arabic word, i.e., *našna’*. It is the idiom of the Arabic

and Hebrew languages that in order to attribute majesty to oneself or to someone else, the word used is *You* or *We*. But these people, in their enthusiasm for creature-worship, did not care at all for the idiom. And only finding the words “Let us make”, considered Trinity to be implied. It is much to be regretted how far these people have strayed on account of love for creature-worship. However, the limit of three has been imposed by them from themselves, otherwise the plural number can be applied to more than three, to hundreds. It is not necessary that the plural number should imply Trinity only.

### **Inferior sacrificed for superior, and not vice versa**

One of my objections against the Christians was that the sacrifice put forward by them is against the Exalted God’s law of nature. For, pondering over the Divine law, we find that God’s practice has always been that the inferior is sacrificed for the superior. For example, man is the noblest of creatures and, by the consensus of all the sages, is superior to all the animals. Hence all the animals are like a sacrifice for the sake of his health, survival and continuity and also for the sake of the system of his civilization. From the organisms in water to the honey bees and silk worms and all the animals such as the goat, the cow etc., when we look they all appear to be in the service of human life and a sacrifice for the sake of mankind. For the sake of just one boil on our body, a hundred leeches sometimes give their lives in order that we be relieved of that boil. Tens of millions of goats, oxen, fish etc., surrender their lives daily for our sake. Only then food suitable for the preservation of our health is made available. Hence, considering this entire system, it appears that God has decreed the inferior to be a sacrifice for the superior. But we find no example in God’s law of nature as to the sacrifice of the superior for the sake of the inferior.

The Christian clergymen are much worried by this objection and are unable to make a reply. In the end they get hold of some senseless stories and fables, some of them giving the reply that there have been occasions when highly superior officers laid

down their lives for the sake of far lesser men who were under them. Thus when, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth [the first], Sir Philip Sidney was injured during the siege of the fort of Zutphen in Holland, and he was in the death throes and extremely thirsty, a cup of water was brought to him which was very scarce there. Near to him was another injured soldier who was thirsty. He started looking at Sidney with much envy. Seeing his desire, Sidney did not drink the cup himself but, by way of sacrifice, gave it to that soldier, saying “your need is greater than mine”.<sup>25</sup> This is an example of bravery and the quality of sacrifice shown by Sidney, the conclusion from which is that a greater man laid down his life for a lesser one. But remember that this story does not provide the answer to my question. My objection was that God’s law of nature, which follows God’s will and purpose, as does the solar system, and which we cannot evade by our power and ingenuity, and which has not been of our making but has been established naturally as such by God’s hand, tells us that for the preservation and protection of the higher, the lower is sacrificed. Hence that practice of God, which has been in action since the foundation of the world was laid, teaches us and reminds us that the purpose of the Exalted God is just this that he places His other creatures in the service of those creatures who are very favoured and chosen in His eyes, and He imposes hardship upon, or kills, the inferior for the deliverance of the superior.

My demand was this: “Has God ever sent the superior to destruction in order to save the inferior?” It is evident that it has no precedent in God’s law of nature. Consider that by drinking a cup of water we become the cause of the death of tens of millions of organisms. Has it ever happened that the Exalted God has killed tens of millions of men for the sake of a germ?

---

25. *Note:* It is quite clear that Sidney considered the soldier to be more valuable than himself for two reasons. Firstly, that Sidney was about to die and the soldier could have been more useful while alive. Secondly, that the soldier was a brave fighter. That is why Sidney said: “Your need is greater”. — *Author.*

Consider again, can anybody count the numerous germs that man kills in his lifetime by all the water he drinks, or the other different animals, worms, flies, leeches, and living creatures used as food that he destroys? So, can it not be understood even now that the law of God, which human life is obliged to follow, has always been that the inferior is sacrificed for the superior?

### **Self-sacrifice**

It is true that the example that has been quoted, although it has no connection with God's law of nature, yet it can be included in the human quality of self-sacrifice. Since man is imperfect and depends on doing good deeds in order to obtain Divine reward, hence sometimes, by way of humility and lowliness, in order to please his God, he gives precedence to someone else's comfort over his own, and deprives himself of a benefit to allow it to reach someone else so that he may thereby please his God. The name of this quality in Arabic is *īthār*. It is evident that although this quality is praiseworthy in humble man, yet it cannot be attributed to God because He neither needs any progress through humility and lowliness, nor can it be ascribed to Him that in order to bestow some sort of comfort on someone, He needs to place Himself in difficulty. For, this is contrary to His omnipotence, the attribute of Divinity and eternal and everlasting glory. If He can allow such humility, trouble and deprivation for Himself then it would also be possible that, as a matter of self-sacrifice, He hands over His Divinity to someone else and Himself becomes idle and redundant. Or, bestowing His perfect attributes on someone else He Himself becomes deprived of those attributes forever. Such a view is grave impertinence towards the Exalted God and I cannot accept that any God fearing, just person would appreciate such a flawed condition for the glorious God.

No doubt this quality of *īthār*,<sup>26</sup> in which destitution, helplessness, weakness and deprivation are pre-requisites is a good

---

26. *Note:* This is called *self-sacrifice* in English. — *Author.*

quality of humble man, that although by catering for the comfort of another he loses his own means of comfort, even then he takes hardship upon himself and bestows comfort on another. But how can we suggest that God can also be in a position that having awarded some sort of comfort to somebody, He Himself becomes deprived of the same? Is this in keeping with His majesty that by way of self-sacrifice He makes somebody All-Powerful and Himself is left weak? Or that, by way of self-sacrifice, He Himself becomes ignorant — I seek refuge with God — and makes another a knower of the unseen? It is quite evident that a necessary condition for self-sacrifice is that the person making the sacrifice becomes content with a state of deprivation for himself and lets another receive his share. If we do some good to someone else without ourselves losing something then this would not be self-sacrifice. For example, if we possess a large number of loaves of bread which we own, and we gave one out of those thousands of loaves to a beggar, this will not be called self-sacrifice. Supposing Sir Philip Sidney had a large quantity of water or that he could have procured it easily, and out of this he had given a cup full of it to that soldier who was lying besides him wounded and thirsty, this action would not be named self-sacrifice, for in the circumstances he could have certainly known that he himself would not be deprived of it either.

Hence this tells us that for the establishment of the quality of self-sacrifice, the necessary condition is weakness, helplessness, lack of power and lack of ability on the part of the one making the self-sacrifice. Therefore this quality cannot be attributed to the All-Powerful God. Similarly, it would not have been attributed to Sir Philip Sidney if he had been in a position to produce water. Further, if God does this, that He deliberately deprives Himself of the use of this power, or that He deliberately, while giving comfort to someone else, puts Himself in a state of difficulty, even this deed cannot be named self-sacrifice. Rather, this deed would be similar to the work of a fool whose house is full of all sorts of foods and who, after

giving one plate of food to a beggar, threw away the rest of the food deliberately and almost killed himself with hunger in order thus to prove the quality of self-sacrifice. In short, these are all errors in which the Christians are deliberately placing themselves, in order somehow to continue beating the drum which they find tied around their necks.

It should also be remembered that man's quality of self-sacrifice is praiseworthy upon the condition that it does not involve any violation of self-respect, shamelessness and loss of rights. For example, if a man, out of self-sacrifice, makes his wife bed someone else who desires her, this quality would not be praiseworthy. Many foolish, ignorant persons perform deeds whose parallel is not found anywhere in the Exalted God's law of nature. They are worthy of reproach in the eyes of sensible people, and not that they should be followed, or that their action should be considered laudable. For example, if an English military officer, appointed to lead a critical expedition with an army several hundred thousand strong, deliberately lays down his own life in order to save the life of a goat's young, thereby placing the entire army in jeopardy and danger of defeat, can our government consider him a praiseworthy man? No, in fact such a fool would be fit for curse and rebuke. Now man compared to God is thousands of times lesser than even the goat [as compared to man]. Some senseless actions of the foolish cannot be considered as following the law of nature, otherwise many Hindus sever their tongues, hands or feet in front of idols and many ignorant Hindus drop their children in the Ganges and call it "the next world of water". And there have been many among them who intentionally got crushed under the wheel of Jagan Nath. Such foolish acts do not deserve to be presented as precedent, nor can these be called the law of nature of the Exalted God. My objection was that the sacrifice of its life by the superior for the sake of the inferior is against the law of nature. Would that these people had first pondered over the meaning of 'law of nature', then they would not have fallen in this manifest error. Can we certify as law of nature those

senseless actions of some ignorant people which are themselves objectionable under the law of nature? Certainly not.

Further it is interesting that as yet the Christians have no right even to enter into this discussion. For, they do not believe that the second person of the Trinity, whose other name according to them is Son of God, was hanged in fact. The reason is that then they have to agree that their God remained dead for three days. Hence, if God Himself remained dead, *who was controlling the administration of this world during that period?*

### **My revelations**

It should also be remembered that these ideas were not contained in the teachings of the Messiah, and his teachings did not add anything to the Torah. He had said very plainly that he was a human being. True, just as the chosen ones of God receive titles of honour, nearness and love from the Exalted God, or just as those people themselves while absorbed in Divine love, utter words of love and union [with God], similar was his case. What doubt is there that, whether someone loves a human being or God, when that love reaches perfection, the lover definitely feels that his soul and that of the beloved have become one. At the stage of spiritual annihilation, many a time he sees himself as one with the beloved. As, for example, the Exalted God addressing my humble self in His revelations says:<sup>27</sup>

“You are from Me and I am from you, and the earth and the heavens are with you as they are with Me, and you are from Our water and other people from dust, and you are from Me as My unity and you are with Me at that stage of union as is not known to any creature. God praises you from His throne. You proceeded from Him and He chose you from

---

27. *Note:* These revelations have been published in my books *Barāhīn Aḥmadīyya*, *Ā’īna Kamālāt Islām*, *Izāla Auhām* and *Tuḥfa Baghdād* etc., and I have been publishing these for about twenty-five years. — *Author.*

out of the whole world. You are exalted in my court. I approved you for Myself. You are the light of the world, your eminence is wonderful. I shall raise you towards Myself, and shall keep your group triumphant till the day of judgment. You have been blessed, God increased your honour. You are God's prestige, so He shall not abandon you. You are the eternal word, so you shall not be obliterated. I shall come to you along with armies. You shall receive my spoils of war. I shall bestow honour on you and protect you. This will happen, this will happen, this will happen, and then there shall be passing away. For you, are My perfect rewards. Tell the people that if you love God then come and walk in my wake so that God may also love you. God is witness to my truth, then why do you not believe? You are before My eyes. I named you 'one resigned to the will of God'. God praises you from the throne. We praise you and send benediction on you. People will wish to extinguish this light but God will take this light, which is His light, to perfection. We shall cast terror in their hearts. Our victory shall come and the affair of the times shall end with Us. That day it shall be said: Was it not the truth? I am with you wherever you are. Whither you face, God faces the same way. To pledge allegiance to you is like pledging allegiance to Me, your hand is My hand. People will come to you from afar and God's help will descend upon you. People will get revelations from God about you and will help you. None can avert God's prophecies.

“O Ahmad, blessing has been made to issue from your lips and mention of your name has been exalted. God will illuminate your argument. You are brave, if faith had been [as distant as] at the Pleiades, you would have found it. Treasures of God's blessing have been given to you. The mention of your forefathers shall be cut off, and God shall start with you. I intended to make My successor so I have created Adam, that is, you. *Āvāhan* (God descended in you). God shall not abandon you, nor leave you till He

---

distinguishes between the pure and the polluted. I was a hidden treasure so I desired to be recognized. You are a mediator between Me and the entire creation. I breathed My spirit in you. You shall be helped and none shall find place to escape to. You have descended with the truth and in you the prophecies of the prophets have been fulfilled. God sent His apostle to strengthen His religion and make it triumphant over all religions. God made him descend near Qadian and he alighted with truth, and was made to alight with truth, and this was ordained from the beginning. You people were at the brink of an abyss, God sent him to rescue you. O My Ahmad, you are My wish and are with Me. I planted the tree of your eminence with My own hand. I shall make you the leader of the people and shall help you. Do the people wonder at this? Say: God is a wonder. He chooses whom He pleases and is not questioned about His actions. God's shadow shall be on you and He shall remain your shield. The heaven was closed up and also the earth, We opened them both. You are that Jesus whose time shall not be wasted. A pearl like you cannot be wasted. We shall make you a sign for the people and this had been destined from the beginning. You are with me. Your secret is My secret. You are dignified and chosen in this world and the hereafter. For you is a special reward and you are dignified above the whole world. Go forth rejoicing as your time has drawn nigh, and the feet of the Muhammadans are settled firmly on a very high minaret. I shall show my splendour, I shall lift you with a show of My power. A warner came to the world but the world accepted him not. But God will accept him and will manifest his truth with very powerful attacks. For him is that abode where man cannot reach by the strength of his deeds. You are with Me, for you the night and day have been created. You have that relationship with Me which is not known to the creatures. O people, the light of God has come to you, so do not become rejectors." etc.