

**BOOKS – FOR - KNOWLEDGE 2**

PROF. DAVID BENJAMIN KELDANI

( B.D., a Roman Catholic *Former Bishop of Uramiah* )

**MUHAMMAD**

**IN THE BIBLE**



**Edited & Annotated**

By

PROF. Dáwúd M.Rifat Al-Hanbali & Ass.PROF. DR. Kaseb. A.AI-Badran  
(Jurisprudent Advisor) (Ex : Dammam UNV, KFU, KFUPM )

Published by: Esbah Publishing House

© Esbah Publishing House- ,1433AH - 20012AD

All rights reserved . no part of this publication may be reproduced ,stored in aretrieval system of transmitted in any form or by any means - electronic ,mechanical , photocopying , recording or otherwise – without written permission from the publishers.the rights to typesetting, photography and artwork are also reserved to the publishers.

Esbah Publishing House- P.O.Box. ٥٠٧٣, Dammam 31422 - K S A

U R L : [www.mohammedinthebible.com](http://www.mohammedinthebible.com) & [www.albadran-law.com](http://www.albadran-law.com)


E- mail : [Info@mohammedinthebible.com](mailto:Info@mohammedinthebible.com) & @ [Al\\_badran\\_law@yahoo.com](mailto:Al_badran_law@yahoo.com)



First edition and annotateted 20012AD

Original Book :	<b>MUHAMMAD IN THE BIBLE</b>
Author :	PROF. David Benjamin Keldani
Year :	20012
ISBN(HB) :	
Pages :	233
Book number :	1

المقدمة



**A BRIEF SKETCH OF HIS BIOGRAPHY:**

*Professor 'Abdu 'l-Ahad Dawud, B.D., the writer of the present series of articles*

is the former Reverend: *Professor* **DAVID BENJAMIN KELDANI**  
**B.D., A ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST OF THE UNIATE-CHALDEAN SECT.**

When asked how he came to Islam he wrote:

“My conversion to Islam cannot be attributed to any cause other than the gracious direction of the Almighty Allah. Without this Divine guidance all learning, search and other efforts to find the Truth may even lead one astray. The moment I believed in the Absolute Unity of God His Holy Apostle Muhammad became the pattern of my conduct and behaviour.”

## Muhammad in the old Testament

### **Prefatory Remarks:**

I propose through this article and the ones which will follow to show that the doctrine of Islam concerning the Deity and the last great messenger of Allah is perfectly true and conforms to the teachings of the Bible.

I Shall devote the present article to discussing the first point, and in a few other papers I shall attempt to show that Muhammad<sup>(pbuh)</sup> is the real object of the Covenant and in him, and him alone, are actually and literally fulfilled all the prophecies in the Old Testament.

### **Allah and his attributes:**

There are two fundamental points between Islam and Christianity which, for the sake of the truth and the peace of the world, deserved a very serious and deep investigation. As these two religions claim their origin from one and the same source, it would follow that no important point of controversy between them should be allowed to exist. Both these great religions believe in the existence of the Deity and in the covenant made between God and the Prophet Abraham<sup>(pbuh)</sup>. On these two principal points a thoroughly conscientious and final agreement must be arrived at between the intelligent adherents of the two faiths.

It would be a mere waste of time here to refute those who ignorantly or maliciously suppose the Allah of Islam to be different from the true God and only a fictitious deity of Muhammad's own creation. If the Christian priests and theologians knew their Scriptures in the original Hebrew instead of in translations as the Muslims read their Qur-án in its Arabic text, they would clearly see that **Allah is the same ancient Semitic name of the Supreme Being who revealed and spoke to Adam<sup>(pbuh)</sup> and all the prophets.**

Allah is the only self-existing, knowing, powerful Being. He encompasses being and thing; and is the source of all life, knowledge

and force. Allah is the unique Creator, Regulator and Ruler of the universe. He is absolutely One. **The essence, the person and nature of Allah are absolutely beyond human comprehension, and therefore any attempt to define His essence is not only futile but even dangerous to our spiritual welfare and faith; for it will certainly lead us into error.**

**In conclusion, I must remind Christians that unless they believe in the absolute unity of God, and renounce the belief in the three persons, they are certainly unbelievers in the true God. Strictly speaking, Christians are polytheists, only with this exception, that the gods of the heathen are false and imaginary, whereas the three gods of the Churches have a distinct character, of whom the Father -as another epithet for Creator- is the One true God, but the son is only a prophet and servant of God, and the third person one of the innumerable holy spirits in the service of the Almighty God.**

The Old Testament and the Qur-án condemn the doctrine of three<sup>1</sup> persons in God; the New Testament does not expressly hold or defend it, but even if it contains hints and traces concerning the Trinity, it is no authority at all, because it was neither seen nor written by Christ himself, nor in the language he spoke, nor did it exist in its present form and contents for -at least- the first two centuries after him.

Some two centuries after the idolatrous and impenitent Kingdom of Israel was overthrown, and the whole population of the ten tribes deported into Assyria, Jerusalem and the glorious temple of Solomon were razed to the ground by the Chaldeans, and the unmassacred remnant of Judah and Benjamin was transported into Babylonia. After a period of seventy years' captivity, the Jews were permitted to return to their country with full authority to build again their ruined city and the temple. When the foundations of the new house of God were being laid, there arose a tremendous uproar of joy and acclamation from the

---

1. Qur-án, 5 : 73 They disbelieve who say: Allah is one of three (in a Trinity:) for there is no god except One Allah. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous chastisement will befall the disbelieves. among them.. (Editors)..

assembly; while the old men and women who had seen the gorgeous temple of Solomon before, burst into a bitter weeping. It was on this solemn occasion that the Almighty sent His servant the Prophet Haggai to console the sad assembly with this important message:-

**“And I will shake all nations, and the *Himada* of all the nations will come; and I will fill this house with glory, says the Lord of hosts. Mine is the silver, mine is the gold, says the Lord of hosts, the glory of my last house shall be greater than that of the first one, says the Lord of hosts; and in this place I will give *Shalom*, says the Lord of hosts”** (Haggai, ii. 7-9).

Jewish and Christian commentators alike have given the utmost importance to the double promise contained in the above prophecy. They both understand a messianic prediction in the word *Himda*. Indeed, here is a wonderful prophecy confirmed by the usual biblical formula of the divine oath, “says the Lord Sabaoth,” four times repeated. If this prophecy be taken in the abstract sense of the words *himda* and *shalom* as “desire” and “peace,” then the prophecy *becomes* nothing more than an unintelligible aspiration. But if we understand by the term *himda* a concrete idea, a person and reality, and in the word *shalom*, not a condition, but a living and active force and a definitely established religion, then this prophecy must be admittedly true and fulfilled in the person of Ahmed and the establishment of Islam. For *himda* and *shalom* - or shlama have precisely the same significance respectively as Ahmed and Islam.

Before endeavouring to prove the fulfilment of this prophecy, it will be well to explain the etymology of the two words as briefly as possible:-

(a) *Himda*. Unless I am mistaken, the clause in the original Hebrew text reads thus. “ve yavu himdath kol haggoyim,” which literally rendered into English would be “and will come the Himda of all nations.” The final *hi* in Hebrew, as in Arabic, is changed into *th*, or *t* when in the genitive case. The word is derived from an archaic Hebrew -or rather Aramaic- root *hmd* (consonants pronounced *hemed*). In Hebrew *hemed* is generally used in the sense of great desire, covet, appetite and lust. The ninth command of the Decalogue is: “Lo *tahmod* ish reikha”

**(“Thou shalt not covet the wife of thy neighbour”). In Arabic the verb *hemida*, from the same consonants *hmd*, means “to praise,” and so on. What is more praised and illustrious than that which is most craved for, coveted, and desired? Whichever of the two meanings be adopted, the fact that Ahmed is the Arabic form of *Himda* remains indisputable and decisive. The Holy Qur-án (61:6.)<sup>1</sup> declares that Jesus<sup>(pbuh)</sup> announced unto the people of Israel the coming of an “Apostle from God whose name was to be Ahmed.”**

The Gospel of St. John, being written in Greek, uses the name *Paracletos*, a barbarous form unknown to classical Greek literature. But *Pericyltos*, which corresponds exactly with Ahmed in its signification of “illustrious,” “glorious” and “praised,” in its superlative degree, must have been the translation into Greek of *Himda* or probably *Hemida* of the Aramaic form, as uttered by Jesus<sup>(pbuh)</sup> Christ. Alas! There is no Gospel extant in the original language spoken by Jesus<sup>(pbuh)</sup>!

**(b) As to the etymology and signification of the words *shalom*, *shlama*, and the Arabic *salám*, *Islam*, I need not detain the reader by dragging him into linguistic details. Any Semitic scholar knows that *Shalom* and *Islam* are derived from one and the same root and that both mean peace, submission, and resignation.**

There is a very, very ancient religious dispute between the Ishmaelites and the Israelites about the questions concerning the Birthright and the Covenant. The readers of the Bible and the Qur-án are familiar with the story of the great Prophet Abraham and his two sons Ishmael (Ismá’íl)<sup>(pbuh)</sup> and Isaac (Isháq)<sup>(pbuh)</sup>. The story of Abraham’s call from the Ur of the Chaldees, and that of his descendants until the death of his grandson Joseph<sup>(pbuh)</sup> in Egypt, is written in the Book of Genesis (chapters xi.-1). In his genealogy as recorded in Genesis, Abraham is the twentieth from Adam<sup>(pbuh)</sup>, and a contemporary of Nimrod, who built the stupendous Tower of Babel.

---

1. Qur-án,61:6. And remember, Jesus, the son of Mary, said: "O Children of Israel! I am the apostle of Allah (sent) to you, confirming the Law (which came) before me, and giving Glad Tidings of an Messenger to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad." But when he came to them with Clear Signs, they said, "this is evident sorcery!" (Editors)..

There are three distinct points which every true believer in God must accept as truths. **The first point is that Ishmael is the legitimate son of Abraham, his firstborn, and therefore his claim to birthright is quite just and legal. The second point is that the Covenant was made between God and Abraham as well as his only son Ishmael before Isaac<sup>(pbuh)</sup> was born. The Covenant and the institution of the Circumcision would have no value or signification unless the repeated promise contained in the divine words, "Throughout thee all the nations of the earth shall be blessed," and especially the expression, the Seed "that shall come out from the bowels, *he* will inherit thee" (Gen. xv. 4). This promise was fulfilled when Ishmael was born (Gen. xvi.), and Abraham had the consolation that his chief servant Eliezer would no longer be his heir. Consequently we must admit that Ishmael was the real and**

**legitimate heir of Abraham's spiritual dignity and privileges. The prerogative that "by Abraham all the generations of the earth shall be blessed, "so often repeated -though in different forms- was the heritage by birthright, and was the patrimony of Ishmael. The inheritance to which Ishmael was entitled by birthright was not the tent in which Abraham lived or a certain camel upon which he used to ride, but to subjugate and occupy forever all the territories extending from the Nile to the Euphrates, which were inhabited by some ten different nations (xvii. 18-21). These lands have never been subdued by the descendants of Isaac<sup>(pbuh)</sup>, but by those of Ishmael. This is an actual and literal fulfilment of one of the conditions contained in the Covenant.**

**The third point is that Isaac<sup>(pbuh)</sup> was also born miraculously and specially blessed by the Almighty, that for his people the land of Canaan was promised and actually occupied under Joshua. No Muslim does ever think of disparaging the sacred and prophetic position of Isaac<sup>(pbuh)</sup> and his son Jacob<sup>(pbuh)</sup>; for to disparage or to lower a Prophet is an impiety. When we compare Ishmael<sup>(pbuh)</sup> and Isaac<sup>(pbuh)</sup>, we cannot but reverence and respect them both as holy servants of God. In fact, the people of Israel, with its Law and sacred Scriptures, have had a unique religious history in the Old World. They were indeed the Chosen People of God. Although**



**that people have often rebelled against God, and fallen into idolatry, yet they have given to the world myriads of prophets and righteous men and women.**

So far there could be no real point of controversy between the descendants of Ishmael and the people of Israel. For if by “Blessing” and the “Birthright” it meant only some material possessions and power, the dispute would be settled as it has been settled by sword and the accomplished fact of the Arab occupation of the promised lands. Nay, there is a fundamental point of dispute between the two nations now existing for nearly four thousand years; and that point is the question of the Messiah and Muhammad<sub>(pbuh)</sub>. The Jews do not see the fulfilment of the so-called Messianic prophecies either in the person of Christ or in that of Muhammad<sub>(pbuh)</sub>. **The Jews have always been jealous of Ishmael because they know very well that in him the Covenant was made and with his circumcision it was concluded and sealed. and it is out of this rancour that their scribes or doctors of law have corrupted and interpolated many passages in their Scriptures. To efface the name “Ishmael” from the second, sixth, and seventh verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Book of Genesis and to insert in its place “Isaac,” and to leave the descriptive epithet “thy only begotten son” is to deny the existence of the former and to violate the Covenant made between God and Ishmael. It is expressly said in this chapter by God: “Because thou didst not spare thy only begotten son, I will increase and multiply the posterity like the stars and the sands on the seashore,” which word “multiply” was used by the Angel to Hagar in the Wilderness: I will multiply thy offspring to an innumerable multitude, and that Ishmael “shall become a fruitful man” (Gen. xvi. 12). Now the Christians have translated the same Hebrew word, which means “fruitful” of “plentiful” from the verb *para* – identical with the Arabic *wefera*- in their versions “a wild ass”! Is it not a shame and impiety to call Ishmael “a wild ass” whom God styles “Fruitful” or “Plentiful”?** It is very remarkable that Christ himself, as reported in the Gospel of St. Barnabas, reprimanded the Jews who said that the Great Messenger whom they call “Messiah” would come down from the lineage of King David, telling them plainly that he could not be the son of David, for David calls him “his Lord,” and then went on to explain how their fathers had altered the Scriptures, and that the

Covenant was made, not with Isaac, but with Ishmael, who was taken to be offered a sacrifice to God, and that the expression “**thy only begotten son**” means Ishmael, and not Isaac.

### **The mystery of the Mispa:**

- In this article, as the title shows, I shall try to give an exposition of the ancient Hebrew Cult of Stone, which they inherited from Abraham, their great progenitor, and to show that this Stone-Cult was instituted at Mecca by that Patriarch and his son Ishmael; in the land of Canaan by Isaac and Jacob<sup>(pbuh)</sup>; and in Moab and elsewhere by the other descendants of Abraham.

By the term “Stone-Cult,” let it be understood, I do not mean stone-worship, which is idolatry; by it I understand the worship of God at a specially consecrated stone meant for that purpose. In those days of yore, when the chosen family was leading a nomadic and pastoral life, it had no settled habitation where to build a house, especially dedicated to the worship of God; it used to erect a particular stone around which it used to make a *hajj*; that is to say, to turn round seven times in the form of a dancing-ring. The word *hajj* might frighten the Christian readers and they might shrink at its sight because of its Arabic form and because of its being at present a Muslim religious performance. The word *hajj* is exactly identical in meaning and etymology with the same in the Hebrew and other Semitic languages. The Hebrew verb *hagag* is the same as the Arabic *hajaj*, the difference being only in the pronunciation of the third letter of the Semitic alphabet *gamal*, which the Arabs pronounce as *j*. The Law of Moses<sup>(pbuh)</sup> uses this very word *hagag* or *haghagh*.<sup>1</sup> when it orders the festival ceremonies to be performed. The word signifies to compass a building, an altar or a stone by running round it at a regular and trained pace with the purpose of performing a religious festival of rejoicing and chanting. In the East the Christians still practise what they call *higga* either during their festival days or at weddings. Consequently, this word has nothing to do with pilgrimage, which is derived from the Italian *Pellegrino*, and this also from the Latin *peregrinus* - meaning a “foreigner.”

---

1. Unlike the Arabs, both the Hebrew as well as the Aramaic peoples have no *j* sound in their alphabet; their third letter, *gamal*, when hard has *g* sound and when soft or aspirate becomes guttural and sounds *gb*.(the auther).

Abraham during his sojourns frequently used to build an altar for worship and sacrifice at different places and on particular occasions. When Jacob<sup>(pbuh)</sup> was on his way to Padan Aram and saw the vision of that wonderful ladder, he erected a stone there, upon which he poured oil and called it Bethel, i.e. “the house of God”; and twenty years later he again visited that stone, upon which he poured oil and “pure wine,” [!] as recorded in Genesis xxviii. 10-22; xxxv. A special stone was erected as a monument by Jacob<sup>(pbuh)</sup> and his father-in-law upon a heap of stones called *Gal’ead* in Hebrew, and *Yaghar sahdutha* by Laban in his Aramaic language, which means “a heap of witness.” But the proper noun they gave to the erected stone was *Mispa* (Gen. xxxi. 45-55), which I prefer to write in its exact Arabic form, *Mispha*, and this I do for the benefit of my Muslim readers.

Now this *Mispha* became later on the most important place of worship, and a centre of the national assemblies in the history of the people of Israel. It was here that Naphthah -a Jewish hero- made a vow “before the Lord,” and after beating the Ammonites, he is supposed to have offered his only daughter as a burnt offering (Judges xi.). It was at *Mispha* that four hundred thousand swordsmen from the eleven tribes of Israel assembled and “swore before the Lord” to exterminate the tribe of Benjamin for an abominable crime committed by the Benjamites of Geba’ and succeeded (Judges xx., xxi.). At *Mispha* all the people were summoned by the Prophet Samuel, where they “swore before the Lord” to destroy all their idols and images, and then were saved from the hands of the Philistines (1 Sam. Vii.). It was here that the nation assembled and Saul was appointed king over Israel (1 Sam. X.). In short, every national question of great moment was decided at this *Mispha* or at Bethel. It seems that these shrines were built upon high places or upon a raised platform, often called *Ramoth*, which signifies a “high place.” Even after the building of the gorgeous Temple of Solomon, the *Misphas* were held in great reverence. But, like the *ka’aba* at Mecca, these *Misphas* were often filled with idols and images. After the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Chaldeans, the *Mispha* still maintained its sacred character as late as the time of the Maccabees during the reign of King Antiochus<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. The Bible which I consult does not contain the so-called deutrocanonical or Apocryphal books of the Old Testament. This Bible is published by the American

Now, what does the word *Mispa* mean? It is generally translated into a “watch-tower.” It belongs to that class of Semitic nouns *-Asmá Zarf-* which take or drive their name from the thing that they enclose or contain. *Mispa* is the place or building which derives its name from *sáphá*, an archaic word for “stone.” The usual word for stone in Hebrew is *iben*, and in Arabic *hajar*. The Syriac for stone is *kípa*. But *safa* or *sapha* seems to be common to them all for some particular object or person when designated as a “stone.” Hence the real meaning of *Mispa* is the locality or place in which a *sapha* or stone is set and fixed. It will be seen that when this name, *Mispa*, was first given to the stone erected upon a heap of stone blocks, there was no edifice built around it. It is the spot upon which a *sapha* rests, that is called *Mispa*.

### Muhammad is the Shiloh:

The famous prophecy, which may be considered as the nucleus of this testament, is contained in the tenth verse of the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis as follows:-

“The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah,  
And the Lawgiver from between his feet,  
Until the coming of Shiloh,  
And to him belongeth the obedience of peoples.”

This is the literal translation of the Hebrew text as much as I can understand it. There are two words in the text which are unique and occur nowhere else in the Old Testament. The first of these words is “Shilōh,” and the other “yiqha” or “yiqhath (by construction or contraction).

*Shilōh* is formed of four letters, *shín*, *yod*, *lamed* and *hi*. There is a “Shiloh,” the proper name of a town in Ephraim,

(1 Sam. i., etc.), but there is no *yod* in it. This name cannot be identical with, or refer to, the town where the Ark of the Covenant or the

---

Bible Society (New York, 1893). The title runs thus *Ktbabbi Qaddisbi Dadiatbiqi Wadiatbiqi Kbadatt An S' bad-watba Pousbaqa dmin lisbani qdimaqi. Matba 'ta d'dasta. Biblioneta d' America* [The Holy Books of the Old Testament and of the New Covenant (Testament), with the concordance or witnesses. Trans. from the ancient languages. Published at the Press of the American Bible Society. (the author).

Tabernacle was; for until then no sceptre or lawgiver had appeared in the tribe of Judah. The word certainly refers to a person, and not to a place.

As far as I can remember, all the versions of the Old Testament have preserved this original *Shiloh* without giving it a rendering. It is only the Syriac *Pshitta* (in Arabic called *al-Bessita*) that has translated it into "He to whom it belongs." It is easy to see how the translator has understood the word as composed of "*sh*" abridged from of *āsher* = "he, that," and *lōh* (the Arabic *lehu*) = "is his." Consequently, according to the Pshitta, the clause will be read in the following manner: "Until he to whom it belongeth come, And," etc. The personal pronoun "it" may refer to the sceptre and the lawgiver separately or collectively, or perhaps to the "obedience" in the fourth clause of the verse, the language being poetic. According to this important version the sense of the prediction would appear to be plainly this:-

"The royal and prophetic character shall not pass away from Judah until he to whom it belongs come, for his is the homage of people."

But apparently this word is derived from the verb *shalah* and therefore meaning "peaceful, tranquil, quiet and trust-worthy."

It is most likely that some old transcriber or copyist *currente calamo* and with a slip of pen has detached the left side of the final letter *het*, and then it has been transformed into *hi*; for the two letters are exceedingly alike being only very slightly different on the left side. If such an error has been transmitted in the Hebrew manuscript either intentionally or not- then the word is derived from *shālāh*, "to send, delegate," the past participle of which would be *shālūh* - that is, "one who is sent, apostle, messenger."

But there appears no reasonable cause for a deliberate change of *het* for *hi*, since the *yod* is preserved in the present shape of Shiloh, which has no *vaw* that would be necessary for the past participle Shālūh. Besides, I think the Septuagint has retained the Shiloh as it is. The only possible change, therefore, would be of the final letter *het* into *hi*. If such be the case, then the word would take the form of Shilūāh and correspond exactly to the "Apostle of Yah," the very title given to Muhammad alone "Rāsūl Allah," i.e. "the Apostle of God." I

know that the term “shiluah” is also the technical word for the “letter of divorce,” and this because the divorced wife is “sent” away.

I can guess of no other interpretation of this singular name besides the three versions I have mentioned.

Of course, it goes without saying that both the Jews and Christians believe this blessing to be one of the foremost Messianic prophecies. That Jesus<sub>(pbuh)</sub>, the Prophet of Nazareth, is a Christ or Messiah no Muslim can deny, for the Qur-án does acknowledge that title. That every Israelite King and High Priest was anointed with the holy oil composed of olive oil and various spices we know from the Hebrew Scriptures (Lev. xxx. 23-33). Even the Zardushti Koresh King of Persia is called God’s Christ: “Thus says the Lord to His Christ Cyrus,” etc. (Isa. xlv. 1-7).

It would be superfluous here to mention that although neither Cyrus nor Jesus<sub>(pbuh)</sub> were anointed by the sacred anointment, yet they are called Messiahs.

As to Jesus<sub>(pbuh)</sub>, even if his prophetic mission were recognized by the Jews, his Messianic office could never be accepted by them. For none of the marks or characteristics of the Messiah they expect are to be found in the man whom they attempted to crucify. The Jew expects a Messiah with the sword and temporal power, a conqueror who would restore and extend the kingdom of David, and a Messiah who would gather together the dispersed Israel unto the land of Canaan, and subdue many nations under his yoke; but they could never acclaim as such a preacher upon the Mount of Olives, or one born in a manger.

To show that this very ancient prophecy has been practically and literally fulfilled in Muhammad the following arguments can be advanced. By the allegorical expressions “the Sceptre” and “Law-giver” it is unanimously admitted by the commentators to mean the royal authority and the prophecy respectively. Without stopping long to examine the root and derivation of the second singular word “yiqha,” we may adopt either of its two significations, “obedience” or “expectation.”

Let us follow the first interpretation of Shiloh as given in the Pshitta version: “he to whom it belongs.” This practically means “the owner of the sceptre and the law,” or “he who possesses the sovereign and legislative authority, and his is the obedience of nations.” Who,

then, can this mighty Prince and great Legislator be? Certainly not Moses<sup>(pbuh)</sup>, for he was the first organizer of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and before him there never appeared a king or prophet in the tribe of Judah. Decidedly not David, because he was the first king and prophet descended from Judah. And evidently not Jesus<sup>(pbuh)</sup> Christ, because he himself repudiated the idea that the Messiah whom Israel was expecting was a son of David (Matt. xxii. 44, 45; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44). He has left no written law, and never dreamt of assuming the royal sceptre; in fact, he advised the Jews to be loyal to Cæsar and pay him tribute, and on one occasion the crowds attempted to make him a king, but he escaped and hid himself. His Gospel was written on the tablet of his heart, and he delivered his message of “good news,” not *in scripto*, but orally. In this prophecy there is no question of the salvation from original sin by the blood of a crucified person, nor of a reign of a god-man over human hearts. Besides, Jesus<sup>(pbuh)</sup> did not abrogate the Law of Moses<sup>(pbuh)</sup>, but he distinctly declared that he had come to fulfil it; nor was he the last Prophet; for after him St. Paul speaks of many “prophets” in the Church.

Muhammad came with military power and the Qur-ân to replace the old Jewish worn-out sceptre and the impracticable and old-fashioned law of sacrifices and of a corrupt priesthood. He proclaimed the purest religion of the one true God, and laid down the best practical precepts and rules for morals and conduct of men. He established the religion of Islam which has united into one real brotherhood many nations and peoples who associate no being with the Almighty. All Muslim peoples obey the Apostle of Allah, love and reverence him as the founder of their religion, but never worship him or give him divine honour and attributes. He crushed and put an end to the last vestiges of the Jewish principality of Qureihda and Khaibar, having destroyed all their castles and fortifications.

The second interpretation of the tetragram “Shilh,” pronounced Shiloh, is equally important and in favour of Muhammad. As it was shown above, the word signifies “tranquil, peaceful, trustworthy, quiet” and so forth. The Aramaic form of the word is *Shilya*, from the same root *Shala* or *Shla*. This verb is not used in Arabic.

It is a well-known fact in the history of the Prophet of Arabia that, previous to his call to the Apostleship, he was extremely quiet,

peaceful, trustworthy, and of a contemplative and attractive character; that he was surnamed by the people of Mecca “Muhammad al-Emīn.” When the Meccans gave this title “Emīn” or “Amīn” to Muhammad they had not the remotest idea of “Shiloh,” yet the ignorance of the idolatrous Arabs was made use of by God to confound the unbelieving Jews, who had scriptures and knew their contents. The Arabic verb *amana*, like the Hebrew *aman*, to be “firm, constant, secure,” and therefore “to be tranquil, faithful and trustworthy,” shows that “amin” is precisely the equivalent of Shiloh, and conveys all the significations contained in it.

Muhammad, before he was called by God to preach the religion of Islam and to abolish the idolatry which he successfully accomplished, was the most quiet and truthful man in Mecca; he was neither a warrior nor a legislator; but it was after he assumed the prophetic mission that he became the most eloquent speaker and the best valiant Arab. He fought with the infidels sword in hand, not for his own personal interest, but for the glory of Allah and for the cause of His religion - Al-Islam. He was shown by God the keys of the treasures of the earth, but he did not accept them, and when he died he was practically a poor man. No other servant of God, whether a king or a prophet, has rendered such an admirably great and precious service to God and to man as Muhammad has done: to God in eradicating the idolatry from a large part of the globe, and to man by having given the most perfect religion and the best laws for his guidance and security. He seized the sceptre and the law from the Jews; fortified the former and perfected the latter. If Muhammad were permitted to reappear to-day in Mecca or Medina, he would be met by the Muslims with the same affection and “obedience” as he saw there during his earthly life. And he would see with a deep sense of pleasure that the holy Book he had left is the same without the least alteration in it,<sup>1</sup> and that it is chanted and recited exactly as he and his companions did. He would be glad to congratulate them on their fidelity to the religion and to the unity of Allah; and to the fact that they have not made of him a god or son of a god.

---

1. Qur-án,15:9 . We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will assuredly guard it (from corruption). (Editors).



**How to distinguish a genuine prophet from a false prophet. Jeremiah has supplied us with a fairly satisfactory answer, namely:**

**“THE PROPHET WHO PREACHES ISLAM”**

In the Book of Deuteronomy (xiii. 1-5, xviii. 20-22) God the Almighty gives some instructions concerning the false prophets who may prophesy in the name of the Lord and in such an insidious way that they could mislead His people. Further, he tells us that the best way to find out the impostor's perfidy was to anticipate the fulfilment of his predictions, and then to put him to death when his fraud was divulged. But, as is well known, the ignorant cannot well distinguish between the genuine prophet and the impostor, just as much as they to-day are unable to definitely discover which of the two, a Roman Catholic priest or a Calvinist minister, is genuine follower of Jesus Christ! A false prophet would also foretell events, work wonders, and do other religious things similar -at least in appearance- to those performed by a true one. The competition between the prophet Moses and the magicians of Egypt is an apt illustration of this statement. Thus it is Jeremiah who gives us the best way of testing the veracity, the genuineness, of a prophet, and that way is the sign of Islam. **Please read the whole chapter xxviii. of Jeremiah, and then ponder and reflect on the ninth verse:-**

**“The prophet which foretells the Islam (Shālōm), at the coming of the word of the Prophet, that prophet will be recognized to have been sent by God in truth” (Jer. xxviii. 9).**

**In examination of that marvellous vision of the Prophet Daniel (Chap. vii.) we saw<sup>1</sup> how Muhammad was escorted by the myriads of celestial beings and conducted to the glorious presence of the Eternal; how he heard the words of honour and affection which no creature had ever been favoured with (2 Cor. xii.); how he was crowned to the dignity of the Sultan of the Prophets and invested with power to destroy the “Fourth Beast” and the “Blasphemous Horn.” Further, we saw how he was authorized to establish and proclaim the Kingdom of**

---

1. *Vide* Articles V and VI, which appeared in the *Islamic Review* for November and December, 1928. (the author).

God on earth; how all that human genius can possibly imagine of the highest honours accorded by the Almighty to a beloved Servant and to His most worthy Apostle could be ascribed to Muhammad alone. It should be remembered that among all the Prophets and Messengers of Allah, Muhammad alone figures like a tower above all; and the grand and noble work he accomplished stands a permanent monument of his honour and greatness. One cannot appreciate the value and importance of Islam as the unique bulwark against idolatry and polytheism unless the absolute unity of God is earnestly admitted. When we fully realize that Allah is the same God whom Adam and Abraham knew, and whom Moses and Jesus worshipped, then we have no difficulty in accepting Islam as the only true religion and Muhammad as the Prince of all the Prophets and Servants of God. We cannot magnify the greatness of Allah by conceiving Him now as a "Father," now as a "Son," and now as a "Holy Ghost," or to imagine Him as having three persons that can address each other with the three singular personal pronouns: I, thou, he. By so doing we lose all the true conception of the Absolute Being, and cease to believe in the true God.

The great destroyer of the "Eleventh Horn," that personified Constantine the Great and the Trinitarian Church, was not a *Bar Allaha* ("Son of God"), but a *Bar Nasha* ("Son of Man") and none other than Muhammad al-Mustapha who *actually* founded and established the Kingdom of God upon earth. It is this Kingdom of God that we are now to examine and expound. It would be remembered that it was during the divine audience of the Sultan of the Prophets, as given in Daniel, that it was promised that:-

"The kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under all heaven shall be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High; its (the people's) kingdom (shall be) a kingdom for ever, and all dominions shall serve and obey it" (Dan. vii. 22 and 27).

The expressions in this prophetic passage that the Kingdom of God shall consist of "the People of the Saints of the Most High," and that all other dominions or powers shall serve and obey that people, clearly indicate that in Islam the Religion and State are

**one and the same body, and consequently inseparable. Islam is not only the Religion of God, but also His earthly empire or kingdom. In order to be able to form a clear and true idea concerning the nature and the constitution of the “Kingdom of God on earth” it is necessary to cast a glance upon the history of the religion of Islam before it was perfected, completed, and formally established by God Himself under His Apostle Muhammad.**

#### **1. ISLAM BEFORE MUHAMMAD WAS NOT THE KINGDOM OF GOD UPON EARTH, BUT ONLY GOD’S TRUE RELIGION**

Those who believe that the true religion of Allah was revealed only to Abraham and preserved by the people of Israel alone, must be very ignorant students of the Old Testament literature, and must have a very erroneous notion of the nature of that religion. **Abraham himself offered tithes to the King and Imam<sup>1</sup> of Jerusalem and was blessed by him (Gen. xiv. 18).** The father-in-law of Moses was also an Imam and a Prophet of Allah; Job, Balaam, Ad, Hud, Loqmân, and many other prophets were not Jews. The various tribes and nations like the Ishmaelites, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, and others which descended from the sons of Abraham and Lot, knew God the Almighty though they too, like the Israelites, fell into idolatry and ignorance. But the light of Islam was never entirely extinguished or substituted by idolatry. Idols or images, which were considered as “sacred” and as household gods by the Jews, as well as their kindred nationalities, and usually called “Traphim” (Gen. xxxi.) in the Hebrew, were, in my humble opinion of the same nature and character as the images and idols which the Orthodox and Catholic Christians keep and worship in their houses and temples. In those olden times of ignorance the idols were of the kind of “identity card” or of the nature of a passport. Is it not remarkable to find that Rachel (Rahîl), the wife of Jacob and the daughter of Laban, should steal the “traphim” of her father? (Gen. xxxi.). Yet Laban as well as her husband were Muslims, and on the same day raised the stone “Mispha” and dedicated it to God!

The Jews in the wilderness, inebriate with the wonders and

---

1. In Hebrew these old Imams are called “Kôhen,” and rendered by Christians as “Priest.” A Jewish priest can never be identified with a Christian Sacramentarian priest. (the auther).

miracles worked day and night - their camp shadowed by a miraculous cloud at daytime and illuminated by a pillar of fire at night, themselves fed with the “manna” and “Salwai”- as soon as the Prophet Moses disappeared for a few days on the misty top of Mount Sinai, made a golden calf and worshipped it. The history of that stubborn people from the death of Joshua to the anointment of King Saul, covering a period of more than four centuries, is full of a series of scandalous relapses into idolatry. It was only after the close of the revelation and the Canon of their holy Scriptures in the third century before Christ that the Jews ceased to worship idols, and have since remained monotheists. **But their belief in the Unity of God, though it makes them Unitarians, does not entitle them to the qualification of being called “Muslims,” because they have stubbornly rejected both the persons and the revelations of Jesus and Muhammad. It is only through submission to the will of God that a man can attain peace and become Muslim, otherwise the faith without obedience and submission is similar to that of the devils who believe in the existence of Allah and tremble.**

As we possess no records concerning the other peoples who were favoured with divine revelations and with the Prophets and Imam sent to them by God, we shall only content ourselves with the declaration that the religion of Islam existed among Israel and other Arab peoples of old, sometimes more luminous, but mostly like a flickering wick or like a dim spark glimmering in a dark room. It was a religion professed by a people who soon forgot it, or neglected it, or transformed it into pagan practices. But all the same there were always individuals and families who loved and worshipped God.

It seems that the Jews, especially the masses, had no true conception of God and of religion as the Muslims have had of Allah and Islam. Whenever the people of Israel prospered and was successful in its wars, then Jahwah was acknowledged and worshipped; but in adverse circumstances He was abandoned and the deity of a stronger and more prosperous nation was adopted and its idol or image worshipped. **A careful study of the Hebrew Scripture will show that the ordinary Jew considered his God sometimes stronger or higher, and sometimes weaker, than those professed by other nations. Their very easy and reiterated relapse into idolatry is a proof that the Israelites had almost the same notion**

about their El or Yahwah, as the Assyrians had of their own Ashur, the Babylonians of Mardukh, and the Phoenicians of their Ba'al. With the exception of the Prophets and the Sophis, the Muslims of Torah, the Israel of the Mosaic Law, never rose equal to the height of the sanctity of their religion nor of the true conception of their Deity. The faith in Allah and a firm conviction and belief in a future life was not ingrained and implanted in the spirit and in the heart of that people.

What a contrast, then, between the Muslims of the Qur-án, the believers of the Muhammadan Law,<sup>1</sup> and the Muslims of Torah or the Mosaic Law! **Has it ever been seen and proved that a Muslim people abandoned its Mosque, Imam, and the Qur-án, and embraced any other religion and acknowledged that Allah was not its God? Never! It is extremely unlikely that a Muhammadan Muslim community, so long as it is provided with the Book of Allah, the Mosque and the Mullah, could relapse into idolatry or even into Christianity.**

But the true religion of God never took the form of the Kingdom of God as it did under the Qur-ánic régime. Allah is His infinite wisdoms had decreed that four great Powers of Darkness should succeed each other before His own Kingdom was to be established. The great ancient civilizations and empires of the Assyro-Chaldeans, of the Medo-Persians, of the Greeks and of the Romans, had to appear and flourish, to persecute and oppress the people of God, and to perpetrate all the evil and wickedness that the Devil could devise. All the glory of these great Powers consisted in their worshipping the Devil; and it was this "glory" that the "Prince of the Darkness" promised to grant to Jesus Christ from the top of a high mountain if he were only to follow him and worship him.

## 2. CHRIST AND HIS DISCIPLES PREACHED THE KINGDOM OF GOD

They were, it is true, the harbingers of the Kingdom of God upon earth. The soul and the kernel of the Gospel of Jesus is contained in that famous clause in his prayer: "Thy Kingdom come." *For twenty centuries the Christians of all denominations and shades of belief*

---

1. The term "Muhammadan" is used here to distinguish it from the Mosaic Law, which both belong to Allah. (the author).

*have been praying and repeating this invocation. "Thy Kingdom come," and God alone knows how long they will continue to pray for and vainly anticipate its coming.* This Christian anticipation of the coming of the Kingdom of God is of the same nature as the anticipation of Judaism for the coming of Messiah.

The Kingdom of God on earth *is a Religion, a powerful society of believers in One God equipped with faith and sword to fight for and maintain its existence and absolute independence against the Kingdom of Darkness, against all those who do not believe that God is One, or against those who believe that He has a son, a father or mother, associates and coevals.*

The religion of God, until Jesus Christ, was consigned chiefly to the people of Israel; it was more material and of a national character. Its lawyers, priests, and scribes had disfigured that religion with a gross and superstitious literature of the traditions of their forefathers. Christ condemned those traditions, denounced the Jews and their leaders as "hypocrites" and "the children of the Devil." Although the demon of idolatry had left Israel, yet later on seven demons had taken possession of that people (Matt. xii. 43-45; Luke xi. 24-26).

Christ reformed the old religion; gave a new life and spirit to it; he explained more explicitly the immortality of the human soul, the resurrection and the life in the next world; and publicly announced that the Messiah whom the Jews were expecting was not a Jew or a son of David, but a son of Ishmael whose name was Ahmad, and that he would establish the Kingdom of God upon earth with the power of the Word of God and with sword.

### 3. THE NATURE AND CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

There is a royal Islamic anthem sung aloud five times a day from the minarets and the mosques in every part of the globe where the Muslims live. This anthem is followed by a most solemn worship to Allah by his faithful people. This royal Muslim hymn is called *Ādhān* (*Āzān*). This is not all; every action, enterprise and business, however important or trifling it may be, is begun with the words *bismi 'l-Lah*, which means "in the name of Allah," and ends with an *Al-Hamdu li'l-Lāh*, meaning "praise be to Allah!" the bond of faith which binds a Muslim to his Heavenly King is so strong, and the union between the Sovereign and His subject so close, that

**nothing, however powerful or seductive, can separate him from Allah.**

**It is evident, therefore, that the nature of Islam consists in its being the only real and truly Theocratic Kingdom on earth. Allah need no longer send Messengers or Prophets to convey His oracles and messages to the Muslims as He used to do to Israel and other Hebrew peoples; for His will is fully revealed in the Holy Qur-án and imprinted on the minds of His faithful subjects.**

As to the formation and the constitution of the Kingdom of God, *inter alia*, the following points should be noted:-

- (a)** All Muslims form one nation, one family, and one brotherhood. I need not detain my readers to study the various quotations from the Qur-án and the Hādīth (Tradition of the Prophet) on these points. We must judge the Muslim society, not as it presents itself *now*, but as it *was in the time* of Muhammad and his immediate successors. Every member of this community is an honest worker, a brave soldier, and a fervent believer and devotee.
- (b)** According to the description of the Prophet Daniel, the citizens of the Kingdom of God are “the People of the Saints.” In the original Chaldish or Aramaic text, they are described as “A’mma d’ qaddishid’ I’lionin,” an epithet worthy only of the Prince of the Prophets and of his noble army of the Muhājirīn (Emigrants) and the Ansār (Helpers), who uprooted idolatry from a great part of Asia and Africa and destroyed the Roman Beast.

#### **4. THE PERMANENCE AND THE DIGNITY OF THE KINGDOM OF ALLAH**

Is doubly assured by an Angel to Daniel. It is stated that “all the nations under the heaven shall serve the People of the Saints of the Most High.” It requires no proof to say that all the Christian Powers show a particular respect, and even deference when necessary, not only to Muslim Powers, to Muslim sacred places and mosques, but also to the local institutions of their Muslim subjects.

#### **1. THE ETYMOLOGY AND SIGNIFICATION OF “EUDOKIA”**

**Now let us proceed to give the true meaning of “Eudokia.”**

The adjectival prefix “eu” signifies “good, well, more, and most,” as in “eudokimeo” -“to be esteemed, approved, loved,” and “to acquire glory”; “eudokimos”- “very esteemed, most renowned and glorious”; “eudoxos” -“most celebrated and glorious”; “eudoxia”- “celebrity, renown.” The Greek substantive “doxa,” used in the compound nouns “orthodox,” “doxology,” and so on, is derived from the verb “dokeo.” Every student of English literature knows that “doxa” signifies “glory, honour, renown.” There are numerous phrases in the classical Greek authors where “doxa” is used to signify “glory”: “Peri doxis makheshai” - “to fight for glory.” The famous Athenian orator Demosthenes “preferred glory to a tranquil life,” “glory equal to that of the gods.” I am cognizant of the fact that “doxa” is, although seldom, used to signify (a) opinion, belief; (b) dogma, principle, doctrine; and (c) anticipation or hope. But all the same, its general and comprehensive sense is “glory.” In fact, the first portion of the Canticle begins with: “Doxa [Glory] be to Allah in the highest.”

In the *Dictionnaire Grec-Français* (published in 1846 in Paris by R. C. Alexandre) the word “eudokia” is rendered “bienveillance, tendresse, volonté, bon plaisir,” etc.; and the author gives “dokeo” as the root of “doxa,” with its various significations I have mentioned above.

The Greeks of Constantinople, among whose teachers I have had several acquaintances, while unanimously understanding by “eudokia” the meaning of “delight, loveliness, pleasantness, and desire,” also admit that it does signify “celebrity, renown, and honourability” in its original sense as well.

## **2. THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE HEBREW FORMS OF MAHMAD AND HIMDAH, AND THEIR SIGNIFICATIONS.**

I am convinced that the only way to understand the sense and the spirit of the Bible is to study it from an Islamic point of view. It is only *then* that the real nature of the Divine Revelation can be understood, appreciated, and loved. It is only then, too, that the spurious, the false, and the heterogeneous elements interpolated in it can be discovered in their blackest features and eliminated. And it is from this point of view that I welcome this Greek word “eudokia,” which in its true and literal signification admirably corresponds to the Hebrew “Mahmad, Mahamod, Himdah,” and “Hemed” so frequently



used in the Old Testament.

(a) *Hamad*. This verb, which is constituted of three essential consonants *hmd*, and common to all the Semitic dialects, *everywhere* in the Sacred Writ of the Hebrews signifies: “to covet, fall in love, long for, take pleasure and delight in,” and “to desire ardently.” Those who know Arabic will naturally understand the comprehensive sense of the word *Shahwat*, which is rendered in English as “lust, cupidity, ardent desire, and appetite.” Well, this is the precise sense and signification of the verb “hamad” in the Hebrew Scriptures. One of the commands in the famous Decalogue of the Torah (Arabic “Taurāt”) or the Law contains this clause: “Lo tahmōd ish réikha” –“Thou shalt not covet the wife of the neighbour” (Exod. xx. 17.)

(b) *Hemed*.<sup>1</sup> The substantive in the masculine gender, and “Himdah” in the feminine, signifies: “lust, desire, pleasantness, delight, object of longing and of desire, loveliness” (Hag. ii. 7; Jerem. xxv. 34, etc.).

(c) *MaHMaD*, *MaHaMoD* (Lam. i. 7, 10; ii. 4, etc.). These participles forms are also derivatives from the verb “hamad” and mean: “most covetable, delightful, pleasant, delicious, charming, precious, beloved.”

That the Arabic form *MuHaMmaD* and the Hebrew *MaHMaD* and *MaHaMoD* are derived from one and the same verb or root, and that they, notwithstanding the slight orthographic difference between the forms, have one common origin and signification, there cannot be a jot or iota of doubt. I have given the meanings of the Hebrew forms as the Jews and the lexicographers have understood them.

(d) It will therefore be observed that the Greek word “eudokia” must be a literal representation of the Hebrew substantive *HiMDah*, and that both signify: “delight, pleasantness, good pleasure (*bon plaisir*), desire, loveliness, preciousness,” and some other synonymous words.

---

1. An article on “Himdah,” by the learned Professor, was published in the *Islamic Review* for October, 1927. (the author).

Now it would follow from the above that the corresponding equivalent to the Hebrew “Mahamod” can be none other than “eudoxos” which was the object of desire and longing, the most delightful, pleasant, and coveted, and the most precious, approved, loved, and esteemed.

**3. That among all the sons of Adam the name Muhammad should be given for the first time alone to the son of ‘Abdullah and Amina in the town of Mecca, is a unique miracle in the history of religions. There could be no artificial device, attempt, or forgery in this respect. His parents and relatives were pagans and knew nothing of the prophecies in the Hebrew or Christian Scriptures concerning a great Prophet who was promised to come to restore and establish the religion of Islam. Their choice of the name Muhammad or Ahmad could not be explained away as a coincidence or an accidental event. It was surely providential and inspired.**

I have faithfully reproduced the significations of the Hebrew forms as given by the lexicographers and translators. But the intrinsical or spiritual sense of “*Himdah*” and “*Mahamod*” is: “praise and praiseworthy, celebrity and celebrated, glory and glorious.” For among the created beings and things, what can be “more glorious, honourable, illustrious, and praised than that which is most coveted and desired.” It is in this practical sense that the Qur-án uses the word *hamdu* from which Ahmad and Muhammad are derivations, and *hamdu* is the same word as the Hebrew *hemed*. The glory of Muhammad surpasses that of any other creatures, as illustrated by Daniel (vii.), and in the oracle of Allah: “Law lā ka lamā Khalaqna ’l-Aflāka” - “Were it not for thee, were is not for thee (O beloved Muhammad), We would not have created the worlds” (or heavens). But the highest honour and glory granted by Allah to His most esteemed Apostle was that he was commissioned to establish and to perfect the true religion of Allah, under the mane of “Islam,” which, like the name of its founder Muhammad, has so very many consolating and salubrious significations; “peace, security, safety, tranquillity, salvation,” and “the Good” in opposition to “the Evil”; besides those of submission and resignation to the will of Allah.

### Chapter III

## JOHN THE BAPTIST ANNOUNCES A POWERFUL PROPHET

John the Baptist, according to the narratives of the four Evangelists, was a cousin and contemporary of Jesus, being only about six months older than the latter. The Qur-án does not mention anything about the life and work of this Prophet except that God, through the angels, announced to his father Zachariah that he would have a son name Yahyā, who would bear witness to the word of Allah, and that he would be an honourable person, chaste, and one of the righteous prophets (Qur-án, iii.-). Nothing is known about his infancy, except that he was a Nazarite living in the wilderness, eating locusts and wild honey, covering his body with a cloth made of camel's hair, tied with a leather girdle. He is believed to have belonged to a Jewish religious sect called the "Essenes," from whom issued the early Christian "Ibionites" whose principal characteristic was to abstain from worldly pleasures. In fact, the Qur-ánic descriptive term of this hermit Prophet –"hasūra," which means "chaste" in every sense of the word- shows that he led a celibate life of chastity, poverty, and piety. He was not seen from his early youth until he was a man of thirty or more, when he began his mission of preaching repentance and baptizing the penitent sinners with water. Great multitudes were drawn to the wilderness of Judea to hear the fiery sermons of the new Prophet; and the penitent Jews were baptized by him in the water of the River Jordan. He reprimanded the educated but fanatical Pharisees and the Priests, and threatened the learned but rationalistic Saduquees (Saducees) with the coming vengeance. He declared that he was baptizing them with water only as a sign of purification of the heart by penance. He promulgated that there was coming after him another Prophet who would baptized them with the Holy Spirit and fire; who would gather together his wheat into his granaries and burn the chaff with an inextinguishable fire. He further declared that he who was coming afterwards was to such an extent superior to himself in power and dignity that the Baptist confessed to be unfit or unworthy to bow down to untie and loose the laces of his shoes.

It was on one of these great baptismal performances of Hazrat

Yahyā (St. John the Baptist) that Jesus of Nazareth also entered into the water of the Jordan and was baptized by the Prophet like everybody else. Mark (i. 9) and Luke (iii. 21), who report this baptism of Jesus by John, are unaware of the remarks of John on this point as mentioned in Matthew (iii), where it is stated that the Baptist said to Jesus: "I need to be baptized by thee, and didst thou come to me?" To which the latter is reported to have replied: "Let us fulfil the righteousness"; and then he baptized him. The Synoptics state that the spirit of prophecy came down to Jesus in the shape of a dove as he went out from the water, and a voice was heard saying: "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased."

The Fourth Gospel knows nothing about Jesus being baptized by John; but tells us that the Baptist, when he saw Jesus, exclaimed: "Behold the Lamb of God," etc. (John i). this Gospel pretends that Andrew was a disciple of the Baptist, and having abandoned his master brought his brother Simon to Jesus (John i) - a story flagrantly contradicting the statements of the other Evangelists (Matt. iv. 18-19, Mark i. 16-18). In St. Luke the story is altogether different: here Jesus knows Simon Peter before he is made a disciple (Luke iv. 38, 39); and the circumstance which led the master to enlist the sons of Jonah and of Zebedee in the list of his disciples is totally strange to the other Evangelists (Luke vi 1-11). The four Gospels of the Trinitarian Churches contain many contradictory statements about the intercourse between the two cousin prophets. In the Fourth Gospel we read that the Baptist did not know who Jesus was until after his baptism, when a Spirit like a pigeon came down and dwelt in him (John i); whereas St. Luke tells us that the Baptist, while a foetus in the womb of his mother, knew and worshipped Jesus, who was also a younger foetus in the womb of Mary (Luke i. 44). Then, again, we are told that the Baptist while in prison, where he was beheaded (Matt. xi. xiv), did not know the real nature of the mission of Jesus!

It is absolutely impossible to get at the truth, the true religion, from these Gospels, unless they are read and examined from an Islamic and Unitarian point of view. It is only *then* that the truth can be extracted from the false, and the authentic distinguished from the spurious. It is the spirit and the faith of Islam that can alone sift the Bible and cast away the chaff and error from its pages. Before

proceeding farther to show that the Prophet foretold by the Baptist could be none other than Muhammad

Now remains the task of determining the identity of “*that Prophet.*” This article, therefore, must be divided into two parts, namely:

**A. The foretold Prophet was not Jesus Christ; and**

**B. The foretold Prophet was Muhammad.**

Everybody knows that the Christian Churches have always regarded John the Baptist as a subordinate of Jesus, and his herald. All the Christian commentators show Jesus as the object of John’s witness and prophecy.

**Although the language of the Evangelists has been distorted by interpolators to that direction, yet the fraud or error cannot for ever escape the searching eye of a critic and an impartial examiner. Jesus could not be the object of John’s witness because:**



- (1) The very preposition “after” clearly excludes Jesus from being the foretold Prophet. They were both contemporaries and born in one and the same year. “He that is coming after me” Says John, “is stronger than I.” this “after” indicates the future to be at some indefinite distance; and in the prophetical language it expresses one or more cycles of time.

**Leaving aside the exaggerations, which have been evidently added to the Gospels, we fully believe that the Baptist introduced Jesus as the true Messiah, and advised the multitudes to obey him and follow his injunctions and his gospel. But he clearly told his people that there was another, and the last, great Luminary, who was so glorious and dignified in the presence of Allah that he (John) was not fit to undo the laces of his shoes.**

- (2) It was not Jesus Christ who could be intended by John, because if such were the case he would have followed Jesus and submitted to him like a disciple and a subordinate. But such was not the case. On the contrary, we find him preaching, baptizing, receiving initiates and disciples, chastizing King Herod, scolding the Jewish

hierarchy, and foretelling the coming of another Prophet “more powerful” than himself, without taking the least notice of the presence of his cousin in Judea or Galilee.

- (3) Although the Christian Churches have made of Jesus Christ a god or son of a god, the fact that he was circumcised like every Israelite, and baptized by St. John like an ordinary Jew, proves the case to be just the reverse. The words interchanged between the Baptist and the baptized in the River Jordan appear to be an interpolation or a commonalty, for they are contradictory and of a deceptive character. If Jesus were in reality the person whom the Baptist foretold as “more powerful” than himself, so much so that he was “not worthy to kneel and unloose his shoes,” and that “he would baptize with the Spirit and fire,” there would be no necessity nor any sense in his being baptized by his inferior in the river like an ordinary penitent Jew! The expression of Jesus, “It behoves us to fulfil all the justice,” is incomprehensible. **Why and how “all the justice” would be accomplished by them if Jesus were baptized? This expression is utterly unintelligible. It is either an interpolation or a clause deliberately mutilated.**



## Chapter IV

### THE PROPHET FORETOLD BY THE BAPTIST WAS CERTAINLY MUHAMMAD

There are two very significant remarks about John the Baptist made by Jesus Christ, but recorded in a mysterious way. The first remark about the Baptist is that in which John is presented to the world as the reincarnate Eliah (Elijah) the Old Testament. The mystery with which this appellation is enveloped consists in the significant silence of Christ about the identity of the person whom Eliah (*not* Elias) was expected to officially announce and introduce to the world as the Last Prophet. The language of Jesus in this respect is exceedingly obscure, ambiguous, and mysterious. If John was Eliah, as is expressly and fearlessly declared, why, then, is the person whose precursor was Eliah *not expressly and fearlessly mentioned*? If Jesus were the “Messenger of the Covenant” and the Dominator [as the Vulgate translates the Hebrew *Adon* (Mal. iii. 1).], why does he not openly say so? If he courageously declared that it was not he himself but *another* Prophet who was that “Dominator,” it must, indeed, have been a criminal hand which erased and effaced the words of Jesus from the original Gospel. At all events, it is the Gospels that are responsible for this ambiguity and obscurity. It cannot but be described as diabolical tampering with the text that has misled billions of Christians for so many centuries. Jesus, whatever he believed he represented, ought to have, to say the least, shown himself straightforward, and to have frankly declared: “John is the Eliah who was sent as a precursor to prepare the way for me!” Or if such was not the case, then he could have made the following declaration: “John is the Eliah who was sent to prepare the way for Mohammad.” Perhaps this is due to the love of Jesus for ambiguity. There are, in fact, several instances -as reported in the Gospels- where Jesus give an answer or makes a statement which is obscure and entirely unintelligible. Leaving his godhead aside, as a Prophet, nay even as a teacher, he was expected to be a straightforward teacher and leader. The other remark is shrouded in still a thicker mystery. “No man born of woman was ever greater than John the Baptist,” says Jesus, “but the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than John.” Does Jesus Christ mean to teach us that John the Baptist and all the Prophets and

the righteous men *were outside* the Kingdom of God? Who is the “least? That was “greater” than John, and consequently than all the people of God preceding the Baptist? Does *Jesus* mean by the “least” *himself*, or the “least” among the baptized Christians? It cannot be himself, because in his time that Kingdom was not yet established on earth; if it be, then he could not be the “least” in it since he was its founder. The Churches -rather each Church, orthodox or heterodox, from its own peculiar point of view- have discovered a very abstruse or a very absurd solution for this problem; and that solution is that the “least” Christian washed with the blood of Jesus -either through the Sacrament of Baptism, according to the belief of the Sacerdotalists, or through the regeneration of some kind, according to the superstition of the Evangelicals- becomes “greater” than the Baptist and all the army of the holy men and women, including Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Eliah, Daniel, and John the Baptist! And the reason or proof of this marvellous claim is that the Christian, however, sinful, ignorant, low, and poor he may be, providing he has faith in Jesus as his Saviour, has the privileges which the holy Prophets coveted to have but did not enjoy. These privileges are innumerable; purification from original sin through the Christian Baptism; the Knowledge of the “Holy Trinity” (! ! ! *hāshā! astaghfiru ‘llāh!* - Allah forbid and pardon this term); the feeding upon the flesh and the blood of Jesus in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; the grace of making the sign of a cross; the privilege of the keys of Heaven and of Hell delivered to the Sovereign Pontiff; and the rapturous ecstasies of the Puritans, Quakers, Brethren, and all other sects called Nonconformists who, each in its own way, while claiming the same privileges and prerogatives, all agree that each good Christian will become on the day of resurrection a pure virgin and present herself as a bride to the “Lamb of God”!



## JOHN-BAPTIST FORETOLD MUHAMMAD

According to the testimony of Jesus, no man born of woman was ever greater than John the Baptist. But the “least” in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than John. The comparison made by the “Spirit of Allah” (Rūhu ’llāh, i.e. Jesus) is between John and all the preceding Prophets as the officers and administrators of the Kingdom of Heaven. Now in chronological order the *last* Prophet would be the *least* of them all, he would be their junior and their youngest. The word “z’irā” in the Aramaic, like the Arabic “saghīr,” signifies “little, small young.” The Pshitttha Version uses the word “z’irā” or “z’eirā” in apposition to “rabba” for “great, old.” Every Christian will admit that Jesus is *not* the “last” Prophet, and therefore he cannot be the “least.” And as we cannot determine *which* of these numerous Church Prophets was the “last, we are naturally forced to seek elsewhere a Prophet who is indisputably the Last and the Seal of the Prophetic List. Can we imagine a stronger and more brilliant evidence in favour of Muhammad than the fulfilment, in his holy person, of this wonderful prophecy of Jesus Christ?

In the long list of the prophetic family, certainly the “youngest,” the “least” is Muhammad; he is the “Benjamin” of the Prophets; yet he is their Sultan, their “Adon” and their “Glory.” To deny the prophetic and apostolical character and nature of Muhammad’s mission is a fundamental denial of the whole Divine Revelation and all the Prophets who preached it. For all other Prophets put together had not accomplished the gigantic work which the Prophet of Mecca did alone in the short period of but twenty-three years of his apostolic mission.

## Chapter V

### THE BAPTISM OF JOHN AND JESUS ONLY

#### A TYPE OF THE “SIBGHATU ’L-LĀH”<sup>1</sup>

It is a great pity that the Evangelists have not left us a complete and detailed account of the sermon of John the Baptist; and assuming they ever did, it is nothing short of a crime on the part of the Church not to have preserved its text. For it is impossible to imagine the mysterious and enigmatic words of the Baptist in their present shape could have been understood even by the most erudite among his audience. We know that the Jewish doctors and lawyers asked him to explain himself upon various points and to make his declarations more explicit and plain (John i. 19-23 and v. 33). There is no doubt that he elucidated those vital points to his hearers, and did not leave them in obscurity; for he was “a burning and enlightening candle,” who “gave witness concerning the truth” (John v. 33, 35). What was this witness, and what was the nature of the truth about which that witness was given? And what makes it still more obscure is the fact that each Evangelist does not report the same points in identical terms. There is no precision about the character of the truth; was it about the person of Christ and the nature of his mission, or was it about the Apostle of Allah as foretold by Jacob (Gen. xlix.)? What were the precise terms of John’s witness about Jesus, and about the future Prophet who was his superior?

In the third article of this series<sup>2</sup> I offered ample proofs that the Prophet foretold by the Baptist was other than Jesus Christ; and in the fourth article<sup>3</sup> we find several arguments in favour of the Apostle of Allah as being a superior and more powerful Prophet than John.

The principal point which constitutes the power and the superiority of the Prince of the Apostles of Allah is the baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire. The admission by the author of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus and his disciples also used to baptize with water simultaneously with John the Baptist is an abrogation *de facto* of the parenthetical note that “Jesus did not baptize himself, but his disciples only” (John

---

1. Qur-án 2: 138. (Our religion) Takes its hue from Allah. And who can give a better hue than Allah, it is He. Whom we worship.(Editors).

2. Vide Islamic Review for March - April, 1930.

3. Ibid., May, 1930.

iii. 23 and iv. 1, 2). But granting that he himself did not baptize, the admission that his disciples did, while yet initiates and unlearned, shows that their baptism was of the same nature as that of John's. Considering the fact that Jesus during the period of his earthly mission administered that rite exactly as the Baptist was doing at the streams or pools of water, and that he ordered his disciples to continue the same, it becomes as evident and as clear as a barn door that he was not the person intended by the Crier in the Wilderness when he foretold the advent of a powerful Prophet with the baptism of the Spirit and fire. It does not require much learning or an extraordinary intelligence to understand the force of the argument - namely, Jesus during his lifetime baptized *not a single person* with the Holy Spirit and with fire. How, then, can he be regarded as the Baptizer with the Holy Spirit and with fire, or be identified with the Prophet foretold by John? If words, sermons, and prophecies *mean* anything, and are uttered in order to *teach* anything at all, then the words of the Baptist *mean* and *teach* us that the baptism with water would continue to be practiced until the Appearance of the "Shilohah" or the Apostle of Allah, and then it would *cease* and give place to the exercise of the baptism with the Spirit and fire. The nature and the efficacy of each baptism is distinctly stated and defined. The one is performed by immersing or washing the body with water as a sign or mark of repentance; and the other is performed *no longer* by water but by the Holy Spirit and the fire, the effect of which is a *thorough change* of heart, faith, and feeling. One purifies the body, the other enlightens the mind, confirms the faith, and regenerates the heart. One is outward, it is Judaism; the other is inward, it is Islam. The baptism of John and Jesus washes the shell, but the baptism of the Apostle of Allah washes the kernel. In short, the Judæo-Christian baptism is substituted by the Islamic "Ghusl" and "Wodhu" -or the ablutions which are performed, not by a prophet or priest, but *by the believing individual himself*. The Judæo-Christian baptism was necessary and obligatory so long as the baptism of Allah -the Qur-ánic "Sibghatu 'I-Lāh"- was anticipated; and when Muhammad thundered the divine revelations of the Qur-án, then it was that the former baptism vanished as a shadow.

The Christian baptism, notwithstanding its fanfaronade definitions, is nothing more of less than and aspersion with water or an immersion in it. The Council of Trent anathematizes anyone who would say that

the Christian baptism is the same as that of St. John's. I venture to declare that the Christian baptism has not only no spiritual character or effect, but is also even below the baptism of the Baptist. And if I deserve the anathema of the Church for my conviction, I shall deem it as a great honour before my Creator. I consider the pretensions of a Christian priest about the baptism as a means of purification of the soul from original sin and all the rest of it as of a piece with the claims of a sorcerer. The baptism with water was *only* a symbol of baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire, and after the establishment of Islam as the official kingdom of God all the three previous baptisms vanished and were abolished.

(d) From the meager and scant account in the Gospels we cannot get a positive definition of the true nature of the baptism practised by John and Jesus. The claim that the Church is the depository of the divine revelation and its true interpreter is as absurd as is ridiculous the claim that the baptized infant or adult receives the Holy Spirit and becomes a child of God.

If the Greek word "baptismos" is the exact word for the Aramaic "Sab'utha" or "Sbhu'tha," which I am sure it is, then the Arabic "Sibghat" in the Qur-ān, not only does it solve the problem and uncover the veil hiding the mysterious prophecy of John the Baptist, but also is a marvellous proof that the sacred scripture of Islam is a direct revelation of Allah, and that His Apostle was inspired and the real person whom John predicted! The baptist ("Saba'ā") plunges or immerses his neophyte or an infant into a pond, as a dyer or a fuller plunges a cloth or garment into a kettle of dye. It is easily understood that baptism is not a "thāra," purification or washing, nor "tabhāla," an immersion, nor even a "rāhsa," a bathing or washing, but "sab'aitha," a dyeing, a colouring. It is extremely important to know these distinctions. Just as a "saba'a," a dyer, gives a new colour to garment by dipping it into a kettle of tincture, so a baptist give his convert a new spiritual hue. Here we must make a fundamental distinction between a proselyte Gentile and a penitent Jew and Ishmaelite Arab. The former was formally circumcized, whereas the latter baptized only. By the circumcision a Gentile was admitted into the family of Abraham, and therefore into the fold of God's people. By baptism a circumcized believer was admitted into the society of the penitent and reformed believers. Circumcision is an ancient divine institution

which was not abrogated by Jesus nor by Muhammad. The baptism practised by John and the Christ was only for the benefit of the penitent persons among the circumcized. Both these institutions indicated and presented a religion. The baptism of John and of his cousin Jesus was a mark of admission into the society of the purified penitents who promised loyalty and homage to the Apostle of Allah whose coming they both foretold.

It follows, therefore, that just as circumcision signified the religion of Abraham and his adherents (his slaves were also circumcized), so baptism signified the religion of John and Jesus, which was a preparation for the Jews and the Gentiles to accord a cordial reception to the Founder of Islam and to embrace his religion.



## Chapter VI

### THE “SIBGHATU ’L-LĀH,” OR THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT AND WITH FIRE

The spiritual baptism is the direct work of God Himself. As a fuller or a laundress washes the linen or any other object with water; as a dyer tints the wool or cotton with a tincture to give it a new hue; and as a baptist blots out the past sins of the true penitent believer, so does God Almighty baptize, *not* the body, but the spirit and the soul of him whom He mercifully directs and guides unto the Holy Religion of Islam. This is the “Sibghatu ’l-Lāh,,” the Baptism of Allah, which makes a person fit and dignified to become a citizen of the kingdom of Allah and a member of His religion. When the Angel Gabriel communicated the Word of Allah for the first time to Muhammad, he (Muhammad) was invested with the gift of prophecy. His spirit was purified and magnified with the Holy Spirit to such a degree and extent that when he in his turn pronounced that Word to those whose spirit Allah pleased to guide were also purified, baptized. They, too, thus became holy officers in the new army of the faithful Muslims. This spiritual baptism does not make the Muslims prophets, sinless saints, or miracle-mongers. For after the Revelation of the Will and Word of Allah in the Holy Qur-án there is the end of the prophecy and of revelation. They are not made sinless saints because their piety and good works would not be the outcome of effort and struggle against evil, and therefore not justly meritorious. They are not appointed to become workers of supernatural miracles because they have a firm and sound faith in their Lord.

Further, this “Sibghatu ’l-Lāh” makes the true Muslims grave, constant in their duties to Allah and towards their fellowmen, especially towards their families. *It does not move them to the folly of believing themselves holier than their co-religionists, and so to arrogate the post of pastorship to themselves over others as if they were their flocks and herds. Fanaticism, religious conceit, and the like are not operations of the Holy Spirit. Every Muslim receives at his creation the same “Sibghatu ’l-Lāh,” the same religion and spiritual baptism, and has to run the race of his short earthly life to the best of his ability and effort in order to win the crown of glory in the next world. Every Muslim needs only education and religious training in accordance with the wisdom of the Word of God. But he needs not the*

*intercession of a priest, sacrament, or saint. Every enlightened believer can become an Imām, a missionary, a preacher according to his learning and religious zeal, not for vain glory or lucrative gain.*

In short, every Muslim, whether at his birth or at his conversion, is baptized spiritually, and becomes a citizen of the Kingdom of God, a free man, and possesses equal rights and obligations, according to his ability, virtue, knowledge, wealth, rank.

**St. John the Baptist ascribes this spiritual and igneous baptism to the Great Apostle of Allah, not as a divine being, God, or son of God, but as a holy agent, and as an instrument through which this divine baptismal sacrament was to be operated.** Muhammad delivered the Message of Allah which was His Word; he led the prayers, administered the divine service, and fought the holy wars against the unbelievers and the idolators to defend his cause. But the success and the victory achieved was God's. in the same way John preached and baptized, but the contrition, penance, and the remission of sins could only be done by God. The Prophet John's prediction that "he who comes after me is more powerful than I; he will baptize you with the Spirit and with fire" is quite intelligible, because only through Muhammad this spiritual baptism was given and performed.

These three effects of the "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" deserve a serious consideration and study. Their exposition is but brief.

1. The Holy Spirit, whether the Archangel Gabriel or another of the created Superior Spirits, by the command of God sanctifies the spirit of a Muslim at his birth or conversion - as the case may be; and this sanctification means:

(a) Engraving a perfect faith in the one true God. The "Subghatu 'l-Lāh" makes the spirit of a true Muslim believe in the absolute unity of Allah, to rely upon Him, and to know He alone is his Master, Owner, and Lord. This faith in the true God is manifest in every person who professes himself a Muslim. The mark and the evidence of this ingrained faith in a Muslim shines brilliantly when he affirms, "Anā muslim, Alhamud li 'l-Lāhi ("I am Muslim; praised be Allah!"). what is more impressive and singularly obvious a sign of a holy faith than the hatred and repugnance which a Muslim feels against any other object of worship besides God?

(b) The sanctification by the Holy Spirit and fire which God works upon the spirit of a Muslim is that He impregnates and fills it with love for, and submission to, Him. An honourable husband would rather divorce his beloved consort than see her sharing his love with any other man. The Almighty will cast away any “believer” who associates any other object or being with Him<sup>1</sup>.

The Muslim’s love for Allah is not theoretical or idealistic but practical and real. He will not hesitate for a moment to expel from his house his wife, son, or friend if he should blaspheme the Holy Name or Person. A pagan or a person of other religion may show a similar furious zeal for his object of worship. But that love which is shown for the One True God is holy and sanctified; and such love can only exist in the heart of a Muslim. Those auspicious and doxological formulæ “Bismi ’l-Lāhi” and Alhamdu li ’l-Lāhi,” which mean, respectively, “In the name of Allah” and “Praised be Allah” at the beginning and the end of every action or enterprise, are the most sincere expressions of the purified Muslim spirit impressed and inebriated with the “Love of God” that transcends and excels every other love.

(c) The baptismal sanctification which the “Sibghatu ’l-Lāh” inspires in the Spirit of a Unitarian Muslim, besides faith and love, is a total submission and resignation to the holy will of God. This absolute submission emanates not only from faith and love, but also from a holy fear and from a deep respect so latent in the soul and spirit of every true believer.

Such are the principal characteristics of the spiritual baptism, and nowhere are they manifest but among the adherents of Islam. John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and his apostles believed in, loved, and feared the same Allah as every Muslim does according to the degree of the divine grace and mercy. The Holy Spirit himself, too, is a creature and loves and fears the same Allah whom you and I do.

2. The second mark of the spiritual baptism is enlightenment. The true knowledge of Allah and of His will, so much as men are able to possess, can only and exclusively be seen in Muslims. This knowledge

---

1. Qur-án,4:48. Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth; to set up partners with Allah is to devise a sin Most heinous indeed.(Editors).



sparkles dazzlingly in the countenance and the general behaviour of every Muslim.

3. The “Sibghatu ’l-Lāh” is that divine baptism with fire which arms and equips the Muslim to become a bulwark against error and superstition, chiefly against idolatry of every kind. It is this baptismal fire that melts the soul and spirit of a Muslim, thus separating its golden substance from the rubbish and ordure. It is the power of God which strengthens and consolidates the union between Him and the believing servant, and arms him to fight for the religion of God.

### **The paraclete is not the holy spirit:**

For a time he was expected at any moment to come down from the clouds with legions of angels. The Apostles had all passed away; the second coming of Jesus Christ was delayed. His person and doctrine gave rise to a variety of religious and philosophical speculations. Sects succeeded one another; Gospels and Epistles under different names and titles appeared in many centres; and a multitude of the Christian scholars and apologists combated and criticized each other’s theory. **If there had been written a Gospel during the lifetime of Jesus, or even a book authorized by the College of the Apostles, the teachings of the Prophet of Nazareth would have preserved their purity and integrity until the appearance of the Periqlit - Ahmad. But such was not the case. Each writer took a different view about the Master and his religion, and described him in his book -which he named Gospel or Epistle- according to his own imagination. The high-soaring flight of thought concerning the Word; the prophecy about the Periqlit; the inexplicable discourse of Jesus upon his flash and blood; and a series of several miracles, events, and sayings recorded in the Fourth Gospel were unknown to the Synoptics and consequently to a great majority of the Christians who had not seen it at least for a couple of centuries.**

*The Fourth Gospel, too, like every other book of the New Testament, was written in Greek and not in Aramaic, which was the mother-tongue of Jesus and his disciples.* Consequently, we are again confronted with the same difficulty which we met with when we were discussing the “Eudokia” of St. Luke,<sup>1</sup> namely: What word or name

---

1. Vide *Islamic Review* for January, 1930.

was it that Jesus used in his native tongue to express that which the Fourth Gospel has translated as “the Paraclete” and which has been converted into “comforter” in all the versions of that Gospel?

-The “Paraclete” does not signify either “consoler” or “advocate”; in truth, it is not a classical word at all. The Greek orthography of the word is *Paraklytos* which in ecclesiastical literature is made to mean “one called to aid, advocate, intercessor” (*Dict. Grec.-Français*, by Alexandre). One need not profess to be a Greek scholar to know that the Greek word for “comforter or consoler” is not “Paraklytos” but “Paracalon”. I have no Greek version of the Septuagint with me, but I remember perfectly well that the Hebrew word for “comforter” (“*mnāhem*”) in the Lamentations of Jeremiah (i. 2, 9, 16, 17, 21, etc.) is translated into *Parakaloon*, from the verb *Parakaloo*, which means to call to, invite, exhort, console, pray, invoke. It should be noticed that there is a long *alpha* vowel after the consonant *kappa* in the “Paracalon” which does not exist in the “Paraklytos.” In the phrase (He who consoles us in all our afflictions) “paracalon” and not “paraklytos” is used. (“I exhort, or *invite, thee to work*”). Many other examples can be cited here.

There is another Greek word for comforter and consoler, i.e. “Parygorytys” from “I console.”

As to the other meaning of “intercessor or advocate” which is given in the ecclesiastical word “Paraclete,” I again insist that “Paracalon” and *not* “Paraklytos” can convey in itself a similar sense. The proper Greek term for “advocate” in *Sunegorus* and for “intercessor” or “mediator” *meditéa*.

In my next article I shall give the true Greek form of which *Paraklytos* is a corruption. *En passant*, I wish to correct an error into which the French savant Ernest Renan has also fallen. If I recollect well, Monsieur Renan, in his famous *The Life of Christ*, interprets the “Paraclete” of St. John (xiv. 16, 26; xv. 7; I John ii. 1) as an “advocate.” He cites the Syro-Chaldean form “Peraklit” as opposed to “Ktighra” “the accuser” from *Kategorus*. The Syrian name for mediator or intercessor is “mis’aaya,” but in law courts the “Snighra” (from the Greek *Sunegorus*) is used for an advocate. Many Syrians unfamiliar with the Greek language consider the “Paraqlita” to be really the Aramaic or the syriac form of the “Paraclete” in the Pshittha Version and to be composed of “Paraq,” “to save from, to deliver from,” and “lita” “the

accursed.” The idea that Christ is the “Saviour from the curse of the law,” and therefore he is himself too “Paraqlita” (1 John ii. 1), may have led some to think that the Greek word is originally an Aramaic word, just as the Greek sentence “Maran atha” in Aramaic is “Mārān Āthī,” i.e. “our Lord is coming” (1 John xvi. 22), which seems to be an expression among the believers regarding the coming of the Last Great Prophet. This ‘Mārān Āthī,’ as well as, especially, the baptismal formula, contains points too important to be neglected. They both deserve a special study and a valuable exposition. They both embody in themselves marks and indications otherwise than favourable to charistianity.

*I think I have sufficiently proved that the “Paraclytos,” from a linguistic and etymological point of view, does not mean “advocate, consoler, or comforter.” Elsewhere I have described this as “barbarous,” but I retract that expression and will replace it by “corruption.” Ignorance commits many errors. For centuries the ignorant Latins and Europeans have been writing the name of Muhammad “Mahomet,” that of Mushi “Moses.” Is it, therefore, small wonder that some sturdy Christian monk or scribe should have written the true name in the corrupted form of Paraklytos? The former means the “most illustrious, praiseworthy,” but the corrupted form means nothing at all except a standing shame to those who have for eighteen centuries understood it to signify an advocate or a consoler.*

### **Periqlytos means Ahmad:**

*“And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Periqlytos, that he may stay with you for ever” (John xiv. 16, etc.).*

There is some incoherency in the words ascribed to Jesus by the Fourth Gospel. It reads as if several Periqlytes had already come and gone, and that “another Periqlytos” would be given only at the request of Jesus. These words also leave behind the impression that the Apostles were already made familiar with this name which the Greek text renders Periqlytos. The adjective “another” preceding a foreign noun for the first time announced seems very strange and totally superfluous. There is no doubt that the text has been tampered with and distorted. It pretends that the Father will send the Periqlyte at the

request of Jesus, otherwise the Periqlyte would never have come! The word “ask,” too, seems superficial, and unjustly displays a touch of arrogance on the part of the Prophet of Nazareth. If we want to find out the real sense in these words we must correct the text and supply the stolen or corrupted words, thus:

*“I shall go to the Father, and he shall send you another apostle whose name shall be Periqlytos, that he may remain with you for ever.”* Now with the additional italicized words, both the robbed modesty of Jesus is restored and the nature of the Periqlyte identified.

We have already seen that the Periqlyte is not the Holy Spirit, that is to say, a divine person, Gabriel, or any other angel. It now remains to prove that the Periqlyte could not be a consoler nor an advocate between God and men.

1. The Periqlyte is not the “Consoler” nor the “Intercessor”. The belief that the death of Jesus upon the Cross redeemed the believers from the curse of original sin, and that his spirit, grace, and presence in the Eucharist would be for ever with them, left them in need of no consolation nor of the coming of a consoler at all. The idea of an “intercessor” between God and man is even more untenable than that of the “consoler.” There is no absolute mediator between the Creator and the creature. Having proved that the “Paraclete” of St. John’s Gospel does not and cannot mean either “consoler” or “advocate,” nor any other thing at all, and that it is a corrupted form of Periqlytos, we shall now proceed to discuss the real signification of it.
2. Periqlytos etymologically and literally means “the most illustrious, renowned, and praiseworthy.” This compound noun is composed of the prefix “peri,” and “kleotis,” the latter derived from “to glorify, praise.” The noun, which I write in English characters Periqleitos or Periqlytos, means precisely what AHMAD means in Arabic, namely the most illustrious, glorious, and renowned. The only difficulty to be solved and overcome is to discover the original Semitic name used by Jesus Christ either in Hebrew or Aramaic.
  - (a) The Syriac Pshittha, while writing “Paraqleita,” does not even in a glossary give its meaning. But the Vulgate translates it into “consolator” or “consoler.” If I am not mistaken the Aramaic form must have been “Mhamda” or “Hamīda” to

correspond with the Arabic “Muhammad” or “Ahmad” and the Greek “Periqlyte.”

The interpretation of the Greek word in the sense of consolation does not imply that the name Periqlyte *itself* is the consoler, but the belief and the hope in the promise that *he will come* “to console the early Christians. The expectation that Jesus would come down again in glory before many of his auditors had “tasted the death” had disappointed them, and concentrated all their hopes in the coming of the Periqlyte.

- (b) *The Qur-ānic revelation that Jesus, the son of Mary, declared unto the people of Israel that he was “bringing glad tidings of an apostle, who shall come after me and whose name shall be Ahmad,” is one of the strongest proofs that Muhammad was truly a Prophet and that the Qur-ān is really a divine revelation.* He could never have known that the Periqlyte meant Ahmad, unless through inspiration and divine revelation. The authority of the Qur-ān is decisive and final; for the literal signification of the Greek name exactly and indisputably corresponds with Ahmad and Muhammad.

It is marvellous that this unique name, never before given to any other person, was miraculously preserved for the most Illustrious and Praiseworthy Apostle of Allah! We never come across any Greek bearing the name Periqleitos (or Periqlytos), nor any Arab bearing the name of Ahmad. True, there was a famous Athenian called Periqleys which means “illustrious,” etc., but not in the superlative degree.

- (c) *it is quite clear from the description of the Fourth Gospel that Periqlyte is a definite person, a created holy spirit, who would come and dwell in a human body to perform and accomplish the prodigious work assigned to him by God, which no other man, including Moses, Jesus, and any other prophet, had ever accomplished.*

3. *There is not the slightest doubt that by “Periqlyte,” Muhammad, i.e. Ahmad, is intended. The two names, one in Greek and the other in Arabic, have precisely the same signification, and both mean the “most Illustrious and Praised,” just as “Pneuma” and “Rūh” mean nothing more or less than “Spirit” in both*

*languages. We have seen that the translation of the word into “consoler” or “advocate” is absolutely untenable and wrong.*

The compound form of Paraqalon is derived from the verb composed of the prefix-Para-qalo, but the Periqlyte is derived from the Peri-qlo. The difference is as clear as anything could be. Let us examine, then, the marks of the Periqlyte which can only be found in Ahmad – Muhammad.

(a) ***Muhammad alone revealed the whole truth about God, His unity, religion, and corrected the impious libels and calumnies written and believed against Himself and many of His holy servants.***


(b) Among the principal marks of Periqlyte, “the Spirit of Truth,” when he comes in the person of the “Son of Man” -Ahmad- is “*he will chastise the world for sin*” (John xvi. 8, 9). ***No other servant of Allah, whether a king like David and Solomon or a prophet like Abraham and Moses, did carry on this chastisement for sin to the extreme end, with resolution, fervour, and courage as Muhammad did.***

(c) ***The other characteristic feature of the exploits of Periqlyte -Ahmad- is that he will reprove the world of righteousness and justice (loc. cit.). The interpretation “of righteousness, because I am going to my Father” (John xvi. 10) put into the mouth of Jesus is obscure and ambiguous.*** The return of Jesus unto his God is given as one of the reasons for the chastisement of the world by the coming Periqlyte. Why so? And *who did* chastise the world on that account? The Jews believed that they crucified and killed Jesus, and did not believe that he was raised and taken up into heaven. It was Muhammad who chastised and punished them severely for their infidelity. “Say, O Muhammad, to the unbelieving Jews: They did not really kill him; but God took him up unto Himself” (Qur-án, 4:157- 158)<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Qur-án,4: 157. That they said (in boast), "We killed Christ Jesus the son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah.:- but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjecture to follow, for of a surety they killed him not:- , Qur-án,4:158 158. Nay, Allah raised him up unto Himself; and Allah is Exalted

(d) “The last but not the least mark of the Periqlyte is that *he will not speak anything of himself, but whatsoever he hears that will he speak, and he will show you the future things*” (John xv. 13). ***There is not one iota, not a single word or comment of Muhammad or of his devoted and holy companions in the text of the glorious Qur-án. All its contents are the revealed Word of Allah. Muhammad uttered, pronounced the Word of God as he heard it read to him by the Angel Gabriel, and was reduced to writing by the faithful scribes. The words, sayings, and teachings of the Prophet, though sacred and edifying, are not the Word of God, and they are called Ahādith or Traditions. Is he not, then, even in this description, the true Periqlyte? Can you show us another person, besides Ahmad, to possess in himself all these material, moral, and practical qualities,*** marks, and distinctions of Periqlyte? You *cannot*. I think I have said enough of the Periqlyte and shall conclude with a sacred verse from the Qur-án: “I follow no other than what is revealed unto me; nor am I more than a Public Warner” (x1vi.).



## Chapter IX

### “THE SON OF MAN,” WHO IS HE?

The Holy Qur-án presents to us the true Jesus Christ as “the Son of Mary;” and the Holy Gospels, too, present him to us as “the Son of Mary;” but that Gospel which was written on the white tablets of the heart of Jesus and delivered to his disciples and followers orally, alas! Was soon adulterated with a mass of myth and legend. “The Son of Mary” becomes “the Son of Joseph,” having brothers and sisters.<sup>1</sup> Then he becomes “the Son of David;”<sup>2</sup> “the Son of Man,”<sup>3</sup> “the Son of God;”<sup>4</sup> “the Son” only;<sup>5</sup> “the Christ;”<sup>6</sup> and “the Lamb.”<sup>7</sup>

It would seem that these Christian priests and pastors, theologians and apologists have a peculiar logic of their own for reasoning and a special propensity for mysteries and absurdities. Their logic knows no medium, no distinction of the terms, and no definite idea of the titles and appellations they use. They have an enviable taste for irreconcilable and contradictory statements which they alone can swallow like boiled eggs. They can believe, without the least hesitation, that Mary was both virgin and wife, that Joseph was both spouse and husband, that James, Jossi, Simon, and Judah were both cousins of Jesus and his brothers, that Jesus is perfect God and perfect man, and that “the Son of God,” “the Son of Man,” “the Lamb,” and “the Son of David” are all one and the same person! They feed themselves on heterogeneous and opposed doctrines which these terms represent with as greedy an appetite as they feel for bacon and eggs at breakfast. They never stop to think and ponder on the object they worship; they adore the crucifix and the Almighty as if they were kissing the bloody dagger of the assassin of their brother in the presence of his father!

---

1. Matt. xiii. 55, 56; Mark vi. 3; iii. 31; Luke ii. 48; viii. 19-21; John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5; Acts i. 14; I Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19; Jude i.

2. Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 35; Luke xx. 41, Matt. xx. 30; ix. 27; xxi. 9; Acts xiii. 22, 23; Apoc. V. 5; Rom. xv. 12; Heb. vii. 14, etc.

3. About eighty-three times in the discourses of Jesus this appellation is repeated.

4. Matt. xiv. 32, xvi. 16; John xi. 27; Acts ix. 20; 1 John iv. 15; v. 5; Heb. i. 2, 5, etc.

5. John v. 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, etc.; and in the Baptismal formula, Matt. xxviii. 19; John i. 34, etc.

6. Matt. xvi. 16, and frequently in the Epistles.

7. John i, 29, 36; and often in the Revelation.



I do not think there is even one Christian in ten millions who really has a precise idea or a definite knowledge about the origin and the true signification of the term “the Son of Man.” All Churches and their commentators without exception will tell you that “the Son of God” assumed the appellation of “the Son of Man” or “the Barnasha” out of humility and meekness, never knowing that the Jewish Apocalyptical Scriptures, in which Jesus and his disciples heart and soul believed, foretold *not* a “Son of Man” who would be meek, humble, having nowhere to lay his head, and be delivered into the hands of the evildoers and killed, *but* a strong man with tremendous power and strength to destroy and disperse the birds of prey and the ferocious beasts that were tearing and devouring his sheep and lambs! The Jews who heard Jesus speaking of “the Son of Man” full well understood *to whom* he was alluding. Jesus did not invent the mane “Barnasha,” but borrowed it from the Apocalyptical Jewish Scriptures: the Book of Enoch, the Sibylline Books, the Assumption of Moses, the Book of Daniel, etc. Let us examine the origin of this title “the Barnasha” or “the Son of Man.”

1. “The Son of Man” is the Last Prophet, who established “the Kingdom of Peace” and saved the people of God from servitude and persecutions under the idolatrous powers of Satan. The title “Barnasha” is a symbolical expression to distinguish the Saviour from the people of God who are represented as the “sheep,” and the other idolatrous nations of the earth under various species of the birds of prey, ferocious beasts, and unclean animals. The Prophet Hezekiel is almost always addressed by God as “Ben Adam,” that is “the Son of Man” (or of Adam) in the sense of a Shepherd of the Sheep of Israel. This Prophet has also some Apocalyptical portions in his book. In his first vision with which he begins his prophetic book he sees besides the sapphire throne of the Eternal the appearance of “the Son of Man.”<sup>1</sup> This “Son of Man” who is repeatedly mentioned as always in the presence of God and above the Cherubim is not Hezekiel (or Ezekiel) himself.<sup>2</sup> He is the prophetic “Barnasha,” the Last Prophet, who was appointed to save the people of God from the hands of the unbelievers *here upon this earth, and not elsewhere!*

---

1. Ezek. i. 26.

2. Ezek. x. 2.

The Sibylline Revelation, which was composed after the last collapse of Jerusalem by the Roman armies, states that “the Son of Man” will appear and destroy the Roman Empire and deliver the Believers in one God. This book was written at least fourscore years after Jesus Christ.

2. The Apocalyptic “Son of Man” could not be Jesus Christ. This surname, “Son of Man,” is absolutely inapplicable to the son of Mary. All the pretensions of the so-called “Gospels” which make the “Lamb” of Nazareth to “catch the kings in the midst of their voluptuous life and hurl them down into the Hell;”<sup>1</sup> lack every bit of authenticity, and the distance separating him from “the Son of Man” marching with the legions of angels upon the clouds towards the Throne of the Eternal is more than that of our globe from the planet of Jupiter. He may be *a* “son of man” and *a* “messiah,” as every Jewish king, prophet, and high priest was, but he was *not* “*the* Son of Man” nor “the Messiah” whom the Hebrew prophets and apocalyptists foretold. And the Jews were perfectly right to refuse him that title and office.

Here are, then the principal reasons why Jesus was not “the Son of Man” nor the Apocalyptic Messiah:

(a) A messenger of God is not commissioned to prophesy about himself as a personage of some future epoch, or to foretell his won reincarnation and thus present himself as the hero in some great future drama of the world. Jacob prophesied about “the Apostle of Allah,”<sup>2</sup> Moses about a prophet who would come after him with the Law, and Israel was exhorted to “obey him;”<sup>3</sup> Haggai foretold Ahmad;<sup>4</sup> Malachi predicted the coming of the “Messenger of the Covenant” and of Elijah;<sup>5</sup> but none of the prophets ever did prophesy about his own second coming into the world.

(b) Jesus knew better than everybody else in Israel *who* “the Son of Man” was and what was his mission. He was to dethrone the profligate kings and to cast them into the hell-fire. The “Revelation of

---

1. Enoch xlv. 4-8.

2. Gen. xlix. 10.

3. Deut. xviii. 15

4. Hag. ii. 7.

5. Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5.

Baruch” and that of Ezra -the Fourth Book of Esdras in the Vulgate-speak of the appearance of “the Son of Man” who will establish the powerful Kingdom of Peace upon the ruins of the Roman Empire. All these Apocryphal Revelations show the state of the Jewish mind about the coming of the last great Deliverer whom they surname “the Son of Man” and “the Messiah.” Jesus could not be unaware of and unfamiliar with this literature and this ardent expectation of his people. Jesus Christ is reported to have declared that the Son of Man “will separate the sheep from the goats.”<sup>1</sup> The “sheep” symbolize the believing Israelites who will enter into the Kingdom but the “goats” signify the unbelieving Jews who had joined with the enemies of the true religion and were consequently doomed to perdition. This was practically what the Apocalypse of Enoch had predicted about the Son of Man. Jesus simply confirmed the revelation of Enoch and gave it a Divine character. He himself was sent to exhort the sheep of Israel<sup>2</sup> to remain faithful to God and await patiently the advent of the Son of Man who was coming to save them for ever from their enemies.

The Son of Man is said to be “the Lord of the Sabbath day,” that is, he had the power to abrogate the law which made it a holy day of rest from labour and work. Jesus was a strict observer of the Sabbath, on which day he used to attend the services in the Temple or in the Synagogue. He expressly commands his followers to pray that the national collapse at the destruction of Jerusalem should not happen on a Sabbath day. How could, then, Jesus claim to be the Son of Man, the Lord of the Sabbath day, while he was obliged to observe and keep it like every Jew? How could he venture to claim that proud title and then predict the destruction of the Temple and of the Capital City? This and many other examples show that Jesus could never appropriate the surname of “Barnasha” to himself, but he ascribed it to the Last Powerful Prophet, who really saved the “sheep,” i.e. the believing Jews; and either destroyed or dispersed the unbelievers among them; abolished the day of Sabbath; established the Kingdom of Peace; and promised that this religion and kingdom will last to the day of the Last Judgment.

---

1. Matt. xxv. 31-34.

2. Matt. xv. 24.



**Chapter X**  
**BY THE APOCALYPTICAL “SON OF MAN,”**  
**MUHAMMAD IS INTENDED**

We can produce many sound arguments to prove the identity of “the Son of Man” with Muhammad only, and shall divide these arguments as follows:

**ARGUMENTS FROM THE GOSPELS, AND FROM**  
**THE APOCALYPSES**

In the most coherent and significant passages in the discourses of Jesus where the appellation “Barnasha” - or “the Son of Man” - appears, only Muhammad is intended, and in him alone the prediction contained therein is literally fulfilled. The commentators of course interpret this passage in a spiritual sense only. Well, it is the mission and the office of every prophet and the preacher of the religion to call the sinners to repent of their iniquity and wickedness. We quite admit that Jesus was sent only to the “lost sheep of Israel,” to reform and convert them from their sins; and especially to teach them more plainly concerning “the Son of Man” who was to come with power and salvation to restore what was lost and to reconstruct what was ruined; nay, to conquer and destroy the enemies of the true believers. Jesus could not assume for himself that Apocalyptic title “the Barnasha,” and then not be able to save his people except Zacchæus, a Samaritan woman, and a few other Jews, including the Apostles, who were mostly slain afterwards on his account. Most probably what Jesus said was: “The Son of Man *will* come to seek and recover what is lost.” For in Muhammad alone the believing Jews as well as the Arabs and other believers found all that was irremediably lost and destroyed - Jerusalem and Mecca, all the promised territories; many truths concerning the true religion; the power and kingdom of God; the peace and blessing that Islam confers in this world and in the next. But one more quotation will suffice, namely: “The Son of Man shall be delivered unto the hands of men.”<sup>1</sup> etc., and all the passages where he is made the subject of passion and death. Such utterances are put into the mouth of Jesus by some fraudulent non-Hebrew writer with

---

1. Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 12, etc.

the object of perverting the truth concerning “the Son of Man” as understood and believe by the Jews, and of making them believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Apocalyptic triumphant Saviour, but he would only appear on the Day of the Last Judgment. It was a policy and a cunning propaganda of dissuasion, and then of persuasion, made purposely for the Jews. But the fraud was discovered, and the Jewish Christians belong to the Church which held these Gospels to be divinely revealed. For nothing could be more repugnant to Jewish national aspiration and religious sentiment than to present to them the expected Messiah, the great Barnasha, in the person of Jesus whom the Chief Priests and the Elders condemned to be crucified as a seducer! It is quite evident, therefore, that Jesus *never* appropriated the title of “the Son of Man;” but he reserved it only for Muhammad. Here are a few of the arguments:

(a) The Jewish Apocalypses ascribe the titles “the Messiah” and “the Son of Man” exclusively to the Last Prophet, who will fight with the Powers of Darkness and vanquish them, and then will establish the Kingdom of Peace and of Light on earth. Thus the two titles are synonymous; to disown either of them is to disown altogether the claim to being the Last Prophet. Now we read in the Synoptics that Jesus categorically denied his being the Christ and forbade his disciples to declare him “the Messiah”. Again, if he were the Messiah, or the Barnasha, he would have at once struck his enemies with terror, and by the aid of his invisible angels destroyed the Roman and Persian powers, then dominant over the civilized world. But he did nothing of the sort; or, like Muhammad, he would have recruited some valiant warriors like “Alī, Omar, Khālid, etc., and not like Zebedees and Jonahs, who vanished, like a frightened spectre when the Roman police came to arrest them.

There are two irreconcilable statements made by Matthew (or corrupted by his interpolator), which logically destroy each other. Within an hour Peter is “the Rock of Faith,” as Catholicism will boast, and, “the Satan of Infidelity,” as Protestantism will scout him! Why so? Because when he believed Jesus to be the Messiah he was rewarded; but when he refused to admit that his master was not the Messiah he was convicted! There are no two “Sons of Man,” the one to be the Commander of the Faithful, fight sword in hand the wars of God, and uproot idolatry and its empires and kingdoms; the other to

be an Abbot of the poor Anchorites on the summit of Calvary, fight the wars of God cross in hand, and be martyred ignominiously by idolatrous Romans and unbelieving Jewish Pontiffs and Rabbis! “The Son of Man,” whose hands were seen under the wings of the Cherubs by the Prophet Ezekiel (ii), and before the throne of the Almighty by the Prophet Daniel (vii), and described in the other Jewish Apocalypses, was not predestined to be hanged upon Golgotha, but to transform the thrones of the pagan kings into their own crosses; to change their palaces into calvaries, and to make sepulchres of their capital cities. Not Jesus, but Muhammad, had the honour of this title, “the Son of Man”! The facts are more eloquent than even the Apocalypses and the visions. The material and moral conquests achieved by Muhammad the Holy Apostle of Allah over the enemy are unrivalled.



## Chapter XI

### THE SON OF MAN ACCORDING TO THE JEWISH APOCALYPSES

From what has been already discussed in these pages it will have been that the appellation “Barnasha,” or “the Son of Man,” is not a title like “Messiah,” that could be applied to every prophet, highpriest, and legally anointed king; but that it is a *proper noun*, belonging

the Apocalyptists describe the Son of Man, who is to come in due time as appointed by the Almighty to deliver Israel and Jerusalem from the heathenish oppression and to establish the permanent kingdom for “the People of the Saints of the Most High.” The Seers, the Sophees, foretell the advent of the Powerful Deliverer; they see him *only* in a vision, revelation, and faith- with all his might and glory. No Prophet or Sophee *ever* said that he *himself* was “*the* Son of Man,” and that he would “come again on the Last Day to judge both the quick and the dead,” as the Nicene Creed puts it on the pretended authority of the Sayings of Jesus Christ. I shall now proceed to show that the Apocalyptic Son of Man was no other than Muhammad al-Mustapha.


1. The most cogent and important proof that the Apocalyptic *Barnasha* is Muhammad is given in a wonderful description in the vision of Daniel (vii.) already discussed in a previous article. In no way whatever the Barnasha therein described can be identified with any of the Macca-bees’ heroes or with Jesus; nor can the terrible Beast which was utterly killed and destroyed by that Son of Man be a prototype of Antiochus Epiphanes or the Roman Caesar, Nero. The culminating evil of that dreadful Beast was the “Little Horn,” which uttered blasphemies against the Most High by associating with His essence three co-eternal divine persons and by its persecution of those who maintained the absolute oneness of God. Constantine the Great is the person symbolized by that hideous Horn.
2. The Son of Man founds the Kingdom of Peace, the capital of which is no longer the old Jerusalem, but the new Jerusalem - the “Dāru ‘s-Salām,” the “city or court of Peace.” The Sophee or Seer in this wonderful vision narrates how the terrestrial Jerusalem is lifted up and transplanted in a southern country; but a new Temple, larger and higher than the first one, is built upon the ruins



of the old edifice! Gracious God! how wonderfully all this was accomplished by Thy most Illustrious and Holy Servant Muhammad! The new Jerusalem is none other than Mecca, for it is in a southern country, its two hills, the “Marwa” and “Sapha,” bear the same names as those of Moriah and Zion, of the same root and signification but originally earlier. “Irushalem” or “Uishalem” of old becomes a city of “Light and Peace.” It is for this reason, too, that Mecca as the seat of the sacred ka’aba became the “Qibla” - the direction towards which the Muslims turn their faces at prayer. Here every year tens of thousands of pilgrim from all Muslim countries assemble, visit the Holy Ka’aba, offer sacrifices, and renew their fidelity to Allah and promise to lead a new life worthy of a Musulman. Not only Mecca, but also Medina and the territory surrounding them, has become sacred and inviolable, and forbidden to any non-Muslim man or woman! It was in fulfilment of his vision of Idris or Enoch, too, that the second khalifa, Omar, rebuilt the Sacred Mosque at Jerusalem on the hill of Moriah, on the spot of the Temple of Solomon! All these marvellously prove that the vision was seen by a seer inspired by God, who saw the Muslim events in a far-distant future. Could Rome or Byzantium claim to be the New Jerusalem? Can the Pope or any schismatic Patriarch claim to be the Apocalyptic White Bull with two large horns? Can Christianity claim to be the kingdom of Peace (Islam = “Shalom”) while it makes Jesus and the Holy Ghost coeval and consubstantial with the Absolute One God? Most decidedly not.

3. In those chapters dealing with the Kingdom of Peace, the Messiah is called Son of Man, but in the description of the Last Judgment which follows at the end of this Reign of Islam or Peace he is called “Son of Woman” and “Son of God,” and made to share with God in the Judgment of the World. It is admitted by all scholars that these extravagant and foolish statements are *not* of Jewish origin but belong to the Christian imaginations, inserted and interpolated by them. The other Apocalypses, those which bear the names of Moses, Baruch, Ezra, the Jubilees, and the Oracula Sibylliana, should be studied impartially, for it is then that they, like those of Daniel and Enoch, will not only be understood but also prove to be fulfilled in Muhammad and Islam.

**Family Tree for the Holly Prophet's <sup>(pbuh)</sup>\***



- Paran where the Prophet Mohammad<sup>(pbuh)</sup> lived and received the revelation after Makkah.

- Madinah in the time of Prophet Mohammad<sup>(pbuh)</sup> when He<sup>(pbuh)</sup> emigrated to it later.



\* Islam comprehensive Way of life - Dr.Ahmed Farid Mustapha –Melbourne,Australia 1978.

\*\* There is a complete family tree for the holy prophet Muhammad (pbuh) available in any main Arabic library.