

Section 15: Dignity of Jesus

Compiler's Note: This Section refutes at length the wide-spread propaganda against Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad that he used abusive language about Jesus. Hazrat Mirza's writings are quoted to show the high reverence in which he held Jesus as a prophet accepted in Islam (15.1). Then, referring to the highly-charged polemical controversies between Christians and Muslims in India in the late nineteenth century, the style of reply which Hazrat Mirza was forced to employ, in order to rebut some nasty Christian literature against the Holy Prophet Muhammad, is explained by quoting from his writings (15.2). Finally, the views and practice of other Muslim theologians, both before and after his time, are given, showing that they adopted exactly the same approach as did Hazrat Mirza (15.3). Indeed their language and tone of writing was much stronger than his.

15.1: Hazrat Mirza honours Jesus as Prophet of God

One of the allegations advanced against Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is that he “insulted” Jesus Christ and used offensive words about him. The first point which belies this allegation is that, if he had criticised Jesus, how would it have been possible for him to call himself *similar* to Jesus? The very claim of Hazrat Mirza was that, in accordance with the Holy Prophet Muhammad's Saying, “The righteous learned ones of my followers will be like the prophets of Israel”, he had come in the *likeness* of Jesus. Had Hazrat Mirza abused Jesus, would it not have reflected on his own person equally! Referring to this very point, he wrote:

“Muhammad Husain, at the time he prepared the ruling that it was permissible to kill me, levelled the false charge against me that I have insulted Jesus, and therefore I deserve to be killed. This is sheer fabrication of Muhammad Husain. Considering that my claim is that I am the Promised Messiah and that I bear resemblance to Jesus, everyone can understand that if, God forbid, I decry Jesus, how can I speak of my

resemblance to him, since it would imply that I myself am bad.” (*Majmu‘a Ishtiharat*, footnote, vol. iii, p. 78)

“In the Mosaic order, the son of Mary was the Promised Messiah, and in the order established after the Holy Prophet Muhammad, I am the Promised Messiah. So I honour him bearing whose name I have come. That person is a mischief maker and fabricator who says that I do not honour the Messiah, son of Mary.” (*Kishti-i Nuh*, p. 16)

In principle, just these two quotations are sufficient to refute this allegation. However, we give below some further extracts from Hazrat Mirza’s books, showing clearly and conclusively that he did not offer any insult to Jesus (peace be upon him), but that he honoured him and declared belief in him (Jesus) to be a basic requirement of faith.

1. “Since we people believe Jesus, peace be upon him, to be a true prophet of God, and a holy and righteous person, how could our pens write words derogatory to his dignity.” (*Kitab al-Bariyya*, p. 93, under the caption *Most important point for the attention of the Government*)
2. “I have been sent by God also for the purpose that I should believe Jesus, peace be upon him, to be a true, holy and righteous prophet of God, and repose faith in his prophethood. There is not even a word in any book of mine that detracts from his dignity, and anyone who thinks that there is, is mistaken and a liar.” (*Ayyam as-Sulh*, Title, p. 2)
3. “By his words and his deeds, Jesus, peace be upon him, showed himself to be humble and helpless, not possessing any attribute of God. He was a weak mortal, though undoubtedly a prophet and true messenger of God.” (*Jang Muqaddas*, p. 50)
4. “I swear by Almighty God that He has clearly revealed to me that Jesus, peace be upon him, was a human being like other human beings. But he was a true prophet, messenger, and chosen one of God.” (*Hujjat al-Islam*, p. 9)
5. “Jesus, peace be upon him, was undoubtedly a prophet beloved of God, possessing the highest qualities. He was righteous,

- venerable, and one who had found God. But he was not God.” (*Majmu‘a Ishtiharat*, vol. ii, p. 376)
6. “As the Holy Quran has testified to the prophethood of Jesus, peace be upon him, we call Jesus a true prophet and believe him to be so, and we declare the denial of his prophethood to be clear heresy.” (*Zia al-Haq*, p. 41)
 7. “And if the objection is that some prophet has been insulted [by me], and that this constitutes heresy, the answer is simply, May the curse of God be upon the liars! We believe in all the prophets and honour them. Some words, which are fitting in their proper context, are not by way of abuse, but by way of supporting the doctrine of God’s uniqueness. Actions are judged by intention. People such as you had declared the author of *Taqwiyyat al-Iman* [Sayyid Muhammad Ismail Shaheed] to be *kafir* because they found such words in this book which they took as being insulting to prophets and equating them with thieves. His answer, like mine, was also that ‘Actions are judged by intention’.” (*Anwar al-Islam*, p. 34)
 8. “God has also informed me that Jesus was in reality one of His most beloved and righteous servants, and of those who are chosen by God, and of those whom God purifies with His own hand and keeps under the shadow of His light. But he is not God, as has been imagined. He is, however, a person who attained to God, and of those perfect ones who are few.” (*Tuhfah Qaisariyya*, pp. 20 – 21)
 9. “I believe that no person who abuses a righteous man like Husain or Jesus can survive even one night, but is overtaken by the Divine threat [contained in Hadith, see *Bukhari* 81:38]: ‘Whoever opposes a saint of Mine, I declare war on him’.” (*Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 38)
 10. “Jesus, peace be upon him, is not God but only a prophet, and not a whit more. And, by God, I have such true love for him as you do not have. I see him with the light with which you cannot. There is no doubt that he was a beloved, chosen prophet of God, and of those who receive His special grace, and who are purified by Him. But he was neither God nor the son

of God.” (*Haqiqat al-Wahy*, under announcement entitled *Da‘wat-i-Haq*, p. 5)

11. “The intensity of love which Christians claim to have for Jesus is also claimed by Muslims, as if his person is a heritage common to both Christians and Muslims, and I have the greatest right [to this claim] because my nature is absorbed in that of Jesus, and his in mine. Heavenly signs are appearing in support of this claim, and everyone has been invited to satisfy himself about this claim through a sign. I have dared to write this much here because the true love and honour I have for Jesus in my heart, and all the things I have heard from his lips [in visions], and the message he gave me, all these things prompted me to respectfully address her majesty the Queen [Victoria], as an emissary from Jesus, that just as God has made her a guardian over the lives and properties of millions of human beings, nay, she has made laws even for the welfare of animals and birds, how well it would be if your majesty could turn your attention to the covert abuse that is offered to the dignity of Jesus [by Christians asserting that he was ‘accursed’ for three days].” (*Tuhfah Qaisariyya*, p. 23)

The above writings of Hazrat Mirza make it quite clear that he believed Jesus to be a holy and righteous person and a true prophet of God. In the light of these extracts, how could it be alleged that he insulted Jesus?

15.2: Hazrat Mirza’s reply to Christian attacks

If the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement were to see the prevailing atmosphere during the time of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and the vituperative writings of the Christian missionaries, in reply to which he was forced to use strong language, they would not raise this objection against him. At that time, Christian preachers used to write such abusive, offensive and filthy words about the Holy Prophet Muhammad that no decent person could bear to hear or read them. Hazrat Mirza told them repeatedly to give up this foul technique and not to pain the hearts of the Muslims, but the missionaries grew bolder and bolder. The writings of Revs. Imad-ud-Din, Thakar Das, and Fathi Masih deeply wounded the Muslims. And when Rev. Fathi Masih wrote a letter to him reviling the Holy Prophet Muhammad,

Hazrat Mirza was forced to give a retaliatory reply based on the Bible. He made it plain that his reply was merely by way of retaliation against Fathi Masih's letter, while he actually believed Jesus to be a true prophet with the high rank given to him by the Holy Quran.

As a Muslim with a sense of honour and self-respect, was it not the duty of Hazrat Mirza, in replying to a foul-mouthed man who had deliberately hurled such abuse to hurt him, that he should not only refute the allegations but retaliate against the slanderer's own beliefs to stop him writing such falsehood and filth in the future. Even in this retaliation, Hazrat Mirza took great care to explain that he was not criticising that prophet Jesus who had been mentioned in the Quran, but was directing his criticism at that Jesus whom Christians call God and the son of God, *not* the real Jesus but the one who existed only in their imagination. Thus he wrote:

1. "What I have written is a retaliatory reply based on the Gospels. Otherwise, I respect Jesus and believe him to be a righteous, honourable prophet." (*Faryad-i Dard*, footnote, p. 79)
2. "Whatever has come from my pen about Jesus which appears to go against his dignity is by way of a retaliatory reply. In fact, we have quoted the words of the Jews. If the Christian preachers behave in a civilised, God-fearing manner, and not hurl abuse at our Holy Prophet, the Muslims for their part would be twenty times more respectful than they." (*Chashma Masihi*, footnote, p. 2)
3. "Everywhere in our writings [of this sort] the imaginary Messiah of the Christians is meant. The humble servant of God, Jesus son of Mary, who is mentioned in the Quran, is not meant. And this technique we adopted after listening to abuse from Christian preachers over a period of full forty years. ... It should be remembered that in future those reverends who give up the technique of hurling abuse, and speak with good manners, we too will deal with them respectfully. ... We were tired of listening to their abuse. If someone swears at a person's father, does not that wronged person have the right to return in kind against his father." (*Nur al-Quran*, Part II, p. 2)

4. "I give you notice by this letter that if you again use such foul language and utter filthy slander in the honour of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, I will retaliate against your imaginary and fake god. O fool! Do you accuse the Holy Prophet of adultery in your letter, and call him evil and wicked, and hurt our heart! We do not turn to any court, nor will we do so, but warn you for the future to refrain from such filth. Fear God, and do not abuse the Messiah, for certainly what you will say about the Holy Prophet Muhammad will be applied to your imaginary Messiah. However, we believe the true Messiah to be holy, venerable and pure. He claimed neither to be God nor the son of God, and gave the news of the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad and believed in him." (*Nur al-Quran*, Part II, p. 13)
5. "I have not said anything disrespectful about Jesus. This is all a fabrication of the opponents. However, as there has not been a Messiah in reality who claimed to be God, called the coming Last of the Prophets a liar, and branded Moses as a thief, I did say about him hypothetically that a Messiah who were to say such things could not be righteous. But our Messiah, the son of Mary, who called himself a servant and messenger of God, and testified to the Holy Prophet, we believe in him." (*Tiryaaq al-Qulub*, footnote, p. 77)
6. "If the Christian preachers change their policy even now, and resolve not to hurl abuse at our Holy Prophet in future, we too will resolve to use mild language in our replies. Otherwise, whatever they say, they will hear the answer to that." (*Anjam Atham*, footnote on footnote, Supplement, p. 8)
7. "Our contention is with that Jesus who claims to be God, not with that chosen Prophet of God mentioned along with the details concerning him in the Holy Quran." (*Majmu'a Ishti-harat*, vol. ii, p. 332)
8. "It should be remembered that this view of ours is about that Jesus who claimed to be God, and called the former prophets as thieves, and said nothing about the Last of the Prophets except that only false prophets would come after him [i.e. after Jesus]. Such a Jesus is not mentioned anywhere in the Quran." (*Anjam Atham*, p. 13)

9. “The readers should note that we had to speak in the same manner about the Christian religion as that which they use towards us. Christians in reality do not believe in our ‘*Isa* (Jesus), peace be upon him, who called himself only a servant and a prophet, believed the former prophets to be righteous, believed in the Prophet to come, the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and had prophesied about him. They believe in a man called *Yasu* who is not mentioned in the Holy Quran, who, they believe, claimed to be God and used to refer to the former prophets as thieves. They also say that this man belied our Holy Prophet Muhammad, and prophesied that all claimants coming after him would be liars. ... The readers should remember not to take our strong words as applying to ‘*Isa* [Muslim name for Jesus], but they have been written with regard to *Yasu*, not a trace of whom is to be found in the Quran or Hadith.” (*Arya Dharm*, Title page, last, under caption *For the attention of the Readers*)
10. “Since Rev. Fathi Masih has sent us an extremely filthy letter, in which he has accused our Holy Prophet Muhammad of adultery, and besides this, has used many words by way of abuse and vituperation, it was, therefore, advisable to publish a reply to his letter; hence this booklet has been written. It is to be hoped that Christian preachers will read it carefully and not be pained by its words, because it is all a consequence of the harsh language and exceedingly filthy abuse by Mr Fathi Masih. Nonetheless, we take account of the holy dignity of the Messiah, peace be upon him, and, in return for Fathi Masih’s strong words, an imaginary Messiah has been mentioned. Even this is out of dire necessity because this fool has heaped a great deal of abuse upon the Holy Prophet Muhammad, and has hurt our feelings.” (*Nur al-Quran*, Part II, p. 3)
11. “If God were to grant you good manners, we would explain things to you with kindness and mercy, as one does to children, and satisfy you on all scores with love and courtesy. But you are falling upon us like wild beasts, and are using harsh words, not out of anger or emotion, but to cause hurt. If you are prepared to employ good morals and to abandon this

brute-like behaviour, we too are ready to show love, courtesy and respect.” (*Maktubat Ahmadiyya*, Vol. iii, p. 33)

12. “There remains the matter of using strong words occasionally in reply to Christians. It is very simple: when our sentiments are very badly hurt by the undeserved attacks of all kinds upon the Holy Prophet Muhammad, then as a warning only, retaliatory replies are given based on their acknowledged scriptures. These people should see if they can show any point we have made about Jesus by way of retaliation which is not from the Gospels. We certainly cannot remain silent on hearing insults heaped upon the Holy Prophet Muhammad. This type of reply is to be found in the Holy Quran itself, as for instance, ‘Are the males for you, and for Him the females’ [53:21], and ‘Now ask them whether thy Lord has daughters and they have sons’ [37:149]. Those people used to call the angels daughters of God. God says: Do you have sons and I have daughters? In short, giving retaliatory replies is a technique of debate. Otherwise, we believe Jesus to be a messenger of God and a chosen, venerable human being.” (*Malfuzat*, vol. 9, pp. 479–480)
13. “Sometimes retaliatory replies have to be given, as the occasion may demand. When feelings are badly hurt, then in order to warn Christians that if this is what constitutes criticism, we too can give like replies, these points are presented out of their own scriptures. This type of reply is also to be found frequently in the Holy Quran. Our replies are only intended to warn the Christian preachers, otherwise we believe Jesus to be a messenger and chosen one of God.” (*Malfuzat*, vol. 9, pp. 470–471)
14. “I am accused of having insulted Jesus, peace be upon him, and Imam Husain, whereas I believe them to be righteous and holy. It is objected that I speak disrespectfully of Jesus and abuse him, whereas I believe him to be a great prophet and righteous servant of God.” (*Malfuzat*, vol. 9, p. 442)
15. “If it had been true that Jesus was indeed the son of God, or God, I would have been the first to worship him. I would have preached his divinity throughout the land, and even though I had to bear persecution or face death and be cut to pieces in

his cause, I would not have refrained from calling people to him. But, O dear ones, may God have mercy on you and open your eyes, Jesus is not God, but only a prophet, not a whit more. And, by God, I have such true love for him as you do not have. I see him with the light with which you cannot. There is no doubt that he was a beloved, chosen prophet of God, and of those who receive His special grace, and who are purified by Him. But he was neither God nor the son of God.” (*Majmu‘a Ishtiharat*, vol. iii, p. 574)

16. “I inform you that actually, in the case of Jesus, the Christians and the Jews went to two opposite extremes. The Christians exaggerated his position so much that a helpless human being, who was born of a woman like ordinary mortals, was considered to be God. Then they brought him down so low as to make him accursed and enter hell [for three days]. The Jews denigrated him so much as to dub him — God forbid — as illegitimate, which some English authors have accepted, and put the entire blame on Mary. But the Holy Quran came to correct both these peoples. It told the Christians that Jesus was a prophet of God, not God, and he was not accursed but exalted spiritually. It told the Jews that he was not illegitimate, but rather that Mary was a righteous woman who became pregnant through ‘guarding her chastity’. This going to opposite extremes has also happened in this age and God has sent me to restore his honour. Muslims, through ignorance, make the mistake of giving him higher than human attributes, and are unaware of the fact of his death. Christians regard him as crucified, and therefore accursed. The time has now arrived to remove all these allegations regarding Jesus, which were removed once before by the Holy Prophet Muhammad. I hope you will give full consideration to these points.” (*Malfuzat*, vol. 3, pp. 110–111)

The references given above show the great honour in which Hazrat Mirza held Jesus, believing him to be a prophet and messenger of God. As to the writings to which objections are raised, they were retaliatory replies to Christian vituperation against the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Hazrat Mirza made it plain that, for the purpose of these rejoinders, the Jesus mentioned in the Holy Quran and the Jesus of the Christian conception were different. Not to distinguish between

the actual and the imaginary Messiah, when Hazrat Mirza has clearly differentiated between the two, is contrary to honesty and fairness.

It is this fact, due to not understanding which, it is alleged in order to incense the masses that Hazrat Mirza insulted Jesus and used offensive words about him. This technique of giving retaliatory replies was not invented by Hazrat Mirza, but, in fact, before him as well as after him many Muslim theologians and writers of the *Ahl as-Sunna* and *Ahl al-Hadith* adopted the same method against Christian abusive literature.

15.3: Muslim Ulama criticise Jesus of the Gospels

1. Maulavi Rahmat-ullah ‘Mahajar Makki’:

- i. “Since Christian preachers are using rude words about the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the Holy Quran and the Hadith, in speech as well as writing, and are not afraid of the consequences in the Hereafter, and give deceitful arguments, we have been compelled to give them retaliatory replies in the same coin and to quote stories from their scriptures by way of example. But it is not a part of my beliefs to criticise and scold any prophet, nor is it my aim to ridicule their religious injunctions. I reject such ideas a thousand times. It is a part of our faith to believe in the true messengers of God.”
(*Izalat-ul-Auham*, Preface, p. 5)
- ii. “It appears from these passages [of the Gospels] that Jesus’ opponents believed him to be voracious and to like drinking. A woman used to kiss his feet, rub fragrance on them ... and whenever he used to come, she would carry on kissing his feet and not stop. Seeing this the Pharisees and others became disgusted with him. Because of these actions of hers, he forgave this loose woman her sins. Many women were friendly with him. Hence a critic could say that, as he was a handsome young man, women used to keep company with him out of love, and serve him with their possessions. His love for many of them was a known fact, and owing to his drinking he used to serve their needs. He had no need to marry, just as there are thousands of recluses sitting by the rivers Ganges and Jumna who, adopting this fashion, have no need to marry.”
(*ibid.*, p. 368)

2. Maulavi Aal Hasan:

- i. “May God keep one away from abusing and belying the prophets, but I write this only to answer the allegations of Christian preachers.”

(*Istiftar*, p. 419)

- ii. “The Christian preachers believe that God entered Mary’s womb as a foetus, and stayed in the menstrual discharge for many months. He then developed into a lump of flesh, and his bones grew. After this, he emerged from the outlet. He used to pass stools and water, till having grown up he became a disciple of John the Baptist. At last he spent three days in hell as an accursed one.”

(*ibid.*, p. 350)

- iii. “From the second and third verses of the eighth chapter of the third Gospel, it appears that many harlots used to help him with their possessions. So if the Jews, out of wickedness and malice, allege that Jesus was a handsome young man with whom harlots kept company for immoral purposes, and this was why he did not marry, but used to pretend that he had no inclination towards women, what answer can be given?”

(*ibid.*, p. 391)

- iv. “Why can Mary’s son be God, but Kausalya’s son, i.e. Ramchandra, and Devaki’s son, i.e. Kanhaiya [Krishna], not be God, whom the Hindus believe to be God as you consider Jesus to be.”

(*Istiftar*, footnote to *Izalat-ul-Auham*, p. 21)

3. Shah Abdul Aziz

He was a son of Shah Wali-ullah and a scholarly theologian in his own right. His reply to a Christian is recorded as follows:

“Once a Christian preacher came to the Shah and asked, Is your prophet the beloved of God? He said, Yes. The Christian said: Why did he not then entreat God to save Imam Husain, or was his plea not heard! The Shah replied, The Prophet did indeed entreat God, but he received the reply: Your grandson has been unjustly martyred by your people, but at this

moment I am remembering the crucifixion of My own son Jesus.”

(*Raud Kausar*, Urdu history of Islam in the Indian subcontinent, by Shaikh Ikram, p. 590)

4. Maulavi Muhammad Qasim Nanotavi

He was the founder of the Deoband School. He wrote:

“Christians who claim to love Jesus so much do not in reality love him because their love is based on his being considered to be the son of God. But this is only in their imagination, and they worship a fictitious image of him and that is what they love. God has kept Jesus away from being their mediator.”

(*Hadyat al-Shi'ah*, p. 244)

5. Maulavi Sana-ullah of Amritsar

This opponent of the Ahmadiyya Movement edited the newspaper *Ahl-i Hadith* which carried the following comments:

i. “Making a thing like wine which is the root of all evil, then serving it at a wedding feast, and participating in that feast of drinking people along with his mother, is recorded in the Gospel of John, while the Old Testament books had strictly prohibited wine.”

(*Ahl-i Hadith*, 3 March 1939)

ii. “The Messiah by his own admission was not a good person. ... The Gospel shows that he got strange women to rub fragrance on him — Matthew 26:6, Mark 14:3, John 12:6.”

(*ibid.*, p. 9)

iii. “When the Messiah, by insulting his mother and treating her contemptuously, went against the emphatic commandments of the previous religious law as well as his own teachings, what doubt could possibly remain in his not being sinless. ... The Gospels also show that he used harsh and strong language in respect of the Jewish elders, see Matthew 23.”

(*ibid.*, p. 9)

6. Sana-ullah's *Tafsir Sana'i*

In his Urdu commentary of the Quran, Maulavi Sana-ullah wrote:

“To liken the Torah and the Gospels to a manuscript requiring correction is on account of their present condition, containing stories such as Lot getting drunk and committing incest with his daughters — Genesis ch. 9 — and the Messiah showing the miracle of increasing the amount of wine at a feast when it ran out — John ch. 2. Otherwise, the actual Torah and Gospel contained light, guidance and mercy.”

(*Tafsir Sana'i*, on verse 3:23; vol. i, p. 191, footnote to note)

7. Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi:

“The fact is that these people [the Christians] do not believe in the historical Messiah who actually arose, but in their minds they have created an imaginary Messiah whom they have made God.”

(*Tafhim al-Quran*, Idara Tarjuman-ul-Quran, Lahore, 4th edition, 1984, vol. i, p. 491, under verse 5:75)

8. Maulavi Ahmad Din Gakharwi:

- i. “Readers should note that we believe Jesus to be a true prophet, and honour him like other messengers of God. We believe it to be clear heresy to abuse him or any other prophet. Hence the example of the Messiah which we shall set forth as a retaliatory reply to objections [against Islam] must not be taken to be our belief. For, our accusatory reply will be based on the Gospel as it is today.”

(*Taqdees Sayyid al-Abrar an Muta'an al-zina*, p. 4)

- ii. “It is requested of the Christian preachers that they should, in future, refrain from hurling abuse at the Founder of Islam, lest their own religion be exposed. One’s honour lies in one’s own hands.”

(*ibid.*, p. 47)

9. Hafiz Qamar-ud-Din

He was the spiritual leader at Sayyal Sharif, Punjab. He wrote:

“A boy from amongst them was called Perez, who was an ancestor of David, Solomon and Jesus. This Tamar [mother of Perez, called harlot in Genesis Ch. 38] was an ancestor of the Israelite prophets and Jesus.”

(Book *Isaee Mazhab*, pp. 4 – 5, published by Dar al-Tabligh, Sayyal Sharif)

10. Maulavi Abul Mahmud:

“Three female ancestors of Jesus were adulteresses and immoral women, and four male ancestors were also of bad character. ... What can remain of the character and position of a man who comes after so many adulterers and adulteresses.”

(*Islam Aur Isaeeat*, p. 73)

11. Maulavi Abdul Haqq Haqqani

In his commentary of the Quran, he wrote:

“Young women used to accompany Jesus and his disciples, making the Jews suspicious.”

(*Tafsir Haqqani*, vol. i, Preface, p. 69)

When people objected to the above words, Maulavi Abdul Haqq Haqqani added the following footnote at this point:

“A covert Christian who, under the false names of Muhammad Salih and Muhammad Sadiq, makes false prophecies in order to ridicule Islam, has made the allegation on the above words, in order to discredit this writer, that I call Jesus an adulterer. Anyone who has even a slight acquaintance with Urdu writing can immediately belie this secret Christian and say that this is a false allegation.”

(*ibid.*, footnote, book published by *Kutub Khana Naeemiyya* of Deoband)

12. Mr Aziz, B.A., editor, *Madina*:

“The Messiah in whom one is invited to believe [in the Holy Quran] does not bear even a distant relation to the Messiah portrayed in the Gospels, about whom both Christians and Jews have made the worst type of allegations.”

(*Madina*, 21 December 1932)

13. Maulavi Muhammad Usman Farqleet

- i. In *Al-Jami'at*, the official organ of the *Jami'at al-'Ulama Hind* (Council of the Ulama of India), he wrote:

“The aim of the above discussion is to show that the Christians are trying to prove the superiority of the crucified Messiah over the Holy Prophet Muhammad from the Quran. On the other hand, the Quran has neither mentioned nor described any superiority of the crucified Messiah, for the Christians have mistakenly thought the crucified man to be the Messiah. However, the Quran does speak of the Messiah who was not crucified. Hence every intelligent and fair-minded person can see that, as there is no mention of the crucified Messiah in the Quran, how can Christians prove his superiority from the Holy Quran.”

(Newspaper *Al-Jami'at*, 20 November 1932)

- ii. In a debate with the Christian missionary Ahmad Masih, Maulavi Muhammad Usman Farqleet told him:

“There are three Messiahs: the Quranic Messiah, the Gospel Messiah and the *Dajjal* Messiah [Anti-Christ]. Why do you give arguments to show the excellences of the Quranic Messiah? Give proofs to show the excellences of your Gospel Messiah. The Quranic Messiah is one person, and the Gospel Messiah is someone else.”

At this, Rev. Ahmad Masih replied:

“When Mirza Ghulam Ahmad distinguishes between the Quranic and the Gospel Messiah, he is declared by you people to be a *kafir*, but when you say the same thing, you are declared a hero of Islam. Why should you not be declared *kafir* for copying Mirza sahib?”

(*Paigham Sulh*, 3 March 1933, p. 5)

Do the critics still have doubts regarding the method employed by Hazrat Mirza? If they consider it right to accuse him of insulting Jesus, and therefore to pronounce all sorts of verdicts against him, they had better first exclude from Islam their own recognised leaders who, like Hazrat Mirza, distinguished between the Quranic and the

Gospel Messiah, and referred to the latter as the “crucified Messiah”, and accepted all the worst allegations imputed against him.

It may be noted that Hazrat Mirza was the man who wrote innumerable articles on the sinlessness of the prophets and declared all prophets to be free of sin, while many commentaries of the Quran had attributed the commission of sins to many prophets, for example, David.