

Muhammad in The Jewish Bible

"And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned." {Isaiah 29:12}

1. Prophet Muhammad's name in Songs of Solomon
2. Prefatory Remarks, Allah And His Attributes "And The Ahmed Of All Nations Will Come." - Haggai, ii.7.
3. The Question Of The Birthright And The Covenant
4. The Mystery Of The "Mispa
5. Prophet Muhammad Is The "Shiloh"
6. Prophet Muhammad Is The Son-Of-Man
7. King David Calls Him: "My Lord"
8. The Lord And The Prophet Of The Covenant
9. Genuine Prophets Preach Only Islam

10. Islam Is The Kingdom Of God On Earth

11. Prophet Muhammad in Isaiah 42

(1) Was he Solomon, Jesus or Muhammad ?

Muhammad's name appeared in Haggai 2:7 under the hebrew word *mahmad* () which means praised one (Muhammad is Arabic for praised one). It almost undoubtedly is referring to the Arabic Prophet Muhammad.

The 5th chapter of Songs of Solomon is discussing someone. Jews will say it is discussing Solomon, while Christians will say it is discussing Jesus. Considering this is the Songs of Solomon, it would seem logical that it is discussing Solomon. The verses describing this mystery man have the narrators speech conjugated in the feminine (meaning it is a woman who is describing this man) so it is possible that it is one of Solomon's wives discussing her Husband (Solomon). However, if a Christian tries to assert that Jesus is being discussed, then they are insinuating that this is discussing a future prophet (a man who was not yet alive at that point), a prophesy.... If the 5th chapter of Songs of Solomon is looking into the future, then there is no doubt it is discussing Muhammad.

Throughout the chapter, someone is being discussed. Whomever it is, verse 15 says his "countenance (face) is as Lebanon", so this is an Arabic gentleman (or Arab looking), a Semitic man none the less. Verse 11 says "his head is as the most fine gold, his locks are wavy, and black as a raven". Verse 10 describes this man as being "radiant and ruddy" which means he was slightly light-skinned with a rosy color. This can be confirmed in the Sahih Bukhari Hadiths, [Volume 4, Book 56, Number 747](#), which says Muhammad was slightly light skinned, with a rosy color (and also has the same hair as is mentioned in verse 11). Also verse 14 describes this man as having a stomach like ivory. I take it this means the parts of his body that were usually covered by his garment from the sun, were very white (like ivory). This also can be attributed to Muhammad who although having a rosy, golden color, had white armpits ([Sahih Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 17, Number 141](#) says you could see the whites of his armpitt when he raised his hand). WHAT'S THE POINT?!?!)

Discussing skin color, and hair color is fruitless, and if I was basing it solely on that, it could be describing ANY Semitic man. However, this person's name is given. In reading the English translation of Songs 5:16 it finishes the description by saying "He is altogether lovely". The words "altogether lovely" was translated from *mahmad* (). We'll take a closer look at this four character word, and prove this is talking about Muhammad...

First of all, the way this word is written in Hebrew is . That happens to be the EXACT same was Muhammad's name is written in Hebrew. Let's look at the spelling of this word...

It has four characters. Going from right to left they are...

Now, when writing in Hebrew, there is no difference between the word *mahmad* () and Muhammad (). The only difference is in the vowels used when pronouncing this word (). Hebrew is an ancient language, and there are no vowels. It is made up of 22 consonants. In ancient times, the reader decided on his own which vowels to add in. It was not until the 8th century that vowels were introduced, in the form of dots and lines. However, this has nothing to do with real Hebrew. The word *mahmad* () in ancient times would most likely have been pronounced "mahamad".

According to Ben Yehuda's Hebrew-English Dictionary, is correctly pronounced "mahamad" (not mahmad) which is very close to Muhammad.

Ben Yehuda's Hebrew-English Dictionary defines "" as "lovely, coveted one, precious one, praised one". The correct way to say "praised one" in Arabic is Muhammad, so this is the same word!

As was stated before, the name Muhammad () and the word *mahmad* () are spelled exactly the same way in Hebrew, and both have the same meaning. The only reason they are pronounced different is because of vowels (dots and lines) introduced in the eighth century.

The Hebrew word for praised one is

The Hebrew word for Muhammad (the Arabic Prophet) is

In conclusion, if Songs of Solomon chapter 5 is discussing a man to come after that time, it is without a doubt Muhammad, as it even mentions his name. Any Christian who believes Jesus is the Messiah, and believes that books were sent down by God after the TaNaKh (Jewish Bible), then surely they should take into account what they just read here, and consider the Qur'an before making a decision.

(2) Muhammad in the Jewish Bible

I. 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 Prophet Muhammad 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.

I wish to make it quite clear that the views set out in this article and those which will follow it are quite personal, and that I am alone responsible for my personal and un-borrowed researches in the Hebrew Sacred Scriptures. I do not, however, assume an authoritative attitude in expounding the teachings of Islam, meaning submission to God.

I have not the slightest intention nor desire to hurt the religious feelings of Christian friends. I love Christ, Moses and Abraham, as I do Prophet Muhammad and all other holy prophets of God.

My writings are not intended to raise a bitter and therefore useless dispute with the Churches, but only invite them to a pleasant and friendly investigation of this all-important question with a spirit of love and impartiality. If the Christians desist from their vain attempt of defining the essence of the Supreme Being, and confess His absolute Oneness, then a union between them and the Muslims is not only probable but extremely possible. For once the Oneness of God is accepted and acknowledged, the other points of difference between the two faiths can more easily be settled.

II. 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. On these two principal points a thoroughly conscientious and final agreement must be arrived at between the intelligent adherents of the two faiths. Are we poor and ignorant mortals to believe in and worship one God, or are we to believe in and fear a plurality of Gods? Which of the two, Christ or Prophet Muhammad, is the object of the Divine Covenant? These two questions must be answered once for all.

It would be a mere waste of time here to refute those who ignorantly or maliciously suppose the God as mentioned in Islam to be different from the true God and only a fictitious deity of Prophet 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 Quran 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 and all the prophets.

Allah is the only Self-Existing, Knowing, Powerful Being. He encompasses, fills every space, 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.

The trinitarian branch of the Christian Church, for about seventeen centuries, has exhausted all the brains of her saints and philosophers to define the Essence and the Person of the Deity; and what have they invented? All that which Athanasius, Augustines and Aquinas have imposed upon the Christians "under the pain of eternal damnation" to believe in a God who is "the third of three"! Allah, in His Holy Quran, condemns this belief in these solemn words:-

"Because the unbelievers are those who say: 'Allah is one of three.' There is but One God. If they do not desist in what they say, a painful punishment will afflict those of them that disbelieve." (Quran Ch.5 v73).

The reason why the orthodox Muslim scholars have always refrained from defining God's Essence is because His Essence transcends all attributes in which it could only be defined. Allah has many Names which in reality are only adjectives derived from His essence through its various manifestations in the universe which He alone has formed. We call Allah by the appellations Almighty, Eternal, Omnipresent, Omniscient, Merciful, and so forth, because we conceived the eternity, omnipresence, universal knowledge, mercifulness, as emanating from His essence and belonging to Him alone and absolutely. He is alone the infinitely Knowing, Powerful, Living, Holy, Beautiful, Good, Loving, Glorious, Terrible. Avenger, because it is from Him alone that emanate and flow the qualities of knowledge, power, life, holiness, beauty and the rest. God has no attributes in the sense we understand them. With us an attribute or a property is common to many individuals of a species, but what is God's is His alone, and there is none other to share it with Him. When we say, "Solomon is wise, powerful, just and beautiful," we do not ascribe exclusively to him all wisdom, power, justice and beauty. We only mean to say that he is relatively wise as compared with others of his species, and that wisdom too is relatively his attribute in common with the individuals belonging to his class.

To make it more clear, a divine attribute is an emanation of God, and therefore an activity. Now every divine action is nothing more or less than a creation.

It is also to be admitted that the divine attributes, inas- much as they are emanations, posit time and a beginning; consequently when Allah said: "Be, and it was" - or He uttered, His word in time and in the beginning of the creation. This is what the Sufis term "aql-kull", or universal intelligence, as the emana- tion of the "aql awal", namely, the "first intelligence." Then the "nafs-kull", or the "universal soul" that was the first to hear and obey this divine order, emanated from the "first soul" and transformed the universe.

This reasoning would lead us to conclude that each act of God displays a divine emanation as His manifestation and particular attribute, but it is not His Essence or Being. God is Creator, because He created in the beginning of time, and always creates. God spoke in the beginning of time just as He speaks in His own way always. But as His creation is not eternal or a divine person, so His Word cannot be consi- dered eternal and a divine Person. The Christians proceed further, and make the Creator a divine father and His Word a divine son; and also, because He breathed life into His creatures, He is surnamed a divine Spirit, forgetting that logically He could not be father before creation, nor "son" before He spoke, and neither "Holy Ghost" before He gave life. I can conceive the attributes of God through His works at manifestations a posteriori, but of his eternal and a prior attributes posses no conception whatever, nor do I ima- gine any human intelligence to be able to comprehend the nature of an eternal attribute and its relationship to the essence of God. In fact, God has not revealed to us the nature of His Being in the Holy Scriptures nor in the human intellect.

The attributes of God are not to be considered as distinct and separate divine entities or personalities, other- wise we shall have, not one trinity of persons in the Godhead, but several dozen of trinities. An attribute until it actually emanates from its subject has no existence. We cannot qualify the subject by a particular attribute before that at- tribute has actually proceeded from it and is seen. Hence we say "God is Good" when we enjoy His good and kind action; but we cannot describe Him - properly speaking - as "God is Goodness," because goodness is not God, but His action and work. It is for this reason that the Quran always attributes to Allah the adjectival appellations, such as the Wise, the Knowing, the Merciful, but never with such descriptions as "God is love, knowledge, word," and so forth; for love is the action of the lover and not the lover himself, just as knowledge or word is the action of the knowing person and not himself.

I particularly insist on this point because of the error into which have fallen those who maintain the eternity and distinct personality of certain attributes of God. The Verb or the Word of God has been held to be a distinct person of the Deity; whereas the word of God can have no other signification than an expression of His Knowledge and Will. The Quran, too, is called "the Word of God," and some early Muslim doctors of law asserted that it was eternal and un- created. The same appellation is also given to Jesus Christ in the Quran - *Kalimatun minho*, i.e. "a Word from Him" (Ch.3 v45). But it would be very

irreligious to assert that the Word or Logos of God is a distinct person, and that it assumed flesh and became incarnate in the shape of a man of Nazareth or in the form of a book, the former called "the Christ" and the latter "the Quran"!

To sum up this subject, I insistently declare that the Word or any other imaginable attribute of God, not only is it not a distinct Divine entity or individuality, but also it could have no actual (in actu) existence prior to the beginning of time and creation.

The first verse with which St. John's Gospel commences was often refuted by the early Unitarian writers, who rendered its true reading as follows: "In the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God's."

It will be noticed that the Greek form of the genitive case "Theou" i.e. "God's" (1) was corrupted into "Theos"; that is, "God," in the nominative form of the name! It is also to be observed that the clause "In the beginning was the word" expressly indicates the origin of the word which was not before the beginning! By the "word of God" is not meant a separate and distinct substance, coeval and coexistent

(1) Footnote: Concerning the Logos, ever since the "Gospels" and "Commentaries" as well as the controversial writings belonging to the Unitarians, except what has been quoted from them in the writings of their opponents, such as the learned Greek Patriarch Photius and those before him.

Among the "Fathers" of the Eastern Christians, one of the most distinguished is St. Ephraim the Syrian. He is the author of many works, chiefly of a commentary on the Bible which is published both in Syriac and in Latin, which latter edition I had carefully read in Rome. He has also homilies, dissertations called "midrishi" and "contra Haeretici," etc. Then there is a famous Syrian, author Bir Disin (generally written Bardisanes) who flourished in the latter end of the second and the first of the third century A.D. From the writings of Bir Disin nothing in the Syriac is extant except what Ephraim, Jacob of Nesibin and other Nestorians and Jacobites have quoted for refutation, and except what most of the Greek Fathers employed in their own language. Bir Disin maintained that Jesus Christ was the seat of the temple of the Word of God, but both he and the Word were created. St. Ephraim, in combating the "heresy" of Bir Disin, says:

(Syriac): "Wai lakh O, dovyia at Bir Disin Dagreit l'Milta eithrov d'Allihi. Baram kthabha la kthabh d'akh hikhin Illa d'Miltha eithov Allihi,"

(Arabic) "Wailu I-laka yi anta' s-Safil Bir Disin Li-anna fara'aita kina I-kalimo li I-Lihi Li-kina I-Kitibo mi Kataba Kazi Illa I-Kalimo Kina I-Lih."

(English translation): "Woe unto thee O miserable Bir Disin That thou didst read the "word was God's"! But the Book [Gospel] did not write likewise, Except that "the Word was God."

Almost in all the controversies on the Logos the Unitarians are "branded" with the heresy of denying the eternity and divine personality of it by having "corrupted" the Gospel of John, etc. These imputations were returned to the Trinitarians by the true Nasira - Unitarians. So one can deduct from the patristic literature that the Trinitarians were always reproached with having corrupted the Scriptures.

_____end footnote

with the Almighty, but saying of His Knowledge and Will when He uttered the word Kun, namely, "Be." When God said Kun, the worlds became; when He said Kun for His Words to be recorded in the Protected Tablets by the pen it became again.

By His saying: "Be," Jesus was created in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and so on - whenever He wills to create a thing He but only says "Be," to it and it becomes.

The Christian auspiciatory formula: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," does not even mention the name of God! And this is the Christian God! The Nestorian and Jacobite formula, which consists of ten syllables exactly like the Muslim "Bismillahi," is thus to be transliterated: Bshim Abha wo-Bhra ou-Ruha d-Qudsha, which has the same meaning as that contained in all other Christian formulas. The Quranic formula, on the other hand, which expresses the foundation of the Islamic truth is a great contrast to the Trinitarians' formula: Bis- millahi r-Rahmani r-Rahim; that is: "In the Name of the Most Merciful and Compassionate Allah."

The Christian Trinity - inasmuch as it admits a plurality of persons in the Deity, attributes distinct personal properties to each person; and makes use of family names similar to those in the pagan mythology - cannot be accepted as a true conception of the Deity. Allah is neither the father of a son nor the son of a father. He has no mother, nor is He self-made. The belief in "God the Father and God the Son and God the Holy Ghost" is a flagrant denial of the Oneness of God, and an audacious confession in three imperfect beings who, united or separately, cannot be the true God.

Mathematics as a positive science teaches us that a unit is no more nor less than one; that one is never equal to one plus one plus one; in other words, one cannot be equal to three, because one is the third of the three. In the same way, one is not equal to a third. And vice versa, three are not equal to one, nor can a third be equal to a unit. The unit is the basis of all numbers, and a standard for the measurements and weights of all dimensions, distances, quantities and time. In

fact, all numbers are aggregates of the unit 1. Ten is an aggregate of so many equal units of the same kind.

Those who maintain the unity of God in the trinity of persons tell us that "each person is omnipotent, omnipresent, eternal and perfect God; yet there are not three omnipotent, omnipresent, eternal and perfect Gods, but one omnipotent . . . God!" If there is no sophistry in the above reasoning then we shall present this "mystery" of the churches by an equation:- .

God = 1 God + 1 God + 1 God; therefore: 1 God = 3 Gods. In the first place, one god cannot equal three gods, but only one of them. Secondly, since you admit each person to be perfect God like His two associates, your conclusion that $1 + 1 + 1 = 1$ is not mathematical, but an absurdity!

You are either too arrogant when you attempt to prove that three units equal one unit; or too cowardly to admit that three ones equal three ones. In the former case you can never prove a wrong solution of a problem by a false process; and in the second you have not the courage to confess your belief in three gods.

Besides, we all - Muslims and Christians - believe that God is Omnipresent, that He fills and encompasses every space and particle. Is it conceivable that all the three persons of the Deity at the same time and separately encompass the universe, or is it only one of them at the time? To say "the Deity does this" would be no answer at all. For Deity is not God, but the state of being God, and therefore a quality.

Godhead is the quality of one God; it is not susceptible of plurality nor of diminution. There are no godheads but one Godhead, which is the attribute of one God alone.

Then we are told that each person of the trinity has some particular attributes which are not proper to the other two. And these attributes indicate - according to human reasoning and language - priority and posteriority among them. The Father always holds the first rank, and is prior to the Son. The Holy Ghost is not only posterior as the third in the order of counting but even inferior to those from whom he proceeds. Would it not be considered a sin of heresy if the names of the three persons were conversely repeated? Will not the signing of the cross upon the countenance or over the elements of the Eucharist be considered impious by the Churches if the formula be reversed thus: "In the name of the Holy Ghost, and of the Son, and of the Father"? For if they are absolutely equal and coeval, the order of precedence need not be so scrupulously observed.

The fact is that the Popes and the General Councils have always condemned the Sabellian doctrine which maintained that God is one but that He manifested Himself as the Father or as the Son or as the Holy Spirit, being always

one and the same person. Of course, the religion of Islam does not endorse or sanction the Sabelian views. God manifested Jamal or beauty in Christ, Jelal or Glory and Majesty in Prophet Muhammad, and Wisdom in Solomon, and so on in many other objects of nature, but none of those prophets are gods neither the beautiful scenery of nature are gods.

The truth is that there is no mathematical exactitude, no absolute equality between the three persons of the Trinity. If the Father were in every respect equal to the Son or the Holy Spirit, as the unit 1 is positively equal to another figure 1, then there would necessarily be only one person of God and not three, because a unit is not a fragment or fraction nor a multiple of itself. The very difference and relationship that is admitted to exist between the persons of the Trinity leaves no shadow of doubt that they are neither equal to each other nor are they to be identified with one another. The Father begets and is not begotten; the Son is begotten and not a father; the Holy Ghost is the issue of the other two persons; the first person is described as creator and destroyer; the second as savior or redeemer, and the third as life-giver. Consequently none of the three is alone the Creator, the Redeemer and the Life-giver. Then we are told that the second person is the Word of the first Person, becomes man and is sacrificed on the cross to satisfy the justice of his father, and that his incarnation and resurrection are operated and accomplished by the third person.

In conclusion, I must remind Christians that unless they believe in the absolute Oneness 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 worshiper of God, and the third person one of the innumerable holy spirits in the service of the Almighty God.

In the Old Testament, God is called Father because of His being a loving Creator and Protector, but as the Churches abused this Name, the Quran has justly refrained from using it.

The Old Testament and the Quran condemn the doctrine of three 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.

It might with advantage be added that in the East the Unitarian Christians always combated and protested against the Trinitarians, and that when they beheld the utter destruction of the "Fourth Beast" by the Great Prophet of Allah, they accepted and followed him. The Devil, who spoke through the mouth of the

serpent to Eve, uttered blasphemies against the Most High through the mouth of the "Little Horn" which sprang up among the "Ten Horns" upon the head of the "Fourth Beast" (Dan. viii.), was none other than Constantine the Great, who officially and violently proclaimed the Nicene Creed. But, Prophet Muhammad has destroyed the "Iblis" or the Devil from the Promised Land for ever, by establishing Islam there as the religion of the One true God.

"AND THE AHMED OF ALL NATIONS WILL COME." - HAGGAI, ii.7.

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 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 worshiper the Prophet Haggai to console the sad assembly with this important message: -

"And I will shake all nations, and the Himdah 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).

I have translated the above paragraph from the only copy of the Bible at my disposal, lent to me by an Assyrian lady cousin in her own vernacular language. But let us consult the English versions of the Bible, which we find have rendered the original Hebrew words himda and shalom into "desire" and "peace" respectively.

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

(a) Himda. 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 neighbor"). 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 Quran (ch.61:6) declares that Jesus announced unto the people of Israel the coming of Ahmad: "And when Jesus, the son of Mary said: 'Children of Israel, I am sent to you by Allah to confirm the Torah that is before me, and to give news of a Messenger who will come after me whose name shall be Ahmad.' Yet when he came to them with clear proofs, they said: 'This is clear sorcery.'"

The Gospel of St. John, being written in Greek, uses the name Paracletos, a barbarous form unknown to classical Greek literature. But Periclytos, 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 Christ. Alas! there is no Gospel extant in the original language spoken by Jesus!

(b) As to the etymology and signification of the words shalom, shlama, and the Arabic salam, 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.

This being made clear, I propose to give a short exposition of this prophecy of Haggai. In order to understand it better, let me quote another prophecy from the last book of the Old Testament called Mallachai, or Mallakhi, or in the Authorized Version, Malachi (chap. iii. I):

"Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: suddenly he will come to his temple. He is the Adonai (i.e. the Lord) whom you desire, and the Messenger of the Covenant with whom you are pleased. Lo he is coming, says the Lord of hosts."

Then compare these mysterious oracles with the wisdom embodied in the sacred verse of the Quran: "Exalted is He who caused His worshiper (Prophet Muhammad) to travel in the night from the sacred Mosque (Mecca) to the farthest Mosque (Jerusalem) which We have blessed around it that We might show him of Our signs. He is the Hearer, the Seer." Ch.17:1 Quran

That by the person coming suddenly to the temple, as foretold in the two biblical documents above mentioned, Prophet Muhammad, and not Prophet Jesus, is intended the following arguments must surely suffice to convince every impartial observer:-

1. The kinship, the relation and resemblance between the two tetragrams Himda and Ahmd, and the identity of the root hmd from which both substantives are derived, leave not a single particle of doubt that the subject in the sentence "and the Himda of all nations will come" is Ahmed; that is to say, Muhammad. There is not the remotest etymological connection between himda and any other names of "Jesus," "Christ," "Savior," not even a single consonant in common between them.

2. Even if it be argued that the Hebrew form Hmdh (read himdah) is an abstract substantive meaning "desire, lust, covetousness, and praise," the argument would be again in favor of our thesis; for then the Hebrew form would, in etymology, be exactly equivalent in meaning and in similarity to, or rather identity with, the Arabic form Himdah. In whatever sense you wish to take the tetragram Hmdh, its relation to Ahmed and Ahmedism is decisive, and has nothing to do with Jesus and Jesuism! If St. Jerome, and before him the authors of the Septuagint, had preserved intact the Hebrew form Hmdh, instead of putting down the Latin "cupi- ditas" or the Greek "euthymia," probably the translators appointed by King James I would have also reproduced the original form in the Authorized Version, and the Bible Society have followed suit in their translations into Islamic languages.

3. The temple of Zorobabel was to be more glorious than that of Solomon because, as Mallakhi prophesied, the great Prophet or Messenger of the Covenant, the "Adonai" or the Seyid of the messengers was to visit it suddenly, as indeed Prophet Muhammad did during his miraculous night journey, as stated in the Quran! The temple of Zorobabel was repaired or rebuilt by Herod the Great. And Jesus, certainly on every occasion of his frequent visits to that temple, honored it by his holy person and presence. Indeed, the presence of every prophet in the House of God had added to the dignity and sanctity of the sanctuary. But this much must at least be admitted, that the Gospels which record the visitations of Christ to the temple and his teachings therein fail to make mention of a single conversion among his audience. All his visits to the temple are reported as ending in bitter disputes with the unbelieving priests and Pharisees! It must also be concluded that Jesus not only did not bring "peace" to the world as he deliberately declared (Matt. xxiv. Mark xiii., Luke xxi.), but he even predicted the total destruction of the temple (Matt. x. 34, etc.), which was fulfilled some forty years afterwards by the Romans, when the final dispersion of the Jews was completed.

4. Ahmad, which is another form of the name Muhammad and of the same root and signification, namely, the "praised," during his night journey visited the sacred spot of the ruined temple, as stated in the Holy Quran, and there and then, according to the sacred tradition uttered repeatedly by himself to his companions, officiated the divine service of prayer and adoration to Allah in the presence of all the Prophets; and it was then that Allah "to travel in the night from the sacred Mosque to the farthest Mosque which We have blessed around it that We might show him of Our Signs." (Ch 17:1 Quran) to the Last Prophet. If Moses and Elias could appear in bodily presence on the mount of transfiguration, they and all the thousands of Prophets could also appear in the arena of the temple at Jerusalem; and it was during that "sudden coming" of Prophet Muhammad to "his temple" (Mal. iii. 1) that God did actually fill it "with glory" (Hag. ii.).

That Amina, the widow of Abdullah, both of whom died before the advent of Islam, should name her orphan son "Ahmed," the first proper noun in the history of mankind, is, according to my humble belief, the greatest miracle in favor of Islam. The second Caliph, Hazrat Omar, rebuilt the temple, and the majestic Mosque at Jerusalem remains, and will remain to the end of the world, a perpetual monument of the truth of the covenant which Allah made with Abraham and Ishmael (Gen. xv.-xvii).

(3) The Question Of The Birthright And The Covenant

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'an are familiar with the story of the great Prophet Abraham and his two sons Ishmael (Isma'il) and Isaac (Ishaq). The story of Abraham's call from the Ur of the Chaldees, and that of his descendants until the death of his grandson Joseph in Egypt, is written in The Book of Genesis (chapters xi.-l). In his genealogy as recorded in Genesis, Abraham is the twentieth from Adam, and a contemporary of Nimrod, who built the stupendous Tower of Babel.

The early story of Abraham in the Ur of Chaldea, though not mentioned in the Bible, is recorded by the famous Jewish historian Joseph Flavius in his Antiquities and is also confirmed by the Qur'an. But the Bible expressly tells us that the father of Abraham, Terah, was an idolater (Jos. xxiv. 2, 14). Abraham manifested his love and zeal for God when he entered into the temple and destroyed all the idols and images therein, and thus he was a true prototype of his illustrious descendant Prophet Muhammad. He came out unhurt and triumphantly from the burning furnace wherein he was cast by the order of Nimrod. He leaves his native land for Haran in the company of his father and his nephew Lot. He was seventy-five years old when his father died at Haran. In obedience and absolute resignation to the divine call, he leaves his country and starts on a long and varied journey to the land of Canaan, to Egypt and to Arabia. His wife Sarah is barren; yet God announces to him that he is destined to become the father of

many nations, that all the territories he is to traverse shall be given as an inheritance to his descendants, and that, "by his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed"! This wonderful and unique promise in the history of religion was met with an unshaken faith on the part of Abraham, who had no issue, no son. When he was led out to look at the sky at night and told by Allah that his posterity would be as numerous as the stars, and as innumerable as the sand which is on the shores of the sea, Abraham believed it. And it was this belief in God, that "was counted righteousness," as the Scripture says.

A virtuous poor Egyptian girl, Hagar by name, is a slave and a maid in the service of Sarah. At the bidding and consent of the mistress the maidservant is duly married by the Prophet, and from this union Ishmael is born, as fore-told by the Angel. When Ishmael is thirteen years old, Allah again sends His Angel with His revelation to Abraham; the same promise is repeated to Abraham; the rite of Circumcision is formally instituted and immediately executed. Abraham, at his ninetieth year of age, Ishmael, and all the male servants, are circumcised; and the "Covenant" between God and Abraham with his only begotten son is made and sealed, as if it were with the blood of circumcision. It is a kind of treaty concluded between Heaven and the Promised Land in the person of Ishmael as the only offspring of the nonagenarian Patriarch. Abraham promises allegiance and fealty to his Creator, and God promises to be forever the Protector and God of the posterity of Ishmael.

Later on - that is to say, when Abraham was ninety- nine years old and Sarah ninety, we find that she also bears a son whom they name Isaac according to the Divine promise.

As no chronological order is observed in the Book of Genesis, we are told that after the birth of Isaac, Ishmael and his mother are turned out and sent away by Abraham in a most cruel manner, simply because Sarah so wished. Ishmael and his mother disappear in the desert, a fountain bursts out when the youth is on the point of death from thirst; he drinks and is saved. Nothing more is heard of Ishmael in the Book of Genesis except that he married an Egyptian woman, and when Abraham died he was present together with Isaac to bury their dead father.

Then the Book of Genesis continues the story of Isaac, his two sons, and the descent of Jacob into Egypt, and ends with the death of Joseph.

The next important event in the history of Abraham as recorded in Genesis (xxii.) is the offering of "his only son" a sacrifice to God, but he was ransomed with a ram which was presented by an angel. As the Qur'an says, "That was indeed a clear trial" for Abraham (Qur'an, Ch. 38:106), but his love for God surpassed every other affection; and for this reason he is called the Friend of Allah, "Allah has taken Abraham for a Friend". (Qur'an)

Thus runs the brief account of Abraham in connection with our subject of the Birthright and the Covenant.

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 first-born, 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 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, but by those of Ishmael. This is an actual and literal fulfillment of one of the conditions contained in the Covenant.

The third point is that Isaac 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 ever thinks of disparaging the sacred and prophetic position of Isaac and his son Jacob; for to disparage or to lower a Prophet is an impiety. When we compare Ishmael and Isaac, we cannot but reverence and respect them both as holy Prophets 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. Rather, 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 Prophet Muhammad. The Jews do not see the fulfillment of the so-called Messianic prophecies either in the person of Christ or in that of Prophet Muhammad. 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 rancor 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 thy 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" or "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. Paul, who pretends to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, uses some irreverent words about Hagar (Gal. vi. 21-31 and elsewhere) and Ishmael, and openly contradicts his Master. This man has done all he could to pervert and mislead the Christians whom he used to persecute before his conversion; and I doubt very much that the Jesus of Paul was Jesus, the son of Mary who according to Christian traditions was hanged on a tree about a century or so before Christ, for his Messianic pretensions. In fact, the Epistles of Paul as they stand before us are full of doctrines entirely repugnant to the spirit of the Old Testament, as well as to that of the humble Prophet, Jesus of Nazareth. Paul was a bigoted Pharisee and a lawyer. After his conversion to Christianity he seems to have become even more fanatical than ever. His hatred to Ishmael and his claim to the birthright makes him forget or overlook the Law of Moses which forbids a man to marry his own sister under the pain of capital penalty. If Paul were inspired by God, he would have either denounced the Book of Genesis as full of forgeries when it says twice (xii. 10-20, xx. 2-18) that Abraham was the husband of his own sister, or that he would have exposed the Prophet to be a liar! (God forbid). But he believes in the words of the book, and his conscience does not torment him in the least when he identifies Hagar with the barren desert of the Sinai, and qualifies Sarah as the Jerusalem above in heaven! (Gal. iv. 25, 26). Did ever Paul read this anathema of the Law:-

"Cursed be he that lieth with his sister, the daughter of his father, or the daughter of his mother. And all the people say: Amen"? (Duet. xxvii. 22).

Is there a human or divine law that would consider more legitimate one who is the son of his own uncle and aunt than he whose father is a Chaldean and his mother an Egyptian? Have you anything to say against the chastity and the piety of Hagar? Of course not, for she was the wife of a Prophet and the mother of a Prophet, and herself favored with Divine revelations.

The God who made the Covenant with Ishmael thus prescribes the law of inheritance, namely: If a man has two wives, one beloved and the other despised, and each one has a son, and if the son of the despised wife is the first-born, that son, and not the son of the beloved wife, is entitled to the birthright. Consequently the first-born shall inherit twice that of his brother. (Duet. xxi. 15-17). Is not, then, this law explicit enough to put to silence all who dispute the just claim of Ishmael to birthright?

Now let us discuss this question of the birthright as briefly as we can. We know that Abraham was a nomad chief as well as a Messenger of God, and that he used to live in a tent and had large flocks of cattle and great wealth. Now the nomad tribesmen do not inherit lands and pastures, but the prince assigns to each of his sons certain clans or tribes as his subjects and dependents. As a rule the youngest inherits the hearth or the tent of his parents, whereas the elder - unless unfit - succeeds him to his throne. The great Mongol conqueror Jenghiz Khan was succeeded by Oghtai, his eldest son, who reigned in Pekin as Khaqan, but his youngest son remained in his father's hearth at Qara-qorum in Mongolia. It was exactly the same with Abraham's two sons. Isaac, who was the younger of the two, inherited the tent of his father and became, like him, a nomad living in tents. But Ishmael was sent to Hijaz to guard the House of Allah which he, together with Abraham, had built as referred to in the Qur'an. Here he settled, became Prophet and Prince among the Arab tribes who believed in him. It was at Mecca, or Becca, that the Ka'aba became the center of the pilgrimage called al-hajj. It was Ishmael that founded the religion of one true Allah and instituted the Circumcision.

His offspring soon increased and was multiplied like the stars of the sky. From the days of Prophet Ishmael to the advent of Prophet Muhammad, the Arabs of Hijaz, Yemen and others have been independent and masters of their own countries. The Roman and Persian Empires were powerless to subdue the people of Ishmael. Although idolatry was afterwards introduced, still the names of Allah, Abraham, Ishmael, and a few other Prophets were not forgotten by them. Even Esau, the elder son of Isaac, left his father's hearth for his younger brother Jacob and dwelt in Edom, where he became the chief of his people and soon got mixed with the Arab tribes of Ishmael who was both his uncle and father-in-law. The story of Esau's selling his birthright to Jacob for a dish of pottage is foul trick invented to justify the ill-treatment ascribed to Ishmael. It is alleged that "God hated Esau and loved Jacob," while the twins were in their mother's womb; and that the "elder brother was to serve his younger one" (Gen. xxv Rom. ix. 12, 13). But, strange to say, another report, probably from another source, shows the case

to be just the reverse of the above-mentioned prediction. For the thirty- third chapter of Genesis clearly admits that Jacob served Esau, before whom he seven times prostrates in homage, addressing him "My Lord," and declaring himself as "your slave."

Abraham is reported in the Bible to have several other sons from Qitura and "the concubines," to whom he gave presents or gifts and sent them towards the East. All these became large and strong tribes. Twelve sons of Ishmael are mentioned by name and described, each one to be a prince with his towns and camps or armies (Gen. xxv.). So are the children from Qitura, and others, as well as those descended from Esau mentioned by their names.

When we behold the number of the family of Jacob when he went to Egypt, which hardly exceeded seventy heads, and when he was met by Esau with an escort of four hundred armed horsemen, and the mighty Arab tribes submitted to the twelve Amirs belonging to the family of Ishmael, and then when the last Messenger of Allah proclaims the religion of Islam, all the Arab tribes unitedly acclaim him and accept His religion, and subdue all the lands promised to the children of Prophet Abraham, we must indeed be blind not to see that the Covenant was made with Ishmael and the promise accomplished in the person of Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace).

Before concluding this article I wish to draw the attention of the students of the Bible, especially that of the Higher Biblical Criticism, to the fact that the so-called Messianic Prophecies and Passages belong to a propaganda in favor of the Davidic Dynasty after the death of King Solomon when his kingdom was split into two. The two great Prophets Elias and Elisha, who flourished in the Kingdom of Samaria or Israel, do not even mention the name of David or Solomon. Jerusalem was not longer the center of religion for the Ten Tribes, and the Davidic claims to a perpetual reign was rejected.

But Prophets like Ishaia and others who were attached to the Temple of Jerusalem and the House of David have foretold the coming of a great Prophet and Sovereign.

As it was said in the first article, there are certain manifest marks with which the coming Last Prophet will be known. And it is these marks that we shall attempt to study in the future articles.

(4) 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; 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, when the chosen family were leading a nomadic and pastoral life, it had no settled habitation where to build a house, especially dedicated to the worship of God; they used to erect a particular stone around which they 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 uses this very word hagag or haghagh (1) 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 practice 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."

----- Footnotes: (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 a g sound and when soft or aspirate becomes guttural and sounds gh. -----End of footnote

Abraham during his sojourns frequently used to build an altar for worship and sacrifice at different places and on particular occasions. When Jacob 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 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 center 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 (I 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 (1).

Now, what does the word Mispa mean? It is generally translated into a "watch-tower." It belongs to that class of Semitic nouns - Asma 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 sapha, an archaic word for "stone." The usual word for stone in Hebrew is iben, and in Arabic hajar. The Syriac for stone is kipa. 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.

Before explaining the signification of the noun sapha I have to tax again the patience of those of my readers who are not acquainted with the Hebrew. The Arabic language lacks the p sound in its alphabet just as much as do the Hebrew and other Semitic languages, in which the letter p, like g, is sometimes soft and is pronounced like f or ph. In English, as a rule, the Semitic and Greek words containing f sound are transliterated and written by the insertion of "ph" instead of "f," e.g. Seraph, Mustapha, and Philosophy. It is in accordance with this rule that I prefer to write this word sapha to safa.

----- Footnote: (1) The Bible which I consult does not contain the so-called deutro- canonical or Apocryphal books of the Old Testament. This Bible is published by the American Bible Society (New York 1893) . The title runs thus Kthahhi Qaddishi Dadiathiqi Wadiathiqi Khadatt An Shad-wath Poushaqa dmin lishani qdimaqi. Matha 'ta d'dasta. Biblioneta d' America [The Holy Books of the Old Testament and of the New Covenant (Testament), with the concordance or witnesses. Translated from the ancient languages. Published at the Press of the American Bible Society]. ----- End of footnote

When Jesus Christ surnamed his first disciple Shim'on (Simon) with the significant title of "Petros" (Peter), he must evidently have had in his mind this

ancient sacred Sapha which had been lost long ago! But, alas! we cannot positively set out the exact word which he expressed in his own language. The Greek form Petros in the masculine gender - Petra in the feminine - is so unclassical and unGreek, that one is astonished at its being ever adopted by the Churches. Did Jesus or any other Jew ever dream of calling the fisherman Bar Yona, Petros? Decidedly not. The Syriac version called Pshitta has frequently rendered this Greek form into Kipha (Kipa). And the very fact that even the Greek text has preserved the original name "Kephas," which the English versions have reproduced in the shape of "Cephas," shows that Christ spoke the Aramaic language and gave the surname "Kipha" to his principal disciple.

The old Arabic versions of the New Testament have frequently written St. Peter's name as "Sham'un' as-Sapha"; that is to say, "Simon the Stone." The words of Christ: "Thou art Peter," etc., have their equivalent in the Arabic version in the form of "Antas-Sapha" (Matt. xvi. 18; John i. 42, etc.).

It follows, therefore, that if Simon is the Sapha, the Church which was to be built on it would naturally be the Mispha. That Christ should liken Simon to Sapha and the Church to Mispha is very remarkable; but when I come to divulge the mystery hidden in this similitude and the wisdom embodied in the Sapha, then it must be accepted as the most marvelous truth of Prophet Muhammad's merit to his glorious title: THE MUSTAPHA'!

From what has been stated above, our curiosity would naturally lead one to ask the following questions: -

(a) Why did the Muslims and Unitarian descendants of Abraham choose a stone to perform their religious service on or around it? (b) Why should this particular stone be named sapha? (c) What is the writer driving at? And so on - perhaps several others.

The stone was selected as the best suitable material upon which a traveling devotee offered his sacrifice, poured his pure oil and wine, (1) and performed his religious services around it. It was more than this; this stone was erected to commemorate the vows and certain promises which a prophet or righteous man made to his Creator, and the revelation he received from God. Consequently, it was a sacred monument to perpetuate the memory and the sacred character of a great religious event. For such a purpose no other material could surpass the stone. Not only does the solidity and durability of the stone make it suitable for that purpose, but its mere simplicity, cheapness, worthlessness in a lonely place would guarantee it against any attraction of human avarice or enmity to steal or destroy it. As is well known, the Law of Moses strictly forbids to hew or carve the stones of the altar. The stone called Sapha was to be absolutely left natural; no images, inscriptions, or engravings were to be wrought upon it, lest any one of these should be worshipped in time to come by the ignorant people. Gold, iron silver, or any other metal, could not answer all these qualities required in the

simple stone. It will be understood, therefore, that the purest, the most durable, eligible, and the safest material for a religious and sacred monument could be none other than the stone.

----- Footnote: 1. Wine was not forbidden to the people of Israel. ----
-----end of footnote

The molten bronze statue of the Jupiter worshipped by the heathen Roman Pontifex Maximus, was taken away from the Pantheon and recast into the image of St. Peter by order of a Christian Sovereign Pontiff; and indeed, the wisdom embodied in the Sapha is admirable and worthy of all those who worship no other object besides God.

It should also be remembered that not only is the erected Sapha a sacred monument, but the very spot and the circuit in which it is situated as well. And it is for this reason that the Muslim hajj, like the Hebrew higga, is performed round the building where the Sacred Stone is fixed. It is known fact that the Karamatians who carried the Black Stone from the Ka'aba and kept it in their own country for some twenty years, were obliged to bring and put it back in its former place because they could not draw the pilgrims from Mecca. If it had been gold or other precious object, it could not have existed, at least, for some five thousand years; or even if it had had on it some carvings or images of art, it would have been destroyed by the Prophet Muhammad himself.

As to the meaning - or rather meanings - of the Sapha, I have already referred to them as qualities of the stone.

The word consists of the consonants "sadi" and "pi" ending with the vowel "hi" both as a verb and noun. It means, in its qal form, "to purify, to watch, to gaze from distance, and to choose." It also has the meanings of "to be firm and sound"; in its pi'el paradigm, which is causative, it simply means "to make a choice, to cause to elect," and so on.

A man who watched from a tower was called Sophi (2 Kings ix. 17, etc.). In ancient times - that is, before the building of the Temple of Solomon - the Prophet or the "Man of God" was called Roi or Hozî, which means the "seer" (1 Sam. ix. 9). The Hebrew scholars are, of course, familiar with the word Msaphpi, or rather Msappi, which is equivalent in orthography to the Arabic musaphphi, which signifies "one who endeavors to elect that which is pure, sound, firm," and so forth. The watchman on the Tower of Yizrael, as quoted above, was gazing and watching sharply from a great distance to distinguish a company of persons coming on towards the town. He saw the first messenger of the King who arrived and joined the group but did not return. The same was the case with the second and the third envoy. It was later on that the Sophi could distinguish the chief of the group as Jehu. Now, what then was the business and the office of that watchman? It was to look out sharply from some distance to distinguish one

among the others with a view to understanding his identity and his movements, if at all possible, and then to inform his king. If you ask: What was the business and the office of the solitary Sophi of the Mispha? the answer - which would merely be that he used to watch from the minaret of the Misppha (Mispha) in order to distinguish the identity of the pilgrims in the desert, or that he used to keep watch against some danger - could not satisfy an eager inquirer. If so, the Mispha would lose its religious and sacred character, and would rather seem to assume that of a military watchtower. But the case with the Sophi of the Mispha was quite different. Originally the Mispha was only a simple shrine on a solitary high place in Gal'ead where the Sophi with his family or attendants used to live. After the conquest and occupation of the land of Canaan by Israel, the number of the Misphas increases, and they soon become great religious centers and develop into institutions of learning and confraternities. They seem to be like the Islamic Mevlevi, Bektashi, Neqshbendi, and other religious confraternities, each one of them being under its own Sheikh and Murshid. They had schools attached to the Mispha, where the Law, the religion, the Hebrew literature and other branches of knowledge were taught. But over and above this educational work, the Sophi was the supreme head of a community of initiates whom he used to instruct and teach the esoteric or mystic religion which we know under the name of Sophia. Indeed, what we term to-day Sufis were then called nbiyim or "prophets," and what is called, in Islamic takkas, zikr or invocation in prayer, they used to term "prophesying." In the time of the Prophet Samuel, who was the head of the State as well as that of the Mispha institutions, these disciples and initiates had become very numerous; and when Saul was anointed and crowned, he joined the zikr or religious practice of invocation with the initiates and was announced everywhere: "Behold Saul also among the Prophets." And this saying became a proverb; for he was also "prophesying" with the group of prophets (1 Sam. x 9-13). The Sufism among the Hebrews continued to be an esoteric religious confraternity under the supremacy of the Prophet of the time until the death of King Solomon. After the division of the kingdom into two, it appears that a great schism had taken place among the Sufis too. In the time of the Prophet Elias, about 900 B.C., we are told that he was the only true Prophet left and that all others were killed; and that there were eight hundred and fifty prophets of the Baal and Ishra who "ate at the table of Queen Izabel" (1 Kings xviii. 19). But only a few years later, Elias's disciple and successor, the Prophet Elisha, at Bethel and at Jericho is met by scores of the "sons of Prophets" who foretell him about the imminent ascension of his master Elias (2 Kings ii.).

Whatever may have been the real position of the Hebrew Sufis (or Sophees) after the great religious and national schism, one thing is certain, namely, that the true knowledge of God and the esoteric science of religion was preserved until the appearance of Jesus Christ, who built his Community of the Initiates in the Inner Religion upon Simon the Sapha, and that the true Sophis or seers of the Christian Mispha perpetuated this knowledge and watched over it until the appearance of the Elect of Allah, Prophet Muhammad al-Mustapha - the Hebrew "Mustaphi"!

The Bible mentions - as I said above - numerous prophets attached to the Misphas; but we must well understand that, as the Qur'an clearly declares, "God best knows whom He shall appoint for His Messenger" that He does not bestow the gift of prophecy on a person on account of his nobility, riches, or even piety, but for His own pleasure. The faith and all works of piety, meditations, spiritual exercises, prayers, fasting, and divine knowledge may raise a novice to become a spiritual murshid or guide, or to the rank of a saint, but never to the status of a prophet; for prophecy is not procured by effort, but is a gift of God. Even among the Prophets there are only a few who were Messengers favored with a special book and commissioned to direct a certain people or with a particular mission. Therefore the term "prophets" as used in the Hebrew Scriptures is often ambiguous.

I must also remark in this connection that probably the majority of the material of the Bible was the work or production of these Misphas before the Babylonian Captivity or even earlier, but afterwards has been revised by unknown hands until it has taken the shape which we nowadays have.

It now remains to say few words about the Muslim Sufism and the Greek word Sophia (wisdom or love of wisdom); and a discussion of these two systems of high knowledge does lie outside the scope of this article. Philosophy, in the wider sense of the term, is the study or science of the first principles of being; in other words, it transcends the limits of physics to study the pure being, and leaves behind the study of causes or laws of that which happens or is seen in nature trying to reach the metaphysics which deals with faith, ethics and law known now as the spiritual aspects of civilization, while the physic is considered the material aspects of civilization. Thereby it takes the greatest pains to find the truth.

The difference between the Greek Sophia and the Muslim Sufi is that the Greek have mixed between the materialistic and spiritual areanas and at the same time, they failed to receive revelation as their top philosophers i.e. Aristotle and Socrates admitted that dealing in the metaphysics without receiving revelation from the Creator is like crossing the ocean on a piece of wood! Whereas the lucky Muslim Sufis concentrated on the area of ethics and following the footsteps of Prophet Muhammad and his companions in disciplining one's heart and self in sailing to reach the High Assembly of the Angels and so forth.

Muslim Sufism is the contemplation on the deeds of Allah and His Creation and ones self and avoiding the contemplation on Allah Himself because the human is made of his environment and sooner use their five senses to describe Allah which becomes exceedingly dangerous as it happened with the Egyptians when they imagined the Sphinx that has head, paws, body etc.

The superiority of the Islamic Sophia to the Greek philosophy is manifest from the object it views at. And it is decidedly superior to the Christian celibacy and monasticism in its indifference towards the consciences and the beliefs of

other people. A Muslim Sophi (Sufi) always entertains respect for other religions, laughs at the idea of "heresy" and abhors all persecutions and oppressions. Most of the Christian Saints were either persecutors of or the persecuted by heretics, and their celebrity consists in their excess of intolerance. This is, alas but only too true.

It is also worthy noting that in the time of the first era of Islam, Muslim Sufis were referred to as "Zahid" or "Zohad" and at that time they had no methodology, but they had a complete fellowship of faith and jurisprudence to their respective school. They concentrated on the ethics and thinking. The following generation established the methodology of courses to be taken by beginners, the intermediate and the advanced based on the Qur'an and Prophetic Quotations. It is very clear that the daily recitation of Qur'an, the remembrance of the Names of Allah and the prayer on Prophet Muhammad together with asking Allah for forgiveness and praying at night, fasting during the day are some of the important characteristics. On the other hand, the authentic Muslim Sufi reject any insincere members who fail to keep the way of Prophet Muhammad. Admittedly, many ignorant people were exposed, thinking that these insincere cases are representative of Muslim Sufism. They fail to understand that the (Ihsan) which is one third of the Religion, as demonstrated in the answer of Prophet Muhammad to the question "What is Islam?, What Is Iman, and What is Ihsan? when Prophet Muhammad commented that the one who asked the questioner was the angel Gabriel and that he had come to teach you the Religion. Also, Islam was served by the four schools of jurisprudence while iman was served by faith schools such as Salaf and Asharia and of course Sufi served Ihsan. If some one doubts this let him name the scholars of Ihsan, because if you go to an Islamic Court which belongs to the section of Islam, or go to a Faith school and admit that he has jealousy and malice in his heart etc. of the disease of the soul both schools will admit that they have nothing to do with this aspect and refer him to an Abid, worshiper, or Sufi, Shaykh.

As a secondary remark I should like to add that the Muslim authors have always written the Greek word "philosophy" in the form of Phelsepha with sin instead of *sadi* or *tzadi*, which is one of the constituent letters in the Hebrew and Arabic words *Sapha* and *Sophi*. I think this form was introduced into the Arabic literature by the Assyrian translators who formerly belonged to the Nestorian sect. The Turks write the name St. Sophia of Constantinople with *sadi*, but philosophy with *sin*, like the samekh of the Hebrews. I believe that the Greek *Sophia* is to be identified etymologically with the Hebrew word; and the idea that the Muslim word *sophia* (*sowfiya*) is derived from the *soph*, which means "wool," ought to be abandoned.

The true *Sophia* - or wisdom - the true knowledge of God, the true science of religion and morality, and the infallible selection of the Last Messenger of Allah from among all His Messengers, belonged to the ancient institution of Israel called *Mispha*, until it was transformed into the *Mispha* of the Nassara or

Christian. It is indeed marvelous to see how complete is the analogy and how the economy of God concerning His dealings with man is carried on with absolute uniformity and order. The Mispha is the filter where all the data and persons are filtered and strained by the Musaphphi (Hebrew, Mosappi) as by a colander (for such is the meaning of the word); so that the genuine is distinguished and separated from the false, and the pure from the impure; yet centuries succeed each other, myriads of Prophets come and go, still the Mustapha, the Elected One, does not appear. Then comes the Holy Jesus; but he is rejected and persecuted, because there existed no longer in Israel that official Mispha which would have recognized and announced him as a true Messenger of God who was sent to bear witness to the Mustapha that was the Last Prophet to follow him. The "Grand Assembly of the Synagogue" convoked and instituted by Ezra and Nehemiah, the last member of which was "Simeon the Just" (ob 310 B.C.), was succeeded by the Supreme Tribunal of Jerusalem, called the "Sahedrin"; but this latter Assembly, whose President was the Nassi or the "Prince," condemned Jesus to death because it did not recognize his person and the nature of his divine mission. A few Sophis, however, knew Jesus and believed in his prophetic mission; but the crowds at one time mistook him for the Mustapha or the "elected" Messenger of Allah, and seized and acclaimed him king, but he vanished and disappeared from among them. He was not the Mustapha, otherwise it would be ridiculous to make Simon the Sapha and his Church the Mispha; for the office and the duty of the Mispha was to watch and look for the Last Messenger, so that when he came he would be proclaimed as the Elected and Chosen One - the Mustapha. If Jesus were the Mustapha, there would be no need for the institution of the Mispha any longer. This is a very deep and interesting subject; it deserves patient study. Prophet Muhammad al-Mustapha is the mystery of the Mispha, and the treasure of the Sophia.

(5) Prophet Muhammad Is The "Shiloh"

Prophet Jacob, the grandson of Prophet Abraham, is lying sick in bed; he is in his one hundred and forty-seventh year, and the end is approaching rapidly. He summons his twelve sons and their families to his bedroom; and he blesses each son and foretells the future of his tribe. It is generally known as the "Testament of Jacob," and is written in an elegant Hebrew style with a poetic touch. It contains a few words which are unique and never occur again in the Bible. The Testament recalls the varied events in the life of a man who has had many ups and downs. He is reported to have taken advantage of his brother's hunger and bought his right of birth for a dish of pottage, and deceived his blind old father and obtained the blessing which by birthright belonged to Esau. He served seven years to marry Rachel, but was deceived by her father, being married to her elder sister Liah; so he had to serve another term of seven years for the former. The massacre of all the male population by his (Jacob's) two sons Simon and Livi for the pollution of his (Jacob's) daughter Dina by Schechim, the prince of that town, had greatly grieved him. The shameful conduct of his first-born, Reubin, in defiling his father's bed by lying with his concubine was never

forgotten nor forgiven by him. But the greatest grief that befell him after the loss of his beloved wife Rachel was the disappearance for many years of his favorite son Joseph. His descent into Egypt and his meeting with Joseph caused him great joy and the recovery of his lost sight. Jacob was a Prophet, and surnamed by God "Israel," the name which was adopted by the twelve tribes that descended from him.

The policy of usurpation of the birthright runs through the records of the Book of Genesis, and Jacob is represented as a hero of this violation of the rights of other persons. He is reported to give the birthright of his grandson Manashi to his younger brother Ephraim, in spite of the remonstrances of their father Joseph (chap. xlvi.). He deprives his firstborn son of his birthright and accords the blessing to Judah, his fourth son, because the former had lain with Bilha, Jacob's "concubine," who is the mother of his two sons Dan and Nephthali; and deprives the latter because he was no better than the other, inasmuch as he committed adultery with his own daughter-in-law Tamar, who bore a son who became an ancestor of David and of Jesus Christ (chap. xxv. 22, chap. xxxviii.)!

It is indeed incredible that the author, or at least the final editor, of this book was "inspired by the Holy Spirit," as the Jews and Christians allege. Jacob is reported to have married two sisters simultaneously, an action condemned by God's law (Lev. xviii. 18). In fact, with the exception of Joseph and Benjamin, his other sons are described as rough shepherds, liars (to their father and to Joseph), murderers, adulterers, which means it was a family not becoming a Prophet at all. Of course, the Muslims cannot accept any calumny against a Prophet or a righteous man unless it be expressly recorded or mentioned in the Qur'an. We do not believe the sin attributed to Judah to be true (cf. chap. xxxviii), otherwise the blessing accorded to him by Jacob would be a contradiction; and it is this very blessing that we propose to study and discuss in this article.

Jacob could not have blessed his son Judah if the latter was really the father of his own daughter-in-law's son, Peres, for both adulterers would be condemned to death by the Law of God, Who had given him the gift of prophecy (Lev. xx 12). However, the story of Jacob and that of his not very exemplary family is to be found in the Book of Genesis (chaps. xxv. - 1).

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 "Shiloh," and the other "yiqha" or "yiqhath (by construction or contraction).

Shiloh is formed of four letters, shin, 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 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 form of asher= "he, that," and loh (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 shalah, 'to send, delegate," the past participle of which would be shaluh - that is, "one who is sent, 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 Shaluh. 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 Shiluah and correspond exactly to the "Messenger of Yah," the very title given to Muhammad alone "Rasul Allah," i.e. "the Messenger 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, the Prophet of Nazareth, is the Christ or Messiah no Muslim can deny, for the Qur'an 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 were anointed by the sacred anointment, yet they are called Messiahs.

As to Jesus, 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 Jews expect 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 Prophet 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, 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 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 Caesar 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 did not abrogate the Law of Moses, but he distinctly declared that he had come to fulfill it; nor was he the last Prophet; for after him St. Paul speaks of many "prophets" in the Church.

Prophet Muhammad came with military power and the Qur'an 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 Prophet of Allah, love and reverence him as the establisher of their religion, but never worship him or give him divine honor 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 favor of Prophet 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 Messengership, he was extremely quiet, peaceful, trustworthy, and of a contemplative and attractive character; that he was surnamed by the people of Mecca "Muhammad al-Emm." When the Meccans gave this title "Emm" or "Amm" 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.

Prophet 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 worshiper of God, whether a king or a prophet, has rendered such an admirably great and precious service to God and to man as Prophet 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 Prophet 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 delivered is the same without the least alteration in it, 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 Oneness of Allah; and to the fact that they have not made of him a god or son of a god.

As to the third interpretation of the name "Shiloh" I remarked that it might possibly be a corruption of "Shaluah," and in that case it would indisputably correspond to the Arabic title of the Prophet so often repeated in the Qur'an, namely, "Rasul" which means exactly the same as Shaluah does, i.e. "a Messenger." "Shaluah Elohim" of the Hebrews is precisely the "Rasul Allah" which phrase is chanted five times a day by the Crier to the Prayers from the minaret of all mosques in the world.

In the Qur'an several prophets, particularly those to whom a sacred scripture has been delivered, are mentioned as Rasul; but nowhere in the Old Testament do we come across Shiloh or Shaluah except in the Testament of Jacob.

Now from whatever point of view we try to study and examine this prophecy of Jacob, we are forced, by the reason of its actual fulfillment in Prophet Muhammad, to admit that the Jews are vainly expecting the coming of another Shiloh, and that the Christians are obstinately persisting in their error in believing that it was Jesus who was intended by Shiloh.

Then there are other observations which deserve our serious consideration. In the first place it is very plain that the sceptre and the legislator would remain in the tribe of Judah so long as the Shiloh does not appear on the scene. According to the Jewish claim, Shiloh has not come yet. It would follow, therefore, that both the Royal Sceptre and the Prophetical Succession were still in existence and belonged to that tribe. But both these institutions have been extinct for over thirteen centuries.

In the second place it is to be observed that the tribe of Judah also has disappeared together with its royal authority and its sister - the prophetical succession. It is an indispensable condition for the maintenance of a tribal existence and identity to show that the tribe as a whole lives either in its own fatherland or elsewhere collectively and speaks its own language. But with the Jews the case is just the reverse. To prove yourself to be an Israelite, you need hardly trouble yourself about it; for anybody will recognize you, but you can

never prove yourself to belong to one of the twelve tribes. You are dispersed and have lost your very language.

The Jews are forced to accept one or the other of the two alternatives, namely, either to admit that Shiloh has come already, but that their forefathers did not recognize him, or to accept the fact that there exists no longer a tribe of Judah from which Shiloh will have to descend.

As a third observation it is to be remarked that the text clearly implies, and much against the Judeo-Christian belief, that Shiloh is to be a total stranger to the tribe of Judah, and even to all the other tribes. This is so evident that a few minutes of reflection are sufficient to convince one. The prediction clearly indicates that when Shiloh comes the sceptre and the lawgiver will pass away from Judah; this can only be realized if Shiloh be a stranger to Judah. If Shiloh is a descendant of Judah, how could those two elements cease to exist in that tribe? It could not be a descendant of any of the other tribes either, for the sceptre and the lawgiver were for all Israel, and not for one tribe only. This observation explodes the Christian claim as well. For Jesus is a descendant of Judah through Mary.

I very often wonder at these itinerant and erring Jews. For over twenty-five centuries they have been learning a hundred languages of the peoples whom they have been serving. Since both the Ishmaelites and the Israelites are the offspring of Abraham, what does it matter to them whether Shiloh comes from Judah or Zebulun, from Esau or Isachar, from Ishmael or Isaac, as long as he is a descendant of their father Abraham? Obey the Law of Prophet Muhammad, becomes Muslims, and then it will be that you can go and live in your old fatherland in peace and security.

(6) Prophet Muhammad Is The Son-Of-Man

In the previous discourse we perused and commented upon the marvelous vision of the Prophet Daniel (Dan. vii.). We saw how the four beasts that represented the four kingdoms succeeding one another were the Powers of Darkness and how they persecuted the Jews and the early Church of Jesus, which was constituted of true believers in the One God. We also remarked that those Powers were pagan and allegorically described as ferocious brutes. Further, we saw that the "Eleventh Horn," which had eyes and mouth, which uttered blasphemies against the Most High had fought and overcome His Saints had changed the times and the Law of God, could be no other than the Emperor Constantine, who in AD. 325, promulgated his imperial rescript proclaiming the creed and the decisions of the Nicene General Council.

In this article let us follow our researches patiently with regard to the glorious BAR NASHA, or the "Son-of-Man," who was presented-upon the clouds to the Most High, to whom was given the Sultaneh (Sholtana in the original text,

i.e. "dominion" or "empire") honor and kingdom for ever, and who was commissioned to destroy and annihilate the terrible Horn.

Now let us proceed forthwith to establish the identity of this "Bar nasha."

Before finding out who this Son-of-Man is, it is but essential that we should take into consideration the following points and observations: -

(a) When a Hebrew Prophet predicts that "all the nations and peoples of the earth shall serve him" (i.e. the Bar nasha) or "the people of the Saints of the Most High," we must understand that he means thereby the nations mentioned in Genesis xv. 18-21, and not the English, the French, or the Chinese nations.

(b) By the phrase "the people of the Saints of the Most High" it is understood to mean first the Jews and then the Christians who confessed the absolute Oneness of God, fought and suffered for it until the appearance of the Bar nasha and the destruction of the Horn.

(c) After the destruction of the Horn the people and the nations that will have to serve the Saints of God are the Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Greeks, and the Romans - the four nations represented by the four beasts that had trod upon and invaded the Holy Land.

From the Adriatic to the Walls of China all the various nations have either as Muslims received the homage or as unbelievers served the Muslims, who are the only true believers in the One God.

(d) It is remarkable to realize the significant fact that God often allows the enemies of His true religion to subdue and persecute His people because of two purposes. First, because he wants to punish His people for their lethargy, drawbacks and sins. Secondly, because He wishes to prove the faith, the patience and the indestructibility of His Law and Religion, and thus to allow the infidels to continue in their unbelief and crime until their cup is full. God in due time Himself intervenes on behalf of the believers when their very existence is on its beam-ends. It was a terrible and most critical time for all Muslims when the Allied Forces were in Constantinople during those awful years of the Armistice. Great preparations were made by the Greeks and their friends to take back the Grand Mosque of Aya Sophia; the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople went to London carrying with him a precious ancient patriarchal cope set in gems and pearls for the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was strenuously advocating the restoration of Constantinople and the grand edifice of St. Sophia to the Greeks. On the eve of the celebration of Prophet Muhammad's night journey to Heaven - called al-mi'raj - the sacred building was crammed with a great multitude of the suppliant faithful who till the dawn most earnestly supplicated the Almighty Allah to deliver Turkey, and particularly the Sacred House, from those who "would fill it with ugly idols and images as before!" In connection with that patriarchal

mantle or cope, I wrote an article in the Turkish paper the Aqsham, showing the existence of a schism between the Greek Orthodox and the Protestant Anglican Churches. I pointed out that the cope was not meant as a pallium of investiture and recognition of the Anglican orders, and that a reunion between the two Churches could never be accomplished unless one or the other of the parties should renounce and abjure certain articles of faith as heretical and erroneous. I also pointed out that the cope was a diplomatic bribe on behalf of Greece and its Church. The letter ended with these words: "All depends upon the grace and miracle which this bakhskish of a pontifical cope is expected to work!"

The result is too well known to be repeated here. Suffice it to say that the Patriarch died in England, and the Almighty, who sent the Bar nasha to crush the Horn and chase out the legions of Rome from the East, raised Mustapha Kamal, who saved his country and restored the honor of Islam!

(e) It is to be noted that the Jews were the chosen people of God until the advent of Jesus Christ. In the eyes of the Muslims neither the Jews nor the Christians have a right to claim the title of "the People of the Saints of the Most High," because the former reject Jesus altogether, while the latter insult him by deifying him. Moreover, both are equally unworthy of that title because of their refusing to recognize the Last Prophet who has completed the list of the Prophets.

We shall now proceed to prove that the Bar nasha - the Son-of-Man - who was presented to the "Ancient of Days" and invested with power to kill the monster, was no other than Prophet Muhammad, whose very name literally means "the Praised and Illustrious." Whatever other person you may try to invent in order to deprive the august Messenger of Allah of this unique glory and majesty bestowed on him in the Divine Court, you will only make yourselves ridiculous; and this for the following reasons: -

1. We know that neither Judaism nor Christianity has any particular name for its faith and its system. That is to say, neither the Jews nor the Christians have any special name for the doctrines and forms of their faith and worship. "Judaism" and "Christianity" are not Scriptural nor authorized either by God or the founders of those religions. In fact, a religion, if true, cannot properly be named after its second founder, for the real author and founder of a true religion is God, and not a Prophet. Now the proper noun for the laws, doctrines, forms and practices of worship as revealed by Allah to Prophet Muhammad is "Islam," which means "making peace" with Him and among men. "Muhammadanism" is not the proper appellation of Islam. For Prophet Muhammad, like Prophet Abraham and all other Prophets, was himself a Muslim, and not a Muhammadan! Judaism means the religion of Judah, but what was Judah himself? Surely not a Judaist! And similarly was Christ a Christian or a Jesuit? Certainly neither of them! What were, then, the names of these two distinct religions? No names at all!

Then we have the barbarous Latin word "religion," meaning "the fear of the gods." It is now used to express "any mode of faith and worship." Now what is the equivalent word for "religion" in the Bible? What expression did Moses or Jesus use to convey the meaning of religion? Of course, the Bible and its authors make no use of this word at all.

Now the Scriptural term used in the vision of Daniel is the same as applied repeatedly by the Qur'an to Islam, namely, "Din" (and in the Qur'an, "Din"), which means "recompense on the Day of Judgement." And the tribune is the "Dayyana" or the "Judge." Let us read the description of this celestial Court of Judgement: "the tribunes are set, the books are opened, and the 'Dina' - recompense of judgment - is established." By the "Books" is to be understood the "Preserved Tablets" wherein the decrees of God are inscribed from which the Qur'an was revealed by the Angel Gabriel to Prophet Muhammad; and also the books of accounts of every man's actions. It was according to the decrees and laws of God contained in that "Preserved Tablet," and the wicked actions of the Horn, that the Great "Dayyana" - the Judge condemned it to death and appointed Prophet Muhammad to be "Adon," i.e. "Commander" or "lord," to destroy the monster. All this language of Daniel is extremely Qur'anic. The religion of Islam is called "Dinu l-Islam." It was according to the decrees and laws of this "Dina" that the "Bar nasha" destroyed the Devil's religion and his lieutenant the Horn. How can it, then, be at all possible that any man other than Prophet Muhammad could be meant by the appearance of a "Son-of-Man" in the presence of the Most High? Islam is, indeed, a "judgment of peace," because it possesses an authenticated Book of Law, with which justice is administered and iniquity punished, the truth discerned and the falsehood condemned; and above all, the Oneness of God, the eternal rewards for good deeds, and eternal damnation for wicked actions are clearly stated and defined. In English a magistrate is called "Justice of Peace;" that is to say, a "judge of peace." Now this is in imitation of a Muslim Judge, who settles a quarrel, decides a case, by punishing the guilty and rewarding the innocent, thus restoring peace. This is Islam and the law of the Qur'an. It is not Christianity nor the Gospel, for the latter absolutely forbids a Christian to appeal to a judge, however innocent and oppressed he may be (Matt. v. 25, 26, 38-48).

2. The Son-of-Man, or Bar nasha, is certainly Prophet Muhammad. For he came after Constantine, and not before him as Jesus or any other Prophet did. The Trinitarian regime in the East represented by the Horn, which we rightly identify with the Emperor Constantine, was permitted to fight with the Unitarians and vanquish them for a period described in the figurative, prophetic language as "time, times and half a time," which phrase signifies three centuries and a half, at the end of which all the power of idolatry on the one hand and the Trinitarian dominion and tyranny on the other were eradicated and swept away entirely. There is nothing more absurd than the assertion that Judah the Maccabaeus (Maqbhaya) was the Bar nasha on the clouds, and the Horn Antiochus. It is alleged that (if I remember aright) Antiochus, after desecrating the Temple of Jerusalem, lived only three years and a half - or three days and a half - at the end

of which time he perished. In the first place, we know that Antiochus was a successor of Alexander the Great and King of Syria, consequently one of the four heads of the winged Tiger and not the eleventh Horn of the fourth Beast as stated in the vision. In the eighth chapter of the Book of Daniel, the Ram and the He-goat are explained by a Saint as representing the Persian and the Greek Empires respectively. It is expressly explained that the Greek Empire immediately succeeded the Persian and that it was divided into four kingdoms, as stated in the first vision. Secondly, the Horn with the speech indicates that the person who blasphemed and changed the Law and holy days could not be a pagan, but one who knew God and associated with Him purposely the other two persons whom he had equally known, and perverted the faith. Antiochus did not pervert the faith of the Jews by instituting a trinity or plurality of Gods, nor did he change the Law of Moses and its festival days. Thirdly, it is childish to give such a magnitude and importance to local and insignificant events which took place between a petty king in Syria and a small Jewish chief, so as to compare the latter with the glorious man who received the homage of the millions of angels in the presence of the Almighty. Moreover, the prophetic vision describes and depicts the Bar nasha as the greatest and the noblest of all men, for no other human being is reported in the Old Testament to have been the object of such honor and grandeur as Prophet Muhammad.

3. It is equally futile to claim for Jesus Christ this celestial honor given to the Son-of-Man. There are two main reasons to exclude Jesus from this honor; (a) If he is purely a man and prophet, and if we consider his work a success or failure, then he is certainly far behind Muhammad. But if he is believed to be the third of the three in the Trinity, then he is not to be enlisted among men at all. You fall into a dilemma, and you cannot get out of it; for in either case the Bar nasha could not be Jesus. (b) If Jesus was commissioned to destroy the fourth Beast, then instead of paying poll-tax or tribute to Caesar and submitting himself to be bastinadoed or whipped by the Roman governor Pilate, he would have chased away the Roman legions from Palestine and saved his country and people.

4. There has never lived upon this earth a Prince - Prophet like Muhammad, who belonged to a dynasty that reigned for a long period of about 2,500 years, was absolutely independent and never bent its neck under a foreign yoke. And certainly there has never been seen on earth another man like Prophet Muhammad, who has rendered more material and moral service to his own nation in particular and to the world in general. It is impossible to imagine another human being so dignified and so worthy as Prophet Muhammad for such a magnificent glory and honor as depicted in the prophetic vision. Let us just compare the great Prophet Daniel with the Bar nasha he was beholding with awe and wonder. Daniel was a slave or captive, though raised to the dignity of a vizier in the courts of Babylon and Susa. What would, in the presence of the Almighty, be his position when compared with Prophet Muhammad, who would be crowned as the Sultan of the Prophets, the Leader of mankind, and the object of the angels'

homage and admiration? Small wonder that the Prophet David calls Prophet Muhammad "My Lord" (Psa, c. 10).

5. It is no wonder to find that on his night journey to Heaven Prophet Muhammad was received with the highest honors by the Almighty and invested with power to extirpate idolatry and the blasphemous Horn from countries given by God to him and to his people as an everlasting heritage.

6. Another most amazing feature in this prophetic vision is, according to my humble belief, that the sight of a Barnasha upon the clouds and his presentation to the Almighty corresponds with and is simultaneous with the Mi'raj - or night journey of the Prophet Muhammad; in other words, this second part of the vision of Daniel is to be identified with the Mi'raj! There are, indeed, several indications both in the language of Daniel and in the "Hadith" - the quotations of the Prophet of Allah - which lead me to this belief. The Qur'an declares that during that night-journey God transported His worshiper from the Sacred Mosque at Mecca to the Father Temple of Jerusalem. He blessed the precincts of that Temple, then in ruins, and showed him His signs (chap. xvii).

It is related by the Holy Prophet that at the Temple of Jerusalem he officiated in his capacity of the Imam, and conducted the prayers with all the company of the Prophets following him. It is further related that it was from Jerusalem that he was carried up unto the Seventh Heaven, being accompanied by the spirits of the Prophets and Angels until he was taken to the presence of the Eternal. The modesty of the Prophet which forbade him to reveal all that he saw, heard and received from the Lord of Hosts is made good by Daniel, who narrates the decision of God's Judgement. It appears that the Spirit which interpreted the vision to Daniel was not an Angel, as thoughtlessly remarked by me elsewhere, but the Spirit or the Soul of a Prophet, for he calls "Qaddish" (in the masculine gender) and "Qaddush" (iv. 10; viii. 13), which means a Saint or a Holy Man - a very usual name of the Prophets and Saints. How glad must have been the holy souls of the Prophets and the Martyrs who had been persecuted by those four beasts especially more so when they saw the decree of death being pronounced by the Almighty against the Trinitarian regime of Constantine and the Seal of the Prophets being commissioned to kill and annihilate the uttering Horn! It will also be remembered that this vision was seen as well during the same night in which took place the journey of the Son of Man nasha from Mecca to the heavens!

From the testimony of Daniel we, as Muslims, must admit that Prophet Muhammad's journey was corporeally performed - a thing of no impossibility to the Omnipotent.

There must exist a law in physics according to which a body is not controlled by the main body to which it belongs, or by the law of gravitation, but by the law of velocity. A human body belonging to the earth cannot escape from it unless a superior force of velocity should detach it from the force of gravitation.

Then there must also exist another law in physics according to which a light body can penetrate into a thick one and a thick body into an even still thicker or harder one through the means of a superior force, or simply through the force of velocity. Without entering into the details of this subtle question, suffice it to say that before the force of velocity the weight of a solid body, whether moved or touched, is of no concern. We know the rate of the velocity of the light from the sun or a star. If we discharge a bullet at the rate, say, of 2,500 meters a second, we know it penetrates and pierces a body of iron plate which is several inches thick. Similarly, an angel, who can move with an infinitely greater velocity than that of the light of the sun and even the thought in the mind, could, of course, transport the bodies of Prophet Jesus, to save him from the crucifixion, and Prophet Muhammad in his miraculous challenge of the Ascent Journey (Miraj) with an astounding facility and rapidity, and set at nought the law of gravitation of the globe to which they belonged.

Paul also mentions a vision he had seen fourteen years before of a man who had been taken up into the third heaven and then unto Paradise, where he heard and saw words and objects that could not be described. The Churches and their commentators have believed this man to be Paul himself. Although the language is such as to convey to us the idea that he himself is the man, yet out of modesty it is that he keeps it a secret lest he should be considered a proud man! (2 Cor. xii. 1-4). Although the Qur'an teaches us that the Apostles of Jesus Christ were good people, their writings cannot be relied upon, because the wrangling and disputant Churches have subjected them to interpolations. The Gospel of St. Barnabas states that Paul afterwards fell into an error and misled many of the believers.

That Paul does not reveal the identity of the person seen by him in the vision, and that the words which he heard in Paradise "cannot be spoken and no man is permitted to speak them," shows that Paul was not himself the person who was taken up to Heaven. To say that Paul, for reason of humility and out of modesty, does not praise himself is simply to misrepresent Paul. He boasts of having rebuked St. Peter to his face, and his epistles are full of expressions about himself which do rather confirm the idea that Paul was neither humble nor modest.

Besides, we know from his writings to the Galatians and the Romans what a prejudiced Jew he was against Hagar and her son Ishmael. The glorious person he saw in his vision could be no other than the person seen by Daniel! It was Prophet Muhammad that he saw, and dare not report the words which were spoken to him because on the one hand he was afraid of the Jews, and because on the other he would have contradicted himself for having glorified himself so much with the Cross and the crucified. I am half convinced that Paul was allowed to see the Barnasha whom Daniel had seen some six centuries before, but "the angel of satan who was continually pouring blows upon his head" (2 Cor. xii 7) forbade him to reveal the truth! It is an admission by Paul that "the angel of Satan," as

he calls him, prohibited him from revealing the secret of Prophet Muhammad, whom he had seen in his vision. If Paul was a true righteous worshiper of God, why was he delivered into the hands of the "angel of the Devil" who was continually beating him on the head? The more one reflects on the teachings of Paul, the less one doubts that he was the prototype of Constantine the Great!

In conclusion, I may be permitted to draw a moral for the non-Muslims from this wonderful vision of Daniel. They should take to heart a lesson from the fate which befell the four beasts, and particularly the Horn, and to reflect that Allah alone is the One True God; that the Muslims alone faithfully profess His absolute Oneness; that He is Aware of their oppressions, and that they have their Caliph of the Prophets near to the Throne of the Most High.

(7) King David Calls Him: "My Lord"

The history of David, his exploits and prophetic writings, are found in two books of the Old Testament, Samuel and the Psalms. He was the youngest son of Yishai (Jessie) from the tribe of Judah. While still a young shepherd, he had killed a bear and torn into halves a lion. The valiant young man swung a small stone right through the forehead of Goliath, an armed Philistine champion and saved the army of Israel. The highest reward for a successful feat displaying valor was the hand of Michal, a daughter of King Saul. David played on a harp and flute, and was a good singer. His flight from his jealous father-in-law, his adventures and attributed exploits as a bandit, are well known in the Bible. On the death of Saul, David was invited by the people to assume the reins of the kingdom, for which he had long before been anointed by the Prophet Samuel. He reigned for some seven years at Hebron. He took Jerusalem from the Jebusites and made it the capital of his kingdom. Its two hills, or mounts, were named "Moriah" and "Sion." Both these words have the same signification and import as the famous mounts of "Marwa" and "Sapha" in Mecca, which words respectively mean "the place of the vision of the Lord," and "the rock" or "stone." David's wars, his very grave family troubles, his sin against the faithful soldier, Uriah, and his wife, Bathsheba, was not left with impunity. He reigned forty years; his life was marked with wars and family griefs. In the Bible there are some contradictory accounts about him which are evidently to be ascribed to the two opposite sources.

The alleged crime of David claimed in the Bible in connection with Uriah and his wife (2 Sam. xi.) is not even alluded to in the Qur'an, rather the Qur'an refers to his excellent pious character and that he was one of the top ranking Messengers. It is one of the superiorities of the Holy Qur'an that it teaches us that all prophets are born sinless and die sinless. It does not, like the Bible, impute to them crimes and sins - e.g. the double crime of David, mentioned in the Bible, which, according to the Law of Moses, is punishable by death - which, let alone a prophet who is a chosen worshiper of God the Almighty, we would not even think of attaching to the name of an ordinary human being.

The story of David committing adultery and two angels having come to him thus to remind him of the sin is a puerile falsehood - wherever it may be found. It has been repudiated by the best Muslim opinion. Razi says: "Most of the learned, and those who have searched for the truth among them, declare this charge false and condemn it as a lie and a mischievous story. The words *istaghfora* and *ghafarna* occurring in the text of verse 24, chap. 38 of the Holy Qur'an by no means indicate that David had committed a sin, for *istighfar* really signifies the seeking of protection; and David sought Divine protection when he saw that his enemies had grown so bold against him; and by *ghafarana* is meant the rectification of his affairs; for David, who was a great ruler, could not succeed in keeping his enemies under complete control.

The Old Testament does not mention the time when the gift of prophecy was granted to David. We read there that after David had committed the two sins it was Nathan the Prophet who was sent by God to chastise David. Indeed, until late in his life we find him always having recourse to other prophets. According to the Biblical accounts, therefore, it would seem that the gift of prophecy came to him after he had thoroughly repented of his sin.

In one of the previous articles I remarked that after the split of the Kingdom into two independent States which were often at war with each other, the ten tribes which formed the Kingdom of Israel were always hostile to the dynasty of David and never accepted any other portion of the Old Testament except the Torah - or the Law of Moses as contained in the Pentateuch. This is evident from the Samaritan version of the first five books of the Old Testament. We do not meet with a single word or prophecy about David's posterity in the discourses of the great prophets, like Elijah, Elisha, and others, who flourished in Samaria during the reigns of the wicked kings of Israel. It is only after the fall of the Kingdom of Israel and the transportation of the ten tribes into Assyria that the Prophets of Judeah began to predict the advent of some Prince from the House of David who was soon to restore the whole nation and subdue its enemies. There are several of these obscure and ambiguous sayings in the writings or discourses of these later prophets which have given a rapturous and exotic exultation to the Fathers of the Church; but in reality they have nothing to do with Jesus Christ. I shall briefly quote two of these prophecies. The first is in Isaiah (Chap. vii., verse 14), where that Prophet predicts that "a damsel already pregnant with child shall bear forth a son, and thou shalt name him Emmanuel." The Hebrew word *almah* does not mean "virgin," as generally interpreted by the Christian theologians and therefore applied to the Virgin Mary, but it signifies "a marriageable woman, maiden, damsel." The Hebrew word for "virgin" is *bthulah*. Then the child's name is to be Emmanuel, which means "God-is-with-us." There are hundreds of Hebrew names which are composed of "el" and another noun, which forms either the first or the last syllable of such compound nouns. Neither Isaiah, nor King Ahaz, nor any Jew, ever thought that the newly born infant would be himself "God-with-us." They never thought anything else but that his name only would be as such. But the text expressly says that it was Ahaz (who

seems to have known the maiden with child), that would give the boy that name. Ahaz was in danger, his enemies were pressing hard against Jerusalem, and this promise was made to him by showing him a sign, namely, a pregnant maiden, and not a Virgin Mary, that would come into the world more than seven hundred years later! This simple prediction of a child that would be born during the reign of Ahaz was equally misunderstood by the writer of the Gospel of Matthew (Matt. i. 23). The name "Jesus" was given by the Angel Gabriel (Matt. i. 21), and he was never called "Emmanuel." Is it not scandalous to take this name as an argument and proof of the Christian doctrine of the "Incarnation"?

The other strange interpretation of a prophetic prediction is from Zachariah (ix. 9), which is misquoted and utterly misunderstood by the writer of the first Gospel (xxi. 5). The Prophet Zachariah says: "Rejoice much, O daughter of Sion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King is coming unto thee; righteous and with salvation is he; meek and mounted upon an ass; and upon a colt, son of a she-ass."

In this poetical passage the poet simply wishes to describe the male ass - upon which the King is seated - by saying that it was a young ass, and this colt, too, is described as the son of a female ass. It was only one male colt or young donkey. Now Matthew quotes this passage in the following way: - "Tell the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King is coming unto thee; Meek, and mounted on a female ass, And on a colt, the son of a female ass."

Whether or not the person who wrote the above verse did really believe that Jesus, when making his triumphal entry into Jerusalem by mounting or sitting at the same time both upon the mother ass and her young colt, worked a miracle is not the question; nevertheless it is true to say that the majority of the Christian Fathers so believed; and it never occurred to them that such a show would look rather a comedy than a royal and pompous procession. Luke, however, is careful, and has not fallen into Matthew's mistake. Were these authors both inspired by the same Spirit?

Zachariah foretells in Jerusalem, after the return of the Jews from captivity, the coming of a king. Though meek and humble, mounted upon a colt of an ass, still he is coming with salvation and would rebuild the house of God. He prophesies this at a time when the Jews are endeavoring to rebuild the Temple and the ruined town; their neighboring peoples are against them; the work of building is stopped until Darius, King of Persia, issues a firman for the construction. Although no Jewish king had ever appeared since the sixth century before Christ, nevertheless they had had autonomous governments under foreign sovereigns. The salvation here promised, be it noted, is material and immediate, and not a salvation to come five hundred and twenty years afterwards, when Jesus of Nazareth would ride upon two asses simultaneously and enter into Jerusalem, already a large and wealthy city with a magnificent temple, simply to be captured and crucified by the Jews themselves and by their Roman masters, as the present

Gospels tell us! This would be no solace at all for the poor Jews surrounded with enemies in a ruined city. Consequently, by the word "king" we may understand one of their chief leaders - Zerobabel, Ezra, or Nehemiah.

These two examples are intended to show chiefly to my Muslim readers - who may not be well acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures - how the Christians have been misguided by their priests and monks in giving stupid interpretations and meanings to the prophecies contained therein.

Now I come to David's prophecy: - "YahwaH said to my ADON, Sit at my right until I place Thine enemies a footstool under thy feet."

This verse of David is written in Psalm cxi, and quoted by Matthew (xxii. 44), Mark (xii. 36), and Luke (xx 42). In all languages the two names contained in the first unstash are rendered as "The Lord said unto my Lord." Of course, if the first Lord is God, the second Lord is also God; nothing more convenient to and suitable an argument for a Christian priest or pastor than this, namely, the speaker is God, and also the spoken to is God; therefore David knows two Gods! Nothing more logical than this reasoning! Which of these two Domini is "the Lord" of David? Had David written, "Dominus meus dixit Domino meo," he would have made himself ridiculous, for then he would have admitted himself to be a slave or worshiper of two Lords, without even mentioning their proper names. The admission would go even farther than the existence of two Lords; it would mean that David's second Lord had taken refuge with his first Lord, who ordered him to take a seat on his right side until he should put his enemies a footstool under his feet. This reasoning leads us to admit that, in order to understand well your religion, you are obliged to know your Bible or Qur'an in the original language in which it was written, and not to depend and rely upon a translation.

I have purposely written the original Hebrew words YaHWaH and Adon, in order to avoid any ambiguity and misunderstanding in the sense conveyed by them. Such sacred names written in religious Scripture should be left as they are, unless you can find a thoroughly equivalent word for them in the language into which you wish to translate them. The tetragram Yhwh used to be pronounced Yehovah (Jehovah), but now it is generally pronounced Yahwah. It is a proper name of God the Almighty, and it is held so holy by the Jews that when reading their Scriptures they never pronounce it, but read it "Adon" instead. The other name, "Elohim," is always pronounced, but Yahwah never. Why the Jews make this distinction between these two names of the same God is a question for itself, altogether outside the scope of our present subject. It may, however, in passing, be mentioned that Yahwah, unlike Elohim, is never used with pronominal suffixes, and seems to be a special name in Hebrew for the Deity as the national God of the people of Israel. In fact, "Elohim" is the oldest name known to all Semites; and in order to give a special character to the conception of the true God, this tetragram is often conjointly with Elohim applied to Him. The Arabic form, Rabb Allah, corresponds to the Hebrew form, Yahwah Elohim.

The other word, "Adon," signifies a "Commander, Lord, and master," or the same as the Arabic and Turkish nouns Amir, Sayyid, and Agha. Adon stands as the opposite term of "soldier, slave, and property." Consequently the first part of the distich is to be rendered as "God said to my Lord."

David, in his capacity of a monarch, was himself the Lord and Commander of every Israelite and the Master of the Kingdom. Whose "servant" was he, then? David, being a powerful sovereign, could not be, as a matter of fact, a slave or worshiper of any living human being whatsoever. Nor is it imaginable that he would call "his Lord" any dead prophet or saint, such as Abraham or Jacob, for whom the usual and reasonable term was "Father." It is equally conceivable that David would not use the appellation "my Lord" for any of his own descendants, for whom, too, the usual term would be "son." There remains, besides God, no other conceivable being who could be David's Lord, except the noblest and the highest man of the race of mankind. It is quite intelligible to think that in the sight and choice of God there must be a man who is the noblest, the most praised, and the most coveted of all men. Surely the Seers and the Prophets of old knew this holy personage and, like David, called him "my Lord."

Of course, the Jewish Rabbins and commentators of the Old Testament understood by this expression the Messiah, who would descend from David himself, and so replied they to the question put to them by Jesus Christ as quoted above from Matthew (xxii.), and the other Synoptic. Jesus flatly repudiated the Jews when he asked them a second question: "How could David call him 'my Lord' if he were his son?" This question of the Master put the audience to silence, for they could find no answer to it. The Evangelists abruptly cut short this important subject of discussion. To stop there without a further explanation was not worthy either of the Master or of his reporters. For, leaving the question of his god-head, and even of his prophetic character, aside, Jesus as a teacher was obliged to solve the problem raised by himself when he saw that the disciples and the hearers were unable to know who then that "Lord," could be!

By his expression that the "Lord," or the "Adon," could not be a son of David, Jesus excludes himself from that title. This admission is decisive and should awaken the religious teachers of the Christians to reduce Christ to his due status of a high and holy worshiper of God, and to renounce the extravagant divine character ascribed to him much to his own disgust and displeasure.

I cannot imagine a teacher who, seeing his pupils unable to answer his question, should keep silent, unless he is himself ignorant like them and unable to give a solution to it. But Jesus was not either ignorant or a malevolent teacher. He was a prophet with a burning love to God and man. He did not leave the problem unsolved or the question without an answer. The Gospels of the Churches do not report the answer of Jesus to the question: "Who was the Lord of David?" But the Gospel of Barnabas does. This Gospel has been rejected by Churches because its language is more in accordance with the revealed Scriptures

and because it is very expressive and explicit about the nature of Jesus Christ's mission, and above all because it records the exact words of Prophet Jesus concerning Prophet Muhammad. A copy of this Gospel can easily be procured. There you will find the answer of Jesus himself, who said that the Covenant between God and Prophet Abraham was made on Ishmael, and that "the most glorious or praised" of men is a descendant of Prophet Ishmael and not of Prophet Isaac through Prophet David. Prophet Jesus repeatedly is reported to have spoken of Prophet Muhammad, whose spirit or soul he had seen in heaven.

I shall have, if God wills, an occasion to write on this Gospel later.

There is no doubt that the prophetic eye of Daniel that saw in a wonderful vision the great Barnasha, who was Prophet Muhammad, was also the same prophetic eye for David. It was this most glorious and praised of men that was seen by the Prophet Job (xix 25) as a "Savior" from the power of the Devil.

Was it, then, Prophet Muhammad who Prophet David calls "my Lord" or my Adon"? Let us see.

The arguments in favor of Prophet Muhammad, who is styled "Sayyidu l-Mursalin." the same as "Adon of the Prophets," are decisive; they are so evident and explicit in the words of the Old Testament that one is astonished at the ignorance and the obstinacy of those who refuse to understand and obey.

1. The greatest Prophet and Adon, in the Eyes of God, and man, is not a great conqueror and destroyer of mankind, nor a holy recluse who spends his life in a cave or cell to meditate upon God only to save himself, but one who renders more good and service to mankind by bringing them into the light of knowledge of the One True God, and by utterly destroying the power of the devil and his abominable idols and wicked institutions. It was Prophet Muhammad who "bruised the head of the serpent," and that is why the Qur'an rightly calls the devil, iblis, namely the bruised one"!! He purged the Temple of the Ka'aba and all Arabia of the idols, and gave light, religion, happiness, and power to the ignorant Arab idolaters, who in a short time spread that light into the four directions of the earth. In the service of God, the works and the success of Prophet Muhammad are incomparable and unrivalled.

The Prophets, Saints, and Martyrs form the army of God against the Power of the Devil; and Prophet Muhammad alone is decidedly the Commander-in-Chief of them all. He is indeed, alone the Adon and Lord not only of David but of all the Prophets, for he has purified Palestine and the countries visited by Abraham of idolatry.

2. Since Jesus Christ admits that he himself was not the "Lord" of David nor that the Messiah was to descend from David, there remains none other than Prophet Muhammad among the Prophets to be the Adon or Lord of David. And

when we come to compare the praiseworthy religious revolution that the Nobel Son of Ishmael brought about in the world, with what all the thousands of prophets put together have achieved, we have to come to the conclusion that it is alone Prophet Muhammad who deserves the meritorious title of Adon.

3. How did David know that "Wahwah said to Adon, 'Sit thou at my right until I put thine enemies a footstool under they feet?'" and when did David hear this word of God? Christ himself gives the answer, namely "David in spirit wrote this." He saw the Adon Muhammad just as Daniel had seen him (Dan. vii), and Paul had seen him (2 Cor. xii) and many others had. Of course, this mystery of "Sit thou at my right" is hidden from us. Yet we may safely conjecture that this official investiture with the honor of seating himself at the right of the Throne of God, and therefore raised to the dignity of the "Adon." not only of the Prophets but of all the Creatures, took place on the famous night of his Mi'raj to Paradise.

4. The only principle objection to Prophet Muhammad's Divine mission and superiority is his condemnation of the trinity. But the Old Testament knows no other God besides Allah, and the Lord of David did not sit at the right hand of a triple god, but at that of the One Allah. Hence among the Prophets who believed in and worshiped Allah none was so great, and accomplished such a stupendous service for Allah and mankind, as Prophet Muhammad, upon whom be peace and blessings.

(8) The Lord And The Prophet Of The Covenant

The last book of the Canonical Jewish Code of the Bible bears the name of "Malachai," which looks to be more a sur- name than a proper noun. The correct pronunciation of the name is Malakh, which means "my angel" or "my messenger." The Hebrew word, "mal'akh," like the Arabic "malak," like the Greek term "angelos" from which the English name "angel" is derived, signifies "a messenger," one commissioned with a message or news to deliver to some- body.

Who this Malakhi is, in what period of the Jewish his- tory he lived and prophesied, is not known either from the book itself or from any other portion of the Old Testament. It begins with the words: "The 'missa' of the Word of Yahweh the El of Israel by the hand of Malakhi," which may be translated: "The discourse of the Word of Yahweh God of Israel, by the hand of Malakhi." It contains four short chapters.

The oracle is addressed, not to a king and his courtiers, but to a people already settled in Jerusalem with the Temple and its services. The sacrifices and oblations are of the meanest and worst kind; the sheep and cattle offered at the altars are not of the best quality; they are blind, lame, and lean animals. The tithes are not regularly paid, and if at all paid are of the inferior material. The priests, too, natu- rally, cannot devote their time and energy to perform their sacred duty. For they cannot chew the beefsteaks and roasted mutton-chops of the lean old,

crippled sacrifices. They cannot live on the scanty tithes or insufficient stipends. Yahweh, as usual with this incorrigible people, now threatens, now holds out promises, and at times complain.

This discourse, or oracle, seems to have been delivered by the Prophet Malakhi in about the beginning of the fourth century before the Christian era, when the people of Israel were also tired of Yahweh; and used to say: "The Table of the Lord (Yahweh) is an abomination, and His meal is contemptible" (Mal. i. 12). "He who doeth evils is good in the eyes of Yahweh, and He is pleased with them; or, where is the God of the judgment?" (Mal. ii. 17).

The Book of Malakhi, notwithstanding its being of a post captivatem date, is, however, written in a seemingly good Hebrew style. To say that this "misa," or discourse, has come down to us intact and unadulterated is to confess ignorance of the language. There are several mutilated sentences, so that it is almost impossible to understand the exact sense they intend to convey.

The subject of our discussion in this article is the famous prediction couched in Mal. iii. 1. The prophecy runs thus: -

"Behold, I send My Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me; and suddenly shall come to his temple the Adon whom ye are seeking, and the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye desire. Behold, he cometh, says the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. iii. 1).

This is a well-known Messianic prophecy. All Christian Saints, Fathers, Popes, Patriarchs, Priests, monks, nuns, and even the Sunday-school children, will tell us that the first messenger mentioned in the text is St. John the Baptist, and the second messenger, whom their vernacular versions have rendered "Angel of the Covenant," is Jesus Christ!

A definite determination of the subject of this prophecy is of extreme importance, because the Christian Churches have ever since believed that two distinct persons are indicated therein; and the author of this erroneous belief is a singularly remarkable blunder of St. Matthew's. One of the characteristic features of the First Gospel - Matthew - is to show and prove the fulfillment of some particular statement or prediction in the Old Testament concerning nearly every event in the life of Jesus Christ. He is very careless to guard himself against contradictions, and less scrupulous in his quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures. He is certainly not well versed in the literature of his own language. I had occasion to refer in the preceding article of this series to one of his blunders concerning the ass upon which Jesus mounted. This is a most serious point directly touching the authenticity and the validity of the Gospels. Is it possible that the Apostle Matthew should himself be ignorant of the true character of the prophecy of Malakh, and ignorantly ascribe to his master a misquotation which would naturally put to question his very quality of a divinely inspired Prophet?

Then, what should we think of the author of the Second Gospel - of St. Mark - who ascribes the passage in Malakh-1 to Isaiah? (Mark i. 2). Jesus is reported by Matthew (xi. 1-15), and this too is followed or copied by Luke (vii. 18-28), to have declared to the multitude that John the Baptist was "more than a Prophet," that it was he "about whom it was written: Behold, I am sending My Angel before thy face, and he shall prepare thy way before thee;" and that "none among those born by women was greater than John, but the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." The corruption of the text of Malakh is plain and deliberately made. The original text tells us that Yahweh Sabaoth, i.e. God of Hosts, is the speaker and the believers are the people addressed, as can be readily seen in the words "whom ye are seeking ... whom ye desire." God says: "Behold, I send My Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before My face." But the Gospels have interpolated the text by effacing the personal pronoun of the first person singular, and inserted "before thee" (or "thy face," as in Hebrew) twice. It is generally believed that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the then vernacular Hebrew or Aramaic in order to prove to the Jews that God, addressing Jesus Christ, said: "Behold, I send My messenger (Angel) [such is the version in Matthew xi. 10] before thee, and he shall prepare thy way before thee;" and wishes to show that this angel or messenger was John the Baptist. Then a contrast between the Prophets John and Jesus is left to Prophet Jesus, who describes John as above every prophet and greater than the sons of all human mothers, but the least in the Kingdom of Heaven - of which Jesus is meant to be the King - is greater than John.

I do not believe for a second that Jesus or any of his disciples could have made use of such language with the object of perverting the Word of God, but some fanatical monk or an ignorant bishop has forged this text and put into the mouth of Jesus the words which no prophet would speak.

The traditional idea that the Messenger commissioned to prepare or repair the way before the "Adon" and the "Messenger of the Covenant" is a worshiper and subordinate of the latter, and therefore to conclude that two distinct persons are predicted is a creation of the ignorance concerning the importance of the mission and the magnitude of the work assigned to that messenger. He is not to be supposed as a pioneer or even an engineer appointed to construct roads and bridges for the passing of a royal procession. Let us therefore pore over this subject more deeply and in a courageous, impartial, and dispassionate manner.

1. In the first place, we must well understand that the Messenger is a man, a creature of human body and soul, and that he is not an Angel or a superhuman being. In the second place, we should open our eyes of wisdom and judgment to see that he is not dispatched to prepare the way before another Messenger called "Adon" and the "Messenger of the Promise," but he is commissioned to establish a straight, safe, and good Religion. He is commissioned to remove all the obstacles in the way between God and His creatures; and to fill up all the gaps and chasms in this grand path, so that it may be smooth, easy to walk on, well lighted,

and protected from all danger. The Hebrew phrase, "u pinna derekh," means to say that the Messenger "will put straight and clear the worship or the religion." The verb "darakh" of the same root as the Arabic "daraka," means "to walk, reach, and comprehend;" and the substantive "derekh" signifies, "road, way, step," and metaphorically "worship and religion." It is used in this spiritual sense all through the Psalms and the Prophets. Surely this high Messenger of God was not coming to repair or reform a way, a religion for the benefit of a handful of Jews, but to establish a universal and an unchangeable religion for all men. Though the Jewish religion inculcates the existence of one true God, still their conception of Him as a national Deity of Israel, their priesthood, sacrificial rites and ceremonies, and then the non-existence of any positive articles of belief in the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, the eternal life in heaven or hell, and many other deficient points, make it absolutely unfit and insufficient for the peoples of diverse languages, races, climates, temperaments, and habits. As regards Christianity, it, with its meaningless seven sacraments, its beliefs in original sin, the incarnation of a god - unknown to all previous religious and mythological literature - and in a trinity of individual gods, and finally because it does not possess a single line in scripto from its supposed founder, Jesus Christ, has done no good to mankind. On the contrary, it has caused divisions and sects, all imbued with bitter feelings of hatred and rancor against each other.

The Messenger, then, was commissioned with the abrogating of both those religions and the establishing of the ancient religion of Prophets Abraham and Ishmael and the other Prophets, with new precepts for all men. It was to be the shortest road to "reach" God; the simplest religion to worship Him, and the safest Faith to remain ever pure and unadulterated with superstition and stupid dogmas. The Messenger was commissioned to prepare a road, a religion that will conduct all who wish to believe in and love the One God without having need of the leadership of hundreds of self-appointed guides and pretenders. And above all, the Messenger was to come suddenly to his temple, whether it be the one in Jerusalem or the one in Mecca; he was to root out all idolatry in those countries, not only by the destruction of idols and images, but also inculcating in their former worshipers the faith in one true Allah. And the accomplishment of this stupendous task, namely, to construct a new Path, a universal religion, that teaches that between God and man no absolute mediator, no priest, saint or sacrament, is at all permissible, has only been done by a Prophet whose name is Muhammad al-Mustapha!

2. John the Baptist was not the Messenger foretold by Malakhi. The accounts given about him by the four Evangelists are very contradictory, but the one thing that they together agree on is that he prepared no way at all; for he was not accredited with a sacred scripture: he neither founded a religion nor reformed the old one. He is reported to have left his parents and home while still a youth; he lived in the desert on honey and the locust; and spent there his life until he was about thirty years old, when he showed himself to the multitudes on the banks of the River Jordan, where he used to baptize the penitent sinners who confessed

their sins to him. While Matthew knows nothing of his relationship with Jesus, or does not care to report it, Luke, who wrote his Gospel, not from a revelation, but from the works of the disciples of the Master, records the homage rendered by John to Jesus when both in the wombs of their mothers (Luke i. 39-46). He baptizes Jesus in the waters of the River Jordan like everybody else, and is reported to have said that he (John) was "not worthy to bow down to untie the laces of the shoes" (Mark i. 7) of Jesus, and according to the Fourth Gospel he (John) exclaimed that Jesus was "the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world" (John i. 29). That he knew Jesus and recognized him to be the Christ is quite evident. Yet when he was imprisoned he sends his disciples to Jesus, asking him: "Art thou he who is to come, or should we anticipate another one?" (Matt. xi. 3, etc.). The Baptist was martyred in the prison because he reprimanded an infidel Edomite, King Herod the Tetrarch, for having married the wife of his own brother. Thus ends, according to the narrative of the Evangelists, the life of a very chaste and holy prophet.

It is strange that the Jews did not receive John as a prophet. It is also stranger still to find that the Gospel of Barnabas does not mention the Baptist; and what is more, it puts the words said to have been uttered by John concerning Christ into the mouth of the latter about Muhammad, the Prophet of Allah. The Qur'an mentions the miraculous birth of John under the name of "Yahya," but does not refer to his mission of baptism.

The description of his sermon is given in the third chapter of Matthew. He seems to have announced the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven and the advent of a Great Messenger and Prophet of God who would baptize the believers, not with water, "but with fire and with the holy spirit."

Now, if John the Baptist were the Messenger appointed by God to prepare the way before Jesus Christ, and if he was his herald and subordinate, there is no sense and wisdom whatever in John to go about baptizing the crowds in the waters of a river or a pond and to occupy himself with half a dozen disciples. He ought to have immediately followed and adhered to Jesus when he had seen and known him! He did nothing of the kind! Of course, a Muslim always speaks of a prophet with utmost respect and reverence, and I am not expected to comment further, as an Ernest Renan or an indifferent critic would do! But to say that a prophet whom they describe as a dervish (Sufi) of the wilderness clad in the skins of animals, and a dervish who comes forth and sees his "Adon" and the "Angel of the Covenant," and then does not follow and cleave to him, is ridiculous and incredible. To think and believe that a prophet is sent by God to prepare the way, to purify and clear the religion for the coming of his superior, and then describing him as living all his life in the desert among the animals, is to tell us that he was constructing chaussees, causeways or railways, not for men, but for beasts and genii.

3. Nor was John the Baptist the Prophet Elijah or Elias, as Christ is made to have said. The Prophet Malakhi, in his fourth chapter (verses 5, 6), speaks of the coming of Elijah, which fact is foretold to take place some time before the day of the Resurrection and not before the Appearance of the Messenger in question. Even if Christ had said that John was Elijah, the people did not know him. What Jesus meant to say was that the two were similar in their ascetical life, their zeal for God, their courage in scolding and admonishing the kings and the hypocrite leaders of the religion.

I cannot go on discussing this untenable claim of the Churches concerning John being the Messenger "to prepare the way." But I must add that this Baptist did not abrogate one iota of the Law of Moses, nor add to it a tittle. And as to baptism, it is the old Jewish ma'muditha or ablution. Washing or ablution could not be considered a "religion" or "way" whose place has been taken by the famous and mysterious Church institution of the sacrament of Baptism!

4. If I say that Jesus Christ is not intended in the prophecy of Malakhi, it would seem that I was advancing an argumentum in absurdum, because nobody will contradict or make an objection to my statement. The Churches have always believed that the "Messenger of the way" is John the Baptist, and not Jesus. The Jews, however, accept neither of the two. But as the person foretold in the prophecy is one and the same, and not two, I most conscientiously declare that Prophet Jesus is not, and could not be, that person. If Jesus was a god, as he is now believed to be, then he could not be employed to prepare the way before the face of Yahweh Sabaoth! If Prophet Jesus were the Yahweh Sabaoth who made this prophecy, then who was the other Yehweh Sabaoth before whose face the way was to be prepared? If he were a simple man, made of flesh and blood, and worshiper of the Lord of Hosts, then the claim falls to the ground. For Jesus as a simple human being and prophet could not be the founder of the trinitarian Churches. Whichever form of the Christian religion we may take, whether it be the Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant, Salvationist, Quaker, or any of the multitudinous sects and communities, none of them can be the "way," the "religion" indicated by Malakhi; and Prophet Jesus is not its founder or preparer. So long as we deny the absolute Oneness of God, we are in error, and Jesus cannot be our friend nor can he help us.

5. The person indicated in the prophecy has three qualifications, namely, the Messenger of Religion, the Lord Commander, and the Messenger of the Convent. He is also described and distinguished by three conditions, namely "he is suddenly coming to his Mosque or Temple, he is looked for and sought by men, and is greatly desired and coveted."

Who can, then, be this glorious man, this Great Benefactor of humanity, and this valiant Commander who rendered noble services in the cause of Allah and His religion other than Prophet Muhammad? - upon whom may rest God's peace and blessing.

He brought to the world an unrivalled Sacred Book, Al-Qur'an, a most reasonable, simple, and beneficial religion of Islam, and has been the means of guidance and conversion of millions and millions of the heathen nations in all parts of the globe, and has transformed them all into one universal and united Brotherhood, which constitutes the true and formal "Kingdom of Allah" upon the earth announced by Prophets Jesus and John the Baptist. It is futile and childish to compare either Jesus or John with the great Messenger of Allah, when we know perfectly well that neither of these two did ever attempt to convert a single pagan nor succeeded in persuading the Jews to recognize his mission.

(9) Genuine Prophets Preach Only Islam

There is no nation known to history like the people of Israel, which during a period of less than four hundred years, was infested with myriads of false prophets, not to mention the swarms of sorcerers, soothsayers and all sorts of witchcrafts and magicians. The false prophets were of two kinds: those who professed the religion and the Torah (Law) of Yahweh and pretended to prophesy in His Name, and those who under the patronage of an idolater Israelite monarch prophesied in the name of Baal or other deities of the neighboring heathen peoples. Belonging to the former category there were several impostors as contemporaries with the true prophets like Mikha (Micah) and Jeremiah, and to the latter there were those who gave much trouble to Elijah, and caused the massacres of the true prophets and believers during the reign of Ahab and his wife Jezebel. Most dangerous of all to the cause of true faith and religion were the pseudo-prophets, who conducted the divine services in the temple as well as in the Misphas and pretended to deliver the oracles of God to the people. No prophet, perhaps, received at the hands of these impostors more of persecution and hardships than the Prophet Jeremiah.

While still a young man, Jeremiah began his prophetic mission about the latter quarter of the seventh century before the Christian era, when the Kingdom of Judah was in great danger of invasion by the armies of the Chaldeans. The Jews had entered into alliance with the Pharaoh of Egypt, but as the latter had been badly defeated by the troops of Nebuchadnezzar, Jerusalem's doom was merely a question of time. In these critical days, during which the fate of the remnant of the people of God was to be decided, the Prophet Jeremiah was stoutly advising the king and the leaders of the Jews to submit and serve the King of Babylon, so that Jerusalem might be saved from being burnt down to ashes and the people from being deported into captivity. He poured out all his eloquent and fiery discourses into the ears of the kings, the priests, and the elders of the people, but all of no avail. He delivered message after message from God, saying that the only remedy for saving the country and the people from the imminent destruction was to submit to the Chaldeans; but there was no one to lend ear to his warnings.

Nebuchadnezzar comes and takes the city, carries away with him the king, the princes, and many captives, as well as all the treasures of the temple,

including the gold and silver vessels. Another prince, and a third one, is appointed by the Emperor of Babylon to reign as his vassal in Jerusalem. This king, instead of being wise and loyal to his master of Babylon, revolts against him. Jeremiah incessantly admonishes the king to remain loyal and to abandon the Egyptian policy. But the false prophets continue to harangue in the temple, saying: "Thus says the Lord of hosts, Behold, I have broken the yoke of the King of Babylon, and in two years' time all the Jewish captives and the vessels of the House of God will be returned to Jerusalem." Jeremiah makes a wooden yoke round his own neck and goes to the temple and tells the people that God has been pleased to place in this way the yoke of the monarch of Babylon upon the neck of all the Jews. He is struck on the face by one opponent prophet, who breaks to pieces the wooden yoke from Jeremiah's neck and repeats the harangue of the false prophets. Jeremiah is thrown into a deep dungeon full of mire, and is fed only on a dry loaf of barley a day until a famine prevails in the city, which is besieged by the Chaldeans. The pseudo-prophet Hananiah dies as Jeremiah had foretold. The wall of the city is thrown down somewhere, and the victorious army rushes into the city, the fleeing King Zedekiah and his retinue are seized and taken to the King of Babylon. The city and the temple, after being pillaged, are set on fire and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem are carried into Babylonia; only the poorer classes are left to cultivate the land. By order of Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah is granted a favor of staying in Jerusalem, and the newly appointed governor, Gedaliah, is charged to guard and well look after the prophet. But Gedaliah is killed by the rebellious Jews, and then they all flee to Egypt, carrying Jeremiah with them. Even in Egypt he prophesies against the fugitives and the Egyptians. He must have ended his life in Egypt.

His books, as it now stands, is quite different from the text of the Septuagint; evidently the copy from which the Greek text was written by the Alexandrian translators had a different order of chapters.

The Biblical critics consider that Jeremiah was the author, or, at any rate, a compiler, of the fifth book of the Pentateuch called Deuteronomy. I myself am of the same opinion. Jeremiah was a Levite and a priest as well as a prophet. There is much of Jeremiah's teachings in Deuteronomy which are unknown in the rest of the Old Testament writings. And I take one of these teachings for my present subject, which I consider as one of the gems or golden texts of the Old Testament and must be esteemed very precious and holy.

After this detailed explanation I hasten to the main point which I have selected for the topic of this article: How to distinguish a genuine prophet from a false prophet. Jeremiah has supplied us with a fairly satisfactory answer, namely:

"THE PROPHET WHO TEACHES 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 fulfillment 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 imposter, 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 a 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 (Shalom), 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).

This translation is strictly literal. The original verb naba, usually translated as "to foretell" or "to prophesy," and the noun nabi, "a prophet" has given the impression that a prophet is a person who foretells the future or past events by the aid of divine revelation. This definition is only partially true. The complete definition of the word "Prophet" must be: "one who receives oracles or messages from God, and delivers them faithfully to the person or people intended." It is evident that a divine message need not necessarily be a foretelling of past and future events. In the same way verb "prophesy" does not necessarily mean to reveal the past or future occurrences, but rather to preach or promulgate the message from God. Consequently to prophesy is to deliver and utter a new oracle, its nature or character being quite immaterial. To read the words of a prophet would be to prophesy no more than would a prophet deliver an oracle when making a discourse or public speech of his own accord. In the Qur'an God orders His beloved worshiper Prophet Muhammad to declare: "Say: I am only human like you, revealed to me is that your God is One God...." Ch. 18:110 so that we may be careful not to attribute to any of the prophets the quality of knowing and saying everything through the Revelation. The Divine Revelations used to come at intervals, while the prophets in their personal intercourse and knowledge might be liable to mistakes and errors. A prophet is not appointed by God to teach humanity physics, mathematics, or any other positive science. It would be very unjust on our part to blame a prophet for a slip of language or a mistake committed as a man.

A prophet, therefore, is the subject of test and examination only when he officially and formally delivers the Message he has received from his Lord. His private affairs, his family concerns, and his personal attainments do not concern us so much as his mission and office. In order to find out whether a prophet is genuine or an impostor, it is not fair to give a verdict against his prophetic

character because he is reported to have been a little harsh or rude to his mother or because he believed in the literal inspiration and the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. While making this observation, I have in mind the case of Jesus Christ, and many others in the history of Israel on other points.

It is mala fides and ill will to accuse prophets of sensuality, rudeness, ignorance in sciences, and of other personal frailties. They were men like ourselves and subject to the same natural inclinations and passions. They were protected from mortal sins and from the perversion of the message they had to hand further. We must be extremely careful not to exalt the prophets of God too high in our imagination, lest God be displeased with us. They are all His creatures and worshipers; they accomplished their work and returned to Him. The moment we forget God and concentrate our love and admiration upon the person of any of the messengers of God we are in danger of falling into the sin of polytheism.

Having so far explained the nature and the signification of the prophet and the prophecy, I shall now endeavor to prove that no prophet could be genuine unless, as Jeremiah expressly says, he preaches and propagates the religion of Islam.

In order to understand better the sense and the importance of the passage under our contemplation we should just cast a glance over the preceding verse where Jeremiah tells his antagonist Prophet Hananiah: "The prophets that have been before me and before thee from old (times) prophesied against many lands, and against great kingdoms, concerning war and evil and pestilence." Then he proceeds: -

"The prophet that prophesies concerning Islam as soon as the word of the prophet comes, that prophet is known to have been sent by the Lord in truth."

There can be raised no serious objection to the English wording of this passage excepting the clause "I shalom" which I have translated as "concerning Islam." The preposition "I" before "shalom" signifies "concerning" or "about," and places its subject in the objective case and not in the dative, as it would be if the predicate were a verb like "come," "go," or "give."

That "shalom" and the Syriac "Shlama," as well as the Arabic "salam" and "Islam," are of one and the same Semitic root, "shalam," and mean the same thing, is an admitted truth by all the scholars of the Semitic languages. The verb "shalam" signifies "to submit, resign oneself to," and then "to make peace;" and consequently "to be safe, sound, and tranquil." No religious system in the world has ever been qualified with a better and more comprehensive, dignified, and sublime name than that of "Islam." The true Religion of the True God cannot be named after the name of any of His worshipers, and much less after the name of a people or country. It is, indeed, this sanctity and the inviolability of the word "Islam" that strikes its opponents with awe, fear, and reverence even when the

Muslims are weak and unhappy. It is the name and title of a religion that teaches and commands an absolute submission and resignation of will and self to the Supreme Being, and then to obtain peace and tranquillity in mind and at home, no matter what tribulations or passing misfortunes may threaten us that fills its opponents with awe (1).

----- Footnote (1) It is interesting and significant to note how the observations of the learned professor coincide with those of the ex-Kaiser of Germany who on the occasion of his seventieth birthday celebrations at Doorn, Holland, was reported to have said in his speech: "And understand this - if ever the Muhammadans should conceive the idea that it is the command of Allah to bring order into a declining West and subjugate to His will, then - with faith in God - they will come upon the godless Europeans like a tidal wave, against which even the reddest Bolshevik, full of eagerness for combat, will be helpless." (Evening Standard, London, January 26, 1929.) ----- End of footnote

It is the firm and unshaking belief in the Oneness of Allah and the unswerving confidence in His Mercy and justice that makes a Muslim distinguishable and prominent among non-Muslims. And it is this sound faith in Allah and the sincere attachment to His Holy Qur'an and the Prophet that the Christian missionaries have been desperately attacking and have hopelessly failed. Hence, Jeremiah's words that "the Prophet who prophesies, namely, who preaches and speaks concerning the affairs of Islam as his religion, he will at once be known to have been sent by the Lord in truth." Let us, therefore, take into serious consideration the following points:-

1. The Prophet Jeremiah is the only prophet before Christ who uses the word Shalom in the sense of a religion. He is the only prophet who uses this word with the object of setting or proving the veracity of a messenger of God. According to the Qur'anic revelation, Prophets Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and all the prophets were Muslims, and professed Islam as their religion. The term "Islam" and its equivalents, "Shalom" and Shlama," were known to the Jews and Christians of Mecca and Medina when Prophet Muhammad appeared to perfect and universalize the religion of Islam. A prophet who predicts "peace" as an abstract, vague and temporary condition cannot succeed in proving his identity thereby. In fact, the point of dispute, or rather the critical national question, controverted by the two eminent prophets known to the court and the nation like Jeremiah and Hananiah (Jer. xxviii.), could not be solved and definitely settled by the affirmation of the one and the denial of the other, of the imminent catastrophe. To predict "peace" by Jeremiah when he had all the time been predicting the great national disaster - either by the submission of the King Sidaqia to the Chaldean sovereign or by his resistance - would not only involve his failure, not to talk of his being a success in proving his veracity, but also it would make him even ridiculous. For, in either case, his presumed "peace" would mean no peace at all. On the contrary, if the Jews resisted the Chaldean army, it meant a complete national ruin, and if they submitted, an unconditional servitude. It is evident,

therefore, that Jeremiah uses the term "Shalom" in the sense of a tangible, concrete, and real religious system which Islam comprises. To make it more clear, we should attentively listen to the arguments of the two opponent prophets discussing and disputing the national question in the presence of a wicked king and his court of vile flatterers and depraved hypocrites. Jeremiah has at heart the cause of God and His religion of peace, and in the vital interests of the religion of peace, or Islam, he advises the wicked king and his courtiers to submit to the yoke of Babylon and serve the Chaldeans and live. For there was no other alternative open to them. They had abandoned the God of their forefathers, polluted His temple, mocked and reviled His prophets, and committed evil and treachery (2 Chron. xxxvi. etc.). So God had delivered them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, and would not save them. For a true and sincere worshiper of God, the religion comes first and the nation after. It is the government and the nation - especially when they have forsaken God - that are to be sacrificed for the cause of religion, and not vice versa! The other Prophet of Gibeon, called Hananiah, sought to please his master the king; he was a courtier and favorite, rich and in splendor, whereas his antagonist was always languishing and starving in the prisons and dungeons. He cares not a fig for the religion and the real welfare of the people. He is also a prophet, for so says the Book of Jeremiah, yet he is a villain, and has exchanged God for a depraved king! He prophesies in the name of the same God as does Jeremiah, and announces the return of the booty and the captives from Babylon in two years' time.

Now, from the above imperfect description of the prophets, which of the two would you qualify as the true worshiper of God and as the loyal defender of God's religion? Surely Jeremiah would at once attract your sympathy and choice.

2. It is only the religion of Shalom, of Islam, that can testify to the character and the office of a true prophet, Imam, or any minister of God on earth. God is One, and His religion is one. There is no other religion in the world like Islam, which professes and defends this absolute Oneness of the Deity. He who, therefore, sacrifices every other interest, honor and love for the cause of this Holy Religion, he is undoubtedly the genuine prophet and the minister of God. But there is still one thing more worthy of our notice, and that thing is this. If the religion of Islam is not the standard and the measure by which to test the veracity of a prophet or minister of God, then there is no other criterion to answer that purpose. A miracle is not always a sufficient proof, for the sorcerers also work wonders. The fulfillment of a prophecy or prediction, too, is not in itself a sufficient proof; for just as one holy Spirit reveals a future event to a true prophet, so does sometimes an evil spirit the same to an imposter. Hence it is clear that the prophet who "prophesies concerning Shalom - Islam - as being the name of Faith and path of life, as soon as he receives a message from God he will be known to have been sent by Him." Such was the argument which Jeremiah had recourse to and with which he wished to convince his audience of the falsity of Hananiah. But the wicked king and his entourage would not listen to and obey the Word of God.

3. As argued in the preceding paragraph, it should be noted that neither the fulfillment of a prediction nor the working of a miracle was enough to prove the genuine character of a prophet; that the loyalty and strict attachment to the religion is the best and the decisive proof for the purpose; that "Shalom" was used to express the religion of peace. Once again we repeat the same assertion that Shalom is no other than Islam. And we demand from those who would object to this interpretation to produce an Arabic word besides Islam and Salam as the equivalent of the Shalom, and also to find for us another word in Hebrew besides Shalom that would convey and express the same meaning as Islam. It is impossible to produce another such an equivalent. Therefore we are forced to admit that Shalom is the same as "salam" or "peace" in the abstract, and "Islam" as a religion and faith in the concrete.

4. As the Qur'an in chap. ii expressly reminds us that Abraham and his sons and grandsons were the followers of Islam; that they were neither Jews nor Christians; that they preached and propagated the worship and the faith in the one God to all the peoples among whom they sojourned or dwelt, we must admit that not only the Jews, but several other nations that descended from the other sons of Abraham and many tribes converted and absorbed by them, were also Muslims; that is to say, believers in Allah and resigned to His Will. There were the people of Esau, the Edomites, the Midianites, and numerous other peoples living in Arabia, who knew God and worshipped Him like the Israelites. These peoples had also their own prophets and religious guides like Job, Jethro (the father-in-law of the Prophet Moses), Balaam, Hud, and many others. But they, like the Jews, had taken to idolatry until it was totally eradicated by the Prince of the prophets. The Jews, in about the fifth century B.C., produced the greater portion of their canonical books of the Old Testament, when the memories of the conquest of the land of Canaan by Joshua, the temple and Jerusalem of Solomon, were events buried in the past epochs of their wondrous history. A nationalistic and Judaistic spirit of solicitude and seclusion reigned among the small remnant of Israel; the belief in the coming of a great Savior to restore the lost throne and crown of David was regnant, and the old meaning of "Shalom" as the name of the religion of Abraham and common to all the different peoples descended from him was no longer remembered. It is from this point of view that I regard this passage of Jeremiah as one of the golden texts in the Hebrew sacred writings.

(10) Islam Is The Kingdom Of God On Earth

In examination of that marvelous vision of the Prophet Daniel (Chap. vii.) we saw how Prophet Muhammad was escorted by the myriads of celestial beings and conducted to the glorious presence of the Eternal; how he heard the words of honor and affection which no creature had ever been favored 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 God on earth; how all that human genius can possibly imagine of the highest honors

accorded by the Almighty to a beloved worshiper and to His most worthy Messenger could be ascribed to Prophet Muhammad alone. It should be remembered that among all the Prophets and Messengers of Allah, Prophet Muhammad alone figures like a tower above all; and the grand and noble work he accomplished stands a permanent monument of his honor and greatness. One cannot appreciate the value and importance of Islam as the unique bulwark against idolatry and polytheism unless the absolute Oneness 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 Prophet Muhammad as the Prince of all the Prophets and Worshipers 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. In the same way, we cannot add a single iota to the sanctity of the religion by the institution of some meaningless sacraments or mysteries; nor can we derive any spiritual food for our spirits from feeding upon the corpse of a prophet or an incarnate deity; for by so doing we lose all idea of a true and real religion and cease to believe in the religion altogether. Nor can we in the least promote the dignity of Prophet Muhammad if we were to imagine him a son of God or an incarnate deity; for by so doing we would entirely lose the real and the historical Prophet of Mecca and fall unconsciously into the abyss of polytheism. The greatness of Prophet Muhammad consists in his establishing such a sound, plain, but true religion, and in the practical application of its precepts and principles with such precision and resolution that it has never been possible for a true Muslim to accept any other creed or faith than that which is professed in the formula: "I believe there is no god except Allah, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah." And this short creed will continue to be the faith of every true believer in Allah to the Day of the Resurrection.

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 Prophet Muhammad al-Mustapha who actually 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 Messenger Muhammad.

1. ISLAM BEFORE PROPHET 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 (I.) 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, Loqman, 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 (Rahil), 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!

----- Footnote (1) In Hebrew these old Imams are called Cohen,' and rendered by Christians as "Priest." A Jewish priest can never be identified with a Christian Sacramentarian priest. ----- end of footnote

The Jews in the wilderness, inebriate with the wonders and 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 Oneness 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 Prophets 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 favored 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'an, the believers of the Islamic Law, 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'an, and embraced any other religion and acknowledged that Allah was not its God? Never! It is extremely unlikely that a Islamic 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.

I am aware of the certain so-called Tartar families who embraced the Orthodox Christian Faith in Russia. But I can assure my readers, on authentic authority, that these "Tartars" were those Mongols who, long after the subjugation of Russia and the establishment of the "Altin Ordu" by Batu Khan, were either still pagans or newly converted to Islam and seem to have been forced or induced

to join the Russian Church. And in this connection it should not be ignored that this happened after the Muslim power of the "Golden Horde" ("Altin Ordu") tumbled down at the tremendous invasion of Timur Lang (Tamerlane). On the contrary, Muslim traders and merchants, in China as well as in the dark continent of Africa, have always propagated their Holy Religion; and the millions of Chinese and negro Muslims are the fruit of these unpaid and unofficial Mussulman missionaries. It is evident from the above that the true religion of God before Prophet Muhammad was only in its infancy, that it remained immature and undeveloped amongst the Hebrews, although it shone brilliantly in the life of the true worshipers of Yahwah. Under the direction of the God-fearing Judges and the pious Kings of Israel, the government was always theocratic, and as long as the oracles of the Prophets were favorably received and their injunctions duly executed, both the religion and the nation prospered.

But the True Religion of God never took the form of the Kingdom of God as it did under the Qur'anic regime. Allah in His Infinite Wisdom 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 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. Both these anticipation exhibit an inconsiderate and thoughtless imagination, and the wonder is that they persistently cling to this futile hope. If you ask a Christian priest or parson what he thinks of the Kingdom of God, he will tell you all sorts of illusory and meaningless things. This Kingdom is, he will affirm, the Church to which he belongs when it will overcome and absorb all the other heretical Churches. Another parson or priest will harangue on the "millennium." A Salvationist or a Quaker may tell you that according to his belief the Kingdom of God will consist of the new-born and sinless Christians, washed and cleansed with the blood of the Lamb; and so forth.

The Kingdom of God does not mean a triumphant Catholic Church, or a regenerated and sinless Puritan State. It is not a visionary "Royalty of the Millennium." It is not a Kingdom composed of celestial beings, including the departed spirits of the Prophets and the blessed believers, under the reign of a divine Lamb; with angels for its police and gendarmes; the Cherubs for its governors and judges; the Seraphs for its officers and commanders; or the Archangels for its Popes, Patriarchs, Bishops, and evangelical preachers. 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 Greek word euangelion, rendered "Gospel" in English, practically means "the enunciation of good news." And this enunciation was the tidings of the approaching Kingdom of God, the least among whose citizens was greater than John the Baptist. He himself and the Apostles after him preached and announced this Kingdom to the Jews, inviting them to believe and repent in order to be admitted into it. Jesus did not actually abrogate or change the Law of Moses, but interpreted it in such a spiritual sense that he left it a dead letter. When he declared that hatred was the root of murder, lust the source of fornication; that avarice and hypocrisy were as abominable sins as idolatry; and that mercy and charity were more acceptable than the burntofferings and the strict observance of the Sabbath, he practically abolished the letter of the Law of Moses in favor of its spiritual sense. These spurious and much interpolated Gospels report frequent parables and references of Christ to the Kingdom of God, and to Bar-Nasha or the Son of Man, but they are so corrupted and distorted that they have succeeded, and still succeed, in misleading the poor Christians to believe that by "Kingdom of God" Jesus only meant his Church, and that he himself was the "Son of Man."

These important points will be fully discussed, if Allah wills, later on; but for the present I have to content myself with remarking that what Prophet Jesus announced was, it was Islam that was the Kingdom of God and that it was Prophet Muhammad who was the Son of Man, who was appointed to destroy the Beast and to establish the powerful Kingdom of the People of the Saints of the Most High.

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 dis- figured 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 next 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. Consequently, the religion of Islam received a new life, light and spirit, and its adherents were exhorted to be humble, to show forbearance and patience. They were beforehand informed of persecutions, tribulations, martyrdoms, and prisons. The early "Nassara," as the Qur'an calls the believers in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, suffered ten fearful persecutions under the Roman Emperors. Then comes the Emperor Constantine and proclaims liberty for the Church; but after the decisions and the Trinitarian Creed of the Nicene Council in 325 A.C., the Unitarian Muslims (I) were submitted to a series of new and even more cruel persecutions by the Trinitarians, until the advent of Prophet Muhammad (upon whom be peace and blessings).

----- Footnote 1. Jesus Christ has never authorized his followers to call themselves "Christians". There is no better title for the early Unitarians than "Muslims." AD. ----- end of footnote 3. THE NATURE AND CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

There is a call to prayer repeated 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 of Allah by His faithful worshipers. This call to prayer is called Adhan (Azan). 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-Lah, meaning "praise be to Allah!" The bond of faith which binds a Muslim to his Eternal King is so strong, and the nearness between the Sovereign and His worshiper is so close, that nothing, however powerful or seductive, can separate him from Allah. The Qur'an declares that Allah is nearer to one than the life-vain.

Never was there a favorite courtier who, in his sentiments of affection, devotion, obedience, and respect for his beneficent monarch, could ever equal those which a Muslim entertains towards his Lord. Allah is the Owner of the Heavens, Earth and Universe, He is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. He is the King and the Lord of every Muslim in particular, for it is a Muslim alone who thanks and praises the Almighty King for all that happens and befalls him, be it prosperity or adversity.

Nearly three hundred million Muslims or more are endowed with the same feelings of faith and trust in 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 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'an and imprinted on the minds of His faithful worshipers.

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'an and the Hadith (Quotations 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 Prophet Muhammad and his immediate successors. Every member of this community is an honest worker, a brave soldier, and a fervent believer and devotee. All honest fruit of the toil belongs by right to him who earns it; nevertheless the law makes it impossible for a true Muslim to become excessively wealthy. One of the five foundations of Islam is the duty of almsgiving, which consists of sadaqa and zakat, or the voluntary and the obligatory alms. In the days of the Prophet and the first four Caliphs, no Muslim was known to be enormously rich. The national wealth went into the common treasury called "Baitu I-Mal," and no Muslim was left in need or want.

----- Footnote (1) The Jihad or "Holy War" is also an obligatory practice of piety. ----- end of footnote

The very name "Muslim" signifies literally "a maker of peace." You can never find another human being more docile, hospitable, inoffensive and peaceful a citizen than a good Muslim. But the moment his religion, honor, and property are attacked, the Muslim becomes a formidable foe. The Qur'an is very precise on this point: "Wa la ta'tadu" - "And you must not transgress" (or take the offensive). The Holy Jihad is not a war of offence, but of self-defense. Though the robbers, the predatory tribes, the semi-barbarous nomad Muslims, may have some religious notions and believe in the existence of Allah, it is the lack of knowledge and of religious training which is the root-cause of their vice and depravity. They are an exception. One can never become a good Muslim without the religious training and education.

(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'ionin," an epithet worthy only of the Prince of the Prophets and of his noble army of the Muhajirm (Emigrants) and the Ansar (Helpers), who uprooted idolatry from a great part of Asia and Africa and destroyed the Roman Beast.

All the Muslims, who believe in Allah, in His angels, Books, and Prophets; in the Day of the Resurrection and Judgment; that the good and evil are from Allah; and perform their pious practices according to their ability and with good will, are holy saints and blessed citizens of the Kingdom. There is no

grosser religious ignorance than the belief that there is a person called the Holy Ghost who fills the hearts of those who are baptized in the names of three gods, each the third of the three, or the three of the third, and thus sanctifies the believers in their absurdities. A Muslim believes that there is not one Holy Spirit, but innumerable holy spirits all created and ministers of the One Allah. The Muslims are sanctified, not by baptisms or ablution, but their spirits are purified and sanctified by the light of faith and by the fire of zeal and courage to defend and fight for that faith. John the Baptist, or rather Christ himself (according to the Gospel of Barnabas), said: "I baptize you with water unto repentance, but he who comes after me, he is stronger than I; he will baptize you with fire and with the holy spirit." It was this fire and this spirit with which Prophet Muhammad baptized the semi-barbarian nomads, the heathen Gentiles, and converted them into an army of heroic saints, who transformed the old waning synagogue and the decaying church into a permanent and strong Kingdom of Allah in the promised lands and elsewhere.

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

This 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. The mystery of this "service" lies in this: in the first place, the Muslims always inspire respect and fear through their dignified behavior, attachment to their religion and obedience to just laws, and their peacefulness; and secondly, because the Christian Governments, as a rule, treat the Muslims with justice and do not interfere with their laws and religion.

Space does not permit us to extend our observations over other points of this Divine Religion and Kingdom, such as the Muslim Caliphas, Sultans, etc. Suffice it to say that the Muslim Sovereigns are subject to the same Qur'anic laws as their compatriots; that justice and modesty are the best safeguards for the prosperity and stability of every State, Muslim or non-Muslim; and that the spirit and the principles of the Book of Allah are the best guidance for all legislation and civilization.

(11) Isaiah 42 describes Muhammad

1- Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

Until "...delighted"

If we consider "mine elect" as a noun then Mine elect = God's elect = Mustafa (in Arabic) the name of our Prophet Muhammad Mustafa (SAV). Otherwise it is true for all prophets of God.

After "...delighted..."

All prophets after Jacob (pbuh) mentioned in the Bible came for Israelites not Gentiles. This includes Jesus (pbuh) (look Matthew 15:21-26, Matthew 10:5-6 and many more). And Jesus (pbuh) did not stay on earth long enough to do that. But Muhammad (pbuh) was a Gentile and he brought message and judgment to Gentiles first.

2- He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.

Here the word "not cry" is used as "not complain about the duty that I gave him" because we see in verse 13 God says "... he shall cry". There is a difference between these two using of the word cry. Now if we read your Bible Matthew 26:39-42, we can not say that Jesus (pbuh) never complained.

But if you read the life of Muhammad (pbuh) , the history of Islam you cannot find even one complaining word of Muhammad (pbuh) about the mission (duty) that given by God Almighty.

3- A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth.

This is true almost all prophets.

4- He shall not fall nor be discouraged, till he had set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law.

Until "earth:"

Jesus (pbuh) couldn't finish his mission which had continued only for ~3 years. He fall and discouraged (you will find many places in NT about this) and he couldn't set judgment in the earth, because his followers were a few and they had little faith (you will find many places in NT about this). And yet they "forsook him and fled" at the time that Roman soldiers came to arrest Jesus (pbuh). And Jesus (pbuh) himself says "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence " John 18:36

But Muhammad established a state and ruled with his law that given by God. Therefore he set judgment in the earth and he did not fall and he was not discouraged.

After "earth:"

Here God says "his law", and in verse 9 says "former things come to pass". This means that he (new prophet) will bring new law. But if we read the Bible again, we see that Jesus (pbuh) says Matthew 5:17 "Think not I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but fulfill". And if we read further we understand that Jesus (pbuh) did not come with new law.

But Muhammad (pbuh) came with new law.

5- Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which come out of it ; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein;

6- I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.

Muhammad (pbuh) is a descendent of Abraham (pbuh) and came to Gentiles.

7- To open blind eyes, to bring out prisoners from prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.

"To open blind eyes". If we read verse 19 we will see more clearly that the word blind is used as idiom.

Meaning, he will show people the things that they did not know and will show people how to comprehend God and His message.

Prison is used as an idiom too. If a spirit doesn't know God and doesn't obey Him, then that spirit is in prison of Satan, and that person is prisoner of Satan. By accepting oneness of God and by obeying Him, the spirit of a person will be free and this makes that person free from prison of Satan. And in verse 8 God clearly states what He meant.

8- I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.

(With explanation of verse 7) we understand that the person that God is talking about will come to a place that people worship idols as their gods. If we read verse 17, we may understand this better.

From verses 7 and 8, we understand that God is not talking about Jesus (pbuh) but Muhammad (pbuh). Because Jesus (pbuh) came to Israelites and they were not worshipping idols. But Muhammad (pbuh) came during the Jahilliya

(ignorance) period of Arabs and destroy the idols. If we read verse 17, it will be understood more clearly.

9- Behold, the former things come to pass, the new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them.

As we read in verse 4 and my explanation of it, the person, God is talking about, will come new law. And this person cannot be Jesus (pbuh) because of the reasons stated above. This person is nobody but prophet Muhammad (pbuh).

10- Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise, ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein; the isles and inhabitants thereof.

If you want to hear this new song please listen to someone reciting the Qur'an. The new song that God talking about is Noble Qur'an. If you hear how people recite the Noble Qur'an, you will understand what God is talking about.

11- Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that Kedar doth inhabit: let the inhabitants of the rock sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains.

12- Let them give glory unto the Lord, and declare his praise in the islands.

Kedar is son of Ishmael (pbuh) (Genesis 25:13-16), and has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh). This verse (verse 11) is not talking about Jesus (pbuh) but Muhammad (pbuh). As you know Muhammad (pbuh) is descendent of Abraham (pbuh) through Ishmael (pbuh). And the cities that they inhabited are in Arabia namely Telma (Tema/Teman), Yathrib (Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah), Paran (Makkah) etc. And if you observe the ritual of Muslims (especially during Hajj), you will see that cities (Makkah and Al-Madinah) lift up their voices** and people shout and glorify Allah from top of mountains, especially Mt. Arafat**. The rock is the rock that God sent to Adam from heaven, and it is located at the side of Kaba. As you know Muslim people make 7 tours around Kaba and kiss this rock while glorifying the Lord.

**in fact, you can see this in every Muslim country, when people are called to prayer, muezzins read the Adhan (calling to prayer) that sounds like a song. And even far from city you can hear this Adhan, it will look like that city lifted up its voice. Meaning of Adhan is

Allah is the greatest, Allah is the greatest

Allah is the greatest, Allah is the greatest

I'm witness that there is no god but Allah

I'm witness that there is no god but Allah

I'm witness that Muhammad is His messenger

Come to prayer, come to prayer

Come to salvation, come to salvation

Allah is the greatest, Allah is the greatest

There is no god but Allah.

13- The Lord shall go forth as a mighty man, he shall stir up jealousy like a man of war: he shall cry, yea, roar; he shall prevail against his enemies.

14- I have long time holding my peace; I have been still, and refrained myself: now will I cry like a travailing women; I will destroy and devour at once.

Until Islam, God had never ordered any prophets to fight against unbelievers to destroy them. Believer were fighting only to defense themselves. But Allah ordered Muhammad (pbuh) to fight against unbelievers, and slay them if they don't accept Allah. And if you study the life of Muhammad (pbuh) you will see that he was the commander of the army and he fought with his sword and he lost one of his teeth during the war. And God destroyed unbelievers at once (with only during of one prophet).

15- I will make waste mountains and hills, and dry up all their herbs; and I will make the rivers islands, and I will dry up the pools.

Here God is talking about deserts of Arabia. In desert place, mountains and hills of sand are not steady, they diminish with winds and another one appears. And you can not find rivers but small water islands as described by God.

Also this verse has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh)

16- And I will bring blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked thins straight. These things I will do unto them, and not forsake them.

As God says above, He did not send to pagan Arabs until Muhammad (pbuh) as stated in verse 22. Until Muhammad (pbuh), Arabs were worshipping idols, killing baby girls, drinking alcohol, gambling etc. Allah a way (Islam, unity of God) that they did not know, made Qur'an and Muhammad (pbuh) guided (as light before) them, and made crooked things (mentioned above) straight.

This verse also has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh).

17- They shall be turned back, they shall be greatly ashamed, that trust in graven images, that they say to the molten images, Ye are our gods.

This is exactly what pagan Arabs did, when they heard the message that given to Muhammad (pbuh) by God. They offered money, authority and many things to our prophet and he did not accept any of them. They ashamed, because they thought that all other Arabs will mock them, and will not visit the Kaba (at that time they were using Kaba as place of the idols that all other Arab tribes were using) and this would be their economic end. And they turned graven images and they asked help from those images.

This verse also has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh).

18- Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see.

19- Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord's servant?

20- Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not.

In this verses God talks to Christians and Jews.

In verse 18: Hear you (Christians and Jews) deaf, and look you (Christians and Jews) blind, you may see that above things are happening every day in Islamic world.

In verse 19: God says, "Who is blind or deaf? My messenger (Muhammad (pbuh) and his followers) or you?"

In verse 20: You do see these things but you don't pay attention, you don't comprehend. You do hear the Qur'an and you know that Muslims sing new song and Muslim cities lift up their voices and they shout from top of mountains, they glorify Me, but you don't pay attention, you don't comprehend.

Indeed, Christians and Jews think that Muslims do not see the right path (blind). Even you wrote that "What Muslims do not understand...".

These verses also have nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh).

21- The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable.

In Qur'an many places Allah calls Prophet as "My friend" (friend is not exactly translation for Habeeb/Habib, because Habeeb is closer then friend but I couldn't find another word for this). And He magnified the law and people still

follow his law. Jesus did not bring new law, and non of the Christians follows the law that he was following.

This verse also has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh)

22- But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison houses: they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore.

In this verse God talks about corrupted society of pagan Arabs. And, indeed, He had not send any prophets to Arabs until Muhammad (pbuh). That's why "none saith, Restore". But up to Jesus (pbuh), many prophets had been send to Israelites.

This verse also has nothing to do with Jesus (pbuh)

23- Who among you will give ear to this? who will hearken and hear for the time to come?

Who will become Muslim?

Conclusion:

Isaiah 42 describes Prophet Muhammad.