



Refutation
of the Allegation
of Insult to Jesus Christ

2004

Islam International Publications Ltd.

حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کی توہین کے الزام کا جواب

**Refutation of the Allegation of
Insult to Jesus Christ**
(English Translation)

Translated from Urdu into English
by Mubasher Ahmad, USA

First Published in UK in 2004

© Islam International Publications Ltd

Published by

Islam International Publications Ltd
"Islamabad"
Sheephatch Lane
Tilford, Surrey GU10 2AQ
United Kingdom

Printed in UK at

Raqeem Press
Tilford, Surrey GU10 2AQ

ISBN: 1 85372 729 6

The Analytical Table of Contents

- Foreword..... vi
- An excerpt from Nūr-ul-Qur’an by Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as}, the Promised Messiah^{as} about Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} x
- The revival of various religions in the early nineteenth century in British India which became an arena of struggle between various religions during the British rule in India..... 1, 3
- The Christian Missionary, William Carey comes to Bengal (1800 AD) to establish ‘The Kingdom of God’, followed by a host of Christian missionaries 1
- Charles Aitchison, the governor of Punjab’s lecture at Simla about the extent of the spread of Christianity in India 1, 2
- John Henry Barrow’s boastful lecture on the prospects of the spread of Christianity in all Islamic lands, giving assurance that ‘Christ in the person of his disciples’ would soon ‘enter the Ka‘bah’ 2-3
- During the British rule in India Christianity had an advantage in its missionary activities over other religions, especially Islam 3
- Muslims, bound by their faith as they were, could not resort to the same foul means as Christian missionaries were using against Islam and its Holy Founder^{sa} 4
- Free use of foul language to disrepute other faiths—a common practice of non-Muslims at the time 4
- Muslims showed respect to the founders of other religions in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Qur’an..... 4

- The admission of ‘Shamsul Akhbār’, a Christian paper, that padre ‘Imād-ud-Dīn’s book ‘Hidāya-tul-Muslimīn’ was detestable and could provoke another mutiny in India.....4-5
- Literature written in great abundance and circulated far and wide to vilify the Holy Prophet^{sa} of Islam. Muslims plunged into despair for their helplessness, being unable to use the same tactics as were employed by padres against Islam.....4-5
- The Muslim scholars adopted a new strategy to make a counter-attack on Christianity. It consisted in the differentiation between Jesus mentioned in the New Testament (whom they could attack on the basis of the Bible) and ‘Īsā^{as} of the Qur’an whom they believed to be a true Prophet of God, free from all blame and blemish6-7
- One to adopt this strategy was Maulawī Raḥmatullāh Muhājir, Meccī, a learned scholar of Sunnī Muslims—excerpts from his book ‘Izālāh Auhām’7-9
- Maulawī Āl-e-Ḥasan uses the same strategy in his book ‘Istifsār’—excerpts from this book.....9-14
- The founder of Brelwī faith Aḥmad Raḍā Khān attacks Christians on the same lines14-15
- Maulawī ‘Abdur Ra’ūf and his attack on Christians, using the same strategy16-25
- One of the Divine missions of the Promised Messiah^{as} was to reform the latter-day Christianity26
- Maulānā Abul Kalām Azād’s tribute to the Promised Messiah^{as} on his demise, acknowledging the Promised Messiah’s Jihad of pen against Christianity and other religions*footnote* 25-26

- The strategy adopted/advocated by the Promised Messiah^{as} for engaging in dialogue with different faiths26-28
- Padres and other Christians did not heed the call of the Promised Messiah^{as} to refrain from abusing the founders of various religions, especially the Holy Prophet^{sa}. The publications of ‘Ummahātul-Mu’minīn’ in which a Christian by the name of Aḥmad Shāh abused the noble wives of the Holy Prophet^{sa}. In response Muslims demanded that the Government should confiscate the book. The Promised Messiah’s stand that it would be counter-productive. His advice to the Muslims about how they should respond to such publications27-28
- The advice of the Promised Messiah^{as} to the British Government regarding what steps it should take with respect to the conflict between different faiths.....28-29
- A glimpse of the way in which the Promised Messiah^{as} refuted Christian doctrines, when Christians attacked Islam. They suffered a crushing defeat at his hand 29
- His rejoinder to Christian Missionaries in response to their accusation that he had insulted Jesus 29
- His well-founded claim that he never abused ‘Īsā^{as}, but only attacked a fictitious person believed to be Jesus by Christians and claimed by them to be the ‘son of God’29-33
- The mullahs join Christians in the accusation about the Promised Messiah^{as}. The example of one excerpt from 'Dāfi-‘ul-Balā’ by the Promised Messiah^{as} cited by the mullahs for their baseless accusation. The comparison drawn by the Promised Messiah^{as}

between Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā ^{as} and Ḥaḍrat Yahyā ^{as} . The meaning and explanation of the word <i>Ḥaṣūr</i>	33-38
• Because of the grudge against the Promised Messiah ^{as} , mullahs of his time denied that padres abused the Holy Prophet of Islam. The Promised Messiah ^{as} invited them to see for themselves the writings of the padres, vilifying the Holy Prophet ^{sa}	38
• The Promised Messiah’s explanation of, and justification for, the approach he adopted in his attack on the padres	38-41
• The highly esteemed and honourable position of Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā ^{as} acknowledged by the Promised Messiah ^{as} . Citation of relevant excerpts from his writings.....	41-47
• Index	49

Foreword

For the last one hundred years or more, there has been a continued and relentless campaign of disinformation and defamation against the Aḥmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at and its Holy Founder, Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad (1835 – 1908), the Promised Messiah and Mahdi. The Jamā‘at has been denying and refuting these baseless and false charges since long.

One of the allegations against the founder of the Jamā‘at is that he used insulting language against Jesus Christ (Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}) in his books. In a bid to give some substance to this allegation, the *Majlis Tahaffuz-e-Khatm-e-Nabuwwat* of Multan, published a booklet entitled *Jesus and the Aḥmadiyya Movement*.

The present booklet is an English version of the Urdu treatise published by Islam International Publications Ltd. UK, which effectively exposes the above baseless charge. It has been rendered into English by Mubasher Ahmad of USA and checked by Munawar Saeed, Munir-ud-Din Shams, Additional Wakīlul Taṣnīf London, England and Professor Amatul Majeed Chaudhry. It is extensively revised and edited by Mirza Anas Ahmad, M.A., M. Litt. (OXON), Wakīlul Ishā‘at, Rabwah, Pakistan. May Allāh bless them all. Amen.

Please note that the references of Rūḥānī Khazā’in are from 1984 London Edition, and the Biblical references are to the New Oxford Annotated

Bible—The Revised Standard (King James) Version, 1973 Edition, published by Oxford University Press.

The Quranic and Biblical references are given by chapter numbers, followed—after colons—by verse number(s). Semicolons are used when more than one reference is given for the same subject.

For the readers who know Urdu it may be mentioned that the Urdu excerpts from ‘Istifsār’ by Maulwī Āl-e-Ḥasan given on pages 9 to 13 are written in old style. For instance گ is written as ك and ے is written as ى. Because they are in quotes we have reproduced them as such. Persian excerpts from Izālah Auhām (pages 7-8) are also reproduced as such without changing the old style of writing.

The name of Muḥammad^{sa}, the Holy Prophet of Islam, has been followed by the symbol ^{sa}, which is an abbreviation for the salutation ‘may peace and blessings of Allāh be upon him.’ The names of other prophets and messengers are followed by the symbol ^{as}, an abbreviation for ‘on whom be peace.’ The actual salutations have not generally been set out in full, but they should nevertheless, be understood as being repeated in full in each case.

In transliterating Arabic words we have followed the following system adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society.

- ا at the beginning of a word, pronounced as *a*, *i*, *u* preceded by a very slight aspiration, like *h* in the English word ‘honour’.
- ث *th*, pronounced like *th* in the English word ‘thing’.
- ح *h*, a guttural aspirate, stronger than *h*.
- خ *kh*, pronounced like the Scotch *ch* in ‘loch’.
- ذ *dh*, pronounced like the English *th* in ‘that’.
- ص *s*, strongly articulated *s*.
- ض *d*, similar to the English *th* in ‘this’.
- ط *t*, strongly articulated palatal *t*.
- ظ *z*, strongly articulated *z*.
- ع ‘, a strong guttural, the pronunciation of which must be learnt by the ear.
- غ *gh*, a sound approached very nearly in the *r* ‘*grasseye*’ in French, and in the German *r*. It requires the muscles of the throat to be in the ‘gargling’ position whilst pronouncing it.
- ق *q*, a deep guttural *k* sound.
- ء ’, a sort of catch in the voice.

Short vowels are represented by *a* for $\text{—}^{\text{—}}$ (like *u* in ‘bud’); *i* for $\text{—}^{\text{—}}$ (like *i* in ‘bid’); *u* for $\text{—}^{\text{—}}$ (like

oo in ‘wood’); the long vowels by \bar{a} for $\text{—}^{\text{ل}}$ or آ (like *a* in ‘father’); \bar{i} for ى $\text{—}^{\text{ـ}}$ or $\text{—}^{\text{ـ}}$ (like *ee* in ‘deep’); *ai* for ى $\text{—}^{\text{ـ}}$ (like *i* in ‘site’); \bar{u} for و $\text{—}^{\text{ـ}}$ (like *oo* in ‘root’); *au* for و $\text{—}^{\text{ـ}}$ (resembling *ou* in ‘sound’).

Please note that in transliterated words the letter ‘e’ is to be pronounced as in ‘prey’ which rhymes with ‘day’; however the pronunciation is flat without the element of English diphthong.*

The consonants not included in the above list have the same phonetic value as in the principal languages of Europe.

It should also be noted that we have not transliterated Arabic words which have become part of English language, e.g., Islam, Mahdi, Qur’an.¹

Please note that for quotes straight commas (straight quotes) are used to differentiate them from the curved commas used in the system of transliteration, ‘ for ع , ’ for ء . Commas as punctuation marks are used according to the normal usage.

For further information please contact any branch of Aḥmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at International.

The Publishers

* This is not included in the system of transliteration by Royal Asiatic Society.

¹ Concise Oxford Dictionary records Qur’an in three forms—Quran, Qur’an and Koran.

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

In the name of Allāh, the Gracious, the Merciful

Our Belief

(In the words of the founder of the Aḥmadiyya Muslim Jamā‘at, Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, peace be upon him.)

“We inform our readers that our belief concerning Jesus is extremely noble. We most sincerely believe that he was a true prophet of Allāh, and He loved him. As the Holy Qur’an tells us, we hold firm faith that he most sincerely believed in our lord and master prophet Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (may peace and blessings of Allāh be on him) for his salvation, and that he was one of the hundreds of obedient servants of the Law of Moses. Therefore, we hold a great esteem for him in accordance with his exalted status.”

(Nūr-ul-Qur’an, Part 2, Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Vol. 9, p. 374.)

In the subcontinent of India, almost two centuries ago, various religious movements experienced a wave of revival, and a struggle started among them to prove their superiority over each other.

In 1800, a Christian missionary, William Carey, came to Bengal to establish “the Kingdom of God”. After that, a regular flow of Christian missionaries started to arrive in India. With the passage of time, this flow of Christian missionaries gained a greater momentum. Within half a century, Christianity got so well-established that the Governor of the Punjab, Charles Aitchison, commenting upon the speedy growth of Christianity claimed in 1888 that the number of Christians had nearly reached the mark of one million in India. In his speech at Simla, India, he, addressing a meeting of Indian Christian Association, said:

“... it may surprise some who have not had an opportunity of looking into the matter to learn that Christianity in India is spreading four or five times as

fast as the ordinary population, and that the native Christians now number a million of souls.”²

In 1897, a famous American evangelist, John Henry Barrows, was invited to visit India. He made a stormy tour and delivered lectures at many places. In these lectures he painted a picture of Christian Empire’s greatness in majestic words, and very proudly he talked about Christianity’s progress in the Islamic countries.

He stated:

“...I might sketch the movement in Mussalman lands, which has touched with radiance of the Cross the Lebanon and Persian mountains, as well as the waters of the Bosphorus, and which is the sure harbinger of the day when Cairo and Damascus and Teheran (sic) shall be the servants of Jesus, and when even the solitudes³ (sic) of Arabia shall be peirced, and Christ, in the person of his disciples, shall enter the Ka‘bah of Mecca and the whole truth shall at last be there spoken,

² The Missions, of the Church Missionary Society and the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society in the Punjab and Sindh, by the late Rev. Robert Clark, M.A., published by Church Missionary Society London 1904, page 155

³ Probably ‘solitude’; seems to be a misprint. [Publisher]

“This is eternal life that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”⁴

The Indian subcontinent was virtually a fighting arena in which the religions of the world were wrestling with each other; especially Hinduism, Christianity and Islam were engaged in this struggle with great enthusiasm on a grand scale. At this point in time the scholars of various religions, other than those of Islam, were trying their utmost to defeat their opponents by all means, fair and foul. Thus they sometimes engaged in a disagreeable way by vilifying the founders of other religions. In doing so, they went to the extreme. By reviling the religious founders of other faiths, they thought that the more they hurt the feelings of their opponents, the better their own religion might look.

At that time, the British ruled over India and obviously Christianity had the upper hand. The Christians had the most favourable circumstances for preaching, while Muslims were at a great disadvantage. For Muslims it is obligatory to respect all prophets of God and the spiritual guides in accordance with the teaching of their holy book, the Qur'an. It is part of

⁴ Barrows Lectures 1896-97, 'Christianity, The World Wide Religion', by John Henry Barrows, p. 42.

their faith to believe that they all are righteous and sinless. Therefore, for Muslims it is inconceivable to deride anyone of them, let alone insult them—which indeed is a great sin.

On the other hand, the holy scripture of Christians did not require them to believe in any other prophet after Jesus. Therefore, the Christians felt free to attack Islam and to ridicule the prophet of Islam - the most immaculate of all the prophets, the best among the best, the chief of the created beings - Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad Muṣṭafā^{sa}. They had launched a vicious attack on his noble character, and crossed all limits of human decency while attacking him most cruelly. Books were published in their thousands in the subcontinent which hurled abuse and profanity upon our lord and master Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad Muṣṭafā^{sa}. One can guess the depth of such obnoxious material by the mere fact that even some Christians were alarmed on the publication of ‘Hidāyatul Muslimīn’ by padre ‘Imād-ud-Dīn. A Christian paper, ‘Shamsul Akhbār’, Lucknow, stated in its October 15, 1875 edition:

“There is nothing more detestable than padre ‘Imād-ud-Dīn’s publications which contain foul expressions. And if there occurs another mutiny like

that of 1857, it would be caused by the filthy language and absurdities of this person.”⁵

Protection granted by the Government and the opportunity to misuse religious freedom made the Christian clergy very bold in their foul and scornful expressions against Islam and its holy founder. To appreciate how much the feelings of Muslims would have been hurt in those days, one has only to see the strong emotional reaction of Muslims recently evoked by ‘Satanic Verses’ written by Salmān Rushdī, the notorious and shameless novelist.

In this hostile environment, without having any political power, and being restrained by the dictates of his faith, every Muslim was being tormented. A defeatist attitude was sinking deep in their hearts, and Muslims felt more and more helpless. If they used the filthy language against Jesus^{as} as the Christian ministers were using against the Holy Prophet

⁵ In addition, examples of extremely foul language are found in the following documents produced by Christian clergymen:

1. Dāfi‘-ul-Buhtān by padre Roncallian,
2. Masīḥ-ud-Dajjāl by Master Rāmchandar ‘Īṣā’ī,
3. Sīrat-ul-Masīḥ wal Muḥammad by padre Thākur Dās,
4. Andrūna-e-Bible by Deputy ‘Abdullāh Ātham,
5. Muḥammad Kī Tawārīkh Kā Ijmāl by padre William,
6. Review Barāhīn-e-Aḥmadiyyah by padre Thākur Dās,
7. Sawāniḥ ‘Umrī Muḥammad Ṣāḥib by Aurang Washington,
8. Akhbār Nūr Afshān, American Mission Press, Ludhiānah,
9. Taftīsh-ul-Islam by padre Rogers,
10. Nabī Ma‘ṣūm, American Press, Ludhiānah, etc.

Muḥammad^{sa}, that would tantamount to committing a sin and going against the grain of their beliefs.

Under the circumstances, the Muslim scholars devised a strategy in response to the vile attacks that Christians were making to malign the Holy Prophet of Islam^{sa}. They noticed that there was a difference between the Quranic Messiah—the great prophet of God, ‘Īsā^{as} bin Maryam^{as}—and the Biblical Messiah presented in the Gospels. The Jesus depicted by the New Testament was not the real Jesus who was sent by God as a messenger to the Israelites. Therefore, the Muslim scholars made the mythical person called ‘Jesus’ in the Gospels a target of their attack. With Biblical references, they represented this fictitious Jesus and disparaged him. It was done only to make Christians realize their folly and to stop them from abusing the Holy Prophet of Islam, Muḥammad^{sa}, the immaculate, the most truthful, the best of all the prophets. Thus, it was done under a compelling need. There was no other way left. No one who loves Islam and the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{sa} should find fault with this approach. It would be a great injustice if one blames those who were defending Islam one hundred years ago under most unfavourable circumstances and alleges that Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}, a prophet of God, was insulted. This allegation is made out of sheer mischief

merely to incite negative feelings. Those Muslim scholars did not insult the honoured person of Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsa^{as}. They only reflected upon the mythical person presented in the Gospels and accepted by Christians as Jesus. That particular person had nothing to do with ‘Īsā bin Maryam^{as}, the prophet of Allāh, mentioned in the Holy Qur’an.

For example, following are a few quotations of the Muslim scholars of the time:

1. Maulawī Raḥmatullāh Muhājir Meccī, a learned scholar among the Sunnī Muslims, in his book ‘Izālah Auhām’, writes:

"اکثر معجزات عیسویہ را معجزات ندانند زیرا کہ مثل انہا ساحران ہم میسازند و یہود
آنجناب را چون نبی نمیدانند در ہنمو معجزات ساحر میگویند۔" ۶

(i) “Most of the miracles attributed to Jesus cannot be considered as miracles because magicians could also perform such feats. That is why the Jews do not accept him as a prophet and they consider his miracles as those of a magician.”⁷

"جناب مسیح اقرار میفرمایند کہ مسیحی علیہ السلام نہ نان میخورند نہ شراب می
آشامیدند و آنجناب شراب ہم می نوشیدند و مسیحی علیہ السلام در بیابان می مانند و

صفحہ ۱۲۹ ۶

7 page 129

همراه جناب مسیح بسیار زنان همراه می گشتند و مال خود می خورانیدند و زنان فاشه پائنا
آنجناب را بوسیدند و آنجناب مرتا و مریم را دوست میداشتند و خود شراب برای
نوشیدن دیگر کسان عطا میفرمودند" 8

(ii) "The Messiah himself affirms that John, peace be upon him, neither ate bread, nor did he consume wine⁹ and that John, peace be upon him, lived in the wilderness ¹⁰ . But Jesus was accompanied in his journeys by several women¹¹ who used to provide for him out of their earnings¹²; prostitutes used to kiss his feet ¹³ ; Martha and Mary (Magdalene) were his friends ¹⁴ ; and he drank wine and offered it to others¹⁵." ¹⁶

"و... یهودا فرزند سعادت مندشان از زوجه پسر خود زنا کرد و حامله گشت و فارض راکه

از اباؤ و اجداد داؤد و سلیمان و عیسی علیم السلام بود" ¹⁷

8 صفحه ۳۰

⁹ Luke 7:33. [Publisher]

¹⁰ Mark 1:4. [Publisher]

¹¹ Mathew 27:55-56; Luke 8:1-3. [Publisher]

¹² Luke 8:3. [Publisher]

¹³ Luke 7:37-38. [Publisher]

¹⁴ John 11:5. [Publisher]

¹⁵ John 2:1-11. [Publisher]

¹⁶ Page 370

¹⁷ صفحه ۳۰۵

(iii) “And...Judah committed adultery with the wife of his son, consequently she became pregnant and gave birth to Perez who was among the forefathers of David, Solomon and Jesus, peace be on them.”¹⁸

2. This book is full of such things, advanced to counter Christian allegations. In the margin of this book, a renowned scholar of Ahl-e-Sunnat wal-Jamā‘at, Maulawī Āl-e-Ḥasan writes in Istifsār:

”اؤر زری کریبان میں سر ڈال کر دیکھو کہ معاذ اللہ حضرت عیسیٰ کے نسبنامہ
مادری میں دؤجکہ تم آپہی زنا ثابت کرتی ہو۔“¹⁹

(i) “And reflect a little bit on your own pathetic condition. God forbid! in the geneology of the mother of Jesus you yourself admit of acts of adultery on two occasions.”²⁰

”دوسرے یہہ کہ حضرت عیسیٰ اپہنی مخالفونکو کتا کہتی تہی اگر ہم بہی اؤنکی مخالفونکو

¹⁸ Page 405; See Genesis 38:12-29, Mathew 1:2-6. [Publisher]

¹⁹ یعنی تمارا اؤر اؤریا۔ ۷۳

²⁰ Page 73.

See i Genesis 38:12-29.
Mathew 1:3, 4.

ii Samual chapters 11 and 12.

Mathew counts Solomon as one of the fathers of Mary and the above reference of Samual admits that Soloman’s mother was an adulteress.

See also Dictionary of the Bible by John. L McKaenzie. [Publisher]

کتا کہیں تو دینے تہذیب اخلاق سی بعید نہیں بلکہ عین تقلید عیسوی ہی "۔²¹

(ii) "Secondly, Jesus used to call his opponents 'dogs'²². Therefore, if we call his opponents dogs, it would not be against moral civility; in doing so we shall be exactly following Jesus."²³

"(عیسیٰ بن مریم)... کہ اخر در ماندہ ہو کر دنیا سی اؤنہون نی وفات پائی " ²⁴

(iii) "(Jesus son of Mary)... at last left this world, having lived a miserable life here."²⁵

"اؤر سب عقلا جانتی ہیں کہ بہت سی اقسام سحر کی مشابہ ہیں معجزات سی
خصوصا معجزات موسویہ اؤر عیسویہ سے " ²⁶

(iv) "And all wise people know that many kinds of magic resemble miracles, especially the miracles of Moses and Jesus."²⁷

"یسوع نی کہا کہ لومڑیوں کی لسی کہہ میں اؤر پرندوں کی لسی بسیری میں پر میری لسی
کہیں سر رکھنی کی جکہ نہیں ہے دیکو یہہ شاعرانہ مبالغہ ہی اؤر صریح دنیا کی تنکی

²¹ ۹۸۔

²² Mathew 7:6. [Publisher]

²³ Page 98

²⁴ ۲۳۔

²⁵ Page 232

²⁶ ۳۳۶۔

²⁷ Page 336

سی شکایت کرنا کہ اقل ترین امور ہی "۔²⁸

(v) "Jesus said that foxes have holes and birds have nests but for him there is no place to lay his head.²⁹ Now, this is a poetic exaggeration. It is extremely deplorable to complain of hardships of mundane life."³⁰

"اؤلکا (پادری صاحبان کا) اصل دین و ایمان ا کر یہ ٹہرا ہی کہ خدا مریم کی رحم
مین جنین بن کر خون حیض کا کئی مہینے تک کہتا رہا اور علقہ سی مضغہ بنا اور
مضغی سی گوشت اور اسمین ہڈیان بنین بعد اوسکی مخرج معلوم سی نکلا اور ہلکا
موتتا رہا یہاں تک کہ جوان ہو کر اپنی بندی کیے کا مرید ہوا اور آخر کار ملعون ہو کر
تین دن دوڑخ مین رہا"³¹

(vi) "The religion and faith of them (Christian padres) is that God, having become a foetus in the womb of Mary, nourished himself for months with menstrual blood; then he grew into a shapeless lump from the clot of blood, later, from this shapeless lump, he grew into flesh & bones. Then he came out of her vaginal tract, excreted urine and faeces. On becoming

²⁸ ۳۳۹۔

²⁹ See Mathew 8:20.

The verse reads as:

"And Jesus said to him, 'Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head'". [Publisher]

³⁰ Page 349

³¹ ۳۵۰۔۳۵۱

of age he became a disciple of his own servant (i.e. that of John the Baptist) and at the end he remained in hell for three days having been cursed by God.”³²

”انجیل اوّل کے باب یازدہم کے درس نوزدہم میں لکھا ہی کہ بڑی کماؤ اور بڑی شرابی تھی۔“³³

(vii) “In chapter eleven verse nineteen of first Gospel (Mathew), it is written (that Jesus) was a glutton and a wine-drinker.”³⁴

”اشعیا اور عیسیٰ علیہما السلام کے بعضی بلکہ اکثر پیش کوئیان میں صرف بطور معنی یا خواب کے میں جس پر چاہو منطبق کر لویا باعتبار ظاہری معنوں کی محض چوٹہ میں یا مانند کلام یوحنا کی کہ محض مجذوبوں کی سی بڑی ہی ویسی پیشین کوئیان البتہ قرآن میں نہیں ہیں“³⁵

(viii) “Some or most prophecies of Isiah and Jesus (on whom be peace) are like riddles or fantasies so that you may fit them anywhere you wish, or, if taken literally, they are only lies. Or like the words of Jonah

³² Pages; 350-351

³³ ۳۵۳۔

³⁴ Page 353; See Mathew 11:18-19 for the full context and exact wording of the verse. [Publisher]

³⁵ ۳۶۶۔۔۳۶۵

they are nonsensical prattle of madmen. And indeed such prophecies are not found in the Qur'an.”³⁶

”پس معلوم ہوا کہ حضرت عیسیٰ کا سب بیان معاذ اللہ جو تہہ ہی اڈ کر امتین اکر بالفرض ہوئی بھی ہون تو وہیسی ہونگی جیسی میح دجال سی ہونی والی مین ”³⁷

(ix) “Thus it is apparent that the entire statement of Jesus is a lie. And if indeed he showed miracles they were no more than the ones the Antichrist will show.”³⁸

”تیسرے انجیل کی اتھوین^۱ باب کے دوسرے اڈرتیسری درس سی ظاہر ہی کہ بہتیری رنڈیان اپنی مال (سے) حضرت عیسیٰ کے خدمت کرتی تھیں... پس اکر کوئی یہودی ازراہ نبیثت اڈر بدبطنی کی کہی کہ حضرت عیسیٰ خوشرو، جوان تھی رنڈیان ان کی ساتھ صرف حرامکاری لی³⁹ لسی رہتی تھیں اسیواسطے حضرت عیسیٰ نے بیاہ نکلیا اڈر ظاہریمہ کرتی تھی کہ مجھی عورت سی رغبت نہیں تو کیا جواب ہوگا اڈر پہلی انجیل کے باب یازدہم کی درس نوزدہم مین حضرت عیسیٰ نے مخالفو کا خیال اپنی حق مین قبول کر کی کہا کہ مین تو بڑا کماؤ اڈر شرابی ہون پس دوئون باتون کی ملانے سے اڈر شراب کے بد مستیونکی لحاظ سی جو کوئی کچھ بدکانے نکر سی سو تھوڑا ہی اڈر دشمن کی نظر مین ان باتونسی کیسی تن آسانے اڈر

³⁶ Page 365-366

³⁷ ۳۶۹۔

³⁸ Page 369

نقل بطابق اصل کی 'ہونا چاہیے۔ (ہیش) ³⁹

نبی ریاضتی حضرت عیسیٰ کے بوجہ جاتی ہے۔" 40

(x) From the eighth chapter verses two and three of the third Gospel it is evident that many prostitutes used to serve Jesus with their (illicitly earned) money⁴¹. Hence, if a Jew, out of sheer mischief or wickedness, claims that Jesus was a handsome man and the prostitutes stayed with him only for adultery—that is the reason why Jesus did not marry and pretended that he was not interested in women—what would be your reply to this (allegation)? Moreover, in chapter eleven verse nineteen of the first Gospel (Mathew) Jesus, admitting the opinion of his opponents about him, confesses that he was a glutton and wine-drinker. Thus combining the two facts (of the life of Jesus i.e. he lived with prostitutes and was used to drinking wine) and in view of the evil effects of liquor one would be justified to go to any extent in having evil suspicions about his character. To the enemies of Jesus, his indulgence and licentiousness were plainly evident.”⁴²

⁴⁰ ۳۹۱-۳۹۰

⁴¹ In Luke 8:3 as given in the New Oxford Annotated Bible, the edition we are using here for Biblical references, translates the relevant part of the verses as: "...who provided for them ^zout of their means"; but gives the note: "^zOther ancient authorities read him'. [Publisher]

⁴² Pages 390-391

3. The founder of the Brelawī faith, the great Imām of Ahl-e-Sunnat, Maulānā Maulawī Shāh Aḥmad Raḍa Khān writes:

"ہاں ہاں عیسائیوں کا خدا مخلوق کے مارے سے دم گنوا کر باپ کے پاس گیا
 اُس نے اکلوتے کی یہ عزت کی اُس کی مظلومی و بے گناہی کی یہ داد دی کہ
 اُسے دوزخ میں جھونک دیا اور اُس کے بدلے اُسے تین دن جہنم میں بھونا۔
 ایسے کو جو روٹی اور گوشت کھاتا ہے اور سفر سے آکر اپنے پاؤں دھلوا کر درخت
 کے نیچے آرام کرتا ہے درخت اُونچا اور وہ نیچا ہے۔ ایسے کو جسکا بیٹا
 اُسے جلال بخشا ہے آریوں کے ایشور کی تو ماں اُسکی جان کی حفاظت کرتی تھی
 عیسائیوں کے خدا کا بیٹا اُسے عزت بخشا ہے کیوں نہ ہو سپوت ایسے ہی ہوتے
 میں اسپر پھر اُسے بیخفا جہنم میں جھونکنا کیسی محن کشی نا انصافی ہے۔ ایسے کو جو
 یقیناً دغا باز ہے۔ پچھتا تا بھی ہے تھکت جاتا بھی ہے۔ ایسے کو جسکی دُجو رہیں
 میں دُونوں پکی زنا کار حد بھر کی فاشہ۔ ایسے کو جسکے لئے زنا کی کافی فاشہ کی خرچی
 کمال مقدس پاک کائی ہے" ⁴³

“Yes, yes! The God of Christians, after getting killed by those he had created, went to his father, but he threw him into hell—and that is how he bestowed honour on him and showed appreciation for his suffering and sinlessness. In place of others (who have committed sins), he roasted him (his innocent son) for

العلیایا النبویة فی الفتاوی الرضویة، جلد کتاب الطہارہ باب التیمم ۴۰۔۔۔ ۴۱، ناشر شیخ غلام علی اینڈ سنز تاجران کتب کشمیری بازار لاہور 43

three days in hell. (Jesus is a god) who eats bread and meat and on his return from his journey, having got his feet washed, he rests under a tree—the tree is higher and he is lower. (God the father) is such that his son invests majesty in him. The mother of the god of Aryās⁴⁴ used to protect the life of her son, but the son of god of Christians bestows honour on his father—and why not sons are meant to be gracious to their fathers! How unjust and ungrateful is the father who, in spite of every thing, throws his son, without any fault of his, into hell. The Christian god is treacherous and regretful. He has two consorts who are both confirmed adulterous and inveterate prostitutes⁴⁵. He is a god for whom the earnings from adultery and expenditure of a prostitute are perfectly sanctified and pure (i.e. to him the money prostitutes earn and spend on him is pure).”⁴⁶

⁴⁴ A Hindu sect. [Publisher]

⁴⁵ Can also be translated as 'confirmed adulterous and extremely obscene'.

⁴⁶ Al-‘Aṭāya An-Nabawīyyah Fil-Fatāwā Ar-Raḍwīyyah’, Vol. 1, Pages 740-741 Kitābul Ṭahārah Bābū Al-tayammum, Publisher: Sheikh Ghulam Ali & Sons, Lahore.

4. In the Friday issue of March 31, 1939, of the paper 'Ahle-Hadīth'⁴⁷, Maulawī 'Abdur Ra'ūf, Ghand-e-Nagrī, District Bastī, India, writes:

"صاف معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ مسیح خود اپنے اقرار کے مطابق کوئی نیک انسان نہ تھے۔ شاید کوئی کہے کہ کسر نفسی سے مسیح نے ایسا کہا تو اس کا جواب یہ ہے کہ عیسائیوں کے اعتقاد کے مطابق مسیح کی انسانیت سب انسانوں کی انسانیت سے برتر ہے اور اس میں گناہ اور خطا کاری کا کوئی شائبہ نہیں۔ تو پھر جب وہاں کسی طرح کا نقص اور گناہ نہیں تو پھر مسیح کا اپنے آپ کو نکوئی کا مصداق نہ قرار دینا کیسے صحیح ہو سکتا ہے کیونکہ کسر نفسی سے وہی قول صحیح ہو سکتا ہے جس کی صحت کسی طرح سے ہو سکے۔ مثلاً اور لوگ کیسے ہی نیک ہوں مگر چونکہ ان کی انسانیت میں نقص ہے تو بنا بریں وہ اپنے کو ناقص کہہ سکتا ہے مگر حضرت مسیح کی انسانیت ہر برائی سے منزہ ہے اس لئے وہاں نکوئی کی نفی کسی طرح صحیح نہیں ہو سکتی۔ پس جب کسر نفسی کا عذر باطل ہو تو نکوئی کی نفی کرنے سے مسیح کا اور انسانوں کی طرح غیر معصوم ہونا بداہتہ ثابت ہوا۔ اسی طرح انجیل کے مطالعہ سے یہ بھی معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ مسیح نے اجنبی عورتوں سے اپنے سر پر عطر ڈلوایا (دیکھو متی ۲۶/۶، مرقس ۱۴/۳، یوحنا ۱۲/۶) یوحنا میں تو یہ بھی لکھا ہے کہ آدھ سیر ناص عطر کا استعمال اس عورت سے آپ نے کرایا۔ اس نے کچھ سر پر ڈالا (مرقس) کچھ پاؤں پر ملا۔ (یوحنا)

⁴⁷ The paper was owned and published, from Amritsar, India, by Abū'al Wafā Maulawī Sanā'ullāh, a known scholar of Ahl-e-Hadīth—a sect of Islam. [Publisher]

لوقا میں تو یہ بھی لکھا ہے کہ

ایک عورت نے جو اس شہر کی بدچلن اور فاشہ عورت تھی مسیح کا پاؤں دھویا پھر اپنے بالوں سے پونچھا پھر انہیں چوما اور ان پر عطر ملا۔ (لوقا ۳۶/۷)

یہ واقعہ صرف لوقا میں ہے۔

ظاہر ہے کہ اجنبی عورت بلکہ فاشہ اور بدچلن عورت سے سر کو اور پاؤں کو ملوانا اور وہ بھی اس کے بالوں سے ملا جانا کس قدر احتیاط کے خلاف کام ہے۔ اس قسم کے کام شریعت الہیہ کے صریح خلاف ہیں۔ امثال میں کیا خوب لکھا ہے کہ

بیگانہ عورت تنگ گڑھا ہے اور فاشہ گہری خندق ہے وہ راہزن کی طرح گھات میں لگی ہے اور بنی آدم میں بدکاروں کا شمار بڑھاتی ہے۔ (امثال باب ۲۳ فقرہ ۲۸) اسی طرح انجیل کے مطالعہ سے یہ بھی معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ معجزہ سے شراب سازی کا کام لے کر اپنا جلال ظاہر کرتے تھے۔ (دیکھو انجیل یوحنا ۲/۹)

(یہ واقعہ صرف یوحنا میں ہے)

دیکھو شراب جیسے ام البنائت چیز کا بنانا اور شادی کی دعوت کے لئے اس شراب کو پیش کرنا اور خود شرابی اہل مجلس کی دعوت میں معہ والدہ کے شریک ہونا اسی یوحنا میں موجود ہے۔ حالانکہ شراب عہد عتیق کی کتابوں میں قطعی حرام قرار پائی تھی۔ حضرت یسعیاہ شراب پینے والوں کی بابت فرماتے ہیں:-

ان پر افسوس جو مے پینے میں زور آور اور شراب ملانے میں پہلوان میں۔ (دیکھو
یسعیاہ باب ۵ فقرہ ۲۲) حضرت ہو سلیع فرماتے ہیں:-

بدکاری (48) اور مے اور نجی مے سے بصیرت جاتی رہتی ہے۔ (ہو سلیع ۴/۱۱)
دانی ایل نبی بھی شراب کو نجس اور ناپاک کرنیوالی بتلاتے ہیں۔ (دانی ایل باب
اؤل فقرہ ۸)

باوجود اس کے کہ اکثر عمد عتیق کی کتابوں میں اسکی ممانعت اور مذمت مذکور تھی۔
لیکن مسیح نے شرائع انبیاء سابقہ کی کچھ پر واه نہ کی اور بقول یوحنا شراب بنائی اور
شرابی مجلس میں معہ والدہ کے شریک ہوئے۔ حالانکہ خود ہی فرماتے ہیں:-
یہ نہ سمجھو کہ میں تورات یا نبیوں کی کتابوں کو منسوخ کرنے آیا ہوں۔ منسوخ کرنے
نہیں بلکہ پورا کرنے آیا ہوں۔ (متی ۵/۱۷)

ان حالات میں مسیح کی شراب سازی خلاف شریعت فعل ہے۔
انجیل کے مطالعہ سے ہمیں یہ بھی معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ مسیح نے کذب کو روار کھا
ہے۔ چنانچہ حضرت مسیح کا قول سردار کی لڑکی کی بابت اس طرح منقول ہے:-
تم کیوں غل مچاتے اور روتے ہو لڑکی مر نہیں گئی بلکہ سوتی ہے۔ (متی ۹/۱۸
مرقس ۵/۳۹ لوقا ۸/۵۳)

اس کے بعد مسیح نے کہا اے لڑکی اٹھ۔ وہ لڑکی اٹھ کر چلنے پھرنے لگی۔ اس
موقعہ پر عیسائی کہتے ہیں کہ وہ لڑکی مر گئی تھی حضرت مسیح کے معجزہ سے زندہ

نوٹ: انگریزی بائبل لگت جیمز ورسن میں بدکاری کا لفظ نہیں۔ اردو بائبل میں ہے۔ دیکھیں اس کتاب کا صفحہ ۲۳ (پبلشر) 48

ہوئی۔ چنانچہ لوقا سے بھی اس کی تائید ہوتی ہے 49۔ لوقا کے الفاظ یہ ہیں :-

اُس کی رُوح پھر آئی اور وہ اسی دم اُٹھی۔ (اس بیان میں لوقا متفرد ہے)
رُوح پھر آنا دلالت کرتا ہے کہ اس کی رُوح نکل چکی تھی دو بارہ زندہ ہوئی۔ لہذا
ضرور تسلیم کرنا پڑیگا کہ مسیح نے اس جگہ ناراست بات کہی اور خلاف واقعہ
شہادت دی۔ حالانکہ مسیح نے خلاف واقعہ بات کرنے سے خود ہی شاکر دوں
کو منع کیا ہے۔ (مرقس باب ۱۶/۱۹) خون نہ کر زنا نہ کر چوری نہ کر جھوٹی گواہی نہ
دے۔ امثال ۵/۱۹ میں ہے کہ جھوٹا گواہ بے سزا نہ چھوٹے گا اور جھوٹ
بولنے والا رہائی نہ پائیگا۔

اسی طرح یوحنا میں ہے کہ

لوگوں نے مسیح سے کہا کہ تم عید میں جاؤ میں ابھی اس عید میں نہیں جاتا۔ لیکن
جب اس کے بھائی عید میں چلے گئے اس وقت وہ بھی گیا۔ (یوحنا ۸/۷)
دیکھو حضرت مسیح نے عید میں جانے سے انکار کیا۔ اور پھر چھپ کے گئے۔
اور متی کے حوالہ سے یہ بھی ثابت ہوتا ہے کہ مسیح نے جھوٹ بولنے اور کھتان
حق کرنے کی اجازت بھی دی ہے۔ چنانچہ متی میں ہے :-

تب اس وقت اس نے علم دیا کہ کسی کو نہ بتانا کہ یہ یسوع مسیح
ہے۔ (متی ۱۶/۲۰)

یہ مضمون لوقا اور مرقس میں بھی ہے۔

اس بات کی تائید کہ لوقا مرگئی تھی۔ (دہلیش) 49

ظاہر ہے کہ جب امر حق کے پوشیدہ کرنے کا حکم فرمایا تو صراحتاً ثابت ہوا کہ اگر کہیں بتانے ہی کی ضرورت پڑے تو خلاف حق ناراست بات کہہ دو۔ ان واقعات سے مسیح کی تعلیم متعلقہ صدق و کذب ظاہر و باہر ہے۔

(i) “It is evident that Jesus, according to his own confession, was not a pious man⁵⁰. Perhaps someone may say that he was being humble. But the response to this explanation is that according to the Christian belief, humanity of Jesus is better than humanity of all the men and there is no iota of doubt in his sinlessness. If there is no doubt in his sinlessness, then how could Jesus himself say that he is not pious! To say something in humility is possible only if it can be verified by some other means. For example, if a person is very pious, yet has some shortcomings in his humanity, he may say that he is not perfect. But if the humanity of the Messiah is devoid of every imperfection or sinfulness, his confessions of not being good cannot be attributed to his humility. Thus, the argument that his confession was out of his humility is not at all valid. It is very clear that his negating himself to be good brings him at the level of other humans and proves him not to be sinless. In the same way the study

⁵⁰ Mark 10:18. [Publisher]

of the Gospels tells us that women anointed him with fragrant oil, pouring it on his head.⁵¹

It is written in the Gospel of John that a pound of very costly oil was used by a woman, some she poured on his head (Mark) and some she used to anoint his feet.⁵²

In the Gospel of Luke it is written that a sinful woman in the city washed his feet and wiped them with her hair and kissed them and anointed them with fragrant oil.⁵³ This incident is narrated only in Luke.

Evidently, to let an unrelated or a sinful woman to anoint the head and feet and wipe them with her hair is much against precaution. Such acts are against the Divine Law. It is well-written in the Book of Proverbs:

“For a harlot is a deep pit;
an adventurous in a narrow well.
She lies in wait like a robber
and increases the faithless among men.”⁵⁴

In the same way the Bible tells us that he made wine through power of miracle and impressed others

⁵¹ Matthew 26:6, 7; Mark 14:3; John 12:3.

⁵² Mark 14:3; John 12:3

⁵³ Luke 7:37

⁵⁴ Proverbs 23:27, 28

with his majesty. This incident is narrated only in John.⁵⁵

To make liquor which is the root of all evils, to offer it at a wedding ceremony and to attend the wedding along with his mother on the invitation of liquor drinkers, all this is written in the Gospel of John.⁵⁶ Yet the use of wine was prohibited in the Old Testament.

Concerning wine, Isaiah says:

“Woe to those who are heroes at
drinking wine,
and valiant men in mixing strong drink.”⁵⁷

(ii) Hosea says:

“Wine and new wine
take away the understanding.”⁵⁸

And the prophet Daniel also considers wine as defiling and filthy.⁵⁹

Despite the fact that most of the books of the Old Testament prohibit, and censure the use of wine, Jesus did not care about the Laws upheld by the prophets.

⁵⁵ John 2:6-9

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ Isaiah 5:22

⁵⁸ Hosea 4:11

⁵⁹ Daniel 1:8

According to the Gospel of John he himself made wine, and attended a wine drinking ceremony with his mother.⁶⁰ And yet he himself says: “Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them.”⁶¹

Thus, to make wine was an act against the Divine Law.

(iii) The study of the Gospels indicates that lying was practiced by Jesus. About a ruler’s daughter who had died, he said: “Why make this commotion and weep? The girl is not dead, but sleeping.”⁶²

After that, Jesus said to the girl: “Little girl, arise.” Here, the Christians say that the girl was dead. But in the words of Luke: ‘Then her spirit returned, and she arose immediately.’ (This statement is only in Luke.) Returning of the spirit indicates that her spirit had departed her body and on its return she came to life again. Therefore, we have to accept that Jesus said something which was not true and gave a false testimony. Actually Jesus himself prohibits his

⁶⁰ John 2:6-9

⁶¹ Matthew 5:17

⁶² Matthew 9:23-25, Luke 8:49-55

disciples from bearing false witness: “Do not kill, Do not commit adultery, ... Do not bear false witness.”⁶³

It is written in the Book of Proverbs:

“A false witness will not go
unpunished,
and he who utter lies will not
escape.”⁶⁴

Similarly, in the Gospel of John, we read that Jesus said to his brothers: “Go to the feast yourselves; I am not going to this feast, for my time has not yet fully come.”⁶⁵

But when his brothers had gone, then he also went up to the feast, not openly, but, as it were, in secret.⁶⁶ Thus we see that Jesus denied going to the feast, but then he went there in secret!

With reference to the Gospel of Matthew, it could be proven that Jesus allowed to tell a lie and to hide the truth: “Then he strictly charged the disciples to tell no one that he was Jesus the Christ.”⁶⁷

⁶³ Mark 10:19. The full verse includes the injunction— ‘...Do not steal...’ [Publisher]

⁶⁴ Proverbs 19:5

⁶⁵ John 7:8

⁶⁶ John 7:10 [Publisher].

⁶⁷ Matthew 16:20

This statement is also written in the Gospels of Luke and Mark⁶⁸. When he commanded to hide a truth it becomes evident that he allowed, whenever it may be necessary, to say incorrect and untrue things.”⁶⁹

The objectives of this newspaper included “to propagate the religion of Islam and the Sunnah of the Prophet^{as}”.

In short, after reading the above quotations, the reader may easily understand that the Jesus mentioned in them is that of the Gospels.

Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad Qādiyānī, the Promised Messiah^{as} was commissioned, among other things, to reform latter-day Christianity. This is clearly stated in the sayings of the Holy Prophet^{sa} when he prophesied about the second coming of ‘Īsā^{as} (of the Messiah).⁷⁰ Therefore, not only he fully participated in this Jihād, but also played the role of a successful general.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Luke 9:18-21; Mark 8:27-30. [Publisher]

⁶⁹ ‘Ahl-e-Ḥadīth’, March 31, 1939, pp. 8-9

⁷⁰ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī: Kitābul Anbiyā, Bābu Nuzūli ‘Īsā bin Maryama; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: Kitābul ‘Īmān, Bābu Biyān-e-‘Īsā. [Publisher]

⁷¹ A famous political and religious leader of the Indian sub-continent, Maulānā Abul Kalām Āzād, who was also an acclaimed writer, wrote about this Jihad of the Promised Messiah peace be upon him in these truth bearing words:

“From our hearts we cannot erase the memory of the time when Islam was encircled by vicious attacks of its enemies. Although the Muslims were duty-

First of all, for a long time he admonished scholars of all religions to refrain, in religious debates, from throwing dirt on each others' faiths. Instead, the approach should be to bring forth the good points of their own faiths.

Secondly, he presented the principle that if one wished to refute beliefs of a religion, one must put forward one's arguments within the context of accepted and established beliefs of that particular religion.

Thirdly, in the same manner, the good qualities and praiseworthy characteristics of the founders of

bound under the commandment of God, the True Defender, to protect Islam by all possible means, but they were powerless and incapable to do so. They were sobbing under the punishment for their own mistakes. On one hand, the scope of extended attacks on Islam was such that the entire Christian world was determined to blow out the divinely lit light of Islam considering it the greatest hurdle in its way. Great intellectual powers and enormous wealth were supporting these attacks enthusiastically. On the other hand, condition to defend Islam was so miserable that there were not even arrows in response of gun shots.

There was no defence and no power to strike back.... Under these conditions Muslims initiated a defence in which Mirzā Ṣāhib had a significant part to play. This defense shattered earlier Christian influence which they had gained under the protective life support of the British Empire. And thus millions of Muslims were protected from a greater and more severe Christian assault. ... The illusory grandeur of Christianity itself began to crumble... Thus, this service of Mirzā Ṣāhib will keep the coming generations obliged for ever. In this Jihad of the pen in defence of Islam, he was in the front line and he left behind him such literature that would last as long as the Muslims have lifeblood in their veins and love of Islam in their national conscience."

(Newspaper "Wakīl", Amritsar, May 1908. See "Badr" Qādiān, June 18, 1908)

religions should be presented instead of abusing and degrading them.

This method became popular as it was totally based upon principles of peace and justice. But foul-mouthed and depraved padres continued their disgusting vulgarities. In 1897, a Christian by the name of Aḥmad Shāh wrote a book entitled “Ummahātul Mu’minīn” (“Mothers of the Believers”). In this book extremely filthy language was used, insulting the noble wives of the Holy Prophet^{sa}. Its venomous language was so provocative and incendiary that every Muslim was agitated and outraged. As a reaction, the Muslims demanded that the Government should confiscate the book. Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} advised the Muslims that the book had already been circulated among the masses and shown its evil effects, therefore, its confiscation will not be of much use. The very basis of the demand to confiscate would be used against any book that might be written in response, and the response would also be confiscated before its publication. Therefore, the demand to confiscate the book being counterproductive, the effective method should be to refute all such nonsensical writings by giving intelligent and persuasive replies. He said:

”ہماری رائے ہمیشہ سے یہی ہے کہ نرمی اور تہذیب اور معقول اور حکیمانہ طرز

سے حملہ کرنے والوں کا ردّ لکھنا چاہیے اور اس خیال سے دل کو خالی کر دینا چاہئے کہ گورنمنٹ عالیہ سے کسی فرقہ کی گوشمالی کراویں۔ مذہب کے حامیوں کو اخلاقی حالت دکھلانے کی بہت ضرورت ہے۔ اس طرح پر مذہب بدنام ہوتا ہے کہ بات بات میں ہم اشتعال ظاہر کریں۔”⁷²

“I have always held the opinion that we should refute those who attack us in a mild, civilized reasonable and rational manner; and should get rid of the thought that the esteemed government be asked to punish any sect. Those who defend religion must demonstrate their moral rectitude. Religion is defamed if we lose our temper on every occasion (our faith is attacked).”⁷³

At the same time he conveyed to the Government of the time the following suggestion:

”گورنمنٹ عالیہ فتنہ انگیز تحریروں کے روکنے کے لئے دو تجویزوں میں سے ایک تجویز اختیار کرے کہ یا تو ہر ایک فریق کو ہدایت ہو جائے کہ کسی اعتراض کے وقت بغیر اس کے کہ فریق مخالف کی معتبر کتابوں کا حوالہ دے ہرگز اعتراض کے لئے قلم نہ اٹھاوے۔ اور یا یہ کہ قطعاً ایک فریق دوسرے فریق کے مذہب پر حملہ نہ کرے۔ بلکہ اپنے اپنے مذہب کی خوبیاں بیان کیا

البلاغ۔ روحانی خزائن جلد ۱۳ ص ۴۰۲۔⁷²

⁷³ Al-Balāgh, page 34 Rūḥānī Khazā' in, Vol. 13, page 402

“To stop publication of offensive writings, the esteemed Government should adopt one of the two proposals: either each party should be asked that when it wants to raise an objection against another religious group, it must not do so without providing references from the authentic books of the other group, or on no account any follower of a religion should attack religious beliefs of the followers of other religions, and should only put forward good points of his own religion.”⁷⁵

In his speeches and writings he refuted the tenets of Christianity using evidence from the Holy Qur’an, sayings of the Holy Prophet^{sa}, the Old and the New Testaments, history, medicine, logic, and rational arguments. He presented the laws of nature as supportive proofs. God Almighty made his arguments prevail by showing heavenly signs. The tools used in this Jihad included a vast, profound and truth-revealing research and deep study. In this encounter every effort made by Christians was defeated and crushed. He presented scholarly arguments and also utilized the

74 البلاغ۔ روحانی خزائن جلد ۱۳۔ ۲۰۲۔ ۲۰۳۔ ۲۰۴

75 Al-Balāgh, pp. 34-35 Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Vol. 13, pp. 402,403

technique of counter accusation. In this technique, however, the element of truth, reasoning and rationality were very prominent. Moreover, whatever he stated was based upon the authentic writings of the Christians. When padres felt defeated, they started alleging that (God-forbid) Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib was being insulting to, and contemptuous of, Ḥaḍrat Īsā^{as}. Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib responded to this false allegation as follows:

”اچکا یہ فرمانا کہ گویا حضرت مسیحؑ کے حق میں میں نے گالی کا لفظ استعمال کر کے ایک گونہ بے ادبی کی ہے۔ یہ آپ کی غلط فہمی ہے۔ میں حضرت مسیحؑ کو ایک سچا نبی اور برگزیدہ اور خدا تعالیٰ کا ایک پیارا بندہ سمجھتا ہوں وہ تو ایک الزامی جواب آپ ہی کے مشرب کے موافق تھا اور آپ ہی پر وہ الزام عائد ہوتا ہے نہ کہ مجھ پر۔“⁷⁶

“You say that I have, as if, insulted Ḥaḍrat Masīḥ (the Messiah) to some extent by using an abusive word with reference to him. This is a misunderstanding of yours. I believe Ḥaḍrat Masīḥ to be a true prophet, a chosen one and beloved servant of God. What I said in retaliation was in keeping with your own faith. Hence

⁷⁶ جنگ مقدس۔ رومانی خزائن جلد ۶، ص ۱۰۶۔

it is you, not me, who stand accused of the accusation that you level at me.”⁷⁷

In addition, he said:

”جب ہمارا دل بہت دکھایا جاتا ہے اور ہمارے نبی کریم صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم پر طرح طرح کے ناجائز حملے کئے جاتے ہیں تو صرف متنہ کرنے کی خاطر انہیں کی مسلمہ کتابوں سے الزامی جواب دیئے جاتے ہیں... ان لوگوں کو چاہئے کہ ہماری کوئی بات ایسی نکالیں جو حضرت عیسیٰ کے متعلق ہم نے بطور الزامی جواب کے لکھی ہو اور وہ انجیل میں موجود نہ ہو۔ آخر یہ تو ہم سے نہیں ہو سکتا کہ آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کی توہین سنکر چپ رہیں۔“⁷⁸

“When we are deeply hurt and unjustified attacks of all kinds are made on our Holy Prophet^{sa}, only then, as a warning, we retaliate in kind on the basis of their (Christians’) own authentic books. ... they ought to point out in my writings any thing which I have written as a retaliatory response and it is not found in the Gospels. After all it is not possible for me, that on hearing the insult of the Holy Prophet^{sa}, I remain silent.”⁷⁹

On this, the Christians repeated this allegation with greater force through some self-serving mullahs. In

⁷⁷ Jang-e-Muqaddas Page 88, Rūḥānī Khazā’ in, Vol. 6, page 170

⁷⁸ ملفوظات جلد ۹۹، ۳۰۰۔ ایڈیشن ۱۹۶۱

⁷⁹ Malfūḏāt, Vol. 9, page 479, edition 1961

response, to this Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib published a poster on December 20, 1895, and explained his position as follows:

"ہم نے اپنی کلام میں ہر جگہ عیسائیوں کا فرضی یسوع مراد لیا ہے اور خدا تعالیٰ کا ایک عاجز بندہ عیسیٰ ابن مریم جو نبی تھا جس کا ذکر قرآن میں ہے وہ ہمارے درشت مخاطبات میں ہرگز مراد نہیں اور یہ طریق ہم نے برابر چالیس برس تک پادری صاحبوں کی گالیاں سن کر اختیار کیا ہے۔ بعض نادان مولوی جن کو اندھے اور نابینا کہنا چاہیے۔ عیسائیوں کو معذور رکھتے ہیں کہ وہ بچارے کچھ بھی منہ سے نہیں بولتے اور آنحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کی کچھ بے ادبی نہیں کرتے۔ لیکن یاد رہے کہ درحقیقت پادری صاحبان تحقیر اور توہین اور گالیاں دینے میں اول نمبر پر ہیں۔ ہمارے پاس ایسے پادریوں کی کتابوں کا ایک ذخیرہ ہے جنہوں نے اپنی عبارت کو صدہا گالیوں سے بھر دیا ہے جس مولوی کی خواہش ہو وہ آ کر دیکھ لیوے اور یاد رہے کہ آئندہ جو پادری صاحب گالی دینے کے طریق کو چھوڑ کر ادب سے کلام کریں گے ہم بھی ان کے ساتھ ادب سے پیش آویں گے اب تو وہ اپنے یسوع پر آپ حملہ کر رہے ہیں۔ کہ کسی طرح سب و شتم سے باز ہی نہیں آتے ہم سنتے سنتے تھک گئے۔" 80

“Everywhere in my writing I (referring to Christ) have meant supposititious Jesus of Christians; and the humble servant of God, ‘Īsa^{as} bin Maryam, who was a

نورالقرآن۔ روحانی خزائن جلد ۹۔ ۳۷۵ 80

prophet of God and who is mentioned in the Holy Qur'an is certainly never intended in my harsh comments. I adopted this path after constantly listening to the abuses of padres for the last forty years. Some ignorant mullahs—who should better be called blind and sightless—excuse the padres and say that they, the poor, helpless fellows, do not utter a word (against the Holy Prophet^{sa}), nor are they in the least disrespectful to him. But it must be borne in mind that in reality it is the padres who are in the forefront in displaying contempt, hurling insults and shouting abuses. I have a stockpile of books by those padres who have filled their writings with hundreds of abuses. Any mullah who wishes should come and see for himself. And let it be remembered that if in future any padre, shunning the ways of abuse, speaks politely, I, too, shall be polite with him. At present they themselves are responsible for the attacks on their Jesus for under no circumstances they refrain from abuse and vituperation. We are sick of listening to them.”⁸¹

The same foolish mullahs, on account of their grudge against Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib, present some extracts from his writings to impress upon the common man as if he (the Promised Messiah^{as}) has insulted

⁸¹ Nūr-ul-Qur'an, Part 2, Rūḥāni Khazā'in, Vol. 9, page 375

Hadrat 'Īsa^{as} and did not respect his high status. For example, they cite the following excerpt from one of his books.

"مسیح کی راستبازی اپنے زمانہ میں دوسرے راستبازوں سے بڑھکر ثابت نہیں ہوتی۔ بلکہ مسیحی نبی کو اس پر ایک فضیلت ہے کیونکہ وہ شراب نہیں پیتا تھا اور کبھی نہیں سنا گیا کہ کسی فاحشہ عورت نے آکر اپنی کمانی کے مال سے اسکے سر پر عطر ملا تھا۔ یا ہاتھوں اور اپنے سر کے بالوں سے اس کے بدن کو چھوا تھا۔ یا کوئی بے تعلق جوان عورت اسکی خدمت کرتی تھی۔ اسی وجہ سے خدا نے قرآن میں مسیحی کا نام حضور رکھا مگر مسیح کا یہ نام نہ رکھا۔ کیونکہ ایسے قصے اس نام کے رکھنے سے مانع تھے۔ اور پھر یہ کہ حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام نے مسیحی کے ہاتھ پر جس کو عیسائی یوحنا کہتے ہیں جو پیچھے ایلیا بنایا گیا۔ اپنے گناہوں سے توبہ کی تھی اور انکے خاص مریدوں میں داخل ہوئے تھے۔ اور یہ بات حضرت مسیحی کی فضیلت کو بہت ثابت کرتی ہے۔ کیونکہ بمقابل اسکے یہ ثابت نہیں کیا گیا کہ مسیحی نے بھی کسی کے ہاتھ پر توبہ کی تھی"۔⁸²

"The righteousness of the Messiah cannot be proven to be greater than that of other righteous persons of his time. The prophet John (the Baptist) is rather better than him in one respect. He did not drink wine, and it is never heard that any prostitute anointed his hair with precious oil that she purchased with her

income, and touched his body with her hands or hair, or any young unrelated woman remained in his service. That's why in the Qur'an God gave to Yaḥyā (John the Baptist) the name “*Ḥaṣūr*”, but did not give this name to the Messiah because such stories did not permit to give this name to him (‘Isa^{as}). And then, Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} made remission of his sins through baptism administered by Yaḥyā - who is called John by Christians and who was later made to be Elijah. Thus he became a special disciple of Yaḥyā. This clearly proves Yaḥyā’s superiority, because it is not evident that Yaḥyā ever repented on anyone’s hand.”⁸³

The hypocrisy of these mullahs is apparent by the very fact that they do not stir a bit and do not open their drowsy eyes when the Christian missionaries launch a vicious attack on the noble character of our Master, the Holy Prophet Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad Muṣṭafā^{sa}, with all their might. But when, quoting authentic books of Christians, a rebuttal is made against the Christian writings that contain mordacious insults to our Master and Leader, Ḥaḍrat Muḥammad Muṣṭafā^{sa}, then they raise hell.

Read the above extract from Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib’s writings. Does it not refer to Jesus mentioned in the

⁸³ Dāfi‘ul-Balā, p.4, footnote, Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Vol. 18, p.220

Gospels? The prophet ‘Īsā^{as} mentioned in the Holy Qur’an has no such stories to be attributed to. Therefore, even if the words “‘Īsa” or “Messiah” are used, the story clearly indicates that here Jesus of the Gospels is being portrayed and not Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} of the Holy Qur’an who was a Prophet of Allāh sent as a messenger to Banī Isrā’īl and who after being absolved of all the calumnies, left this world in a great victory. Peace was on him the day he was born and peace was on him the day he died.

Before presenting his (The Promised Messiah’s) belief about Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as}, the prophet of Allāh, mentioned in the Qur’an, and his love for him, we would like to explain the meaning of the word “Ḥaṣūr” mentioned in the above extract. In the Qur’an this is a name used for Ḥaḍrat Yaḥyā^{as}. The significance of this name, as explained in the above extract, while a comparison is drawn from the Gospels between Jesus and John the Baptist, is exactly the same as written in “Tafsīr Ibnī Jarīr, Tafsīr Jāmi‘ul Bayān, Tafsīr Kamālāin, and Tafsīr Tarjamānūl Qur’an”. In all these books, the meaning of “Ḥaṣūr” is given as **الذی لا یقرب الذی لا یأتی النساء** ، النساء ، “the one who does not go near women.” In the Gospels there is not a single story that tells that Yaḥyā (John the Baptist) ever mingled with

women. But there are many stories in the Gospels telling that Jesus had close contacts with women.

Referring to these stories, Maulawī Raḥmatullāh Muhājir Meccī, who is the leader of mullahs who raise objections against the Promised Messiah^{as}, writes in his book ‘Izālah Auhām’, on page 370:

"جناب مسیح اقرار میفرماید که یسعی علیه السلام نه نان میخوردند نه شراب می
آشامیدند و اینجناب شراب هم می نوشیدند و یسعی علیه السلام در بیابان می ماندند و
همراه جناب مسیح بسیار زنان همراه می گشتند و مال خود می خورانیدند و زنان فاحشه پائنا
آینجناب را ببوسیدند و اینجناب مرتا و مریم را دوست میداشتند و خود شراب برای
نوشیدن دیگر کسان عطا میفرمودند۔" 84

(ii) "The Messiah himself affirms that John, peace be upon him, neither ate bread, nor did he consume wine and that John, peace be upon him, lived in the wilderness. But Jesus was accompanied in his journies by several women who used to provide for him out of their earnings; prostitutes used to kiss his feet; Martha and Mary (Magdalene) were his friends; and he drank wine and offered it to others."⁸⁵

Here, Maulawī Muhājir Meccī has written "Messiah" and not Jesus; but the facts mentioned here

84 صفحہ ۳۷۰

85 Page 370, please refer to page 7 of this book. [Publisher]

tell that here the Jesus of the Gospels is being discussed and not Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsa of the Qur’an^{as}. The same is the nature of the use of the words “‘Īsa” and “the Messiah” in Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib’s writings.

It should also be noted that the purpose of Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib’s writings is the same as that of Maulawī Muhājir Meccī Ṣāḥib’s and both have a common end to achieve. Therefore, to raise objection to the writings of the Promised Messiah^{as} is actually an attack on their own leader and guide, viz., Maulawī Raḥmatullāh Muhājir Meccī, and also on the earlier great Mufasssīrīn—the Interpreters of the Qur’an.

Thus, due to their grudge and animosity for Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib^{as}, these mullahs felt compelled to tolerate insults hurled on the noble person of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad^{sa} but could not bear any attack on the fictitious person of Jesus Christ — the person not mentioned in the Holy Qur’an at all. On the other hand, Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāḥib explains his helplessness in the following words:

”اس بات کو ناظرین یاد رکھیں کہ عیسائی مذہب کے ذکر میں ہمیں اسی طرز سے کلام کرنا ضروری تھا جیسا کہ وہ ہمارے مقابل پر کرتے ہیں۔ عیسائی لوگ درحقیقت ہمارے اُس عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کو نہیں مانتے جو اپنے تئیں صرف بندہ اور نبی کہتے تھے اور پہلے نبیوں کو راستباز جانتے تھے اور آنے والے نبی

حضرت محمد مصطفیٰ صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم پر سچے دل سے ایمان رکھتے تھے اور آنحضرت ﷺ کے بارے میں پیشگوئی کی تھی بلکہ ایک شخص یسوع نام کو مانتے ہیں جس کا قرآن میں ذکر نہیں اور کہتے ہیں کہ اس شخص نے خدائی کا دعویٰ کیا اور پہلے نبیوں کو بٹار وغیرہ ناموں سے یاد کرتا تھا۔ یہ بھی کہتے ہیں کہ یہ شخص ہمارے نبی صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم کا سخت مکذب تھا اور اُس نے یہ بھی پیشگوئی کی تھی کہ میرے بعد سب جھوٹے ہی آئیں گے۔ سو آپ لوگ خوب جانتے ہیں، کہ قرآن شریف نے ایسے شخص پر ایمان لانے کے لئے ہمیں تعلیم نہیں دی۔ بلکہ ایسے لوگوں کے حق میں صاف فرمادیا ہے کہ اگر کوئی انسان ہو کر خدائی کا (دعویٰ) کرے تو ہم اس کو جہنم میں ڈالیں گے۔ اسی سبب سے ہم نے عیسائیوں کے یسوع کے ذکر کرنے کے وقت اُس ادب کا لحاظ نہیں رکھا جو سچے آدمی کی نسبت رکھنا چاہیے۔ ایسا آدمی اگر نابینا نہ ہوتا تو یہ نہ کہتا کہ میرے بعد سب جھوٹے ہی آئیں گے۔ اور اگر نیک اور ایماندار ہوتا تو خدائی کا دعویٰ نہ کرتا۔ پڑھنے والوں کو چاہئے کہ ہمارے بعض سخت الفاظ کا مصداق حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کو نہ سمجھ لیں بلکہ وہ کلمات اس یسوع کی نسبت لکھے گئے ہیں جس کا قرآن و حدیث میں نام و نشان نہیں۔" 86

“The readers should keep it in mind that with reference to Christian religion it was necessary for me to argue in the same manner as they (the Christians) adopt in confrontation with us. In fact, Christians do

not believe in that ‘Īsa^{as} of ours who claimed about himself that he was only a servant (of God) and a prophet, acknowledged that earlier prophets were righteous and sincerely and truly believed in the prophet to come—The Holy Prophet^{sa}. He prophesied about the advent of the Holy Prophet^{sa}. Rather they believe in a man by the name of Jesus of whom there is no mention in the Qur’an and say that that person claimed to be God and called earlier prophets robbers etc. They also say that this man was a staunch disbeliever of our Holy Prophet^{sa} and that he prophesied that he would be followed only by false claimants. And you know very well that the glorious Qur’an has not taught us to believe in such a man. Rather the Qur’an, with reference to such people, has categorically stated that if anyone, being a human, claims to be God, God will throw him into hell. It is for this reason that whenever I have mentioned the Jesus of Christians I have not observed such reverence for him as one should observe with respect to truthful and righteous person. Were such a man not blind, he would never have said that he would be followed only by false claimants; and were he pious and faithful, he would not have claimed to be God. The readers (of my writings) should keep it in mind that some harsh words that I have used do not apply to Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsa^{as}. On the

contrary they are used for Jesus of whom we find no mention whatsoever in the Qur'an or Ḥaḍīth.”⁸⁷

This is the person named Yasū‘ (Jesus) and the Gospels give detailed information about him. But, for the Prophet of Allāh called ‘Īsa^{as}, who is described in the Holy Qur'an, Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ṣāhib^{as} has paid great respect, extolling his high rank and eminence. He claimed himself to be in the likeness of that great person, in his image and his brother. At several places in his writings he mentioned his esteemed and honorable position with great reverence. We would like to conclude this discussion with a few selections from his writings.

Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad^{as} writes:

"مسیح خدا کے نہایت پیارے اور نیک بندوں میں سے ہے۔ اور ان میں سے ہے جو خدا کے برگزیدہ لوگ ہیں۔ اور ان میں سے ہے جن کو خدا اپنے ہاتھ سے صاف کرتا۔ اور اپنے نور کے سایہ کے نیچے رکھتا ہے۔ لیکن جیسا کہ گمان کیا گیا ہے خدا نہیں ہے۔ ہاں خدا سے واصل ہے اور ان کاملوں میں سے ہے جو تھوڑے ہیں"۔⁸⁸

“The Messiah is one of the most beloved and righteous servants of God. He is among those who are

⁸⁷ Majmū‘ah Ishtihārāt, Vol. 2, pp. 295, 296

⁸⁸ تحفہ قیمتیہ۔ روحانی خزائن جلد ۲۲، ۲۳۔ ۲۴

chosen by God. He belongs to those whom God purifies with his own Hand and whom he keeps under the shelter of His light. But he is not God—as is presumed. Yes, he is close to God and is among those perfect ones who are the few.”⁸⁹

"اور ہم لوگ پادری صاحبوں کے مقابل پر کیا سختی کر سکتے ہیں۔ کیونکہ جس طرح انکا فرض ہے کہ حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کی بزرگی اور عزت مانیں ایسا ہی ہمارا بھی فرض ہے کہ ہم لوگ صرف خدائی کا منصب خدا تعالیٰ کے لئے خاص رکھ کر باقی امور میں حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام کو ایک صادق اور راستباز اور ہر ایک ایسی عزت کا مستحق سمجھتے ہیں جو سچے نبی کو دینی چاہئے۔" ⁹⁰

“And how can I, in response to the padres, be harsh in my attack. For as they are bound to believe in the eminence and honour of Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsa^{as}, so I—apart from confining the station of Godhead to God alone—am under the obligation to acknowledge that Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsa^{as} was truthful and righteous and deserved all respect which is due to a true prophet of God.”⁹¹

"میں مسیح ابن مریم کی بہت عزت کرتا ہوں۔ کیونکہ میں روحانیت کی رُو سے اسلام میں خاتم الخلفاء ہوں جیسا کہ مسیح ابن مریم اسرائیلی سلسلہ کے لئے

⁸⁹ Toḥfa-e-Qaiṣariyyah, pp.20, 21 Rūḥāni Khazā’in, Vol. 12, pp. 272, 273

⁹⁰ کتاب البریۃ۔ روحانی خزائن جلد ۱۳، ۱۵۳۔۱۵۴

⁹¹ Kitābul-Bariyyah, pp.135, 136 Rūḥāni Khazā’in, Vol. 13, pp.153, 154

نا تم الخلفاء تھا۔ موسیٰ کے سلسلہ میں ابن مریم مسیح موعود تھا۔ اور محمدی سلسلہ میں میں مسیح موعود ہوں۔ سو میں اُس کی عزت کرتا ہوں جس کا ہم نام ہوں۔ اور مفسد اور مقتری ہے وہ شخص جو مجھے کہتا ہے کہ میں مسیح ابن مریم کی عزت نہیں کرتا۔ بلکہ مسیح تو مسیح میں تو اُسکے چاروں بھائیوں کی بھی عزت کرتا ہوں۔ کیونکہ پانچوں ایک ہی ماں کے بیٹے ہیں۔ نہ صرف اسی قدر بلکہ میں تو حضرت مسیح کی دونوں تھقی ہمشیروں کو بھی مقدمہ سمجھتا ہوں۔" 92

“I greatly esteem the Messiah son of Mary because in Islam I am spiritually the Khātamul Khulafā (Seal of the caliphs) as the Messiah son of Mary was the Khātamul Khulafā’ in the dispensation of Banī Isrā’īl. In the dispensation of Moses^{as}, the son of Mary was the Promised Messiah^{as}, and in the dispensation of Muḥammad^{sa}, I am the Promised Messiah^{as}. So, I respect him whose name I share. And that person is wicked and a liar who says that I do not respect the Messiah, son of Mary^{as}. Not only the Messiah^{as}, I also respect his four brothers because all five are of the same mother. Not only that, I also consider the two real sisters of the Messiah^{as} as blessed.”⁹³

"حضرت عیسیٰ علیہ السلام خدا تعالیٰ کے ایک بزرگ نبی ہیں اور بلاشبہ عیسیٰ مسیح

کشی نوح۔ روحانی خزائن جلد 19، ص 18، 19۔ 92

93 Kashtī-e- Nūh, Rūhānī Khazā’in, Vol. 19, pp.17, 18

خدا کا پیارا، خدا کا برگزیدہ اور دنیا کا نور اور ہدایت کا آفتاب اور جناب الہی کا مقرب اور اس کے تخت کے نزدیک مقام رکھتا ہے اور کروٹا ہا انسان جو اس سے سچی محبت رکھتے ہیں اور اس کی وصیتوں پر چلتے ہیں اور اس کی ہدایات کے کاربند ہیں۔ وہ جہنم سے نجات پائیں گے۔”⁹⁴

“Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} is an exalted Prophet of God. Without any doubt, ‘Īsā the Messiah^{as} is a beloved of God, a Chosen one, Light for the world, a Sun of guidance, a dear one to God, placed closed to His Throne. Millions of people who love him truly and follow his exhortations correctly shall be saved from hell.”⁹⁵

”میں اس کو اپنا ایک بھائی سمجھتا ہوں اور میں نے اسے بارہا دیکھا ہے۔ ایک بار میں نے اور میچ نے ایک ہی پیالہ میں گائے کا گوشت کھایا تھا۔ اس لئے میں اور وہ ایک ہی جوہر کے دو ٹکڑے ہیں۔”⁹⁶

“I consider him as a brother of mine, and I have seen him several times (in visions). Once the Messiah^{as} and I ate beef together out of one bowl. Thus, he and I are two portions of the same gem.”⁹⁷

⁹⁴ ضمیر رسالہ گورنمنٹ انگریزی اور ہندوستان، رومانی خزائن جلد نمبر ۳۶۱۔

⁹⁵ “Ḍamīmah Risālah Government Angrezī Aur Jihad”, p. 4. Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Vol. 17, p. 26

⁹⁶ ملفوظات جلد ۳۳۰۔ ایڈیشن ۱۹۶۱

⁹⁷ Malfūḍāt, Vol. 3, p. 330, edition 1961

"اس عاجز پر ظاہر کیا گیا ہے کہ یہ خاکسار اپنی غربت اور انکسار اور توکل اور ایثار اور آیات اور انوار کے رو سے مسیح کی پہلی زندگی کا نمونہ ہے اور اس عاجز کی فطرت اور مسیح کی فطرت باہم نہایت ہی متشابہ واقع ہوئی ہے گویا ایک ہی جوہر کے دو ٹکڑے یا ایک ہی درخت کے دو پھل ہیں اور بحمدی اتحاد ہے کہ نظر کشفی میں نہایت ہی باریک امتیاز ہے اور نیز ظاہری طور پر بھی ایک مشابہت ہے اور وہ یوں کہ مسیح ایک کامل اور عظیم الشان نبی یعنی موسیٰ کا تابع اور خادم دین تھا۔ اور اس کی انجیل تورات کی فرع ہے۔ اور یہ عاجز بھی اس علیل الشان نبی کے اتقر خادمین میں سے ہے کہ جو سید الرسل اور سب رسولوں کا سرتاج ہے۔ اگر وہ حامد ہیں تو وہ احمد ہے۔ اگر وہ محمود ہیں تو وہ محمد ہے۔ صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم" 98

"It is revealed to this humble one that in my meekness, humility, trust, sacrifice, signs and blessings I am the model of the first manifestation of Messiah. My nature has close affinity to that of the Messiah, as if we were two portions of the same gem or two fruits of a single tree. We are so closely bonded together that only a spiritually-gifted eye can detect the fine difference that exists between us. Moreover, there is a manifest resemblance between us. For the Messiah was the subordinate to a perfect prophet of great grandeur

برائین احمدیہ ۵۹۳ء۔ ۵۹۴ء۔ حاشیہ در حاشیہ نمبر ۳ روحانی خزائن جلد نمبر ۱ 98

i.e. Moses and was the servant of the religion (of Moses) and his Gospel is a branch of Torah. And this humble one too is one of the most humble servants of that Prophet^{sa} of great eminence who is the Master of all prophets and the Crown of all Messengers. If they praise their Lord, he extolled Him in the highest possible way in such a manner that no one can compete with him or excel him in his praise of his Lord: if they (the prophets) deserve praise, he is the only one who deserves the highest possible praise—his Lord (Allah) praised Him as He praised no one.”⁹⁹

وانى رئيْتُ عيسى عليه السلام مراراً فى المنام و
 مراراً فى الحالة الكشفية و قد اكل معى على مائدة
 واحدة و ربيته مرة و استفسرته مما وقع قومه فيه
 فاستوى عليه الدهش و ذكر عظمة الله و طفق يسبح و
 يقدس و اشار الى الارض و قال انما انا ترابى و برى
 مما يقولون فرئيته كالمنكسرين المتواضعين

100

“I have seen ‘Īsā^{as} several times in my dreams, and many a time I met him in visions. And he had indeed eaten with me the same food. Once I asked him about the state (of idolatry and sin) into which his people have plunged themselves. He was gripped with the fear

⁹⁹ Brāhīn-e-Aḥmadiyyah, pp. 593, 594, marginal notes within margin No.3, Rūḥāni Khazā’in, Vol. 1

¹⁰⁰ نورالحق ازل ٥٦-٥٧ روحانى خزائن جلد ٨

and awe of God. He proclaimed the Greatness of God and began glorifying and extolling Him. Then he pointed towards the earth and said: ‘I am only a speck of dust and am innocent of all that they say about me’. Then I realized that he was one of those who are meek and humble.’¹⁰¹

واخر دعوانا ان الحمد لله رب العالمين
 كُلُّ اٰمِنٍ بِاللّٰهِ وَمَلٰٓئِكَتِهِ وَكُتُبِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ ۗ لَا نَفَرِقُ بَيْنَ اَحَدٍ مِّنْ
 رُّسُلِهِ ۗ وَقَالُوْا سَمِعْنَا وَاَطَعْنَا ۗ غُفْرٰنَكَ رَبَّنَا وَاِلَيْكَ الْمَصِيْرُ

And our last prayer is that all praise belongs to Allāh alone, the Lord of all the worlds.

All of them (the believers) believe in Allāh, and in His angels, and in His Books, and in His Messengers, saying, ‘We make no distinction between any of His Messengers;’ and they say, ‘We hear and we obey. We implore Thy forgiveness, O our Lord, and to Thee is the returning.’¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Nūr-ul-Ḥaq, Part one, pp. 56-57 Rūḥānī Khazā’in, Vol. 8

¹⁰² 2:286

Index

- ✦ Abdur Ra'ūf, Maulawī _ iv, 17-25
- ✦ Aḥmad, Mirzā Ghulām^{as}
 see under Promised Messiah^{as}
- ✦ Aitchison, Charles
 (The Governor of the Punjab 1-2
 the spread of Christianity in
 India, according to _____ iii, 1
 one million Christian
 (in 1888) in India,
 according to. _____ iii, 2
- ✦ *Akḥbār Nūr Afshān* _____ 5
- ✦ Āl-e-Ḥassan, Maulawī _____ 9-14
- ✦ *Andrūna-e-Bible* _____ 5
- ✦ Antichrist and Jesus _____ 13
- ✦ Āryas _____ 16
- ✦ Āzād, Abu'l Kalām *footnote* 26, 27
- ✦ Barrows, John Henry
 (An American
 Evangelist) _____ iii, 2, 3
 visits India (1897) _____ 2
 his boast about the spread of
 Christianity in Muslim
 lands _____ iii, 2, 3
- ✦ Bengal _____ iii, 1
- ✦ Bible _____ iv, vii, 5, 9, 14, 22, 49
- ✦ Book of Proverbs (OT)
 on prostitution _____ 22
 on false witnesses _____ 25
- ✦ Carey, William
 (Christian Missionary) _____ 1
 comes to Bengal (1800) _____ iii, 1
- followed by other
 missionaries _____ 1
- ✦ Christ
 see under Jesus
- ✦ Christian(s)_ iii, iv, v, 1, 2, 4, 5, 9,
 _____ 11, 16, 21, 27, 28, 36,
 _____ 40, 49, 50, 51
 Christian missionaries arrival
 of, in India _____ iii, 1
 took undue advantage of the
 policies of British Govt. in
 India _____ iii, 1, 3, 4, 6
 abuse of Islam, by _____ 4
 abuse of the Holy Prophet^{as},
 by _____ iii, 4, 5
 attack on Islam, by _____ iii, 4, 5
- ✦ Christianity _____ iii, 1-4, 27, 28, 31
- ✦ *Dāfi'-ul-Buhtān* _____ 5
- ✦ Daniel
 on wine _____ 23
- ✦ David _____ 9
- ✦ Elijah _____ 36
- ✦ *Hadāyatul Muslimīn* _____ 4
- ✦ *Ḥaṣūr*,
 meaning of _____ 37-38
- ✦ Hinduism _____ 3
- ✦ Hosea
 on wine _____ 23
- ✦ Imāduddīn, Padre _____ iii, 4
- ✦ India
 Revival of various religions
 in the early nineteenth

- century, in _____ iii, 1
 An arena of religious
 struggle _____ iii, 1, 3
 rapid growth of Christianity,
 in _____ iii, 1, 2
 British rule in, & Christianity 3
- ✦ Indian Christian Association ___ 1
- ✦ Indian Subcontinent
see under India
- ✦ ‘Īsā^{as} bin Maryam
 different from
 Jesus _____ iv, 6, 33, 39, 40
 Muslims believe in _____ 6
 never abused by
 Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad ___ 31-34, 39, 40
 Praise of, by Ḥaḍrat Aḥmad 42-47
- ✦ Isiah
 prophecies of _____ 12
 on wine _____ 23
- ✦ Israelites _____ 6
- ✦ *Istifsār* _____ 9-13, 14, 15
- ✦ Jesus, Christ
 a mythical figure as
 portrayed in the New
 Testament _____ iii, 6, 33, 34
 distinct from ‘Īsā^{as} bin
 Maryam _____ iv, 6, 33
 Muslim attack on this
 mythical figure based on the
 New Testament _____ 7-26
 miracles and prophecies
 of _____ 7, 10, 12, 13
 led a miserable life in the
 world _____
 was born like ordinary
 human being _____ 11
- cursed by God _____ 11
 remained in hell for three
 days _____ 11
 was not sinless _____ 17, 21
 claimed to fulfill the Law
 (Judaic) _____ 24
 did not care for the Law
 (Judiac) _____ 23
 reviled by the New Testa-
 ment _ 8-10, 12-14, 17-26, 35-36
- ✦ Jews & Jesus _____ 7, 13
- ✦ Jews _____ 7
- ✦ Jihād _____ 26, 30
- ✦ John the Baptist
see under Yaḥyā^{as} _____ 12, 35
- ✦ Jonah _____ 12
- ✦ Judah _____ 9
- ✦ Khān Raḍa, Maulawī ___ iii, 14-15
- ✦ Kingdom of God _____ iii, 1
- ✦ Lucknow _____ 4
- ✦ *Masīḥ-ud-Dajjāl* _____ 5
- ✦ Messiah
see under Jesus and ‘Īsā^{as} bin
 Maryam^{as} _____
- ✦ Moses _____ viii, 6, 39, 44
- ✦ Muḥammad, Ḥaḍrat^{as} vii, 6, 39, 44
- ✦ *Muḥammad Kī Tawārīkh Kā
 Ijmāl* _____ 5
- ✦ Mullāhs, the Hypocrisy of _____ 36
 Mullāhs, Christians and Jesus 36
- ✦ Muslims
 at a disadvantage vis-à-vis
 the attack of Christian

- missionaries _____ iii, 3
 helplessness of _____ 5
 adopt a new strategy to
 counter the Christian attack
 on Islam _____ iii, 6
- ✦ *Nabī Ma‘šūm* _____ 5
- ✦ Padre(s) _____ , v, 49, 51
- ✦ Parež _____ 9
- ✦ Promised Messiah ___ iii, iv, v, vi,
 one of the missions of _____ 26
 the Holy Prophet’s prophecy
 about _____ 26
 and Jihād of pen _____ 26
 condemns the vilification
 of Prophets and faiths _____ 27
 three ways of engaging in
 religious debates, proposed
 by _____ 27-28
 confiscation of opponents
 books not desirable and
 counter-productive _____ 28
 advice of, about the manner
 of response to critics
 of Islam _____ 28-29
 his advice to the British
 Govt. about resolving
 religious differences _____ 29-30
 deeply hurt by the attack on
 the Holy Prophet^{sa} _____ 32
 refutation of Christianity _____ 28, 30
 _____ 33-34, 39-40
 Never abused ‘Īsā^{as}
 Falls allegations of Padres
 and Mullāhs against _____ 31-37
 — ‘Īsā^{as} revered by _____ 42-47
 — and Jesus (mentioned in
 the New Testament) _ 33-34, 39
 — and Padres _____ 31-34
 — and mullāhs _____ 33, 34
 — and Yaḥyā^{as} _____ 35-36
- ✦ Qur’an, The _____ iii, iv, ix, xi,
 4, 7, 13, 31, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43
- ✦ Raḥmatullāh Muhājir _ 7-9, 38, 39
 Criticism of Biblical Jesus _ 7-9
 and John _____ 7-9
- ✦ *Review Barāhīn-e-Aḥmadiyyah* _ 5
- ✦ Rushdi, Salman _____ 5
- ✦ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī _____ 26
- ✦ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim _____ 26
- ✦ *Satanic Verses* _____ 5
- ✦ Shāh, Aḥmad
 A Christian writer _____ 28
 ‘*Ummahātul Mu’minīn*’ _____ 28
 Muslims demands the
 consification of _____ 28
- ✦ *Shamsul Akhbār* _____ iii, 4
- ✦ Simla _____ iii, 1
- ✦ *Sīrat-ul-Masīḥ wal Muḥammad* _ 5
- ✦ Solomon _____ 9
- ✦ *Sawānīḥ ‘Umrī Muḥammad
 Ṣāhib* _____ 5
- ✦ *Taftīsh-ul-Islam* _____ 5
- ✦ *Ummahātul Mu’minīn* _____ 28
- ✦ Yaḥyā^{as} _____ 7-8, 35-36

Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā Kī Tauhīn Ke Ilzām Kā Jawāb

REFUTATION OF THE ALLEGATION OF INSULT TO JESUS CHRIST

This is the English translation of the booklet “Ḥaḍrat ‘Īsā^{as} Kī Tauhīn Ke Ilzām Kā Jawāb”. It is commonly alleged that Ḥaḍrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the Promised Messiah, has used insulting language against Jesus Christ in his books. In a bid to give some substance to this allegation, the *Majlis Tahaffuz-e-Khatm-e-Nabuwwat* of Multan, published a booklet entitled *Jesus and the Aḥmadiyya Movement*.

The present publication is a rebuttal of the allegations contained in the above mentioned booklet. The reader will discover for himself that the Promised Messiah has in reality portrayed Jesus Christ in the same respectful manner as he is described in the Holy Qur’an.

Whenever Promised Messiah^{as} attacked Jesus it was never aimed at ‘Īsa bin Maryam^{as} (of the Qur’an), the true Jesus; it was invariably directed at the fictitious person of Jesus as mythologized by Christians and he (the Promised Messiah) always based his arguments on the Bible. His counter-attack on this fictitious person of Jesus must be viewed in the perspective of vicious attacks made by the Christian missionaries of the time against the Holy Prophet^{sa} of Islam.