THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM

OR

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF MOHAMMED

BY

AMEER ALI, SYED, M. A., C. I. E.

BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

JUDGE OF HIS MAJESTY'S HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE IN BENGAL,

AUTHOR OF

"A Short History of the Saracens," "The Ethics of Islâm" "Mahommedan Law"

"The Personal Law of the Mahommedans"

"A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed"

etc. etc.

سخن کز بهر دین گوئي چه عبراني چه سرياني

مکان کز بهر حق جوئي چه جابلقا چه جابلسا

"What matters it whether the words thou utterest in prayer are Hebrew or Syrian, or whether the place in which thou seekest God is Jabalka or Jabalsa ?"—*Sanaï*

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Calcutta:

S. K. LAHIRI & Co.,

54, COLLEGE STREET.

1902.

All Rights Reserved.

PREFACE TO THE POPULAR EDITION.

SINCE the promulgation of Islâm the world has seen great changes ; empires have risen and disappeared ; great nationalities have been swept away making room for others ; knowledge and culture have drifted from the East to the West ; and with knowledge not only power but material prosperity has changed hands. Under the influence of their Prophet, a congeries of warring tribes consolidated into a nation, had for centuries carried aloft the torch of learning for the enlightenment of the world. With the fall of their dominion they ceased to be the preceptors of humanity. The younger nations who succeeded to their heritage continued some of their glory in arms but less in arts and literature. They too declined in power and influence, and now the greatest of them is but a shadow of its former self. And yet as an active, living faith, Islam has lost none of its pristine force nor the magic hold it possesses over its followers. In certain parts of the world it is spreading with greater rapidity than any other creed, and its acceptance among the less advanced races has invariably tended to raise them in the moral scale.

As the study of comparative religion, like the study of comparative history, acquires importance in the estimation of scholars and students, the interest in Islam as a motive power in the world will deepen. For outsiders,, however, to undestand its genius, and the causes of its unparalleled success in vitalising humanity, and its vast potentiality for good, it is necessary to grasp its "spirit," and its aims and aspirations from a philosophical point of view ; for the Islamist who desires to act up to the prescriptions of his religion, it is essential he should understand the significance of its ethics, the true meaning of its enunciations, and learn to differentiate between the permanent and the temporary. It is only then

that he can maintain his religion as it was intended to remain, an important lever, a valuable factor, for the progress and development of the world, and be himself in a position to keep pace with the growing ethical and social needs of a living and advancing community. Nations like individuals, when they fail to realise the bent of the times and the necessities of the age, are doomed. And no one saw this more clearly or expressed it more forcibly than the Arabian Seer.

In the following pages, I have endeavoured, however feebly and inefficiently, to portray the Islam of the Prophet and "the Philosophers of his House," and to give expression to their ethical teachings and spiritual aspirations. Naturally the consideration of Islamic ethics has involved a criticism of the ethics of the earlier systems. But it has not been done in a spirit of cavil or antagonism, nor does it imply the smallest want of respect for any other moral creed.

I have deliberately adopted the English language for communicating my thoughts and views to Islamists as well as to others. English now exercises the same unchallenged sway over a greater part of the globe as Arabic did in Asia, Africa and Spain for nearly seven centuries. It is the language of culture and civilised progress. In India it has become, within the last thirty years, the ordinary vehicle of literary thought. The Mahommedan subjects of this great Empire occupy a unique position in the history of our times. Living under a Government which pursues, so far as possible, a policy of strict neutrality in religious matters while it is at the same time anxious to promote the moral and intellectual development of the people, they can, if they choose, avail themselves to the fullest extent of the progressive tendencies of the age without abandoning their faith or the prescriptions of their religion. And by placing themselves in a line with the advancing communities of the West, they can sensibly influence other Mahommedan communities which happen to be less favourably situated.

For the last few centuries Islâm has become, in the minds of a large number of its votaries, associated with a lifeless formalism ; the practice of its rules of morality has given place to mere profession ; and its real aim *as a creed to live by* has been forgotten. For myself I attach far more importance to moral vigor than to mental agility—to character than to the faculty for passing examinations. I believe that the continued growth of a nation depends not on mere imitative intellectual cleverness but on the purity of its ethical standards. And I consider that the first duty of those who wish to free their religion from the charge of obscurantism, bigotry or narrowness, is to endeavour to revive among the Moslems a knowledge of true Islamic ethics,—to elevate the general tone of thought, and to create a sense of patriotism and solidarity combined with a feeling of loyalty to the government under which they live.

In India we are in the throes of a great moral, social and intellectual revolution ; the West is jostling the East, perhaps too vigorously at times, trying to awaken it from its lethargy, from its intense self-satisfaction and conceit in its old civilisation. Those, who would perhaps like to see the two retain their separate individualities, are apt to forget that races, however remote in their modes of thought, must, by the very process of coming together, act and re-act on each other. What is happening in India today happened ten centuries ago in the Iberian Peninsula. The learned author of "Studies in History and Jurisprudence" has recently compared British rule in India with Roman provincial government. He would probably find greater analogy in the Saracenic administration of Spain. It was equally liberal, sympathetic, non-exclusive and expansive ; it gave the freest scope to local self-government ; it fostered trade and commerce ; encouraged agriculture and promoted education with unstinted generosity ; offices of trust and emolument were open

to all creeds and races. It also had its frontier raids and reprisals; its religious riots; its racial prejudices. Apart, however, from political features, the splendid eclectic civilisation which grew up in Spain from the introduction of Saracenic culture among the Vandals, the Goths and the Romans, shows what the result must be from the contact of a vigorous, progressive nationality with communities who have become stationary or have lost the genius of striving for advancement. And the intermixture of ideas, where the intermixture of races is not possible, acts as a solvent to the ignorance which idolises old forms. It would be disastrous if the Renaissance movement among the Moslems of India should fail to receive the countenance and support of the ruling classes, the only cultured classes in this country in the true sense of the word. Although in the main the progress of a nation is in its own hands, much may be done by *them* towards imparting a higher moral tone to and creating nobler ideals among the Indian communities. In my opinion the success of Islamic Renaissance will come only from the general diffusion of true Islamic culture and it is in this direction that the efforts of all interested in Mahommedan advancement should, I venture to suggest, be directed.

Throughout this work my object has been to discuss the Islamic teachings in a historical spirit, and to develop among the latter-day Islamists a perception of the difference between ethics and ceremonialism. The book was issued to the public only a few years ago, barely more than a decade, a mere trifle in the life of a nation. And yet within this short period, its influence, judging from the results, must be admitted by all lovers of progress and friends of Islam, to be eminently satisfactory. The opposition it has evoked has only served to strengthen the hold of ideas which it was intended to diffuse among the growing generation.

The demand, which has sprung up in consequence, has induced me to bring out a popular edition, enlarged and revised. The task of revision has been carried through under heavy pressure of judicial work and other literary undertakings, and I claim, therefore, some measure of indulgence for any shortcomings that may be found in this volume.

AMEER ALI.

CALCUTTA

August 1902.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

—o—

EIGHTEEN years ago I published a small work, entitled, *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed.* Since then a great change has taken place in the estimate of Islâm as a Faith among the cultured classes of Christendom. Writers like Johnson, Lane-Poole, Bosworth-Smith, Isaac Taylor, have discussed, from a philosophical and historical point of view, the merits of Islam both as a creed and as a humanising agency. There seems, however, to be still room for an exposition of the Spirit of Islam as it was understood by the immediate descendants of its Teacher. The present work, which it would be a misnomer to call a second edition of the earlier one, is primarily intended for the Indian Moslems. I have endeavoured to embody in these pages the philosophical and ethical spirit of Islam, in the hope that it may assist the Moslems of India to achieve their intellectual and moral regeneration under the auspices of the great European power that now holds their destinies in its hands. At the same time, I trust this book may prove of some practical value to those Seekers of Truth in the West whose minds have gone forth in quest of a positive and eclectic Faith suited for the noblest, and, by its disciplinary character, also for the lowest, natures. The glamour of the poet has not succeeded in making the Creed of Negation popular in England,—that home of common sense,—for Buddhism has no vitality as a system ; its religious life is represented now by the prayer-wheels of the Lamas. But the general spread of liberalism in the West has, without the factitious assistance rendered to Buddhism, also led to the diffusion of Islamic ideas in Europe and cultured America, and even to the formation of a genuine Islamic centre in England. Unitarianism and Theism are neither more nor less than the Islam of

Mohammed, shorn of the disciplinary rules framed for the guidance of the common folk. For these in every land something more is needed than mere philosophy ; they require practical rules and positive directions for their daily life. Dogmatic Christianity and philosophical Unitarianism both inculcate the exercise of self-restraint. Yet do all the preachings in churches and chapels reduce to any appreciable extent the drunkenness, the brutality, the licentiousness of the lowest natures? The secular law imposes penalties, and keeps within bounds the recklessness of uncultured man. The Islâm of Mohammed, with its stern discipline and its severe morality, has proved itself the only practical religion for low natures to save them from drifting into lawless materialism. It is probable, however, that, should the creed of the Arabian Prophet receive acceptance among European communities, much of the rigid formalism which has been imparted to it by the lawyers of Central Asia and Irak will have to be abandoned. Perhaps the present exposition of the true *Spirit of Islam* may help in the diffusion of Islâmic ideas in the West.

Calcutta, September 1890. AMEER ALI.

*** The transliteration I have adopted in this work of Arabic letters requires a word of explanation. The Indians, the Persians, and the Turks generally pronounce certain letters of the Arabic alphabet quite differently from the Arabs, *e. g.*, they make no difference between ث and س, pronouncing both as an *s* ; and, excepting among the Arabic scholars, ض and ز are pronounced alike as *z*. Little difference is made between ه and ح. For these reasons I have eschewed the system, recently started in Europe, of differentiating the sounds of Arabic letters by dots and commas ; for to one unacquainted with Arabic, an *h* with a dot underneath it, and so forth, can convey no meaning. In the present volume I have generally represented ص as *dh*, excepting in the case of words in common use among non-Arabs, such as Ramazan, Fazl, and other words derived from the same root ; as ث *th*, subject to the same exception (as in the case of Osman). The sound of ع occurring in the middle with a *Fathha*, I have represented by two *a*'s (as in Jaafar) ; occurring in the beginning or end, or in the middle, with a *kasra* or *zamma*, as they are pronounced by non-Arabs, as in Omar, etc. In the use of the word Banu I have followed the Arabic rule, giving it as Banu when a nominative, and as Bani when a dative, ablative, etc.

CORRIGENDUM.

P. 96, line 13 for "jewelleries" *read* "jewellery."

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

—o—

PART I.

THE LIFE OF MOHAMMED.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGES

The continuity of religious development—Bactria (Balkh) supposed to be the original seat of the human race—Dispersion of the races—Fetishism and Pantheism—The Eastern and Western Aryans—The Assyrians—Babylon and the Jews—Hinduism—Zoroastrianism—Judaism—Christianity—Gnosticism—Manichæism—Degradation of the earlier creeds—The tribes of Arabia, their origin, their diversity of culture and religious conceptions—Idolatry among the Arabs—The folk-lore of Arabia—The advent of Mohammed—a necessity of religious development ... ... i-lix.

CHAPTER I.

Mecca, its foundation—Kossay, his descendants—Abdul Muttalib—The Meccan decemvirs—The Abyssinian invasion—The Era of the Elephant—The birth of Mohammed—Okâz—The depravity of the Arabs—Mohammed's marriage—Formation of the league of the Fuzul—Mohammed's designation of Al-Amîn—The period of probation, of communion, of inspiration—Commencement of the ministry—Persecution by the Koraish—Moral evidences of Mohammed's mission—Koraishite hostility—The Year of Mourning ... ... 1—37

CHAPTER II.

Visit to Tâyef—Ill-treatment—Return to Mecca—First Pledge of Akaba—Vision of the Ascension—Second pledge of Akaba—The Hegira ... ... 38—46

CHAPTER III.

PAGES

The Prophet at Medîna—Erection of the first mosque in Islâm —The preachings of Mohammed ... ... 47—51

CHAPTER IV.

Hostility of the Koraish and the Jews—Three parties in Medina ; Moslems, Munafikin, Jews—The charter of Mohammed—Attack by the Koraish—Battle of Badr—Victory of Islam—Ideas regarding angels in Islam and in Christianity ... ... 52—61

CHAPTER V.

Invasion of Medîna by the Koraish—Battle of Ohod—Defeat of the Moslems—Barbarities of the Koraish—Jewish treachery —The Banu-Kainukaa, their expulsion—The Banû Nadhîr, their banishment—Coalition against the Moslems—Beleaguerment of Medîna—Banu-Kuraizha, their defection—Success of the Moslems—Punishment of the Kuraizha ... 62—77

CHAPTER VI.

Mohammed's clemency—Charter granted to the monks of St. Catherine—Cruelty prohibited—Peace of Hudaiba—Mohammed's message to Heraclius and Parvîz—Murder of the Moslem envoy by the Christians ... ... 78—85

CHAPTER VII.

Continued hostility of the Jews—Expedition against Khaibar —The Jews sue for forgiveness—Pilgrimage of Accomplishment—Violation by the Meccans of the treaty of Hudaiba—Fall of Mecca—Treatment of the Meccans—Diffusion of the Faith ... ... 86—93

CHAPTER VIII.

Deputations to Medîna—Apprehension of a Greek invasion—Expedition to Tabûk—Conversion of Orwa—His martyrdom—The Banu Tay, their conversion—Adoption of the Faith by Kaab Ibn-Zuhair—His eulogium of the Prophet —Idolaters prohibited from visiting the Kaaba ... 94—101

CHAPTER IX.

PAGES

Fulfilment of Mohammed's work—His superiority over his predecessors—His appeal to reason—His Sermon on the Mount—Instructions to the governors—The false prophets—Last illness of Mohammed : his death, his character ... 102—113

PART II.

THE SPIRIT OF ISLÂM.

CHAPTER I.

Islâm, its signification—The ethical principles of Islâm—Idea of Godhead among the different religionists of the world—Mariolatry and Christolatry—Modern idealistic Christianity—Koranic conception of God—Primary aim of the new dispensation, its morality ... ... 117—137

CHAPTER II.

The religious spirit of Islâm—Its practical duties—Conception of prayer—Among the Mago-Zoroastrians and Sabeans—Jews—Christians—Islamic conception of prayer—Of moral purity—Institution of fasting—Of pilgrimage to Mecca—Their *raison d'etre*—Intoxication and gambling forbidden—Ethical code of Islam, its disciplinary rules—The Islam of Mohammed, its aims and aspirations—Faith and charity—Reprobation of hypocrisy and falsehood—No difference between true Christianity and true Islâm—Reason of their present divergence—Defects of modern Mahommedanism ... ... 138—165

Sumptuary regulations of Mohammed (note 1) ... ...

CHAPTER III.

The Church militant of Islâm—Its wars purely defensive—Toleration in Islam—Intolerance of the Jews, Christians, Mago-Zoroastrians, and Hindus—Islam opposed to isolation and exclusiveness—Wars of Islam after the Prophet—The capture of Jerusalem by the Moslems compared with its capture by the Crusaders ... ... 166—182

CHAPTER IV.

PA

The status of women in Islâm—Polygamy, its origin—Practised by all the nations of antiquity—Polygamy among the Christians—Opinion of St. Augustine and the German reformers —Polygamy among the Arabs and the Jews—Mohammed's regulations—Monogamy, result of development—Compatibility of Mohammed's regulation with every stage of development—Mohammed's marriages examined—Status of women in early Christianity—Conception of Jesus about marriage—Divorce among the Romans and the Jews—Among the Christians—Regulations of Mohammed on the subject—Concubinage forbidden—Custom of female seclusion—Idealisation of womanhood—Prophecy and chivalry, offspring of the desert—The women of Islam—Improvement effected by Mohammed in the status of women 183

CHAPTER V.

Slavery existed among all ancient nations—Position of slaves among the Romans and Jews—Slavery among the Christians—Regulations of Mohammed about slavery—Slavery abhorrent to Islâm 217

CHAPTER VI.

The idea of a future existence, result of development—The idea of future existence among the Egyptians, the Jews, the Zoroastrians —The Jewish belief in a personal Messiah —Real origin of this belief—Character of the Christian traditions—Strongly-developed idea of an immediate kingdom of heaven in the mind of Jesus and the early disciples—Paradise and hell, according to the traditional words of Jesus—The millenarian dream—How it has died away—The Islamic conception of a future existence—The parabolic character of many verses of the Koran—Progressive development a necessity of human nature—The Koranic conception of present and future happiness ... 227—241

PAGES

CHAPTER VII.

The political spirit of Islâm—Degraded condition of humanity at the time of the Prophet's advent—Serfdom and villeinage—Absence of human liberty and equality—Intolerance of Christianity—The Charter of Mohammed—The message of the Prophet to the Christians of Najran—The character of the early Republic—Administration of the Caliphs Abu Bakr and Omar—Equality of men inculcated by Islam—Spain under the Arabs—*Kitâb Târîkh-ud-dawal* ... 222—262

CHAPTER VIII.

The political divisions and schisms of Islâm—Owed their origin to clannic desert feuds, fostered by dynastic disputes—Osman's partiality for the Ommeyyades—His death—Accession of Ali—Revolt of Muawiyah—The battle of Siffîn—The arbitrament of Amr ibn-ul-Aas and Abu Musa al-Ashaarî—Assassination of Ali—The usurpation of Muawiyah—The butchery of Kerbela—The triumph of paganism—The sack of Medina—The rise of the Abbassides—The origin of the Sunni Church—Mamun—The question of the Imamate—Shiahism—Sunnïsm—The principal Shiah sects—The *Zaidias*—The *Ismailias*—The *Asnâ-Aasharias*—The Paulicians—The doctrine of Abdullah ibn-Maimun al-Kaddah—The Grand Lodge of Cairo—The assassins of Alamut—The Asna-Aasharias divided into *Usûlis* and *Akhbâris*, their respective doctrines—The Sunnis divided into *Hanafîs*, *Mâlikîs*, *Shâfeis*, *and Hanbalîs*—The *Khârijîs*—*Bâbism*—The *Ahl-uz-zâh ir*—The *Ahl-ul-Bâtin*. ... ... 263—336

CHAPTER IX.

The literary and scientific spirit of Islâm—The Arabian Prophet's devotion to knowledge and science—His precepts—The Caliph Ali's sayings—Learning and arts among the primitive Moslems—The school of Medina—Imam Jaafar as-Sâdik—The foundation of Bagdad—Al-Mansûr—Mâmûn, the Augustus of the Saracens—Al-Muiz li-dîn-illah—The *Dâr-ul-Hikmat* of Cairo—Astronomy and mathe-

PAGES

matics among the Arabs—Architecture—History—Poetry—The Koran—The intellectual achievements of the Moslems—Their present stagnation, its causes—The terrible destruction committed by the Tartars—The result of the Crusades—The Usbegs and Afghans—The Almohades. 331

CHAPTER X.

The rationalistic and philosophical spirit of Islâm—The Koranic teachings about free-will and divine government—Mohammed's sayings—The exposition of the Caliph Ali and of the early descendants of the Prophet—The *Jabarias* or predestinarians—The *Sifâtias*—The *Mutazalas*—Mutazalaism the same as the teachings of the philosophers of the family of the Prophet—Rationalism in Islam—The reign of Mamun—Philosophy among the Moslems—Avicenna and Averroes—The fall of rationalism and philosophy in Islam—Its causes—Mutawakkil—His alliance with patristicism—The triumph of patristicism—Abu'l Hassan Ali al-Ashaarî—His retrogressive teachings—Abu Hanïfa, Mâlik, Shafeï, and Ibn Hanbal—*Ilm-ul-Kalâm*—The Ikhwan us-Safa ("The Pure Brethren"), their teachings—Imâm al-Ghazzâlî—Sûfîsm 372

APPENDICES :— 421

INDEX OF NAMES 433

PART I.

THE LIFE OF MOHAMMED.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION.

———o———

ای که در هیچ جا نداري جا
بو العجب مانده ام که هر جائي

وصالي

کفر و دین هر دو در رهت پویان
وحده لا شریک له گویان

سنائي

THE continuity of religious progress among mankind is a subject of enthralling interest to the student of humanity. The gradual awakening of the human mind to the recognition of a Personality, of a Supreme Will overshadowing the universe; the travails through which individuals and races have passed before they arrived at the conception of an Universal Soul pervading, regulating, and guiding all existence,—furnish lessons of the deepest import. The process by which humanity has been lifted from the adoration of material objects to the worship of God, has often been retarded. Masses of mankind and individuals have broken away from the stream of progress, have listened to the promptings of their own desires, have given way to the cravings of their own hearts; they have gone back to the worship of their passions, symbolised in the idols of their infancy. But though unheard, the voice of God has always sounded the call to truth, and when the time has arrived His servants have risen to proclaim the duties of man to himself and his Creator. These men have been the veritable "messengers of Heaven." They came among their people as the children of their time; they represented the burning aspirations of the human soul for truth, purity, and justice. Each was an embodiment of the spiritual necessities of his

age; each came to purify, to reform, to elevate a degraded race, a corrupted commonwealth. Some came as teachers of a smaller culture, to influence a smaller sphere; others came with a world-wide message—a message not confined to one race or nation, but intended for all humanity. Such was Mohammed. His mission was not to the Arabs alone. He was not sent for one age or clime, but "for all mankind to the end of the world." The advent of this great Teacher, whose life from the moment of his Ministry is a verifiable record, was not a mere accident, an unconnected episode in the history of the world. The same causes, the same crying evils, the same earnest demand for an "assured trust" in an all-pervading Power, which led to the appearance on the shores ot Galilee, in the reign of Augustus Cæsar, of a Prophet whose life is a tragedy, operated with greater force in the seventh century of the Christian era. The beginning of the seventh century, as has been rightly said, was an epoch of disintegration—national, social, and religious: its phenomena were such as have always involved a fresh form of positive faith, to recall all wandering forces to the inevitable track of spiritual evolution towards the integration of personal worship. They all pointed to the necessity of a more organic revelation of divine government than that attained by Judaism or Christianity. The holy flames kindled by Zoroaster, Moses, and Jesus had been quenched in the blood of man. A corrupt Zoroastrianism, battling for centuries with a still more corrupt Christianity, had stifled the voice of humanity, and converted some of the happiest portions of the globe into a veritable Aceldama. Incessant war for supremacy, perpetual internecine strife, combined with the ceaseless wrangling of creeds and sects, had sucked the life-blood out of the hearts of nations, and the people of the earth, trodden under the iron heels of a lifeless sacerdotalism, were crying to God from the misdeeds of their masters. Never in the history of the world was the need so great, the time so ripe, for the appearance of a Deliverer. In order, therefore, to appreciate thoroughly the achievement of Mohammed in the moral world, it is necessary to take a rapid survey of the religious and social condition of the nations of the earth previous to, and about the time of, the Islâmic Dispensation.

The high table-land of Bactria, appropriately styled by Arab geographers *Umm ul-Bilâd*, or "mother of countries," is supposed to be the cradle of humanity, the original birth-place of creeds and

nations. Through the faint and shadowy light, which comparative ethnology throws on the infancy of mankind, we perceive groups of families congregated in this primeval home of the human race, gradually coalescing into clans and tribes, and then forced by the pressure of increasing population, issuing in successive waves to people the face of the globe. The Hamitic branch were apparently the first to leave their ancient habitations. They were followed by the Turanians, or as they are sometimes called, the Ugro-Finnish tribes, supposed to be an offshoot of the Japhetic family. Some of them apparently proceeded northwards, and then spreading themselves in the East, founded the present Mongolian branch of the human race. Another section proceeded westward and settled in Azarbaijan, Hamadan, and Ghilan, countries to the south and south-west of the Caspian, better known in ancient history as Media. A portion of these descending afterwards into the fertile plains of Babylonia, enslaved the earlier Hamitic colonies, and in course of time amalgamating with them, formed the Accadian nation, the Kushites of the Christian and Jewish Scriptures. This composite race created Babylon, and gave birth to a form of religion which, in its higher phases, was akin to natural pantheism. In its lower phases, with its pan-dæmonism, its worship of the sun-gods and moon-gods, closely associated with the phallic cult and the sexual instincts, the sacrifice of children to Baal and Moloch, of virginity to Beltis and Ashtoreth, it marks an epoch when high material civilisation was allied to gross licentiousness, and cruelty was sanctioned by religion.

The Semites were the next to leave the primeval home. They also, following in the footsteps of the Turanians, migrated towards the West, and apparently settled themselves in the northern part of the Mesopotamian Delta. Increasing in numbers and strength, they soon overthrew the Babylonian kingdom, and founded a far-reaching empire which wielded its sway over all the neighbouring states. In their seat of power between the two great rivers of Western Asia, the Assyrians at times rose to a positive monotheistic conception. Their system of celestial hierarchy furnish indications of a distinct recognition of one Supreme Personality.

Whilst the main body of the Semitic colony was developing itself in the upper parts of the Delta, a small section had penetrated far into a district called Ur, within the boundaries of the Chaldæan

monarchy.[1] The patriarch of this tribe, whose self-imposed exile and wanderings have passed into the religious legends of more than one creed, became the father of the future makers of history. [2]

The Japhetic family seems to have tarried longest in its ancient habitation. Whilst the other races, which had broken away from the original stock, were forming empires and evolving creeds, the Japhetic branch underwent a development peculiar to itself. But the march of nations once set on foot was never to cease; actuated by that spirit of unrest which works in barbarous tribes, or influenced by the pressure of population and the scarcity of space in their old haunts for the pursuit of their pastoral avocations, tribe after tribe moved away towards the West. Among the first were the Pelasgians and the Celts. Other tribes followed, until the Aryans proper were left alone in the old haunts. One section apparently had its abode near Badakhshan, the other towards Balkh proper, where for centuries they lived almost isolated from the neighbouring nations, unaffected by their wars or their movements. The light of history which has dawned on the Western races, the founders of kingdoms and civilisations, also falls upon these ancient dwellers of the earth, and reveals, though indistinctly and as through a mist, several clans gathered together on that plateau; just emerged from savageness into barbarism, they are becoming alive to the sense of an Universal Ideality. Innumerable idealities are taking the place of the natural objects, hitherto worshipped with fear and trembling. With some of them, the host of abstractions and personifications of the powers of nature are subordinated to two comprehensive principles—Light and Darkness. The sun, the bright harbinger of life and light, becomes the symbol of a beneficent Divinity, whose power, though held in check, is eventually to conquer the opposing principle of Evil and Darkness. With others, the idealities which they now impress on the fetish they worshipped before, merge in each other; at one time standing forth as distinct personal entities, at another time resolving themselves into a hylozoic whole. Gradually the clouds lift, and we see the tribal and clan-formations giving way to monarchical institutions; agriculture taking by slow degrees the place of pastoral

[1] Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, p. 23.

[2] In the Arabian traditions the father of Abraham is called Âzar, which is evidently the same as Asshur; and the beautiful idols of Âzar are frequently referred to in Moslem literature. These traditions confirm the belief that Abraham was an Assyrian.

avocations; primitive arts being cultivated: the use of metals gaining ground, and, above all, the higher conception of a Supreme Personality forcing itself upon the yet unopened mind. Kaiumurs, Hoshang, and the other old kings of whom Firdousi sings with such wondrous power, are types of an advancing civilisation. The introduction of the monarchical institutions among the Aryans proper, seems to be coeval with that religious conflict between the two branches of the Aryan family which led to the expulsion of the Eastern branch from their Bactrian home. A powerful religious revolution had been inaugurated among the Western Aryans by a teacher whose name has been preserved in the literature of his religion as Çitama Zarathustra. The sharp religious conflict, which resulted from this movement, has left its mark in the deep imprecations heaped by the Vedic hymn-singers on the enemy of their race and creed, the Djaradashti of the Vedas. The attitude of the Vedic hymn-singers towards the reformed faith, even more than the extraordinary coincidence in names, furnishes the strongest proof that the religious divergence was the immediate cause of the split between the two branches of the Aryans proper. In this, probably the first religious war waged among mankind, the Western dualistic clans were successful in driving their half-polytheistic, half-pantheistic brethern across the Paropamisadæ. The Eastern Aryans burst into India, driving before them the earlier black races, massacring and enslaving them, treating them always as inferior beings, Dasyus and Sudras, slaves and serfs. The difference between the Vedic and the Zoroastrian religions was, however, purely relative. Zoroastrianism substituted for the worship of the phenomena, the adoration of the cause. It converted the gods of the Vedas into demons and the deva-worshippers into infidels; whilst the Vedic hymn-singer, on his side, called the Ahura of the Avesta an evil god, an Asura, a power hostile to the gods, and heaped burning maledictions on the head of Djaradashti.

Whilst the place and time of the early Zoroaster's birth are enwrapt in mystery, under Darius Hystaspes arose another teacher, who, under the same name, revived, organised, and enlarged the basis of the ancient teachings.

Retracing our steps for a moment, we see the tide of Aryan conquest in India flowing eastward and southward for centuries. The Aryan colonies were naturally influenced by the fetishism of the races whom they conquered or among whom they settled, until at

last the revolting and inhuman Sakti worship[1] was produced on the one hand, and the degrading sensualism of Krishna on the other.

In the parts, however, which formed the core of the Aryan nation, the thoughts and feelings brought from their native home continued for ages to exercise an influence. But they, also, were to lose what remained. In the enjoyment of peace and plenty, separated from the energetic life of their brothers of the West, exposed to the voluptuous influences of a morbidly fertile imagination, and without possessing a system of positive morality embodied in effectual laws, the Aryan settlers soon lost the spiritual belief of their forefathers. In time they obtained a code; but it represented the ideas which prevailed in an age of great moral decadence and gross materialism.[2]

A revolt ensued, from revolutionary and negative instincts acting on a Hindu mind. But Buddhism, with all its grand aspirations, did not possess any pretension of being a positive religion. Essentially adapted to the recluse, it never acquired a tangible hold on the masses; and its failure under the most favourable circumstances sealed its fate in India as a religious system.

On the expulsion of Buddhism from Hindustan, Brahmanism regained its supremacy. The old Nature-worship was dead; its place was taken by a lifeless sacrificial cult. The ability of the ministering priest properly to perform the rites, rather than the conduct of the worshipper, supplied the test of merit. Among the masses, the demons of destruction and lust became the two favourite objects of adoration; and the revolting orgies of Ashtoreth and Moloch were enacted under other names and aspects. Prostitution was not only recognised, but honoured in the class of dancing girls, especially those attached to the temples for the service of the gods and their

1 The *Sakti* is the female half and active creative side of each Hindu deity. The *Sakti* or spouse of Siva is the dread goddess known under various names, such as Parbati, Kali, Durga, Chamunda. The worship of this goddess as described in the drama of Bhavabhuti, written apparently in the 7th century of the Christian era, was celebrated with human sacrifices and other revolting rites. Human sacrifice prevailed in the Vedic times also and was called *Purush-amedha.* The *Sakti* worship represented the complete abandonment of the Aryan mind to the dark superstitions of the pre-Aryan races. Primitive Sivaism was the unmixed cult of Priapus originating in the adoration offered by the denizens of the forests aud the hills to the generative powers of the universe figured in a symbolism which alone appealed to their mind.

2 Non-dualistic Vedantism, which unquestionably represents the highest form of religio-philosophical developement among the Hindus, was, I venture to think, connected with the grand upheaval in Western Asia originated by the Prophet of Arabia.

ministers. The family law admitted forms of marriage which are "only euphemisms for seduction and rape."[1] In the south, polyandry was universal; in the north, its practice was sanctified by the example of the heroes of antiquity. The relations between the sexes were marked by indescribable grossness. The condition of woman, during that vague and mythic period which passes under the name of the Vedic age, was not so favourable as some writers on India would fain represent to us now. In the "Epic times," she formed the prize in gambling and feats of athletics, and had to accept as many husbands as there were brothers in the family. But she arrived at the depth of degradation under Brahmanic domination. The contempt with which the Brahmanic legislator speaks of women, and the complete servitude to which he subjects them, are astonishing. "Women," says Manu, "have impure appetites; they show weak flexibility and bad conduct. Day and night must they be kept in subjection."[2]

Let us turn now to Persia—a country which, by its proximity to the birthplace of Islam, and the powerful influence it has always exercised on Mahommedan thought, not to speak of the character and tone it communicated to Christianity and Judaism, deserves our earnest attention.

Consolidated into a nation, and with a new spiritual development, the western Aryans soon burst their ancient bounds, and spread themselves over the regions of modern Persia and Afghanistan. They appear to have conquered or destroyed most of the Hamitic and Cushite races inhabiting those tracts, and gradually reached the confines of the Caspian, where they found the more tenacious and hardy Turanians settled in Media and Susiana. Before, however, they had succeeded in subjugating the Turanians, they themselves fell under the yoke of a foreign invader, Cushite or Assyrian, more probably the latter, under whose iron sway they remained for a considerable time.[3] With the

1 Mayne's *Hindu Law.*

2 The rite of initiation by thich the men of the three Aryan castes obtained a "second birth" was denied to women along with the Sudras. In later ages they must have lost further ground, for women have no place in the scheme of salvation propounded by the Vedantic philosophy.

3 According to the Persian traditions, Zuhhak ruled over Iran for over a 1000 years, and this is supposed by several scholars to represent the exact period of Assyrian domination. The rise of Farîdun would, according to this view, be synchronous with the downfall of Nineveh.

expulsion of the foreigners commenced that conflict between Irân and Turan which lasted with varying fortunes for centuries, and ended with the partial subjugation of the Turanians in Media and Susiana.[1] The frequent contact of the followers of Afrasiab and Kai-Kaus in the field and the hall exercised a lasting effect on the Persic faith. The extreme materialism of the Turanians did not fail to degrade the yet undeveloped idealism of their Iranian rivals and neighbours, who, whilst they succeeded in superimposing themselves on the ancient settlers of Media, had partially to incorporate Turanian worship with their own. And thus, whilst in Persia, Ormuzd alone was adored and Ahriman held up to execration, in Media, the good and the evil principle were both adored at the altars. Naturally the Turanian population was more inclined to worship their ancient national god than the deity of their Aryan conquerors; and in the popular worship, Ahriman, or Afrasiab, took precedence of Ormuzd.

The Assyrian empire had fallen before a coalition, the first of its kind known in history, of the Medes and the Babylonians, but the religion of Asshur, from its long domination over many of the parts occupied by the Aryans, left an ineffaceable mark on the conception of the Zoroastrians. The complex system of celestial co-ordination, the idea of a divine hierarchy prevalent among the Assyrians, engrafted itself on Zoroastrianism. Ormuzd was henceforth worshipped as a second Asshur; and the Persian's symbol of the God of light, the all-beneficent power, became a winged warrior, with bow and lifted hand, enclosed in the world-circle. Their symbol of growth also, the tree with the candelabra branches ending upwards in the pine-cone, was converted into the Persian fir-cone. Before the rise of Cyrus in Farsistan and his consolidating conquests, the symbolic worship in vogue among the early emigrants and settlers became degraded among the masses into pyrolatry, or took the form of Chaldæo-Assyrian Sabæism.

The city of Asshur,—which had ruled Western Asia up to the confines of India for nearly a thousand years, and almost wrested from the Pharaohs the empire of Egypt,—the city of the mighty Sargon and the great Sennacherib, had fallen before the combined

[1] Lenormant, *Ancient Hist. of the East*, p. 54.

forces of the Babylonian and the Mede,[1] never again to raise its head among the nations of the world. Babylon, which after its early rivalry with Nineveh had been reduced to a dependency of Assyria, became again the centre of Asiatic civilisation. She gathered up the arts and sciences of a thousand years of growth, and the product of "interfused races and religions, temples and priesthoods," and supplied the connecting link between the inorganic faiths of antiquity and the modern beliefs. Assyria had, with the civilisation and literature of the early Accadians, also borrowed much of their religion. Babylon, rising into more potent grandeur from the ashes of Nineveh, centred in herself the essence of the Assyrian and Chaldæan cults. Under Nebuchadnezzar II. the empire of Babylonia attained the zenith of its power; Judæa fell, and the flower of the nation was carried into captivity to lament by the waters of Babylon the downfall of the kingdom of Jehovah. The mighty conqueror penetrated into Arabia, and overwhelmed and nearly destroyed the Ishmaelites;[2] he smote the Tyrians, and broke the power of the Egyptian Pharaoh. In spite of the maledictions heaped upon her head by the Hebrew patriot, Babylon was by no means such a hard taskmaster as Egypt. The Israelites themselves bear testimony to the generosity of their treatment. Not until the redeemer was nigh with his mighty hosts, marching to the conquest of the doomed city, did the children of Israel raise their voice against Babylon. Then burst forth the storm of imprecations, of predictions of woe which displayed the characteristics of the race in its pristine savagery. "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept when we remembered Zion. O Daughter of Babylon! happy shall he be who dasheth thy little ones against the stones."[3]

Under Nebuchadnezzar, Babylon was indisputably the centre of all existing civilisations. And the influence wielded by her priesthood did not cease with the empire of Babylonia. The mark of the Babylonian conceptions is traced in unmistakable characters in both the Judaical and Christian systems. The long exile of the Jews among the Chaldæan priesthood, the influence which some of the Hebrews obtained in the court of the Babylonian king, and the

[1] 606 B.C.

[2] Jer. xlix. 27 to 29.

[3] Ps. cxxxvii.

unavoidable interfusion of the two peoples, tended to impart a new character to later Judaism. They were carried to Babylon in a state of semi-barbarism; they returned to Zion after their long probation in the land of exile a new people, advanced in faith and doctrine, with larger aspirations and their political vision extended.[1]

With the conquest of Babylon begins a new era in religious development. Henceforth the religion of dualism wields the empire of Asia. The grand toleration which Cyrus extended towards the Jews naturally led to his exaltation as "the Messiah," "the Redeemer," "the anointed Saviour of the world." The captivity of the Hebraic tribes, and their enforced settlement near the seat of Persian domination, and their subsequent intermixture under Cyrus with the Persians, most probably gave impetus to that religious reform among the Zoroastrians which occurred during the reign of Darius Hystaspes. There was mutual action and reaction. The Israelites impressed on renovated Zoroastrianism a deep and abiding conception of a Divine Personality overshadowing the universe. They received from the Iranians the notion of a celestial hierarchy, and the idea of a duality of principles in the creation of good and evil. Henceforth it is not the Lord who puts a lying spirit into the mouths of evil-dooers; Satan, like Ahriman, from this time takes a prominent part in the religious and moral history of the Hebrews.

The reign of Cyrus was one of conquest, hardly of organisation. The reign of Darius was one of consolidation; stern worshipper of Ormuzd, to whom he ascribes all his victories, he endeavoured to purify the faith of Zoroaster of all its foreign excrescences, to stamp out the Magism of the Medes from its stronghold, and to leave Aryan Persia the dominant power of the civilized world. Nothing, however, could arrest the process of decay. Before a hundred years had gone by, Zoroastrianism had imbibed to the full the evils which it had fought against in its infancy. The scourgers of idolatry, the uncompromising iconoclasts, who, in their fiery zeal, had slaughtered the Egyptian Apis and overturned its shrine, soon absorbed into the worship of Ormuzd the Semitic gods of their subject states. The old Magian element-worship was revived, and Artaxerxes Mnemon, one of the immediate successors of Darius, introduced among the Zoroastrians the worship of that

[1] Johnson's *Oriental Religions, in loco.*

androgynous Mythra—the Persian counterpart of the Chaldæan Mylitta or Anaitis, with its concomitant phallic cult. It was impossible for Zoroastrianism to escape or avoid the magic influence of the ancient civilisations. The old religions furnished to the Persians the form which later Zoroastrianism presents to the student of history.

Never was the condition of woman so bad, never was she held under greater subjection,—a slave to the caprice of man,—than under the Mago-Zoroastrians. The laws of Manu imposed certain rules of chastity, and the stringency of primitive exogamy exercised a restraining effect upon human passions. The Persian in the relations of the sexes recognised no law but that of his own will. He could marry his nearest kindred, and divorce his wives at his pleasure. The system of female seclusion was not confined to the Persians alone. Among the Ionic Greeks, women were confined within the *gynaikonitis*, often kept under lock and key, and never allowed to appear in public. But the Greek *gynaikonomoi* were not, until later times, mutilated specimens of humanity. In Persia, the custom of employing eunuchs to guard the women prevailed from the remotest antiquity. As in Greece, concubinage was a recognised social institution, and was interwoven with the foundations of society. The Persian, however, never allowed lewdness to be incorporated with the national worship. He worshipped no Aphrodite Pandemos; nor was Zoroastrian society tainted with that "moral pestilence,"[1] the most degrading of all vices, which was universal in Greece, which spread itself afterwards in Rome, and was not even rooted out by Christianity.

With the downfall of the Achæmenian empire ended the vitality of Zoroastrianism as a motive power in the growth of the world. The swarms of conquerors, who swept like whirlwinds over the face of Persia, destroyed all social and moral life. The Macedonian conquest, with the motley hordes which followed on its footsteps, the influx of all the dregs of Lesser Asia, Cilicians, Tyrians, Pamphylians, and various others, half Greeks, half Asians, obeying no moral law, the hasty and reckless temper of the conqueror himself,—all led to the debasement of the Zoroastrian faith. The Mobeds, the representatives of the national life, were placed under the ban

1 Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii. p. 239.

of persecution by the foreigner, the aim of whose life was to hellenise Asia.

Alexander's career was splendidly meteoric. Shorn of the legends which have surrounded his life and turned it into an epopee, he stands before us a man of gigantic conceptions and masterly purposes, possessed of a towering ambition, a genius which overpowered all opposition, and a personality which enabled him to mould the minds of all around him according to his own will. His was a nature full of contradictions. A disciple of Aristotle, who aimed at the hellenisation of Asia, with himself as the central figure in the adoration of the world, an associate of philosophers and wise men, his life was disgraced by excesses of a revolting type. "The sack of Tyre and the enslavement of its population, the massacres and executions in India and Bactria, the homicide of Clytus, the death warrants of Philotas and the faithful Parmenio, the burning of Persepolis and the conflagration of its splendid libraryat the instigation of a courtezan, are acts," says an apologist and an admirer, "for which no historian has found a palliation." With the conquest of Alexander and the extinction of the Achæmenian dynasty, Zoroastrianism gave way to Hellenism and the worst traditions of Chaldæan civilisation. The extreme partiality of the hero of many legends towards Babylon, and his anxious desire to resuscitate that city and make it the centre of a mightier and more complete civilisation, led him to discourage all creeds and faiths, all organisations, religious or political, which militated with his one great desire. Under the Seleucidæ, the process of denationalisation went on apace. Antiochus Epiphanes, the cruel persecutor of the worshippers of Jehovah, won for himself from them as well as the Zoroastrians, the unenviable designation of Ahriman. Even the rise of the Parthian power tended to accelerate the decline and ruin of Zoroastrianism. The Seleucidæ ruled on the Tigris and the Orontes; the Parthians formed for themselves a kingdom in the middle portion of the Achæmenian empire; the Græco-Bactrian dynasties were in possession of the eastern tracts, viz. Bactria and the nothern part of Afghanistan. The state-religion of the Seleucidæ was a mixture of Chaldæo-Hellenism. The Jews and Zoroastrians were placed under the ban and ostracised. Under the Parthians, Mazdism, though not actually extinguished, was compelled to hide itself from the gaze of the rulers. In quiet and settled parts, Zoroastrianism became mixed

with the old Sabæism of the Medes and the Chaldæans; or, where kept alive in its pristine character, it was confined to the hearts of some of those priests who had taken refuge in the inaccessible recesses of their country. But with Parthia enlarged into an empire, and the Parthian sovereigns aspiring to the title of Shah-in-shah, persecution gave way to toleration, and Mago-Zoroastrianism again raised its head among the religions of the world. And the rise of the Sassanides gave it another spell of power. The founder of the new empire placed the Mobeds at the head of the State. Last sad representatives of a dying faith! Around them clustered the hopes of a renovated religious existence under the auspices of the Sassanide dynasty. How far the brilliant aspirations of Ardeshir Babekan (Artaxerxes Longimanus), the founder of the new empire, were realised, is a matter of history. The political autonomy of Persia—its national life—was restored, but the social and religious life was lost beyond the power of rulers to restore. The teachings of yore lived perhaps in books, but in the hearts of the people they were as dead as old Gushtasp or Rustam.

Under the Sassanides, the Zoroastrians attained the zenith of their power. For centuries they competed with Rome for the empire of Asia. Time after time they defeated her armies, sacked her cities, carried away her Cæsars into captivity. and despoiled her subjects of their accumulated riches; but the fire of Zoroastrianism was extinct. It burnt upon the high altars of the temples, but it had died out from the heart of the nation. The worship of the true God had given place to a Chaldæo-Magian cult, and the fierce intolerance with which Ardeshir and his successors persecuted rival creeds, failed to achieve its purpose. The Persian empire, under the later Sassanides, only rivalled in the turmoil of its sects and the licentiousness of its sovereigns, in the degeneration of its aristocracy and the overweening pride of its priesthood, the empire of the Byzantines. The kings were gods; they were absolute masters over the person and property of their subjects, who possessed no rights, and were virtual serfs. The climax of depravation was reached when Mazdak, in the beginning of the sixth century of the Christian era, bade all men to be partners in riches and women, "just as they are in fire, water, and grass; private property was not to exist; each man was to enjoy or endure the good and bad lots of this world."[1] The lawfulness of

[1] The *Dabistân-i-Mazâhib* of Mohsin Fâni.

marriages with sisters and other blood relations had already been recognised by Mago-Zoroastrianism. The proclamation of this frightful communism revolted some of the nobler minds even anomg the Persians. The successor of Zoroaster, as Mazdak styled himself, was put to death; but his doctrines had taken root, and from Persia they spread over the West.

All these evils betokened a frightful depravation of moral life, and foreshadowed the speedy extinction of the nation in its own iniquities. This doom, though staved off for a time by the personal character of Kesra Anushirvan, became inevitable after his death. But a Master had already appeared, destined to change the whole aspect of the world!

Eleven centuries had passed over the Jews since their return from the Babylonian captivity, and witnessed many changes in their fortunes. The series of disasters which one after another had befallen the doomed nation of Moses, had culminated in the wars of Titus and Hadrian. Pagan Rome had destroyed their temple, and stamped out in fire and blood their existence as a nation. Christian Constantinople persecuted them with an equally relentless fury, but the misfortunes of the past had no lessons for them in the future. Their own sufferings at the hands of ruthless persecutors had failed to teach them the value of humanity and peace. The atrocious cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyprus and Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous harmony with the unsuspecting natives, are terribly revolting. The house of Israel was a total wreck; its members were fugitives on the face of the earth, seeking shelter far and wide, but carrying everywhere their indomitable pride, their rebellious hardness of heart, denounced and reprehended by an endless succession of prophets. The Jews, in their safe retreats in foreign lands, re-enacted the scenes of past times. The nation lived in hope, but the hope was mixed with rigid uncompromising bigotry on the one hand, and a voluptuous epicureanism on the other. Jesus had come and gone, without producing any visible effect upon them. The child of his age, he was imbued with the Messianic ideas floating in the atmosphere in which he lived and moved. The Book of Daniel, written during one of the greatest travails of the nation, with its hopes and aspirations, could not but make a deep impression on the mind of the Teacher mourning over the sight of his stricken people. The fierce intoler-

ance of the Zealots seated in their mountain homes, the lifeless ceremonialism of the Sadducees, the half-hearted liberalism of the Pharisees, the dreamy hopefulness of the Essenes, with one hand extended towards Alexandria and the other towards Buddhistic India, the preachings and denunciations of the wild Dervish, whose life became a sacrifice to the depravity of the Herodian court, all appealed to the heart of Jesus. But the Eagle's talons were clutched on the heart of Judæa and its legions crushed out all hope of a violent change. The quietism of Jesus, and his earnest anticipation of a kingdom of heaven, to be ushered in by the direct instrumentality of God, were the outcome of his age. Among a nation of furious and relentless bigots, he had come as the messenger of universal brotherhood and love. In the midst of a proud and exclusive race, he trod the paths of humility and meekness; kind and gentle to his immediate followers, devoted to the cause of all, he left behind him the impress of an elevated, self-denying spirit. Among the powel, rfuthe rich, and the ruling classes, he had roused only feelings of hatred, fear, and opposition; among the poor, the despised, the ignorant and the oppressed, the deep compassion of the great Teacher had awakened sentiments of gratitude and love. One bright sunny morning he had entered the stronghold of Jewish fanaticism full of hope in his ministry as the promised Messiah; before a fortnight had run out, he was sacrificed to the vested interests of his day.

Amidst the legends which surround his life, so much at least is clear. Born among the poor, his preachings were addressed to the poor. Deeply versed in the Rabbinical lore, his short ministry was devoted almost exclusively to the humble denizens of the country side—the proverty-stricken peasantry and the fishermen of Galilee. His disciples were poor, ignorant folk. In spite of their credulous natures, and the vivid—not to say weird—effect exercised on their imaginations by the untimely disappearance of the Master, they never regarded him as anything more than a man. It was not until Paul adopted the creed of him at whose execution he had presided, that the idea of an incarnate God or angel was introduced into Christianity. In spite of the promise attached to the "effusion of the Holy Ghost," "it was found necessary," says the historian of Ecclesiasticism, "that there should be some one defender of the gospel who, who versed in the learned arts, might be able to combat the Jewish doctors and the pagan philosophers with their own arms.

For this purpose Jesus himself, by an extraordinary voice from heaven, had called to his service a thirteenth apostle, whose name was Saul (afterwards Paul), and whose acquaintance both with Jewish and Grecian learning was very considerable."[1]

The Mago-Zoroastrian believed in an angel-deliverer, in the Surûsh who was to appear from the East; the Buddhist, in an incarnate God born of a virgin; the Alexandrian mystic inculcated the doctrine of the Logos and the Demiurge. The esoteric conceptions regarding the birth, death, and resurrection of Osiris, the idea of the Isis-Ceres, the virgin mother "holding in her arms the new-born sun-god Horus,"[2] were in vogue both in Egypt and Syria. And Paul, the Pharisee and the scholar, was deeply imbued with these half-mystical, half-philosophical notions of his time. A visionary and enthusiast by nature, not free from physical ailments, as Strauss suggests, he, who had never come in actual contact with the great Master, was easily inclined to attach to him the attributes of a Divinity—of an Angel Incarnate. He infused into the simple teachings of his Master the most mysterious principles of Neo-Pythagoreanism, with its doctrine of intelligences and its notion of the triad, borrowed from the far East.

The jealousy between the home and the foreign, the Judaical and the anti-Judaical party, was shown in the curious though well-known antipathy of the two apostles, Peter and Paul.[3] The Ebionites most probably represented the beliefs of the original companions of the Prophet of Nazareth. He had conversed with them familiarly, and "in all the actions of rational and animal life" had appeared to them as of the same nature as themselves. They had marked him grow from infancy to youth and from youth to manhood; they had seen him increase in stature and wisdom. Their belief was tempered by their knowledge of him as a man. The depravation of ideas from this original faith, through various intermediate phases like those of the Docetes, the Marcionites, the Patripassians,[4] and various others

1 Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 63.

2 Mr. Ernest de Bunsen's Essay on Mohammed's Place in the Church, *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, April 1889.

3 Milner, *Hist. of the Church of Christ*, vol. i. pp. 26, 27.

4 The Docetes believed Jesus to be a pure God. The Marcionites regarded him as a being "most like unto God, even his Son Jesus Christ, clothed with a certain shadowy resemblance of a body, that he might thus be visible to mortal eyes." The Patripassians believed that the Father suffered with the Son on the cross (Mosheim and Gibbon, *in loco*; aud Neander, vol. ii. pp. 150, 301 et seq).

down to the decisions of the Council of Nice in 328, forms a continuous chain. The prevalent belief in æons and emanations predisposed all classes of people, especially those who had never beheld the Prophet, observed his humanity, or noted his everyday life, to accept his divinity without any question.

Several causes had assisted in the diffusion of the Christian faith before the accession of Constantine: the utter disorganisation of paganism, the absence of any hierarchy interested in the maintenance of an order which was fast falling to pieces; the unsatisfying character of its rites and ceremonies; above all, the growth of the various schools of philosophy, rendered the progress of Christianity both easy and rapid. In its higher phases the religion of Jesus appealed to the nobler instincts of mankind. It brought solace and comfort to the down-trodden; and whilst the dogmatism of its preachers silenced questioning minds, it satisfied the yearnings of those who, fleeing from the indecencies of the olden cults, hungered for a purer life; even the persecutions to which they were sometimes subjected added to their prestige in the minds of the masses, and by attaching to their leaders the halo of martyrdom, gave an impetus to the cause.

The early cessation of the ministry of Jesus and the absence of any organic teaching, whilst it allowed a freer scope to imagination, perhaps "a freer latitude of faith and practice,"[1] as shown in the lives of even the early Christians, furnished an open ground for contending factions to dispute not only about doctrines and discipline, but also as to the nature of their Teacher. The expulsion of the Jews and the Christians from Jerusalem, which abounded in so many traditions relating to the humanity of Jesus; the intermixture of the latter with the non-Judaic people who surrounded them on all sides, and among whom the Neo-Pythagorean or Platonic ideas as to the government of the universe were more or less prevalent; the very vagueness which surrounded the figure of Jesus in the conception of his followers,—soon gave birth to an infinite variety of doctrines and sects. And age after age everything human, "everthing not purely ideal, was smoothed away from the adored image of an incarnate God," the essentially pathetic history of Jesus was converted into a "fairy

[1] Mosheim, p. 121.

tale," and his life so surrounded with myths that it is now impossible for us to know "what he really was and did."

The fantastic shapes assumed by Christianity in the centuries which preceded the advent of Mohammed are alike amusing and instructive.

The Gnostic doctrines, which were absolutely in conflict with the notions of the Judaic Christians, are supposed to have been promulgated towards the end of the first century, almost simultaneously with the capture and destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian. Cerinthus, the most prominent of the Gnostic teachers in this century, inculcated among his followers the dual worship of the Father and the Son, whom he supposed to be totally distinct from the man Jesus, "the creator of the world."

The narrowness of Pauline Christianity, and its futile endeavours to reconcile its doctrines with the philosophy of the Alexandrian schools, gave birth about the same time to the Neo-Platonic eclecticism of Ammonius Saccas, adopted afterwards by Origen and other leading Christians. This versatile writer, whose impress is visible in the writings of almost all the prominent thinkers of Christendom in the earlier centuries, endeavoured to bring about a general concordance among all the existing creeds and sects. In some respects, Ammonius was the prototype of Mani, or Manes, and was undoubtedly above the level of his contemporaries. He succeeded in forming a school, but his teachings never regulated the morals or influenced the faith of a community,

The second century of the Christian era was ushered in strife and disorder. Divisions and heresies were rife throughout the Christian Church. Gnosticism was in great force, and left its character indelibly impressed on Christianity. Some of the sects which came into prominence in this century deserve a passing notice, as they show not only the evils which flowed from the crude teachings of the Church, but also the influence exercised upon Christianity by Zoroastrianism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, and the ancient Sabæism of the Chaldæans.

The Marcionites, who were perhaps the most important of the early Gnostics, believed in the existence of two principles, the one perfectly good and the other perfectly evil. Between these there existed the Demiurge, an intermediate kind of deity, neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature, who administered

rewards and inflicted punishments. The Demiurge was, according to the Marcionite doctrines, the creator of this inferior world, and engaged in perpetual conflict with the Principle of Evil,—mark the impress of the Zoroastrian ideas! The Supreme Principle, in order to terminate this warfare and to deliver from their bondage the human souls, whose origin is celestial and divine, sent to the Jews, "a being most like unto Himself, even His Son Jesus Christ," clothed with a certain shadowy resemblance of a body, that thus he might be visible to mortal eyes. The commission to this celestial messenger was to destroy the empire, both of the Evil Principle and of the Author of this world, and to bring back wandering souls to God. "On this account he was attacked with inexpressible violence and fury by the Principle of Evil" and by the Demiurge, but without effect, since, having a body only in appearance, he was thereby rendered incapable of suffering.

The Valentinians, whose influence was more lasting, taught that "the supreme God permitted Jesus, His Son, to descend from the upper regions to purge mankind of all the evils into which they had fallen, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and aerial body." The Valentinians believed Jesus to be an emanation from the Divine Essence come upon earth to destroy the dominion of the Prince of Darkness.

The Ophites, who flourished in Egypt, entertained the same notions as the other Egyptian Gnostics concerning the æons, the eternity of matter, the creation of the world in opposition to the will of God, the tyranny of the Demiurge, and "the divine Christ united to the man Jesus in order to destroy the empire of this usurper." They also maintained that the serpent, by which Adam and Eve were deceived, was either Christ himself, or Sophia, disguised as a serpent.

Whilst the Gnostic creeds were springing into existence under the the influence of Chaldæan philosophy, the Greeks on their side endeavoured to bring about a certain harmony between the Pauline doctrine concerning "the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, and the two natures united in Christ," and their own philosophical views as to the government of the world. Praxeus was the first of these sophistical preachers of Christianity, and he set the ball rolling by denying any real distinction between the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and maintained that the Father was so intimately united with

the man Christ, His Son, that He suffered with him the anguish of an afflicted life, and the torments of an ignominious death!

"These sects," says Mosheim, "were the offspring of philosophy. A worse evil was to befall the Christian Church in the person of Montanus, a native of Phrygia." This man, who disdained all knowledge and learning, proclaimed himself the Paraclete promised by Jesus. He soon succeeded in attaching to himself a large body of followers, the most famous of whom were Priscilla and Maximilla, the prophetesses, "ladies more remarkable for their opulence than for their virtue." They turned Northern Asia into a slaughter-house, and by their insensate fury inflicted terrible sufferings on the human race.

Whilst the Marcionites, Valentinians, Montanists, and the other Gnostic sects were endeavouring to spread their doctrines throughout the empire of Rome, there arose in Persia a man whose individuality has impressed itself in ineffaceable characters on the philosophy of two continents. Mani was, to all accounts, the most perfect embodiment of the culture of his age. He was an astronomer, a physicist, a musician, and an artist of eminence. The stories relating to his art-gallery[1] have passed into a proverb.

Throughly acquainted with the Jewish Cabbala and the teachings of the Gnostic masters, imbued with the ancient philosophy and mysticism of the East, a Magi by birth and Christian by education, he rose in revolt against the jarring discord which surrounded him on all sides, and set himself to the task of creating, from the chaos of beliefs, an eclectic faith which would satisfy all demands, the aspirations of all hearts. The audacity with which Mani applied himself to undermine the current faiths by an outward profession, joined to a subtle criticism, which destroyed all foundations of belief in the neophyte,—a process afterwards imitated by his congeners, the Ismailias,[2]—and his assertion, like the Batinias, of an esoteric insight into all religious doctrines, armed against him every creed and sect; and naturally, wherever he or his disciples appeared, they were persecuted with unparalleled ferocity.

The doctrine of Mâni was a fantastic mixture of the tenets of Christianity with the ancient philosophy of the Persians and the

[1] *Arzang-i-Mâni.*
[2] See *post*, chap. xviii.

Chaldæans. According to him, Matter and Mind are engaged in perpetual strife with each other. In the course of this conflict human beings were created by the Principle of Matter endowed with two natures, one divine, the other material, the former being a part of the light or spirit which had been filched from heaven. In order to release the struggling divine soul from the prison in which it was confined, the Supreme God sent from the solar regions an Entity created from His own substance—which was called Christ. Christ accordingly appeared among the Jews clothed with the shadowy form of a humam body, and during his ministry taught mortals how to disengage the rational soul from the corrupt body—to conquer the violence of malignant matter. The Prince of Darkness having incited the Jews to put him to death, he was apparently, but not in reality, crucified. On the contrary, having fulfilled his mission, he returned to his throne in the sun.

The Manichæan Christ thus could neither eat, drink, suffer, nor die; he was not even an incarnate God, but an illusory phantasm—"the all-pervading light-element imprisoned in nature, striving to escape matter, without assuming its forms." However blasphemous and irrational these doctrines may seem, they appear hardly more so to us than the doctrine of transubstantiation, recognised by so many Christians, the changing of the eucharistic elements into the actual flesh and blood of the Deity.

Manes divided his disciples into two classes; one, the "elect," and the other, the "hearers." The "elect" were compelled to submit to a rigorous abstinence from all animal food and intoxicating drink, to abjure wedlock and all gratifications of the senses. The discipline appointed for the "hearers" was of a milder kind. They were allowed to possess houses, lands, and wealth, to feed upon flesh, to enter into the bonds of conjugal relationship; but this liberty was granted them with many limitations, and under the strictest conditions of moderation and temperance.

Manes, or Mâni, was put to death by Bahrâm-Gur, but his doctrines passed into Christianity and were visible in all the struggles which rent the Church in later times.

About the middle of the third century arose the sect of the Sabellians, which marked a new departure in the religion of Jesus. They regarded Jesus as only a man, and believed that a certain energy proceeding from the Supreme Father had united itself with

the man Jesus, thus constituting him the son of God. This peculiar doctrine, which Gibbon regards as an approach to Unitarianism, was the cause of serious disorders in the Christian Church, and led to the promulgation in the early part of the fourth century, by Origen, of the doctrine of three distinct personalities in the Godhead. Tritheism was only a modification of the ancient paganism suited to the character of the people who had adopted the creed of Jesus. Polytheism was ingrained in their nature, and tritheism was a compromise between the teachings of Jesus and the ancient worship of a number of personalities. In the course of time, tritheism merged into the doctrine of the trinity, but not before it had given birth to the most philosophic sect of Christianity.[1]

The rise of Arianism is due principally to the revolt of the human intellect from the irrational teachings of the Church. In Alexandria, which was at that time the most fanatical of Christian cities, Arius had the boldness to preach, in opposition to his own bishop, that Christ was not of the same essence with God. Arianism soon spread itself in Egypt and Northern Africa, and in spite of violent and frequent persecution, kept its hold in these parts as well as Spain until his followers were taken into the fold of Islam.

The troubles generated by the schism of Arius induced Constantine, in A. C. 325, to assemble the Council of Nice, in Bithynia. In this general council, after many violent efforts on both sides, the doctrine of Arius was condemned, and "Christ was declared consubstantial with the Father."[2] Whatever may have been the condition of the Christian Church before, henceforth its history presents a eonstant and deplorable record of trouble and violence, of internecine strife and wrangling, of fearful and cruel persecutions, of bitter hatred and a perpetual endeavour to crush out reason and justice from the minds of men. The vices of the regular clergy assumed monstrous proportions, and the luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness of the sacerdotal order became the subject of complaint on all sides. The asceticism of the early times had given place to monasticism, and the licentiousness of the monks became a byword. They were the free lance of the Church,—always foremost in fomenting tumults and seditions, and the streets of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Rome frequently ran with blood in consequence of their unruliness and turbulence.

[1] Mosheim, p. 411. [2] Gibbon, vol. iv. 307.

The disputes of Nestorius with Cyril, the murderer of Hypatia, forms a prominent chapter in the history of Christianity. The second Council of Ephesus was convoked partly with the object of conciliating the various parties which had sprung up in the Church; but "the despotism of the Alexandrian Patriarch," says Gibbon, "again oppressed the freedom of debate. The heresy of the two natures was formally condemned. 'May those who divide Christ, be divided with the sword.' 'May they be hewn in pieces.' 'May they be burned alive!' were the charitable wishes of a Christian synod."

At the Council of Chalcedon, which was convened at the instance of the Bishop of Rome, the doctrine of the incarnation of Christ in one person but in two natures was definitely settled.

The Monophysites and Nestorians, revolting from the doctrine of incarnation, endeavoured to make a stand against the decree of Chalcedon. But they succumbed under the furious onslaught of the orthodox, who had succeeded in solving the mystery of their Teacher's nature. Jerusalem was occupied by an army of monks; in the name of one incarnate nature they pillaged, they murdered; the sepulchre of Christ was defiled with blood. The Alexandrian Christians, who had murdered a woman, did not hesitate to massacre their Patriarch in the baptistery, committing his mangled corpse to the flames and his ashes to the wind.

About the middle of the sixth century the drooping fortunes of the Monophysites revived under the guidance of one of their leaders, Jacob, bishop of Edessa. Under him and his successor they acquired overwhelming predominance in the Eastern empire, and by their unrelenting persecution of the Nestorians and their bitter quarrels with the orthodox or the Chalcedonians, plunged the Christian Church into internecine warfare and bloodshed. To a non-Christian, the doctrines of the Monophysites, who taught that "the divine and human nature of Christ were so founded as to form only one nature, yet without any change, confusion, or mixture of the two natures," seem to be in no way different from those laid down by the Council of Chalcedon. And yet this distinction without a difference was the cause of untold misery to a large number of the human race. At last, in 630 A. C., Heraclius tried to allay the disorders by starting a new sect, that of the Monothelites, whose doctrines were no less monstrous and fantastical. The Monothelites maintained that "Christ was both perfect God and perfect man, and that in him

were two distinct natures so united as to cause no mixture or confusion, but to form by their union only one person." Instead, however, of bringing peace into the bosom of the Church of Jesus, the rise of this sect intensified the evil; and Western Asia, Northern Africa, and various parts of Europe continued to be the scene of massacres and murders and every kind of outrage in the name of Christ.

Such was the religious condition of Christendom during the centuries which preceded the advent of Islâm.

With the apparent conversion of Constantine, Christianity became the dominant power in the Roman empire. The fate of paganism was sealed. Its downfall, though staved off for a time by the greatest and most sincere of the Roman emperors, had become inevitable. "After the extinction of paganism," says Gibbon, "the Christians, in peace and piety, might have enjoyed their solitary triumph. But the principle of discord was alive in their bosom, and they were more solicitous to explore the nature than to practise the laws of their founder." The whole of Christian Europe was immersed in absolute darkness, and the Church of Jesus was rent with schisms and heresies. The religious conception of the masses had not advanced beyond the pagan stage; the souls of the dead were worshipped in numbers, and the images of those who were honoured in life were objects of adoration. Relic and saint worship had become universal, Christianity had reverted to heathenism.

The social and political condition of the nations subject to the sway of Christianity was equally deplorable. Liberty of thought and freedom of judgment were crushed out from among mankind. And the reign of Christ was celebrated by the sacrifice of heretics who ventured to differ from any idea which predominated for the time.

In the streets of Alexandria, before the eyes of the civilised world, the noblest woman of antiquity was slaughtered with nameless horrors by a Christian who bears the name of saint in the annals of Christendom, and who, in modern times, has found an apologist. The eloquent pages of Draper furnish a vivid account of the atrocious crime which will always remain one of the greatest blots on Christianity. A beautiful, wise, and virtuous woman, whose lecture-room was full to overflowing with the wealth and fashion of Alexandria was attacked as she was coming out of her academy by a mob of the zealous professors of Christianity. Amidst the fearful yelling

of these defenders of the faith she was dragged from her chariot, and in the public street stripped naked. Paralysed with fear, she was haled into an adjoining church, and there killed by the club of a saint. The poor naked corpse was outraged and then dismembered; but the diabolical crime was not completed until they had scraped the flesh from the bones with oyster shells and cast the remnants into the fire. Christendom honoured with canonisation the fiend who instigated this terrible and revolting atrocity, and the blood of martyred Hypatia was avenged only by the sword of Amru!

The condition of Constantinople under Justinian, the Christian and the glorified legislator, is the best index to the demoralised and degraded state of society all over Christendom. Public or private virtue had no recognition in the social conceptions; a harlot sat on the throne of the Cæsars, and shared with the emperor the honours of the State. Theodora had publicly plied her trade in the city of Constantine, and her name was a byword among its dissolute inhabitants. And now she was adored as a queen in the same city by "grave magistrates, orthodox bishops, victorious generals, and captive monarchs." The empire was disgraced by her cruelties, which recognised no religious or moral restraint. Seditions, outbreaks, and sanguinary tumults, in which the priesthood always took the most prominent part, were the order of the day. On these occasions every law, human or divine, was trampled under foot; churches and altars were polluted by atrocious murders; no place was safe or sacred from depredations; the bonds of society were absolutely rent asunder, and revolting outrages were perpetrated in broad daylight. Nothing, however, can equal the horrors which were inflicted upon this unholy city during the Nika riots in the fifth year of Justinian's reign. The horrible anarchy of the circus, with its incessant bloodshed and sensuality, stimulated to its worst excesses by the support and encouragement which the imperial champions of orthodoxy extended to the most barbarous of the factions, was unparalleled in any heathen land.

As compared with Constantinople at this period, Persia was a country of order and law.

Humanity revolts from the accounts of the crimes which sully the annals of Christian Constantinople. Whilst the Prophet of Islam was yet an infant, one of the most virtuous emperors who ever ascended the throne of Byzantium was massacred, with his children

and wife, with fearful tortures at the instance of a Christian monarch. The emperor was dragged from his sanctuary, and his five sons were successively murdered before his eyes; and this tragic scene closed with the execution of the emperor himself. The empress and her daughters were subjected to nameless cruelties and then beheaded on the very ground which had been stained with the blood of the poor Emperor Maurice. The ruthless treatment meted out to the friends, companions and partisans of the imperial victim, serves as an index to the morality of the Byzantine Christians. Their eyes were pierced, their tongues were torn from the root, their hands and feet were amputated; some expired under the lash, others in the flames, others again were transfixed with arrows. "A simple, speedy death," says Gibbon, "was a mercy which they could rarely obtain."

The Byzantine empire, slowly bleeding unto death, torn by political and religious factions, distracted with theological wranglings, and "crazed by an insane desire to enforce uniformity of religious belief," offered a wretched spectacle of assassinations, dissoluteness, and brutality.[1]

The countries included in Asiatic Turkey westward of the Euphrates, devastated alternately by the Parthians and the Romans, and then by the Persians and the Byzantines, presented a picture of utter hopelessness. The moral misery of the people was surpassed by their social ruin. The followers of Jesus, instead of alleviating, intensified the evil. Mago-Zoroastrianism combating with a degraded

1 Milman thus describes the Christianity of those days: "The Bishop of Constantinople was the passive victim, the humble slave, or the factious adversary of the Byzantine emperor; rarely exercised a lofty moral control upon his despotism. The lower clergy, whatever their more secret beneficent or sanctifying workings on society, had sufficient power, wealth, and rank to tempt ambition or to degrade to intrigue; not enough to command the public mind for any great salutary purpose, to repress the inveterate immorality of an effete age, to reconcile jarring interests, to mould together hostile races; in general they ruled, when they did rule, by the superstitious fears, rather than by the reverence and attachment of a grateful people. They sank downward into the common ignorance, and yielded to that worst barbarism—a worn-out civilisation. Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion and religious indolence; but except when the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions, they had little effect on the condition of society. They stood aloof from the world—the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks in their jealously-barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition."—Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. *Introd.* p. 4.

Christianity in Mesopotamia, the Nestorians engaged in deadly conflict with the orthodox party, the earlier contests of Montanus and the prophetesses, had converted Western Asia into a wilderness of despair and desolation.

The whirlwinds of conquest which had passed over Africa, the massacres, the murders, the lawlessness of the professors and teachers of the Christian religion, had destroyed every spark of moral life in Egypt and in the African provinces of the decaying empire. In Europe the condition of the people was, if possible, still more miserable. In the open day, in the presence of the ministers of religion and the people, Narses, the benefactor of his country, was burnt alive in the market-place of Constantinople. In the streets of Rome, under the eyes of the Exarch, the partisans of rival bishops waged war, and deluged churches with the blood of Christians. Spain exhibited a heart-rending scene of anarchy and ruin. The rich, the privileged few, who held the principal magistracies of the province under the emperors, or who were dignified with the title of magistrates, were exempt from all burdens. They lived in extreme luxury in beautiful villas, surrounded by slaves of both sexes; spending their time in the baths, which were so many haunts of immorality; or at the gaming table, when not engaged in eating and drinking. The sight of this luxury and opulence offered a terrible contrast to the miseries of the masses. The middle class, the free population of the cities and the villages, were ground to the earth by the tyranny of the Romans. Agrarian slavery had disappeared; its place was taken by the colonists, occupying an intermediate position between freedom and slavery. They were in some respects happier than the slaves. They could contract valid marriages; they obtained a limited share of the produce of the lands they cultivated; and their patrons could not take their goods and chattels from them. But in all other respects they were the slaves of the soil. Their personal services were at the disposal of the State. They were liable to corporal chastisement, like the domestic slaves;[1] slaves, not of an individual, but of the soil, they remained attached to the lands they cultivated by an indissoluble and hereditary tie. The condition of the slaves, who formed the bulk of the population, was miserable

[1] Three hundred lashes was the usual allowance for trivial faults, see Dozy, *Hist. des Mussulmans d'Espagne*, vol. ii. p. 87.

beyond description. They were treated with pitiless cruelty, worse than cattle. The invasion of the barbarians brought with it a dire punishment upon the ill-fated land. In their wake followed desolation, terrible and absolute; they ravaged, they massacred, they reduced into slavery the women, children, and the clergy.

A vast number of Jews were settled in the peninsula for centuries. The terrible persecutions which they suffered at the hands of the ecclesiastics in the reign of the Visigoth Sisebut in the year 616 A.C., lasted until Islâm brought emancipation to the wretched victims of ignorance and fanaticism. It was Islâm which rendered possible for Judaism to produce such men as Maimonides or Ibn Gebrol.

Let us turn now to Arabia, that land of mystery and romance, which has hitherto lain enwrapt in silence and solitude, isolated from the great nations of the world, unaffected by their wars or their polity. The armies of the Chosroes and the Cæsars had for centuries marched and re-marched by her frontiers without disturbing her sleep of ages. And though the mutterings of the distant thunder, which so frequently rolled across the dominions of the Byzantine and the Persian, often reached her ears, they failed to rouse her from her slumber. Her turn, however, was come, and she soon found her voice in that of the noblest of her sons.

The chain of mountains which, descending from Palestine towards the Isthmus of Suez, runs almost parallel to the Red Sea down to the southern extremity of the Arabian peninsula, is designated in the Arabic language, Hijaz, or Barrier, and gives its name to all the country it traverses until it reaches the province of Yemen. At times the mountains run close to the sea, at times they draw far away from the coast, leaving long stretches of lowland, barren, desolate, and inhospitable-looking, with occasional green valleys and rich oases formed in the track of the periodical rain-torrents. Beyond this range, and eastward, stretches the steppe of Najd—the "highland" of Arabia—a vast plateau, with deserts, mountain gorges, and here and there green plantations refreshing to the eye. In Hijaz, the barrier-land, lie the holy cities, Mecca and Medîna, the birthplace and cradle of Islâm.

This vast region is divided into four tolerably well-defined countries. First, to the north lies Arabia Petræa, including the countries of the ancient Edomites and the Midianites. Then comes Hijaz proper, containing the famous city of

Yathrib, known afterwards in history as the City of the Prophet,—Medinat un-Nabi, or Medina. South of Hijaz proper lies the province of Tihama, where are situated Mecca and the port of Jeddah,—the landing-place of the pilgrims of Islam. The fourth and the southernmost part is called Asyr, bordering on Yemen. Yemen, properly so called, is the country forming the south-western extremity of the Arabian Peninsula, bounded on the west by the Red Sea, on the south by the Indian Ocean, on the north by Hijaz, and on the east by Hazramut (Hadhramaut). The name of Yemen is often applied to southern Arabia generally. It then includes, besides Yemen proper, Hazramut and the district of Mahra to the east of Hazramut. Beyond Mahra, at the south-east corner of the peninsula, is Oman, and to the north of this al-Bahrain, or al-Ahsa, on the Persian Gulf. This latter country is also called Hijr, from the name of its principal province.

Najd, the highland, is the large plateau which, commencing westward on the eastern side of the mountains of Hijaz, occupies the whole of Central Arabia. That portion of Najd, which borders on Yemen, is called the Najd of Yemen, and the northern part simply Najd. These two divisions are separated by a mountainous province called Yemama, famous in the history of Islam. North of Najd, stretches the Syrian desert, not really a part of Arabia, but where the Arab tribes now roam, free and wild, leading a nomadic life like their ancient Aramæan predecessors. North-east are the deserts of Irak (Barriyat ul-Irak), bordering the fertile territory of Chaldæa on the right bank of the Euphrates, and separating it from the cultivated portions of Arabia. Eastward, Najd is separated from al-Ahsa by one of those strips of desert called *Nafud* by the Arabs. Towards the south lies the vast desert of Dahna. It separates Najd from Hazramut and Mahra.

This vast region, which embraces an area twice the size of France in the height of its power, was then as now inhabited by two different types of people, "the people of the town" and "the dwellers of the desert." The virtues and the defects of the Bedawee, his devotion to his clan, his quixotic sense of honour, with his recklessness and thirst for revenge, and his disregard for human life, have been portrayed in vivid and sympathetic colours by eminent writers like Burton and Poole. But whatever the difference between the Bedouin and the citizen, the Arab is peculiar-

ly the child of the desert. His passionate love of freedom and his spiritual exaltation are the outcome of the free air which he breathes and of the wide expanse which he treads,—conscious of his own dignity and independence. In spite of the annual gatherings at Mecca and Okaz, the tribes and nationalities which inhabited the soil of Arabia were far from homogeneous. Each was more or less distinct from the other in culture, development, and religion. This diversity of culture was mainly due to the diversity of their origin. Various races had peopled the peninsula at various times. Many of them had passed away, but their misdeeds or their prowess were fresh in the memory of successive generations, and these traditions formed the history of the nation. The Arabs themselves divide the races who have peopled the peninsula into three grand subdivisions, viz.: (1) the *Arab ul-Bâïdah*, the extinct Arabs, under which are included the Hamitic colonies (Cushites), which preceded the Semites in the work of colonisation, as also the Aramæan populations of Syria, Phœnicia, and other parts; (2) the *Arab ul-Aâriba*, or *Mutaariba*, original Arabs, true Semites, whom tradition represents to be descended from Kahtân, or Joktan, and who, in their progress towards the south, destroyed the aboriginal settlers. The Joktanite Arabs, nomads by nature, super-imposed themselves in those countries on the primitive inhabitants, the Hamitic astral-worshippers. Their original cradle was the region whence also came the Abrahamites, and is precisely indicated by the significant names of two of the direct ancestors of Joktan, Arphaxad, "border of the Chaldæan," and Eber, "the man from beyond (the river)," in reference to Babylon, or the district now called Irak-Araby, on the right bank of the Euphrates.[1] (3) The *Arab ul-Mustaariba*, "or naturalised Arabs," Abrahamitic Semites, who, either as peaceful immigrants or as military colonists, introduced themselves into the peninsula, and who intermarried and settled among the Joktanite Arabs.[2] These three names, *Aâriba*, *Mutaariba*, and *Mustaariba*, are derived from the same root, and by the modification of their grammatical form indicate the periods when these races were naturalised in the country.[3]

1 Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, vol. ii. p. 293.
2 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. i. pp. 55-58.
3 Caussin de Perceval regards the *bâidah* as the same as *Aâriba*, and puts the *Mutaariba* as forming the second group. In the following pages I adopt his classification.

Among the *Arab ul-Aâriba*, the races which require special mention in connection with the history of Islam are the Bani-Aad,[1] the Amalika, the Banı-Thamud,[2] and Banî-Jadıs (the Thamudiens and Jodicites of Diodorus Siculus and Ptolemy). The Banî-Aad, Hamitic in their origin, were the first settlers and colonists in the peninsula, and they were established principally in that region of Central Arabia, which is called by Arab historians and geographers, the *Ahsâf ur-ramal*, contiguous to Yemen, Hazramut, and Oman. They appear during one period of their existence to have formed a powerful and conquering nation. One of the sovereigns of this race, Shaddâd, whose name is preserved in the Koran, seems to have extended his power even beyond the confines of the Arabian peninsula. He is said to have conquered Irak, and even approached the borders of India. This tradition probably points to the invasion of Babylonia or Chaldæa by the Arabs more than 2000 years before Christ, and possibly might be referred to the same event which, in Persian traditions, is called the invasion of Zuhhak. The same Shaddad, or one of his successors bearing the same name, carried his arms into Egypt and farther west. This invasion of Egypt by the Arabs has been identified with the irruption of the Hyksos into that country. And the way in which the nomadic invaders were ultimately driven out of Africa by a combination of the princes of the Thebaid, with the assistance of their Ethiopian or Cushite neighbours towards the south, gives some degree of corroboration to the theory.

The bulk of the Aâdites are said to have been destroyed by a great drought which afflicted their country. A small remnant escaped and formed the second Aadite nation, which attained considerable prosperity in Yemen. These later Aadites, however, were engulphed in the Joktanide wave.

The Banû-Amâlîka, supposed by Lenormant to be of Aramæan origin, who are undoubtedly the same as the Amalekites of the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures,—the Shashu of the Egyptian monuments,—expelled from Babylonia by the early Assyrian sovereigns, entered Arabia, and gradually spread themselves in Yemen

[1] The Aâdites are said to have been overwhelmed, conquered, and destroyed by the Joktanite Arabs; the Thamudites, "that strange race of troglodytes," by the Assyrians under Chedorlaomer (Khozâr al-Ahmar).

[2] With a ث

and Hijâz, as well as Palestine and Syria. They appear to have penetrated into Egypt, and gave her several of her Pharaohs. The Amalika of Hijaz were either destroyed or driven out by the Banî-Jurhum, a branch of the Banî-Kahtan, who had originally settled in the south, and subsequently moving northwards, overwhelmed the Amâlika.

The Banû-Thamûd, who, like the Banû-Aâd, were Cushite or Hamitic, inhabited the borders of Edom and afterwards the country named Hijr, situated to the east of Arabia Petræa, and between Hijaz and Syria. These people were troglodytes, and lived in houses cut in the side of rocks. Sir Henry Layard, in his *Early Travels*, has described the ruins of these rocky habitations, and one can fix the exact location of the Thamudites by comparing the Arabian traditions with the accounts of modern travellers and the results of recent discoveries. As the "indispensable middlemen" of the commerce between Syria and Najd or Hijaz, the Thamudites attained a high degree of prosperity. They were, ultimately, in great part exterminated by Chedorlaomer (Khozar al-ahmar), the great Elamite conqueror, in the course of his victorious campaigns in Syria and Arabia. The terrible fate which overtook these ancient cave-dwellers, who, in their solid habitations, considered themselves safe from divine wrath, is often referred to in the Koran as a warning to the Koraishites.

After this disaster, the rest of the Banî-Thamûd retreated to Mount Seir, on the north of the Elamitic Gulf, where they lived in the times of Isaac and Jacob. But they soon disappeared, doubtless absorbed by the neighbouring tribes, and their place was taken by the Edomites who held Mount Seir for a time.[1] These Edomites were apparently succeeded in their possessions by a body of Arabs driven from Yemen by the Banî Kahtan. In the days of Diodorus Siculus, under the same name as their predecessors they furnished contingents to the Roman armies.

Leaving the Tasm, and Jadîs, and other smaller tribes, as too unimportant to require any specific mention, we come to the Banî-Jurhum, who, also, are classed under the head of Arab ul-Aariba, and who appear to have overwhelmed, destroyed, and replaced the Amalika in Hijaz. There seem to have been two tribes of that name,

1 Gen. xiv. 4, 6.

one of them, the most ancient, and contemporaneous with the Aâdites, and probably Cushite in their origin; the other, descendants of Kahtan, who, issuing from the valley of Yemen in a season of great sterility, drove out the Amalekite tribes of Hijaz, and established themselves in their possessions. The irruption of the Banî-Jurhum, of Kahtanite origin, is said to have taken place at a time when the Ishmaelitic Arabs were acquiring prominence among the Amalika, in whose country they had been long settled. The Ishmaelites entered into amicable relations with the invading hordes, and lived side by side with them for a period. Before the advancing tide of the descendants of Ishmael, the Jurhumites began gradually to lose their hold over the valley, and before a century was well over the dominion of Hijaz and Tihama passed into the hands of the Abrahamitic Arabs. The development of the *Mustaariba* Arabs suffered a temporary check from the inroad of the Babylonian monarch, but, as we shall see later, they soon recovered their vitality, and spread themselves over Hijaz, Najd, and the deserts of Irak and Mesopotamia, where they finally absorbed the descendants of Kahtan, their predecessors.

The *Arab ul-Mutaariba* were tribes sprung from Kahtan, son of Eber,[1] and were chiefly concentrated in Yemen. The descendants of Kahtan had burst into Arabia from its northeast corner, and had penetrated down into the south, where they lived for a time along with the Aadites of the race of Cush, subject to their political supremacy, and at last became the governing power. The population sprung from Kahtan was not, however, exclusively confined to Southern Arabia. Their primitive cradle lay in Mesopotamia. In moving southward from that locality to Yemen, the Kahtanite tribes must have passed through the whole length of the Arabian peninsula, and no doubt left some settlements behind them along their route.

According to the Arab historians, the wave which entered the peninsula at this period was headed by two brothers, Kahtan and Yaktan, the sons of Eber or Heber. And it was the son of Kahtan, Yareb, whom they regard as the first prince of Yemen, who gave his name to all his descendants and to the whole of the peninsula. Yareb is said to have been succeeded by his son Yeshhad, founder of Mareb, the ancient capital of the realm, and father of the famous Abd ush-Shams, surnamed *Saba*. This surname, which means

[1] Ibn ul-Athir calls him *Ghâbir* or *Aâbir*.

Capturer, was given to him on account of his victories. The posterity of Saba became the progenitors of the various tribes of Kahtanite descent, famous in Arab traditions. Saba left two sons, Himyar (which means red) [1] and Kuhlan. The former succeeded to his father's throne, and it was after him that the dynasty of Saba were called Himyary or Himyarite.[2] His descendants and those of Kuhlan, his brother and successor, alternately ruled Yemen until the century before Mohammed. To this dynasty belonged the great Zu'lkarnain, and the celebrated Balkîs, who went to Jerusalem in the time of Solomon.[3]

1 From the red mantle which he used to wear, in imitation of the Pharaohs.

2 The Himyarite sovereigns of Yemen, who were styled Tobbas, seem to have been from the earliest times in communication both with Persia and Byzantium.

3 There is considerable doubt as to the identity of Zu'lkarnain. Several Mahommedan historians have thought that the Zu'lkarnain referred to in the Koran is identical with Alexander of Macedon. This opinion, however, is open to question. Zu'lkarnain in its primitive sense means "the lord of two horns." When we remember the head-dress worn by the ancient Sabæan sovereigns, the crescent-shaped moon with its two horns, borrowed probably from Egypt about the period of this king, there can be little room for doubt that the reference in the Koran is to some sovereign of native origin, whose extensive conquests became magnified in the imagination of posterity into a world-wide dominion.

Lenormant thinks that Shaddad, Zu'lkarnain, and Balkîs were all Cushites.

Judaism was strongly represented among the subjects of the Himyarite sovereigns, and in the year 343 A. C., at the instance of an ambassador sent to Yemen by the Emperor Constantine, several Christian churches were erected in their dominions. But the bulk of the nation adhered to the primitive Semitic cult.

Towards the end of the fifth century, Zu-Nawas, known to the Byzantines as Dimion, made himself the master of Yemen and its dependencies, after slaying the ferocious usurper, Zu-Shinatir. His cruel persecution of the Christians, under the instigation of the Jews, whose creed he had adopted, drew upon him the vengeance of the Byzantine emperor. Instigated from Constantinople, an Abyssinian army, under the command of Harith or Aryat, landed on the shores of Yemen, defeated and killed Zu-Nawas, and made themselves masters of Yemen. This occurred about 525 A. C.

Shortly afterwards (537 A. C.) Aryat was killed by Abraha al-Arsham, who subsequently became the Abyssinian viceroy. It was under Abraha that the Christian Abyssinians made their abortive attempt to conquer Hijaz. Yemen remained under the Abyssinian domination for nearly half a century, when Maadi Karib, the son of the famous Saif zu'l Yezen, whose heroic deeds are sung up to the present day by the Arabs of the desert, restored the Himyarite dynasty (573 A. C.) with the help of an army furnished by Kesra Anushirvan. On Maadi Karib's assassination by the Christians in 597, Yemen came under the direct domination of Persia, and was ruled by viceroys appointed by the court of Ctesiphon. Wahraz was the first Marzban. Under him Yemen, Hazramut, Mahra, and Oman were added to the Persian empire. The last of these viceroys was Bazan, who became Marzban under Khusru Parvîz towards the year 606. It was during the viceroyalty of Bazan that Islam was introduced into Yemen, and he himself accepted the Faith. The Persian domination of Yemen was extremely mild. All religions enjoyed equal toleration, and the chiefs of the different tribes exercised their authority in their different tracts, subject to the control of the Marzbân.

The traditions respecting the early Ishmaelite settlement in Arabia relate back to the time of Abraham and his expulsion or expatriation from Chaldæa. The descendants of Ishmael prospered and multiplied in Hijaz until they, with their allies the Jurhumites, were overwhelmed and almost destroyed by the formidable king of Babylonia, Nebuchadnezzar, who, of all the monarchs that endeavoured to attack the heart of Arabia, was alone successful in wounding it seriously. The foundation of Mecca was apparently co-eval with the establishment of the Abrahamitic Arabs in the peninsula, for according to the Arab traditions a Jurhumite chief named Meghass ibn-Amr, whose daughter was married to the progenitor of the *Mustaariba Arabs*, Ishmael or Ismail, was the founder of the city. About the same time was built the temple, which gave Mecca an overwhelming predominance over the other cities of Arabia. Built by Abraham, that "Saturnian father of the tribes," in the remotest antiquity, the Kaaba ever remained the holiest and most sacred of the temples of the nation. Here were ranged the three hundred and sixty idols, one for each day, round the great god Hobal, carved of red agate, the two *ghazâlas*, gazelles of gold and silver, and the image of Abraham and of his son. Here the tribes came, year after year, "to kiss the black stone which had fallen from heaven in the primeval days of Adam, and to make the seven circuits of the temple naked." Mecca was thus from the earliest times the centre, not only of the religous associations of the Arabs, but also of their commercial enterprises. Standing on the highway of the commerce of antiquity, it gathered to itself the wealth and culture of the neighbouring countries. Not even the Babylonian monarch could touch her mercantile prosperity; for, from the necessity of their situation, the Arabs of Hijaz became the carriers of the nations of the world.

Mecca was the centre of the commercial activity which has distinguished the Arabs at all times from the other nations of the East. From Mecca eradiated the caravans which carried to the Byzantine dominions and to Persia the rich products of Yemen and the far-famed Ind, and brought from Syria the silks and stuffs of the Persian cities. But they brought with them more than articles of trade; in the train of these caravans came all the luxurious habits and vices which had corroded the very heart of the

neighbouring empires. Grecian and Persian slave girls, imported from Syria and Irak, beguiled the idle hours of the rich with their dancing and singing, or ministered to their vices. The poet, whose poems formed the pride of the nation, sung only of the joys of the present life, and encouraged the immorality of the people. And no one bethought himself of the morrow.

The Arabs, and especially the Meccans, were passionately addicted to drinking, gambling, and music. Dancing and singing as in other Eastern countries, were practised by a class of women occupying a servile position, who were called Kiyan, or, in the singular, Kayna, and whose immorality was proverbial. And yet they were held in the highest estimation, and the greatest chiefs paid public court to them.[1] As among the Hindoos, polygamy was practised to an unlimited extent. A widow (other than the mother) was considered an integral part of her deceased husband's patrimony, and passed into the use of the son; and the atrocious and inhuman practice of burying female infants was universal.

The Jews, chased successively from their native homes by the Assyrians, the Greeks, and the Romans, had found among the Arabs safety and protection. But they had brought with their religion that bitter spirit of strife which was perhaps the cause of the greater portion of their misfortunes. They had succeeded, however, in gaining in Arabia a considerable body of proselytes; and at the time when Mohammed proceeded to announce his mission, Judaism was professed in Yemen by a notable fraction of the descendants of Himyar and Kinda, issue of Kuhlan; at Khaibar and at Yathrib, by the Kuraizha and the Nadhîr, tribes of Ishmaelite origin, but naturalised as Arabs from very ancient times. The Nestorians and the Jacobite Christians had also founded colonies in Arabia. The deadly rivalry between these two creeds to dominate over

1 The moral depravity of the people is evidenced by the fact that these women used to give receptions, which were attended by all the men of light and leading in the city.

The town Arab was so passionately addicted to dicing that he would frequently, like the Germans of Tacitus, stake away his own liberty. It was on account of these evils, and the immoralities associated with their practice, that Mohammed wisely prohibited to his followers gambling, dancing, and drinking of wine. The Ommeyyades revived all the three evils; they represented, in fact, the uprise of the old barbarism, which had been stamped out with such labour by the great Prophet.

Arabia occasioned sanguinary wars in the most fertile provinces.[1] Christianity had commenced to introduce itself among some families of the race of Rabia son of Nizar, such as the Taglibites established in Mesopotamia, and the Banu Abd ul-Kais who were settled in al-Bahrain. It nourished at Najran among the Bani-l-Harith ibn Kaab; in Irak, among the Ibad; in Syria, among the Ghassanides and some Khuzaite families; at Dumat ul-Jandal, among the Saconi and Bani-Kalb. And some of the tribes who roamed over the desert that lay between Palestine and Egypt were also Christians. Magism and Sabæism had also their representatives among the Arabs, and specially among the Himyarites: the Banu-Asad worshipped Mercury; the Jodham, Jupiter; the Banu-Tay, Canopus; the descendants of Kays-Aylan, Sirius;[2] a portion of the Koraish, the three moon-goddesses,—al-Lat, the bright moon, al-Manat the dark, and al-Uzza, the union of the two,—who were regarded as the daughters of the high god (*Banât-ullâh*). Mecca was, at this time, the centre of a far-reaching idolatry, ramifications of which extended throughout the tribes of the peninsula. The Kinana, closely allied to the Koraish politically and by blood, besides the star Aldobaran, served the goddess Uzza, represented by a tree at a place called Nakhla, a day and a half's journey from Mecca. The Hawazin, who roamed towards the south-east of Mecca, had for their favourite idol the goddess Lat, located at Tayif. Manat was represented by a rock on the caravan road between Mecca and Syria. The worship of these idols was chiefly phallic, similar in character to that which prevailed among the ancient Semites, the Phœnicians and the Babylonians. But the majority of the nation, especially the tribes belonging to the race of Mozar, were addicted to fetishism of the grossest type. Animals and plants, the gazelle, the horse, the camel, the palm-tree, inorganic matter like pieces of rock, stones, etc., formed the principal objects of adoration. The idea of a Supreme Divinity, however, was not unrecognised; but its influence was confined to an inappreciable few, who, escaping from the bondage of idolatry, betook themselves to a philosophical scepticism, more or less tinged with the legendary notions, religious and secular, of their neighbours, the Sabæans, the

[1] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. i. p. 308 et seq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. vi. pp. 114, 115; Caussin de Perceval, *Hist. des Arabes*, vol. i. pp. 128-131.

[2] Koran, sura xli. 37.

Jews, or the Christians. Among these some distinctly recognised the conception of the supreme Godhead, and, revolting at the obscenities and gross materialism of their day, waited patiently for the appearence of a Deliverer who, they felt in their hearts, would soon appear.

Among some tribes, in the case of a death, a camel was sacrificed on the tomb, or allowed to die from starvation, in the belief that it would serve as a conveyance for the deceased in a future existence. Some believed that when the soul separated itself from the body, it took the shape of a bird called *Hama* or *Sada*. If the deceased was the victim of a violent death, the bird hovered over the grave, crying *askuni*, "Give me drink," until the murder was avenged. Belief in *Jins*, *ghouls*, and oracles rendered by their idols, whom they consulted by means of pointless arrows, called *Azlâm* or *Kidâh*, was universal. Each tribe had its particular idols and particular temples. The priests and hierophants attached to these temples received rich offerings from the devotees. And often, there arose sanguinary conflicts between the followers or the worshippers of rival temples.[1]

But the prestige of the Kaaba, the chapel of Abraham and Ishmael, stood unimpeached among all. Even the Jews and the Sabæans sent offerings there. The custody of this temple was an object of great jealousy among the tribes, as it conferred on the custodians the most honourable functions and privileges in the sight of the Arabs. At the time of Mohammed's birth this honour was possessed by his family ; and his grandfather was the venerable chief of the theocratic commonwealth which was constituted round the Kaaba. Human sacrifices were frequent. Besides special idols located in the temples each family had household penates which exacted rigorous observances.

Such was the moral and religious condition of the Arabs. Neither Christianity nor Judaism had succeeded in raising them in the scale of humanity. "After five centuries of Christian evangelization," says Muir, "we can point to but a sprinkling here and there of Christians ;—the Bani Harith of Najran ; the Banî Hanifa of Yemama ; some of the Banî Tay at Tayma, and hardly any more. Judaism, vastly more powerful, had exhibited a spasmodic effort of

1 Among others, the temple of Zu'l-Khulâsa in Yemen, belonging to the the tribe of Banu-Khatham ; the temple of Rodha in Najd, belonging to the Banî-Rabîa ; the temple of Zu'l Sabat in Irak ; and that of Manat at Kodayd. not far from the sea, belonging to the tribe of Aus and Khazraj, domiciled at Yathrib—were the most famous.

proselytism under Zu Nawâs ; but, as an active and converting agent the Jewish faith was no longer operative. In fine, viewed thus in a religious aspect, the surface of Arabia had been now and then gently rippled by the feeble efforts of Christianity ; the sterner influences of Judaism had been occasionally visible in a deeper and more troubled current ; but the tide of indigenous idolatry and of Ishmaelite superstition, setting from every quarter with an unbroken and unebbing surge towards the Kaaba, gave ample evidence that the faith and worship of Mecca held the Arab mind in a thraldom, rigorous and undisputed."[1]

The divisions and jealousies of the tribes,[2] combined with the antagonistic feelings which actuated one against the other from religious and racial differences, had enabled the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Persians, and Abyssinians, to become masters of various provinces in the north, in the east, and in the south-west. The Abyssinians had even gone so far as to invade Hijaz, with the intention of destroying the national temple. But their power was broken before Mecca by the sturdy patriotism of Abd ul-Muttalib. After twenty years' oppression, they were driven out of Yemen with the assistance of Persia by a native prince, the son of the celebrated Saif zu'l-Yezen. On his assassination by the Christians, the sovereignty he had enjoyed under the auspices of the great Anushirvan passed entirely into Persian hands, and Yemen became tributary to Persia.[3]

Besides the direct domination which the rival empires of Constantinople and Ctesiphon exercised over the various provinces of Arabia, two of the greatest chieftains, the kings of Ghassan and of Hîra, divided their allegiance between the Cæsars and the Chosroes ; and in the deadly wars, profitless and aimless, which Persian and Byzantine waged against each other, sucking out the life-blood of their people from mere lust of destruction, though oftener the right was on the side of the Zoroastrian than the Christian, the Ghassanide and Hirite stood face to face in hostile array, or locked in mortal combat.[4]

1 Muir, vol. i. Introd. p. ccxxxix.

2 These tribal jealousies and family feuds, which I shall have to describe later, were the causes which led to the ruin of the Arab empire.

3 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. i. pp. 324, 327 ; Caussin de Perceval, vol. i. p. 138 et seq. ; Tibri (Zotenbergs transal.), vol. ii. pp. 217, 218.

4 The sedentary portion of the Arab population of Yemen, of Bahrain and Irâk, obeyed the Persians. The Bodouins of these countries were in reality free from all yoke. The Arabs of Syria were subject to the Romans ; those

The heterogeneous elements of which the Arabian peninsula was thus composed gave an extremely varied character to the folklore of the country. Among uncultured nations, the tendency is always to dress facts in the grab of legends. Imagination among them not only colours with a roseate hue, but magnifies distant objects. And the variety of culture multiplies legends, more or less based on facts. The Hamitic colonies of Yemen and of the south-west generally; the true Semites who followed in their footsteps, like the Aryans in the East; the Jews, the Christians,—all brought their traditions, their myths, their legends with them. In the course of ages, these relics of the past acquired a consistency and character, but however unsubstantial in appearance, on analysis there is always to be found uuderlying them a stratum of fact. In the legend of Shaddad and his garden of Irem, we see in the hazy past the reflection of a mighty empire, which even conquered Egypt,—"of a wealthy nation, constructors of great buildings, with an advanced civilisation analogous to that of Chaldæa, professing a religion similar to the Babylonian; a nation, in short, with whom material progress was allied to great moral depravity and obscene rites."[1] In the traditional, half-legendary, half-historic destruction of the Aadites and the Thamudites, we see the destructive fate which overwhelmed these Hamitic races before the Semitic tide, Assyrian and Arab.[2]

The children of Jacob, flying from their ruthless enemies, brought their legends and traditions with them, and thus contributed their quota to the folklore of the Peninsula. The last of the Semitic colonies that entered Arabia was acknowledged by themselves as well as their neighbours to be descended from Abraham; and tradition had handed down this belief, and given it a shape and character.

Manicheism, stamped out from Persia and the Byzantine dominions, had betaken itself to Arabia.[3] The early Docetes, the Marcionities, the Valentinians, all had their representatives in this land of freedom. They all disseminated their views and traditions, which in course of time became intermixed with the traditions of the

of Mesopotamia recogniced alternately the Roman and Persian rule. The Bedouins of Central Arabia and of Hijaz, over whom the Himyarite kings had exercised a more or less effective sovereignty, had nominally passed under Persian rule, but they enjoyed virtual independence.

1 Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, vol. ii. p. 296.

2 Ibn ul-Athir, vol. i. pp. 55–58.

3 Beausobre, *Hist. du Manicheisme*, pt. i. l. ii. chap. iv.

country. These Christians, more consistent in their views than their orthodox persecutors, believed that the God incarnate, or at least the Son of God, His Word, born in the bosom of eternity, an Æon, an Emanation issuing from the Throne of Light, could not, did not, die on the cross ; that the words of agony which orthodox Christian traditions put into the mouth of Jesus did not, and could not, escape from his lips ; in short, that the man who suffered on the cross was a different person from the Divine Christ, who escaped from the hands of his persecutors and went away to the regions whence he had come.[1] This doctrine, however fanciful, was more consistent with the idea of the sonship of Jesus, and in itself appears to have been based on some strong probabilities. The intense desire of Pilate, whom Tertullian calls a Christian at heart, to save Jesus ;[2] even the unwillingness of Herod to incur more odium by the murder of the blessed prophet of Nazareth ; the darkness of the short hours when that great benefactor of humanity was led forth for the consummation of the frightful scenes which had continued throughout the night ; the preternatural gloom which overshadowed the earth at the most awful part of this drama :[3] all these coincident circumstances lend a strong probability to the belief that the innocent escaped and the guilty suffered.

Before the Advent of Mohammed, all these traditions, based on fact though tinged by the colourings of imagination, must have become firmly imbedded in the convictions of the people, and formed essential parts of the folklore of the country. Mohammed, when promulgating his faith and his laws, found these traditions current among his people ; he took them up and adopted them as the lever for raising the Arabs and the surrounding nations from the depths of social and moral degradation into which they had fallen.

The light that shone on Sinai, the light that brightened the lives of the peasants and fishermen of Galilee, is now aflame on the heights of Fârân !

1 Mosheim and Gibbon, *in loco.*

2 Blunt, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 138.

3 Comp. Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 348-362.

If anything could lend stronger probability to this curious belief, it ought to be the circumstantial account of Luke, xxiv. 36 et seq., about Jesus allowing himself to be touched and felt (after the resurrection) in order to calm his affrighted disciples, who believed him to be a spirit ; and his asking for "meat," and partaking of "a broiled fish and of a honey-comb."

CHAPTER I.

MOHAMMED THE PROPHET.

بَلَغَ الْعُلَى بِكَمَالِهِ
كَشَفَ الدُّجَى بِجَمَالِهِ
حَسُنَتْ جَمِيعُ خِصَالِهِ
صَلُّوا عَلَيْهِ وَآلِهِ

THESE lines, untranslatable in their beauty, do not in the least exaggerate the sweetness of disposition, the nobility of character, of the man whose life, career, and teachings we propose to describe in the following pages. At the dawn of the seventh century of the Christian era, in the streets of Mecca might often be seen a quiet thoughtful man, past the meridian of life, his Arab mantle thrown across his shoulders, his *tailasân*[1] drawn low over his face; sometimes gently sauntering, sometimes hurrying along, heedless of the passers-by, heedless of the gay scenes around him, deeply absorbed in his own thoughts,—yet withal never forgetful to return the salutation of the lowliest, or to speak a kindly word to the children who loved to throng around him. This is *al-Amîn*, "the Trusty." He has so honourably and industriously walked through life, that he has won for himself from his compatriots the noble designation of the true and trusty. But now, owing to his strange preaching, his fellow-townsmen are beginning to look suspiciously upon him as a wild visionary, a crazed revolutionist, desirous of levelling the old landmarks of society, of doing away with their ancient privileges, of making them abandon their old creeds and customs.

[1] A scarf thrown over the head usually covering the turban, and brought round under the chin and passed over the left shoulder.

Mecca was, at this time, a city of considerable importance and note among the townships of Arabia, both from its associations and its position. Situated in a low-lying valley stretching north to south, bordered on the west by a range of hills, on the east by high granite rocks,—the Kaaba in its centre, its regular and paved streets, its fortified houses, its town-hall opening on to the platform of the temple, the city presented an unusual appearance of prosperity and strength. The guardianship of the Kaaba, originally an appanage of the children of Ishmael, had in consequence of the Babylonian attack, passed into the hands of the Jurhumites. The combination of the secular and religious power enabled the chiefs of the Banî-Jurhum to assume the title of *malik* or king. In the early part of the third century the Jurhumites were overwhelmed by the irruption of a Kahtanite tribe, called the Banî-Khuzaa, who, issuing from Yemen, possessed themselves of Mecca and the southern parts of Hijaz. In the meantime, the race of Ishmael, which had suffered so terribly at the hands of the Babylonian king, was gradually regaining its former strength. Adnan, one of the descendants of Ishmael, who nourished about the first century before Christ, had, like his ancestor, married the daughter of the Jurhumite chief, and established himself at Mecca, and his son Maad became the real progenitor of the Ishmaelites inhabiting Hijaz and Najd. FIHR, surnamed Koraish, a descendant of Maad, who flourished in the third century, was the ancestor of the tribe which gave to Arabia, her Prophet and Legislator.

The Khuzaites remained in possession of the temple, and of all the pre-eminence it conferred on them, for more than two centuries. Upon the death of Holayl, the last of the Khuzaite chief, Kossay, a descendant of Fihr,[1] who had married Holayl's daughter, drove the Khuzaites out of Mecca, and possessed himself of the entire power, both secular and religious, in the city, and thus became the virtual ruler of Hijaz.[2] We now arrive on absolutely historical grounds.

Kossay appears to have made himself the master of Mecca about the middle of the fifth century of the Christian era, and he

[1] Kossay was the fifth in descent from Fihr, and was born about 398 A.C. The word Koraish is derived from *Karash*, to trade, as Fihr and his descendants were addicted to commerce.

[2] The next we hear of the Khuzaites is when the Koraish invoked their assistance against the Prophet.

at once set himself to the task of placing the administration of the city upon an organised basis. Until Kossay's time, the different Koraishite families had lived dispersed in separate quarters, at considerable distances from the Kaaba, and the extreme sanctity they attached to the temple had prevented their erecting any habitation in its neighbourhood. Perceiving the dangers to which the national pantheon was exposed from its unprotected condition, he induced the Koraish to settle in its vicinity, leaving a sufficient space free on the four sides of the temple for the *tawâf* (circumambulation). The families, to whom the lands were allotted, dwelt in strongly fortified quarters.

Kossay built for himself a palace, the door of which opened on the platform of the temple. This palace was called the *Dâr un-Nadwa*, [1] "the council hall," where, under the presidency of Kossay, public affairs were discussed and transacted. To this hall, no man under the age of forty, unless a descendant of Kossay, could gain admission. Here also were performed all civil functions. At the *Dâr un-Nadwâ*, the Koraishites, when about to engage in a war, received from the hands of Kossay the standard, *liwa*. Kossay himself attached to the end of a lance a piece of white stuff, and handed it, or sent it by one of his sons, to the Koraishite chiefs. This ceremony, called the *Akd ul-liwa*, continued in vogue from the time of its inauguration by Kossay until the very end of the Arab empire. Another of Kossay's institutions endured much longer. By representing to the Koraish the necessity of providing food for the poor pilgrims who annually visited Mecca, and by impressing on them the duties of hospitality, Kossay succeeded in making them submit to the payment of an annual poor-tax, called the *Rifâda*, which he applied in feeding the poorer pilgrims during the *Ayyâm ul-Minâ*,[2]—the day of the sacrificial feast, and the two following days which they passed at Minâ. This usage continued after the establishment of Islam, and was the origin of the distribution of food which was made at Mina each year during the pilgrimage, in the name of the Caliphs and the Sultans, their successors. The words *nadwa*, *liwa* and *rifâda* denote the functions exercised by Kossay, being the right of convoking and presiding at the council of the nation, of

1 This building, after having been renewed several times, was ultimately converted into a mosque, under Abdul Malik II. (one of the Ommeyyades).

2 Mina, (the 'i' pronounced very short) is a suburb of Mecca.

bestowing the standard,—the symbol of military command,—and of levying imposts, raised for the purpose of supplying food to the pilgrims. With these dignities, Kossay also held the administration of the water supplied by the wells in Mecca and its neighbourhood (*sikâya*), and the custody of the keys of the Kaaba (*hijâba*), with the ministration to the worship of the gods.

Kossay thus united in his own person all the principal religious, civil, and political functions. He was king, magistrate, and chief pontiff. His power, which was almost royal, threw great lustre on the tribe of Koraish, of whom he was the acknowledged chief, and from his time the Koraish acquired a marked preponderance among the other descendants of Ishmael.

Kossay died at an advanced age, about the year 480 A. C.

He had in his lifetime designated his eldest son Abd ud-Dar as his successor, and after his death the son succeeded quietly, and without dispute, to the high position of the father. Upon the death of Abd ud-Dar, serious disputes broke out between his grandchildren and the sons of Abd(u)Manaf, his brother. The various clans and their allies and neighbours ranged themselves on opposite sides. The dispute, however, was amicably settled for the time. By the compromise thus effected, the *sikâya* and the *rifâda* were intrusted to Abd us-Shams, the son of Abd(u)Manaf, whilst the *hijâba*, *nadwa*, and *liwa* remained in the hands of the children of Abd ud-Dar. Abd us-Shams, who was comparatively a poor man, transferred the duties which had been intrusted to him to his brother Hashim, a man of great consequence as well as riches among the Koraish. HASHIM was the receiver of the tax imposed on the Koraishites by Kossay for the support of the pilgrims, and the income derived from their contributions joined to his own resources, was employed in providing food to the strangers who congregated at Mecca during the season of the pilgrimage.

Like the majority of the Meccans, Hâshim was engaged in commerce. It was he who founded among the Koraishites the custom of sending out regularly from Mecca two caravans, one in winter to Yemen, and the other in summer to Syria. Hashim died in the course of one of his expeditions into Syria, in the city of Ghazza, about the year 510 A. C., leaving an only son, named Shayba, by an Yathribite lady of the name of Salma. The charge of the

rifâda and the *sikâya* passed, upon his death, to his younger brother Muttalib, who had won for himself a high place in the estimation of his comparriots, and the noble designation of *al-Faiz* (the Generous) by his worth and munificence. Muttalib brought Shayba, the white-haired youth, from Yathrib, to Mecca. Mistaking Shayba for a slave of Muttalib, the Meccans called him ABD UL-MUTTALIB and history recognises the grandfather of the Prophet under no other name than that of *Abd ul-Muttalib*, "the slave of Muttalib." [1]

Muttalib died at Kazwân, in Yemen, towards the end of 520 A.C., and was succeeded by his nephew, Abd ul-Muttalib, as the virtual head of the Meccan commonwealth. The government of Mecca was at this time vested in the hands of an oligarchy composed of the leading members of the house of Kossay. After the discovery of the sacred well of Zemzem by Abd ul-Muttalib, and the settlement of the disputes regarding its superintendence, the governing body consisted of ten senators, who were styled *Sharîfs*. These decemvirs occupied the first place in the State, and their offices were hereditary in favour of the eldest member, or chief, of each family. These dignities were—

(1). The *Hijâba*, the guardianship of the keys of the Kaaba, a sacerdotal office of considerable rank. It had been alloted to the house of Abd ud-Dar, and at the time when Mecca was converted to Islâm, it was held by Osmân, the son of Talha.

(2). The *Sikâya*, or the intendance of the sacred wells of Zemzem, and of all the water destined for the use of the pilgrims. This dignity belonged to the house of Hashim, and was held at the time of the conquest of Mecca, by Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet.

(3). The *Diyat*, or the civil and criminal magistracy, which had, for a long time, belonged to the house of Taym ibn-Murra, and, at the time of the Prophet's advent, was held by Abdullah ibn-Kuhafa, surnamed Abû Bakr.

(4). The *Sifârath*, or legation. The person to whom this office belonged was the plenipotentiary of the State, authorised to discuss and settle the differences which arose between the Koraish and the

[1] Of the sons of Abd(u)Manâf, Hâshim died first, at Ghazza; then died Abd ush-Shams at Mecca; then Muttalib at Kazwan; and lastly, Naufal, some time after Muttalib, at Silman, in Irak.

other Arab tribes, as also with strangers. This office was held by Omar.

(5). The *Liwa*, or the custody of the standard under which the nation marched against its enemies. The guardian of this standard was the general-in-chief of all the forces of the State. This military charge appertained to the house of Ommeyya, and was held by Abu Sufian, the son of Harb, the most implacable enemy of Mohammed.

(6). The *Rifâda*, or the administration of the poor tax. Formed with the alms of the nation, it was employed to provide food for the poor pilgrims, whether travellers or residents, whom the State regarded as the guests of God. This duty, after the death of Abu Talib, upon whom it had devolved after Abd ul-Muttalib, was transferred to the house of Naufal, son of Abd(u)Manaf, and was held at the time of the Prophet by Harith, son of Amr.

(7). The *Nadwa*, the presidency of the national assembly. The holder of this office was the first councillor of the State, and under his advice all public acts were transacted. Aswad, of the house of Abd ul-Uzza, son of Kossay, held this dignity at the time of the Prophet.

(8). The *Khaïmmeh*, the guardianship of the council chamber. This function, which conferred upon the incumbent the right of convoking the assembly, and even of calling to arms the troops, was held by Khalid, son of Walîd, of the house of Yakhzum, son of Marra.

(9). *Khâzina*, or the administration of the public finances, belonged to the house of Hassan, son of Kaab, and was held by Harith, son of Kais.

(10). The *Azlâm*,[1] the guardianship of the divining arrows by which the judgment of the gods and goddesses was obtained. Safwan, brother of Abu Sufian, held this dignity. At the same time it was an established custom that the oldest member exercised the greatest influence, and bore the title of Rais or Syed, chief and lord *par excellence*. Abbâs was at the time of the Prophet the first of these senators.

In spite, however, of this distribution of privilege and power, the personal character and influence of Abd ul-Muttalib gave him an

(1) With a ز (*zay*), plural of *zalam*.

undoubted pre-eminence. The venerable patriarch, who had, in accordance with the custom of his nation, vowed to the deities of the Kaaba the sacrifice of one of his male children, was blessed with a numerous progeny.[1] And in fulfilment of his vow he proceeded to offer up to the inexorable gods of his temple the life of his best beloved son, Abdullah. But this was not to be. The sacrifice of the human life was commuted, by the voice of the Pythia attached to the temple, to a hundred camels—thenceforth the fixed *wehrgeld*, or price of blood.

Abdullah was married to Âmina, a daughter of Wahb, the chief of the family of Zuhri. The year following the marriage of Abdullah was full of momentous events. At the beginning of the year the whole of Arabia was startled by an event which sent a thrill through the nation, Abraha al-Arsham, the Abyssinian viceroy of Yemen, had built a church at Sana. and was anxious to divert into his own city the wealth which the sanctity of the Kaaba attracted to Mecca. The desecration of the church by a Meccan furnished him with an ostensible motive, and he marched a large army to the destruction of the temple, himself riding at the head of his troops on a magnificently caparisoned elephant. The sight of the huge animal striding solemnly in the midst of the vast force so struck the imagination of the Arabian tribes, that they dated an era from this event, and named it as the Era of the Elephant (570 A.C.). On the approach of the Abyssinians, the Koraish, with their women and children, retired to the neighbouring mountains, and from there watched the course of affairs, hoping all the while that the deities of the Kaaba would defend their dwelling place. The morning dawned brightly as the Abyssinians advanced towards Mecca, when, lo and behold, say the traditionists, the sky was suddenly overcast by an enormous flight of small birds, swallows, which poured small stones

[1] Abd ul-Muttalib had twelve sons and six daughters. Of the sons, Hârith, born towards A. C. 528, was the eldest; the others were Abd ul-Uzza, *alias Abu Lahab*, the persecutor of the Prophet; Abd(u)Manâf, better known as *Abû Tâlib* (born in A. C. 540, died in 620 A. C.); Zubair and ABDULLAH (545), born of Fatima, daughter of Amr, the Makhzumi; Dhirâr and Abbâs (566-652), born of Nutayla; Mukawwim, Jahl, surnamed al-Ghaydak (the liberal), and Hamzah, born of Hala. The daughters were Atika, Omayma, Arwa, Barra, and Umm-Hakîm, surnamed al-Bayza (the fair), by Fatima, and Safiya, born of Hala, who married Awwam, the grandfather of the famous Abdullah ibn-Zubair, who played such an important part in the history of Islam. The names of the two other sons of Abd ul-Muttalib are not known, probably because they left no posterity.

over the ill-fated army. These stones, penetrating through the armour of men and horses, created terrible havoc among the invaders. At the same time the flood-gates of heaven were opened, and there burst forth torrents of rain, carrying away the dead and dying towards the sea.

Abraha fled to Sana covered with wounds, and died there soon after his arrival. Ibn-Hisham, after narrating this prodigy, adds, "it was in the same year that small-pox manifested itself for the first time in Arabia." "This indication explains the miracle," says Caussin de Perceval. One can well understand the annihilation of Abraha's army by some terrible epidemic, similar to the fate which overtook Sennacherib, to which was joined perhaps one of those grand down-pours of rain which often produce terrible inundations in the valley of Mecca.

Shortly after this event, Abdullah died in the course of a journey to Yathrib, in the twenty-fifth year of his age[1]. And, a few days after, the afflicted wife gave birth to a son who was named MOHAMMED. Mohammed was born on the 12th of Rabi I., in the year of the Elephant, a little more than fifty days after the destruction of the Abyssinian army, or the 29th of August 570.[2] His birth, they say, was attended with signs and portents from which the nations of the earth could know that the Deliverer had appeared. The rationalistic historian smiles, the religious controversialist, who, upon *a priori* reasoning, accepts without comment the accounts of the wise men following the star, scoffs at these marvels. To the critical student, whose heart is not devoid of sympathy with earlier modes of thought, and who is not biased with preconceived notions, "the portents and signs" which the Islamist says attended the birth of his Prophet are facts deserving of historical analysis. We, moderns, perceive, in the ordinary incidents in the lives of nations and individuals, the current of an irresistible law; what wonder then that 1300 years ago they perceived in the fall of a nation's memorial the finger of God, pointing to the inevitable destiny, which was to overtake it in its iniquity. In accordance with the

1 He was buried in the quarter occupied by the sons of Aadi, his maternal uncles.

2 Towards the end of the fortieth year of the reign of Kesrâ Anûshirvân, and the end of the year 880 of the era of the Seleucidæ.

custom of the Arabs, the child was confided during his early infancy to a Bedouin woman[1] of the tribe of Banî-Saad, a branch of the Hawazin, and upon being returned by her to his mother, was brought up by Âmina with the tenderest care. But she died not long after, and the doubly-orphaned child was thus thrown upon the care of his grandfather, Abd ul-Muttalib, who, during the few years that he survived the mother, watched his grandson with the utmost tenderness. But nothing could make up for the loss of that parental care and love which are the blessings of childhood. His father had died before he was born. He was bereft of his mother when only six years of age, and this irreparable loss made a deep impression on the mind of the sensitive child. Three or four years later he lost his grandfather also. Abd ul-Muttalib died towards the year 579 A.C.,[2] shortly after his return from a journey to Sana, where he had gone as the representative of the Koraish to congratulate Saif the son of Zu'l Yezen on his accession to the throne of the Tobbas, with the help of the Persians.

With the death of Abd ul-Muttalib opens another epoch in the life of the orphan. On his death-bed the old grandfather had confided to Abu Talib the charge of his brother's child, and in the house of Abu Talib Mohammed passed his early life. We can almost see the lad with his deep wistful eyes, earnest and thoughtful, looking, as it were, into futurity, moving about in the humble unpretentious household of his uncle, or going often into the desert to gaze upon the beauteous face of nature; sweet and gentle of disposition, painfully sensitive to human suffering, this pure-hearted child of the desert was the beloved of his small circle, and there ever existed the warmest attachment between uncle and nephew. "The angels of God had opened out his heart, and filled it with light." His early life was not free from the burden of labour. He had often to go

1 In after life, when this poor Bedouin woman was brought by the Koraish as a captive to Mecca, Mohammed recognised her with tears of joy, and obtained for her from his rich wife an ample provision for her life.

2 Of the two duties of the *Sikâya* and *Rifâda* held by Abd ul-Muttalib, the *Sikâya*, with the custody of the Zemzem, passed to his son Abbas. The second devolved on Abu Talib, who enjoyed at Mecca great authority and consideration. Abu Talib, however, did not transmit the *Rifâda* to his children. This dignity was transferred, upon his death, to the branch of Naufal, son of Abd(u)Manaf; and at the time Mecca surrendered to the Prophet, Harith, the son of Amr, and the grandson of Naufal, exercised, as we have said before, the functions of the *Rifâda*.

into the desert to watch the flocks of his uncle. The princely munificence of Hashim and Abd ul-Muttalib had told upon the fortunes of their heirs, and the Hashimites, owing to the lack of means, were fast losing their commanding position. The duty of providing the pilgrims with food was given up to the rival branch of Ommeyya, who had always entertained the bitterest jealousy towards the children of Hâshim.

Mohammed was but a child when the "Sacrilegious Wars"—*the Ghazwat ul-Fijâr*, which continued with varying fortunes and considerable loss of human life for a number of years—broke out at Okaâz between the Koraish and the Banı-Kinana on one side, and the Kais-Aylan on the other. Okaaz lies between Tayef and Nakhla, three short journeys from Mecca. At this place, famous in Arab history, was held a great annual fair in the sacred month of Zi'l-kaada, when it was forbidden to engage in war or shed human blood in anger,—"a sort of God's truce." Other fairs were held at Majna near Marr uz-Zuhran, not far from Mecca, and at Zu'l Majaz at the foot of Mount Arafat; but the gathering at Okaaz was a great national affair. Here, in the sacred month, when all enmity and tribal vendetta was supposed to lie buried for the time, flowed from all parts of Arabia and even more distant lands, the commerce of the world. Here came the merchants of "Araby the blest," of Hijaz, of Najd; the poet-heroes of the desert; and the actors, often disguised from the avengers of blood, in masks or veils, to recite their poems and win the applause of the nations gathered there. Okaaz was "the Olympia of Arabia;" here they came, not for trade only, but to sing of their prowess, of their glory,—to display their poetical and literary talents. The *Kasîdas*, which won the admiration of the assembled multitude, were inscribed in letters of gold (*Muzahhabât*, golden), and hung up in the national pantheon as a memorial to posterity.[1] During these weeks, Okaâz presented a gay scene of pleasure and excitement. But there was another side to the picture also. The dancing women, like their modern representatives the *almas* and *ghawâzin* of Egypt, moving from tent to tent exciting the impetuous son of the desert by their songs and their merriment; the congregation of Corinthians, who did not even pretend to the calling of music; the drunken orgies, frequently ending in brawls and

[1] Hence also called the *Muallakât*, or "suspended poems."

bloodshed; the gaming-tables, at which the Meccan gambled from night till morning; the bitter hatred and ill-feeling evoked by the pointed personalities of rival poets, leading to sudden affrays and permanent and disastrous quarrels, deepened the shadows of the picture, and made a vivid impression on the orphan child of Âmina.

During the interval between the first and second of those fratricidal wars, named *sacrilegious* from the violation of the sanctity of the month in which all quarrel was forbidden, Mohammed accompanied his uncle and guardian on one of his mercantile journeys to Syria.[1] Here was opened before him a scene of social misery and religious degradation, the sight of which never faded from his memory. Silently and humbly, with many thoughts in his mind, the solitary orphan boy grew from childhood to youth and from youth to manhood.

Deeply versed in the legendary lore of his nation, education in the modern sense of the term he had none. With all his affection for his people, in his ways and mode of thought he seemed far removed from them, isolated in the midst of a chaotic society with his eyes fixed intently on the moving panorama of an effete and depraved age. The lawlessness rife among the Meccans, the sudden outbursts of causeless and sanguinary quarrels among the tribes frequenting the fairs of Okaaz, the immorality and scepticism of the Koraish, naturally caused feelings of intense horror and disgust in the mind of the sensitive youth.

In the twenty-fifth year of his age, Mohammed travelled once more into Syria as the factor or steward of a noble Koraishite lady named Khadîja, a kinswoman of his. The prudence with which he discharged his duties made a favourable impression on Khadija, which gradually deepened into attachment. A marriage, which proved a singularly happy one, was soon after arranged between Mohammed and his noble kinswoman, and was solemnised amidst universal rejoicings. In spite of the disparity of age between Mohammed and his wife, who was much the senior of her husband, there always existed the tenderest devotion on both sides. This

[1] Abû Tâlib, like his father and grandfather, carried on a considerable trade with Syria and Yemen. He transported to Damascus, to Basra, and other places in Syria the dates of Hijaz and Hijr and the perfumes of Yemen, and in return brought back with him the products of the Byzantine empire.

marriage "brought him that repose and exemption from daily toil which he needed in order to prepare his mind for his great work. But beyond that it gave him a loving woman's heart, that was the first to believe in his mission, that was ever ready to console him in his despair, and to keep alive within him the thin flickering flame of hope when no man believed in him,—not even himself,—and the world was black before his eyes."

Khadîja is a notable figure, an exemplar among the womanhood of Islam. The calumny which is levelled at Mohammed's system, that it has degraded the female sex, is sufficiently refuted by the high position which his wife and youngest daughter, our "Lady of Light," occupy in the estimation of the Islamist. Khadija bore Mohammed several children—three sons and four daughters; but the sons all died in infancy, and their loss, which wrung the heart of the bereaved father so tenderly and devotedly attached to them, supplied the hostile Koraish later with an abusive epithet to apply to the Prophet.[1] The daughters long survived the new Dispensation. With the exception of an occasional appearance in public when the exigencies of his position or the necessities of the city of his birth demanded it, the next fifteen years after his marriage is a silent record of introspection, preparation, and spiritual communion. Since the death of Abd ul-Muttalib authority in Mecca had become more or less divided. Each of the senators enjoyed a somewhat limited authority, and among the different functions there was no such institution as a magistracy to insure the peaceable enjoyment by individuals of their rights and property. The ties of blood and family *esprit de corps* afforded some degree of protection to each citizen against injustice and spoliation, but strangers were exposed to all kinds of oppression. They would often find themselves robbed, not only of their goods and chattels, but also of their wives and daughters. A famous poet of the name of Hanzala of the tribe of Bani'l Kayn, better known as Abu Tamahan, was publicly robbed in the streets of Mecca, notwithstanding that he had entered the city as a client of a Koraishite notable, Abdullah ibn Judaân. Another similar act of lawlessness brought matters to a crisis. At the instance of Mohammed, the descendants of Hashim and of Muttalib and the principal members of the family

1 *Al-abtar*, literally without a tail; in its secondary sense, one without issue.

of Zuhra and Taym bound themselves by a solemn oath to defend every individual, whether Meccan or stranger, free or slave, from any wrong or injustice to which he might be subjected in Meccan territories, and to obtain redress for him from the oppressor. This chivalrous league received the name of the *Hilf ul-Fuzul*, or the Federation of the Fuzul, in memory of an ancient society instituted with a similar object among the Jurhum, and composed of four personages, named Fazl, Fazal, Muffazzal, and Fuzail, collectively Fuzul. Mohammed was the principal member of this new association, which was founded about 595 A. C., shortly after his marriage. The League of the Fuzûl exercised efficient protection over the weak and oppressed, and during the first year of its institution the simple threat of its intervention was sufficient to repress the lawlessness of the strong, and to afford redress to the helpless. The League continued to exist in full force for the first half-century of Islam. It was some years after the establishment of the *Hilf ul-Fuzûl*, and towards the commencement of the seventh century of the Christian era, that an attempt was made by Osman, son of Huwairis, backed by Byzantine gold, to convert Hijaz into a Roman dependency. His attempt failed chiefly through the instrumentality of Mohammed, and Osman was obliged to fly into Syria, where he was subsequently poisoned by Amr, the Ghassanide prince. (In 605 A. C., when Mohammed was thirty-five, the Koraish took in hand the reconstruction of the Kaaba. In the course of this work a dispute among the different families engaged in the building of the temple, which at one time seemed likely to lead to great bloodshed, was happily settled by the ready intervention of Mohammed.) These are all we know of his public acts within these fifteen years. His gentle sweet disposition, his austerity of conduct, the severe purity of his life, his scrupulous refinement, his ever-ready helpfulness towards the poor and the weak, his noble sense of honour, his unflinching fidelity, his stern sense of duty had won him, among his compatriots, the high and enviable designation of al-Amîn, the Trusty.

It was at this period that he tried to discharge some portion of the debt of gratitude and obligation he owed his uncle Abu Talib, by charging himself with the education of Ali, one of his sons. Abu Talib's endeavour to maintain the old position of his family had

considerably straitened his circumstances. Mohammed, rich by his alliance with Khadîja, and Abbas, the brother of Abu Talib, were the most opulent citizens of Mecca. During a severe famine which afflicted the country, Mohammed persuaded his uncle Abbas, to adopt one of the sons of Abu Talib, whilst he adopted another. Thus Abbas took Jaafar · Mohammed, Ali, and Akîl remained with his father.[1] Mohammed had lost all his sons in early infancy. In the love of Ali he found some consolation for their loss; and the future marriage of the son of Abu Talib with the youngest daughter of Mohammed, Fatima,[2] sealed the bond of love and devotedness.

Mohammed about this time set an example to his fellow-citizens by an act of humanity which created a salutary effect upon his people. A young Arab of the name of Zaid, son of Harith, was brought as a captive to Mecca by a hostile tribe, and sold to a nephew of Khadija, who presented the young lad to her. Mohammed obtained Zaid as a gift from Khadija, and immediately enfranchised him. This kindness on the one side gave rise to absolute devotion on the other, and the Arab boy could not be induced, even by his own father, to return to his tribe or forsake Mohammed.

Thus passed the fifteen years of trial and probation, years marked by many afflictions and yet full of sympathy with human suffering and sorrow.

Before him lay his country, bleeding and torn by fratricidal wars and inter-tribal dissensions, his people sunk in barbarism, addicted to obscene rites and superstitions, and, with all their desert virtues, lawless and cruel. His two visits to Syria had opened to him a scene of unutterable moral and social desolation; rival creeds and sects tearing each other to pieces, wrangling over the body of the God they pretended to worship, carrying their hatred to the valleys and deserts of Hijaz, and rending the townships of Arabia with their quarrels and bitterness. The picture before him was one of dreary hopelessness. The few who, abandoning their ancient beliefs, were groping in the dark for some resting-place, represented a general feeling of unrest.[3] In their minds there was nothing capable of

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, p. 109; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 42; Tibri, vol. ii. p. 396.

[2] Born in 606 A.C.

[3] Four men, Zaid, Waraka son of Naufal and a cousin of Khadîja, and two others (Obaidullah and Osman), abandoning the fetishism of their countrymen, had betaken themselves to a search for the true faith. Zaid was the principal person among them. Before the Prophet retired into the wilderness, like

appealing to the humanity beyond themselves. Mohammed's soul was soaring aloft, trying to peer into the mysteries of creation, of life and death, of good and evil, to find order out of chaos. And God's words uttered to his soul became at last the life-giving power of the world. For years after his marriage it had been his wont to betake himself, sometimes with his family, at other times alone, for prayer and meditation to a cave on the Mount Hira,[1] "a huge barren rock, torn by cleft and hollow ravine, standing out solitary in the full white glare of the desert sun, shadowless, flowerless, without well or rill." Solitude had indeed become a passion with him. Here in this cave he often remained whole nights plunged in profoundest thought, deep in communion (التحنث) with the unseen yet all-pervading God of the Universe. Slowly the heaven and earth fill with pre-destined vision and command. A voice seems to issue even from the inanimate objects around him, the stones and rocks and trees, calling on him to fulfil the task an Almighty Power was directing him to undertake.[2] Can the poetry of the soul go further? The mental visions and the apparitions of angels at these moments were the bright, though gradual, dawnings of those truths with which he was to quicken the world into life. Often in the dark and benighted pathways of concrete existence, the soul of every great man has been conscious of unrealised yet not unseen influences, which have led to some of the happiest achievements of humanity. From Samuel, that ancient Seer, wild and awful as he stands, deep in the misty horizon of the Past, to Jesus in the wilderness, pondering over the darksome fate of his people and the magnitude of his work, listening to the sweet accents of the God of Truth,—from Jesus to Mohammed in the solitude of his mountain retreat, there is no break in the action of these influences.[3] In the still hours of the night, in the sweet calmness of the early dawn, in the depth of solitude, when no

Jesus, to commune with God, he had come in contact with Zaid, and learnt to esteem his abhorrence of idolatry. When Zaid's cousin asked the Prophet in later times to supplicate divine mercy for him, Mohammed, who would not pray for his own grandfather, as he had died in idolatry, willingly did so for Zaid.—Ibn-Hisham, p. 145.

1 Now called the Mount of Light. Ibn-Hisham, Ibn ul-Athîr, and Abulfeda mention the month of Ramazan as the month which Mohammed usually spent at Hira in prayer and the succour of the poor and famished wayfarers of the desert. Tibri mentions Rajab.

2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 151.

3 Koran, sura xcvi. 2; Ibn-Hisham, p. 153; Ibn ul-Athîr, Vol. II p. 34.

human sympathy is near, a Voice comes to him from heaven, gently as the sough of the morning breeze: "Thou art the man, Thou art the Prophet of God;" or, when wrapt in thought it comes in mighty waves: "Cry in the name of thy Lord."[1] The over-wrought mind at these moments raises a vision before the eye, a vision of the celestial ministrants who are believed to form the medium of inter-communication between the God of Heaven and the man on earth. "The Father of Truth chooses His own prophets, and He speaks to them in a voice stronger than the voice of thunder. It is the same inner voice through which God speaks to all of us. That voice may dwindle away, and become hardly audible; it may lose its divine accent, and sink into the language of worldly prudence; but it may also from time to time assume its real nature with the chosen of God, and sound in their ears as a voice from heaven."[2]

"The natural relations of Mahomet's vast conception of the personality of God with the atmosphere of his age," says a great writer,[3] "is the only explanation of that amazing soberness and self-command with which he entertained his all-absorbing visions;" and then adds, "it could not have been accidental that the one supreme force of the epoch issued from the solitudes of that vast peninsula round which the tides of empire rose and fell. Every exclusive prophetic claim in the name of a sovereign will has been a cry from the desert. The symbolic meaning given to Arabia by the withdrawal of the Christian apostle to commune with a power above flesh and blood, in Mahomet became more than a symbol. Arabia was itself the man of the hour, the prophet of Islam its concentrated word. To the child of her exalted traditions, driven by secret compulsion out into the lonely places of the starry night, his mouth in the dust, the desert spoke without reserve."

One night—"the Night of Power and Excellence"—when a divine peace rests on creation, and all nature is lifted up towards its Lord, —in the middle of that night the Book was opened to the thirsting soul. Whilst lying self-absorbed, he is called by a mighty Voice, surging like the waves of the ocean, to cry. Twice the Voice called, and twice he struggled and waived its call. But a fearful weight

1 Comp. Isa. xl. 6.

2 Professor Muller, quoted from Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, Part i. Lect. xviii. p. 394.

3 Johnson, *Oriental Religions*, p. 561.

was laid on him, and an answer was wrung out of his heart. "Cry!" called out the Voice for the third time.

And he said, "What shall I cry?" Came the answer: "Cry—in the name of thy Lord!"

When the Voice had ceased to speak, telling him how from minutest beginnings man had been called into existence and lifted up by understanding and knowledge of the Lord, who is most beneficent, and who *by the Pen* had revealed that which men did not know,[1] Mohammed woke from his trace, and felt as if the words spoken to his soul had been written in his heart. A great trembling came upon him, and he hastened home to his wife, and said, "O Khadîja! What has happened to me?" He lay down, and she watched by him. When he recovered from his paroxysm he said, "O Khadîja! he of whom one would not have believed it (meaning himself) has become either a soothsayer[2] (Kâhin) or one possessed —mad." She replied, "God is my protection, O Abu'l-Kasim! (a name of Mohammed, derived from one of his boys), He will surely not let such a thing happen unto thee; for thou speakest the truth, dost not return evil for evil, keepest faith, art of a good life, and kind to thy relations and friends. And neither art thou a babbler in the market-places. What has befallen thee? Hast thou seen aught terrible?" Mohammed replied, "Yes." And he told her what he had seen. Whereupon she answered and said, "Rejoice, O dear husband, and be of good cheer. He, in whose hands stands Khadija's life, is my witness that thou wilt be the Prophet of this people." Then she arose and went to her cousin Waraka, son of Naufal, who was old and blind, and "knew the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians." When she told him what she had heard, he cried out, "*Kuddûsun, Kuddusun*! Holy, holy! Verily this is the *Nâmûs ul-akbar*[3] who came to Moses. He will be the Prophet of his people. Tell him this. Bid him be of brave heart."

1 Sura xcvi. vers. 1-5. "Ikrâ" is usually rendered into "read"; but I have preferred to follow the rendering suggested by Deutsch, as more in accordance with the call to the Prophet; see Rodwell also, and compare Zamakhshari.

2 Divines and soothsayers were his particular aversions; most of them were attached to the temples.

3 The primary signification of the word *Nâmûs* in Arabic is a messenger, one who communicates a secret message. It also means law, as the Greek νομος. "In Talmudical phraseology," says Deutsch, "it signifies the revealed law. In Waraka's mind these different significations were combined; the messenger and the message, both divine, had come to Mohammed even as they had come to Moses."

In the midst of the wreck of empires and nations, in the wild turmoil of tribes and clans, there was a voice in the air—east and west, north and south—that God's message was close at hand: the shepherd was nigh who was to call back the erring flock into the Master's fold. It had spoken to the heart of Waraka.

And when the two men met subsequently in the streets, the blind old reader of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, who had searched in them for consolation and found none, but who knew of the promise held out to mankind of a Deliverer, spoke of his faith and trust. "I swear by Him in whose hand Waraka's life is," said the old man, "God has chosen thee to be the prophet of this people; the *Nâmus ul-akbar* has come to thee. They will call thee a liar. they will persecute thee, they will banish thee, they will fight against thee. Oh, that I could live to those days! I would fight for thee." [1] And he kissed him on his forehead. These words of hope and trust brought comfort to the troubled soul. [2] And then followed a period of waiting for the Voice to come again,—the inspiration of Heaven to fall once more on the anxious mind.

We can appreciate the spiritual throes, the severe mental conflicts, the doubts, hopes, and misgivings which alternately wrung the heart of Mohammed, when we are told that before he had himself realised his Mission he was driven to the verge of self-destruction, when the angel of God recalled him to his duty to mankind. [3] It spoke to the poor grieved heart, agitated by doubt and fear,—of hope and trust, of the bright future when he should see the people of the earth crowding into the one true Faith.

Saved by the gracious monition, he hurries home from the desert, exhausted in mind and body, to the bosom of his devoted wife, praying only to be covered from the overwhelming Presence.

His was not the communion with God of those egoists who bury themselves in deserts or forests, and live a life of quietude for themselves alone. His was the hard struggle of the man who is led onwards by a nobler destiny towards the liberation of his race from the bondage of idolatry. His destiny was unfolded to him when, wrapt in profound meditation, melancholy and sad, he felt himself called by that Voice from heaven which had called those who had

1 *Rouzat-us-safa.*—Ibn-Hishâm, p. 103.
2 Waraka died soon after this event.—Ibn-Hisham, p. 104.
3 Ibn ul Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 35, 36; Tibri (Zotenberg's transl.), vol. ii. p. 392.

gone before him, to arise and preach. "O thou, enwrapped in thy mantle, arise and warn, and glorify thy Lord."[1] And he arose and girded himself for the work to which he was called. Thenceforth his life is devoted to humanity. Preaching with unswerving purpose amidst frightful persecutions, insulted and outraged, he held on in his path of reproof and reform.

Khadîja was the first to accept his Mission. She was the first to believe in the revelation, to abandon the idolatry of her people, and to join with him in purity of heart in offering up prayers to the All-Merciful. Not only was she the first to believe in him and his divine message, but in the struggle which was to follow she was his true consoler; and "God," says tradition, "comforted him through her when he returned to her, for she roused him up again and made his burden more light to him, assuring him of her own faith in him, and representing to him the futility of men's babble."

In the beginning Mohammed opened his soul only to those who were attached to him, and tried to wean them from the gross practices of their forefathers. After Khadîja, Ali was the next disciple.[2] Often did the Prophet go into the depths of the solitary desert around Mecca, with his wife and young cousin, that they might together offer up their heartfelt thanks to the God of all nations for His manifold blessings. Once they were surprised in the attitude of prayer by Abu Talib, the father of Ali. And he said to Mohammed, "O son of my brother, what is this religion that thou art following?" "It is the religion of God, of His angels, of His prophets, and of our ancestor Abraham," answered the Prophet. "God has sent me to His servants to direct them towards the truth; and thou, O my uncle, art the most worthy of all. It is meet that I should thus call upon thee, and it is meet that thou shouldst accept the truth and help in spreading it." "Son of my brother," replied Abu Talib, in the true spirit of the sturdy old Semite, "I cannot abjure the religion of my fathers; but by the Supreme God, whilst I am alive none shall dare to injure thee." Then turning towards Ali, his son, the venerable patriarch inquired what religion was his. "O father," answered Ali, "I believe in God and His Prophet, and go with him."

[1] Koran, sura lxxiv.

[1] Ibn-Hisham, p. 155; Abulfeda (Desvergers' transl. p. 14); *Rouzat-us-safa.*

"Well, my son," said Abû Tâlib, "he will not call thee to aught save what is good, wherefore thou art free to cleave unto him."[1]

Soon after Zaid, the son of Harith, who notwithstanding his freedom had cast in his lot with Mohammed, became a convert to the new faith. He was followed by a leading member of the Koraishite community of the name of Abdullah, son of Abu Kuhafa, who afterwards became famous in history as Abu Bakr.[2] A member of the important family of Taym ibn-Murra, a wealthy merchant, a man of clear, calm judgment, at the same time energetic, prudent, honest, and amiable, he enjoyed great consideration among his compatriots. He was but two years younger than the Prophet, and his unhesitating adoption of the new faith was of great moral effect. Five notables followed in his footsteps, among them Osman, son of Affan, of the family of Ommeyya, who afterwards became the third caliph; Abdur Rahman, son of Auf; Saad, son of Abi Wakkas, afterwards the conqueror of Persia; Zubair, son of Awwam and nephew of Khadîja, presented themselves before the Prophet and accepted Islam at his hands. Several proselytes also came from the humbler walks of life. It is a noble feature in the history of the Prophet of Arabia, and one which strongly attests the sincerity of his character, the purity of his teachings and the intensity of his faith and trust in God, that his nearest relations, his wife, his beloved cousin, and intimate friends, were most thoroughly imbued with the truth of his Mission and convinced of his inspiration. Those who knew him best, closest relations and dearest friends, people who lived with him and noted all his movements, were his sincere and most devoted followers. If these men and women, noble, intelligent, and certainly not less educated than the fishermen of Galilee, had perceived the slightest sign of earthliness, deception, or want of faith in the Teacher himself, Mohammed's hopes of moral regeneration and social reform would all have been dashed to pieces in a moment. They braved for him persecutions and dangers; they bore up against physical tortures and mental agony, caused by social excommunication, even unto death. Would this have been so had they perceived the least backsliding in their

[1] The above is a paraphrase of the account given by Ibn Hishâm, pp. 159, 160; and Ibn ul-Athir, vol. ii. pp. 42, 43.

[2] Desvergers in a note (p. 108) mentions that before his conversion to Islam, he was called Abd ul-Kaaba, "servant of the Kaaba."

master? But even had these people not believed in Mohammed with such earnest faith and trust, it would furnish no reason for doubting the greatness of his work or the depth of his sincerity. For the influence of Jesus himself was least among his nearest relations. His brothers never believed in him,[1] and they even went so far as once to endeavour to obtain possession of his person, believing him to be out of his mind.[2] Even his immediate disciples were not firm in their convictions. [3]

Perhaps this unsteadiness may have arisen from weakness of character, or it may have resulted, as Milman thinks,[4] from the varying tone of Jesus himself; but the fact is undeniable.[5] The intense faith and conviction on the part of the immediate followers of Mohammed is the noblest testimony to his sincerity and his utter self-absorption in his apppointed task.

For three weary long years he laboured quietly to wean his people from the worship of idols. But polytheism was deeply rooted among them; the ancient cult offered attractions which the new Faith in its purity did not possess. The Koraish had vested interests in the old worship; and their prestige was involved in its maintenance. Mohammed had thus to contend, not only with the heathenism of his city sanctified by ages of observance and belief but also with the opposition of the oligarchy which ruled its destinies, and with whom like the generality of their people, superstition was allied to great scepticism. With these forces fighting against him, little wonder that the life and death struggle of the three years drew only thirty followers. But the heart of the great Teacher never failed. Steadfast in his trust in the Almighty Master whose behests he was carrying out, he held on. Hitherto he had preached quietly and unobtrusively. His compatriots had looked askance at him, had begun to doubt the sanity of al-Amin, thought him crazed or "possessed," but had not interfered with his isolated exhortations. He now determined to appeal publicly to the Koraish to abandon their idolatry. With this object he convened an assembly on the hill of Safa, and

[1] John vii. 5. [2] Mark iii. 21.

[3] And these were the men whom Jesus called "his mother and brethren." in preference to his *own* mother and brothers, Matt. xii 45—48; Mark iii. 32, 33.

[4] Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 254, 255.

[5] Sir W. Muir admits this in the most positive terms (vol. ii. p. 274); he says, "the apostles fled at the first sound of danger."

there spoke to them of the enormities of their crimes in the sight of the Lord, their folly in offering adoration to carved idols. He warned them of the fate that had overtaken the races which had passed unheeded the words of the preachers of bygone days, and invited them to abjure their old impious worship, and adopt the faith of love and truth and purity. But the mockers mocked his words, laughed at the enthusiasm of young Ali, and departed with taunts and scoffs on their lips, and fear in their hearts at the spirit of revolution which had risen in their midst. Having thus failed to induce the Koraish to listen to the warnings of Heaven, he turned his attention to the strangers visiting the city for trade or pilgrimage. To them he endeavoured to convey God's words. But here again his efforts were frustrated by the Koraish. When the pilgrims began to arrive on the environs of the city, the Koraishites posted themselves on the different routes and warned the strangers against holding any communication with Mohammed, whom they represented as a dangerous magician. This machination led, however, to a result little expected by the Meccans. As the pilgrims and traders dispersed to their distant homes, they carried with them the news of the advent of the strange, enthusiastic preacher, who at the risk of his own life was calling aloud to the nations of Arabia to give up the worship of their fathers.

If the Koraish were under the impression that Mohammed would be abandoned by his own kith and kin, they were soon undeceived by a scathing denunciation hurled at them by Abu Talib. The old patriarch, who had refused with characteristic persistency to abandon his ancient creed, or to adopt the new faith rebelled at the injustice and intolerance of his compatriots towards the reformer, and with true desert chivalry he deplored, in a poem which lies embalmed in history, the enormities of the Koraish towards one who was the benefactor of the orphan and the widow—*al-Amîn*, who never failed in word or deed; and declared that the childrem of Hashim and of Muttalib would defend the innocent with their lives. About the same time an Yathribite chief wrote to the Koraish of Mecca, and, holding up the examples of bygone ages, exhorted them not to embroil themselves with civil dissensions and warfare. He advised them to give a hearing to the new preacher: "An honourable man has adopted a certain religion, why persecute him? for it is only the Lord of the Heaven who can read the heart of man!" His counsel

had some effect, and occasioned a change of tactics among the Koraish. For a time, accordingly, calumnies and vilifications, exasperating contumelies and petty outrages were substituted for open and violent persecution. The hostile Koraish stopped the Prophet from offering his prayers at the Kaaba; they pursued him wherever he went; they covered him and his disciples with dirt and filth when engaged in their devotions. They incited the children and the bad characters of the town to follow and insult him. They scattered thorns in the places which he frequented for devotion and meditation. In this act of refined cruelty the lead was always taken by Umm ul-Jamil, the wife of Abu Lahab, one of Mohammed's uncles. She was the most inveterate of his persecutors. Every place which he or his disciples frequented for devotion she covered with thorns. This exasperating conduct brought down upon her the designation of being "the bearer of faggots" (*hammâlat ul-hatab*) [to hell].

Amidst all these trials Mohammed never wavered. Full of the intensest confidence in his Mission, he worked on steadily. Several times he was in imminent danger of his life at the hands of the Koraish. On one occasion he disarmed their murderous fury by his gentle and calm self-control. But persecution only added to the strength of the new faith. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," is a truth not confined to one creed. The violence of the Koraish towards Mohammed, their burning and bitter intolerance, led to the conversion of the redoubtable Hamza, the youngest son of Abd ul-Muttalib. This intrepid warrior, brave, generous, and true, whose doughty sword was held in dread by all the Koraish, about this time came to the Prophet, adopted his faith, and became thenceforth a devoted adherent of Islam, and eventually laid down his life in the cause.

Amidst all this persecution Mohammed never ceased calling to the nation so wedded to iniquity to abadon their evil ways and abominations. He threw his heart and soul into his preachings. He told them in burning words, which seared into the hearts of his listeners, the punishment which had lighted on the tribes of Aad and Thamud who had heeded not the warnings of God's messengers, of the outpouring of Heaven's wrath at the iniquities of Noah's people. He adjured them by the wonderful sights of nature, by the noon-day brightness, by the night when she spreadeth her veil, by the day when

it appeareth in glory, to listen to the warning before a like destruction came upon them. He told them of the day of reckoning, when the deeds done by man in this world shall be weighed before the Eternal Judge, when the children who had been buried alive shall be asked for what crime they hed been put to death, and when heaven and earth shall be folded up and none be near but God. He spoke to them of the rewards and punishments of the Hereafter, describing to his materialistic people the joys of Paradise and the pains of hell "with all the glow of Eastern imagery." He told them what the unbelievers were like—"They are like unto one who kindleth a fire, and when it hath thrown its light on all around him, God taketh away the light and leaveth him in darkness and they cannot see."

"Deaf, dumb, blind, therefore they shall not retrace their steps."

"They are like those who, when there cometh a storm-cloud of heaven big with darkness, thunder, and lightning, thrust their fingers into their ears because of the thunder-clap for fear of death. God is round about the infidels."

"The lightning almost snatcheth away their eyes; so oft as it gleameth on them, they walk on in it; but when darkness closeth upon them, they stop; and if God pleased, of their ears and of their eyes would He surely deprive them: verily God is Almighty."[1]

"As to the infidels, their works are like the *Sarâb* on the plain,[2] which the thirsty [traveller] thinketh to be water, and then when he cometh thereto, he findeth it [to be] nothing but he findeth God round about him, and He will fully pay him his account; for swift in taking an account is God."

"Or, as the darkness over a deep sea, billows riding upon billows below, and clouds above; one darkness over another darkness; when a man stretcheth forth his hand he is far from seeing it; he to whom God doth not grant light, no light at all hath he."[3]

The people were awestruck, and conversions grew frequent.

The Koraish were now thoroughly alarmed; Mohammed's preaching betokened a serious revolutionary movement. Their power and prestige were at stake. They were the custodians of the idols whom Mohammed threatened with destruction; they were the ministers of the worship which Mohammed denounced,—their very existence depended upon their maintaining the old institutions intact. If his

[1] Sura ii. [2] *i.e.* the mirage of the desert. [3] Sura xxiv 39, 40.

predictions were fulfilled, they would have to efface themselves as a nation pre-eminent among the nationalities of Arabia. The new preacher's tone was intensely democratic; in the sight of his Lord all human beings were equal. This levelling of old distinctions was contrary to all their traditions. They would have none of it, for it boded no good to their exclusive privileges. Urgent measures were needed to stifle the movement before it gained further strength.

They accordingly decided upon an organised system of persecution. In order, however, not to violate their laws of vendetta, each family took upon itself the task of strangling the new religion within its own circle. Each household tortured its own members, or clients, or slaves, who were supposed to have attached themselves, to the new faith. Mohammed, owing to the protection of Abu Talib and his kinsmen, Abu Bakr and a few others, who were either distinguished by their rank or possessed some influential friend or protector among the Koraish, were, for the time, exempt from immediate violence. The others were thrown into prison, starved, and then beaten with sticks. The hill of Ramdha and the place called Bathâ became thus the scenes of cruel tortures.[1] The men or women whom the Koraish found abandoning the worship of their idol-gods, were exposed to the burning heat of the desert on the scorching sand, where, when reduced to the last extremity by thirst, they were offered the alternative of adoring the idols or death. Some recanted only to profess Islam once more when released from their torments; but the majority held firmly to their faith. Such a one was Billal, the first Muazzin of Islam. His master, Ommeyya, son of Khallaf, conducted him each day to Batha when the heat of the sun was at its greatest, and there exposed him bare-backed with his face to the burning sun, and placed on his chest an enormous block of stone. "There shalt thou remain until thou art dead," Ommeyya used to say, "or thou hast abjured Islam." As he lay half-stifled under his heavy weight, dying with thirst, he would only answer, "*Ahadûn, ahadûn,*" "one [God], one." This lasted for days, until the poor sufferer was reduced to the verge of death, when he was ransomed by Abu Bakr, who had in like manner purchased the liberty of six other slaves. They killed with excruciating toments Yasar and Samiya his wife; they inflicted fearful tortures on Ammar

[1] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 50; Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 205-209.

their son. Mohammed was often an eye-witness to the sufferings of his disciples,—sufferings borne with patience and fortitude as became martyrs in the cause of truth. And these were not the only martyrs in the early history of Islâm.[1]

Like the Pharisees tempting Jesus, the Koraish came to Mohammed with temptations of worldly honour and aggrandisement, to draw him from the path of duty. One day, says the chronicler, he was sitting in the Kaaba, at a little distance from an assembly of the antagonistic chiefs, when one of them, Otba, son of Rabia, a man of moderate views came to him and said, "O son of my brother, thou art distinguished by thy qualities and thy descent. Now thou hast sown division among our people, and cast dissension in our families; thou denouncest our gods and goddesses; thou dost tax our ancestors with impiety. We have a proposition to make to thee; think well if it will not suit thee to accept it." "Speak, O father of Walîd,"[2] said the Prophet, "I listen, O son of my brother." Commenced Otba: "If thou wishest to acquire riches by this affair, we will collect a fortune larger than is possessed by any of us; if thou desirest honours and dignity, we shall make thee our chief, and shall not do a thing without thee; if thou desirest dominion, we shall make thee our king; and if the spirit (demon) which possesses thee cannot be overpowered, we will bring thee doctors and give them riches till they cure thee." And when he had done, "Hast thou finished, O father of Walid?" asked the Prophet. "Yes," replied he. "Then listen to me." "I listen," he said. "In the name of the most merciful God," commenced the Warner, "this is a revelation from the most Merciful: a book, the verses whereof are distinctly explained, an Arabic Koran, for the instruction of people who understand; bearing good tidings, and denouncing threats: but the greater part of them turn aside, and hearken not thereto. And they say, 'Our hearts are veiled from the doctrine to which thou invitest us; and there is a deafness in our ears, and a curtain

1 *E.g.* Khobaib bin Aada, who, being perfidiously sold to the Koraish, was by them put to death in a cruel manner by mutilation and cutting off his flesh piece-meal. In the midst of his tortures, being asked whether he did not wish Mohammed in his place, answered, "*I would not wish to be with my family, my substance, and my children on condition that Mohammed was only to be pricked with a thorn.*"

2 Walîd being a son of Otba. It was usual, and is so even now, among the Arabs to call a man as the father of so-and-so, instead of using his own name, as a mark of consideration.

between us and thee: wherefore act thou as thou shalt think fit; for we shall act according to our own sentiments.' Say 'verily I am only a man like you. It is revealed unto me that your God is one God; wherefore direct your way straight unto him; and ask pardon of Him for what is past.' And woe be to the idolators, who give not the appointed alms, and believe not in the life to come![1] But as to those who believe and work righteousness, they shall receive an everlasting reward,"[2] When the Prophet finished this recitation, he said to Otba, "Thou hast heard, now take the course which seemeth best to thee."[3]

Profoundly afflicted by the sufferings of his disciples, whose position, as time went on, became more and more unbearable, he advised them to seek a refuge in the neighbouring Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, where ruled a pious sovereign, till God in His mercy wrought a change in the feelings of the Koraish. He had heard of the righteousness of this Christian sovereign, of his tolerance and hospitality, and was certain of a welcome for his followers.

Some immediately availed themselves of the advice, and sailed, to the number of fifteen, to the hospitable shores of the Negus (Najashi). This is called the first Exile (*muhájarat*) in the history of Islam, and occurred in the fifth year of Mohammed's Mission (615 A.C.). These emigrants were soon joined by many more of their fellow-sufferers and labourers in the cause of truth, until their number amounted to eighty-three men and eighteen women.[4] But the untiring hostility of the Koraish pursued them even here. They were furious at the escape of their victims, and sent deputies to the king to demand the delivery of these refugees that they might be put to death. They stated the chief charges against the poor fugitives to be the abjuration of their old religion, and the adoption of a new one. The Negus sent for the exiles, and inquired of them whether what their enemies had stated was true. "What is this religion for which you have abandoned your former faith", asked the king, "and adopted neither mine nor that of any other people?" Jaafar, son of Abu Talib, and brother of Ali, acting as spokesman for the fugitives, spoke thus: "O king, we were plunged in the depth of ignorance

1 Whilst hospitality was regarded as a great virtue, charity was considered a weakness among the Arabs; and a future life, an old woman's fable.

2 Koran, Sura xli. 3 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 185, 186.

4 Ibn-Hisham, p. 208 et seq.; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 58; Abulfeda, p. 20.

and barbarism; we adored idols, we lived in unchastity; we ate dead bodies, and we spoke abominations; we disregarded every feeling of humanity, and the duties of hospitality and neighbourhood; we knew no law but that of the strong, when God raised among us a man, of whose birth, truthfulness, honesty, and purity we were aware; and he called us to the unity of God, and taught us not to associate anything with Him;[1] he forbade us the worship of idols; and enjoined us to speak the truth, to be faithful to our trusts, to be merciful, and to regard the rights of neighbours; he forbade us to speak evil of women, or to eat the substance of orphans; he ordered us to fly vices, and to abstain from evil; to offer prayers, to render alms, to observe the fast. We have believed in him, we have accepted his teachings and his injunctions to worship God, and not to associate anything with Him. For this reason our people have risen against us, have persecuted us in order to make us forego the worship of God and return to the worship of idols of wood and stone and other abominations. They have tortured us and injured us, until finding no safety among them, we have come to thy county, and hope thou wilt protect us from their oppression."[2]

The demands of the Koraish were scouted by the king, and the deputies returned in confusion to Mecca.

Whilst the disciples of Mohammed were seeking safety in other lands from the persecution of their enemies, he himself stood bravely at his post, and amidst every insult and outrage pursued his mission. Again they came to him with promises of honour and riches, to seduce him from his duty; the reply was as before, full of life, full of faith: "I am neither desirous of riches nor ambitious of dignity nor of dominion; I am sent by God, who has ordained me to announce glad tidings unto you. I give you the words of my Lord; I admonish you. If you accept the message I bring you, God will be favourable to you both in this world and in the next; if you reject my admonitions, I shall be patient, and leave God to judge between you and me." They mocked him, scoffed at him, tried by insidious questions to expose the fallacy of his teachings.[3] His simple trust

1 The idolaters are almost always called "Associators," *Mushrikîn*, in the Koran, or men who associate other beings with God.

2 Can there be a better summary of Mohammed's work or of his teachings? Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 61; and Ibn-Hisham, pp. 219, 220.

3 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 188. A Christian historian goes into raptures at the subtlety of the idolaters; see Osborn, *Islam under the Arabs*.

and sublime faith in his Master rose superior to all their materialistic scepticism. They asked him to cause wells and rivers to gush forth, to bring down the heaven in pieces, to remove mountains, to have a house of gold erected, to ascend to heaven by a ladder.[1] It was a repetition of the old story, with this difference, that in the case of Jesus his own followers insisted upon his performing miracles to satisfy them of the truth of his mission. "His immediate disciples," says Professor Momerie, "were always misunderstanding him and his work: wanting him to call down fire from heaven; wanting him to declare himself king of the Jews; wanting to sit on his right hand and on his left hand in his kingdom; wanting him to show them the Father, to make God visible to their bodily eyes; wanting him to do, and wanting to do themselves, anything and everything that was incompatible with His great plan. This was how they treated him until the end. When that came, they all forsook him, and fled."

To these unsatisfied, lukewarm spirits, whose craving for wonders was no less strong than that of the Koraish, and who afterwards clothed the revered figure of Jesus in a mist, a legacy which even modern idealistic Christianity cannot shake off, the Master was wont to reply, at times angrily, that it was an evil and adulterous age which sought after a sign, and that no sign should be given to it; and that if a man believed not in Moses and the prophets, he would not repent even though one rose from the dead.[2]

It must be said to the credit of the disciples of the Arabian teacher, that they never called for a miracle from *their* Master. They—scholars, merchants, and soldiers—looked to the moral evidences of his mission. They ranged themselves round the friendless preacher at the sacrifice of all their worldly interests and worldly hopes, and adhered to him through life and death with a devotion to his human personality to which there is scarcely a parallel in the history of the world.

In an age when miracles were supposed to be ordinary occurrences at the beck of the commonest saint, when the whole atmos-

[1] Sura xvii. 92-96.

[2] Patristic Christianity has held, and still holds, to the miracles as a proof of the divinity of Jesus; modern Christianity calls them *Aberglaube*. It may well be, as the author of *Literature and Dogma* says, that the miracles are doomed, and that the miracle-saga of Christianity must, sooner or later, go with all legends, Eastern or Western.

phere was surcharged with supernaturalism, not only in Arabia, but in the neighbouring countries where civilisation had made far greater progress, the great Pioneer of rationalism unhesitatingly replies to the miracle-seeking heathens—"God has not sent me to work wonders; He has sent me to preach to you. My Lord be praised! Am I more than a man sent as an apostle? . . . Angels do not commonly walk the earth, or God would have despatched an angel to preach His truth to you.[1] I never said that Allah's treasures are in my hand, that I knew the hidden things, or that I was an angel. . . . . I who cannot even help or trust myself, unless God pleaseth." . . . No extraordinary pretensions, no indulgence in hyperbolical language, no endeavour to cast a glamour round his character or personality. "I am only a preacher of God's words, the bringer of God's message to mankind," repeats he always. From first to last no expression escapes him "which could be construed into a request for human worship;"[2] from first to last there is unvarying soberness of expression, which, considering the age and surroundings, is more marvellous; from first to last the tone is one of simple, deep humility before the Creator. And in the moment of his greatest exaltation the feeling is one of humble, sweet thankfulness:—

"In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate! Whatsoever is in heaven and on earth praises God the King, the Holy One, the Almighty, the All-wise. It is He who out of the midst of the illiterate Arabs has raised an apostle to show unto them His signs, and to sanctify them, and to teach them the Scripture and the Wisdom, them who before had been in great darkness. . . . This is God's free grace, which He giveth unto whomsoever He wills. God is of great mercy!"[3]

Disclaiming every power of wonder-working, the Prophet of Islam ever rests the truth of his divine commission entirely upon his Teachings. He never resorts to the miraculous to assert his influence or to enforce his warnings. He invariably appeals to the familiar phenomena of nature as signs of the divine presence.[4] He unswervingly addresses himself to the inner consciousness of man, to his

[1] Sura xvii. 97, 98; sura lxxii. 21-24. [2] Professor Momerie.
[3] Sura lxii. vv. 1-10.
[4] The passage of Sir W. Muir on this point is, to say the least, remarkable. He says: "Whether the idolatry of Mecca would not have succumbed without a struggle before such preaching as Mahomet's, *sustained by reasonable*

reason, and not to his weakness or his credulity. Look round yourself: is this wonderful world, the sun, moon, and stars, holding their swift silent course in the blue vault of heaven, the law and system prevailing in the universe; the rain-drops falling to revive the parched earth into life; the ships moving across the ocean, beladen with what is profitable to mankind; the beautiful palm covered with its golden fruit,—are these the handiwork of your wooden or stone gods?[1]

Fools! do you want a sign, when the whole creation is full of the signs of God. The structure of your body, how wonderfully complex, how beautifully regulated; the alternations of night and day, of life and death; your sleeping and awaking; your desire to accumulate from the abundance of God; the winds driving abroad the pregnant clouds as the forerunners of the Creator's mercy; the harmony and order in the midst of diversity; the variety of the human race, and yet their close affinity; fruits, flowers, animals, human beings themselves,—are these not signs enough of the presence of a Master-Mind?[2]

To the Prophet of Islâm, nature in itself is a revelation and a miracle.

"There is a tongue in every leaf,
A voice in every rill,
A voice that speaketh everywhere,
In flood and fair, through earth and air,
A voice that's never still."[3]

The Prophet of Monotheism is pre-eminently the Prophet of Nature. His ethical appeal and his earnest assertion of divine Unity are founded upon the rational and intellectual recognition of all-pervading order, of the visible presence of one Mind, one Will, regulating, guiding, and governing the Universe. His grandest miracle is the Book in which he has poured forth with an inspired tongue all the "revelations of nature, conscience, and prophecy." Ask you a greater miracle than this, O unbelieving people! than to have your vulgar tongue chosen

evidence, may be matter for speculation" (the italics are his own), vol. ii. p. 144. Like the Koraish, Sir W. Muir is not satisfied with the teachings, unless supported by wonder-workings.

[1] Sura xxv. 49-59; sura l. 9, etc.

[2] Sura vi. 95-99, li. 20, xv. 20, xx. 50-57, xxxiv. 20-28, 39, etc.

[3] Comp. هر گیاهی که از زمین روید * وحده لا شر یک له گوید

"Every blade that springs from the earth bears testimony to the unity of God."

as the language of that incomparable Book, one piece of which puts to shame all your golden poesy and suspended songs—to convey the tidings of universal mercy, the warnings to pride and tyranny !

But to all his exhortations the Koraish turned a deaf ear. They were blind to the signs of God, blind to the presence of a Divine Personality in nature, deaf to the call of the Seer to come back to righteousness, to forego the crimes and abominations of antiquity. Their answear to him breathes a fierce animosity parallelled only by the darkest days of Arian or Pelagian persecution in Christendom. "Know this, O Mohammed," said they, "we shall never cease to stop thee from preaching till either thou or we perish."

During this interval occured an incident which has been differently construed by the Moslem historians and the Christian biographers of the Prophet. One day, in one of his prophetic trances, Mohammed was reciting within the Kaaba some verses which now form part of the fifty-third chapter of the Koran. When he came to the words, "What think ye of al-Lât, al-Uzza, and Manah ? the third besides," an idolater who was present on the occasion, and whom tradition has converted into the devil, anxious to avert the threatened denunciation called out, "They are exalted damsels, and their intercession with God may be hoped for." These words were supposed to form part of the Prophet's revelation. And the Koraish, overjoyed either at the trick or at Mohammed's supposed concession, hastened to express their willingness to come to terms. When Mohammed learnt what had happened, he immediately proclaimed the words, "They are nought but empty names, which you and your fathers have invented." This is the version given by Mahommedan historians and traditionists. According to the Christian biographers, the incident is supposed to indicate a momentary desire on the part of the Prophet to end the strife with the Koraish by some compromise. The bigot calls it "a lapse" and "a fall" ; but the generous and unbiased historian considers the episode as throwing additional lustre on the Prophet of Arabia. Persecution was becoming fiercer and fiercer every day, the sufferings of his followers were increasing, and the whole city was up in arms against them. The sight of his poor disciples afflicted him deeply ; his weary struggle with the Arabian idolatry filled him with grief. What wonder that a momentary thought crossed his mind to end the conflict by making a slight concession to the bigotry of his enemies. "And so Mohammed made his first and last concession.

He recited a revelation to the Koraish, in which he spoke respectfully of the three moon-goddesses, and asserted that their intercession with God might be hoped for : 'Wherefore bow down before God and serve Him ;' and the whole audience, overjoyed at the compromise, bowed down and worshipped at the name of the God of Mohammed, —the whole city was reconciled to the double religion. But this dreamer of the desert was not the man to rest upon a lie. At the price of the whole city of Mecca he would not remain untrue to himself. He came forward and said he had done wrong,—the devil had tempted him. He openly and frankly retracted what he had said ; and 'as for their idols, they were but empty names which they and their fathers had invented.' "

"Western biographers have rejoiced greatly over 'Mohammed's fall.' Yet it was a tempting compromise, and few would have withstood it. And the life of Mohammed is not the life of a god, but of a man ; from first to last it is intensely human. But if for once he was not superior to the temptation of gaining over the whole city, and obtaining peace where before had been only bitter persecution, what can we say of his manfully thrusting back the rich prize he had gained, freely confessing his fault, and resolutely giving himself over again to the old indignities and insults ? If he was once insincere—and who is not ?—how intrepid was his after sincerity ! He was untrue to himself for a while, and he is ever referring to it in his public preaching with shame and remorse ; but the false step was more than atoned for by his magnificent recantation." [1]

Upon the promulgation that Lat, Uzza, and Manah were but empty names, the persecution burst out anew with redoubled fury.

Supported, however, by a firm conviction in divine assistance, and upheld by the admonitions of the heavenly voice within, conveyed to him by the ministrators of heavenly mercy, he continued his preaching undeterred by the hostility of his enemies, or by the injuries they inflicted upon him. In spite of all opposition, however, slowly but surely the new teachings gained ground. The seeds of truth thus scattered could not fail to fructify. The wild Arab of the desert, the trading citizen of distant townships who came to the national fair, heard the words of the strange man whom his enemies thought possessed, listened to the admonitions in which he poured

1 Stanley Lane-Poole, *Introd. to the Selections from the Koran*, p. xlix.

forth his soul, listened with awe and wonder to his denunciations of their divinities and of their superstitions, of their unrighteousness, of their evil ways, and carried back to their far-off homes new light and new life, even unconsciously to themselves. And the satires, the ill-names his enemies heaped upon Mohammed, only tended to make his words more extensively known.

The Meccans, on their side, were by no means quiet. Several times the Koraish sent deputations to Abu Talib, asking him to stop his nephew from preaching against their religion. At first Abu Talib turned them away with soft and courteous words. But as Mohammed persisted in his fiery denunciations against their godlessness and impiety, they expelled him from the Kaaba where he was wont to preach latterly, and then came in a body to his uncle.[1] "We respect thy age and thy rank," said they, "but our respect for thee has bounds, and verily we can have no further patience with thy nephew's abuse of our gods, and his ill words against our ancestors; wherefore do thou either prevent him from so doing, or thyself take part with him, so that we may settle the matter by fight until one of the two parties is exterminated."[2] Having thus spoken, they departed. Abu Talib was unwilling to separate himself from his people, neither did he like abandoning his nephew to the idolaters. Sending for Mohammed, he informed him of the speech of the Koraish, and begged him to renounce his task. Mohammed thought his uncle wished to withdraw his protection; but his high resolve did not fail him even at this moment. Firmly he replied: "O my uncle, if they placed the sun on my right hand and the moon on my left, to force me to renounce my work, verily I would not desist therefrom until God made manifest His cause, or I perished in the attempt." But overcome by the thought of desertion by his kind protector, he turned to depart. Then Abu Talib called aloud: "Son of my brother, come back;" and he came. And Abu Talib said: "Say whatsoever thou pleasest; for by the Lord, I shall not abandon thee, nay, never."[3] The Koraish made another attempt to persuade Abu Talib to deliver up his nephew to them. They offered in exchange a young man of the family of Makhzum, but it was of no avail.[4] The declared intention

1 Tibri, vol. ii. p. 406; according to this author's authorities, ver. 214 of chap. xxi. of the Koran was revealed about this period.
2 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 47; Ibn-Hisham, pp. 167, 168.
3 Ibn-Hisham, p. 168; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 48; Abulfeda, p. 17.
4 Ibn-Hisham, p. 169; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 48.

of Abû Tâlib to support his nephew excited their fury, and they renewed their menaces of violence. The venerable patriarch appealed to the sense of honour of the Banı-Hashim and Banı-Muttalib, the kinsmen of Mohammed, to protect a distinguished member of their family from falling a victim to the hatred of rival clans. And the appeal was nobly responded to, with the solitary exception of the squint-eyed Abu Lahab, "the Father of the Flame," as the sequel will show.

At this time the new Faith gained a valuable adherent in Omar, whose energy of character made him an important factor in the future commonwealth of Islam. His services to the religion of Mohammed have engraved his name on the pages of history. A distinguished member of the family of Aadi ibn-Kaab, and the son of the Khattab, notorious for the persecution of the Moslems, he was hitherto a violent opponent of Islam, and the bitterest adversary of the Prophet. His conversion is said to have been worked by the magic effect on his mind of a chapter of the Koran which he heard recited in his sister's house, where he had gone in a furious rage and with murderous intent.

Struck with the words which he had heard, he went straight to the Prophet with the naked sword in his hand with which he had meant to slay Mohammed and his disciples, causing considerable consternation among the assembly of the Faithful listening to the Preacher. He kissed the Master's hand, and then demanded to be taken into the fold of God; and heartfelt thanks went up to heaven from the Moslems for the grace that had fallen on Omar. After his conversion he became one of the bulwarks of the Faith.

Islâm need no more hide its head in byways and corners, go about in concealment, or offer its prayers to God in secret and trepidation. Besides a large following taken from the humbler walks of life, there were now gathered round the Prophet a chosen band of apostles, consisting, not of ignorant folk, but of men of energy, talent, and worth, like Hamza, Abu Bakr, and Omar. And though Ali was in his youth, he was fast rising into prominence.

These important adhesions gave heart to the Moslems, and they now ventured to perform their devotions in public. The Koraish, who were at first thunderstruck at the conversion of Omar, saw the gravity of the situation. And yet they waited to strike the decisive blow.

The return of the deputies, however, from Abyssinia, and the announcement of their unsuccessful mission, roused them to frenzy. They determined at last to exterminate with one stroke the entire clan of Hashim and Muttalib. With that purpose they, in the 7th year of the Mission, towards the end of 616 A.C, formed a league against the descendants of Hashim and Muttalib. They bound themselves by a solemn document, which was deposited in the Kaaba, not to enter into any contract of marriage with the Hashimites, or to buy and sell with them. The Hashimites and Muttalibites, Mussulmans as well as idolaters, were struck with dismay, and fearful that this might be the prelude to some other attack, judged it safer to abandon their houses dispersed in the city, and concentrate themselves at one point. They betook themselves accordingly to the *Shi-b* (or quarter) of Abu Talib,—a long, narrow mountain defile on the eastern skirts of Mecca, cut off by rocks or walls from the city, except for one narrow gateway. Abu Lahab alone remained aloof, and ranged himself on the side of the enemy.

They lived in this defensive position with Mohammed in their midst for nearly three years, beleaguered by the Koraish, and subjected to every privation. The provisions which they had carried with them were soon exhausted, and the cries of the starving children could be heard outside. Probably they would have entirely perished but for the occasional help they received surreptitiously from less bigoted compatriots. Some of the chiefs, however, were beginning to be ashamed of their injustice. Towards the tenth year of the Mission (619 A.C.), Hisham, son of Amr, who took a lively interest in the Hashimites, tried to bring about a reconciliation between the Koraishites and the two families of Hashim and Muttalib. He succeeded in winning over Zubair, son of Abu Ommeyya, to his side; and, seconded by him and others, the pact was annulled, and the two families were taken back to the enjoyment of the communal rights, and were allowed to return to Mecca.

During the period Mohammed was shut up in the *Shi-b* with his kinspeople, Islam made no progress outside. In the sacred months, when violence was considered a sacrilege, the Teacher would come out of his prison and endeavour to obtain hearers among the pilgrims; but the squint-eyed "Father of the Flame" followed him about, and made his words nought by calling him "a liar and a Sabean."

The year which followed is called in the history of Islâm "the Year of Mourning" for the loss of Abu Talib and Khadîja, who followed each other to the grave within a short interval. In Abu Talib, Mohammed lost the guardian of his youth, who had hitherto stood between him and his enemies. The death of Khadija was a severe blow. When none believed in him, when he himself had not yet awakened to the full consciousness of his mission, and his heart was full of doubts, when all around him was dark and despairing, her love, her faith had stood by him. "She was ever his angel of hope and consolation." To the end of his life he retained the tenderest recollection of her love and devotion.

Note to Chapter I.

Sir W. Muir thinks M. Caussin de Perceval has made a mistake in supposing Ramdhâ and Bathâ to be names of places. He thinks they signify the nature of the soil over which these people were tortured; vol. ii. p. 128. To corroborate M. Caussin de Perceval and myself, I have only to add that the existence of these places is an undoubted fact; and Batha especially has been frequently referred to by Mahommedan authors as a place in the immediate vicinity of Mecca. For example, the celebrated Hakîm Sanai says:—

Cho ilmat hast khidmat kun cho
bi-ilman, ke zisht aid,
Girifta Chînian ihram, wa Mekki
khufta dar Batha.

"If thou possessest knowledge, serve like those who are ignorant; for it is unseemly that people from China should adopt the Ihrâm (that is to say, come on a pilgrimage to Mecca), and the native of Mecca should lie sleeping at Bathâ."

CHAPTER II.

THE HEGIRA.

مُحَمَّدٌ سَيِّدُ الكَوْنَيْنِ وَالثَّقَلَيْنِ * وَالفَرِيقَيْنِ مِنْ عُرْبٍ وَمِنْ عَجَمِ

THE children of Ommeyya and other hostile clans, actuated as much by their attachment to the old cult as by their jealousy of, and hatred towards, the Hashimites, considered this a favourable opportunity to crush out Islam in Mecca; and the death of Abu Talib, whose personal influence and character had restrained their fury within some limits, became the signal for the Koraish to redouble their persecutions.[1]

Weighed down by the loss of his venerable protector and of his cherished wife, hopeless of turning the Koraish from idolatry, with a saddened heart, and yet full of trust, he determined to turn to some other field for the exercise of his ministry. Mecca had rejected the words of God, hapless Tayef may listen to them. Accompanied by his faithful servant Zaid, he arrived among the Thakîf.[2] He spoke to them about his Mission; told them about their iniquities, and called them to the worship of God. His words caused a storm of indignation; Who was this crazy man, said they, who invited them to abandon the beautiful divinities they worshipped with such lightness of heart and such freedom of morals? They drove him from the city; and the rabble and the slaves followed, hooting and pelting him with stones until the evening, when they left him to pursue his way alone. Wounded and bleeding, footsore and weary, he betook himself to prayer under the shade of some palm trees, which afforded a welcome shelter to the thirsty and famished wayfarer. Raising his hands towards heaven, he cried: "O Lord! I make my complaint unto Thee, out of my feebleness, and the vanity of my wishes, I am

[1] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 69.

[2] The people of Tayef.

insignificant in the sight of men. O Thou most merciful! Lord of the weak? Thou art my Lord! Do not forsake me. Leave me not a prey to strangers, nor to mine enemies. If Thou art not offended, I am safe. I seek refuge in the light of Thy countenance, by which all darkness is dispersed, and peace comes here and hereafter. Let not Thy anger descend on me; solve my difficulties as it pleaseth Thee. There is no power, no help, but in Thee."[1]

Mohammed returned to Mecca sorely stricken in heart. He lived here for some time, retired from his people, preaching occasionally, but confining his efforts mainly to the strangers who congregated in Mecca and its vicinity during the season of the annual pilgrimage, hoping, as Tibri expresses it, to find among them some who would believe in him, and carry the truth to their people.

One day, whilst thus sadly but yet hopefully working among these half-traders, half-pilgrims, he came upon a group of six men from the distant city of Yathrib conversing together. He asked them to sit down and listen to him; and they sat down and listened. Struck by his earnestness and the truth of his words, they became his proselytes (620 A.C); [2] and returning to their city, they spread the news, with lightning rapidity, that a Prophet had risen among the Arabs who was to call them to God, and put an end to their dissensions, which had lasted for centuries.

The next year these Yathribites returned, and brought six more of their fellow-citizens as deputies from the two principal tribes who occupied that city.[3]

On the self-same spot which had witnessed the conversion of the former six, the newcomers gave in their adhesion to Mohammed. This is called the first Pledge of Akaba, from the name of the hill on which the conference was held.[4]

The pledge they took was as follows: "We will not associate anything with God; we will not steal, nor commit adultery, nor fornication; we will not kill our children; we will abstain from

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 279, 280; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 70, 71.
2 Ibn-Hisham, pp. 286, 287; Tibri (Zotenberg's transl.), vol. ii. p. 438.
3 Aus and Khazraj.
4 In the history of Islam, this pledge is also called the "Pledge of Women," in contradistinction to the second pledge, in which the deputies of Yathrib took an oath to assist the Moslems, *even by arms* against the attacks and outrages of their enemies.

calumny and slander; we will obey the Prophet in everything that is right; and we will be faithful to him in weal and in sorrow."[1]

After the pledge, they returned home with a disciple of Mohammed to teach them the fundamental doctrines of the new religion, which rapidly spread among the inhabitants of Yathrib.

The interval which elapsed between the first and second pledge is remarkable as one of the most critical periods of Mohammed's Mission. The sublime trust of Mohammed in God, and the grandeur of his character, never stand forth more prominently than at this period. He was sad at the sight of his people so sternly wedded to idolatry;[2] but his sorrow was assuaged by the hope that the truth would in the end prevail.[3] He might not live to see it;[4] but as surely as darkness flies before the rays of the sun, so surely falsehood will vanish before truth.[5] Regarding this epoch, a few words of unconscious admiration escape even the lips of Muir: "Mahomet, thus holding his people at bay, waiting, in the still expectation of victory, to outward appearance defenceless, and with his little band, as it were, in the lion's mouth, yet trusting in His Almighty power whose messenger he believed himself to be, resolute and unmoved,—presents a spectacle of sublimity parallelled only in the sacred records by such scenes as that of the prophet of Israel, when he complained to his Master, 'I, even I only, am left.'"[6]

This period of anxious waiting is also remarkable for that notable Vision of the Ascension which has furnished worlds of golden dreams for the imaginative genius of poets and traditionists. They have woven beautiful and gorgeous legends round the simple words of of the Koran: "Praise be to Him who carried His servant by night from the sacred temple to the temple that is more remote, whose precincts We have blessed, that We might show him some of our signs! for He is the Hearer, the Seer."[7] And again: "And remember we said to thee, Verily, thy Lord is round about mankind; We ordained the Vision which We showed thee."[8] In spite of the

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 289; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 73 74.
2 Koran sura vi. ver. 107.
3 Koran, sura xl. ver. 78, xliii, ver. 40, etc.
4 Koran, sura xxi. ver. 18.
5 *Life of Mahomet*, vol. ii. p. 228.
6 Koran, sura xvii. ver. 1.
7 Koran, chap. xvii. ver. 62. "All that Mohammedans *must* believe respecting the Meraj is, that *the Prophet saw himself*, in a vision, transported from Mecca to Jerusalem, and that in such vision he really beheld some of the greatest signs of his Lord. It must be evident to the reader that the

beautiful garb in which the traditionists have dressed this wonderful incident, "it is still a grand vision full of glorious imagery, fraught with deep meaning."[1]

The following year (622 A.C.), the Yathribites who had adopted the new religion repaired to Mecca, to the number of seventy-five, in company with their idolatrous brethren, to invite the Prophet to their city;[2] but the idolaters had no knowledge of the intention of their companions.

In the stillness of night,[3] when all hostile elements appeared slumbering, these pioneers of the new faith met under the hill which had witnessed the first pledge. Mohammed appeared among them, accompanied by his uncle Abbas, who, though not a convert, yet took a warm interest in the progress of Islam. He opened the conference, and vividly described to the Yathribites the risk they incurred by adopting Islam and inviting its Teacher to their city. They replied with one voice, that they adopted the religion fully conscious of the dangers that surrounded them. "Speak, O Prophet of God," said they, "and exact any pledge for thyself and thy Lord." The Prophet began, as was his wont, by reciting several passages of the Koran; he then invited all present to the service of God, and dwelt upon the blessings of the new dispensation.[4] The former pledge was repeated, that they would worship none but God; that they would observe the precepts of Islam; that they would obey Mohammed in all that was right, and defend him and his, even as they would their women and children.[5] "And," said they, "if we die in the cause of God, what shall be our return?" "Happiness hereafter," was the reply.[6] "But," said they, "thou wilt not leave us in the hour of prosperity to return to thy people?" The Prophet smiled

visions also of a prophet are a mode of divine inspiration,"—Syed Ahmed Khan, *Ess.* xi. p. 34. Muir says that "the earliest authorities point only to a vision, not to a real bodily journey," vol. ii. p. 221, note. Compare the early traditions given by Ibn-Hisham, p. 267, which support this view. It may, I think, be fairly asked why Christians, who believe in the bodily resurrection and bodily ascension of Jesus and of Elijah, should look upon those Moslems who believe in the bodily ascension of Mohammed as less rational than themselves?

1 Stanley Lane-Poole, *Introd. to the Selections from the Koran, p. lvi.*

2 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 296.

3 In the night of the first and second day of the Tashrîk, the period of three days which follow immediately the celebration of the rites of the pilgrimage.

4 Ibn-Hisham, p. 296; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 76. 5 *Ibid.*

6 Abulfeda, p. 29; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 77.

and said: "Nay never; your blood is my blood; I am yours, you are mine." "Give us then thy hand;" and each one placing his hand on the Prophet's swore allegiance to him and his God. Scarcely had the compact been concluded, when the voice of a Meccan, who had been watching this scene from a distance, came floating on the night air, striking a sudden panic into the self-denying hearts there assembled. The firm words of Mohammed restored their presence of mind.

Mohammed then selected twelve men from among them—men of position, pointed out to him by the voice of the people—as his delegates (*Nakîbs*).[1] Thus was concluded the second Pledge of Akaba.

The Meccan spy had already spread the news of this conference through the city. Astounded at the temerity of Mohammed and his followers, the Koraish proceeded in a body to the caravan of the Yathribites to demand the men who had entered into the pledge with him. Finding no clue, however, as to the persons who had taken part at the meeting, they allowed the caravan to depart unmolested. But this apparent moderation on the part of the Koraish formed only a prelude to a furious persecution of Mohammed and his disciples. The position of the latter became every day more and more perilous. The Prophet, fearing a general massacre, advised his followers to seek immediate safety at Yathrib; whereupon about one hundred families silently disappeared by twos and threes from Mecca and proceeded to Yathrib, where they were received with enthusiasm. Entire quarters of the city thus became deserted; and Otba, the son of Rabîa, at the sight of these vacant abodes, once so full of life, "sighed heavily," and recited the old verse: "Every dwelling-place, even if it has been blessed ever so long, will one day become a prey to unhappiness and bitter wind;" "And," he sorrowfully added, "all this is the work of the son of our brother, who has scattered our assemblies, ruined our affairs, and created dissension amongst us." [2]

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 297-300. Seventy-five people, men and women, took part in this Pledge. This event occurred in the month of Zi'l-Hijja, and the Prophet stopped at Mecca throughout the remainder of this month and Muharram and Safar. In Rabi I. he left for Medîna; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 78

2 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 316.

As it was with Jesus, so it was with Mohammed; only with this difference, that in one case the Teacher himself says: "Think not that I came to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword: for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-inlaw."[1] In Mohammed's case it was one of his most persevering opponents who accused him of creating dissension in families.

Throughout this period, when the storm was at its height and might at any moment have burst over his head, Mohammed never quailed. All his disciples had left for Yathrib; alone he remained bravely at his post, with the devoted Ali and the venerable Abu Bakr.

Meanwhile the clouds were gathering fast. Fearful of the escape of the Prophet, an assembly of the Koraish met in all despatch in the town-hall (Dar un-Nadwa), and some chiefs of other clans were invited to attend. The matter had become one of life and death. Stormy was the meeting, for fear had entered their hearts. Imprisonment for life, expulsion from the city, each was debated in turn. Assassination was then proposed; but assassination by one man would have exposed him and his family to the vengeance of blood. The difficulty was at last solved by Abu Jahl,[2] who suggested that a number of courageous men, chosen from different families, should sheath their swords simultaneously in Mohammed's bosom, in order that the responsibility of the deed might rest upon all, and the relations of Mohammed might consequently be unable to avenge it.[3] This proposal was accepted, and a number of noble youths were selected for the sanguinary deed. As the night advanced, the assassins posted themselves round the Prophet's dwelling. Thus they watched all night long, waiting to murder him when he should

[1] Matt. x. 34, 35.

[2] Ibn-Hisham, pp. 323-325; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 79; the Koran, sura viii. ver. 30. According to Ibn Hisham, this proposal of Abu Jahl, one of the Koraish, was seconded by a stranger, in the guise of a venerable Sheikh from Najd whom tradition has resolved into Satan himself. Abu Jahl was one of the bitterest enemies of the Prophet. His real name was Amr and he was surnamed, for his sagacity, *Abu'l Hikam* ("father of wisdom," in the plural). Owing to his fanaticism and bigotry, which prevented his perceiving any good in the new Teachings, Mohammed called him instead *Abu Jahl* ("father of ignorance"). Ignorance has in all ages posed as the champion of orthodoxy. Abu Jahl has thus become a type. It is to this fact Hakîm Sanaï, the great mystical poet, refers in the following couplet:—

"*Ahmed-i-Mursil nishista kai rawâ dârad Khirad.*
"*Dil asîr-i-sirat-i-Bu Jahl-i-Kâfir dâshtan.*"
"Ahmed the Prophet is sitting (in your midst), how can reason allow.
"The heart to become captive of the qualities of Bû-Jahl the unbeliever."

leave his house in the early dawn, peeping now and then through a hole in the door to make sure that he still lay on his bed. But, meanwhile, the instinct of self-preservation, the instinct which had often led the great Prophet of Nazareth to evade his enemies,[1] had warned Mohammed of the danger. In order to keep the attention of the assassins fixed upon the bed, he put his own green garment upon the devoted and faithful Ali, bade him lie on his bed,[2] "and escaped, as David had escaped, through the windows." He repaired to the house of Abû Bakr, and they fled together unobserved from the inhospitable city of their birth. They lay hid for several days in a cavern of Mount Thour, a hill to the south of Mecca.[3]

The fury of the Koraish was now unbounded. The news that the would-be assassins had returned unsuccessful, and Mohammed had escaped, aroused their whole energy. Horsemen scoured the country. A price was set upon Mohammed's head.[4] Once or twice the danger approached so near that the heart of old Abu Bakr quaked with fear. "We are but two," said he. "Nay," said Mohammed, "we are three, God is with us;" and He was with them. After three days the Koraish slackened their efforts. All this time Mohammed and his companion were sustained by food brought to them at night by a daughter of Abu Bakr.[5] On the evening of the third day the fugitives left the cavern, and, procuring with great difficulty two camels, endeavoured to reach Yathrib by unfrequented paths. But even here the way was full of danger. The heavy price set upon Mohammed's head had brought out many horsemen from Mecca, and they were still diligently seeking for the helpless wanderer. One, a wild and fierce warrior, actually caught sight of the fugitives and pursued them. Again the heart of Abû Bakr misgave him, and he cried, "We are lost." "Be not afraid," said the Prophet, "God will protect us." As the idolater overtook Mohammed, his horse reared and fell. Struck with sudden awe, he entreated the forgiveness of the man whom he was pursuing and asked for an attestation of his pardon. This was given to him on a piece of bone by Abû Bakr.[6]

1 Comp. Milman, *Hist of Christianity* vol. i. p. 253.
2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 325; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 80.
3 See Desvergers' note (57) to his Abulfeda, p. 116.
4 Of a hundred camels, Ibn-Hisham p. 328; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 81.
5 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 81.
6 Ibn-Hisham, pp. 331, 332; Ibn ul-Athîr, *ibid.*

The fugitives continued their journey without further molestation and after three days' journeying reached the territories of Yathrib. It was a hot day in June, 622 of the Christian era, when Mohammed alighted from his camel upon the soil which was thenceforth to become his home and his refuge. A Jew watching on a tower first espied him,[1] and thus were the words of the Koran fulfilled: "They, to whom the Scriptures have been given, recognise him as they do their own children."[2] Mohammed and his companion rested for a few days[3] at a village called Koba,[4] situated only two miles to the south of Yathrib, and remarkable for its beauty and and fertility. Here he was joined by Ali, who had been severely maltreated by the idolaters after their disappointment at Mohammed's escape.[5] Ali fled from Mecca and journeyed on foot, hiding himself in the daytime and travelling only at night, lest he should fall into the hands of the Koraish.[6]

The Banû Amr bin-Auf, to whom the village belonged, requested Mohammed to prolong his stay amongst them. But the duty of the Prophet lay before him; and he proceeded towards Yathrib, attended by a numerous body of his disciples. He entered the city on the morning of a Friday, 16th of Rabi I., corresponding (according to M. Caussin de Perceval) with the 2nd of July 622.[8]

Thus was accomplished the Hijrat, called in European annals "the flight of Mohammed," from which dates the Mahommedan calendar.

Note 1 to Chapter II.

The "Hegira," or the era of the *Hijrat*, was instituted seventeen years later by the second Caliph. The commencement, however, is not laid at the real time of the departure from Mecca, which happened on the 4th of Rabi I., but on the first day of the first lunar month of the year, viz. Muharram—which day, in the year when the era was established, fell on the 15th of July.

1 Ibn-Hishâm p. 330. 2 Koran, sura vi. ver. 20.
3 Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, Ibn-Hisham, p. 335; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 83.
4 See Desvergers' Abulfeda, p. 116, note 59.
5 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 80. 6 *Ibid.* vol. ii. 82.
7 Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. pp. 17-20.
8 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 335; Abulfedâ, p. 30.

But though Omar instituted the official era, the custom of referring to events as happening before or after the *Hijrat* originated, according to some traditions, with the Prophet himself ; this event naturally marking the greatest crisis in the history of his Mission.—Comp. Tibri, *in loco.*

Note 2 to Chapter II.

The twelve Moslem months are ; Muharram (the sacred month), Safar (the month of departure), Rabi I. (first month of the spring), Rabi II. (second month of the spring), Jamadi I. (first dry month), Jamadî II. (second dry month), Rajab (*respected*, called often Rajab ul-Murajjab), Shaban (the month of the budding of trees), Ramazan (month of heat), Shawwal (month of junction), Zi'l-Kaada (month of truce, rest, or relaxation), Zi'l Hijja (month of pilgrimage). The ancient Arabs observed the lunar year of 354 days, 8 hours, 48 seconds, divided into twelve months of 29 and 30 days alternately. In order to make them agree with the solar year of their neighbours, the Greeks and the Romans, and also in order to make the months fall in the right season, they added a month every third year. This intercalation was called Nasî ; and although it was not perfectly exact, it served to maintain a sort of correlation between the denomination of the months and the seasons. Since the suppression of the Nasî, on account of the orgies and various heathen rites observed in the intercalary years, the names of the months have no relation to the seasons.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPHET AT MEDINA.

پیش از همه شاهان غیور آمدهٔ
هرچند که آخر بظهور آمدهٔ
اے ختم رسل قرب تو معلومم شد
دیر آمدهٔ ز راه دور آمدهٔ

FEW Mussulmans of the present day understand the full import of the mystical verses quoted at the head of this chapter, but all appreciate the deep devotion to the grand Seer implied in those words. And this devotion is not one which has twined itself round a mythical ideal, or has grown with the lapse of time. From the moment of his advent into Yathrib he stands in the full blaze of day—the grandest of figures upon whom the light of history has ever shone. The minutest details of his life are carefully noted and handed down to posterity, to become crystallised, often against the spirit of his own Teachings, which aimed at the perpetual growth of the human race. We have seen this wonderful man as an orphan child who had never known a father's love, bereft in infancy of a mother's care, his early life so full of pathos, growing up from a thoughtful childhood to a still more thoughtful youth. His youth as pure and true as his boyhood; his manhood as austere and devout as his youth. His ear ever open to the sorrows and sufferings of the weak and the poor; his heart ever full of sympathy and tenderness towards all God's creatures. He walks so humbly and so purely, that men turn round and point, there goes al-Amîn, the true, the upright, the trusty. A faithful friend, a devoted husband; a thinker intent on the mysteries of life and death, on the responsibilities of human actions, the end and aim of human

existence,—he sets himself to the task of reclaiming and reforming a nation, nay, a world, with only one loving heart to comfort and solace him. Baffled, he never falters; beaten, he never despairs. He struggles on with indomitable spirit to achieve the work assigned to him. His purity and nobleness of character, his intense and earnest belief in God's mercy, bring round him ultimately many a devoted heart; and when the moment of the severest trial comes, like the faithful mariner, he remains steadfast at his post until all his followers are safe, and then betakes himself to the hospitable shore: such we have seen him. We shall see him now the king of men, the ruler of human hearts, chief, lawyer, and supreme magistrate, and yet without any self-exaltation, lowly and humble. His history henceforth is merged in the history of the commonwealth of which he was the center. Henceforth the Preacher who mended with his own hands his clothes, and often went without bread, was mightier than the mightiest sovereigns of the earth.

"Mohammed had shown men what he was; the nobility of his character, his strong friendship, his endurance and courage, above all, his earnestness and fiery enthusiasm for the truth he came to preach,—these things had revealed the hero, the master whom it was alike impossible to disobey and impossible not to love. Henceforward it is only a question of time. As the men of Medina come to know Mohammed, they too will devote themselves to him body and soul; and the enthusiasm will catch fire and spread among the tribes, till all Arabia is at the feet of the Prophet of the one God. 'No emperor with his tiaras was obeyed as this man in a cloak of his own clouting.' He had the gift of influencing men, and he had the nobility only to influence them for good."

Medîna, the "illuminated"[1]—the city of many names—is situated about eleven days' journey to the north of Mecca. Now a walled city of considerable strength, in those days it was completely open and exposed to outside attacks until the Prophet made the famous moat as a defence against the Koraishites. The city is said to have been established by an Amalekite chief, whose name it bore until the advent of the Prophet. In early times Yathrib[2] and its

[1] *Munawwarèh.*

[2] With a ث (pronounced by the Arabs like *th* in thin, by all non-Arabs like *s.*)

environs were inhabited by the Amalekites; these are said to have been overwhelmed and destroyed by successive colonies of Jews, who, flying before Babylonian and Greek and Roman persecutors or avengers, entered Arabia and established themselves in the northern part of Hijaz. The most important of these colonies were the Banu-Nadhîr at Khaibar, the Banu-Kuraizha at Fidak, the Banu-Kainukaa near Medîna itself. Living in fortified cantons, they had domineered over the neighbouring Arab tribes, until the establishment of two Kahtanite tribes, Aus and Khazraj at Yathrib. These two tribes, who yielded at first some sort of obedience to the Jews, were able to reduce them to a state of clientage. Before long, however, they commenced quarrelling among themselves, and it was only about the time when the Prophet announced his Mission at Mecca that, after long years of decimating warfare, they had succeeded in patching up a peace.

Such was the political condition of Yathrib when the Prophet made his appearance among the Yathribites. With his advent a new era dawned upon the city.

The two tribes of Aus and Khazraj, forgetting their inveterate and mortal feuds in the brotherhood of the Faith, rallied round the standard of Islam and formed the nucleus of the Moslem commonwealth. The old divisions were effaced, and the noble designation of *Ansâr* (Helpers) became the common title of all who had helped Islam in its hour of trial. The faithful band who had forsaken their beloved birthplace, and every tie of home, received the name of *Muhâjirîn* (Emigrants or Exiles).

In order to unite the Ansâr and Muhâjirîn in closer bonds, the Prophet established a brotherhood between them, which linked them together in sorrow and in happiness.

Yathrib changed its ancient name, and was henceforh styled *Medînat un-Nabî*, the City of the Prophet, or shortly, Medîna, the city.

A mosque was soon built, in the erection of which Mohammed assisted with his own hands; and houses for the accommodation of the emigrants rose apace. Two brothers, who owned the land on which it was proposed to build the mosque, had offered it as a free gift; but as they were orphans, the Prophet paid them the price at which it was valued.

The building was simple in form and structure, suited to the

unostentatious religion he taught. The walls were of brick and earth, and the roof of palm leaves. A portion of the mosque was set apart as a habitation for those who had no home of their own.

Everything in this humble place of worship was conducted with the greatest simplicity. Mohammed preached and prayed standing on the bare ground or leaning against a palm tree, and the devoted hearts around him beat in unison with his soul-stirring words.

"He who is not affectionate to God's creatures and to his own children," he would say, "God will not be affectionate to him. Every Moslem who clothes the naked will be clothed by God in the green robes of Paradise."[1]

In one of his sermons he thus dwelt on the subject of charity: "When God created the earth, it shook and trembled, until He put mountains upon it to make it firm. Then the angels asked, 'O God, is there anything in Thy creation stronger than these mountains?' And God replied, 'Iron is stronger than the mountains, for it breaks them.' 'And is there anything in Thy creation stronger than iron?' 'Yes; fire is stronger than iron, for it melts it.' 'Is there anything in Thy creation stronger than fire?' 'Yes; water, for it quenches fire.' O Lord, is there anything in Thy creation stronger than water?' 'Yes; wind, for it overcomes water and puts it in motion.' 'Oh, our Sustainer, is there anything in Thy creation stronger than wind?' 'Yes; a good man giving alms; if he give with his right hand and conceal it from his left, he overcomes all things.'"

His definition of charity embraced the wide circle of kindness: "Every good act," he would say, "is charity. Your smiling in your brother's face is charity; an exhortation addressed to your fellow-men to do virtuous deeds is equal to alms-giving. Putting a wanderer in the right path is charity; assisting the blind is charity; removing stones and thorns and other obstructions from the road is charity; giving water to the thirsty is charity."[2] "A man's true wealth hereafter is the good he does in this world to his fellow-men. When he dies, people will ask, What property has he left behind him? But the angels, who examine him in the grave, will ask, What good deeds hast thou sent before thee?"

[1] From Abû Huraira, *Mishkât*, book xii. chap. iii. part. i.
[2] From Abu Saîd Khazrî.

"Oh Prophet!" said one of his disciples, "my mother, Umm Saad, is dead; what is the best alms I can give away for the good of her soul?" "Water!" replied Mohammed, bethinking himself of the panting heat of the desert. "Dig a well for her, and give water to the thirsty." The man digged a well in his mother's name, and said, "This is for my mother, that its blessings may reach her soul."

"Charity of the tongue," says Irving, "that most important and least cultivated of charities, was likewise earnestly inculcated by Mahomet." Abu Jariya, an inhabitant of Basrah, coming to Medîna, and being convinced of the apostolic office of Mohammed, begged of him some great rule of conduct. "Speak evil of no one," answered the Prophet. "From that time," says Abu Jariya, "I never abused any one, whether freeman or slave."

The teachings of Islâm extended to the courtesies of life. "Make a salam (or salutation) to the dwellers of a house on entering and leaving it.[1] Return the salute of friends and acquaintances, and wayfarers on the road. He who rides must be the first to make the salute to him who walks; he who walks to him who is sitting; a small party to a large party, and the young to the old."[2]

[1] Compare Koran, chap. xxiv. vers. 27, 28, 61, and 62.

[2] From Abu Hurairah, *Mishkât*, Bk. xxii. chap. i. part 1. Besides the references already given, consult the *Kitab ul-Mustatrif*, chaps. iv. v. x. xii. xix. xxii. xxiii. and xxv. The *Mustatrif* gives fully the references to Tirmizi, Muslim, and Bukharî. Consult also the *Majâlis ul-Abrâr*, *Majlis* (seance), 84.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HOSTILITY OF THE KORAISH AND THE JEWS.

1 A. H.=19th April 622—7th May 623 A. C.

بلغ اللهُ صلاتي و سلامي ابدًا
لنبيٍ عربيٍ مدنيٍ حرمي

شمس فضل و ضياء و سناء اسنى
نور بدرٍ و بهاء و سماء الكرم

اكرم الخلق وجودًا و سجودًا و هجودًا
احسن الناس سخاءً بعطاء النعم

AT this time there were three distinct parties in Medîna. The Muhâjirîn (the Exiles) and the Ansâr (the Helpers) formed the kernel of Islam. Their devotion to the Prophet was unbounded. The Exiles had forsaken their homes, and abandoned, contrary to all Arab traditions, the ties of kith and kin, in the cause of the Faith. They had braved all sufferings, withstood all temptations in the service of the Lord. Many of them had come to the City of Safety without means. They had been received with open arms by the Medinite converts, who in many cases shared their worldly goods with the poorer of the new-comers. The brotherhood of Faith, so wisely established by the Prophet, whilst it prevented the growth of jealousy, gave rise to a generous emulation, both among the Ansar and the Muhajirın, as to who would bring the greatest sacrifice in the service of God and His Prophet. The enthusiasm and earnestness with which these men and women devoted themselves to the new awakening, the zeal

1 A. H. = 19th April 622 to 7th May 623 A.C.

with which they laid down their lives, was a manifestation such as had not been seen since the best days of the Christian phase of religious development. The second, and at first by no means an unimportant party, was composed principally of lukewarm converts to the Faith, who retained an ill-concealed predilection for idolatry; and was headed by Abdullah ibn-Ubbay, a chief of some position in the city, who aspired to the kinghood of Medina. With this object he had gathered round him, like Abu Sufian at Mecca, a strong body of partizans. Everything was ripe for him to seize the reins of power, when the arrival of the Prophet upset his designs. The popular enthusiasm compelled him and his followers to make a nominal profession of Islam; but, ever ready as they were to turn against the Moslems at the least opportunity, they were a source of considerable danger to the new-born commonwealth, and required unceasing watchfulness on the part of the Prophet. Towards them he always showed the greatest patience and forbearance, hoping in the end to win them over to the faith. And this expectation was fully justified by the result. With the death of Abdullah ibn-Ubbay his party, which has been stigmatised[1] as the party of the *Munâfikîn* (the Disaffected), disappeared for a time from view.

But the Jews, who may be said to have formed the third party, constituted the most serious element of danger. They had close business connections with the Koraish, and their ramifications extended into various parts hostile to the new Faith. At first they were inclined to look with some favour on the preachings of Mohammed. He could not, of course, be their promised Messiah, but perhaps a weak dreamer, a humble preacher, dependent upon the hospitality of their old enemies, now their patrons, the Aus and the Khazraj, might become their avenger, help them in conquering the Arabs, and found for them a new kingdom of Judah. With this aim in view, they had joined with the Medinites in a half-hearted welcome to the Prophet. And for a time they maintained a pacific attitude. But it was only for a time; for barely a month had gone by before the old spirit of rebellion, which had led them to crucify

[1] Koran, sura xlii.; Ibn Hishâm, pp. 363, 411. The Munâfikîn or the *Irreconcileables* have never disappeared completely from the Islâmic body politic. Ever and anon they have exercised the most disastrous effects in Islam. In later times they posed as the champions of orthodoxy. Note for example, the *Khârijis* of Africa.

their prophets, found vent in open seditions and secret treachery. One of the first acts of Mohammed after his arrival in Medina was to weld together the heterogeneous and conflicting elements of which the city and its suburbs were composed. into an orderly confederation. With this object he had granted a charter to the people, by which the rights and obligations of the Moslems *inter se*, and of the Moslems and Jews, were clearly defined. And the Jews, borne down for the moment by the irresistible character of the movement, had gladly accepted the Pact. This document, which has been carefully preserved in the pages of Ibn-Hisham, reveals the Man in his real glory—a master-mind, not only of his own age, as Muir calls him, but of all ages. No wild dreamer he, bent upon pulling down the existing fabrics of society, but a statesman of unrivalled powers, who in an age of utter and hopeless disintegration. with such materials and such polity as God put ready to his hands, set himself to the task of re-constructing a State, a commonwealth, a society, upon the basis of universal humanity. "In the name of the most merciful and compassionate God," says this first charter of freedom of conscience, "given by Mohammed, the Prophet, to the Believers, whether of the Koraish or of Yathrib. and all individuals of whatever origin who have made common cause with them, all these shall constitute one nation." Then, after regulating the payment of the *Diat* [1] by the various clans, and fixing some wise rules regarding the private duties of Moslems as between themselves, the document proceeds thus: "The state of peace and war shall be common to all Moslems; no one among them shall have the right of concluding peace with, or declaring war against, the enemies of his co-religionists. The Jews who attach themselves to our commonwealth shall be protected from all insults and vexations; they shall have an equal right with our own people to our assistance and good offices: the Jews of the various branches of Awf, Najjar, Harith, Jashm, Saalaba, Aus, and all others domiciled in Yathrib, shall form with the Moslems one composite nation; they shall practise their religion as freely as the Moslems; the *clients* [2] and allies of the Jews shall enjoy the same security and freedom; *the guilty shall be pursued and punished;* the Jews shall join the

[1] Diat, *wehrgeld*, price which a homicide had to pay to the family of the victim, if they consented to it.

[2] *I.e.* the protected.

Moslems in defending Yathrib (Medîna) against all enemies ; the interior of Yathrib shall be a sacred place for all who accept this Charter ; the *clients* and allies of the Moslems and the Jews shall be as respected as the *patrons ;* all true Moslems shall hold in abhorrence every man guilty of crime, injustice, or disorder : no one shall uphold the culpable, though he were his nearest kin." Then, after some other provisions regarding the internal management of the State, this extraordinary document concluded thus : " All future disputes between those who accept this Charter shall be referred, under God, to the Prophet." [1]

A death-blow was thus given lo that anarchic custom of the Arabs, which had hitherto obliged the aggrieved and the injured to rely upon his own or his kinsmen's power in order to exact vengeance, or satisfy the requirements of justice. It constituted Mohammed the chief magistrate of the nation, as much by his prophetic function as by a virtual compact between himself and the people.

2 A.H. 7th May 623 to 26th April 624 A.C.

The Jewish tribes of the Banî-Nadhîr, Banî-Kuraizha, and Banî-Kainukâa, settled in the vicinity of Medîna, were not at first included in this Charter ; but after a short time they, too, gratefully accepted its terms.

No kindness or generosity, however, on the part of the Prophet would satisfy the Jews ; nothing could conciliate the bitter feelings with which they were animated. Enraged that they could not use him as their instrument for the conversion of Arabia to Judaism, and that his belief was so much simpler than their Talmudic legends, they soon broke off, and ranged themselves on the side of of the enemies of the new Faith. And when asked which they preferred, idolatry or Islam, they, like many Christian controversialists, declared they preferred idolatry, with all its attendant evils, to the creed of Mohammed. They reviled him ; they " twisted their tongues" and mispronounced the Koranic words and the daily prayers and formulæ of Islam, rendering them meaningless, absurd, or blasphemous ; and the Jewish poets and poetesses, of whom there existed many at the time, outraged all common decency and

[1] Ibn-Hisham, pp. 341-343. The quaintness of this document has led me to paraphrase it, in order to throw into greater relief its real worth.

the recognised code of Arab honour and chivalry by lampooning in obscene verse the Moslem women. But these were minor offences. Not satisfied with insulting the women of the Believers and reviling the Prophet, they sent out emissaries to the enemies of the State, the protection of which they had formally accepted. The Koraish, who had sworn Mohammed's death, were well acquainted, thanks to the party of Abdullah ibn-Ubbay and the faithless Israelites, with the exact strength of the Moslems. They also knew that the Jews had accepted Mohammed's alliance only from motives of temporary expediency, and that the moment they showed themselves in the vicinity of Medina the worshippers of Jehovah would break away from him and join the idolaters.

And now came the moment of severest trial to Islâm. Barely had the Prophet time to put the city in a state of defence and organise the Believers, before the blow descended upon him.[1] Medina itself was honeycombed by sedition and treachery. And it now became the duty of Mohammed to take serious measures to guard against that dreaded catastrophe which a rising within, or a sudden attack from without, would have entailed upon his followers. He was not simply a preacher of Islam; he was also the guardian of the lives and liberties of his people. As a Prophet, he could afford to ignore the revilings and the gibes of his enemies; but as the head of the State, "the general in a time of almost continual warfare," when Medina was kept in a state of military defence and under a sort of military discipline, he could not overlook treachery. He was bound by his duty to his subjects to suppress a party that might have led, and almost did lead to the sack of the city by investing armies. The safety of the State required the proscription of the traitors, who were either sowing the seeds of sedition within Medîna or carrying information to the common enemy. Some half a dozen were placed under the ban, outlawed, and executed. We are, however, anticipating the course of events in referring to these executions.

The Koraish army was afield before Mohammed received God's command to do battle to His enemies.

He who never in his life wielded a weapon, to whom the sight of

[1] Koran, sura ix. ver. 13; Al-Jannabî; Zamakhshari (the *Kashshâf*), Egypt. ed., pp. 314, 315.

human suffering caused intense pain and pity, and who, against all the canons of Arab manliness, wept bitterly at the loss of his children or disciples, whose character ever remained so tender and so pathetic as to cause his enemies to call him womanish,[1]—this man was now compelled, from the necessities of the situation, and against his own inclination, to repel the attacks of the enemy by force of arms, to organise his followers for purposes of self-defence, and often to send out expeditions to anticipate treacherous and sudden onslaughts. Hitherto, Arab warfare consisted of sudden and murderous forays, often made in the night or in the early morn; isolated combats or a general melee, when the attacked were aware of the designs of the attacking party. Mohammed, with a thorough knowledge of the habits of his people, had frequently to guard against these sudden onslaughts by sending forth reconnoitring parties.

The Meccans and their allies commenced raiding up to the very vicinity of Medina, destroying the fruit-trees of the Moslems, and carrying away their flocks. A force, consisting of a thousand well-equipped men, marched under the noted Abu Jahl, "the Father of Ignorance," towards Medina to destroy the Islamites, and to protect one of their caravans bringing munitions of war. The Moslems received timely notice of the movement, and a body of three hundred disciples proceeded at once to forestall the heathens by occupying the valley of Badr, upon which Abu Jahl was moving. When Mohammed saw the infidel army arrogantly advancing into the valley, raising his hands towards heaven, like the prophets of Israel, he prayed that the little band of the Faithful might not be destroyed: "O Lord, forget not Thy promise of assistance. O Lord, if this little band were to perish, there will be none to offer unto Thee pure worship."[2]

Three of the Koraish advanced into the open space which divided the Moslems from the idolaters, and, according to Arab usage, challenged three champions from the Moslem ranks to single combat. Hamza, Ali, and Obaidah accepted the challenge, and came out conquerors. The engagement then became general. At one time the fortunes of the field wavered, but Mohammed's appeal to his people decided the fate of the battle. "It was a stormy winter day.

1 Compare Dozy, *Histoire des Mussulmans d'Espagne*, vol. i. p. 32.
2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 444; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 97.

A piercing blast swept across the valley." It seemed as if the angels of heaven were warring for the Moslems. Indeed, to the earnest minds of Mohammed and his followers, who, like the early Christians, saw God's providence " in all the gifts of nature, in every relation of life, at each turn of their affairs, individual, or public,"— to them those blasts of wind and sand, the elements warring against the enemies of God, at that critical moment appeared veritable succour sent from heaven; as angels riding on the wings of the wind, and driving the faithless idolaters before them in confusion.[1] The Meccans were driven back with great loss; many of their chiefs were slain; and Abu Jahl fell a victim to his unruly pride.[2]

A large number remained prisoners in the hands of the Moslems, but only two of them were executed. They had been noted for their virulent animosity towards the followers of the new Faith, and by the laws of war among the Arabs they now paid the penalty of their conduct.[3]

The rest of the prisoners, contrary to all the usages and traditions of the Arabs, were treated with the greatest humanity. The Prophet gave strict orders that respect should be paid to their misfortunes, and that they should be treated with kindness. The Moslems, to whose care he confided them, faithfully obeyed his instructions. They shared their own food with the prisoners, giving them the bread which formed the best part of their repast, and contenting themselves with dates alone.[4]

The division of the spoil gave rise to sharp dissensions among the Moslem soldiery. For the present, Mohammed calmed their

1 Koran, Sura viii. ver. 9, and Sura iii. vers. 11, 119, 120, and 121. Comp. also Muir, vol. iii, p. 106.

2 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 443 et seq.; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 26 et seq. Sir W. Muir mentions that when the head of Abu Jahl was brought to Mohammed, he said, " It is more acceptable to me than the choicest camel in Arabia." This passage, which is not to be found either in Ibn-Hisham, Ibn ul-Athîr, Abulfeda, or Tibri, is apocryphal.

3 Nadhr, son of Harith, the man referred to in ver. 32 of Sura viii, of the Koran.

4 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 459, 460; Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 79. Muir speaks thus: " In pursuance of Mahomet's commands, the citizens of Medîna, and such of the refugees as possessed houses, received the prisoners, and treated them with much consideration. 'Blessings be on the men of Medîna!' said one of these prisoners in later days; 'they made us ride, while they themselves walked; they gave us wheaten bread to eat when there was little of it; contenting themselves with dates,' " vol. iii. p. 122.

disputes by dividing it equally amongst all.[1] But as such dissensions among an unruly people were likely to lead to mischief, the Prophet, with a view to prevent all future quarrels over spoil acquired in war, promulgated a special ordinance, which is incorporated in the chapter of the Koran entitled *al-Anfâl* (the Spoils). By this law the division of the spoils was left to the discretion of the chief of the commonwealth ; a fifth being reserved for the public treasury for the support of the poor and indigent.[2]

The remarkable circumstances which led to the victory of Badr, and the results which followed from it, made a deep impression on the minds of the Moslems, They firmly believed that the angels of heaven had battled on their side against the unbelieving host.

The few simple touches in the Koran which bring into vivid prominence the poetic element involved in the conception of the angels fighting the battle of the Lord, will not yield in beauty or sublimity to the most eloquent words of the Psalmist. Indeed, the same poetic character is perceptible in both of them.[3]

Probably Mohammed, like Jesus and other teachers, believed in the existence of intermediate beings, celestial messengers from God to man. The modern disbelief in angels furnishes no reason for ridiculing the notions of our forefathers. Our disbelief is as much open to the name of superstition as their belief ; only one is negative, the other positive. What we, in modern times, look upon as the principles of nature, they looked upon as angels, ministrants of heaven. Whether there exist intermediate beings, as Locke thinks, between God and man, just as there are intermediate beings between man and the lowest form of animal creation, is a question too deep to be fathomed by the human intellect.

Mohammed also, like Jesus, probably believed in the existence of the Principle of Evil as a personal entity. But an analysis of his

1 "It is remarkable," says Sale, "that the dispute among Mohammed's men about sharing the booty at Badr arose on the same occasion as did that among David's soldiers in relation to the spoils taken from the Amalekites ; those who had been in the action insisting that they who tarried by the stuff should have no part of the spoil ; and that the same decision was given in both cases, which became a law for the future, to wit, that they should part alike." *Prel. Disc.* sec. vi.)

2 Koran, chap. viii. ver. 42. Though the distribution was left to the discretion of the chief of the State, certain customs were invariably observed which under the Caliphs became precedents, and thus gave a more definite shape to the law. Compare M. Querry's splendid work, entitled *Droit Mussulman* (Paris 1871), tome i. p. 335.

3 Ps. xviii.

words reveals a more rationalistic element, a subjective conception clothed in language suited for the apprehension of his followers. When somebody asked him where Satan lived, he replied "In the heart of man."

The belief in angels and devils has given rise to an extraordinary number of legends both in Islam and in Christianity. The saints of heaven and angels fight for the Christian. The Moslem tries as much as possible to leave the saints to themselves, and only accepts the assistance of angels in the battles of life. Tradition converts the Pharisee who tempted Jesus, into the veritable Prince of Hell.[1]

Note to Chapter IV.

The story of Mohammed's inhuman reply to the appeal of Okba, son of Abu Muait, when he was being led forward to execution, is utterly false ; it is said that on Okba's asking, "Who will take care of my liltle children ?", Mohammed answered, "Hell fire." This story is so preposterous in itself, so opposed to Mohemmed's true character (one of whose noblest traits was his love for children, and who always inculcated love and protection of orphans as an absolute duty, and an act most acceptable to God), that it is hardly necessary to search for its true origin. Christian writers, however, seem to gloat over it, and hence it becomes needful to examine how the story arose.

It originated most probably from the sobriquet of *Sibyat un-Nâr* (children of fire), applied to the children of Okba. Okba himself belonged to the tribe of Ajlan,[2] a branch of which inhabited certain valleys near Safra, and were known by the name of Banı un-Nar (children or descendants of fire). The sobriquet was probably derived from this circumstance ; and the story of Mohammed's reply from the nickname.

1 All the Schleiermacher school believe the tempter to have been the head priest. Milman mentions this view as well as the patristic and orthodox one, but dexterously leaves for the reader to choose which he likes. The chapter of Reuss on Angels (*History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, English translation, note 1. pp. 401-404), with the mass of references arrayed therein, distinctly proves that the early Christians, the immediate disciples of Jesus, firmly believed the angels and devils to be personal entities, beings slightly ethereal, but in every way human-like ; and this belief, those disciples of Jesus must have received from the Master himself, who indeed, as Renan says, could not have been, in these respects, intellectually different from the people of his age ; *Vie de Jesus*, 3rd ed. 1867, p. 267.

2 Aghani, according to C. de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 79.

Another story of Mohammed's having bitterly apostrophised the dead of the idolaters on their burial is, to say the least, distorted. Tibri thus narrates the circumstances which have given rise to this calumny : "The Prophet placed himself by the side of the large grave or pit which had been prepared for the corpses ; and as the bodies were lowered, the names were called out, and Mohammed then uttered these words, 'You, my kindred, you accused me of lying, when others believed in me ; you drove me from my home, when others received me ; what destiny has been yours ! Alas ! all that God threatened is fulfilled." These words, which were palpably meant to express pity, have been distorted to imply bitterness.

CHAPTER V.

HOSTILITY OF THE JEWS AND ARABS.

2 A. H=624 A. C.

كالزَّهرِ في تَرَفٍ والبَدرِ في شَرَفٍ

و البحرِ في كرمٍ و الدَّهرِ في هِمَمِ

SUCCESS is always one of the greatest criterions of truth. Even in the early days of Christianity, the good Pharisee said, "Let them alone; if these men be false, they will come to nought, or else you yourselves shall perish." If Constantine had not seen, or fancied he had seen, the notable cross in the heavens; if he had not marched to success under its auspices; if it had not led him on to victory and to the throne,—we can hardly conceive what would have been the fate of Christianity. What the victory of Badr was for Islam, the victory of the Milvian Bridge was for Christianity.[1] It thenceforth ruled from the throne of the Cæsars.

2 A. H. 624
A C.

For the Moslems the victory of Badr was indeed most auspicious. It was not surprising that they, like the Israelites or Christians of yore, saw the hand of Providence in their success over the idolaters. Had the Moslems failed, we can imagine what their fate would have been —a universal massacre.

Whilst Mohammed was engaged in this expedition, he lost one of his favourite daughters, Rukaiya, married to Osman, who had only recently returned from the Abyssinian exile. But the desire for

1 The Christians themselves look upon the defeat of Maxentius by Constantine (312 A.C.) as the greatest triumph of their faith. The chapter of Gibbon, vol. iii. chap. xx., mingled satire and history, shows how the success of Christianity dates from that event.

revenge with which the idolaters were burning allowed him no time to indulge in domestic sorrow. As soon as all the Koraishite prisoners had returned home, Abu Sufian issued forth from Meeca with two hundred horsemen, vowing solemnly never to return until he had avenged himself on Mohammed and his followers. Scouring the country to within a few miles of Medına, he came down with a fell swoop on the unprepared Moslems, slaying the people, and ravaging the date-groves which furnished the staple food of the Arabs. The Meccans had provided themselves with bags of "*sawîk*" [1] for the foray. As soon, however, as the Moslems sallied forth from Medına to avenge the murders, the Meccans turned bridle and fled, dropping the bags in order to lighten their beasts : whence this affair was derisively called by the Moslems, *Ghazwat us-sawîk,* "the battle of the meal-bags." [2]

It was on this occasion that an incident happened to the Prophet, which has been exceedingly well told by Washington Irving. Mohammed was sleeping one day alone at the foot of a tree, at a distance from his camp, when he was awakened by a noise, and beheld Durthur, a hostile warrior, standing over him with a drawn sword. "O Mohammed," cried he, "who is there now to save thee ?" "God !" replied the Prophet. The wild Bedouin was suddenly awed, and dropped his sword, which was instantly seized upon by Mohammed. Brandishing the weapon, he exclaimed in turn, "Who is there now to save thee, O Durthur ?" "Alas, no one !" replied the soldier. "Then learn from me to be "merciful." So saying, he returned the sword. The Arab's heart was overcome ; and in after years he proved one of the staunchest adherents of the Prophet.[3]

5th Zi'l-Hijja = 1st April 624.

1 *Sawîk* is the old and modern Arabic name for a dish of green grain, toasted, pounded, mixed with dates or sugar, and eaten on journeys when it is found difficult to cook.

2 The place where the affair took place bears now the name of Suwayka—a few hours' journey to the south-west of Medîna.

3 The last month of this year was marked by the death of Osman, son of Mahzun, and the marriage of Ali, son of Abu Talib, to Fatima, Mohammed's daughter.

Osman was one of the earliest believers, and he was the first of the Muhajirîn who died at Medîna, and was interred at Baki, a suburb of Medîna, where lie buried a number of illustrious and saintly people, whose tombs are up to the present day venerated by the Moslems.

Ali had been betrothed to Fatima several days before the expedition to Badr, but the marriage was only celebrated three months later, Ali being in his twenty-first, and Fatima in her fifteenth year.

But this skirmish between the idolaters and the Moslems, like others which followed, proved only a prelude to the great drama that was about to be enacted.

The idolaters were burning for revenge. They made formidable preparations for another war upon the Moslems. Their emissaries succeeded in obtaining the assistance of the tribes of Tihâma and Kinâna, and their united forces soon amounted to three thousand well-equipped soldiers (of whom seven hundred were mailed warriors), animated with but one desire, that of revenge. This army was as formidable to the petty tribes of Arabia as the multitudinous hordes of Xerxes to the Grecian States.

3 A. H. = 26th April 624 to 15th April 625 A.C.

Marching under the command of the relentless Abû Sufiân, and meeting with no opposition from any side, they took up a well-chosen position to the north-east of Medina, where only the hill of Ohod and a valley separated them from the devoted city. From this safe vantage-ground they ravaged the fields and fruit groves of the Medinites.

Forced by the enthusiasm of his followers, and by their fury at the destruction of their property, Mohammed marched out of Medina with a thousand men. The ill-concealed enmity of the Jews led to the defection of Addullah ibn-Ubbay, the leader of the Munafikin (the Disaffected), with three hundred of his followers. This desertion reduced the strength of Mohammed's small force to seven hundred men, who only possessed two horses amongst them. But still this gallant band marched steadily forward. Advancing quietly through groves of fruit trees, they soon gained the hill of Ohod. They passed the night in the defile, and in the morning after offering prayers as they stood in arms, they debouched into the plain. Mohammed now took up his position immediately under the hill.[1] Posting a few

[1] Burton thus describes the spot: "This spot, so celebrated in the annals of El Islam, is a shelving strip of land, close to the southern base of Mount Ohod. The army of the infidels advanced from the fiumara in crescent shape, with Abu Sufiyan, the general, and his idols in the centre. It is distant about three miles from El Medinah in a northerly direction. All the visitor sees is hard gravelly ground, covered with little heaps of various coloured granite, red sandstone, and bits of porphyry, to denote the different places where the martyrs fell and were buried. Seen from this point, there is something appalling in the look of the holy mountain. Its seared and jagged flanks rise like masses of iron from the plain, and the crevice into which the Moslem host retired, when the disobedience of the archers in hastening to plunder enabled Khalid ben Walid to fall upon Mohammed's rear, is the

archers on a height behind the troops, he gave them strict injunctions not to abandon their place whatever happened, but to harass the cavalry of the enemy and protect the flanks of the Moslems. The idolaters, confident in their numbers, marched down into the plain with their idols in the centre of their army, and the wives of the chiefs chanting their war-songs and beating their timbrels.[1] The first violent onslaught of the Koraish was bravely repulsed by the Moslems, led by Hamza, who, taking advantage of the confusion of the enemy, dashed into the midst of the Koraishites, dealing havoc on all sides. Victory had almost declared for the Moslems, when the archers, forgetting the injunction of the Prophet, and seeing the enemy in flight, dispersed in search of plunder.[2] And what happened in later days at Tours happened at Ohod. Khalid bin Walîd, one of the Koraish, at once perceived their error, and rallying his horse, fell on the rear of the Moslems.[3] The infantry of the Koraish also turned, and the Moslem troops, taken both in rear and front, had to renew the battle at fearful odds. Some of the bravest chiefs in the Moslem army fell fighting. The intrepid Hamza, with several others, was killed; Ali, who had chivalrously answered the first call of defiance (*Rajz*) of the idolaters,[4] and Omar and Abu Bakr were severely wounded. The efforts of the idolaters were, however, principally directed towards Mohammed, who surrounded by a few disciples, and separated from the main body of his people, became now the chief object of their assaults. His friends fell fast around him. Though

only break in the grim wall. Reeking with heat, its surface produces not one green shrub or stunted tree; not a bird or beast appeared upon its inhospitable sides, and the bright blue sky glaring above its bald and sullen brow made it look only the more repulsive."—Burton's *Pilgrimage to Mecca*, vol. ii. pp. 236, 237.

1 Extracts from their war-songs are given by Ibn ul-Athîr, Vol. ii p. 118. "Courage! Ye sons of Abd ud-Dar; courage! defenders of women! strike home with the edges of your swords." Another runs thus: "We are daughters of the Star of the Morn (Tarik); we tread softly on silken cushions (*namârik*); face the enemy boldly, and we shall press you in our arms; fly, and we shall shun you, shun you with disgust."

2 This disobedience is referred to in the Koran, sura iii. ver. 146.

3 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. 119; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 26.

4 Tibri says that Talha, the standard-bearer of the idolaters, a man of heroic bravery, placed himself before Ali, and brandishing his sabre, defied him, crying, "You Moslems say that our dead will go to hell, and yours to heaven; let me see whether I cannot send thee to heaven." Upon this Ali replied, "Be it so!" and they faught, and Talha was struck to the ground. "Mercy, O son of my uncle," cried he. Ali replied, "Mercy be it; thou dost not deserve the fire."—Vol. iii. p. 25.

wounded and bleeding he did not forget their loving hearts, and blessed the hand that tried to stanch the blood which flowed from his forehead.[1] But rescue was nigh. The brave warriors who under Ali had been fighting in the centre with the energy of despair, succeeded in retreating to a point on the hill, where they were secure from the attacks of the enemy, but full of consternation at the loss, as they supposed, of their great Master. Seeing, however, their brethren still fighting in another part of the field, they rushed down into the midst of the idolaters. Penetrating to the place where the small group of Moslems yet defended the Prophet, and finding that he still lived, they succeeded, after great exertions, in retreating with him to the heights of Mount Ohod, where they breathed again. Ali fetched water in his shield from the hollow of a rock. With this he bathed Mohammed's face and wounds, and with his companions offered up the mid-day prayers sitting.

The Koraish were too exhausted to follow up their advantage, either by attacking Medina or driving the Moslems from the heights of Ohod. They retreated from the Medinite territories after barbarously mutilating their slain enemies. The wife of Abu Sufian, Hind, the daughter of Otba, with the other Koraishite women, showed the greatest ferocity in this savage work of vengeance, tearing out the heart of Hamza, and making bracelets and necklaces of the ears and noses of the dead.

The barbarities practised by the Koraish on the slain created among the Moslems a feeling of bitter exasperation. Even Mohammed was at first so moved by indignation as to declare that the dead of the Koraish should in future be treated in like manner. But the gentleness of his nature conquered the bitterness of his heart. "Bear wrong patiently," he preached; "verily, best it will be for the patiently enduring."[2] And from that day the horrible

1 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 114, and Abulfedâ, p. 44, mention the date of the battle of Ohod as the 7th of Shawwal; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 21, mentions the 8th; Ibn-Hisham, the 5th; and several others the 11th. C. de Perceval, however, calculates the 11th to have been the real date of the battle, as according to all the chroniclers the day was a Saturday, and the 11th of Shawwâl (26th of January) fell on a Saturday.—*Hist. des Arabes*, vol. iii. p. 96, note.

2 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 580 et seq.; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 115-126; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 16 et seq.; Abulfeda, pp. 44–46.

1 Koran, sura xvii. ver. 127; Ibn-Hisham, pp. 584,585; Zamakhsharî (the *Kashshâf*), Egypt. ed., p. 446.

practice of mutilation which prevailed among all the nations of antiquity was inexorably forbidden to the Moslems.[1]

On his return to Medîna the Prophet directed a small body of the disciples to pursue the retreating enemy, and to impress on them that the Moslems, though worsted in battle, were yet unbroken in spirit, and too strong to be attacked again with impunity. Abu Sufian, hearing of the pursuit, hastened back to Mecca, having first murdered two Medinites whom he met on his route. He, however, sent a message to the Prophet, saying that he would soon return to exterminate him and his people. The reply as before was full of trust and faith—"God is enough for us, a good guardian is He!"[2]

The moral effect of this disastrous battle was at once visible in the forays which the neighbouring nomades prepared to make on the Medinite territories. Most of them, however, were repressed by the energetic action of Mohammed, though some of the hostile tribes succeeded in enticing Moslem missionaries into their midst, under the pretence of embracing Islam, and then massacred them. On one such occasion seventy Moslems were treacherously murdered near a brook called Bîr-Mauna, within the territories of two tribes, the Banî-Aamir and the Banî-Sulaim, chiefly through the instrumentality of the latter. One of the two survivors of the slaughter escaped towards Medîna. Meeting on the way two unarmed Arabs belonging to the Banî-Aamir who were travelling under a safe-conduct of the Prophet, and mistaking them for enemies, he killed them. When Mohammed heard of this he was deeply grieved. A wrong had been committed by one of his followers, though under a mistake, and the relatives of the men that were killed were entitled to redress. Accordingly orders were issued for collecting the Diat (the *wehrgeld*) from the Moslems and the people who had accepted the Charter.[3] The Jewish tribes of the Banî un-Nadhîr, the Kuraizha, and others were bound equally with the Moslems to contribute towards this payment.[4] Mohammed himself, accompanied by a few disciples,

1 The Jews used to burn their prisoners alive, and most barbarously mutilate the slain. The Greeks, the Romans, and the Persians all practised similar barbarities. Christianity effected no improvement in these frightful customs, for as late as the sixteenth century we read of the most horrible mutilations.

2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 590; Koran, sura iii. ver. 167.

3 See *ante*, pp. 54–55.

4 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. iii. p. 133; Tibri, vol. iv. p. 50. Muir and Sprenger have strangely garbled this part of the affair. Sir W. Muir does not find

proceeded to the Banî un-Nadhîr, and asked from them their contribution. They seemingly agreed to the demand, and requested him to wait awhile. Whilst sitting with his back to the wall of a house, he observed sinister movements amongst the inhabitants, which led him to divine their intention of murdering him.

Bnt to explain the hostility of the Jews we must trace back the course of events. We have seen with what bitter animosity they dogged Mohammed's footsteps from the moment of his arrival at Medîna. They tried to sow disaffection among his people. They libelled him and his followers. They mispronounced the words of the Koran so as to give them an offensive meaning. But this was not all. By their superior education and intelligence, by their union with the party of the Munafikîn (the Disaffected), and by the general unanimity which prevailed among them (so different from the disunion of the Arabs), the Jews formed a most dangerous element within the federated State which had risen under the Teacher of Islâm. Among unadvanced nations poets occupy the position and exercise the influence of the press in modern times.[1] The Jewish poets by their superior culture naturally exercised a vast influence among the Medinites; and this influence was chiefly directed towards sowing sedition among the Moslems, and widening the breach between them und the opposing faction. The defeat of the idolaters at Badr was felt as keenly by the Jews as by the Meccans. Immediately after this battle a distinguished member of their race, called Kaab, the son of Ashraf,

any authority for M. C. de Perceval's saying, that the Jews were bound by treaty to contribute towards the *Diat*. If he had referred to Tibri he would have seen the following statement: "En suite il ordonna de reeunir cette somme, ou la repartissant sur la ville de Medine, et d'y faire contribuer egalement les Juifs, tels que les Beni-Nadhir, les Koraizha et ceux de Fadak, que y etaient obliges par le traite."—Zotenberg's transl. vol. iii. p. 50. So also Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 133.

1 An example of the influence which poets and rhapsodists exercise among unprogressed nations, is afforded by one of the episodes connected with the war of Ohod. Whilst preparing for this eventful campaign, the Koraish requested a poet of the name of Abu Uzza to go round the tribes of the desert, and excite them by his songs and poetry against the Moslems, and persuade them to join the confederacy, formed under the auspices of the Meccans, for the destruction of Mohammed and his followers. This man had been taken prisoner by the Moslems in the battle of Badr, but was released by the Prophet, without ransom, on pledging himself never again to take up arms against the Medinites. In spite of this, he was tempted to break his word, and went round the tribes, rousing them to arms by his poetry; and it is said he was eminently successful in his work. After Ohod he was again taken prisoner and executed by the Moslems. Ibn-Hisham, p. 591.

belonging to the tribe of Nadhîr, publicly deploring the ill-success of the idolaters, proceeded towards Mecca. Finding the people there plunged in grief, he spared no exertion to revive their courage. By his satires against the Prophet and his disciples, by his elegies on the Meccans who had fallen at Badr, he succeeded in exciting the Koraish to that frenzy of vengeance which found vent on the plains of Ohod. Having attained his object, he returned to his home near Medina in the canton of Nadhir, where he continued to attack Mohammed and the Mussulmans in ironical and obscene verses, not sparing even the women of the Believers, whom he addressed in terms of the grossest character. His acts were openly directed against the commonwealth of which he was a member. He belonged to a tribe which had entered into the Compact[1] with the Moslems, and pledged itself for the internal as well as the external safety of the State, Another Jew of the Nadhîr, Abu Rafe Sallam, son of Abu'l Hukaik, was equally wild and bitter against the Mussulmans. He inhabited, with a fraction of his tribe, the territories of Khaibar, four or five days' journey to the north-west of Medina. Detesting Mohammed and the Mussulmans, he made use of every endeavour to excite the neighbouring Arab tribes, such as the Sulaim and the Ghatafan, against them. It was impossible for the Mussulman Commonwealth to tolerate this open treachery on the part of those to whom every consideration had been shown, with the object of securing their neutrality, if not their support. The very existence of the Mussulman community was at stake; and every principle of safety required that these traitorous designs should be quietly frustrated. The sentence of outlawry was executed upon them by the Medinites themselves—in one case by a member of the tribe of Aus, in the other by a Khazrajite.

Christian controversialists have stigmatised these executions as "assassinations." And because a Moslem was sent secretly to kill each of the criminals, in their prejudice against the Prophet, they shut their eyes to the justice of the sentence, and the necessity of a swift and secret execution. There existed then no police court, no judicial tribunal, nor even a court-martial, to take cognisance of individual crimes. In the absence of a State executioner any individual might become the executioner of the law. These men had broken

[1] See *ante*, p. 54.

their formal pact; it was impossible to arrest them in public, or execute the sentence in the open before their clans, without causing unnecessary blood-shed, and giving rise to the feud of blood, and everlasting vendetta. The exigencies of the State required that whatever should be done should be done swiftly and noiselessly upon those whom public opinion had arraigned and condemned.[1] The existence of the republic, and the maintenance of peace and order within the city, depended upon the prompt execution of the sentence passed upon the culprits before they could rally their clansmen round them.

2 A.H. Shawwal, February 624 A. C.

The fate of these two traitors, and the expulsion of their brethren the Banî-Kainukâa from the Medinite territories, had given rise to a bitter feeling of animosity among the Nadhîr against the Prophet. The circumstances connected with the banishment of the Kainukâa require a brief notice. Whilst the other Jewish tribes were chiefly agricultural, the Banu-Kainukaa hardly possessed a single field or date plantation. They were for the most part artisans employed in handicraft of all kinds.[2] Seditious and unruly, always ready for a broil like their co-religionists of Alexandria, the Banu-Kainukaa were also noted for the extreme laxity of their morals. One day a young girl from the country came to their bazaar or market (Suk) to sell milk. The Jewish youths insulted her grossly. A Moslem passer-by took the part of the girl, and in the fray which ensued the author of the outrage was killed; whereupon the entire body of the Jews present rose and slaughtered the Moslem. A wild scene then followed. The Moslems, enraged at the murder of their compatriot, flew to arms, blood flowed fast, and many were killed on both sides. At the first news of the riots, Mohammed hastened to the spot, and, by his presence, succeeded in restraining the fury of his followers. He at once preceived what the end would be of these seditions and disorders if allowed to take their course. Medina would be turned into an amphitheatre, in which members of hostile factions might murder one another with impunity. The Jews had openly and knowingly infringed the terms of their compact. It was necessary to put a stop to this with a firm hand, or

1 Our Christian historians forget that the "wise" Solon himself, for the safety of his small city, made it obligatory on the Athenians to become executioners of the law, by pursuing the factious, or taking one of two sides in a public riot. They also forget that even the laws of Christian England allow any person to pursue and kill "an outlaw."

2 Tibri, vol. iii. p. 8.

farewell to all hope of peace and security. Consequently Mohammed proceeded at once to the quarter of the Banî-Kainukaa, and required them to enter definitely into the Moslem Commonwealth by embracing Islam, or to vacate Medîna. The reply of the Jews was couched in the most offensive terms. "O, Mohammed, do not be elated with the victory over thy people (the Koraish). Thou hast had an affair with men ignorant of the art of war. If thou art desirous of having any dealings with us, we shall show thee that we are men."[1] They then shut themselves up in their fortress, and set Mohammed's authority at defiance. But their reduction was an absolute duty, and siege was accordingly laid to their stronghold without loss of time. After fifteen days they surrendered. At first it was intended to inflict some severe punishment on them, but the clemency of Mohammed's nature overcame the dictates of justice, and the Banû-Kainukaa were simply banished.

All these circumstances were rankling within the breasts of the Banî un-Nadhîr. They only waited for a favourable opportunity to rid themselves of Mohammed, and therefore looked upon his arrival amongst them as providential. But their sinister designs, as we have before said, did not escape the eye of the Prophet. He immediately left the place without raising the suspicions of the Jews, and thus saved himself and his disciples from almost certain destruction.[2]

The Banu un-Nadhîr had now placed themselves in exactly the same position as the Banu-Kainukaa had previously done. They had by their own act put themselves outside the pale of the Charter; and therefore on his arrival at Medîna, Mohammed sent them a message of the same import as that which was sent to the Kainukaa. Relying on the support of the Munafikîn and Abdullah ibn-Ubbay, the Banu un-Nadhîr returned a defiant answer. Disappointed, however, in the promised assistance of Abdullah, and of their brethren, the Banî-Kuraizha, after a siege of fifteen days[3] they sued for terms.

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 545. Tibri gives the speech of the Kainukâa with a slight variation. But all historians agree in its being defiant and offensive. I cannot understand whence Gibbon obtained the excessively meek reply he puts into the mouth of these people.

2 As any betrayal of suspicion by Mohammed or his disciples of the intents of the Jews would have made these people desperate, and precipitated matters, the Prophet went away by himself, leaving his followers behind, which led the Jews to suppose he was not gone far, and would quickly return.

3 Tibri says eleven days (vol. iii. p. 54).

The previous offer was renewed, and they agreed to evacuate their territories. They were allowed to take all their moveables with them, with the exception of arms.[1] In order to prevent the Moslems from occupying their dwellings, they destroyed these before leaving.[2]

Their land, warlike materials, etc., which they could not carry away, were distributed by the Prophet, with the consent and cordial approval of the Ansaar, among the Muhâjirîn, who, up to this time, had been entirely dependent for support on the generosity of the Medinites. Notwithstanding the strong brotherly love which existed between the "Refugees" and the "Helpers"[3], Mohammed knew that the assistance of the Medinites afforded but a precarious means of subsistence. He accordingly assembled the principal men from among the Ansar, and asked them whether they had any objection to his distributing among their poor brethren who had followed him from Mecca the goods left behind by the Jews. With one voice they answered, "Give to our brothers the goods of the Jews; assign to them even a portion of ours: we willingly consent." Upon this the Prophet divided the property among the Muhajirîn and two of the Ansar who were extremely poor.[4]

Rabi I. 4 A.H = June to July, 625 S. C.

The expulsion of the Banî un-Nadhîr took place in the month of Rabi I. of the fourth year.[5] The remaining portion of this year and the early part of the next were passed in repressing the spasmodic hostile attempts of the nomadic tribes against the Moslems, and in inflicting punishments for various murderous forays on the Medinite territories.[6]

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 652, 653; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 133; Abulfedâ, p. 49.

2 Koran, sura lix. ver. 5.

3 See *ante*, p. 49.

4 Ibn-Hisham, p. 654; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 133; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 54. A principle was henceforth established that any acquisition, not made in actual warfare, should belong to the State, or the chief of the State; and that its application should depend upon his discretion (vide *Droit Mussalman* by M. Querry, p. 337). Sura lix. of the Koran treats almost entirely of the circumstances connected with the banishment of the Banî un-Nadhîr.

5 According to Ibn-Hisham, p. 653, and Abulfeda, p. 49; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 55, says it was the month of Safar.

6 Of this nature was the expedition against the Christian Arabs of Dûmat ul-Jandal (a place, according to Abulfeda, about seven days' journey to the south of Damascus), who had stopped the Medinite traffic with Syria and even threatened a raid upon Medîna; these marauders, however, fled on the approach of the Moslems, and Mohammed returned to Medîna, after concluding a treaty with a neighbouring chief, to whom he granted premission of pasturage on the Medinite territories.—C. de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 129; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 60.

Meanwhile the enemies of the Faith were by no means idle. Far and wide the idolaters had sent their emissaries to stir up the tribes against the Moslems. The Jews were the most active in these efforts. Some of the Banî-Nadhîr had remained behind with their brethren settled near Khaibar, and there, fired with the hope of vengeance, had set themselves to the work of forming another league for the destruction of the Believers.[1] Their efforts were successful beyond their utmost hopes. A formidable coalition was soon formed; and an army, consisting of ten thousand well-appointed men, marched upon Medina, under the command of the relentless Abû Sufiân. Meeting no opposition on their way, they soon encamped within a few miles of Medina, on its most vulnerable side, towards Ohod. To oppose this host the Moslems could only muster a body of three thousand men.[2] Forced thus by their inferiority in numbers, as well as by the factious opposition of the *Munâfikîn* within the city,[3] to remain on the defensive, they dug a deep trench round the unprotected quarters of Medîna, and, leaving their women and children for safety in their fortified houses, they encamped outside the city, with the moat in front of them. In the meantime they relied for the safety of the other side, if not upon the active assistance, at least upon the neutrality of the Banî-Kuraizha, who possessed several fortresses at a short distance, towards the south-east, and were bound by the Compact to assist the Moslems against every assailant. These Jews, however, were persuaded by the idolaters to violate their pledged faith, and to join the Koraish. As soon as the news of their defection reached Mohammed, he deputed "the two Saads," Saad ibn-Muaz and Saad ibn-Ubada, to entreat them to return to their duty. The reply was defiant and sullen: "Who is Mohammed, and who is the Apostle of God that we should obey him? There is no bond or compact betwixt us and him."[4]

5 A. H. =3rd May 626 to 23rd April 627 A. C.

Shawwâl, 5 A. H. =2 February 627.

As these Jews were well acquainted with the locality, and could materially assist the besiegers by showing them the weak points of the city, the consternation among the Moslems became great, whilst

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 963; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 639; Tibri vol. iii. pp. 60, 61.
2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 678.
3 Referred to in the Koran, sura xxxiii. vers. 12, 13, 14, etc.
4 Ibn-Hisham, p. 675; Muir, vol. iii. p. 259.

the disaffected body within the walls increased the elements of danger.[1]

The idolaters and the Jews, failing in all their attempts to draw the Moslems into the open field, or to surprise the city under the direction of Jewish guides, determined upon a regular assault. The siege had already lasted twenty days. The restless tribes of the desert, who had made common cause with the Koraish and their Jewish allies, and who had expected an easy prey, were becoming weary of this protracted compaign. Great efforts were made at this critical moment by the leaders of the beleaguering host to cross the trench and fall upon the small Moslem force. Every attempt was, however, repulsed by untiring vigilance on the part of Mohammed. The elements now seemed to combine against the besieging army; their horses were perishing fast, and provisions were becoming scanty. Disunion was rife in their midst, and the far-seeing chief of the Moslems, with matchless prudence, fomented it into actual division. Suddenly this vast coalition, which had seemed to menace the Moslems with inevitable destruction, vanished into thin air. In the darkness of night, amidst a storm of wind and rain, their tents overthrown, their lights put out, Abu Sufian and the majority of his formidble army fled, the rest took refuge with the Bani-Kuraizha.[2] Mohammed had in the night foretold to his followers the dispersion of their enemies. Daybreak saw his prognostication fulfilled, and the Moslems returned in joy to the city.[3]

But the victory was hardly achieved in the opinion of the Moslems as long as the Banu-Kuraizha remained so near, and in such dangerous proximity to the city of Islam. They had proved themselves traitors in spite of their sworn alliance, and had at one time almost surprised Medîna from their side,—an event which, if

5 A. H. = 28th February 626 to 24 March 627. A C.

1 The whole scene is so beautifully painted in the Koran, sura xxxiii. (Surat ul-Ahzab, "The Confederates"), that I cannot resist quoting a few verses here: "When they assailed you from above you and from below you, and when your eyes became distracted, and your hearts came up into your throats, and ye thought divers thoughts of God, then were the Faithful tried, and with strong quaking did they quake; and when the disaffected and diseased of heart (with infidelity) said, 'God and His Apostle have made us but a cheating promise.'"

2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 683; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 140.

3 In Moslem annals this war is called the "War of the Trench."

successful, would have involved the general massacre of the Mussulmans. The Moslems therefore felt it their duty to demand an explanation of the treachery. This was doggedly refused. The consequence was that the Jews were besieged, and compelled to surrender at discretion. They made only one condition, that their punishment should be left to the judgment of the Ausite chief, Saad ibn-Muâz. This man, a fierce soldier who had been wounded in the attack, and indeed died from his wounds the next day, infuriated by their treacherous conduct, gave sentence that the fighting men should be put to death, and that the women and children should become the slaves of the Moslems; and this sentence was carried into execution.[1] "It was a harsh, bloody sentence," says Lane-Poole, "worthy of the episcopal generals of the army against the Albigenses, or of the deeds of the Augustan age of Puritanism; but it must be remembered that the crime of these men was high treason against the State during a time of siege; and those who have read how Wellington's march could be traced by the bodies of deserters and pillagers hanging from the trees, need not be surprised at the summary execution of a traitorous clan."[2]

The punishment inflicted on the various Jewish tribes has furnished to the Christian biographers of the Prophet, like Muir, Sprenger, Weil, and Osborn, a ground for attack. The punishment meted out to the Bani-Kainukaa and Bani un-Nadhîr was far below their deserts. The Banu-Kuraizha alone were treated with anything like severity.

Human nature is so constituted that, however criminal the acts of an individual may be, the moment he is treated with a severity which to our mind seems harsh or cruel, a natural revulsion of feeling occurs, and the sentiment of justice gives place to pity within our hearts. No doubt the sentence on the Banu-Kuraizha, from our point of view, was severe. But however much we may regret that the fate of these poor people should have been, though at their own special request, left in the hands of an infuriated soldier,—however much we may regret that the sentence of this man should have been so carried into effect,—we must not, in the sentiment of pity, overlook the stern question of justice and culpability.

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 686-690; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 141 et seq.; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 68 et seq.

[2] Selections from the Koran, *Introd.* p. lxv.

We must bear in mind the crimes of which they were guilty,—their treachery, their open hostility, their defection from an alliance to which they were bound by every sacred tie. Moreover, we must bear in mind the temptations which they, the worshippers of the pure Jehovah, held out to the heathen Arabs to continue in the practice of idolatry. Some Moslems might naturally be inclined to say, with the Christian moralist: "It is better that the wicked should be destroyed a hundred times over than they should tempt those who are as yet innocent to join their company."[1]

These Moslems might say with him, with only the variation of a word: "Let us but think what might have been our fate, and the fate of every other nation under heaven at this hour, had the sword of the *Arab*[2] done its work more sparingly. The Arab's sword, in its bloodiest executions, wrought a work of mercy for all the countries of the earth to the very end of the world." If the Christian's argument is correct and not inhuman, certainly the Moslem's argument cannot be otherwise. Other Moslems, however, might look upon this fearful sentence on the Bani-Kuraizha in the same light as Carlyle looks upon the order of Cromwell for the promiscuous massacre of the Irish inhabitants of Drogheda: "An armed soldier solemnly conscious to himself that he is the soldier of God the Just,—a consciousness which it well beseems all soldiers and all men to have always,—armed soldier, terrible as death, relentless as doom; doing God's judgment on the enemies of God."

We, however, are not disposed to look at the punishment of these Jews from either of these points of view. We simply look upon it as an act done in perfect consonance with the laws of war as then understood by the nations of the world: "a strict application of admitted customs of war in those days."[3] These people brought their fate upon themselves. If they had been put to death, even without the judgment of Saad, it would have perfectly accorded with the principles which then prevailed. But they had themselves chosen Saad as the sole arbiter and judge of their fate; they knew that his judgment was not at all contrary to the received notions, and accordingly never murmured. They knew that if they had succeeded they would have massacred their enemies without compunction. People

1 Arnold's *Sermons*, 4th Sermon, "Wars of the Israelites," pp. 35, 36.
2 In the original, of course, Israelites.
3 An observation of Grote, *Hist of Greece*, vol. vi. p. 499.

judge of the massacres of King David according to the "lights of his time."[1] Even the fearful slaughters committed by the Christians in primitive times are judged according to certain "lights." Why should not the defensive wars of the early Moslems be looked at from the same standpoint? But, whatever the point of view; an unprejudiced mind[2] will perceive that no blame can possibly attach to the Prophet in the execution of the Banî-Kuraizha.

The number of men executed could not have been more than 200 or 250.

In the distribution of the surviving people, it is said, a young Jewess of the name of Raihana was allotted to the Prophet. Some say she was previously set apart. The Christian historians, always ready to seize upon any point which to their mind offers a plausible ground for attacking Mohammed, have not failed to make capital of this story. Leaving the examination of the question of slavery to a later chapter, we will here only observe that the allotment of Raihana, even if true, furnishes no ground for modern attack, as it was perfectly consonant with the customs of war recognised in those days. The story about Raihana becoming a wife of the Prophet is a fabrication, for, after this event, she disappears from history and we hear no more of her, whilst of others we have full and circumstantial accounts.

[1] 2 Sam. viii. 2: "The conquered Ammonites he treated with even greater ferocity, tearing and hewing some of them in pieces with harrows, axes, and saws; and roasting others in brick-kilns" (xii. 31); Maitland, *Jewish Literature and Modern Education*, p. 21. Compare also Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, vol. ii. p. 99.

[2] I can only remember M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole among Europeans who have not been carried away by prejudice.

CHAPTER VI.

MOHAMMED'S CLEMENCY.

دَعَا اِلَى اللّٰهِ فَالْمُسْتَمْسِكُوْنَ بِهٖ - مُسْتَمْسِكُوْنَ بِحَبْلٍ غَيْرِ مُنْفَصِمٍ

THE formidable coalition formed by the Jews and the idolaters to compass tne destruction of the new commonwealth of Medîna had utterly failed, well might the Moslems say, miraculously.[1] But the surrrounding tribes of the desert, wild and fierce, were committing depredations, accompanied with murders, on the Medinite territories: and the existence of the State required the employment of stern measures for their repression. Several expeditions were despatched against these marauders, but the slippery sons of the desert generally evaded the approach of the Moslems. The Banî-Lihyan, who had requested Mohammed to send a few of his disciples among them to teach the precepts of Islam, and who, on the arrival of the missionaries, had killed some and sold the rest to the Meccans,—had, up to this period, remained unpunished. But the time had come when this crime should be avenged. In the month of Jamadî I. of this year, a body of troops, under the personal command of the Prophet, marched against the Banı-Lihyan. The marauders, however, receiving timely notice of the Prophet's approach, fled into the mountains, and the Moslems retuned to Medina without having accomplished their purpose.[2]

6 A H =23rd April 627 to 12th April 628 A. C.

A few days had only elapsed when a chief of the Banî-Fizâra, a branch of the nomade horde of Ghatafan, (Khail-Ghatafan), suddenly fell upon the open suburbs of the city, and drove off a large herd of camels, murdering the man who had charge of them,

1 Comp. Koran, sura xxxiii. ver. 9.
2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 718; Ion ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 143; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 72.

and carrying off his wife. The Moslems were immediately on their track, and a few of the animals were recovered; but the Bedouins escaped into the desert with the larger portion of their booty.

It was about this time that the Prophet granted to the monks of the monastery of St. Catherine, near Mount Sinai, and to all Christians, a Charter which has been justly designated as one of the noblest monuments of enlightened tolerance that the history of the world can produce. This remarkable document, which has been faithfully preserved by the annalists of Islam, displays a marvellous breadth of view and liberality of conception. By it the Prophet secured to the Christians privileges and immunities which they did not possess even under sovereigns of their own creed; and declared that any Moslem violating and abusing what was therein ordered, should be regarded as a violator of God's testament, a transgressor of His commandments, and a slighter of His faith. He undertook himself, and enjoined on his followers, to protect the Christians, to defend their churches, the residences of their priests, and to guard them from all injuries. They were not to be unfairly taxed; no bishop was to be driven out of his bishopric; no Christian was to be forced to reject his religion; no monk was to be expelled from his monastery; no pilgrim was to be detained from his pilgrimage. Nor were the Christian churches to be pulled down for the sake of building mosques or houses for the Moslems. Christian women married to Moslems were to enjoy their own religion, and not to be subjected to compulsion or annoyance of any kind on that account. If Christians should stand in need of assistance for the repair of their churches or monasteries, or any other matter pertaining to their religion, the Moslems were to assist them. This was not to be considered as taking part in their religion, but as merely rendering them assistance in their need, and complying with the ordinances of the Prophet which were made in their favour by the authority of God and of His Apostle. Should the Moslems be engaged in hostilities with outside Christians, no Christian resident among the Moslems should be treated with contempt on account of his creed. Any Moslem so treating a Christian should be accounted recalcitrant to the Prophet.

Man always attaches an idea of greatness to the character of a person who, whilst possessing the power of returning evil for evil, not only preaches but *practises* the divine principle of forgiveness.

Mohammed, as the chief of the State and guardian of the life and liberty of the people, in the exercise of justice sternly punished every individual guilty of crime. Mohammed the Prophet, the Teacher, was gentle and merciful even to his greatest enemies. In him were combined the highest attributes that the human mind can conceive—justice and mercy.

A chief of the tribe of Hanafa, named Thumâma, son of Uthâl, was taken prisoner by the Moslems in one of their expeditions against the unruly Arabs of the desert. He was brought to Medina, where he was so affected by the kindness of the Prophet, that from an enemy he soon became the most devoted follower. Returning to his people he stopped the transport to Mecca of provisions from Yemama, and this stoppage by Thumama reduced the Meccans to the direst straits. Failing to move the Hanafites, they at last addressed themselves to Mohammed, and besought him to intercede for them. The Prophet's heart was touched with pity, and he requested Thumama to allow them to have whatever they wanted; and at his word the convoys were again permitted to reach Mecca.

Endless instances might be cited of Mohammed's merciful nature. We will, however, only instance two. A daughter of his—a beloved child—was, after the treaty of Hudaiba, fleeing from Mecca. She was far advanced in pregancy, and as she was mounting her camel, a Koraish named Habrar, with characteristic ferocity, drove the butt-end of his lance against her, throwing her to the ground, and eventually causing her death. On the conquest of Mecca the murderer was proscribed. After hiding for some time he presented himself before the Prophet, and threw himself on the mercy of the bereaved father. The wrong was great; the crime was atrocious,—but the injury was personal. The man was to all appearance sincere in his penitence and the profession of the Faith. Pardon was unconditionally granted. The Jewess who attempted his life at Khaibar, and Ikrima, the son of Abu Jahl, who was bitterly personal in his animosity towards the Prophet, were freely forgiven.

A tribe of Christian Bedouins (the Banû-Kalb), settled about Dumat ul-Jandal, had, in their depredations, appeared on the Medinite territories. An expedition was now despatched to summon them to embrace Islam and forego their lawless practices. Whilst delivering his injunctions to the captain who headed this small force, Mohammed

used the memorable words, "In no case shalt thou use deceit or perfidy, nor shalt thou kill any child."[1]

In his instructions to the leaders of the expeditions against marauding and hostile tribes and people, he invariably enjoined them in peremptory terms never to injure the weak. "In avenging the injuries inflicted upon us," he said to his troops, whom he dispatched against the Byzantines, "molest not the harmless inmates of domestic seclusion; spare the weakness of the female sex; injure not the infant at the breast, or those who are ill in bed. Abstain from demolishing the dwellings of the unresisting inhabitants; destroy not the means of their subsistence, nor their fruit trees; and touch not the palm," Abu Bakr, following his master, thus enjoined his captain: "O Yezid! be sure you do not oppress your own people, nor make them uneasy, but advise with them in all your affairs, and take care to do that which is right and just; for those that do otherwise shall not prosper. When you meet your enemies quit yourselves like men, and do not turn your backs; and if you gain the victory, kill not little children, nor old people, nor women. Destroy no palm trees, nor burn any fields of corn. Cut down no fruit trees, nor do any mischief to cattle, only such as you kill for the necessity of subsistence. When you make any covenant or article, stand to it, and be as good as your word. As you go on, you will find some religious persons that live retired in monasteries, who propose to themselves to serve God that way. Let them alone, and neither kill them nor destroy their monasteries."[2] These injunctions contrast strangely with the fearful denunciations of the Christians, Catholic, Protestant, and Greek, from the days of St. Lactantius to those of the Covenanters.[3] The followers of the "Prince of Peace" burnt and ravished, pillaged and murdered promiscuously, old and young, male and female, without

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 992. Compare these injunctions of the Arabian Prophet, as also the historic words of Abu Bakr (the first Caliph) to Yezid bin Abu Sufian, when despatching him against the Byzantines, with the commands of the Israelite prophet: "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts. . . . Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass," I Sam. xv. 3; "Slay utterly old and young, both maids, and little children, and women," Ezek. ix. 6.

2 Compare Mill's *History of Muhammedanism*, pp. 45, 46; and Gagnier, *Vie de Mahomet, in loco.*

3 The massacre of 5000 Chinese men, women and children at Blagovestchenk in Manchuria in the 20th century by the troops of a great Christian power needs no mention.

compunction, up to recent times. And his vicegerents on earth, popes and patriarchs, bishops, priests, and presbyters, approved of their crimes, and frequently granted plenary absolution for the most heinous offences.

In the month of Shâbân of this year (November–December, 627) an expedition was directed against the Banî-Mustalik. These people had up to this time been on friendly terms with the Moslems. But, recently, instigated by their chief Harith, the son of Abu Dhirâr, they had thrown off their allegiance, and committed forays on the suburbs of Medîna. The expedition was entirely successful, and several prisoners were taken, amongst whom was a daughter of Harith, called Juwairiya.[1]

Six years had now passed since the exiles of Mecca had left their homes and their country for the sake of their faith, and of him who had infused into them a new consciousness such as they had never felt before, awakening in them the spirit of union, love, and brotherhood. People flocked from every part of Arabia to listen to the words of the wondrous man who had achieved all this; to ask his counsel in the affairs of everyday life, even as the sons of Israel consulted of old the prophet Samuel.[2]

But the hearts of these exiles still yearned sadly for the place of their birth. Driven from their homes, they had found refuge in a rival city; expelled from the precincts of the sacred Kaaba, which formed the glorious centre of all their associations,—the one spot round which gathered the history of their nation,—for six years had they been denied the pilgrimage of the holy shrine, a custom round which time, with its hoary traditions, had cast the halo of sanctity. The Teacher himself longed to see the place of his nativity with as great a yearning. The temple of the Kaaba belonged to the whole Arab nation. The Koraish were merely the custodians of this shrine, and were not authorised by the public law of the country to interdict the approach even of an enemy, if he presented himself without any hostile design, and with the avowed object of fulfilling a religious duty.[3]

The season of the pilgrimage had approached; the Prophet accordingly announced his intention of visiting the holy places. At

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 725; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 146.
2 Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, vol. i. *in loco*.
3 Tibri, vol. iii. p. 84; Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. pp. 174, 175 et seq.

once a thousand voices responded to the call. Preparations were rapidly made, and, accompanied by seven hundred Moslems, Ansar and Muhajirîn, all perfectly unarmed, he set out on the pilgrimage.[1] The animosity of the Koraish, however, was not yet extinguished. They posted themselves, with a large army, some miles in advance of Mecca, to bar the way, but soon after fell back on the city, in order to keep every point of access closed to the Moslems. They swore solemnly not to allow the followers of the Prophet to enter the shrine, and maltreated the envoy who was sent to them to solicit permission to visit the Kaaba. A body of the Meccans went round the Prophet's encampment with the avowed object of killing any unwary Moslem who might leave the camp. They even attacked the Prophet with stones and arrows.[2] Finding the idolaters immovable, and wishful himself to end the state of warfare between the Moslems and Koraish, Mohammed expressed himself willing to agree to any terms the Meccans might feel inclined to impose. After much difficulty a treaty was concluded, by which it was agreed that all hostilities should cease for ten years; that any one coming from the Koraish to the Prophet without the permission of the guardian or chief, should be re-delivered to the idolaters; that any individual from among the Moslems going over to the Meccans should not be surrendered; that any tribe desirous of entering into alliance, either with the Koraish or with the Moslems, should be at liberty to do so without hindrance; that the Moslems should retrace their steps on this occasion, without advancing farther; that they should be permitted in the following year to visit Mecca and to remain there for three days with their travelling arms, namely, their "scimitars in sheaths."[3]

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, p. 740; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 84; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 152. Abulfeda, p. 60, mentions the number as 1400.

[2] When some of these men were seized and brought before the Prophet, he pardoned and released them. Ibn-Hisham, p. 745. It was on this occasion that the Moslems took the pledge, called "The Agreeable Pledge" (*Biat-ur-Rizwân*,), or "The Pledge of the Tree" (*Biat-ush-Shajra*). Osmân being sent to the Koraish to repeat the request for permission, they seized and detained him. The Moslems, fearful of his murder, flocked round Mohammed, and solemnly swore to avenge his death. Ibn-Hisham, p. 746; Koran, sura xlviii. ver. 17; comp. also Muir, vol. iv. p. 32.

[3] *i.e.* the *Salâh-ur-râkib;* Ibn-Hisham, p. 747; Ibn ul-Athir, vol. ii. p. 156; *Mishkât*, bk. xvii. chap. 10, part i. It was on the occasion of this peace that a Koraishite envoy who was sent to the Moslem encampment, struck with the profound reverence and love shown to the Prophet by his followers, on his return to the Koraish, told them he had seen sovereigns like the Chosroes (Kesra), the Cæsar (Kaiser), and the Negus (Najashi), surrounded with all the pomp and circumstance of royalty; but he had never witnessed a sovereign

The moderation and magnanimity displayed by Mohammed in concluding this treaty caused some discontent among the more impulsive of his followers, in whose hearts the injuries and cruelties inflicted by the Koraish yet rankled. In virtue of the third stipulation of the treaty, by which the Moslems bound themselves to surrender every idolater who came over to their cause without the permission of their patron or chief, the Koraish demanded the surrender of several of the Prophet's disciples; and their demand was immediately complied with by Mohammed, in spite of the murmurs of some of the Moslems.[1]

On his return to Medîna, Mohammed, in pursuance of the catholic wish by which he was inspired, that his religion should embrace all humanity,[2] despatched several envoys to invite the neighbouring sovereigns and their subjects to drink of the cup of life offered to them by the Preacher of Islam. Two of the most noted embassies were to Heraclius the Emperor of the Greeks, and to Khusru Parvîz, the Kesra of Persia. The King of Kings was amazed at the audacity of the fugitive of Mecca in addressing him, the great Chosroes, on terms of equality, and enraged at what he considered the insolence of the letter, tore it to pieces, and drove the envoy from his presence with contumely. When the news of this treatment was brought to the Prophet, he quietly observed, "Thus will the empire of Kesra be torn to pieces."[3] The fulfilment of the prophecy is engraved on the pages of history. Heraclius, more polite or more reverential, treated the messenger with great respect, and returned a gracious and careful reply. Before, however, leaving Syria he tried to acquaint himself better with the character of the man who had sent him the message. With this object he is said to have summoned to his presence some Arab merchants who had arrived at Gaza with a caravan from Arabia. Among them was the notorious Abu Sufian, still one of the bitterest enemies of the Prophet. The Greek emperor appears to have questioned him with regard to Mohammed, and his replies, as preserved in the traditions, are

in the midst of his subjects receiving such veneration and obedience as was paid to Mohammed by his people; Ibn-Hishâm, p. 745; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 154; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 87; and Abulfeda, p. 61.

[1] As women were not included in the treaty, the demand of the idolaters for the surrender of the female Moslems was peremptorily declined.

[2] Koran, sura vii. vers. 157, 158.

[3] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 163, 164.

almost identical with the summary which Jaafar gave to the Negus of the teachings of Mohammed. "What are the doctrines Mohammed advances?" asked Heraclius of Abu Sufian. "He bids us abandon the worship of our ancient idols to adore one God; to bestow alms; to observe truth and purity; to abstain from fornication and vice, and to flee abominations." Asked if his followers were increasing in number, or if they were falling off, the reply was, "his adherents are increasing incessantly, and there has not been one who has forsaken him."

Another ambassador sent soon afterwards to the Ghassanide prince, a feudatory of Heraclius, residing at Busra, near Damascus, instead of receiving the reverence and respect due to an envoy, was cruelly murdered by another chief of the same family, and *Amîr* of a Christian tribe subject to Byzantium. This wanton outrage on international obligations became eventually the cause of that war which placed Islam in conflict with the whole of Christendom. But of this we shall treat later.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DIFFUSION OF THE FAITH.

فَمَا تَطَاوَلُ آمَالُ الْمَدِيِّ إِلَـ - ـمَا فِيهِ مِنْ كَرَمِ الْاَخْلَاقِ وَالشِّيَمِ

THE Jewish tribes, in spite of the reverses they had already suffered were still formidable,—still busy with their machinations to work the destruction of the Moslems. They possessed, at the distance of three or four days' journey to the north-east of Medîna, a strongly fortified territory, studded with castles, the principal of which, called al-Kamus, was situated on an almost inaccessible hill. This group of fortresses was called *Khaibar*, a word signifying a fortified place. The population of Khaibar included several branches of the Banî-Nadhîr and the Kuraizha, who had taken refuge there. The Jews of Khaibar had shown an active and implacable hatred towards Mohammed and his followers, and since the arrival of their brethren among them, this feeling had acquired greater force. The Jews of Khaibar united by an ancient alliance with the Bedouin horde of the Banî-Ghatafan, and other cognate tribes, worked incessantly for the formation of another coalition against the Moslems.[1] These latter were alive to the power possessed by the desert-races to injure them, and prompt measures were needed to avert the evils of another league against Medîna. Accordingly, early in the month of Muharram of this year, an expedition, consisting of about 1400 men, was despatched against Khaibar. The Jews now solicited the assistance of their allies. The Banu-Fezara hastened to their support, but afraid of the Moslems turning their flank, and surprising their flocks and herds in their absence, speedily retreated. The Jews were thus left alone to bear the brunt of the war. Terms were offered to them

7 A. H. 12th April 628 to 1st May [illegible] A. C.

1 Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. pp. 193, 194.

by the Moslems, but were refused. In spite of the most determined resistance on the part of the Jews, fortress after fortress opened its gate. At last came the turn of the redoubtable castle, al-Kamus. After a spirited defence, it also fell into the hands of the Moslems. The fate of this, their principal fortress, brought the remaining Jewish townships to see the utter futility of further resistance. They sued for forgiveness, which was accorded. Their lands and immoveable property were guaranteed to them (on condition of good conduct), together with the free practice of their religion; and, as they were exempt from the regular taxes, the Prophet imposed upon them the duty of paying to the Commonwealth, in return for the protection they would thenceforth enjoy, half the produce of their lands. The moveable property found in the fortresses which the Moslems reduced by regular sieges and battles, was forfeited to the army, and distributed among the men according to the character of their arms; thus, for instance, three shares were given to a horseman, whilst a foot-soldier received only one.[1]

Towards the end of the seventh year of the Hegira, Mohammed and his disciples availed themselves of their truce with the Koraish to accomplish the desire of their hearts[2]—the pilgrimage to the holy places. This journey, in Moslem history, is reverently styled "the Pilgrimage, or Visit of Accomplishment."[3] It was in March 629 that the Prophet, accompanied by 2000 Moslems, proceeded to Mecca to perform the rites of the Lesser Pilgrimage—rites which every pilgrim of Islam has now to observe. The Koraish would, however, have nothing to say to the pilgrims, and hold no converse with them. For the three days during which the ceremonies lasted, they evacuated the city, and from the summits of the neighbouring heights watched the Moslems performing the rites. "It was surely

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 764 and 773; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 169. The story of Kinana being tortured for the sake of disclosing the concealed treasures is false.

Frequent attempts were made about this time to assassinate the Prophet. On his entry into Khaibar, a Jewess, animated with the same vengeful feeling as the Judith of old, spread a poisoned repast for him and some of his followers. One of them died immediately after he had taken a few mouthfuls. The life of the Prophet was saved, but the poison permeated his system, and in after-life he suffered severely from its effects, and eventually died thereof. In spite of this crime, Mohammed forgave the woman, and she was allowed to remain among her people unharmed, Tibri, vol. iii. p. 104; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 170.

2 See Koran, sura xlviii, ver. 27.

3 *Umrat-ul-Kazâ.*

a strange sight," says Muir, with an unconscious thrill, "which at this time presented itself in the vale of Mekka,—a sight unique in the history of the world. The ancient city is for three days evacuated by all its inhabitants, high and low, every house deserted ; and, as they retire, the exiled converts, many years banished from their birthplace, approach in a great body, accompanied by their allies, revisit the empty homes of their childhood, and within the short allotted space, fulfil the rites of pilgrimage. The outside inhabitants, climbing the heights around, take refuge under tents, or other shelter among the hills and glens ; and, clustering on the overhanging peak of Aboo-Kubeys, thence watch the movements of the visitors beneath, as with the Prophet at their head they make the circuit of the Kaabeh, and the rapid procession between Es-Safa and Marwah ; and anxiously scan every figure if perchance they may recognise among the worshippers some long-lost friend or relative. It was a scene rendered possible only by the throes which gave birth to Islam."[1] In strict conformity with the terms of the treaty, they left Mecca after a sojourn of three days. This peaceful fulfilment of the day-dream of the Moslems was followed by important conversions among the Koraish. The self-restraint and scrupulous regard for their pledged word displayed by the Believers created a visible impression among the enemies of Islam. Many of those who were most violent among the Koraish in their opposition to the Prophet, men of position and influence, who had warred against him, and reviled him, struck by Mohammed's kindness of heart and nobility of nature, which overlooked all crimes against himself, adopted the Faith.[2]

The murder of the Moslem envoy by a feudatory[3] of the Greek emperor was an outrage which could not be passed over in silence, and unpunished. An expedition, consisting of three thousand men, was despatched to exact reparation from the Ghassanide prince. The lieutenants of the Byzantine emperor, instead of disavowing the crime, adopted it, and thus made the quarrel an imperial one. Uniting their forces, they attacked the Moslems near Muta, a village

1 Muir, *Life of Mohammed*, vol. iii. 402.

2 For instance, Khalid bin-Walîd, who commanded the Koraish cavalry at Ohod, and Amr ibn al-Aas, famous as Amru.

3 According to Caussin de Perceval, the name of this chieftain was Shurâbhîl, son of Amr (and not, as Abulfedâ mentions it, Amr, son of Shurabhil).—Vol. ii. p. 253, and vol. iii. p. 211.

not far from Balkâ in Syria, the scene of the murder. The Byzantines and their allies were repulsed, but the disparity of numbers was too great, and the Moslems retreated to Medîna.[1]

It was about this time that the Koraish and their allies the Banû-Bakr, in violation of the terms of peace concluded at Hudaiba, attacked the Banu-Khuzaa, who were under the protection of, and in alliance with, the Moslems. They massacred a number of the Khuzaa, and dispersed the rest. The Banu-Khuzaa brought their complaints to Mohammed, and asked for justice. The reign of iniquity and oppression had lasted long at Mecca. The Meccans had themselves violated the peace, and some of their chief men had taken part in the massacre of the Khuzaa. The Prophet immediately marched ten thousand men against the idolaters. With the exception of a slight resistance by Ikrima,[2] and Safwan[3] at the head of their respective clans, in which several Moslems were killed, Mohammed entered Mecca almost unopposed.

Thus, at length, Mohammed entered Mecca as a conqueror. He, who was once a fugitive and persecuted, now came to prove his mission by deeds of mercy. The city which had treated him so cruelly, driven him and his faithful band for refuge amongst strangers, which had sworn his life and the lives of his devoted disciples, lay at his feet. His old persecutors, relentless and ruthless who had disgraced humanity by inflicting cruel outrages upon inoffensive men and women, and even upon the lifeless dead, were now completely at his mercy. But in the hour of triumph every evil suffered was forgotten, every injury inflicted was forgiven, and a general amnesty was extended to the population of Mecca. Only four criminals, "whom justice condemned," made up Mohammed's proscription list when he entered as a conqueror the city of his bitterest enemies. The army followed his example, and entered gently and peaceably; no house was robbed, no woman was insulted. Most truly has it been said that through all the annals of conquest, there has been no triumphant entry like unto this one. But the idols of the nation

1 Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 211 et seq. ; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 178–180. In this battle, Zaid, the son of Harith, who commanded the Moslem troops, Jaafar, a cousin of Mohammed, and several other notables were killed.

2 The son of Abû Jahl, who fell at Badr. 3 The son of Ommeyya.

were unrelentingly struck down. Sorrowfully the idolaters stood round and watched the downfall of the images they worshipped. And then dawned upon them the truth, when they heard the old voice, at which they were wont to scoff and jeer, cry, as he struck down the idols, "Truth has come, and falsehood vanisheth; verily falsehood is evanescent,"[1] how utterly powerless were their gods!

After destroying these ancient idols and abolishing every pagan rite, Mohammed delivered a sermon to the assembled people. He dwelt first upon the natural equality and brotherhood of mankind, in the words of the Koran,[2] and then proceeded as follows: "Descendants of Koraish, how do you think I should act towards you?" "With kindness and pity, gracious brother and nephew," replied they.[3] At these words, says Tibri, tears came into the eyes of the Prophet, and he said, "I shall speak to you as Joseph spake unto his brothers, 'I shall not reproach you to-day; God will forgive,' He is the most merciful and compassionate."[4]

And now was enacted a scene of which there is no parallel in the history of the world. Hosts upon hosts came and adopted the religion of Mohammed. Seated on the hill of Safa, he received the old pledge, exacted before from the Medinites: "They would not adore anything; they would not commit larceny, adultery, or infanticide; they would not utter falsehood, nor speak evil of women."[5]

Thus were the words of the Koranic prophecy fulfilled, "When arrives victory and assistance from God, and seest thou men enter in hosts the religion of God, then utter the praise of thy Lord, and implore His pardon; for He loveth to turn in mercy (to those who seek Him)."[6] Mohammed now saw his Mission all but completed. His principal disciples were despatched in every direction to call the wild tribes of the desert to Islam, and with strict injunctions to preach peace and good-will. Only in case of violence were they to defend themselves. These injunctions were loyally obeyed with one exception. The men of Khâlid bin-Walîd, under the orders of this fierce and newly-converted warrior, killed a

[1] Koran, sura xvii. ver. 83; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 192.
[2] Koran, sura xlix. ver. 13.
[3] Ibn-Hisham, p. 821; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 134.
[4] Koran, sura xii. ver. 32.
[5] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 192; Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 234.
[6] Koran, sura cx; comp. Zamakhshari (the *Kasshâf*), Egypt. ed., pt. ii. pp. 490, 491. The verse is given at the head of chapter ix *post*.

few of the Banî Jazîma[1] Bedouins, apparently mistaking them for hostile soldiers; but the other Moslems interfering, prevented further massacre. The news of this wanton bloodshed deeply grieved the Prophet, and he cried, raising his hands towards heaven, "O Lord! I am innocent of what Khalid has done." He immediately despatched Ali to make every possible reparation to the Banı Jazıma for the outrage committed on them. This was a mission congenial to Ali's nature, and he executed it faithfully. He made careful inquiries as to the number of persons killed by Khalid, their status, and the losses incurred by their families, and paid the *Diat* strictly. When every loss was made good, he distributed the remainder of the money he had brought among the kinsmen of the victims and other members of the tribe, gladdening every heart, says the chronicler, by his gentleness and benevolence. Carrying with him the blessings of the whole people, he returned to the Prophet, who overwhelmed him with thanks and praises.[2]

The formidable Bedouin tribes, the Hawâzin, the Thakîf,[3] and various others who pastured their flocks on the territories bordering Mecca, and some of whom possessed strongly fortified towns like Tayef, unwilling to render obedience to the Moslems without resistance, formed a league, with the intention of overwhelming Mohammed before he could make preparations to repulse their attack. His vigilance, however, disappointed them. After a well-contested battle fought near Hunain, a deep and narrow defile about ten miles to the north-east of Mecca,[4] the idolaters were defeated with great loss.[5] Separating their forces, one body of the enemy, consisting principally of the Thakıf, took refuge in their city of Tayef, which only eight or nine years before had driven the Prophet from within its walls with insults; the rest fled to a fortified camp in the valley of the Autas. This was forced, and the families of the Hawazin, with all

1 With a ذ (*zâl*).

2 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 834, 835; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 195; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 141.

3 With a ث

4 Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 248; in the *Kâmûs*, Hunain is merely said to be on the road from Mecca to Tayef. In the *Mujam ul-Buldân* the distance between Mecca and Hunain (lying to the south of Zu'l Majaz) is given as three nights' journey, Vol II p. 35.

5 This battle is referred to in the Koran, sura ix. vers. 25, 26; Ibn-Hisham, p. 846; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol, ii. pp. 200, 201.

their worldly effects,—their flocks and herds,—fell into the hands of the Moslems. Tayef was then besieged, but after a few days Mohammed raised the siege, well knowing that the pressure of circumstances would soon force the Tayefites to submit without bloodshed. Returning to the place where the captured Hawazin were left for safety, he found a deputation from this powerful tribe awaiting his return to solicit the restoration of their families. Aware of the sensitiveness of the Arab nature regarding their rights, Mohammed replied to the Bedouin deputies that he could not force his people to abandon all the fruits of their victory, and that they must at least forfeit their effects if they would regain their families. To this they consented, and the following day, when Mohammed was offering the mid-day prayers,[1] with his disciples ranged behind him, they came and repeated the request: "We supplicate the Prophet to intercede with the Moslems, and the Moslems to intercede with the Prophet, to restore us our women and children." Mohammed replied to the deputies, "My own share in the captives, and that of the children of Abd ul-Muttalib, I give you back at once." His disciples, catching his spirit, instantaneously followed his example, and six thousand people were in a moment set free.[2] This generosity won the hearts of many of the Thakif,[3] who tendered their allegiance, and became earnest Moslems. The incident which followed after the distribution of the forfeited flocks and herds of the Hawazin, shows not only the hold the Prophet had over the hearts of the Medinites, and the devotion he inspired them with, but it also proves that at no period of his career had he any material reward to offer to his disciples. In the division of the spoil a larger proportion fell to the share of the newly-converted Meccans than to the people of Medina. Some of the Ansar looked upon this as an act of partiality, and their discontent reaching the ear of the Prophet, he ordered them to be assembled. He then addressed them in these

1 Tibri says morning prayer, vol. iii. p. 155.

2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 877; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 206; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 155.

3 The people of Tayef were so called. The story told by Muir (vol. iv. p. 149), as a curious illustration of the Prophet's mode of life, is apocryphal. It must be remembered, firstly, that the division of the booty had not taken place, and consequently the Prophet could not have given away as gift part of his own share; but this he had promised to the deputies (before the division) to restore to the Hawazin. The story is a fabrication, and utterly worthless.

words: "Ye Ansâr, I have learnt the discourse ye hold among yourselves. When I came amongst you, you were wandering in darkness, and the Lord gave you the right direction; you were suffering, and He made you happy; at enmity amongst yourselves, and He has filled your hearts with brotherly love and concord. Was it not so, tell me?" "Indeed, it is even as thou sayest," was the reply; "to the Lord and His Prophet belong benevolence and grace." "Nay, by the Lord," continued the Prophet, "but ye might have answered, and answered truly, for I would have testified to its truth myself. '*Thou camest to us rejected as an impostor, and we believed in thee; thou camest as a helpless fugitive, and we assisted thee: poor, and an outcast, and we gave thee an asylum; comfortless, and we solaced thee.*' Ye Ansâr, why disturb your hearts because of the things of this life? Are ye not satisfied that others should obtain the flocks and the camels, while ye go back unto your homes with me in your midst? By Him who holds my life in His hands, I shall never abandon you. If all mankind went one way and the Ansar another, verily I would join the Ansar. The Lord be favourable unto them, and bless them, and their children, and their children's children!" At these words, says the chronicler, they all wept until the tears ran down upon their beards. And they all cried with one voice, "Yea, Prophet of God, we are well satisfied with our share." Thereupon they retired happy and contented.[1]

Mohammed soon after returned to Medîna.

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, p. 886; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 208; Abulfedâ, p. 82.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE YEAR OF DEPUTATIONS.

فَاقَ النَّبِيِّينَ فِي خَلْقٍ وَّ فِي خُلُقٍ
وَ لَمْ يُدَانُوهُ فِي عِلْمٍ وَّلَا كَرَمٍ
دَعْ مَا ادَّعَتْهُ النَّصَارَى فِي نَبِيِّهِمْ
وَ احْكُمْ بِمَا شِئْتَ مَدْحاً فِيهِ وَ احْتَكِمِ

KASÎDAT-UL-BURDA.

إِنَّ الرَّسُولَ لَنُورٌ يُسْتَضَاءُ بِهِ
وَ صَارِمٌ مِنْ سُيُوفِ اللهِ مَسْلُولُ

BÂNAT SUÂD.

THE ninth year of the Hegira was noted for the embassies which flocked into Medîna to render homage to the Prophet of Islâm. The cloud which so long had rested over this land, with its wild chivalry, its blood-feuds, and its heathenism, is now lifted for ever. The age of barbarism is past.

9 A. H. 20th April 630 to 9th April 631 A.C.

The conquest of Mecca decided the fate of idolatry in Arabia. The people, who still regarded with veneration those beautiful moon-goddesses, Manat, Lat, and Uzza, and their peculiar cult, were painfully awakened by the fall of its stronghold. Among the wild denizens of the desert the moral effect of the submission of the Meccans was great. Deputations began to arrive from all sides to tender the allegiance and adherence of tribes hitherto most inimical

to the Moslems.[1] The principal companions of the Prophet, and the leading citizens of Medîna, at his request, received these envoys in their houses, and entertained them with the time-honoured hospitality of the Arabs. On departure, they always received an ample sum for the expenses of the road, with some additional presents, corresponding to their rank. A written treaty, guaranteeing the privileges of the tribe, was often granted, and a teacher invariably accompanied the departing guests to instruct the newly-converted people in the duties of Islam, and to see that every remnant of idolatry was obliterated from their midst.

Whilst thus engaged in consolidating the tribes of Arabia under the new gospel, the great Seer was alive to the dangers which threatened the new confederation from outside.

The Byzantines seem about this time to have indulged in those dreams of Arabian conquests which had, once before, induced the founder of the Roman empire to despatch expeditions into that country.[2] Heraclius had returned to his dominions elated by his victories over the Persians. His political vision could not have been blind to the strange events which were taking place in Arabia, and he had probably not forgotten the repulse of his lieutenants, at the head of a large army, by a handful of Arabs. During his stay in Syria he had directed his feudatories to collect an overwhelming force for the invasion of Arabia. The news of these preparations was soon brought to Medina, and caused some consternation among the Moslems. If the report was true it meant a serious danger to the Islamic commonwealth. Volunteers were summoned from all quarters to repel the threatened attack. Unfortunately, a severe drought had lately afflicted Hijaz and Najd; the date crops had been ruined, and the beasts of burden had died in large numbers; and the country people at large were unwilling to engage at this juncture on an expedition far from their homes. To some, the time of the year seemed unseasonable; whilst the intensity of the heat, the hardships of the journey and the marvellous stories regarding the power of the Byzantine empire added largely to the fears of the timorous. Many applied to be exempted from service; and the Prophet acceded to the prayers of those who were either too weak

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, p. 934 et seq. ; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 219.

[2] I allude to the expedition of Ælius Gallus under Augustus.

or too poor to take up arms or leave their homes, and such others as had no one besides themselves to look after their families.[1]

The unwillingness of the lukewarm was aggravated by the machinations of the Munafikîn, who spared no endeavours to fan it into discontent.[2] The example, however, of the principal disciples and other sincere followers of the Faith, infused vitality into the hearts of the timorous, and shamed the backsliders into enthusiasm which soon spread among the people. Contributions poured in from all sides. Abu Bakr offered all he possessed towards the expenses of the expedition; Osman equipped and supplied at his own expense a large body of volunteers, and the other prominent and affluent Moslems were equally generous. The women brought their ornaments and jewelleries and besought the Prophet to accept the same for the needs of the State. A sufficient force was eventually collected,[3] and accompanied by the Prophet the volunteers marched towards the frontier.

During his absence from Medîna the Prophet left Ali in charge of the city. The Munafikîn, with Abdullah ibn-Ubbay, had proceeded with the army as far as "the Mount of Farewell,"[4] but they quietly fell back from there and returned to the city. Here they spread the report that the Prophet had not taken his cousin with him as he was apprehensive of the dangers of the expedition. Stung by the malicious rumour, Ali seized his arms and hastened after the army. Overtaking the troops, he told the Prophet what he had heard. Mohammed pronounced it to be a base calumny. "I have appointed thee my Vicegerent (*Khalîfa*) and left thee in my stead. Return then to thy post, and be my deputy over my people and thine. O Ali, art thou not content that thou art to me what Aaron was to Moses."[5] Ali accordingly returned to Medîna.

1 These were called the *al-Bakâûn*, the *Weepers*, as they were distressed by their inability to join in the sacred enterprise of repelling a dangerous enemy—Ibn Hisham p. 791.

2 The machination of the Disaffected are censured in Sura IX, v. 82. These secret conspirators had for their rendezvous the house of a Jew named Suwailim near the suburb of Jâsum. This house was ultimately rased to the ground. It was at this time that the great Teacher made the prophecy that there will always be Munafikîn in Islam to thwart the endeavours of the true followers of the Faith to do good to their people.

3 It was called the *Jaish-ul-usra*, "the army of distress," owing to the difficulties with which it was collected.

4 *Siniat-ul-Wadâa* with a ث. *Mujam ul-Buldân* vol. I p. 937. 5 وقال

The sufferings of the troops from heat and thirst were intense. After a long and painful march they reached Tabuk, a place situated midway between Medîna and Damascus,[1] where they halted. Here they learnt to their amazement, and perhaps to their relief, that the apprehended attack was a Grecian dream, and that the emperor had his hands full at home. Finding, therefore, nothing at the moment to threaten the safety of the Medinite commonwealth, the Prophet ordered the Moslems to retrace their steps.[2] After a sojourn of twenty days at Tabûk, where they found abundance of water for themselves and forage for their famished beasts of burden, the Moslems returned to Medîna in the month of Ramazân.[3]

The Prophet's return to Medîna was signalised by the arrival of a deputation from the refractory and hard-hearted idolaters of Tayef, the very people who had driven the poor Preacher from their midst with insults and violence. Orwa, the Tayefite chief, who had been to Mecca after the Hudaiba incident as the Koraishite envoy, was so impressed with the words of the Teacher and his kindness, that shortly after the accomplishment of his mission he had come to the Prophet and embraced his religion. Though repeatedly warned by Mohammed of the dangers he ran among the bigoted of his city, he hastened back to Tayef to proclaim his abjuration of idolatry, and to invite his fellow-citizens to share in the blessings imparted by the new Faith. Arriving in the evening, he made public his conversion and called upon the people to join him. The following morning he again addressed them; but his words roused the priests and worshippers of Uzza into frenzy, and they literally stoned him to death. With his dying breath he said he had offered up his blood unto his

كذّبوا ولكني خلّقتك لما تركت و راءي فارجع فاخلفني في اهلي و اهلك

Ibn-Hishâm * أفلا ترضى يا علي ان تكون مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى

p. 897.

According to the Shiahs, the Prophet distinctly indicated in these words that Ali should be his successor.

1 Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. pp. 285, 286.

2 Ibn-Hisham, p. 904; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 215; Abulfeda, p. 85.

3 According to C. de Perceval, middle of December 630 A. C. Chapter iv. of the Koran treats vividly of these events. At Tabuk Mohammed received the submission of many of the neighbouring chiefs; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 215.

Master for the good of his people, and he thanked God for the honour of martyrdom, and as a last wish prayed his friends to bury him by the side of the Moslems who had fallen at Hunain.[1] The dying words of Orwa had a greater effect upon his compatriots than all his endeavours whilst living. The martyr's blood blossomed into faith in the hearts of his murderers. Seized with sudden compunction, perhaps also wearying of their hostility with the tribes of the desert, the Tayefites sent the deputation to which we have referred above, to pray for forgiveness and permission to enter the circle of Islam. They begged, however, for a short respite for their idols. First they asked two years, then one year, and then six months, but all to no purpose. The grace of one month might surely be conceded, they urged as a last appeal. Mohammed was immovable. Islam and the idols could not exist together. They then begged for exemption from the daily prayers. Mohammed replied that without devotion religion could be nothing.[2] Sorrowfully, at last, they submitted to all that was required of them. They were excused, however, from destroying the idols with their own hands, and the notorious Abu Sufiân, the son of Harb, the father of the well-known Muawiyath, the Judas Iscariot of Islam, one of those who have been stigmatised as the *Mualafat ul-Kulub* (the nominal believers)—for they had adopted the Faith from policy,—and Mughîra, the nephew of Orwa, were selected for that work. They executed their commission amidst uproarious cries of despair and grief from the women of Tâyef.[3]

The tribe of Tay had about this time proved recalcitrant, and their disaffection was fostered by the idolatrous priesthood. A small force was despatched under Ali to reduce them to obedience and to destroy their idols. Aadi, the son of the famous Hatim, whose generosity and munificence have been sung by poets and minstrels throughout the Eastern world, was the chief of his tribe. On the approach of

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 914, 915; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 216.

2 Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 217.

3 Ibn-Hisham, pp. 917, 918; Tibrî vol. iii. pp. 161—163. The great number of deputations received by Mohammed in the ninth year has led to its being called the "Year of Deputations;" (*wufûd*, pl. of *wafad*). The principal adhesions which followed immediately upon the conversion of the Thakîf were of the Himyarite princes of Yemen, of Mahra, of Oman, of the country of the Bahrain, and of the tribes domiciled in Yemâma.

Ali he fled to Syria; but his sister, with some of his principal clansmen, fell into the hands of the Moslems. They were conducted, with every mark of respect and sympathy, to Medîna. Mohammed at once set the daughter of Hatim and her people at liberty, and bestowed on them many valuable gifts. She proceeded to Syria, and told her brother of the nobleness of Mohammed. Touched by gratitude, Aadi hastened to Medina to throw himself at the feet of the Prophet, and eventually embraced Islam. Returning to his people, he persuaded them to abjure idolatry; and the Banu-Tay, once so wedded to fetishism, became thenceforth devoted followers of the religion of Mohammed.[1]

Another notable conversion which took place about the same time as that of the Banî-Tay is deserving of more than passing notice. Kaab ibn-Zuhair, a distinguished poet of the tribe of Mozayna, had placed himself under the ban by trying to incite hostilities against the Moslems. His brother was a Moslem and had counselled him strongly to renounce idolatry and embrace Islâm. Kaab, following the advice of his brother, came secretly to Medîna, and proceeded to the mosque where Mohammed was wont to preach. There he saw a man surrounded by Arabs listening to his words with the greatest veneration. He at once recognised the Prophet, and penetrating into the circle, said aloud, "Apostle of God, if I should bring before thee Kaab as a Mussalman, would you pardon him?" "Yes," answered Mohammed. "It is I who am Kaab, the son of Zuhair." Several people around the

[1] Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 948, 949; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 218; Tîbri, vol. ii. pp. 171-174. The conversion of Aadi occurred in Rabi II. of the ninth year (July-August, 630 A. C.), and accordingly, ought to have been placed before the expedition to Tabuk. But I have followed the order of the Arab historians. When the daughter of Hatim, whose name was Sufana, came before the Prophet, she addressed him in the following words: "Apostle of God, my father is dead; my brother, my only relation, fled into the mountains on the approach of the Moslems. I cannot ransom myself; it is thy generosity which I implore for my deliverance. My father was an illustrious man, the prince of his tribe, a man who ransomed prisoners, protected the honour of women, nourished the poor, consoled the afflicted, never rejected any demand. I am Sufana, daughter of Hatim." "Thy father," answered Mohammed, "had the virtues of a Mussalman; if it were permitted to me to invoke the mercy of God on any one whose life was passed in idolatry, I would pray to God for mercy for the soul of Hatim." Then addressing the Moslems around him he said: "The daughter of Hatim is free, her father was a generous and humane man; God loves and rewards the merciful." And with Sufana, all her people were set at liberty. The Persian poet Saadi has some beautiful lines in the *Bostân* concerning this touching episode.

Prophet wanted leave to put him to death. "No," said the Prophet, "I have given him grace." Kaab then begged permission to recite a *Kasîda*[1] (poem) which has always been considered a masterpiece of Arabic poetry. When he came to the lines[2] quoted at the head of this chapter, the Prophet bestowed on the poet his own mantle, which was afterwards sold by his family to Muawiyah for 40,000 dirhems, and, after passing into the hands of the Ommeyades and Abbassides, is now preserved by the Ottoman Turks.[3]

Hitherto no prohibition had issued against the heathens entering the Kaaba, or performing their old idolatrous rites within its sacred precincts. It was now decided to put an end to this anomalous state, and remove once for all any possibility of a relapse into idolatry on the part of those upon whom the new and pure creed hung somewhat lightly. Accordingly, towards the end of this year, during the month of pilgrimage, Ali was commissioned to read a proclamation to the assembled multitudes, on the day of the great Sacrifice, (*Yeum-un-Nahr*), which should strike straight at the heart of idolatry and the immoralities attendant upon it: "No idolater shall, after this year, perform the pilgrimage; no one shall make the circuit (of the temple) naked;[4] whoever hath a treaty with the Prophet, it shall continue binding till its termination; for the rest,

1 Called the *Kasîda of Bânat Suâd* from the opening words of the poem, which begins with the prologue usual in Arabic *Kasîdas*. The poet tells his grief at the departure of Suad (his beloved); she has left him, his heart is drooping, distracted and unhappy, following her train like a captive in chains. He praises her beauty, her sweet soft voice, her bright laughter, her winsome smile. The theme suddenly changes, and the poet reaches the climax when he bursts forth into a song of praise of his great subject. The language throughout is sonorous and virile,—a quality often wanting in the poems of later times, and the rhythmical swing and cadence are maintained, with extraordinary evenness, up to the last.

2 "The Prophet is the torch which has lighted up the world; he is the sword of God for destroying ungodliness."

3 Called the *Khirkai-sharîf* (the Holy Mantle) which is taken out as the national standard in times of great emergency. The *Kasîda of Bânat Suâd*, which is sometimes also called the *Kasîdat-ul-Burda* (the Kasîda of the Mantle), is different from the *Kasîdat-ul-Burda* of Abu Abdullah Mohammed ibn-Saîd, who flourished in the reign of Malik Zahir, which opens with the following lines:—

أمِن تَذَكُّرِ جيرانٍ بِذى سَلَمٍ - مَزَجْتَ دمعاً جرى من مقلةٍ بدمِ

For translation see Appendix.

4 Alluding to a disgraceful custom of the idolatrous Arabs.

four months are allowed to every man to return to his territories; after that there will exist no obligation on the Prophet, except towards those with whom treaties have been concluded."[1]

This "Declaration of Discharge," as it is styled by Moslem writers, was a manifestation of far-sighted wisdom on the part of the Prophet. It was impossible for the state of society and morals which then existed to continue; the idolaters mixing year after year with the Moslem pilgrims, if allowed to perform the lascivous and degrading ceremonies of their cultus, would soon have undone what Mohammed had so laboriously accomplished. History had already seen another gifted, yet uncultured, branch of the same stock as the Arabs, settling amongst idolaters; their leaders had tried to preserve the worship of Jehovah by wholesale butcheries of the worshippers of Baal. They had failed miserably. The Israelites had not only succumbed under the evil influences which surrounded them, but had even surpassed those whom they at first despised in the practice of nameless abominations. Mohammed felt that any compromise with heathenism would nullify all his work. He accordingly adopted means seemingly harsh, but yet benignant in their ultimate tendency. The vast concourse who had listened to Ali returned to their homes, and before the following year was over the majority of them were Moslems.

1 Ibn-Hishâm, pp. 921, 922; Ibn-ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 222; Abulfeda, p. 87.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FULFILMENT OF MOHAMMED'S MISSION.

إِذَا جَآءَ نَصْرُ اللَّهِ وَالْفَتْحُ * وَرَأَيْتَ النَّاسَ يَدْخُلُونَ فِي دِينِ
اللَّهِ أَفْوَاجًا * فَسَبِّحْ بِحَمْدِ رَبِّكَ وَاسْتَغْفِرْهُ إِنَّهُ كَانَ تَوَّابًا

DURING this year,[1] as in the preceding, numerous embassies poured into Medîna from every part of Arabia to testify to the adhesion of their chiefs and their tribes. To the teachers, whom Mohammed sent into the different provinces, he invariably gave the following injunctions: "Deal gently with the people, and be not harsh; cheer them, and contemn them not. And ye will meet with many people of the books[2] who will question thee, what is the key to heaven? Reply to them [the key to heaven is] to testify to the truth of God, and to do good work."[3]

10 A. H. 9th April 631 to 29th March 632 A. C.

The Mission of Mohammed was now achieved. In the midst of a nation steeped in barbarism a Prophet had arisen "to rehearse unto them the signs of God to sanctify them, to teach them the scriptures and knowledge,—them who before had been in utter darkness."[4] He found them sunk in a degrading and sanguinary superstition; he inspired them with the belief in one sole God of truth and love. He saw them disunited, and engaged in perpetual war with each other; he united them by the ties of brotherhood and charity. From time immemorial the Peninsula had been wrapt in absolute

1 In the tenth year of the Hegira took place the conversions of the remaining tribes of Yemen and of Hijaz. Then followed the conversions of the tribes of Hazramût and Kinda.

2 Christians, Jews, aud Zoroastrians.

3 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 907.

4 Koran, sura lxii, vers. 2-5.

moral darkness. Spiritual life was utterly unknown. Neither Judaism nor Christianity had made any lasting impression on the Arab mind. The people were sunk in superstition, cruelty, and vice. Incest and the diabolical custom of female infanticide were common. The eldest son inherited his father's widows, as property, with the rest of the estate. The worse than inhuman fathers buried alive their infant daughters; and this crime, which was most rife among the tribes of Koraish and Kinda, was regarded, as among the Hindoo Rajpoots, as a mark of pride. The idea of a future existence, and of retribution of good and evil, were, as motives of human action, practically unknown. Only a few years before, such was the condition of Arabia. What a change had these few years witnessed! The angel of heaven had veritably passed over the land, and breathed harmony and love into the hearts of those who had hitherto been engrossed in the most revolting practices of semi-barbarism. What had once been a moral desert, where all laws, human and divine, were contemned and infringed without remorse, was now transformed into a garden. Idolatry, with its nameless abominations, was utterly destroyed. Islâm furnishes the only solitary example of a great religion which though preached among a nation and reigning for the most part among a people not yet emerged from the dawn of an early civilisation, has succeeded in effectually restraining its votaries from idolatry. This phenomenon has been justly acknowledged as the pre-eminent glory of Islam, and the most remarkable evidence of the genius of its Founder. Long had Christianity and Judaism tried to wean the Arab tribes from thier gross superstition, their inhuman practices, and their licentious immorality. But it was not till they heard "the spirit-stirring strains" of the "Appointed of God" that they became conscious of the God of Truth, overshadowing the universe with His power and love. Henceforth their aims are not of this earth alone; there is something beyond the grave—higher, purer, and diviner—calling them to the practice of charity, goodness, justice, and universal love. God is not merely the God of to-day or of to-morrow, carved out of wood or stone, but the mighty, loving, merciful Creator of the world. Mohammed was the source, under Providence, of this new awakening,—the bright fountain from which flowed the stream of their hopes of eternity; and to him they paid a fitting obedience and reverence. They were all

animated with one desire, namely, to serve God in truth and purity; to obey His laws reverently in all the affairs of life. The truths and maxims, the precepts which, from time to time during the past twenty years. Mohammed had delivered to his followers, were embalmed in their hearts, and had become the ruling principles of every action. Law and morality were united· "Never, since the days when primitive Christianity startled the world from its sleep, and waged a mortal conflict with heathenism, had men seen the like arousing of spiritual life,—the like faith that suffered sacrifices, and took joyfully the spoiling of goods for conscience' sake."[1]

The Mission of Mohammed was now accomplished. And in this fact,—the fact of the whole work being achieved in his lifetime—lies his distinctive superiority over the prophets, sages, and philosophers of other times and other countries. Jesus, Moses, Zoroaster, Sakya-Muni, Plato, all had their notions of realms of God, their republics, their ideas, through which degraded humanity was to be elevated into a new moral life; all had departed from this world with their aspirations unfulfilled, their bright visions unrealised; or had bequeathed the task of elevating their fellow-men to sanguinary disciples or monarch pupils.[2] It was reserved for Mohammed to fulfil his mission, and that of his predecessors. It was reserved for him alone to see accomplished the work of amelioration,—no royal disciple came to his assistance with edicts to enforce the new teachings. May not the Moslem justly say, the entire work was the work of God?

The humble preacher, who had only the other day been hunted out of the city of his birth, and been stoned out of the place where he had betaken himself to preach God's words, had, within the short space of nine years, lifted up his people from the abysmal depths of moral and spiritual degradation to a conception of purity and justice.

His life is the noblest record of a work nobly and faithfully performed. He infused vitality into a dormant people; he consolidated a congeries of warring tribes into a nation inspired into action with the hope of everlasting life; he concentrated into a focus all the fragmentary and broken lights which had ever fallen on the

1 Muir, vol. ii. p. 269. Coming from an avowed enemy of Islâm, this observation is of the utmost value.

2 A Joshua among the Israelites; an Asoka among the Buddhists; a Darius among the Zoroastrians; a Constantine among the Christians.

heart of man. Such was his work, and he performed it with an enthusiasm and fervour which admitted no compromise, conceived no halting; with indomitable courage which brooked no resistance, and allowed no fear of consequences; with a singleness of purpose which thought of no self. The religion of divine unity preached on the shores of Galilee had given place to the worship of an incarnate God; the old worship of a female deity had revived among those who professed the creed of the Master of Nazareth. The Recluse of Hira, the unlettered philosopher,—born among a nation of unyielding idolaters,—impressed ineffaceably the unity of God and the equality of men upon the minds of the nations who once heard his voice. His "democratic thunder" was the signal for the uprise of the human intellect against the tyranny of priests and rulers. In "that world of wrangling creeds and oppressive institutions," when the human soul was crushed under the weight of unintelligible dogmas, and the human body trampled under the tyranny of vested interests, he broke down the barriers of caste and exclusive privileges. He swept away with his breath the cobwebs which self-interest had woven in the path of man to God. He abolished all exclusiveness in man's relations to his Creator. This unlettered Prophet, whose message was for the masses, proclaimed the value of knowledge and learning. By the Pen, man's works are recorded. By the Pen, man is to be judged. The Pen is the ultimate arbiter of human actions in the sight of the Lord. His persistent and unvarying appeal to reason and to the ethical faculty of mankind, his rejection of miracles, "his thoroughly democratic conception of the divine government, the universality of his religious ideal, his simple humanity,"—all serve to differentiate him from his predecessors, "all affiliate him," says the author of *Oriental Religions*, "with the modern world." His life and work are not wrapt in mystery. No fairy tale has been woven round his personality.

When the hosts of Arabia came flocking to join his faith, Mohammed felt that his work was accomplished, [1] and under the impression of his approaching end, he determined to make a farewell pilgrimage to Mecca. On the 25th of Zu'l-Kaada (23rd February

[1] Koran, sura cx.

632), the Prophet left Medîna with an immense concourse of Moslems.[1] On his arrival at Mecca, and before completing all the rites of the pilgrimage, he addressed the assembled multitude from the top of the *Jabl ul-Arafat* (8th Zu'l-Hijja, 7th March), in words which should ever live in the hearts of all Moslems.

"Ye people! listen to my words, for I know not whether another year will be vouchsafed to me after this year to find myself amongst you at this place."

"Your lives and property are sacred and inviolable amongst one another until ye appear before the Lord, as this day and this month is sacred for all; and (remember) ye shall have to appear before your Lord, who shall demand from you an account of all your actions. . . . Ye people, ye have rights over your wives, and your wives have rights over you. . . . Treat your wives with kindness and love. Verily ye have taken them on the security of God, and have made their persons lawful unto you by the words of God." "Keep always faithful to the trust reposed in you, and avoid sins." "Usury is forbidden.[2] The debtor shall return only the principal; and the beginning will be made with [the loans of] of my uncle Abbas, son of Abd ul-Muttalib.[3]...Henceforth the vengeance of blood practised in the days of Paganism (*Jâhilyat*) is prohibited; and all blood-feud abolished, commencing with the murder of my cousin Rabîâ[4] son of Hârith son of Abd ul-Muttalib . . . .

"And your slaves! See that ye feed them with such food as ye eat yourselves, and clothe them with the stuff ye wear; and if they commit a fault which ye are not inclined to forgive, then part from

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 966; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 230. It is said that from 90,000 to 140, 000 people accompanied the Prophet. This pilgrimage is called the *Hajjat-ul-Balâgh* the Great *Hajj*, or *Hajjat-ul-Islâm*, the Hajj of Islam, and sometimes *Hajjat-ul-Wadâa*, Pilgrimage of Farewell.

2 *Ribâ* or interest in kind was prohibited, but not legitimate profit on advances or loans for purposes of business or trade. No one who realises the economic condition of Arabia can fail to appreciate the wisdom of this rule. In fact the same reasons which impelled the great Prophet to forbid usury in his country, induced the Christian divines, upto nearly the end of the 17th century of the Christian era, to anathematise against usury. The elder Disraeli's chapter on this subject in his "Curiosities of Literature" is most interesting.

3 This shows that Abbâs must have been a capitalist. In the application of the rule against *Ribâ* and blood-fued, the Prophet set to his fiery people the example of self-denial in his own family.

4 Rabîa was confided during his infancy, to the care of a family of the Banî Lais. This child was cruelly murdered by members of the tribe of Huzail but the murder was not yet avenged.

them, for they are the servants of the Lord, and are not to be harshly treated."

"Ye people! listen to my words and understand the same. Know *that all Moslems are brothers unto one another.* Ye are one brotherhood. Nothing which belongs to another is lawful unto his brother, unless freely given out of good-will. Guard yourselves from committing injustice."

"Let him that is present tell it unto him that is absent. Haply he that shall be told may remember better than he who hath heard it."[1]

This Sermon on the Mount, less poetically beautiful, certainly less mystical, than the other, appeals by its practicality and strong common sense to higher minds, and is also adapted to the capacity and demands of inferior natures which require positive and comprehensible directions for moral guidance.

Towards the conclusion of the sermon, Mohammed, overpowered by the sight of the intense enthusiasm of the people as they drank in his words, exclaimed, "O Lord! I have delivered my message and accomplished my work." The assembled host below with one voice cried, "Yea, verily thou hast." "O Lord, I beseech Thee, bear Thou witness unto it."

With these words the Prophet finished his address, which, according to the traditions, was remarkable for its length, its eloquence, and enthusiasm. Soon after, the necessary rites of the pilgrimage being finished, the Prophet returned with his followers to Medîna.[2]

11 A. H. 29th M—h 632 to 18th March 633 A C.

The last year of Mohammed's life was spent in that city. He settled the organisation of the provinces and tribal communities which had adopted Islam and become the component parts of the Moslem federation. In fact, though the Faith had not penetrated among the

1 After each sentence the Prophet stopped and his words were repeated in a stentorian voice by Rabîa son of Ommeyya son of Khalaf who stood below, so that whatever was said was heard by the entire assembled host.

2 Abdullah the son of Ubbay, the head of the Munafikîn died in the month of Zu'l Kaada (February 631 A. C.). In his last moments he solicited the Prophet to say the funeral prayers over him. Mohammed who never rejected the wishes of a dying man, against the remonstrances of Omar, who reminded him of the persistent opposition and calumny of Abdullah, offered the prayers and with his own hands lowered the body into the grave.

Arab races settled in Syria and Mesopotamia, most of whom were Christians, the whole of Arabia now followed the Islamic Faith. Officers were sent to the provinces and to the various tribes for the purpose of teaching the people the duties of Islam, administering justice, and collecting the tithes or *zakât*. Muaz ibn-Jabal was sent to Yemen, and Mohammed's parting injunction to him was to rely on his own judgment in the administration of affairs in the event of not finding any authority in the Koran. To Ali, whom he deputed to Yemama, he said, " When two parties come before you for justice, do not decide before hearing both."

Preparations were also commenced for sending an expedition under Osama, the son of Zaid, who was killed at Muta, against the Byzantines to exact the long-delayed reparation for the murder of the envoy in Syria. In fact, the troops were already encamped outside the city ready for the start. But the poison which had been given to the Prophet by the Jewess at Khaibar, and which had slowly penetrated his system, began now to show its effects, and it became evident that he had not long to live. The news of his approaching end led to the stoppage of the expedition under Osama. It had also the effect of producing disorder in some of the outlying provinces. Three pretenders started up claiming divine commission for their reign of licentiousness and plunder. They gave themselves out as prophets, and tried by all kinds of imposture to win over their tribes. One of these, the most dangerous of all, was Ayhala ibn-Kaab, better known as al-Aswad (the black). He was a chief of Yemen, a man of great wealth and equal sagacity, and a clever conjuror. Among his simple tribesmen, the conjuring tricks he performed invested him with a divine character. He soon succeeded in gaining them over, and, with their help, reduced to subjection many of the neighbouring towns. He killed Shahr, who had been appointed by Mohammed to the governorship of Sana in the place of Bazan, his father, who had just died. Bazan had been the viceroy of Yemen under the Chosroes of Persia, and after his adoption of Islam was continued in his viceroyalty by the Prophet. He had during his lifetime exercised great influence, not only over his Persian compatriots settled in Yemen, who were called by the name of *Abnâ*, but also over the Arabs of the province. His example had led to the conversion of all the Persian settlers of Yemen. Al-Aswad, the impostor, had

massacred Shahr, and forcibly married his wife Marzbâna. He was killed by the *Abnâ*, assisted by Marzbana, when he was lying drunk, after one of his orgies. The other two pretenders, Tulaiha, son of Khuwailid, and Abu Sumama Haran, son of Habıb, commonly called Mosailima, were not suppressed until the accession of Abu Bakr to the Caliphate. Mosailima had the audacity to address the Prophet in the following terms: "From Mosailima, prophet of God, to Mohammed, prophet of God, salutations! I am your partner: the power must be divided between us: half the earth for me, the other half for your Koraishites. But the Koraishites are a grasping people, not given to justice." Mohammed's reply reveals his sterling nature. "In the name of God the merciful and compassionate, from Mohammed, the Prophet of God, to Mosailima the Liar.[1] Peace is on those who follow the right path. The earth belongs to God; He bestows it on such of his servants as He pleaseth. The future is to the pious [*i.e.* only those prosper who fear the Lord]!"

The last days ot the Prophet were remarkable for the calmness and serenity of his mind, which enabled him, though weak and feeble, to preside at the public prayers until within three days of his death. One night, at midnight, he went to the place where his old companions were lying in the slumber of death, and prayed and wept by their tombs, invoking God's blessings for his "companions resting in peace." He chose Âyesha's house, close to the mosque, for his stay during his illness, and, as long as his strength lasted, took part in the public prayers. The last time he appeared in the mosque he was supported by his two cousins, Ali and Fazl, the son of Abbas. A smile of inexpressible sweetness played over his countenance, and was remarked by all who surrounded him. After the usual praises and hymns to God, he addressed the multitude thus: "Moslems, if I have wronged any one of you, here I am to answer for it; if I owe aught to any one, all I may happen to possess belongs to you." Upon hearing this, a man in the crowd rose and claimed three dirhems which he had given to a poor man at the Prophet's request. They were immediately paid back, with the words, "Better to blush in this world than in the next." The Prophet then prayed and implored heaven's mercy for those present, and for those who had

1 *Kazzâb*, superlative of *Kâzib*.

fallen in the persecutions of their enemies; and recommended to all his people the observance of religious duties, and the practice of a life of peace and good-will, and concluded with the following words of the Koran: "The dwelling of the other life we will give unto them who do not seek to exalt themselves on earth or to do wrong; for the happy issue shall attend the pious."[1]

After this, Mohammed never again appeared at public prayers. His strength rapidly failed. At noon on Monday (12th of Rabi I., 11 A. H.—8th June 632 A. C.), whilst praying earnestly in whisper, the spirit of the great Prophet took flight to the "blessed companionship on high."[2]

So ended a life consecrated, from first to last, to the service of God and humanity. Is there another to be compared to his, with all its trials and temptations? Is there another which has stood the fire of the world, and come out so unscathed? The humble preacher had risen to be the ruler of Arabia, the equal of Chosroes and of Cæsar, the arbiter of the destinies of a nation. But the same humility of spirit, the same nobility of soul and purity of heart, austerity of conduct, refinement and delicacy of feeling, and stern devotion to duty which had won him the title of al-Amîn, combined with a severe sense of self-examination, are ever the distinguishing traits of his character. Once in his life, whilst engaged in a religious conversation with an influential citizen of Mecca, he had turned away from a humble blind seeker of the truth. He is always recurring to this incident with remorse, and proclaiming God's disapprobation.[3] A nature so pure, so tender, and yet so heroic, inspires not only reverence,

1 Koran, sura xxviii. ver. 83; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. p. 241; Tibri, vol. iii. p. 207 et seq.

2 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 1009; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. ii. pp. 244, 245; Abulfedâ, p. 91. Comp. Caussin de Perceval, vol. iii. p. 322 and note.

3 The Sura in connection with this incident is known by the title of "He frowned," and runs thus:—

"The Prophet frowned, and turned aside,
Because the blind man came to him.
And how knowest thou whether he might not have been cleansed from his sins.

Or whether he might have been admonished, and profited thereby?
As for the man that is rich,
Him thou receivest graciously;
And thou carest not that he is not cleansed.
But as for him that cometh unto thee earnestly seeking his salvation,

but love. And naturally the Arabian writers dwell with the proudest satisfaction on the graces and intellectual gifts of the son of Abdullah. His courteousness to the great, his affability to the humble, and his dignified bearing to the presumptuous, procured him universal respect and admiration. His countenance reflected the benevolence of his heart. Profoundly read in the volume of nature, though ignorant of letters, with an expansive mind, elevated by deep communion with the Soul of the Universe, he was gifted with the power of influencing equally the learned and the unlearned. Withal, there was a majesty in his face, an air of genius, which inspired all who came in contact with him with a feeling of veneration and love [1]

His singular elevation of mind, his extreme delicacy and refinement of feeling, his purity and truth, form the constant theme of the traditions. He was most indulgent to his inferiors, and would never allow his awkward little page to be scolded whatever he did. "Ten years," said Anas, his servant. "was I about the Prophet, and he never said so much as 'Uff' to me." [2] He was very affectionate towards his family. One of his boys died on his breast in the smoky house of the nurse, a blacksmith's wife. He was very fond of children. He would stop them in the streets, and pat their litttle cheeks. He never struck any one in his life. The worst expression he ever made use of in conversation was, "What has come to him? May his forehead be darkened with mud!" [3] When asked to curse

And trembling anxiously, him dost thou neglect.
By no means shouldst thou act thus."

After this, whenever the Prophet saw the poor blind man, he used to go out of his way to do him honour, saying, "The man is thrice welcome on whose account my Lord hath reprimanded me;" and he made him twice governor of Medîna. See the remark of Bosworth Smith on Muir about this incident.

1 *Mishkât*, Bk. xxiv. chap. 3, pt. 2. 2 *Ibid.* Bk. xxiv. chap. 4, pt. 1.
3 *Ibid.* Bk. xxiv. chap. 4, pt. 1.

Mr. Poole's estimate of Mohammed is so beautiful and yet so truthful that I cannot resist the temptation to quote it here: "There is something so tender and womanly, and withal so heroic, about the man, that one is in peril of finding the judgment unconsciously blinded by the feeling of reverence and well-nigh love that such a nature inspires. He who, standing alone braved for years the hatred of his people, is the same who was never the first to withdraw his hand from another's clasp; the beloved of children, who never passed a group of little ones without a smile from his wonderful eyes and a kind word for them, sounding all the kinder in that sweet-toned voice. The frank friendship, the noble generosity, the dauntless courage and hope of the man, all tend to melt criticism into admiration."

some one, he replied, "I have not been sent to curse, but to be a mercy to mankind."

He visited the sick, followed very bier he met, accepted the invitation of a slave to dinner, mended his own clothes, milked his goats, and waited upon himself, relates summarily another tradition.[1] He never first withdrew his hand out of another's palm, and turned not before the other had turned. His hand was the most generous, his breast the most courageous, his tongue the most truthful; he was the most faithful protector of those he protected; the sweetest and most agreeable in conversation; those who saw him were suddenly filled with reverence; those who came near him loved him; they who described him would say, "I have never seen his like, either before or after." He was of great taciturnity; and when he spoke, he spoke with emphasis and deliberation, and no one could ever forget what he said. "Modesty and kindness, patience, self-denial, and generosity pervaded his conduct, and riveted the affections of all around him. With the bereaved and afflicted he sympathised tenderly. . . . He shared his food even in times of scarcity with others, and was sedulously solicitous for the personal comfort of every one about him." He would stop in the streets listening to the sorrows of the humblest. He would go to the houses of the lowliest to console the afflicted and to comfort the heart-broken. The meanest slaves would take hold of his hand and drag him to their masters to obtain redress for ill-treatment or release from bondage,[2] He never sat down to a meal without first invoking a blessing, and never rose without uttering a thanks-giving. His time was regularly apportioned. During the day, when not engaged in prayers, he

"He was an enthusiast in that noblest sense when enthusiasm becomes the salt of the earth, the one thing that keeps men from rotting whilst they live. Enthusiasm is often used despitefully, because it is joined to an unworthy cause, or falls upon barren ground and bears no fruit. So was it not with Mohammed. He was an enthusiast when enthusiasm was the one thing needed to set the world aflame, and his enthusiasm was noble for a noble cause. He was one of those happy few who have attained the supreme joy of making one great truth their very life-spring. He was the messenger of the one God; and never to his life's end did he forget who he was, or the message which was the marrow of his being. He brought his tidings to his people with a grand dignity sprung from the consciousness of his high office, together with a most sweet humility, whose roots lay in the knowledge of his own weakness."

1 *Mishkât*, Bk. xxiv. chap. 4, pt. 2.

2 *Hyat-ul-Kulûb* (Shiah) and the *Rouzat-ul-Ahbab* (Sunni).

received visitors and transacted public affairs. At night he slept little, spending most of the hours in devotion. He loved the poor and respected them, and many who had no home or shelter of their own slept at night in the mosque contiguous to his house. Each evening it was his custom to invite some of them to partake of his humble fare. The others became the guests of his principal disciples.[1] His conduct towards the bitterest of his enemies was marked by a noble clemency and forbearance. Stern, almost to severity, to the enemies of the State, mockings, affronts, outrages, and persecutions towards himself were, in the hour of triumph—synonymous with the hour of trial to the human heart—all buried in oblivion, and forgiveness was extended to the worst criminal.

Mohammed was extremely simple in his habits. His mode of life, his dress and his furniture, retained to the very last a character of patriarchal simplicity. Many a time, Abu Huraira reports, had the Prophet to go without a meal. Dates and water frequently formed his only nourishment. Often, for months together, no fire could be lighted in his house from scantiness of means. God, say the Moslem historians, had indeed put before him the key to the treasures of this world, but he refused it !

[1] Abulfedâ, p. 99.

PART II.

THE SPIRIT OF ISLÂM.

CHAPTER I.

ISLÂM.

هَلُمَّ إِلَيَّ لا تَقْصُدْ سِوَائِي
أَنَا الْمَنَّانُ فَاطْلُبْنِي تَجِدْنِي
أَتَذْكُرُ لَيْلَةً نَادَيْتَ سِرًّا
فَلَمْ أَسْمَعْكَ فَاطْلُبْنِي تَجِدْنِي
إِذَا الْمُضْطَرُّ قَالَ أَلَا تَرَانِي
نَظَرْتُ إِلَيْهِ فَاطْلُبْنِي تَجِدْنِي
إِذَا عَبْدِي عَصَانِي لَمْ تَجِدْنِي
سَرِيعَ الْأَخْذِ فَاطْلُبْنِي تَجِدْنِي [1]

THE religion of Jesus bears the name of Christianity, derived from his designation of Christ; that of Moses and of Buddha are known by the respective names of their teachers. The religion of Mohammed alone has a distinctive appellation. It is Islâm.

In order to form a just appreciation of the religion of Mohammed it is necessary to understand aright the true significance of the word Islam. *Salam* (*salama*), in its primary sense, means, to be tranquil, at rest, to have done one's duty, to have paid up, *to be at perfect peace*; in its secondary sense, to surrender oneself to Him with whom peace is made. The noun derived from it means peace, greeting, safety, salvation. The word does not imply, as is

[1] For translation, see Appendix.

commonly supposed, absolute submission to God's will, but means, on the contrary, *striving after righteousness.*

The essence of the ethical principles involved and embodied in Islam is thus summarised in the second chapter of the Koran: "There is no doubt in this book—a guidance to the pious, who believe in the Unseen, who observe the prayers, and distribute (charity) out of what We have bestowed on them; and who believe in that which We have commissioned thee with, and in that We commissioned others with before thee, and who have assurance in the life to come;—these have received the direction of their Lord." [1]

The principal bases on which the Islamic system is founded are (1) a belief in the unity, immateriality, power, mercy, and supreme love of the Creator; (2) charity and brotherhood among mankind; (3) subjugation of the passions; (4) the outpouring of a grateful heart to the Giver of all good; and (5) accountability for human actions in another existence. The grand and noble conceptions expressed in the Koran of the power and love of the Deity surpass everything of their kind in any other language. The unity of God, His immateriality, His majesty, His mercy, form the constant and never-ending theme of the most eloquent and soul-stirring passages. The flow of life, light, and spirituality never ceases. But throughout there is no trace of dogmatism. Appeal is made to the inner consciousness of man, to his intuitive reason alone.

Let us now take a brief retrospect of the religious conceptions of the peoples of the world when the Prophet of Islam commenced his preachings. Among the heathen Arabs the idea of Godhead varied according to the culture of the individual or of the clan. With some it rose, comparatively speaking, to the "divinisation" or deification of nature; among others it fell to simple fetishism, the adoration of a piece of dough, a stick, or a stone. Some believed in a future life; others had no idea of it whatever. The pre-Islamite Arabs had their groves, their oracle-trees, their priestesses, like the Syro-Phœnicians. Phallic worship was not unknown to them; and the generative powers received adoration, like the hosts of heaven, under monuments of stone and wood. The wild denizens of the desert, then as now, could not be impervious to the idea of some unseen hand driving the blasts

1 Koran, sura ii. 1-6.

which swept over whole tracts, or forming the beautiful visions which rose before the traveller to lure him to destruction. And thus there floated in the Arab world an intangible, unrealised conception of a superior deity, the Lord of all.[1]

The Jews, those great conservators of the monotheistic idea, as they have been generally regarded in history, probably might have assisted in the formation of this conception. But they themselves showed what strange metamorphoses can take place in the thoughts of a nation when not aided by a historical and rationalistic element in their religious code.

The Jews had entered Arabia at various times, and under the pressure of various circumstances. Naturally, the conceptions of the different bodies of emigrants, refugees, or colonists would vary much. The ideas of the men driven out by the Assyrians or Babylonians would be more anthropomorphic, more anthropopathic, than of those who fled before Vespasian, Trajan, or Hadrian. The characteristics which had led the Israelites repeatedly to lapse into idolatry in their original homes, when seers were in their midst to denounce their backslidings, would hardly preserve them from the heathenism of their Arab brothers. With an idea of "the God of Abraham" they would naturally combine a materialistic conception of the deity, and hence we find them rearing "a statue representing Abraham, with the ram beside him ready for sacrifice," in the interior of the Kaaba.

Amongst the later comers the Shammaites and the Zealots formed by far the largest proportion. Among them the worship of the law verged upon idolatry, and the Scribes and Rabbins claimed a respect almost approaching adoration. They believed themselves to be the guardians of the people, the preservers of law and tradition, "living exemplars and mirrors, in which the true mode of life, according to the law, was preserved."[2] They looked upon themselves as the "flower of the nation," and they were considered, through their intercourse with God, to possess the gift of prophecy. In fact, by their people as well as by themselves they were regarded as the prime

[1] Shahristâni; Tiele calls the religion of the pre-Islâmite Arabs "animistic dolÿdæmonism."

[2] Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii. p. 308.

favourites of God.[1] The veneration of the Jews for Moses went so far, says Josephus, that they reverenced his name next to that of God; and this veneration they transferred to Ezra, the restorer of national life and law under the Kyânian dynasty.[2]

Besides, the mass of the Jews had never, probably, thoroughly abandoned the worship of the Teraphim, a sort of household gods made in the shape of human beings, and consulted on all occasions as domestic oracles, or regarded perhaps more as guardian penates.[3] This worship must have been strengthened by contact with the heathen Arabs.

When Jesus made his appearance in Judæa, the doctrine of divine unity and of a supreme Personal Will, overshadowing the universe with its might and grace, received acceptance only among one race—the worshippers of Jehovah. And even among them, despite all efforts to the contrary, the conception of the divinity had either deteriorated by contact with heathen nations, or become modified by the influence of pagan philosophies. On the one hand, Chaldæo-magian philosophy had left its finger-mark indelibly impressed on the Jewish traditions; on the other, their best minds, whilst introducing among the Greek and Roman philosophers the conception of a great Primal Cause, had imbibed, in the schools of Alexandria, notions hardly reconcilable with their monotheistic creed.

The Hindoos, with their multitudinous hordes of gods and goddesses; the Mago-Zoroastrians, with their two divinities struggling for mastery; the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians, with their pantheons full of deities whose morality was below that of the worshippers,—such was the condition of the civilised world when Jesus commenced his preachings. With all his dreams and aspirations, his mind was absolutely exempt from those pretensions which have been fixed on him by his over-zealous followers. He never claimed to be a "complement of God," to be a "hypostasis of the Divinity."

Even modern idealistic Christianity has not been able yet to shake itself free from the old legacy bequeathed by the anthro-

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii. 24. They were, so to speak, the Brahmins Judaism.

Ezra vii. 10 et seq.

[3] Judges xviii. 14.

pomorphism of bygone ages. Age after age everything human has been eliminated from the history of the great Teacher, until his personality is lost in a mass of legends. The New Testament itself, with "its incubation of a century," leaves the revered figure clothed in a mist. And each day the old idea of "an Æon born in the bosom of eternity," gathers force until the Council of Nice gives it a shape and consistency, and formulates it into a dogma.

Many minds, bewildered by the far-offness of the universal Father, seek a resting-place midway in a human personality which they call divine. It is this need of a nearer object of adoration which leads modern Christianity to give a name to an ideal, clothe it with flesh and blood, and worship it as a man-God.

The gifted author of the *Defects of Modern Christianity* considers the frequency with which the Nazarene Prophet asserted that he was "the Son of God," and demanded the same worship as God Himself, a proof of his Divinity. That Jesus ever maintained he was the Son of God, in the sense in which it has been construed by Christian divines and apologists, we totally deny. Matthew Arnold has shown conclusively that the New Testament records are in many respects wholly unreliable. So far as the divinity of Christ is concerned, one can almost see the legend growing. But assuming that he made use of the expressions attributed to him, do they prove that he claimed to be "the only-begotten of the Father"? Has the apologist not heard of the Eastern dervish, famous now as al-Hallaj, who claimed to be God Himself? "*An-al-Hakk*" "I am God—I am the Truth," said he; and the Mussulman divines, like the Jewish Sanhedrim, pronounced him guilty of blasphemy, and condemned him to death? A poor simple heart, kindling with an exalted mysticism, was thus removed from earth. The Baby still believes that his master, "the Gate" to eternal life, was not killed, but miraculously removed to heaven. Can it be said that when Abû Mughais al-Hallaj[1] and the Bab called themselves "Truth" and the "Gate to heaven," they meant to imply that they were part of the Divinity, or, if they did, that their "claim" is tantamount to proof?

1 Abû Mughais ibn Mansûr, *al-Hallâj*, died in the prime of life. He was a man of pure morals, great simplicity, a friend of the poor, but a dreamer and an enthusiast. For an account of the Bâb and Babism, see Gobineau, *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l' Asie Centrale* and the *History of the Bâb* by Browne.

But, as we said before, we deny that Jesus, whose conceptions, when divested of the *Aberglaube* of his followers, were singularly free from exaggeration as to his own character or personality, ever used any expression to justify the demand attempted to be fixed upon him. His conception of the "Fatherhood" of God embraced all humanity. All mankind were the children of God, and he was their Teacher sent by the Eternal Father.[1] The Christian had thus a nobler exemplar before him. The teachings of the Prophet of Nazareth should have elevated him to a purer conception of the Deity. But six centuries had surrounded the figure of Jesus with those myths which, in opposition to his own words, resolved him into a manifestation of the Godhead. The "Servant" took the place of the Master in the adoration of the world. The vulgar masses, unable to comprehend or realise this wonderful mixture of Neo-Pythagoreanism, Platonism, Judæo-Hellenistic philosophy, and the teachings of Jesus, adored him as God incarnate, or reverted to the primitive worship of relics and of a tinselled goddess who represented the pure mother of Jesus.[2] The Collyridians, who were by no means an unimportant sect, went so far as to introduce in the Christian pantheon the Virgin Mary for God, and worship her as such, offering her a sort of twisted cake called *collyris*, whence the sect had its name. At the Council of Nice which definitely settled the nature of Jesus, there were men who held that besides "God the Father," there were two other gods—Christ and the Virgin Mary.[3] And the Romanists even now, it is said, call the mother of Jesus the *complement* of the Trinity.

In the long night of superstition the Christians had wandered far away from the simplicity of the Nazarene teachings. The worship of images, saints, and relics had become inseparably blended with the religion of Jesus. The practices which he had denounced, the evils which he had reprehended, were, one by one, incorporated with his faith. The holy ground where the revered Teacher had

1 The use of the word "Father" in relation to God was cut out from Islâm owing to the perversion of the idea among the then Christians.

2 The Isaurian sovereigns, indirectly inspired by Islâm, for over a century battled against the growing degradation of Christianity, strived with all their might to make it run back in the channel pointed out by the great Teacher, but to no purpose.

3 Mosheim, vol. i. p. 432.

lived and walked was involved in a cloud of miracles and visions, and "the nerves of the mind were benumbed by the habits of obedience and belief."[1]

Against all the absurdities we have described above, the life-aim of Mohammed was directed. Addressing, with the voice of truth, inspired by deep communion with the God of the Universe, the fetish-worshippers of the Arabian tribes on one side and the followers of degraded Christianity and Judaism on the other, Mohammed, that "master of speech," as he has been truly called, never travelled out of the province of reason, and made them all blush at the monstrousness of their beliefs. Mohammed, the grand apostle of the unity of God, thus stands forth in history in noble conflict with the retrogressive tendency of man to associate other beings with the Creator of the universe. Ever and anon in the Koran occur passages, fervid and burning, like the following: "Your God is one God; there is no God but He, the Most Merciful. In the creation of the heaven and earth, and the alternation of night and day, and in the ship which saileth on the sea, laden with what is profitable to mankind; and in the rain-water which God sendeth from heaven, quickening again the dead earth, and the animals of all sorts which cover its surface; and in the change of winds, and the clouds balanced between heaven and earth,—are signs to people of understanding; yet some men take idols beside God, and love them as with the love due to God."[2] What a depth of sympathy towards those benighted people do these words convey! Again: "It is He who causeth the lightning to appear unto you (to strike) fear and (to raise) hope; and formeth the pregnant clouds. The thunder celebrateth His praise, and the angels also. . . . He launcheth His thunderbolts, and striketh therewith whom He pleaseth while they dispute concerning Him. . . . It is He who of right ought to be invoked, and those (the idols) whom they invoke besides Him

1 Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical Hist.* vol. i. p. 432; comp. also Hallam, *Const. Hist of England*, chap. ii. p. 75. From the text it will be seen how much truth there is in the assertion that Islâm derived "everything good it contains" from Judaism or Christianity. "It has been the fashion", says Deutsch, "to ascribe whatever is good in Mohammedanism to Christianity. We fear this theory is not compatible with the results of honest investigation. For of Arabian Christianity at the time of Mohammed, the less said, perhaps, the better. By the side of it . . . even modern Amharic Christianity of which we possess such astounding accounts, appears pure and exalted."—*Quarterly Review*, No. 954, p. 315. 2 Sura ii. 158—160.

shall not respond to them at all; otherwise than as he who stretched forth his hands to the water that it may ascend to his mouth when it cannot ascend (thither).[1] He hath created the heavens and the earth to (manifest His) justice; far be that from Him which they associate with Him. He hath created man . . . and behold he is a professed disputer. He hath likewise created the cattle for you, and they are a credit unto you when they come trooping home at evening-time, or are led forth to pasture in the morn. . . . And He hath subjected the night and day to your service; and the sun and the moon and the stars are all bound by His laws. . . . It is He who hath subjected the sea unto you, and thou seest the ships ploughing the deep . . . and that ye might render thanks. . . . Shall He therefore who createth be as he who createth not? Do ye not therefore take heed? If ye were to reckon up the blessings of God, ye shall not be able to compute their number; God is surely gracious and merciful. He knoweth that which ye conceal and that which ye publish. But those [the idols] whom ye invoke, besides the Lord, create nothing, but are themselves created. They are dead and not living."[2]

"God! there is no God but He—the Living, the Eternal. No slumber seizeth Him. Whatsoever is in heaven or in earth is His. Who can intercede with Him but by His own permission? He knows what has been before, and what shall be after them; yet nought of His knowledge shall they grasp but He willeth. His Throne reacheth over the heavens and the earth, and the upholding of them both burdeneth Him not,[3] . . . He throweth the veil of night over the day, pursuing it quickly. He created the sun, moon, and stars subjected to laws by His behest. Is not all creation and all empire His? Blessed be the Lord of the worlds. Say, He alone is God: God the Eternal. He begetteth not, and He is not begotten; there is none like unto Him.[4] Praise to God, the Lord of the worlds, the Compassionate, the Merciful, King on the day of reckoning; Thee only do we worship, and to Thee do we cry for help. Guide us on the straight path,—the path of those to whom Thou art gracious, with whom Thou art not angry; such as go not astray.[5]..... Against the evil in His creation

[1] Sura xiii. 13—15.
[2] Sura xvi. 3—21. [3] Sura ii. 256. [4] Sura xii.
[5] This is the Surat-ul-Fatiha, the opening chapter of the Koran.

I betake me to the Lord of the daybreak". "Thou needest not raise thy voice, for He knoweth the secret whisper, and what is yet more hidden. Say, Whose is what is in the heavens and the earth? Say, God's who has imposed mercy on Himself.[1] . . . With Him are the keys of the unseen. None knows them save He; He knows what is in the land and in the sea; no leaf falleth but He knoweth it; nor is there a grain in the darkness under the earth, nor a thing, green or sere, but it is recorded by itself. He taketh your souls in the night, and knoweth what the work of your day deserveth; then He awaketh you, that the set life-term may be fulfilled; then unto Him shall ye return, and then shall He declare unto you what you have wrought.[2] Verily, God it is who cleaves out the grain and the date-stone; He brings forth the living from the dead, and it is He who brings the dead from the living. There is God! How then can ye be beguiled?"

"It is He who cleaves out the morning, and makes night a repose, and the sun and the moon two reckonings; that is the decree of the Mighty, the Wise,[3]

. . . . . .

"There is God for you, your Lord! There is no God but He, the Creator of everything; then worship Him, for He over everything keeps guard!"

"Sight perceives Him not, but he perceives men's sights; for He is the All-penetrating, the Aware.[4]

. . . . . .

"Say, Verily my prayers and my devotion, and my life and my death, belong to God, the Lord of the worlds."[5]

"Dost thou not perceive that all *creatures* both in heaven and earth praise God; and the birds also?

"Every one knoweth His prayer and His praise.

"Unto God belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth; and unto God shall be the return.

"Whose is the kingdom of the heavens and of the earth? There is no God but He! He maketh alive and killeth.[6] . . . He

1 Sura vi. 12
2 Sura vi. 59, 60.
3 Sura vi. 95.
4 Sura vi. 102.
5 Sura vi. 16 3.
6 Sura vii. v. 158.

is the Living One. No God is there but He. Call then upon Him, and offer Him a pure worship. Praise be to God, the Lord of the worlds! . . . . My prayers and my worship and my life and my death are unto God, Lord of the worlds. He hath no associate.[1] It is He who hath brought you forth, and gifted you with hearing and sight and heart; yet how few are grateful! . . . It is He who hath sown you in the earth, and to Him shall ye be gathered.[2] . . . O my Lord, place me not among the ungodly people.[3] . . . He it is who ordaineth the night as a garment and sleep for rest, and ordaineth the day for waking up to life."[4]

"Is not He the more worthy who answereth the oppressed when they cry to Him, and taketh off their ills, and maketh you to succeed your sires on the earth?[5] God the Almighty, the All-knowing, Forgiver of Sin, and Receiver of Penitence."[6]

"Shal II seek any other Lord than God, when He is Lord of all things? No soul shall labour but for itself, and no burdened one shall bear another's burden."

"At last ye shall return to your Lord, and He will declare that to you about which you differ.[7] Knower of the hidden and the manifest! the Great, the Most High! . . . Alike to Him is that person among you who concealeth his words, and he that telleth them abroad; he who hideth him in the night, and he who cometh forth in the day."[8]

"God is the light of the heavens and the earth; His light is as a niche in which is a lamp, and the lamp is in a glass; the glass is as though it were a glittering star; it is lit from a blessed tree, an olive neither of the east nor of the west, the oil of which would well-nigh give light though no fire touched it—light upon light! God guides to His light whom He pleases; and God strikes out parables for men, and God all things doth know."

"In the houses God has permitted to be reared and His name to be mentioned therein, His praises are celebrated therein mornings and evenings."

1 Sura vii. v. 158.
2 Sura lxvii. 23, 24.
3 Sura xxiii 96.
4 Sura xxv. 49.
5 Sura xxvii. 63.
6 Sura xl. 1.
7 Sura ii. 286.
8 Sura xiii. 10, 11.

"Men whom neither merchandise nor selling divert from the remembrance of God, and steadfastness in prayer and giving alms, who fear a day when hearts and eyes shall be upset, that God may recompense them for the best they have done, and give them increase of His grace; for God provides whom He pleases without count."

"But those who misbelieve, their works are like the mirage in a plain,—the thirsty counts it water till when he comes to it he finds nothing, but he finds that God is with him, and He will pay him his account, for God is quick to take account."

"Or like darkness on a deep sea; there covers it a wave, above which is a wave, above which is a cloud,—darknesses one above the other,—when one puts out his hand he can scarcely see it, for he to whom God has given no light he has no light."

"Hast thou seen that God? All who are in the heavens and the earth celebrate His praises, and the birds, too, spreading out their wings; each one knows its prayer and its praise, and God knows what they do."

"Hast thou not seen that God drives the clouds, and then reunites them, and then accumulates them, and thou mayest see the rain coming forth from their midst; and He sends down from the sky mountains with hail therein, and He makes it fall on whom He pleases, and He turns it from whom He pleases; the flashing of His lightning well-nigh goes off with their sight."

"God interchanges the night and the day; verily in that is a lesson to those endowed with sight."

The chapter entitled "The Merciful," which has been well called the *Benedicite* of Islam, furnishes one of the finest examples of the Prophet's appeal to the testimony of nature.

"The sun and the moon in their appointed time,
The herbs and the trees adore,
And the heavens He raised them, and set the Balance that ye should not be outrageous in the balance;
But weigh ye aright and stint not the measure.
And the earth, He has set it for living creatures;
Therein are fruits, and palms with sheaths, and grain with chaff and frequent shoots.

He created man of crackling clay like the potter's, and He created the firmament from the smokeless fire.

. . . . . .

The Lord of the two easts and the Lord of the two wests,
He has let loose the two seas that meet together ; between them is a barrier they cannot pass.
He brings forth from each pearls both great and small !

. . . . . .

His are the ships which rear aloft in the sea like mountains.
Every one upon it is transient, but the face of thy Lord endowed with majesty and honour shall endure.

. . . . . .

Of Him whosoever is in the heaven and in the earth does beg ; every day is He in [some fresh] work.
Blessed be the name of thy Lord, possessed of majesty and glory."

"Every man's fate have we hung about his neck, and on the last day shall be laid before him a wide-opened Book."[1] . . . "By a soul, and Him who balanced it, and breathed into it its wickedness and its piety, blest now is he who hath kept it pure, and undone is he who hath corrupted it."[2] . . . "No defect canst thou see in the creation of the God of mercy ; repeat the gaze, seest thou a single flaw, then twice more repeat the gaze, thy gaze shall return to thee dulled and weary."[3] . . . "He quickeneth the earth when it is dead ; so too shall you be brought to life."

"The heavens and the earth stand firm at His bidding ; hereafter when at once He shall summon you from the earth, forth shall ye come."[4] . . . " When the sun shall be folded up, and the stars shall fall, and when the mountains shall be set in motion ; when the she-camels shall be left, and the wild beasts shall be gathered together ; when the seas shall boil, and souls be re-paired [with their bodies] ; when the female child that was buried alive shall be asked for what crime she was put to death ; when the leaves of the Book shall be unrolled, and the heavens shall be stripped away, and the fire of hell blaze forth, and paradise draw

[1] Sura xvii. 14. [2] Sura xci. [3] Sura lxvii. 3. [4] Sura xxx. 25.

nigh, then shall every soul know what it hath done."[1] . . . "What knowledge hast thou [Mohammed] of the hour? Only God knoweth its period. It is for thee only to warn those who fear it." . . . "What shall teach thee the inevitable? Thamûd and Aâd treated the Day of Decision as a lie. They were destroyed with thunderbolts and roaring blasts."

And yet with all His might, His tender care and pity are all-embracing :—

"By the noonday brightness, and by the night when it darkeneth, thy Lord hath not forsaken thee, neither hath He been displeased. Surely the future shall be better for thee than the past; and in the end He shall be bounteous to thee, and thou shalt be satisfied. Did He not find thee an orphan, and give thee a home; erring, and guided thee; needy, and enriched thee? As to the orphan, then, wrong him not; and chide not away him that asketh of thee, and tell abroad the favours of thy Lord."[2] "Did ye think We had made you for sport, and that ye should not be brought back again to us?" "O our God, punish us not if we forget and fall into sin; blot out our sins and forgive us." "Have mercy, O Lord, for of the merciful, Thou art the best."[3] "The heavy laden shall not bear another's load. We never punished till we had sent an apostle." "This clear Book, behold, on a blessed night have we sent it down for a warning to mankind." "Not to sadden thee have we sent it thee.'

And so on goes this wonderful book, appealing to the nobler feelings of man,—his inner consciousness and his moral sense, proving and manifesting the enormity of idolatrous beliefs. Scarcely a chapter but contains some fervid passages on the power, mercy, and unity of God. The Islamic conception of the Almighty has been misunderstood by Christian writers. The God of Islam is commonly represented as "a pitiless tyrant, who plays with humanity as on a chess-board, and works out His game without regard to the sacrifice of the pieces." Let us see if this estimate is correct. The God of Islâm is the All-mighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Lord of the worlds, the Author of the heavens and the earth, the Creator of life and death, in whose hand is dominion and irresistible power; the great, all-powerful Lord of the glorious Throne. God is the

[1] Sura lxxxi. [2] Sura xciii. [3] Sura xxiii. 118.

Mighty, the Strong, the Most High, the Producer, the Maker, the Fashioner, the Wise, the Just, the True, the Swift in reckoning, who knoweth every ant's weight of good and of ill that each man hath done, and who suffereth not the reward of the faithful to perish. But the Almighty, the All-wise, is also the King, the Holy, the Peaceful, the Faithful, the Guardian over His servants, the Shelterer of the orphan, the Guide of the erring, the Deliverer from every affliction, the Friend of the bereaved, the Consoler of the afflicted; in His hand is good, and He is the generous Lord, the Gracious, the Hearer, the Near-at-hand, the Compassionate, the Merciful, the Very-forgiving, whose love for man is more tender than that of the mother-bird for her young.

The mercy of the Almighty is one of the grandest themes of the the Koran. The very name [Ar-Rahman] with which each chapter opens, and with which He is invoked, expresses a deep, all-penetrating conviction of that love, that divine mercy, which enfolds creation.[1]

The moral debasement of the followers of the two previous Dispensations wring the Teacher's heart, and then burst forth denunciations on the Christians and the Jews for the superstitious rites they practised in defiance of the warnings of their prophets. The fire of religious zeal, that had burned in the bosoms of Isaiah and Jeremiah, was rekindled in the breast of another and far greater man. He denounces; but above the wail, the cry of agony at the degradation of humanity, is heard the voice of hope.

The Korân severely censures the Jews for their "worship of false gods and idols," the *teraphim* before referred to, and for their exaggerated reverence for the memory of Ezra; the Christians, for their adoration of Jesus and his mother. "Hast thou not seen those to whom a portion of the Scriptures have been given? They believe in false gods and idols. They say to the unbelievers they are better directed in the right way than those that believe [the Moslems]."[2] "The Jews say, Ezra is the Son of God; the Christians say, Christ is the Son of God. May God resist them. How infatuated they are! They take their priests and their monks for their lords besides God. . . . They seek to extinguish the light

1 Sura iii. 124, xxv. 50, xxviii. 74, xlii. 3, etc. etc.

2 Sura iv. 49.

of God with their mouths."[1] . . . "The Jews and the Christians say, We are the children of God, and His beloved."[2] "Many of those unto whom the Scriptures have been given[3] desire to render you again unbelievers, after ye have believed. . . . Be constant in prayer, and give alms; and what good ye have sent before you for your souls, ye shall find it with God." . . . "They say, Verily, none shall enter paradise except those who are Jews or Christians. . . . Say, Produce your proof if ye speak the truth. Nay, but he who directeth towards God, and doth that which is right, he shall have his reward with his Lord."[4]

"O ye who have received the Scriptures, exceed not the just bounds in your religion, neither say of God otherwise than the truth. Verily, Christ Jesus, the Son of Mary, is the apostle of God and His word. Believe therefore in God and His apostles, and say not, There are three Gods; forbear this . . . Christ doth not proudly disdain to be a servant unto God."[5] "It beseemeth not a man, that God should give him the Scriptures, and the wisdom, and the gift of prophecy, and that then he should say to his followers, 'Be ye worshippers of me, as well as of God,' but rather, 'Be ye perfect in things pertaining to God, since ye know the Scriptures, and have studied deep.'"[6]

The following passage[7] shows the feeling with which such religious conceptions were regarded: "They say the God of mercy hath begotten a Son. Now have ye uttered a grievous thing; and it wanted but little that the heaven should be torn open, and that the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down, for that they attribute children unto the Merciful; whereas it is not meet for God to have children. Verily there is none in heaven or on earth but shall approach the Merciful as His servant. He encompasseth them." . . .

But the inspired Preacher whose mission it is to proclaim the Truth does not confound the good with the bad: "Yet they are not all alike; there are of those who have received the Scriptures

1 Sura ix. 30–32. 2 Sura v. 21.
3 The Jews, the Christians, and the Zoroastrians.
4 Sura 105, 106. 5 Sura iv. 169, 170. 6 Sura iii. 73.
7 Sura xix. 91–94.

upright people ; they meditate on the signs of God in the night season, and worship ; they believe in God and the last day ; and command that which is just ; and forbid that which is unjust, and zealously strive to excel in good works ; these are of the righteous."[1]

The mutual and burning hatred of Jew and Christian, the savage wars of Nestorian and Monophysite, the meaningless wrangle of the sects, the heartless and heart-rending logomachy of the Byzantine clergy, ever and anon bring down denunciations like the following:—

"To Jesus and other apostles we gave manifest signs ; and if God had pleased, their followers would not have fallen into these disputes. But God doeth what He will!" "Mankind was but one people, and God sent them prophets of warning and glad tidings, and the Book of Truth to settle all disputes. Yet none disputed like those to whom the Book had been sent ; for they were filled with jealousy of each other." "O people of the Book, why wrangle about Abraham? Why contend about that whereof ye know nothing?"

The primary aim of the new Dispensation was to infuse [illegible]evive in the heart of humanity a living perception of truth in the common relations of life. "The moral ideal of the new gospel," to use the phraseology of an eminent writer, "was set in the common sense of duty and the familiar instances of love."

"Verily, those people[2] have now passed away ; they have the reward of their deeds ; and ye shall have the meed of yours ; of their doings ye shall not be questioned."[3] "Every soul shall bear the good and the evil for which it has laboured ; and God will burden none beyond its power." "Blessed is he who giveth away his substance that he may become pure, and who offereth not favours to any one for the sake of recompense . . . but only as seeking the approval of his Lord the Most High."[4] . . .

"They are the blest who, though longing for it themselves, bestowed their food on the poor and the orphan and the captive [saying], 'We feed you for the sake of God : we seek from you neither recompense nor thanks.' "[5]

"Worship God alone ; be kind to kindred and servants, orphans

1 Sura iii. 109, 110.
2 *I.e.* Abraham, Ishmael, and Isaac, and the tribes.
3 Sura ii. 128. 4 Sura xcii. 18, 19. 5 Sura lxxvi. 8, 9.

and the poor; speak righteously to men, pray, and pay alms." "Defer humbly to your parents; with humility and tenderness say, O Lord, be merciful to them, even as they brought me up when I was helpless." "Abandon the old barbarities, blood-vengeance, and child-murder, and be united as one flesh." "Do thy alms openly or in secret, for both are well." Give of that which hath been given you before the day cometh when there shall be no trafficking, nor friendship, nor intercession." "Wouldst thou be taught the steep [path]? It is to ransom the captive, to feed the hungry, the kindred, the orphan, and him whose mouth is in the dust". "Be of those who enjoin steadfastness and compassion on others."[1] "Woe to them that make show of piety, and refuse help to the needy." "Make not your alms void by reproaches or injury." "Forgiveness and kind speech are better than favours with annoyance." "Abandon usury." "He who spendeth his substance to be seen of men, is like a rock with thin soil over it, whereon the rain falleth and leaveth it hard. But they who expend their substance to please God and establish their souls, are like a garden on a hill, on which the rain falleth and it yieldeth its fruits twofold; and even if the rain doth not fall, yet is there a dew."

"Judge between men with truth, and follow not thy passions, lest they cause thee to err from the way of God."[2] "Covet not another's gifts from God." "There is no piety in turning the face east or west, but in believing in God only and doing good." "Make the best of all things; enjoin justice and avoid the foolish; and if Satan stir thee to evil, take refuge in God." "Touch not the goods of the orphan. Perform your covenant, and walk not proudly on the earth."[3] "The birth of a daughter brings dark shadows on a man's face." . . . "Kill not your children for fear of want: for them and for you will We provide. Verily the killing them is a great wickedness."[4] "God hath given you wives that ye may put love and tenderness between you."

"Reverence the wombs that bear you." "Commit not adultery; for it is a foul thing and an evil way."[5] "Let the believer restrain his eyes from lust; let women make no display of ornaments, save to their own kindred."

[1] Sura xc. 12–15. [2] Sura xxxviii. 25.
[3] Sura xvii. 36. [4] Sura xvii. 33. [5] Sura xvii. 25.

"Know ye that this world's life is a cheat, the multiplying of riches and children is like the plants that spring up after rain, rejoicing the husbandman, then turn yellow and wither away. In the next life is severe chastisement, or else pardon from God and His peace." "Abandon the semblance of wickedness and wickedness itself. They, verily, whose only acquirement is iniquity, shall be rewarded for what they shall have gained."[1] "Those who abstain from vanities and the indulgence of their passions, give alms, offer prayers, and tend well their trusts and their covenants, these shall be the heirs of eternal happiness."[2] "Show kindness to your parents, whether one or both of them attain to old age with thee: and say not to them 'Fie!' neither reproach them; but speak to them both with respectful speech and tender affection."[3] "And to him who is of kin render his due, and also to the poor and to the wayfarer; yet waste not wastefully."[4]

"And let not thy hand be tied up to thy neck; nor yet open it with all openness, lest thou sit thee down in rebuke in beggary."[5] "Enjoin my servants to speak in kindly sort."[6] "Turn aside evil with that which is better."[7] "Just balances will We set up for the day of the Resurrection, neither shall any soul be wronged in aught; though were a work but the weight of a grain of mustard seed, We would bring it forth *to be weighed:* and Our reckoning will suffice."[8] "Seek pardon of your Lord and be turned unto Him: verily, my Lord is merciful, loving."[9] "And your Lord saith, 'Call upon me, I will hearken unto you."[10] "Say: O my servants who have transgressed to your own injury, despair not of God's mercy, for all sins doth God forgive. Gracious, merciful is He!"[11] "The good word riseth up to Him, and the righteous deed will He exalt."[12] "Truly my Lord hath forbidden filthy actions, whether open or secret, and iniquity, and unjust violence."[13]

"Call upon your Lord with lowliness and in secret, for He loveth not transgressors. And commit not disorders on the well-ordered earth after it hath been well ordered; and call on Him with fear and longing desire: Verily the mercy of God is nigh unto the

1 Sura vi. 120.
2 Sura xxiii. 8.
3 Sura xvii. 24.
4 Sura xvii. 28.
5 Sura xvii. 31.
6 Sura xvii. 55.
7 Sura xxiii. 98.
8 Sura xxi. 48.
9 Sura xi. 92.
10 Sura xl. 62.
11 Sura xxxix. 54.
12 Sura xxxv. 11.
13 Sura vii. 31.

righteous."[1] "Moreover, We have enjoined on man to show kindness to his parents. With pain his mother beareth him; with pain she bringeth him forth; and he saith, 'O my Lord! stir me up to be grateful for Thy favours wherewith Thou hast favoured me and my parents, and to good works which shall please Thee; and prosper me in my offspring: for to Thee am I turned, and am resigned to Thy will.'"[2] "For them is a dwelling of peace with their Lord; and in recompense for their works shall He be their protector."[3] "Lost are they who, in their ignorance, have foolishly slain their children, and have forbidden that which God hath given them for food, devising an untruth against God! Now have they erred; and they were not rightly guided."[4]

"The likeness of those who expend their wealth for the cause of God, is that of a grain of corn which produceth seven ears, and in each ear a hundred grains; they who expend their wealth for the cause of God, and never follow what they have laid out with reproaches or harm, shall have their reward with their Lord; no fear shall come upon them, neither shall they be put to grief. A kind speech and forgiveness is better than alms followed by injury."[5]

"God will not burden any soul beyond its power. It shall enjoy the good which it hath acquired, and shall bear the evil for the acquirement of which it laboured." . . . "O Lord! punish us not if we forget, or fall into sin, O our Lord! and lay not on us a load like that which Thou hast laid on those who have been before us, O our Lord! And lay not on us that for which we have not strength: but blot out our sins and forgive us and have pity on us."[6] "The patient and the truthful, the lowly and the charitable, they who seek pardon at each daybreak:"[7] . . . "Who give alms, alike in prosperity and in success, and who master their anger, and forgive others! God loveth the doers of good;"[5] [theirs a goodly home with their Lord.] "O our Lord! forgive us then our sin, and hide away from us our evil deeds, and cause us to die with the righteous:"[9] . . . "And their Lord answereth them, 'I will not suffer the work of him among you that worketh, whether of male

1 Sura vii. 53. 2 Sura xlvi. 14. 3 Sura vi. 127.
4 Sura vi. 141. 5 Sura ii. 263, 264, and 265.
6 Sura ii. 286. 7 Sura iii. 15. 8 Sura iii. 128. 9 Sura iii. 191.

or female, to be lost, the one of you is the issue of the other.'"[1] "And fear ye God, in whose name ye ask favours of each other—and respect women."[2]

"And marry not women whom your fathers have married: for this is a shame, and hateful, and an evil way."[3]

"Covet not the gifts by which God hath raised some of you above others."[4]

"Be good to parents, and to kindred, and to orphans, and to the poor, and to a neighbour, whether kinsman or new-comer, and to a fellow-traveller, and to the wayfarer, and to the slaves whom your right hands hold; verily, God loveth not the proud, the vain boaster."[5] "He who shall mediate between men for a good purpose shall be the gainer by it. But he who shall mediate with an evil mediation shall reap the fruit of it. And God keepeth watch over everything.[6]" "O ye Moslems! stand fast to justice, when ye bear witness before God, though it be against yourselves, or your parents or your kindred, whether the party be rich or poor. God is nearer than you to both. Therefore follow not passion, lest ye swerve from truth."[7]

Do the preachings of this desert-born Prophet, addressing a larger world and a more advanced humanity, in the nobility of their love, in their strivings and yearnings for the true, the pure, and the holy, fall short of the warnings of Isaiah or "the tender appeals of Jesus"?

The poor and the orphan, the humble dweller of the earth "with his mouth in the dust," the unfortunate being bereft in early life of parental care, are ever the objects of his tenderest solicitude. Ever and again he announces that the path which leads to God is the helping of the orphan, the relieving of the poor, and the ransoming of the captive. His pity and love were not confined to his fellow-beings, the brute creation shared with them his sympathy and tenderness.

"A man once came to him with a bundle, and said: 'O Prophet, I passed through a wood and heard the voice of the young of birds,

1 Sura iii. 193. 2 Sura iv. 1.
3 Sura iv. 26. 4 Sura iv. 36.
5 Suraiv. 40. 6 Sura iv. 87. 7 Sura iv. 34.

and I took them and put them in my carpet, and their mother came fluttering round my head.' And the Prophet said: 'Put them down'; and when he had put them down the mother joined the young. And the Prophet said: 'Do you wonder at the affection of the mother towards her young? I swear by Him who has sent me, Verily, God is more loving to His servants than the mother to these young birds. Return them to the place from which ye took them, and let their mother be with them.'" "Fear God with regard to animals," said Mohammed; "ride them when they are fit to be ridden, and get off when they are tired. Verily, there are rewards for our doing good to dumb animals, and giving them water to drink."

In the Koran, animal life stands on the same footing as human life in the sight of the Creator. "There is no beast on earth," says the Koran, "nor bird which flieth with its wings, but the same is a people like unto you—unto the Lord shall they return." It took centuries for Christendom to awaken to a sense of duty towards the animal creation. Long before the Christian nations ever dreamt of extending towards animals tenderness and humanity, Mohammed proclaimed in impressive words the duty of mankind towards their dumb and humble servitors. These precepts of tenderness so lovingly embalmed in the creed are faithfully rendered into a common duty of everyday life in the world of Islam.

CHAPTER II.

ISLÂM.

قُلْ لِّمَنْ مَّا فِي السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْأَرْضِ
قُلْ لِّلّٰهِ * كَتَبَ عَلٰى نَفْسِهِ الرَّحْمَةَ

قُلْ تَعَالَوْا أَتْلُ مَا حَرَّمَ رَبُّكُمْ عَلَيْكُمْ أَلَّا تُشْرِكُوا بِهِ شَيْئًا وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ
إِحْسَانًا * وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَوْلَادَكُمْ مِّنْ إِمْلَاقٍ * نَحْنُ نَرْزُقُكُمْ وَإِيَّاهُمْ *
وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَنَ * وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ
الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللّٰهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ * ذٰلِكُمْ وَصّٰكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ *
لَا تَقْرَبُوا مَالَ الْيَتِيمِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ حَتّٰى يَبْلُغَ أَشُدَّهُ *
أَوْفُوا الْكَيْلَ وَالْمِيزَانَ بِالْقِسْطِ * لَا نُكَلِّفُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا *
وَإِذَا قُلْتُمْ فَاعْدِلُوا وَلَوْ كَانَ ذَا قُرْبٰى * وَبِعَهْدِ اللّٰهِ أَوْفُوا * ذٰلِكُمْ
وَصّٰكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَذَكَّرُونَ *

FOR the conservation of a true religious spirit, Mohammed attached to his precepts certain practical duties, of which the following are the principal: (1) prayer, (2) fasting, (3) almsgiving, and (4) pilgrimage.

Man's consciousness of a supreme, all-pervading Power; his helplessness in the eternal conflict of nature; his sense of benefaction,—all lead him to pour out the overflowing sentiments of his

heart in words of gratitude and love, or repentance and solicitation, to One who is ever-wakeful and merciful. Prayers are only the utterance of the sentiments which fill the human heart. All these emotions, however, are the result of a superior development. The savage, if supplications do not answer his purpose, resorts to the castigation of his fetish. But every religious system possessing any organic element has recognised, in some shape, the efficacy of prayer. In most, however, the theurgic character predominates over the moral; in some, the moral idea is entirely wanting.

The early Hindoo worship consisted of two sets of acts—oblations and sacrifice accompanied with invocations. In the infancy of religious thought the gods are supposed to possess the same appetites and passions as human beings; and thus whilst man needs material benefits, the gods require offerings and propitiation. This idea often finds expression in the old hymns of the *Rig Veda*. With the development of religious conceptions, it is probable that, among at least the more advanced or thoughtful minds, the significance attached to oblations and sacrifice underwent considerable modification. But as the hold of the priestly caste, which claimed the possession of a "secret virtue" transmissible only through the blood, strengthened on the minds of the masses, Brahminism crystallised into a literally sacrificial cult. The sacrifice could be performed only by the priest according to rigid and unalterable formulæ; whilst he recited the *mantras* and went through the rites in a mechanical spirit, without religious feeling or enthusiasm, the worshipper stood by, a passive spectator of the worship which was performed on his behalf. The smallest mistake undid the efficacy of the observances. The devotional spirit, however, could not have been entirely wanting, or the *Bhagavat Gitâ* could not have been composed. But for the people as a whole, their worship had become a vast system of sacrifice, the value of which depended not so much upon the moral conduct of the individual worshipper as upon the qualification of the officiating priest. The former had only to believe in the efficacy of the rite and be in a state of legal purity at the time.

The Mago-Zoroastrian and the Sabæan lived in an atmosphere of prayer. The Zoroastrian prayed when he sneezed, when he cut his nails or hair, while preparing meals, day and night, at the lighting of

lamps, etc. Ormuzd was first invoked, and then not only heaven, earth, the elements and stars, but trees, especially the moon-plant,[1] and beasts. The formulæ were often to be repeated as many as twelve hundred times.[2] The moral idea, however pure with the few, would be perfectly eliminated from the minds of the common people. But even the sort of spiritual life enjoyed by exceptional minds was monopolised by the ministers of religion. The barriers of special holiness which divided the priesthood from the laity, shut out the latter from all spiritual enjoyments of a nobler type. The Magians, like the Ophici, had two forms of worship, or rather, two modes of understanding the objects of worship: one esoteric, especially reserved for the priestly classes; the other exoteric, in which alone the vulgar could participate.[3]

The Mosaic law contained no ordinances respecting prayers; only on the payment of tithes to the priests, and the domestic solemnity of the presentation of the firstlings, was there a prescribed formula of a prayer and acknowledgment, when the father of the house, on the strength of his having obediently performed the behests of the law, supplicated blessings from Jehovah on Israel, "even as He had sworn unto their fathers."[4] But, with the rise of a more spiritual idea of the Deity among the people and the teachers, and the decline of an uncompromising anthropomorphism, the real nature of prayer, as the medium of intercommunication between God and man, began to be understood. Tradition and custom, in default of any express regulation by the law, made the Jews at last, as Dollinger says, a people of prayer.[5] Three hours daily were consecrated to devotional exercises, viz. nine, twelve, and three o'clock. The necessity, however, for the service of priests, combined with the absence of any positive precedent coming down from the Lawgiver himself, tended to make prayer, in the majority of cases, merely mechanical. Phylacteries were in use in the time

1 Called *Soma* by the Sanscritic, and *Homa* or *Haoma* by the Zend races.

2 Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. i. p. 398. The Zend Avesta itself is a grand repertory of prayers, hymns, invocations, etc., to a multitude of deities, among whom Ormuzd ranks first. In fact, it is a book of liturgies. Comp. Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, pp. 187, 202.

3 Reland, *Dissertationes Miscellanæ*, part i. p. 191; Shahristani.

4 Deut. xxvi. 12–15 5 Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 372.

of Jesus, and the Koran reproaches the Jews in bitter terms for "selling the signs of God."[1]

The teachings of Jesus, representing a later development of the religious faculty in man, recognised the true character of prayer. He consecrated the practice by his own example.[2] The early disciples, in the spirit of their Master, laid great stress on the habit of devotion and thanksgiving to God.[3] But the want of some definite rule for the guidance of the masses, in process of time, left them completely adrift in all that regarded the practice of devotion, and under subjection to the priests, who monopolised the office of regulating the number, length, and the terminology of prayers. Hence missals, liturgies, councils, and convocations to settle articles of faith and matters of conscience; hence also, the mechanical worship of droning monks, and the hebdomadal flocking into churches and chapels on one day in the week to make up for the deficiency of spiritual food during the other six; hence also the "presbyter," who, merely a "servant" at first,[4] came to regard himself as "the Lord of the spiritual heritage" bequeathed by Jesus.

All these evils had culminated to a point in the seventh century, when the Prophet of Arabia began to preach a reformed religion. In instituting prayers, Mohammed recognised the yearning of the human soul to pour out its love and gratitude to God, and by making the practice of devotion periodic, he impressed that disciplinary character on the observance of prayer which keeps the thoughts from wandering into the regions of the material.[5] The formulæ, consecrated by his example and practice, whilst sparing the Islamic world the evils of contests regarding liturgies, leave to the individual worshipper the amplest scope for the most heartfelt outpouring of devotion and humility before the Almighty Presence.

The value of prayer as the means of moral elevation and the purification of the heart, has been clearly set forth in the Koran :—

"Rehearse that which hath been revealed unto thee of the Book, and be constant at prayer, for prayer preserveth from crimes and from

1 Sura ii. 38. 2 Luke ix. 1—4.

3 *E. g.* Eph. vi. 18 ; Col. i. 12 et seq.

4 Mosheim, vol. i. 99 et seq.

5 Comp. Oelsner, *Des Effets de la Religion de Mohammed*, p. 6.

that which is blameable; and the remembering of God is surely a most sacred duty." [1]

The forms of the supplicatory hymns, consecrated by the example of Mohammed, evince the beauty of the moral element in the teachings of Islâm :—

"O Lord! I supplicate Thee for firmness in faith and direction towards rectitude, and to assist me in being grateful to Thee, and in adoring Thee in every good way: and I supplicate Thee for an innocent heart, which shall not incline to wickedness; snd I supplicate Thee for a true tongue, and for that virtue which Thou knowest; and I pray Thee to defend me from that vice which Thou knowest, and for forgiveness of those faults which Thou knowest. O my Defender! assist me in remembering Thee and being grateful to Thee, and in worshipping Thee with the excess of my strength. O Lord! I have injured my own soul, and no one can pardon the faults of Thy servants but Thou; forgive me out of Thy loving-kindness, and have mercy on me; for verily Thou art the forgiver of offences and the bestower of blessings on Thy servants."[2]

Another traditional prayer, called the prayer of David, runs thus; "O Lord, grant to me the love of Thee; grant that I may love those that love thee; grant that I may do the deeds that may win Thy love; make Thy love to be dearer to me than self, family or than wealth."[3]

The two following prayers of Ali (the Caliph) evince the highest devotional spirit.

"Thanks be to my Lord; He the Adorable, and only to be adored. My Lord, the Eternal, the Ever-existing, the Cherisher, the True Sovereign whose mercy and might overshadow the universe; the Regulator of the world, and Light of the creation. His is our worship; to Him belongs all worship; He existed before all things, and will exist after all that is living has ceased. Thou art the adored, my Lord; Thou art the Master, the Loving and Forgiving; Thou bestowest power and might on whom Thou pleasest; him whom Thou hast exalted none can lower; and him whom Thou hast lowered none can exalt. Thou, my Lord, art the Eternal, the Creator of all,

1 Koran xxix. 44.

2 *Mishkât*, bk. iv. chap. 18, parts 2, 3.

3 *Tafsîr-Jellâli*, p. 288.

All-wise Sovereign Mighty ; Thy knowledge knows everything ; Thy beneficence is all-pervading ; Thy forgiveness and mercy are all-embracing. O my Lord, Thou art the Helper of the afflicted, the Reliever of all distress, the Consoler of the broken-hearted ; Thou art present everywhere to help Thy servants. Thou knowest all secrets, all thoughts, art present in every assembly, Fulfiller of all our needs, Bestower of all blessings. Thou art the Friend of the poor and bereaved ; my Lord, Thou art my Fortress ; a Castle for all who seek Thy help. Thou art the Refuge of the weak ; the Helper of the pure and true. O my Lord, Thou art my Supporter, my Helper, the Helper of all who seek Thy help. . . . O my Lord, Thou art the Creator, I am only created ; Thou art my Sovereign, I am only Thy servant ; Thou art the Helper, I am the beseecher ; Thou, my Lord art my Refuge ; Thou art the Forgiver, I am the sinner ; Thou, my Lord, art the Merciful, All-knowing, All-loving ; I am groping in the dark ; I seek Thy knowledge and love. Bestow, my Lord, all Thy knowledge and love and mercy ; forgive my sins, O my Lord, and let me approach Thee, my Lord."

" O my Lord, Thou the Ever-praised, the Eternal, Thou art the Ever-present, Ever-existing, the Ever-near, the All-knowing. Thou livest in every heart, in every soul, all-pervading ; Thy knowledge is ingrained in every mind." "He bears no similitude, has no equal, One, the Eternal ; thanks be to the Lord whose mercy extends to every sinner, who provides for even those who deny Him. To Him belong the beginning and the end, all knowledge and the most hidden secret of the heart. He never slumbers, the Ever-just, the Ever-wakeful. He forgiveth in His mercy our greatest sins,—loveth all creation. I testify to the goodness of my Lord, to the truth of His Messenger's message, blessings on him and his descendants and his companions."[1]

"It is one of the glories of Islâm," says an English writer, "that its temples are not made with hands, and that its ceremonies can be performed anywhere upon God's earth or under His heaven."[2] Every place in which the Almighty is faithfully worshipped is equally pure. The Moslem, whether he be at home or abroad, when the hour of prayer arrives, pours forth his soul in a brief but earnest supplicatory

[1] *Sahîfai-Kâmila.*
[2] Hunter, *Our Indian Musalmans*, p 179.

address; his attention is not wearied by the length of his prayers, the theme of which is always self-humiliation, the glorification of the Giver of all good, and reliance on His mercy.[1] The intensity of the devotional spirit embalmed in the church of Mohammed has hardly been realised by Christendom. Tradition, that faithful chronicler of the past, with its hundred corroborative witnesses, records how the Prophet wept during his prayers with the fervour of his emotions; how his noble cousin and son-in-law became so absorbed in his devotions that his body grew benumbed.

The Islâm of Mohammed recognises no caste of priesthood, allows no monopoly of spiritual knowledge or special holiness to intervene between man and his God. Each soul rises to its Creator without the intervention of priest or hierophant. No sacrifice,[2] no ceremonial, invented by vested interests, is needed to bring the anxious heart nearer to its Comforter. Each human being is his own priest; in the Islâm of Mohammed no one man is higher than the other.

European rationalists have complained of the complex character of the Moslem prayers, but the ritual of the Koran is astonishing in its simplicity and soberness. It includes the necessary acts of faith, the recital of the creed, prayer, almsgiving, fasting, and pilgrimage, but lays down scarcely any rules as to how they are to be performed. "Observe the prayers and the mid-day prayer, and stand ye attent before God; seek aid from patience and prayer. Verily, God is with the patient;" but nothing is said regarding the manner in which the prayers should be offered. "When ye journey about the earth," says the Koran, "it is no crime to you that ye come short in prayer if ye fear that those that disbelieve will set upon you. God pardons everything except associating aught with Him."

The practice of the Prophet has, however, attached certain rites and ceremonies to the due observance of prayers. At the same time it is pointed out in unmistakeable terms that it is to the devotional state of the mind the Searcher of the spirit looks: "It is not the flesh or the blood of that which ye sacrifice which is acceptable to

[1] Sura ii. 129, 239, etc., vii. 204, 205, xv. 132, xvii. 79, xx. 130, xxx. 16, 17, etc. etc. See the *Kitâb ul-Mustatrif*.

[2] The annual sacrifice at the Hajj and the Bairam is a mere memorial observance

God: it is your piety which is acceptable to the Lord."[1] "It is not righteousness," continues the Koran, "that ye turn your faces in prayer towards the east or the west; but righteousness is of him who believeth in God; . . . who giveth money for God's sake unto his kindred, and unto orphans, and the needy, and the stranger, and those who ask, and for the redemption of captives; who is constant at prayers and giveth alms; and of those who perform their covenant, when they have covenanted; and who behave themselves patiently in hardship and adversity, and in times of violence: these are they who are true."[2] . . .

It was declared that prayer without "the presence of the heart" was of no avail, and that God's words which were addressed to all mankind and not to one people, should be studied with the heart and lips in absolute accord. And the Caliph Ali held that devotion offered without understanding was useless and brought no blessing.[3] The celebrated Imam al-Ghazzali [4] has pronounced that in reading the sacred book[5] heart and intelligence must work together; the lips only utter the words; intelligence helps in the due apprehension of their meaning; the heart, in paying obedience to the dictates of duty.[6] "It is not a sixth nor a tenth of a man's devotion," said the Prophet, "which is acceptable to God, but only such portion thereof as he offers with understanding and true devotional spirit."[7]

The practice of baptism in the Christian Church, even the lustrations, which the Egyptians, the Jews, or the hierophants of the heathen religions in the East and the West, required as preliminary to the performance of devotional or religious exercises, show the peculiar sanctity which was attached to external purifications. Mohammed, by his example, consecrated this ancient and beneficent custom. He required cleanliness as a necessary preliminary to the worship and adoration of God.[8] At the same time, he especially inculcated

1 Sura xxii. 38. 2 Sura ii. 172. 3 *Ghurrar wa'd Durrar*
4 *See post*, chap xx. 5 The Koran.
6 The *Kitâb ul-Mustatrif*, Chap. 1.
7 From Muaz ibn Jabal, reported by Abu Daud and Nisaï.
8 Sura v. 8.
The Koran, in its universality, speaks of ablutions, but where water is not available it allows any cleansing substitute for lavation, but nowhere lays down the details of the *Wuzu*. As usual, the manner of performing the lavations or ablutions, derived from the practice of the Prophet, has given rise to considerable discussions and difference among the theologians.

that mere external, or rather physical, purity does not imply true devotion. He distinctly laid down that the Almighty can only be approached in purity and humility of spirit.[1] Imâm al-Ghazzâli expressly says, as against those who are only solicitous about external purifications, and have their hearts full of pride and hypocrisy, that the Prophet of God declared the most important purification to be the cleansing of the heart from all blameable inclinations and frailties, and the mind from all vicious ideas, and from all thoughts which distract attention from God.[2]

In order to keep alive in the Moslem world the memory of the birthplace of Islam, Mohammed directed that during prayers the Moslem should turn his face towards Mecca, as the glorious centre which saw the first glimmerings of the light of regenerated truth.[3] With the true instinct of a prophet he perceived the consolidating effect of fixing a central spot round which, through all time, should gather the religious feelings of his followers; and he accordingly ordained that everywhere throughout the world the Moslem should pray looking towards the Kaaba. "Mecca is to the Moslem what Jerusalem is to the Jew. It bears with it all the influence of centuries of associations. It carries the Moslem back to the cradle of his faith, the childhood of his Prophet, it reminds him of the struggle between the old faith and the new, of the overthrow of the idols, and the establishment of the worship of the one God; and, most of all, it bids him remember that all his brother Moslems are worshipping towards the same sacred spot; that he is one of a great company of believers, united by one faith, filled with the same hopes, reverencing the same things, worshipping the same God. Mohammed showed his knowledge of the religious emotions in man when he preserved the sanctity of the temple of Islam."[4] But that this rule is not an essential requisite for devotion, is evident from the passage of the Koran quoted above.[5]

The institution of fasting has existed more or less among all nations. But it may be said that throughout the ancient world the

1 Sura vii. 204. 2 Compare the *Kitâb ul-Mustatrif*, chap. i. sec. 1.
3 Sura ii. 139, 144, etc.
4 Stanley Lane-Poole, Introd. to the *Selections from the Koran*, p. lxxxv.
5 See *ante*, p. 145.

idea attached to it was, without exception, more of penitence than of abstinence. Even in Judaism the notion of fasting as an exercise of self-castigation or self-abnegation was of later growth. The Essenians (from their connection with the Pythagoreans, and, through them, with the asceticism of the further East) were the first among the Jews to grasp this moral element in the principle of fasting; and Jesus probably derived this idea, like other conceptions, from them.

The example of Jesus consecrated the custom in the Church. But the predominating idea in Christianity, with respect to fasts generally, is one of penitence or expiation;[1] and partially, of precedent.[2] Voluntary corporal mortifications have been as frequent in the Christian Church as in other Churches; but the tendency of such mortifications has invariably been the destruction of mental and bodily energies, and the fostering of a morbid asceticism. The institution of fasting in Islam, on the contrary, has the legitimate object of restraining the passions, by diurnal abstinence for a limited and definite period, from all the gratifications of the senses, and directing the overflow of the animal spirits into a healthy channel. Useless and unnecessary mortification of the flesh is discountenanced, nay, condemned. Fasting is prescribed to the able-bodied and the strong, as a means of chastening the spirit by imposing a restraint on the body. For the weak, the sickly, the traveller, the student (who is engaged in the pursuit of knowledge—the *Jihâd-ul-Akbar*), the soldier doing God's battle against the assailants of the faith, and women in their ailments, it is disallowed. Those who bear in mind the gluttony of the Greeks, the Romans, the Persians, and the pre-Islamite Arabs, their excesses in their pleasures as well

Mosheim, vol. i. p. 131. Mosheim distinctly says that fasting came early to be regarded "as the most effectual means of repelling the force, and disconcerting the stratagems of evil spirits, and of appeasing the anger of an offended deity;" Vol. i. p. 398.

"The weekly and yearly festivals of the Christians," says Neander, "originated in the same fundamental idea, . . . the idea of imitating Christ, the crucified and risen Saviour." And, again, "by the Christians—who were fond of comparing their calling to a warfare, a militia Christi—such fasts, united with prayers, were named *stationes*, as if they constituted the watches of the soldiers of Christ (the *milites Christi*);" Neander, *Church Hist.* vol. i. pp. 408, 409.

as their vices, will appreciate the value of the regulation, and comprehend how wonderfully adapted it is for keeping in check the animal propensities of man, especially among semi-civilised races.

Mark the wisdom of the rule as given in the Koran: "O ye that have believed, a fast is ordained to you . . . that ye may practise piety, a fast of a computed number of days. But he among you who shall be ailing, or on a journey, (shall fast) an equal number of other days; and they that are able to keep it (and do not), shall make atonement by maintaining a poor man. . . . But if ye fast, it will be better for you if ye comprehend; . . . God willeth that which is easy for you." [1]

This rule of abstinence is restricted to the day; in the night, in the intervals of prayer and devotion, the Moslem is allowed, perhaps indeed, is bound, to refresh the system by partaking in moderation of food and drink, and otherwise enjoying himself lawfully. In the true spirit of the Teacher, the legists invariably laid down the rule that, during the fast, abstinence of mind from all base thoughts is as incumbent as the abstinence of the body.[2]

9. No religion of the world prior to Islâm had consecrated charity, the support of the widow, the orphan, and the helpless poor, by enrolling its principles among the positive enactments of the system.

The *agapæ*, or feasts of charity among the early Christians, depended on the will of individuals; their influence, therefore, could only be irregular and spasmodic. It is a matter of history that this very irregularity led to the suppression of the "feasts of charity or love-feasts" only a short time after their introduction.[3]

By the laws of Islam every individual is bound to contribute a certain part of his substance towards the help and assistance of his poorer neighbours. This portion is usually one part of forty, or 2½ per cent. on the value of all goods, chattels, emblements, on profits of trade, mercantile business, etc. But alms are due only

[1] Sura ii. 181. [2] The *Kitâb ul-Mustatrif*, chap. i. sec. 4.

[3] Neander, vol. i. p. 450 et seq.; Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 56. I do not mean to say that this was the only form in which Christian charity expressed itself. The support of the widow, the poor, and orphan was as much insisted upon in Christianity as in Islam. But even this divine charity taught by Jesus received an impress of exclusiveness from the disciples, in whose hands he left his work. The widow, in order to claim the benefits of charity, was required to be "threescore years of age, to have been the wife of one man, to have brought up children," etc. Compare throughout Blunt's *History of the Christian Church*, p. 27 et seq.

when the property amounts to a certain value,[1] and has been in the possession of a person for one whole year; nor are any due from cattle employed in agriculture or in the carrying of burdens. Besides, at the end of the month of Ramazan (the month of fasting), and on the day of the *Id-ul-Fitr*, the festival which celebrates the close of the Moslem Lent, each head of a family has to give away in alms, for himself and for every member of his household, and for each guest who breaks his fast and sleeps in his house during the month, a measure of wheat, barley, dates, raisins, rice, or any other grain, or the value of the same.

The rightful recipients of the alms, as pointed out by the practice of Mohammed and his disciples, are (1) the poor and the indigent; (2) those who help in the collection and distribution of the obligatory alms; (3) slaves, who wish to buy their freedom and have not the means for so doing; (4) debtors, who cannot pay their debts; (5) travellers and strangers.[2] General charity is inculcated by the Koran in the most forcible terms.[3] But the glory of Islam consists in having embodied the beautiful sentiment of Jesus[4] into definite laws.

The wisdom which incorporated into Islâm the time-honoured custom of annual pilgrimage to Mecca and to the shrine of the Kaaba, has breathed into Mohammed's religion a freemasonry and brotherhood of faith in spite of sectarian divisions. The eyes of the whole Moslem world fixed on that central spot, keep alive in the bosom of each some spark of the celestial fire which lighted up the earth in that century of darkness. Here, again, the wisdom of the inspired Lawgiver shines forth in the negative part of the enactment, in the conditions necessary to make the injunction obligatory:—(1) ripeness of intelligence and discernment; (2) perfect freedom and liberty; (3) possession of the means of transport and subsistence during the journey; (4) possession of means sufficient to support the pilgrim's family during his absence; (5) the possibility and practicability of the voyage.[5]

1 For example, no alms are due from a man unless he own twenty camels.

2 *Jâmaa ut-Tirmizi*, chapter on "Alms-giving;" *Jâmaa-Abbâsi;* Querry, *Droit Musulman.* Comp. also the *Mabsût.*

3 Sura ii. 267, 269, 275, etc., ix. 60, etc.

4 Matt. xxv. 35, 36.

5 *Jâmaa-Abbâsi;* Querry, *Droit Musulman*, vol. i; the *Mabsut.*

Owing to the minute regulations, almost Brahminical in their strictness, in force among the heathen Arabs regarding the lawful or unlawful character of various kinds of food, the Teacher of Islam had frequently to admonish his followers that, with certain exceptions, all food was lawful. "And eat of what God hath given you for food that which is lawful and wholesome: and fear God, in whom ye believe."[1] "Say," says the Koran, "I find not in what hath been revealed to me aught forbidden to the eater to eat, except it be that which dieth of itself, or blood poured forth, or swine's flesh, for that is an abomination, and meat which has been slain in the name of other than God [idols]." This is amplified in the fifth sura, which is also directed against various savage and idolatrous practices of the pagan Arabs. "That which dieth of itself, and blood, and swine's flesh, and all that hath been sacrificed under the invocation of any other name than that of God,[2] and the strangled, and the killed by a blow or by a fall, or by goring,[3] and that which hath been eaten by beasts of prey, unless ye give the death-stroke yourselves, and that which hath been sacrificed on the blocks of stone,[4] is forbidden to you: and to make division of the slain by consulting the arrows, is impiety in you."[5] "Eat ye of the good things wherewith we have provided you and give thanks to God."[6]

1 Sura v. 90.

2 The heathen Arabs, when killing any animal for food, used to consecrate it by invoking the names of their gods and goddesses.

3 The idolatrous Arabs had different savage methods of killing animals. This prohibition has reference to the brutal processes employed by them.

4 Sacrificial stones placed round the Kaaba or at the entrance of houses over which the offerings were made to the idols.

5 Sura v. 4.

6 Things by nature abhorrent to man, such as the flesh of carnivorous animals, birds of prey, snakes, etc., required no specific prohibition. The idea prevalent in India, borrowed from the Hindoos, that Moslems should not partake of food with Christians, is entirely fallacious, and opposed to the precept contained in the following passage of the Koran (sura v. 7): "This day things healthful are legalised to you, and the meats of those who have received the Scriptures are allowed to you, as your meats are to them." With regard to the sumptuary regulations, precepts, and prohibitions of Mohammed, it must be remembered that they were called forth by the temporary circumstances of the times and people. With the disappearance of such circumstances, the need for these laws have also disappeared. To suppose, therefore that every Islamic precept is necessarily immutable, is to do an injustice to history and the development of the human intellect Ibn Khaldun's words are in this connection, deserving of our serious consideration: "It is only by an attentive examination and well-sustained application that we can discover the truth, and guard ourselves against errors and mistakes. In fact, if we were merely to satisfy ourselves by reproducing the records transmitted by tradition without consulting the rules furnished by experience, the funda-

Intoxication and gambling, the curse of Christian communities, and the bane of all uncultured and inferior natures, and excesses of all kinds, were rigorously prohibited.

Nothing can be simpler or more in accord with the advance of the human intellect than the teachings of the Arabian Prophet. The few rules for religious ceremonial which he prescribed were chiefly with the object of maintaining discipline and uniformity, so necessary in certain stages of society; but they were by no means of an inflexible character. He allowed them to be broken in cases of illness or other causes. "God wishes to make things easy for you, for," says the Koran, "man was created weak." The legal principles which he enunciated were either delivered as answers to questions put to him as the Chief Magistrate of Medina, or to remove or correct patent evils. The Prophet's Islam recognised no ritual likely to distract the mind from the thought of the one God; no law to keep enchained the conscience of advancing humanity.

The ethical code of Islâm is thus summarised in the fourth Sura: "Come, I will rehearse what your Lord hath enjoined on you—that ye assign not to Him a partner; that ye be good to your parents; and that ye slay not your children because of poverty: for them and for you will We provide; and that ye come not near to pollutions, outward or inward; and that ye slay not a soul whom God hath forbidden, unless by right . . . and draw not nigh to the wealth of the orphan, save so as to better it . . . and when ye pronounce judgment then be just, though it be the affair of a kinsman. And God's compact fulfil ye; that is, what He hath ordained to you. Verily, this is my right way; follow it, then."[1] And again, "Blessed are they who believe and humbly offer their thanksgiving to their Lord . . . who are constant in their charity, and who guard their chastity, and who observe their trust and convenants . . . Verily, God bids you do justice and good, and give to kindred

mental principles of the art of government, the nature, even, of the particular civilisation, or the circumstances which characterise the human society; if we are not to judge of the wants which occurred in distant times by those which are occurring under our eyes, if we are not to compare the past with the present we can hardly escape from falling into errors and losing the way of truth," *Prolegomenes d' Ibn Khaldoun*, traduits par M. de Slane, *Premiere Partie*, p. 13.

[1] Sura iv. 152 et seq.

their due; and He forbids you to sin and to do wrong and oppress."

"Faith and charity," to use the words of the Christian historian, "are not incompatible with external rites and positive institutions, which, indeed, are necessary in this imperfect state to keep alive a sense of religion in the common mass."[1] And, accordingly, Mohammed had attached a few rites to his teachings in order to give a more tangible conception to the generality of mankind. Jesus himself had instituted two rites, baptism and the "Holy Supper."[2] Probably, had he lived longer, he would have added more. But one thing is certain, that had a longer career been vouchsafed to him, he would have placed his teachings on a more systematic basis. This fundamental defect, in Christianity has been, in fact, the real cause of the assembling of councils and convocations for the establishment of articles and dogmas, which snap asunder at every slight tension of reason and free thought. The work of Jesus was left unfinished. It was reserved for another Teacher to systematise the laws of morality.

Our relations with our Creator are matters of conscience; our relations with our fellow-beings must be matters of positive rules; and what higher sanction—to use a legal expression—can be attached to the enforcement of the relative duties of man to man than the sanction of religion. Religion is not to be regarded merely as a subject for unctuous declamations by "select preachers," or as some strange theory for the peculiar gratification of dreamy minds. Religion ought to mean the rule of life; its chief object ought to be the elevation of humanity towards that perfection which is the end of our existence. The religion, therefore, which places on a systematic basis the fundamental principles of morality, regulating social obligations and human duties, which brings us nearer and nearer, by its compatibility with the highest development of intellect, to the All-Perfect—that religion, we say, has the greatest claim to our consideration and respect. It is the distinctive characteristic of Islam, as taught by Mohammed, that it combines within itself the grandest and the most prominent features in all ethnic and catholic[3] religions compatible with the reason and moral intuition of man. It is not merely a system of positive moral rules, based on a true conception of human progress, but it is also "the establishment of certain

1 Mosheim, vol. i. p. 124. 2 *Ibid.*

3 For the use of these words see Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, chap. I.

principles, the enforcement of certain dispositions, the cultivation of a certain temper of mind, which the conscience is to apply to the ever-varying exigencies of time and place." The Teacher of Islam preached, in a thousand varied ways, universal love and brotherhood as the emblem of the love borne towards God. "How do you think God will know you when you are in His presence—by your love of your children, of your kin, of your neighbours, of your fellow-creatures?"[1] "Do you love your Creator? love your fellow-beings first."[2] "Do you wish to approach the Lord? love His creatures, love for them what you love yourself, reject for them what you reject for yourself, do unto them what you wish to be done unto you." He condemned in scathing language the foulness of impurity, the meanness of hypocrisy, and the ungodliness of self-deceit. He proclaimed, in unmistakable terms, the preciousness of truth, charity, and brotherly love.

The wonderful adaptability of Islâmic precepts to all ages and nations; their entire concordance with the light of reason; the absence of all mysterious doctrines to cast a shade of sentimental ignorance round the primal truths implanted in the human breast,—all prove that Islam represents the latest development of the religious faculties of our being. Those who have ignored the historic significance of some of its precepts have deemed that their seeming harshness, or unadaptability to present modes of thought ought to exclude it from any claim to universality. But a little inquiry into the historic value of laws and precepts, a little more fairness in the examination of facts, would evince the temporary character of such rules as may appear scarcely consonant with the requirements or prejudices of modern times. The catholicity of Islam, its expansiveness, and its charity towards all moral creeds, has been utterly mistaken, perverted, or wilfully concealed by the bigotry of rival religions.

"Verily," says the Koran, "those who believe (the Moslems), and those who are Jews, Christians, or Sabæans, whoever hath faith in God and the last day (future existence), and worketh that which is

1 *Mishkât*, bks. xxii. xxiii. chaps. xv. and xvi.

2 Comp. Kastalâni's *Commentary on the Sahih of Bukhâri*, pt. i. p. 70.

right and good,—for them shall be the reward with their Lord; there will come no fear on them; neither shall they be grieved."[1]

The same sentiment is repeated in similar words in the fifth Sura; and a hundred other passages prove that Islam does not confine "salvation" to the followers of Mohammed alone:—"To every one have we given a law and a way. . . . And if God had pleased, He would have made you all (all mankind) one people (people of one religion). But He hath done otherwise, that He might try you in that which He hath severally given unto you: wherefore press forward in good works. Unto God shall ye return, and He will tell you that concerning which ye disagree."[2]

Of all the religions of the world that have ruled the conscience of mankind, the Islam of Mohammed alone combines both the conceptions which have in different ages furnished the mainspring of human conduct,—the consciousness of human dignity, so valued in the ancient philosophies, and the sense of human sinfulness, so dear to the Christian apologist. The belief that man will be judged by his work solely, throws the Moslem on the practice of self-denial and universal charity; the belief in Divine Providence, in the mercy, love, and omnipotence of God, leads him to self-humiliation before the Almighty, and to the practice of those heroic virtues which have given rise to the charge that the virtues of Islam are stoical,"[3] patience, resignation, and firmness in the trials of life. It leads him to interrogate his conscience with nervous anxiety, to study with scrupulous care the motives that actuate him,[4] to distrust his own strength, and to rely upon the assistance of an Almighty and All-Loving Power in the conflict between good and evil.

In some religions the precepts which inculcated duties have been so utterly devoid of practicability, so completely wanting in a knowledge of human nature, and partaking so much of the

1 Sura v. 73. Compare the spirit of these teachings with that of the Athanasian Creed.

2 Sura v. 56. Compare also xxix. 45, xxxii. 23, 24, xxxix. 47, xl. 13, etc.

3 Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, p. 484.

4 Compare the first Apologue in the *Akhlâk* (Ethics) of Hussain Wâiz on *Ikhlâs*.

dreamy vagueness of enthusiasts, as to become in the real battles of life simply useless.[1] The practical character of a religion, its abiding influence on the common relations of mankind, in the affairs of everyday life, its power on the masses, are the true criteria for judging of its universality. We do not look to exceptional minds to recognise the nature of a religion. We search among the masses to understand its true character. Does it exercise deep power over them? does it elevate them? does it regulate their conception of rights and duties? does it, if carried to the South Sea islander, or preached to the Caffrarians, improve or degrade them?—are the questions we naturally ask. In Islam is joined a lofty idealism with the most rationalistic practicality. It did not ignore human nature; it never entangled itself in the tortuous pathways which lie outside the domains of the actual and the real. Its object, like that of other systems, was the elevation of humanity towards the absolute ideal of perfection; but it attained, or tries to attain, this object by grasping the truth that the nature of man is, in this existence, imperfect. If it did not say, "If thy brother smite thee on one cheek, turn thou the other also to him;" if it allowed the punishment of the wanton wrong-doer to the extent of the injury he had done,[2] it also taught, in fervid words and varied strains, the practice of forgiveness and benevolence, and the return of good for evil:—"Who speaketh better," says the Koran, "than he who inviteth unto God, and worketh good? . . . Good and evil shall not be held equal. Turn away evil with that which is better."[3] And again, speaking of paradise, it says, "It is prepared for the godly, who give alms in prosperity and adversity, who bridle their anger, and forgive men; for God loveth the beneficent."[4]

The practice of these noble precepts does not lie enshrined in the limbo of false sentimentalism. With the true follower of the Prophet they form the active principles of life. History has pre-

[1] Compare M. Ernest Havet's remarks in his valuable and learned work, *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, Pref. p. xxxix.

[2] Koran, sura xxii. 40, 41. Thonissen's remark, that Mohammed allowed the punishment of the wilful wrong-doer for the purpose of preventing enormous evils, must always be borne in mind.—*L'Hist. du Droit Criminel des Peuples Anciens*, vol. ii. p. 67.

[3] Koran, sura xli. 33, 34.

[4] Koran, sura v. 127, 128.

served, for the admiration of wondering posterity, many examples of patience under suffering exhibited by the followers of other creeds. But the practice of the virtue of patient forgiveness is easier in adversity, when we have no power to punish the evil-doer, than in prosperity. It is related of Hussain, that noble martyr of Kerbela, that a slave having once thrown the contents of a scalding dish over him as he sat at dinner, fell on his knees and repeated the verse of the Koran, "Paradise is for those who bridle their anger." "I am not angry," answered Hussain. The slave proceeded, "and for those who forgive men." "I forgive you." The slave, however, finished the verse, adding, "for God loveth the beneficent." "I give you your liberty and four hundred pieces of silver," replied Hussain.[1]

The author of the *Kashshâf* thus sums up the essence of the Islamic teachings: "Seek again him who drives you away; give to him who takes away from you; pardon him who injures you:[2] for God loveth that you should cast into the depth of your soul the roots of His perfections."[3]

In the purity of its aspiration, can anything be more beautiful than the following: "The servants of the Merciful are they that walk upon the earth softly; and when the ignorant speak unto them, they reply, Peace! they that spend the night worshipping their Lord, prostrate, and standing, and resting: those that, when they spend, are neither profuse nor niggardly, but take a middle course: . . . those that invoke not with God any other God, and slay not a soul that God hath forbidden otherwise than by right; and commit not fornication: . . . they who bear not witness to that which is false; and when they pass by vain sport, they pass it by with dignity: who say, 'Oh, our Lord, grant us of our wives and children such as shall be a comfort unto us, and make us examples unto the pious,'—these shall be the rewarded, for that they persevered; and they shall be

1 This anecdote has been told by Sale in a note to the third chapter of his translation of the Koran, and also by Gibbon; but both have, by mistake, applied the episode to Hassan, the brother of Hussain. See the *Tafsîr-Hussaini*, Mirat Ed. p. 199.

2 Compare this with the precept of Mohammed reported by Abû Dardâ, Mishkat, bk. iv. chap. i. part ii., and the whole chapter on "Forgiveness" (chap. xxxvi.) in the *Mustatrif*.

3 Zamakhsharî, (the *Kashshâf*), Egypt. Ed. part i. p. 280.

accosted in paradise with welcome and salutation :—For ever therein, —a fair abode and resting-place !" [1]

This is the Islâm of Mohammed. It is not "a mere creed; it is a life to be lived in the present"—a religion of right-doing, right-thinking, and right-speaking, founded on divine love, universal charity, and the equality of man in the sight of the Lord. However much the modern professors of Islam may have dimmed the glory of their Master (and a volume might also be written on the defects of modern Mahommedanism), the religion which enshrines righteousness and "justification by work" [2] deserves the recognition of the lovers of humanity.

مي توانی از ره آسان شدن بر آسمان
راست باش و راست رو کانجا نباشد کاستی

"Wishest thou to approach God?
Live purely, and act righteously."

Jellâl ud-din Rûmi says,—

از بهایم بهره داری وز ملایک نیز هم
بگذر از بهایم تا از ملایک هم بگذری

"Thou partakest of the nature of the beast as well as the angel;
Leave the nature of the beast, that thou mayest surpass the angel."

The present life was the seed-ground of the future. To work in all humility of spirit for the human good, to strive with all energy to approach the perfection of the All-Perfect, is the essential principle of Islam. The true Moslem is a true Christian, in that he accepts the ministry of Jesus, and tries to work out the moral preached by him. Why should not the true Christian do honour to the Preacher who put the finishing stroke to the work of the earlier Masters? Did not he call back the wandering forces of the world into the channel of progress?

Excepting for the conception of the sonship of Jesus, there is

1 Koran, sura xxv. 64–67.

2 Mr. Cotter Morrison, in his *Service of Man*, calls the other doctrine the most disastrous to human morality.

no fundamental difference between Christianity and Islâm. In their essence they are one and the same; both are the outcome of the same spiritual forces working in humanity. One was a protest against the heartless materialism of the Jews and the Romans; the other a revolt against the degrading idolatry of the Arabs, their ferocious customs and usages. Christianity, preached among a more settled and civilised people subject to an organised government, had to contend with comparatively milder evils. Islam, preached among warring tribes and clans, had to fight against all the instincts of self-interest and ancient superstition. Christianity, arrested in its progress towards the East by a man of cultured but bizarre character, who, though a Jew by birth, was by education an Alexandrian Greek, was carried to Greece and Rome, and there gathering up the pagan civilisation of centuries, gave birth to new ideas and doctrines. Christianity ceased to be Christian the moment it was transplanted from the home of its birth. It became the religion of Paul, and ceased to be that of Christ. The pantheons of ancient paganism were tottering to their fall. Greek and Alexandrian philosophy had prepared the Roman world for the recognition of an incarnate God—a demiurgus, an Æon born in the bosom of eternity, and this conception imbedded itself in Pauline Christianity. Modern idealistic Christianity, which is more a philosophy than a positive religion, is the product of centuries of pre-Christian and post-Christian civilisation. Islâm was preached among a people, among conditions social and moral, wholly divergent. Had it broken down the barrier which was raised against it by a degraded Christianity, and made its way among the higher races of the earth, its progress and its character would have presented a totally different aspect from what it now offers to the observer, among the less cultured Moslem communities. Like rivers flowing through varied tracts, both these creeds have produced results in accordance with the nature of the soil through which they have found their course. The Mexican who castigates himself with cactus leaves, the idol-worshipping South American, the lower strata of Christian nations, are hardly in any sense Christians. There exists a wide gulf between them and the leaders of modern Christian thought. Islâm, wherever it has found its way among culturable and progressive nations, has shown itself in complete accord with

progressive tendencies, it has assisted civilisation, it has idealised religion.[1]

A religion has to be eminently positive in its "commandments and prohibitions" to exercise an abiding salutary influence on the ignorant and uncultured. The higher and more spiritualised minds are often able to forge on the anvils of their own hearts, lines of duty in relation to their fellow creatures without reference to outside directions. They are in commune with God and are guided by the consciousness of right and wrong, of truth and purity which has grown up with their being. Plato and Aristotle, who had never received the light of the Semitic revelations, spoke to the world of the highest principles of morality in as distinct terms as the great prophets. They too had heard the voice of God, and were lifted up to Him by their own thoughts.

To the mass of mankind, however, sunk either in ignorance or barbarism, for the uncultured and the sodden, moral enunciations convey no meaning unless they are addressed in a positive form and formulated with the precision of enactments surrounded with definite sanctions. The ethical side of a religion does not appeal to their feelings or sentiments; and philosophical conceptions exercise no influence on their minds, their daily conduct or their lives.

They are swayed far more by authority and precedent than by sermons on abstract principles. They require definite prescriptions to regulate not only their relations towards their fellow-beings but also their Creator whom, in the absence of such rules, they are apt to forget.

The success of Islâm in the seventh century of the Christian era, and its rapid and marvellous diffusion over the surface of the globe, were due to the fact that it recognised this essential need of human nature. To a world of wrangling sects and creeds, to whom words were of far greater importance than practice, it spoke in terms

[1] The faith which could give birth to the heroic devotion of Ali, the gentleness of Jaafar (the Sadik), the piety and patience of Musa, the divine purity of Fatima, the saintliness of Rabia; the religion which could produce men like Ibn-Sîna, Al-Beiruni, Ibn-Khaldun, Sanai, Jellal ud-din Rumi, Farîd ud-din (the Attâr), Ibrahim Adham, and a host of others, surely contains every element of hopefulness.

of positive command from an Absolute Source. Amidst the moral and social wreck in which it found its birth, it aimed at the integration of the worship of a Personal Will, and thereby to recall humanity to the observance of duty which alone pointed to the path of spiritual development. And by its success in lifting up the lower races to a higher level of social morality it proved to the world the need of a positive system. It taught them sobriety, temperance, charity, justice and equality as the commandments of God. Its affirmation of the principle of equality of man and man and its almost socialistic tendency represented the same phase of thought that had found expression on the shores of Galilee. But even in his most exalted mood the great Teacher of Islam did not forget the limitations imposed on individual capacity which occasion economic inequalities.

Alas for the latter-day professors of Islâm! The blight of patristicism has ruined the blossom of true religion and a true devotional spirit.

A Christian preacher has pointed out with great force the distinction between religion and theology, and the evils which have followed in his Church from the confusion of the two.[1] What has happened in Christianity has happened in Islâm. Practice has given way to the mockery of profession, ceremonialism has taken the place of earnest and faithful work,—doing good to mankind for the sake of doing good, and for the love of God. Enthusiasm has died out, and devotion to God and His Prophet are meaningless words. The earnestness without which human existence is no better than that of the brute creation, earnestness in right-doing and right-thinking, is absent. The Moslems of the present day have ignored the spirit in a hopeless love for the letter. Instead of living up to the ideal preached by the Master, instead of "striving to excel in good works," "of being righteous;" instead of loving God, and for the sake of His love loving His creatures,—they have made themselves the slaves of opportunism and outward observance. It was natural that in their reverence and admiration for the Teacher his early disciples should stereotype his ordinary mode of life, crystallise the

[1] Professor Momerie in his *Defects of Modern Christianity*.

passing incidents of a chequered career, imprint on the heart orders, rules, and regulations enunciated for the common exigencies of the day in an infant society. But to suppose that the greatest Reformer the world has ever produced, the greatest upholder of the sovereignty of Reason, the man who proclaimed that the universe was governed and guided by law and order, and that the law of nature meant progressive development, ever contemplated that even those injunctions which were called forth by the passing necessities of a semi-civilised people should become immutable to the end of the world, is doing an injustice to the Prophet of Islâm.

No one had a keener perception than he of the necessities of this world of progress with its ever-changing social and moral phenomena, nor of the likelihood that the revelations vouchsafed to him might not meet all possible contingencies. When Muaz was appointed as governor of Yemen, he was asked by the Prophet by what rule he would be guided in his administration of that province. "By the law of the Koran," said Muâz. "But if you find no direction therein?" "Then I will act according to the example of the Prophet." "But if that fails?" "Then I will exercise my own judgment." The Prophet approved highly of the answer of his disciple, and commended it to the other delegates.

The great Teacher, who was fully conscious of the exigencies of his own times, and the requirements of the people with whom he had to deal,—people sunk in a slough of social and moral despond,—with his keen insight and breadth of views, perceived, and one may say foretold, that a time would come when the accidental and temporary regulations would have to be differentiated from the permanent and general. "Ye are in an age," he declared, "in which, if ye abandon one-tenth of what is ordered, ye will be ruined. After this, a time will come when he who shall observe one-tenth of what is now ordered will be redeemed."[1]

1 This authentic tradition is given in the *Jâmaa ut-Tirmizi* and is to be found also in the *Mishkât*.

وَعَنْ اَبِيْ هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ قَالَ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ اِنَّكُمْ فِيْ زَمَانٍ مَنْ تَرَكَ مِنْكُمْ عُشْرَ مَا اُمِرَ بِهِ هَلَكَ ثُمَّ يَاْتِيْ زَمَانٌ مَنْ عَمِلَ مِنْهُمْ عُشْرَ مَا اُمِرَ بِهِ نَجَا

رَوَاهُ التِّرْمِذِيُّ - مِشْكٰوةُ الْمَصَابِيْحِ - بَابُ الْاِعْتِصَامِ بِالْكِتَابِ وَالسُّنَّةِ

As we have already observed, the blight which has fallen on Mussalman nations is not due to the teachings of the Master. No religion contained greater promise of development, no faith was purer, or more in conformity with the progressive demands of humanity.

The present stagnation of the Mussalmân communities is principally due to the notion which has fixed itself on the minds of the generality of Moslems, that the right to the exercise of private judgment ceased with the early legists, that its exercise in modern times is sinful, and that a Moslem in order to be regarded as an orthodox follower of Mohammed should belong to one or the other of the schools established by the schoolmen of Islam, and abandon his judgment absolutely to the interpretations of men who lived in the ninth century, and could have no conception of the necessities of the nineteenth.

Among the Sunnis, it is the common belief that since the four Imams,[1] no doctor has arisen qualified to interpret the laws of the Prophet. No account is taken of the altered circumstances in which Moslems are now placed; the conclusions at which these learned legists arrived several centuries ago are held to be equally applicable to the present day. Among the Shiahs, the Akhbari will not allow his judgment to travel beyond the dictates of "the expounders of the law." Mohammed had consecrated reason as the highest and noblest function of the human intellect. Our schoolmen and their servile followers have made its exercise a sin and a crime.

As among Christians, so among Moslems. The lives and conduct of a large number of Moslems at the present day are governed less by the precepts and teachings of the Master, and more by the theories and opinions of the *mujtahids* and *imams* who have tried, each according to his light, to construe the revelations vouchsafed to the Teacher. Like men in a crowd listening to a preacher who from a lofty position addresses a large multitude and from his vantage ground overlooks a vast area, they observed only their immediate surroundings, and, without comprehending the wider meaning of his words or the nature of the audience whom he addressed, adapted his

[1] Abû Hanîfa, Shâfei, Mâlik, and Ibn Hanbal.

utterances to their own limited notions of human needs and human progress. Oblivious of the universality of the Master's teachings, unassisted by his spirit, devoid of his inspiration, they forgot that the Prophet, from the pinnacle of his genius, had spoken to all humanity. They mixed up the temporary with the permanent, the universal with the particular. Like many of the ecclesiastics of Christendom, not a few were the servants of sovereigns and despots whose demands were not consistent with the precepts of the Master. Canons were invented, theories started, traditions discovered, and glosses put upon his words utterly at variance with their spirit. And hence it is that most of the rules and regulations which govern now the conscience of so many professors of the faith are hardly derived from any express and positive declarations of the Koran, but for the most part from the lego-religious books with which the Islâmic world was flooded in the later centuries. "Just as the Hebrews deposed their Pentateuch in favour of the Talmud," justly observes an English writer, "so the Moslems have abolished the Koran in favour of the traditions and decisions of the learned." "We do not mean to say," he adds most pertinently, "that any Mohammedan if asked what was the text-book of his religion, would answer anything but the 'Koran;' but we do mean that practically it is not the Koran that guides his belief or practice. In the Middle Ages of Christendom it was not the New Testament, but the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas, that decided questions of orthodoxy; and in the present day, does the orthodox churchman usually derive his creed from a personal investigation of the teaching of Christ in the Gospels? Probably, if he refers to a document at all, the Church Catechism contents him; or if he be of a peculiarly inquiring disposition, a perusal of the Thirty-nine Articles will resolve all doubts. Yet he too would say his religion was drawn from the Gospels, and would not confess to the medium through which it was filtered. In precisely the same way modern Mohammedanism is constructed, and a large part of what Moslems now believe and practise is not to be found in the Koran at all."

And yet each system, each school contains germs of improvement, and if development is now stopped, it is not even the fault of the lawyers. It is due to a want of apprehension of the spirit of

the Master's enunciations, and even of those of the fathers of the Church.[1]

In the Western world, the Reformation was ushered in by the Renaissance and the progress of Europe commenced when it threw off the shackles of Ecclesiasticism. In Islam also, enlightenment must precede reform; and, before there can be a renovation of religious life, the mind must first escape from the bondage which centuries of literal interpretation and the doctrine of "conformity" have imposed upon it. The formalism that does not appeal to the heart of the worshipper must be abandoned; externals must be subordinated to the inner feelings; and the lessons of ethics must be impressed on the plastic mind; then alone can we hope for that enthusiasm in the principles of duty taught by the Prophet of Islam. The reformation of Islam will begin when once it is recognised that divine words rendered into any language retain their divine character and that devotions offered in any tongue are acceptable to God. The Prophet himself had allowed his foreign disciples to say their prayers in their own tongue.[2] He had expressly permitted others to recite the Koran in their respective dialects; and had declared that it was revealed in seven languages.

In the earliest ages of Islâm there was a consensus of opinion that devotion without understanding was useless. Imam Abu Hanifa considered the recitation of the *namâz* and also of the *Khutba* or sermon, lawful and valid in any language.[3] The disciples of Abû Hanifa, Abu Yusuf and Mohammed, have accepted the doctrine of their master with a certain variation. They hold that when a person does not know Arabic, he may validly offer his devotions in any other language[4]

1 The *Radd ul-Muhtâr* of Mohammed Amîn the Syrian, and the *Majma ul-Anhâr* of the Shaikh Zâdeh are as much in advance of the *Multeka* and the *Hedâya* as the views of an Eldon or Mansfield upon those of a Coke or Blackstone. The opinions of Shaikh Murtaza, in their liberal and liberalising tendencies, are far above those of the narrow-minded self-opinionated Mohakkik. But the servile Akhbari follows the latter in preference to the former.

2 Salman the Persian, whom Ali had saved from a lion, was the first to whom this permission was granted.

3 *Jawâhir ul-Akhlâti; Durr ul-Mukhtâr, Bab us-Salât* (Chapter on Prayer). This view is also given in the *Tajnîs*. Tahtawi states that the Imam's opinion is authoritative and should be followed. The commentator of the *Durr ul-Mukhtâr* also recognises the validity of reciting prayers in Persian.

4 This is construed by the *Ulemas* of the present day to mean, when the worshipper is unable to pronounce Arabic words! The absurdity of the explanation is obvious.

There is, however, one great and cogent reason why the practice of reciting prayers in Arabic should be maintained wherever it is possible and practicable. Not because it was the language of the Prophet, but because it has become the language of Islam and maintains the unity of sentiment throughout the Islamic world. And wherein lies more strength than in unity?

NOTE I.

The sumptuary prohibitions of Mohammed may be divided into two classes, *qualitative* and *quantitative*. The prohibition against excess in eating and drinking and others of the like import belong to the latter class. They were called forth in part by the peculiar semi-barbarous epicureanism which was coming into fashion among the Arabs from their intercourse with the demoralised Syrians and Persians, and in part by circumstances of which only glimpses are afforded us in the Koran. The absolute prohibition of swine's flesh, which may be classed under the head of qualitative prohibitions, arose, as is evident, from hygienic reasons and this prohibition must remain unchanged as long as the nature of the animal and the diseases engendered by the eating of the flesh remain as at present. The prohibition against dancing was directed against the orgiastic dances with which the heathen Arabs used to celebrate the Syro-Phœnician worship of their Ashtaroth, Moloch and Baal.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH MILITANT OF ISLÂM.

لَآ إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ [1]

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا وَالصَّابِئُونَ وَالنَّصَارَىٰ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

THE extraordinary rapidity with which the religion of the Arabian Prophet spread over the surface of the globe is one of the most wonderful phenomena in the history of religions. For centuries Christianity had hidden itself in byways and corners; not until it had largely absorbed and assimilated paganism, not until a half-pagan monarch had come to its assistance with edicts and orders, was it able to rear its head among the creeds of the world. Islam, within thirty years of the death of its Teacher, found its way into the hearts of millions of people. And before a century was well over the voice of the Recluse of Hira had rolled across three continents. The legions of the Cæsars and the Chosroes, who endeavoured to stop the on-rush of the new democracy preached in Arabia, were shattered to pieces by the children of the desert. Its wonderful success and marvellous effect upon the minds of men have given rise to the charge that, as a religion of the sword, Islam was propagated by the sword and upheld by the sword. We propose, therefore, carefully to examine the circumstances and facts connected with the rise of Islam, to see whether there is any truth in the statement.

At the time of the Prophet's advent into Medina, the two tribes

1 Sura ii. 257, "Let there be no compulsion in religion."

2 Sura v. 73; See p. 167. Compare this with the thunders of the Athanasian Creed.

of Aus and Khazrâj, who had been engaged in deadly conflict for years, had just ended their strife by a hollow peace. There was every prospect of the war breaking out again with fiercer animosity. The Jews, who after the onslaught of Jabala had accepted the clientage of the Medinite Arabs, were fast recovering their strength, and were openly threatening their pagan compatriots with the vengeance of the Messiah, whose appearance was hourly expected. The surrounding tribes, among whom the influence of the Koraish was supreme, were arrayed in all their desert ferocity against Medîna. The moment Mohammed appeared among the Medinites the elements of danger which threatened the new religion became apparent. The Meccan disciples who had braved death, and now faced destitution and exile for their Master and the light which he had brought to their hearts, were few and weak. His Medinite followers were not many; they were divided amongst themselves, actuated by tribal jealousies. An important faction, headed by an influential chieftain, an aspirant to the throne of Medîna, worked in the city on the side of the heathens.[1] The Jews, compact and united, jealously and relentlessly, with poison and with treachery, opposed him in every direction. But the heart, which did not fail when the Koraish threatened him with death, was not daunted when the existence of others depended on him. He at once set himself to the task of organising into a social entity the varied elements which had gathered round him as the minister of God. He substituted referees for the old tribal vendetta; he abolished the distinction of Aus and Khazraj; he comprehended the Jews and Christians in his little commonwealth, and planted germs of cordial relations among all believers; he proclaimed that a Jew, Sabæan, or Christian, whoever believed in God and future life, and acted righteously, "on him shall come no fear." To a people wedded to the worst type of heathenism, to a race with whom the shedding of blood was a second nature, he taught purity and truth, self-restraint, charity, and love of one's kind. "It shall be an expiation with God," he said to them, "when one shall drop his right of retaliation." "He who shall mediate between men for a good purpose shall be the gainer thereby, but the mediator for evil shall reap the fruit of his doing."[2]

[1] See *ante* p. 53

[2] Sura iv. 87.

Whilst engaged in this divine work of humanising his people, raising them from the abyss of degradation, purifying them from abominations, he is attacked by his enemies, ruthless and untiring in their vengeance. They had sworn his death and the extirpation of his creed. The apostates from the faith of their fathers, as the Koraish regarded Mohammed and his followers to be, had betaken themselves to the rival city, to plant the germs of revolutionary doctrines. United Arabia must annihilate these crazy enthusiasts who had forsaken home and wealth for the sake of an unseen God, so exacting in His worship, so insistent on the common duties of love, charity, and benevolence, on purity of thought and deed. From the moment of his entry into Medina, Mohammed's destiny had become intertwined with that of his people, and of those who had invited and welcomed him into their midst. His destruction meant the destruction of the entire body of people who had gathered round the minister of God. Surrounded by enemies and traitors, the whole of Arabia responding to the call of the Koraish, the ancient servitors of the national gods marching to their slaughter, his followers would have inevitably perished but for the swords in their hands. And it was not until their enemies were upon them that it was declared, "The infidels regard not in a believer either ties of blood or covenant; when they break their oaths of alliance, and attack you, defend yourself;" and again, "Defend yourself against your enemies; but attack them not first: God hateth the aggressor."[1] To the Moslems self-defence had become a question of self-preservation. They must either submit to be massacred or fight when they were attacked. They chose the latter alternative, and succeeded, after a long struggle, in subduing their enemies.

The bitter animosity of the Jews, their repeated violations of the most solemn engagements, their constant seditiousness, and their frequent endeavours to betray the Moslems to the idolaters, led naturally to severe chatisement. It was essentially necessary for the safety of the weak and small community, more as a deterrent warning than as a vindictive punishment.

We have no right to assume that because some of the great teachers who have from time to time appeared on earth have

[1] Sura ii, 286.

succumbed under the force of opposing circumstances and become martyrs, that because others have created in their brains an unrealised Utopia, that because dreamers have existed, and enthusiasts have suffered, Mohammed was bound to follow their example, and leave the world before he had fulfilled his mission. Nor was he obliged to sacrifice himself and the entire community over which he was called to preside, for the sake of carrying out what, in the present time, would be called an 'Idea.'

Let us compare the struggles of the Moslems in self-defence, and for self-preservation, with the frightful wars of the Jews and the Christians, and even of the gentle Parsis, for the propagation of their respective faiths. In the case of the Jews, aggression and extirpation were sanctified by religion. They were cursed for sparing.

In the case of the early Christians, the doctrine of humility and meekness, preached by the Prophet of Nazareth, was soon forgotten in the pride of power. From the moment Christianity became a recognised force,—the dominant faith of a community,—it became aggressive and persecuting. Parallels have been drawn between Jesus and Mohammed by different writers. Those fully penetrated with the conviction of the godhead of Jesus have recognised in the "earthly" means employed by the Arabian Prophet for the regeneration of his people the result of "Satanic suggestions," while the non-employment of such means (perhaps from want of opportunity to use them) has been looked upon as establishing the divinity of the Prophet of Nazareth. We shall furnish reasons to show that such comparisons are unfair, based as they are on what is not only false to history, but false to human nature.

The circumstances attending the lives of Jesus and Mohammed were wholly different. During his short ministry the influence of Jesus remained confined to a small body of followers, taken chiefly from the lower and uneducated ranks. He fell a victim[1] to the passions he had evoked by his scathing denunciations of the lifeless sacerdotalism of the priestly classes—to the undying hatred of a

[1] I write according to the generally received opinion among Western scholars; that Mohammed, in accordance with the traditions current in his time, believed that Jesus miraculously disappeared, there is no doubt. In spite of this so-called apocryphal Gnostic tradition being opposed to the general body of Christian traditions, there is as much historic probability on one side as the other; See *ante*, p. lviii.

relentless race—before his followers had become either numerous or influential enough to require practical rules for their guidance, or before they could form an organisation, either for purposes of spiritual teaching, or as a safeguard against the persecutions of the dominant creed. Drawn from among a people with settled laws, the observance of which was guaranteed by the suzerain power, the followers of Jesus had no occasion to constitute themselves into an organised body, nor had the Teacher any need to frame rules of practical positive morality. The want was felt when the community became more extensive, and the genius of a scholar, well-versed in the Neo-Platonic lore, destroyed the individuality and simplicity of the teachings of the Master.

Mohammed, like Jesus, was followed from the commencement of his career as a preacher and reformer by the hostility and opposition of his people. His followers also, in the beginning, were few and insignificant. He also was preceded by men who had shaken off the bondage of idolatry, and listened to the springs of life within. He, too, preached gentleness, charity, and love.

But Mohammed appeared among a nation steeped in barbarous usages, who looked upon war as the object of life,—a nation far removed from the materialising, degrading influences of the Greeks and the Romans, yet likewise far from their humanising influences. At first his enunciations evoked scorn, and then vengeful passions. His followers, however, increased in number and strength until at last the invitation of the Medinites crowned his glorious work with success. From the moment he accepted the asylum so nobly proffered, from the moment he was called upon to become their chief magistrate as well as their spiritual teacher, his fate became involved in theirs; from that time the hostilities of the idolaters and their allies required an unsleeping vigilance on the part of the Moslems. A single city had to make head against the combined attacks of the multitudinous tribes of Arabia. Under these circumstances, energetic measures were often necessary to sustain the existence of the Moslem commonwealth. When persuasion failed, pressure was required.

The same instinct of self-preservation which spoke so warmly within the bosom of the great Prophet of Nazareth,[1] when he

[1] Luke xxii. 36.

advised his disciples to look to the instruments of defence, caused the persecuted Moslems to take up arms when attacked by their relentless enemies.

Gradually, by gentle kindness and energy, all the disjointed fragments of the Arabian tribes were brought together to the worship of the true God, and then peace settled upon the land. Born among a people the most fiery of the earth, then as now vehement and impulsive by nature, and possessed of passions as burning as the sun of their desert, Mohammed impressed on them habits of self-control and self-denial such as have never before been revealed in the pages of history.

At the time of Mohammed's advent international obligations were unknown. When nations or tribes made war upon each other, the result usually was the massacre of the able-bodied, the slavery of the innocent, and plunder of the household penates.

The Romans, who took thirteen centuries to evolve a system of laws which was as comprehensive as it was elevated in conception,[1] could never realise the duties of international morality or of humanity They waged war for the sole purpose of subjugating the surrounding nations. Where they succeeded, they imposed their will on the people absolutely. Treaties were made and broken, just as convenience dictated. The liberty of other nations was never of the slightest importance in their estimation.[2] The introduction of Christianity made little or no change in the views entertained by its professors concerning international obligations. War was as inhuman and as exterminating as before; people were led into slavery without compunction on the part of the captors; treaties were made and broken just as suited the purpose of some designing chieftain. Christianity did not profess to deal with international morality, and so left its followers groping in the dark.

Modern thinkers, instead of admitting this to be a real deficiency in the Christian system, natural to the unfinished state in which it was left, have tried to justify it. A strange perversion of the human intellect! Hence, what is right in the individual comes to be considered wrong in the nation, and *vice versâ*. Religion and

1 In justice to the Semitic races, I must say that almost all the great jurists of Rome were Semites,—Phœnicians, Syrians, or Carthaginians.

2 Compare Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew* throughout on this subject.

morality, two convertible terms, are kept apart from the domain of law. Religion, which claims to regulate the tie of individual men, ignores the reciprocal relations of the various aggregates of humanity. Religion is thus reduced into mere sentimentalism, an object of gushing effusion, or mutual laudation at debating societies, albeit sometimes rising to the dignity of philosophical morality.

The basis of international obligations, as has been ably observed, consists in the recognition of nations as individuals, and of the fact that there is not one standard for individuals and another for nations; for as individuals compose a nation, so nations compose humanity; and the rights of nations and their obligations to each other in nowise differ from those existing between individuals.[1]

True it is, that the rise of the Latin Church in the West, and the necessary augmentation of the power of the bishops of Rome, introduced in the Latin Christian world a certain degree of international responsibility. But this was absolutely confined to the adherents of the Church of Rome, or was occasionally extended as a favour to Greek Christianity. The rest of the world was unconditionally excluded from the benefits of such responsibility. "The name of religion served as the plea and justification of aggression upon weaker nations; it led to their spoliation and enslavement." Every act of violation was sanctified by the Church, and, in case of extreme iniquity, absolution paved the criminal's way to heaven. From the first slaughters of Charlemagne, with the full sanction of the Church, to the massacre and enslavement of the unoffending races of America, there is an unbroken series of the infringement of international duties and the claims of humanity. This utter disregard of the first principles of charity led also to the persecution of those followers of Jesus who ventured to think differently from the Church.[2]

The rise of Protestantism made no difference. The wars and mutual persecutions of the several religious factions form a history in themselves. "Persecution," says Hallam, "is the deadly original sin of the Reformed Churches, that which cools every honest man's

1 Comp. David Urquhart's essay on the Effects of the Contempt of International Law, reprinted from *The East and West*, Feb. 1867.

2 Compare Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 352, and Lecky, *History of Rationalism in Europe*, chap. on Persecution.

zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more expansive." [1]

But, however much the various new-born Churches disagreed among themselves, or from the Church of Rome, regarding doctrinal and theological points, they were in perfect accord with each other in denying all community of interests and rights to nations outside the pale of Christendom.[2]

The spirit of Islâm, on the contrary, is opposed to isolation and exclusiveness. In a comparatively rude age, when the world was immersed in darkness, moral and social, Mohammed preached those principles of equality which are only half-realised in other creeds, and promulgated laws which, for their expansiveness and nobility of conception, would bear comparison with the records of any faith. "Islam," says the able writer to whom we have referred above, "offered its religion, but never enforced it; and the acceptance of that religion conferred co-equal rights with the conquering body, and emancipated the vanquished States from the conditions which every conqueror, since the world existed up to the period of Mohammed, had invariably imposed."

By the laws of Islâm, liberty of conscience and freedom of worship were allowed and guaranteed to the followers of every other creed under Moslem dominion. The passage in the Koran, "Let there be no compulsion in religion," [3] testifies to the principle of toleration and charity inculcated by Islam. "What wilt thou force men to believe when belief can come only from God?"—"Adhere to those who forsake you; speak truth to your own heart; do good to every one that does ill to you:" these are the precepts of a Teacher who has been accused of fanaticism and intolerance. Let it be remembered that these are the utterances, not of a powerless enthusiast or philosophical dreamer paralysed by the weight of

1 Hallam's *Const. Hist. of England*, vol. i. chap. ii. p. 62. When Calvin burnt Servetus for his opinions regarding the Trinity, his act was applauded, says Lecky, by all sections of Protestants. Melanchthon, Bullinger, and Farel wrote to express their warm approbation of the crime. Beza defended it in an elaborate treatise; Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, vol. ii. p. 49. A study of the penal laws of England against the Catholics, Dissenters, and non-Conformists is enough to shock any candid mind.

2 Grotius, the founder, perhaps, of international law in Europe, formally excepted the Moslems from all community of rights with the European nations.

3 Sura ii. 257 (a Medîna sura).

opposing forces. These are the utterances of a man in the plenitude of his power, of the head of a sufficiently strong and well-organised State, able to enforce his doctrines with the edge of his reputed sword.

In religion, as in politics, individuals and sects have preached toleration, and insisted upon its practice only so long as they have been powerless and feeble. The moment they have acquired strength enough to battle with the forces which they wish to supersede, tolerance gives way to persecution. With the accession of Constantine to the throne of the Cæsars, Christianity was safe from molestation. But from that period commenced a system of religious persecution in its atrocity paralleled only by that of the Jews. "From the very moment," says Lecky, "the Church obtained civil power under Constantine, the general principle of coercion was admitted and acted on, both against the Jews, the heretics, and pagans."[1] They were tortured with every refinement of cruelty; they were burnt at a slow-consuming fire to enable them to think of the charity and humanity of the church of Christ. Father after father wrote about the holiness of persecution. One of the greatest saints of the Church, "a saint of the most tender and exquisite piety"—supplied arguments for the most atrocious persecution. Except during the Titanic struggles in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Christian church, purporting to derive its authority from the Apostles, has never hesitated to encourage war,—or to give its sanction, in the name of religion and "the glory of Christ" to exterminating enterprises against heretics and heathens. These had no claims on Christian humanity or the law of nations; nor have the poor black races now! In the fifteenth century, the Pope granted a special charter by which the non-Christian world was allotted to the Portuguese and Spaniards in equal shares with absolute power to convert the inhabitants in any way they chose! History records how liberally they construed the permission. And all the atrocious doctrines relating to persecution and the treatment of non-Christians are unjustly based upon the words of Jesus himself! Did not the Master say, "Compel them to come in"?

In the hour of his greatest triumph, when the Arabian Prophet entered the old shrine of Mecca and broke down the idols, it was

1 Comp. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of England*, vol. i. chap. iii. p. 98.

not in wrath or religious rage, but in pity, that he said—"Truth is come, darkness departeth,"—announcing amnesty almost universal, commanding protection to the weak and poor, and freeing fugitive slaves.

Mohammed did not merely preach toleration; he embodied it into a law. To all conquered nations he offered liberty of worship. A nominal tribute was the only compensation they were required to pay for the observance and enjoyment of their faith. Once the tax or tribute was agreed upon, every interference with their religion or the liberty of conscience was regarded as a direct contravention of the laws of Islâm.[1] Could so much be said of other creeds? Proselytism by the sword was wholly contrary to the instincts of Mohammed, and wrangling over creeds his abhorrence. Repeatedly he exclaims, "Why wrangle over that which you know not; try to excel in good works; when you shall return to God, He will tell you about that in which you have differed."

We must now return to our examination of the wars of the Prophet. We have seen that the various conflicts of the Moslems under Mohammed with the surrounding tribes were occasioned by the aggressive and unrelenting hostility of the idolaters, and were necessary for self-defence.

The battle of Mûta and the campaign of Tabûk, the earliest demonstrations against a foreign State, arose out of the assassination of an envoy by the Greeks. Probably we should not have heard of the promulgation of Islam by the sword had the Moslems not punished the eastern Christians for this murder. The battle of Muta was indecisive, and the campaign of Tabuk, which was entirely defensive in its nature, (being undertaken to repulse the gathering of the forces of Heraclius), left this international crime unpunished during the lifetime of the Prophet; but his successors did not forget it, and a heavy penalty was exacted.

The extent of the Greek empire brought the Moslems into a state of belligerency with the greatest portion of Christendom. Besides, the anomalous position occupied by the governors of the provinces under the waning suzerainty of the Byzantine emperors rendered it impossible for the Moslem Chiefs to put an end to this condition of affairs by means of treaty-stipulations with any one of

[1] See chapter on *The Political Spirit of Islâm.*

them. Before one could be subdued and brought to terms another committed some act of hostility, and compelled the Moslems to punish him. Hence the career once entered upon, they were placed in just warfare with nearly the whole of Christendom.[1]

Religion has often furnished to designing chieftains, among Moslems as among Christians, a pretext for the gratification of ambition. The Moslem casuists, like the Christian jurists and divines, have divided the world into two regions—the *Dâr ul-Harb* and the *Dâr ul-Islâm*, the counterparts of Heathendom and Christendom. An examination, however, of the principles upon which the relations of Moslem states with non-Moslem countries were based, shows a far greater degree of liberality than has been evinced by Christian writers on international law. It is only in recent times, and under stress of circumstances that non-Christian states have been admitted into the "comity of nations." The Moslem jurists, on the other hand, differentiate between the condition of belligerency and that of peace. The expression, *Dâr ul-Harb*,[2] thus includes countries with which the Moslems are at war; whilst the States with which they are at peace are the *Dâr ul-Amân*.[3] The *harbi*, the inhabitant of the *Dâr ul-Harb*, is an alien, pure and simple. He has no right to enter Islamic States without express permission. But once he receives the *âmân* or guarantee of safety from even the poorest Moslem, he is perfectly secure from molestation for the space of one year. On the expiration of that period, he is bound to depart. The inhabitant of the *Dâr ul-Amân* is a *mustâmin*. The *âmân* may be for ever or for a limited duration; but so long as it lasts, the *mustâmin's* treatment is regulated in strict accordance

1 See Urquhart's *Islam as a Political System*. I do not mean to assert that the Moslems were never actuated by the spirit of aggression or by cupidity. It would be showing extreme ignorance of human nature to make such an assertion. It was hardly possible, that after the unprecedented progress they had made against their enemies and assailants, and after becoming aware of the weakness of the surrounding nations, they should still retain their moderation, and keep within the bounds of the law. Nor do I shut my eyes to the fact that there have been wars among the followers of Mohammed perhaps as cruelly waged as among the Christians. But these wars have been invariably dynastic. The persecutions to which certain sects have been subjected have arisen also, for the most part, from the same cause. The persecution of the descendents of Mohammed, the children of Ali and Fatima, by the Ommeyyades, found its origin in the old hatred of the Koraish to Mohammed and the Hâshimis, as I shall show hereafter.

2 *Lit. the country of war.* 3 *The country of peace*

with the terms of the treaty with his country.[1] The *Mustâmins* were governed by their own laws, were exempt from taxation and enjoyed other privileges.

The spirit of aggression never breathed itself into that code which formally incorporated the Law of Nations with the religion; and the followers of Mohammed, in the plenitude of their power, were always ready to say to their enemies, "Cease all hostility to us, and be our allies, and we shall be faithful to you; or pay tribute, and we will secure and protect you in all your rights; or adopt our religion, and you shall enjoy every privilege we ourselves possess."

The principal directions of Mohammed, on which the Moslem laws of war are founded, show the wisdom and humanity which animated the Islamic system: "And fight for the religion of God against those who fight against you; but transgress not (by attacking them first), for God loveth not the transgressors; . . . if they attack you, slay them; . . . but if they desist, let there be no hostility, except against the ungodly."[2]

In turning their arms against Persia the Moslems were led on by circumstances. The Munzirs, a dynasty of semi-Arab kings who reigned under the shadow of the Persian monarchy, though politically hostile, were allied to the Byzantines by ties of faith and community of interests. The first conflicts of the Moslems with the Greeks naturally re-acted on the Hirites, the subjects of the Munzirs. The Hirite territories comprehended a large tract of country, from the banks of the Euphrates westward, overlapping the desert of Irak, and almost reaching the pasturage of the Ghassânide Arabs, who owned allegiance to the Byzantines.

The position of Hîra under the Persians was similar to that of Judæa under Augustus or Tiberius. About the time of the Moslem conquest a Persian nominee ruled this principality; but the jealousy of the Chosroes associated a *marzbân*, or satrap, with the successor of the Munzirs, whose subjects, as impatient of control then as their descendants now, engaged in predatory raids on the neighbouring tribes, and became involved in hostilities with the Moslems. A strong government under the guidance of a single ruler, whose

1 These *Âmâns* formed the origin of the Capitulations which have proved the ruin of Turkish resources.

2 Sura, ii. 186, compare ver. 257.

power had become doubly consolidated after the suppression of the revolts of the nomades on the death of the Prophet, was little inclined to brook quietly the insults of the petty dependency of a tottering empire. A Moslem army marched upon Hîra; the *marzbân* fled to Madain (Ctesiphon), the capital of the Persian empire, and the Arab chief submitted, almost without a struggle, to the Moslems under Khâlid bin-Walîd.

The conquest of Hîra brought the Moslems to the threshold of the dominion of the Chosroes. Persia had, after a long period of internecine conflict, signalised by revolting murders and atrocities, succeeded in obtaining an energetic ruler, in the person of Yezdjard. Under the directions of this sovereign, the Persian general brought an imposing force to bear on the Moslems. The great Omar who now ruled at Medina, before taking up the challenge, offered to Yezdjard. through his deputies, the usual terms by which war might be avoided. These terms were, the profession of Islam, which meant the reform of the political abuses that had brought the Kyanian empire so low; the reduction of all those heavy taxes and perquisites,[1] which sucked out the life-blood of the nation; and the administration of justice by the code of Mohammed, which held all men, without distinction of rank or office, equal in the eye of the law. The alternative offer was the payment of tribute in return for protection. These terms were disdainfully refused by the Persian monarch and the days of Kadesia followed. After the conquest of Madain (Ctesiphon), the Caliph promulgated peremptory orders that under no circumstance should the Moslems cross the Tigris towards the East, and that that river should for ever form the boundary between the Persian and the Saracenic empires. Upon this basis a peace was concluded. But Irân chafed under the loss of Mesopotamia; and the successive breaches of faith by the Persians led to Nehavend. The Kesra's power was irretrievably shattered; many of his nobles and the chiefs of the priesthood, whose interest it was to keep up the reign of disorder and oppression, were cut off, and he himself became a fugitive like another Darius. The nation at large

[1] Save the tenth on landed property, and 2½ per cent. of every man's means for the poor, the distribution of which would have been left to himself and his officers.

hailed the Moslems as their deliverers.[1] The advance of the Saracens from the Tigris to the Elburz and from the Elburz to Transoxiana was like that of the British in India and due to similar causes.

The general conversion of the Persians to the religion of Mohammed, and the almost total extinction of the Magian worship, are often taken as proofs of the intolerant character of Islam. But, in the blindness of bigotry, even scholars forget the circumstances under which the Moslems entered the country. Every trace of religious life was extinct among the people; the masses were ground down by the worst of all evils, a degenerate priesthood and a licentious oligarchy. The Mazdakian and Manichæan heresies had loosened every rivet in the social fabric. Kesra Anushirvan had only postponed for a time the general disruption of society.

The consequence was, that as soon as the Moslems entered the country as the precursors of law and order, a general conversion took place, and Persia became for ever attached to Islâm.[2]

An impartial analyst of facts will now be able to judge for himself how much truth there is in the following remark of Muir: "It was essential to the permanence of Islam that its aggressive course should be continuously pursued, and that its claim to an universal acceptance, or, at the least, to an universal supremacy, should be enforced at the point of the sword."[3] Every religion, in some stage of its career, has, from the tendencies of its professors, been aggressive. Such also has been the case with Islam; but that it ever aims at proselytism by force, or that it has been more aggressive than other religions, must be entirely denied.[4]

Islâm seized the sword in self-defence, and held it in self-defence, as it will ever do. But Islam never interfered with the dogmas of any moral faith, never persecuted, never established an Inquisition. It never invented the rack or the stake for stifling difference of opinion, or strangling the human conscience, or exterminating

1 Yezdjard, like Darius, was assassinated by his own people. See my *Short History of the Saracens*, (Macmillan 1899) p. 32.

2 As a testimony to the spirit which animated the Moslems, we quote the following from Gibbon: "The administration of Persia was regulated by an actual survey of the people, the cattle, and the fruits of the earth; and this monument, which attests the vigilance of the caliphs, might have instructed the philosophers of every age."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. v. p. 97. See also Suyûtî, *Târikh ul-Khulafâ* (*History of the Caliphs*).

3 Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, vol. iii. p. 251.

4 Compare Niebuhr's remarks in his *Description de l' Arabie*.

heresy. No one who has a competent knowledge of history can deny that the Church of Christ, when it pretended to be most infallible, "shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind." In England, after it became Protestant, the Presbyterians, through a long succession of reigns, were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged, and exposed in the pillory. In Scotland, they were hunted like criminals over the mountains; their ears were torn from the roots; they were branded with hot irons; their fingers were wrenched asunder by thumbkins; the bones of their legs were shattered in the boots. Women were scourged publicly through the streets. The Catholics were tortured and hung. Anabaptists and Arians were burnt alive. But as regards non-Christians, Catholics and Protestants, orthodox and un-orthodox, were in perfect accord. Mussulmans and Jews were beyond the pale of Christendom. In England, the Jews were tortured and hung. In Spain, the Moslems were burnt. Marriages between Christians and Jews, and Christians and "infidels," were null and void, in fact prohibited under terrible and revolting penalties. Even now, Christian America burns alive a Christian negro marrying a Christian white woman. Such has been the effect produced by Christianity.

To this day, wherever scientific thought has not infused a new soul, wherever true culture has not gained a foothold, the old spirit of exclusiveness and intolerance, the old ecclesiastical hatred of Islam, displays itself in writings, in newspaper attacks, in private conversations, in public speeches. The spirit of persecution is not dead in Christianity; it is lying dormant, ready to burst into flame at the touch of the first bigot.

Let us turn from this picture to the world of Islâm. Whilst orthodox Christianity persecuted with equal ferocity the Jews and Nestorians,—the descendants of the men who were supposed to have crucified its Incarnate God, and the men who refused to adore his mother,—Islam afforded them both shelter and protection Whilst Christian Europe was burning witches and heretics, and massacring Jews and "infidels," the Moslem sovereigns were treating their non-Moslem subjects with consideration and tolerance. They were the trusted subjects of the State, councillors of the empire. Every secular office was open to them along with the

Moslems. The Teacher himself had declared it lawful for a Moslem to intermarry with a Christian, Hebrew, or Zoroastrian. The converse was not allowed, for obvious political reasons. Moslem Turkey and Persia entrust their foreign interests to the charge of their Christian subjects. In Christendom, difference of faith has been a crime; in Islâm it is an accident. "To Christians," says Urquhart, "a difference of religion was indeed a ground for war, and that not merely in dark times and amongst fanatics." From the massacres, in the name of religion, of the Saxons, the Frisians and other Germanic tribes by Charlemagne; from the burning to death of the thousands of innocent men and women; from the frightful slaughters of the Arians, the Paulicians, the Albigenses and the Huguenots, from the horrors of the sacks of Magdeburg and Rome, from the sanguinary scenes of the Thirty Years' War, down to the cruel persecutions of Calvinistic Scotland and Lutheran England, there is an uninterrupted chain of intolerance, bigotry, and fanaticism. Can anything be more heart-rending than the wholesale extermination of the unoffending races of America in the name of Christ?

It has been said that a warlike spirit was infused into mediæval Christianity by aggressive Islam! The massacres of Justinian and the fearful wars of Christian Clovis in the name of religion, occurred long before the time of Mohammed.

Compare, again, the conduct of the Christian Crusaders with that of the Moslems. "When the Khalif Omar took Jerusalem, A. D. 637, he rode into the city by the side of the Patriarch Sophronius, conversing with him on its antiquities. At the hour of prayer, he declined to perform his devotions in the Church of the Resurrection, in which he chanced to be, but prayed on the steps of the Church of Constantine; for, said he to the Patriarch, 'had I done so, the Mussulmans in a future age might have infringed the treaty, under colour of imitating my example.' But in the capture by the Crusaders, the brains of young children were dashed out against the walls; infants were pitched over the battlements; men were roasted at fires; some were ripped up, to see if they had swallowed gold; the Jews were driven into their synagogue, and there burnt; a massacre of nearly 70,000 persons took place; and

the pope's legate was seen partaking in the triumph!"[1] When Saladin recaptured the city, he released all Christians, gave them money and food, and allowed them to depart with a safe-conduct.[2]

Islam "grasped the sword" in self-defence; Christianity grasped it in order to stifle freedom of thought and liberty of belief. With the conversion of Constantine, Christianity had become the dominant religion of the Western world. It had thenceforth nothing to fear from its enemies; but from the moment it obtained the mastery, it developed its true character of isolation and exclusiveness. Wherever Christianity prevailed, no other religion could be followed without molestation. The Moslems, on the other hand, required from others a simple guarantee of peace and amity, tribute in return for protection, or perfect equality,—the possession of equal rights and privileges,—on condition of the acceptance of Islâm.

1 Draper, *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*, vol. ii. p. 22.

2 For a full account see *Short History of the Saracens*, p. 356.

CHAPTER IV.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN ISLÂM.

الجنة تحت اقدام الامّهات [1]

IN certain stages of social development, polygamy, or more properly speaking, polygyny,—the union of one man with several women,—is an unavoidable circumstance. The frequent tribal wars and the consequent decimation of the male population, the numerical superiority of women, combined with the absolute power possessed by the chiefs, originated the custom which, in our advanced times, is, justly regarded as an unendurable evil.

Among all Eastern nations of antiquity polygamy was a recognised institution. Its practice by royalty, which everywhere bore the insignia of divinity, sanctified its observance to the people. Among the Hindoos, polygamy, in both its aspects, prevailed from the earliest times. There was, apparently, as among the ancient Medes, Babylonians, Assyrians, and Persians, no restriction as to the number of wives a man might have. A high caste Brahmin, even in modern times, is privileged to marry as many wives as he chooses. Polygamy existed among the Israelites before the time of Moses, who continued the institution without imposing any limit on the number of marriages which a Hebrew husband might contract. In later times, the Talmud of Jerusalem restricted the number by the ability of the husband to maintain the wives properly; and though the Rabbins counselled that a man should not take more than four wives, the Karaites differed from them, and did not recognise the validity of any limitation.

[1] "Paradise is at the foot of the mother;" Mohammed.

To the Persians, religion offered a premium on the plurality of wives.[1]

Among the Syro-Phœnician races, whom the Israelites displaced, conquered, or destroyed, polygamy was degraded into bestiality.[2]

Among the Thracians, Lydians, and the Pelasgian races settled in various parts of Europe and Western Asia, the custom of plurality of marriages prevailed to an inordinate extent, and dwarfs all comparison with the practice prevailing elsewhere.[3]

Among the Athenians, the most civilised and most cultured of all the nations of antiquity, the wife was a mere chattel, marketable and transferable to others, and a subject of testamentary disposition. She was regarded in the light of an evil, indispensable for the ordering of the household and procreation of children. An Athenian was allowed to have any number of wives; and Demosthenes gloried in the possession by his people of three classes of women, two of which furnished the legal and semi-legal wives.[4]

Among the Spartans, though the men were not allowed, unless under especial circumstances, to have more than one wife, the women could have, and almost always had, more than one husband.[5]

The peculiar circumstances under which the Roman State was originally constituted probably prevented the introduction of legal polygamy at the commencement of its existence. Whatever the historical truth of the Rape of the Sabines, the very existence of the tradition testifies to the causes which helped to form the primitive laws of the Romans on the subject of matrimony. In the surrounding states generally, and especially among the Etruscans, plurality of marriage was a privileged custom. The contact, for centuries, with the other nations of Italy, the wars and conquests of ages, combined with the luxurious habits which success engendered, at last resulted in making the sanctity of marriage a mere by-word amongst the Romans. Polygamy was not indeed legalised, but "after the Punic triumphs the matrons of Rome aspired to the common benefits of a free and opulent republic, and their wishes

1 Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, pp. 405, 406.
2 Lev. xviii. 24.
3 *Encyclopedie Universelle*, art. "Mariage;" Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii. p. 233.
4 Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii. pp. 233-238.
5 Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. vi. p. 136.

were gratified by the indulgence of fathers and lovers."[1] Marriage soon became a simple practice of promiscuous concubinage. Concubinage recognised by the laws of the State acquired the force of a privileged institution. The freedom of women, the looseness of the tie which bound them to men, the frequency with which wives were changed or transferred, betoken in fact the prevalence of polygamy, only under a different name.

In the meantime, the doctrines of primitive Christianity preached on the shores of Galilee began to irradiate the whole Roman world. The influence of the Essenes, which is reflected visibly in the teachings of Jesus, combined with an earnest anticipation of the Kingdom of Heaven, had led the Prophet of Nazareth to depreciate matrimony in general, although he never interdicted or expressly forbade its practice in any shape.

Polygamy flourished in a more or less pronounced form until forbidden by the laws of Justinian. But the prohibition contained in the civil law effected no change in the moral ideas of the people, and polygamy continued to be practised until condemned by the opinion of modern society. The wives, with the exception of the one first married, laboured under severe disabilities. Without rights, without any of the safeguards which the law threw around the favoured first one, they were the slaves of every caprice and whim of their husbands. Their children were stigmatised as bastards, precluded from all share in the inheritance of their father, and treated as outcasts from society.

Morganatic and left-handed marriages were not confined to the aristocracy. Even the clergy, frequently forgetting their vows of celibacy, contracted more than one legal or illegal union. History proves conclusively that, until very recent times, polygamy was not considered so reprehensible as it is now. St. Augustine[2] himself seems to have observed in it no intrinsic immorality or sinfulness, and declared that polygamy was not a crime where it was the legal institution of a country. The German reformers, as Hallam points out, even so late as the sixteenth century, admitted the validity of a second or a third marriage contemporaneously with the first, in default of issue and other similar causes.

1 Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. ii. p. 206.
2 St. Augustine, lib. ii. *cont. Faust* ch. xlvii.

Some scholars, whilst admitting that there is no intrinsic immorality in a plurality of wives, and that Jesus did not absolutely or expressly forbid the custom, hold that the present monogamous practice, in one sense general throughout Europe, arose from the engrafting of either Germanic or Hellenic-Roman notions on Christianity.[1] The latter view is distinctly opposed to fact and history and deserves no credit. As regards the Germans, the proof of their monogamous habits and customs rests upon the uncorroborated testimony of one or two Romans, of all men the most untrustworthy witnesses to facts when it was to their interest to suppress them. Besides, we must remember the object with which Tacitus wrote his *Manners of the Germans.* It was a distinct attack upon the licentiousness of his own people, and, by contrasting the laxity of the Romans with the imaginary virtues of barbarians, was intended to introduce better ideas into Rome. Again, supposing that Tacitus is right, to what cause should we ascribe the polygamous habits of the higher classes of the Germans, even up to the nineteenth century?[2]

Whatever may have been the custom of the Romans in early times, it is evident that in the latter days of the republic and the commencement of the empire, polygamy must have been accepted as an institution, or, at least, not regarded as illegal. Its existence is assumed, and its practice recognised, by the edict which interfered with its universality. How far the Prætorian Edict succeeded in remedying the evil, or diverting the current of public opinion, appears from the rescript of the Emperors Honorius and Arcadius towards the end of the fourth century, and the practice of Constantine and his son, both of whom had several wives. The emperor Valentinian II, by an edict, allowed all the subjects of the empire, if they pleased, to marry several wives; nor does it appear from the ecclesiastical history of those times that the bishops and the heads of the Christian Churches made any objection to this law.[3] Far from it, all the succeeding emperors practised polygamy, and the people generally were not remiss in following their example.

1 M. Barthelemy St. Hilaire appears to hold the opinion that monogamy was engrafted upon Christianity from Hellenic and Roman sources.

2 Comp. *Encyclopedie Universelle*, art, " Mariage."

3 Comp. *Encyclopedie Universelle*, art. " Mariage," and Davenport, *Apology for Mahomet.*

This state of the laws continued until the time of Justinian, when the concentrated wisdom and experience of thirteen centuries of progress and development in the arts of life resulted in the proclamation of the laws which have shed a factitious lustre on his infamous reign. But these laws owed little to Christianity, at least directly. The greatest adviser of Justinian was an atheist and a pagan. Even the prohibition of polygamy by Justinian failed to check the tendency of the age. The law represented the advancement of thought; its influence was confined to a few thinkers, but to the mass it was a perfectly dead letter.

In the western parts of Europe, the tremendous upheaval of the barbarians, the intermingling of their moral ideas with those of the people among whom they settled, tended to degrade the relations between man and wife. Some of the barbaric codes attempted to deal with polygamy,[1] but example was stronger than precept, and the monarchs, setting the fashion of plurality of wives, were quickly imitated by the people[2]. Even the clergy, in spite of the recommendation to perpetual celibracy held out to them by the Church, availed themselves of the custom of keeping several left-handed wives by a simple licence obtained from the bishop or the head of their diocese[3].

The greatest and most reprehensible mistake committed by Christian writers is to suppose that Mohammed either adopted or legalised polygamy. The old idea of his having introduced it, a sign only of the ignorance of those who entertained that notion, is by this time exploded; but the opinion that he adopted and legalised the custom is still maintained by the common masses, as well as by many of the learned in Christendom. No belief can be more false.

Mohammed found polygamy practised, not only among his own people, but amongst the people of the neighbouring countries, where it assumed some of its most frightful aspects. The laws of the Christian empire had indeed tried to correct the evil, but without

1 Like the laws of Theodoric. But they were based on advanced Byzantine notions.

2 For polygamy among the Merovingian and Carlovingian sovereigns, see *Short History of the Saracens*, (Macmillian 1899) p. 623.

3 Comp. Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i. p. 87, and note; *Middle Ages*, p. 353 (1 vol. ed.).

avail. Polygamy continued to flourish unchecked, and the wretched women, with the exception of the first wife, selected according to priority of time, laboured under severe disabilities.

The corruptness of morals in Persia about the time of the Prophet was fearful. There was no recognised law of marriage, or, if any existed, it was completely ignored. In the absence of any fixed rule in the Zend-Avesta as to the number of wives a man might possess, the Persians indulged in a multitude of regular matrimonial connections, besides having a number of concubines.[1]

Among the ancient Arabs and the Jews there existed, besides the system of plurality of wives, the custom of entering into conditional, as well as temporary contracts of marriage. These loose notions of morality exercised the most disastrous influence on the constitution of society within the peninsula.

The reforms instituted by Mohammed effected a vast and marked improvement in the position of women. Both among the Jews and the non-nomadic Arabs the condition of women was degraded in the extreme. The Hebrew maiden, even in her father's house, stood in the position of a servant; her father could sell her if a minor. In case of his death, the sons could dispose of her at their will and pleasure. The daughter inherited nothing, except when there were no male heirs.[2] Among the settled pagan Arabs, who were mostly influenced by the corrupt and effete civilisation of the neighbouring empires, a woman was considered a mere chattel; she formed an integral part of the estate of her husband or her father; and the widows of a man descended to his son or sons by right of inheritance, as any other portion of his patrimony. Hence the frequent unions between step-sons and step-mothers which, when subsequently forbidden by Islam, were branded under the name of *Nikâh ul-Makt* ("shameful or odious marriages"). Even polyandry was practised by the half-Jewish, half-Sabæan tribes of Yemen.[3]

The pre-Islamite Arabs carried their aversion to women so far as to destroy, by burying alive, many of their female children. This fearful custom, which was most prevalent among the tribes of Koraish and Kendah, was denounced in burning terms by Moham-

[1] Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. i. p. 406.
[2] Num. xxx. 17.
[3] Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, vol. ii. p. 318.

med and was prohibited under severe penalties, along with the inhuman practice, which they, in common with other nations of antiquity, observed, of sacrificing children to their gods.

In both the empires, the Persian and the Byzantine, women occupied a very low position in the social scale. Fanatical enthusiasts, whom Christendom in later times canonised as saints, preached against them and denounced their enormities, forgetting that the evils they perceived in women were the reflections of their own jaundiced minds. It was at this time, when the social fabric was falling to pieces on all sides, when all that had hitherto kept it together was giving way, when the cry had gone forth that all the older systems had been weighed in the scale of experience and found wanting, that Mohammed introduced his reforms.

The Prophet of Islâm enforced as one of the essential teachings of his creed, "respect for women." And his followers, in their love and reverence for his celebrated daughter, proclaimed her "the Lady of Paradise," as the representative of her sex. "Our Lady of Light"[1] is the embodiment of all that is divine in womanhood,—of all that is pure and true and holy in her sex,—the noblest ideal of human conception. And she has been followed by a long succession of women, who have consecrated their sex by their virtues. Who has not heard of the saintly Rabia and a thousand others her equals?

In the laws which the Arabian Prophet promulgated he strictly prohibited the custom of conditional marriages, and though at first temporary marriages were tacitly allowed, in the third year of the Hegira even these were forbidden.[2] Mohammed secured to women, in his system, rights which they had not before possessed; he allowed them privileges the value of which will be more fully appreciated as time advances. He placed them on a footing of perfect equality with men in the exercise of all legal powers and functions. He restrained polygamy by limiting the maximum number of contemporaneous marriages, and by making absolute equity towards all obligatory on the man. It is worthy of note that the clause in the

[1] *Khâtûn-i-jinnat, Fâtimat-uz-zahrâ.*

[2] A section of the Shiahs still regard temporary marriages as lawful. But with all deference to the Mujtahids, who have expounded that view, I cannot help considering that it was put forward to suit the tastes of the times, or of the sovereigns under whom these lawyers flourished. In many of their doctrines one cannot fail to perceive the influence of personal inclinations.

Koran which contains the permission to contract four contemporaneous marriages, is immediately followed by a sentence which cuts down the significance of the preceding passage to its normal and legitimate dimensions. The passage runs thus, "You may marry two, three, or four wives, but not more." The subsequent lines declare, "but if you cannot deal equitably and justly with all, you *shall* marry only one." The extreme importance of this proviso, bearing especially in mind the meaning which is attached to the word "equity" (*aadl*) in the Koranic teachings, has not been lost sight of by the great thinkers of the Moslem world. *Aadl* signifies not merely equality of treatment in the matter of lodgment, clothing and other domestic requisites but also complete equity in love, affection and esteem. As absolute justice in matters of feeling is impossible, the Koranic presciption amounted in reality to a prohibition. This view was propounded as early as the third century of the Hegira.[1] In the reign of al-Mamun. the first Mutazalite doctors taught that the developed Koranic laws inculcated monogamy. And though the cruel persecutions of the mad bigot, Mutawakkil, prevented the general diffusion of their teachings, the conviction is gradually forcing itself on all sides, in all advanced Moslem communities, that polygamy is as much opposed to the teachings of Mohammed as it is to the general progress of civilised society and true culture.[2]

The fact must be borne in mind, that the existence of polygamy depends on circumstances. Certain times, certain conditions of society, make its practice absolutely needful for the preservation of women from starvation or utter destitution. If reports and statistics speak true, the greatest proportion of the frightful immorality prevalent in the centres of civilisation in the West arises from absolute destitution. Abbe Huc and Lady Duff Gordon have both remarked that in the generality of cases sheer force of circumstances drives people to polygamy in the East.

With the progress of thought, with the ever-changing conditions of this world, the necessity for polygamy disappears, and its practice is tacitly abandoned or expressly forbidden. And hence it is, that in

1 *The Radd ul-Muhtâr* distinctly says "some doctors [the Mutazala] hold that *aadl* includes equality in love and affection, but *our* masters differ from this view and confine it to equal treatment in the matter of *nafkah*, which in the language of law, signifies food, clothing and lodgment."

2 Compare the remarks on this subject of Moulvi Chiragh Ali in his able work called, *Are Reforms possible in Mahommedan States?*

those Moslem countries where the circumstances which made its existence at first necessary are disappearing, plurality of wives has come to be regarded as an evil, and as an institution opposed to the teachings of the Prophet; while in those countries where the conditions of society are different, where the means which, in advanced communities, enable women to help themselves are absent or wanting, polygamy must necessarily continue to exist. Perhaps the objection may be raised, that as the freedom of construction leaves room for casuistical distinctions, the total extinction of polygamy will be a task of considerable difficulty. We admit the force of this objection, which deserves the serious consideration of all Moslems desirous of freeing the Islamic teachings from the blame which has hitherto been attached to them, and of moving with advancing civilisation. But it must be remembered that the elasticity of laws is the greatest test of their beneficence and usefulness. And this is the merit of the Koranic provision. It is adapted alike for the acceptance of the most cultured society and the requirements of the least civilised. It ignores not the needs of progressive humanity, nor forgets that there are races and communities on the earth among whom monogamy may prove a dire evil. The task of abolishing polygamy, however, is not so difficult as is imagined. The blight that has fallen on the Moslem nations is due to the patristic doctrine which has prohibited the exercise of individual judgment (*Ijtihâd*). The day is not far distant when an appeal to the Teacher's own words will settle the question whether the Islamist will follow Mohammed or the Fathers of the Church, who have misused the Master's name to satisfy their own whimsicalities, or the capricious dictates of Caliphs and Sultans, whose obsequious servants they were. Europe has gone through the same process herself, and instead of hurling anathemas at the Church of Mohammed, ought to watch, with patience and sympathy, the efforts of regenerated Islam to free itself from patristic bondage. When once the freedom from the enthralment of old ideas is achieved, it will be easy for the jurists of each particular Moslem State to abolish, by an authoritative dictum, polygamy within that State. But such a consummation can only result from a general progress in the conception of facts, and a proper understanding of the Prophet's teachings. Polygamy is disappearing, or will soon disappear, under the new light in which his words are being studied.

As remarked already, the compatibility of Mohammed's system with every stage of progress shows their Founder's wisdom. Among unadvanced communities, polygamy, hedged by all the safeguards imposed by the Prophet, is by no means an evil to be deplored. At least it is preferable to those polyandrous customs and habits and modes of life which betoken an utter abandonment of all moral self-restraint. As culture advances, the mischiefs resulting from polygamy are better appreciated, and the meaning of the prohibition better comprehended. We are by no means prepared to say that the Mussalmans of India have benefited greatly by their intermixture with the Brahminical races, among whom prostitution was a legalised custom. Their moral ideas have become lax; the conception of human dignity and spiritual purity has become degraded; the class of *hetairai* has become as popular among them as among their pagan neighbours. And yet there are signs visible which bid us hope that God's light, which lit up Arabia in the seventh century, will fall on their hearts and bring them out of the darkness in which they are now plunged. The Mutazali is, by conviction, a strict monogamist; according to him the law forbids a second union during the subsistence of a prior contract. In other words, a Mutazali marriage fulfils in every respect the requirements of an essentially monogamous marriage as a "voluntary union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others."

Even among the archaic sects, a large and influential body hold polygamy to be unlawful, the circumstances which rendered it permissible in primitive times having either passed away or not existing in the present day.

As a matter of fact, the feeling against polygamy is becoming a strong social, if not a moral, conviction, and many extraneous circumstances, in combination with this growing feeling, are tending to root out the custom from among the Indian Mussalmâns. It has become customary among all classes of the community to insert in the marriage-deed a clause, by which the intending husband formally renounces his supposed right to contract a second union during the continuance of the first marriage. Among the Indian Mussalmans ninety-five men out of every hundred are at the present moment, either by conviction or necessity, monogamists. Among the educated classes, versed in the history of their ancestors, and able to compare

it with the records of other nations, the custom is regarded with disapprobation. In Persia, only a small fraction of the population enjoy the questionable luxury of plurality of wives.[1] It is earnestly to be hoped that, before long, a general synod of Moslem doctors will authoritatively declare that polygamy, like slavery, is abhorrent to the laws of Islam.

We now turn to the subject of Mohammed's marriages, which to many minds not cognisant of the facts, or not honest enough to appreciate them, seem to offer a fair ground of reproach against the Prophet of Islam. His Christian assailants maintain that in his own person by frequent marriages he assumed a privilege not granted by the laws, and that he displayed in this manner a weakness of character little compatible with the office of prophet. Truer knowledge of history, and a more correct appreciation of facts, instead of proving him to be a self-indulgent libertine, would conclusively establish that the man, poor and without resource himself, when he undertook the burden of supporting the women whom he married in strict accordance with the old patriarchal institution, was undergoing a self-sacrifice of no light a character. And we believe that a thorough analysis of motives from the standpoint of humanity will demonstrate the falsehood and uncharitableness of the charges levelled at "the Great Arabian." When Mohammed was only twenty-five years of age, in the prime of life, he married Khadîja, much his senior in years. For twenty-five years his life with her was an uninterrupted sunshine of faithfulness and happiness. Through every contumely and outrage heaped on him by the idolaters, through every persecution, Khadîja was his sole companion and helper. At the time of Khadîja's death Mahommed was in the fifty-first year of his age. His enemies cannot deny, but are forced to admit, that during the whole of this long period they find not a single flaw in his moral character. During the lifetime of Khadîja, the Prophet married no other wife, notwithstanding that public opinion among his people would have allowed him to do so had he chosen.

Several months after Khadîja's death and on his return, helpless and persecuted, from Tayef, he married Sauda, the widow of one Sakran, who had embraced Islam, and had been forced to fly into Abyssinia to escape the persecution of the idolaters. Sakran had

[1] Only two per cent. according to Col Macgregor.

died in exile, and left his wife utterly destitute. According to the customs of the country, marriage was the only means by which the Teacher could protect and help the widow of his faithful disciple. Every principle of generosity and humanity would impel Mohammed to offer her his hand. Her husband had given his life in the cause of the new religion; he had left home and country for the sake of his faith; his wife had shared his exile, and now had returned to Mecca destitute. As the only means of assisting the poor woman, Mohammed, though straitened for the very means of daily subsistence, married Saudâ.

Abdullah, the son of Osmân Abû Kuhâfa, known afterwards in history as Abu Bakr, "the Father of the Virgin," was one of the most devoted followers of Mohammed. He was one of the earliest converts to the faith of the Prophet; and in his sincere, earnest and unvarying attachment to Mohammed he might almost be compared with Ali.

Abû Bakr, as by anticipation we may well call him, had a little daughter named Ayesha, and it was the desire of his life to cement the attachment which existed between himself and the Prophet, who had led him out from the darkness of scepticism, by giving Mohammed his daughter in marriage. The child was only seven years of age, but the manners of the country recognised such alliances. At the earnest solicitation of the disciple, the little maiden became the wife of the Prophet.

Some time after the arrival of the fugitives at Medîna there occurred an incident which throws considerable light on the conditions of life among the Arabs of the time. Those who know the peculiarities of the Arab character—"pride, pugnacity, a peculiar point of honour, and a vindictiveness of wonderful force and patience"—will be able to appreciate the full bearing of the story. Even now "words often pass lightly between individuals," says Burton, "which suffice to cause a blood-feud amongst Bedouins." Omar Ibn ul-Khattab, who afterwards became the second Caliph of Islam, had a daughter of the name of Hafsa. This good lady had lost her husband at the battle of Badr, and being blessed with a temper as fiery as that of her father, had remained ever since without a husband. The disciples bent upon matrimony fought shy of her. It was almost a reflection on the father; and Omar, in order to get

rid of the scandal, offered his daughter's hand to Abû Bakr, and, upon his declining the honour, to Osman. He also met the offer with a refusal. This was little less than a direct insult, and Omar proceeded in a towering rage to Mohammed to lay his complaint before the Prophet. The point of honour must anyhow be settled in his favour. But neither Abu Bakr nor Osman would undertake the burden of Hafsa's temper:—a dispute, ludicrous in its origin from our point of view, but sufficiently serious then to throw into commotion the small body of the Faithful. In this extremity the chief of the Moslems appeased the enraged father by marrying the daughter. And public opinion not only approved, but was jubilant over it.[1]

Hind Umm Salmâ, Umm Habîba, and Zainab Umm ul-Masâkîn,[2] three other wives of the Prophet, had also been widows, whom the animosity of the idolaters had bereft of their natural protectors, and whom their relations were either unable or unwilling to support.

Mohammed had married his devoted friend and freedman, Zaid, to a high-born lady of the name of Zainab, descended from two of the noblest families of Arabia. Proud of her birth, and perhaps also of her beauty, her marriage with a freedman rankled in her breast. Mutual aversion at last culminated in disgust. Probably this disgust on the husband's part was enhanced by the frequent repetition, in a manner which women only know how to adopt, of a few words which had fallen from the lips of Mohammed on once seeing Zainab. He had occasion to visit the house of Zaid, and

1 The story told by Muir, Sprenger, and Osborn, with some amount of gloating, of the domestic squabble between Hafsa and Mohammed, concerning Mary, the Coptic girl presented to the Prophet's household by the Negus, is absolutely false and malicious. A tradition, which is repudiated by all the respectable commentators of the Koran, and which must have been invented in the time of some Ommeyyade or Abbasside sensualist, founded on the weakest authority, has been seized with avidity by these critics for the vilification of the Prophet. The verse in the Koran which has been supposed to refer to this story, refers, in truth, to a wholly different circumstance. Mohammed, in his boyhood, when he tended the flocks of his uncle, had acquired a fondness for honey, which was often supplied by Zainab. Hafsa and Âyesha set to work to make him give up honey, and they succeeded in inducing him to vow he would never touch it. But after he had made the vow to her came the thought that he was making something unlawful in which there was nothing unlawful, simply to please his wives. His conscience smote him as to his weakness, and then came the verse, "O Prophet, why holdest thou that to be prohibited which God has made lawful, seeking to please thy wives?"—(Zamakhsharî.)

2 "Mother of the poor," so called from her charity and benevolence.

upon seeing Zainab's unveiled face, had exclaimed, as a Moslem would say at the present day when admiring a beautiful picture or statue, "Praise be to God, the ruler of hearts!"

The words, uttered in natural admiration, were often repeated by Zainab to her husband to show how even the Prophet praised her beauty, and naturally added to his displeasure. At last he came to the decision not to live any longer with her, and with this determination he went to the Prophet and expressed his intention of being divorced. "Why," demanded Mohammed, "hast thou found any fault in her?" "No," replied Zaid, "but I can no longer live with her." The Prophet then peremptorily said, "Go and guard thy wife; treat her well and fear God, for God has said, 'Take care of your wives, and fear the Lord!'" But Zaid was not moved from his purpose, and in spite of the command of the Prophet he divorced Zainab. Mohammed was grieved at the conduct of Zaid, more especially as it was he who had arranged the marriage of these two uncongenial spirits.

After Zainab had succeeded in obtaining a divorce from Zaid, she commenced importuning Mohammed to marry her, and was not satisfied until she had won for herself the honour of being one of the wives of the Prophet.[1]

Another wife of Mohammed was called Juwairiya. She was the daughter of Haris, the chief of the Banı Mustalik, and was taken prisoner by a Moslem in an expedition undertaken to repress their revolt. She had made an agreement with her captor to purchase her freedom for a stipulated sum. She petitioned Mohammed for the amount, which he immediately gave her. In recognition of this kindness, and in gratitude for her liberty, she offered her hand to Mohammed, and they were married. As soon as the Moslems heard of this alliance, they said amongst themselves the Banu Mustalik are now connections of the Prophet, and we must treat

1 Tibri (Zotenberg's translation), vol. iii. p. 58. This marriage created a sensation amongst the idolaters, who, whilst marrying their step-mothers and mothers-in-law, looked upon the marriage of the divorced wife of an adopted son (as Zaid at one time was regarded by Mohammed) by the adoptive father as culpable. To disabuse the people of the notion that adoption creates any such tie as real consanguinity, some verses of chap. xxxiii. were delivered, which destroyed the pagan custom of forbidding or making sacred the person of a wife or husband, or intended wife or husband, by merely calling her mother, sister, father, or brother—much less by her or him being first allied to an adopted son or daughter. One of the greatest tests of the Prophet's purity is that Zaid never swerved from his devotion to his master.

them as such. Each victor thereupon hastened to release the captives he had made in the expedition, and a hundred families, thus regaining their liberty, blessed the marriage of Juwairiya with Mohammed.[1]

Safiya, a Jewess, had also been taken prisoner by a Moslem in the expedition against Khaibar. Her, too, Mohammed generously liberated, and elevated to the position of his wife at her request.

Maimuna, whom Mohammed married in Mecca, was his kinswoman, and was already above fifty. Her marriage with Mohammed, besides providing for a poor relation the means of support, gained over to the cause of Islam two famous men, Ibn-Abbas and Khalid bin-Walîd, the leader of the Koraish cavalry in the disastrous battle of Ohod, and in later times the conqueror of the Greeks.

Such was the nature of the marriages of Mohammed. Some of them may possibly have arisen from a desire for male offspring, for he was not a god, and may have felt the natural wish to leave sons behind him. He may have wished also to escape from the nickname which the bitterness of his enemies attached to him.[2] But taking the facts as they stand, we see that even these marriages tended in their results to unite the warring tribes, and bring them into some degree of harmony.

The practice of *Thâr* (vendetta) prevailed among the heathen Arabs; blood-.feuds decimated tribes. There was not a family without its blood-feud, in which the men were frequently murdered, and the women and children reduced to slavery. Moses had found the practice of *Thar* existing among his people (as it exists among all people in a certain stage of development); but failing to abolish it, had legalised it by the institution of sanctuaries. Mohammed, with a deeper conception of the remedies to be applied, connected various rival families and powerful tribes to each other and to himself by marriage ties. Towards the close of his mission, standing on the

1 Ibn-Hishâm, p. 729.

2 With savage bitterness the enemies of the Prophet applied to him the nick-name of *al-abtar* on the death of his last son. This word literally means "one whose tail has been cut off." Among the ancient Arabs, as among the Hindoos, a male issue was regarded as the continuation of the blessings of the gods; and the man who left no male issue behind was looked upon as peculiarly unfortunate. Hence the bitter word applied to the Prophet; Koran, chap. cviii. (see the *Kashshâf*). Hence, also, the idolatrous Arabs used to bury alive their female offspring, which Mohammed denounced and reprehended in burning terms; Comp. Koran xvii. 34, etc.

Mount of Arafat, he proclaimed that from that time all blood-feuds should cease.

The malevolence of unfair and uncandid enemies has distorted the motives which, under the sanction of the great patriarchs of ancient times, led Mohammed to have a plurality of wives, and so provide helpless or widowed women with subsistence in the lack of all other means. By taking them into his family, Mohammed provided for them in the only way which the circumstances of the age and the people rendered possible.

People in the West are apt to regard polygamy as intrinsically evil, and its practice not only illegal, but the result of licentiousness and immorality. They forget that all such institutions are the offspring of the circumstances and necessities of the times. They forget that the great patriarchs of the Hebraic race, who are regarded by the followers of all Semitic creeds as exemplars of moral grandeur, practised polygamy to an extent which, to our modern ideas, seems the culmination of legalised immorality. We cannot perhaps allow their practice or conduct to pass unquestioned, in spite of the sanctity which time-honoured legend has cast around them. But in the case of the Prophet of Arabia, it is essential we should bear in mind the historic value and significance of the acts.

Probably it will be said that *no* necessity should have induced the Prophet either to practise or to allow such an evil custom as polygamy, and that he ought to have forbidden it absolutely, Jesus having overlooked it. But this custom, like many others, is not absolutely evil. Evil is a relative term. An act or usage may be primarily quite in accordance with the moral conceptions of societies and individuals; but progress of ideas and changes in the condition of a people may make it evil in its tendency, and, in process of time, it may be made by the State, illegal. That ideas are progressive is a truism; but that usages and customs depend on the progress of ideas, and are good or evil according to circumstances, or as they are or are not in accordance with the conscience,—"the spirit of the time"—is a fact much ignored by superficial thinkers.

One of the most remarkable features in the history of early Christianity is its depreciation of marriage. Matrimony was regarded as a condition of inferiority, and the birth of children an evil. Monasticism had withdrawn from the world the most vigorous minds;

the lay-clergy were either not allowed to marry, or to marry but once. This morbid feature was partly due to the example of the Master, and partly the resultant of a variety of circumstances which pressed upon the early Christian organisation.

The Nazarene Prophet's intimate connection with the Essene ascetics, his vivid anticipation of the immediate advent of a kingdom of God, where all social relations would be at an end, and the early cessation of his ministry, all explain his depreciation of matrimony, and we may add, perhaps, his never entering the married state. His association with the Baptist, himself an Essene, throws light upon the history of a short but most pathetic life. The strong and inexplicable antipathy of Paul towards the female sex, joined to the words of the Master, strengthened in the Church the Essenic conception that the union of man and woman in the holiest of ties was an act of sinfulness, an evil to be avoided so far as possible. Marriage was regarded as having for its sole object the procreation of children and the gratification of "man's carnal lusts," and the marriage services of most of the Christian Churches bear to this day the impress of this primitive notion. It was under these influences, the idea engrafted itself upon Christianity, which still retains its hold where not displaced by humanitarian science, that a person who has never married is a far superior being to one who has contaminated himself by marriage. The ash-covered Yogis of India, the matted-locked ascetics of the East generally, the priests of Buddha, were celibates. According to them, "knowledge was unattainable without sundering all the loving ties of home and family, and infinity impossible of realisation without leading a life of singleness." Celibacy passed into Christianity through many hands from Eastern Gnosticism and and Asceticism. The "sinlessness" of Jesus has been regarded by some as a proof of his divinity, by others as an indication of his immeasurable superiority over the rest of the teachers of the world. To our mind, the comparison or contrast which is so falsely instituted between Jesus and Mohammed appears wholly misconceived, and founded upon a wrong estimate of moral ideals. If never marrying constitutes a man an ideal being, then all the ascetics, the hermits, the dervishes are perfect. A perfect life would then imply a total abandonment of all domestic relations. Surely this view would be a perversion of nature, and end in disastrous consequences to humanity.

But if it be not so, then why this disparagement of the Prophet, who fulfilled the work of Jesus? Is it because he married more wives than one? We have shown what these marriages meant; we have at least endeavoured to show that in those very deeds which have been used to calumniate him, he was undergoing a sacrifice.

But let us look for a moment at his marriages from an abstract point of view. Why did Moses marry more than one wife? Was he a moral, or a sensual man for doing so? Why did David, "the man after God's heart," indulge in unlimited polygamy? The answer is plain—each age has its own standard. What is suited for one time is not suited for the other, and we must not judge of the past by the standard of the present. Our ideals do not lose their greatness or their sublimity by having acted truthfully and honestly up to the standard of their age. Would we be justified in calling Jesus a vain, ambitious, unpractical dreamer, or Moses and David sanguinary sensualists, because the mind of one was filled with vague imaginings of expected sovereignty, and the lives of the others were so objectionable from the nineteenth century point of view? In both cases we would be entirely wrong; the aspirations of the one, the achievements of the others, were all historical facts, in accord with their times. It is the truest mark of the Prophet that, in his most exalted mood, he does not lose sight of the living in his anticipation of the yet unborn. In his person he represents the growth and development of humanity. Neither Jesus nor Mohammed could at once efface existing society, or obliterate all national and political institutions. Like Jesus, Mohammed contented himself, except where ordinances were necessary, to meet the requirements of the moment, "with planting principles in the hearts of his followers which would, when the time was ripe for it, work out their abolition."

As regards the statement that Mohammed assumed to himself a privilege which he denied to his followers, only thus much need be said, that it is founded on a misconception resulting from ignorance. The limitation on polygamy was enunciated at Medina some years after the exile; and the provision regarding himself, instead of being a privilege assumed by a libertine, was a burden conscientiously imposed on a self-conscious, self-examining soul. All his marriages were contracted before the revelation came restricting polygamy; and with that came the *other* which took away from him

all privileges. Whilst his followers were free, (subject to the conditions imposed by the law), to marry to the limit of four, and by the use of the power of divorce, which, in spite of the Prophet's denunciations, they still exercised, could enter into fresh alliances, he could neither put away any of his wives, whose support he had undertaken, nor could he marry any other. Was this the assumption of a "privilege;" or was it not a humane provision for those already allied to him—and to himself, a revelation of perfect self-abnegation in his prophetic task?

The subject of divorce has proved a fruitful source of misconception and controversy; but there can be no question that the Koranic laws concerning the treatment of women in divorce are of "better humanity and regard for justice than those of any other scripture."

Among all the nations of antiquity, the power of divorce has been regarded as a necessary corollary to the law of marriage; but this right, with a few exceptions, was exclusively reserved for the benefit of the stronger sex; the wife was under no circumstance entitled to claim a divorce.

The progress of civilisation and the advancement of ideas led to a partial amelioration in the condition of women. They, too, acquired a qualified right of divorce, which they were never backward in exercising freely, until the facility with which marriages were contracted and dissolved under the Roman emperors passed into a by-word.

Under the ancient Hebraic Law, a husband could divorce his wife for any cause which made her disagreeable to him, and there were few or no checks to an arbitrary and capricious use of his power. Women were not allowed to demand a divorce from their husbands for any reason whatsoever.[1]

In later times, the Shammaites, to some extent, modified the custom of divorce by imposing certain restrictions on its exercise, but the school of Hillel upheld the law in its primitive strictness.

At the time of the Prophet's appearance, the Hillelite doctrines were chiefly in force among the Jewish tribes of Arabia, and repudiations by the husbands were as common among them as among the pagan Arabs.

1 Ex. xxi. 2; Deut. xxi. 14, xxiv. 1. Compare also Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii pp. 339, 340; and Selden's *Uxor Hebraica, in loco.*

Among the Athenians the husband's right to repudiate the wife was as unrestricted as among the ancient Israelites.

Among the Romans, the legality of the practice of divorce was recognised from the earliest times. The laws of the Twelve Tables admitted divorce. And if the Romans, as is stated by their admirers, did not take advantage of this law until five hundred years after the foundation of their city, it was not because they were more exemplary than other nations, but because the husband possessed the power of summarily putting his wife to death for acts like poisoning, drinking, and the substitution of a spurious child. But the wife had no right to sue for a divorce ;[1] and if she solicited separation, her temerity made her liable to punishment. But in the later Republic, the frequency of divorce was at once the sign, the cause, and the consequence of the rapid depravation of morals.

We have selected the two most prominent nations of antiquity whose modes of thought have acted powerfully on modern ways of thinking and modern life and manners. The laws of the Romans regarding divorce were marked by a progressive spirit, tending to the melioration of the condition of women, and to their elevation to an equality with men. This was the result of the advancement of human ideas, as much as of any extraneous cause.

"The ambiguous word which contains the precept of Jesus is flexible to any interpretation that the wisdom of the legislator can demand."[2] We may well suppose that at the time Jesus uttered the words, "What God has joined, let not man put asunder," he had no other idea than that of stemming the torrent of moral depravity, and he did not stop to consider the ultimate tendency of his words. The subsequent rule, which makes fornication[3] (using the translated word) the only ground of valid divorce, shows abundantly that Jesus was alive to the emergency.[4] But the "wisdom"

1 Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, vol. ii p. 255.
2 Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. iv. (2nd Ed.) p. 209.
3 Matt. xxix. 9.
4 Two of the Christain Gospels make no mention of the reason for which Jesus allowed his followers "to put away" their wives (Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18). If the traditions recorded by these two Gospels be considered of higher authority than those passing under the name of Matthew, then our contention is that Jesus, whilst preaching noble sentiments, and inculcating high principles of morality, did not intend his words should be considered as an immutable and positive law, nor had he any other idea than that of stemming the rising tide of immorality and irreligion. Selden thinks that by an evasive

of subsequent legislators has not confined itself to a blind adherence to a rule laid down probably to suit the requirement of an embryonic community, and delivered verbally. The rule may be regarded as inculcating a noble sentiment; but that it should be considered as the typical law of divorce is sufficiently controverted by the multitudinous provisions of successive ages in Christian countries.

Among the Arabs, the power of divorce possessed by the husband was unlimited. They recognised no rule of humanity or justice in the treatment of their wives. Mohammed looked upon the custom of divorce with extreme disapproval, and regarded its practice as calculated to undermine the foundations of society.[1] He repeatedly declared that nothing pleased God more than the emancipation of slaves, and nothing more displeased Him than divorce. It was impossible, however, under the existing conditions of society to abolish the custom entirely. He was to mould the mind of an uncultured and semi-barbarous community to a higher development so that in the fulness of time his spiritual lessons might blossom in the hearts of mankind. The custom was not an unmixed evil; and accordingly he allowed the exercise of the power of divorce to husbands under certain conditions. He permitted to divorced parties three distinct and separate periods within which they might endeavour to become reconciled and resume their conjugal relationship; but should all attempts at reconciliation prove unsuccessful, then the third period in which the final separation was declared to have arrived, supervened. In case of conjugal disputes, he advised settlement by means of arbiters chosen by the two disputants.

M. Sédillot, than whom no Western writer has analysed the laws of Mohammed better, has the following passage on the subject:—

"Divorce was permitted, but subject to formalities which allowed (and, we will add, recommended), a revocation of a hurried or not well-considered resolution. Three successive declarations, at a month's interval, were necessary in order to make it irrevocable."[2]

answer, Jesus wanted to avoid giving offence either to the school of Shammai or that of Hillel, *Uxor Hebraica*, l. iii. c. 18-22, 28, 31. Compare Gibbon's valuable note on the interpretation of the Greek, word *πορνεία*, rendered "fornication" in the English version, vol. iv. (2nd Ed.) p. 209.

1 Koran, sura ii. 226. 2 Sédillot, *Histoire des Arabes*, vol. i. p. 85.

The reforms of Mohammed marked a new departure in the history of Eastern legislation. He restrained the power of divorce possessed by the husbands; he gave to the women the right of obtaining a separation on reasonable grounds; and towards the end of his life he went so far as practically to forbid its exercise by the men without the intervention of arbiters or a judge. He pronounced "*talâk* to be the most detestable before God of all permitted things," for it prevented conjugal happiness and interfered with the proper bringing up of children. The permission, therefore, in the Koran though it gave a certain countenance to the old customs, has to be read with the light of the Lawgiver's own enunciations. When it is borne in mind how intimately law and religion are connected in the Islamic system, it will be easy to understand the bearing of his words on the institution of divorce.

Naturally, great divergence exists among the various schools regarding the exercise of the power of divorce by the husband of his own motion and without the intervention of the judge. A large and influential body of jurists regard *talâk* emanating from the husband as really prohibited, except for necessity, such as the adultery of the wife. Another section, consisting chiefly of the Mutazalas,[1] consider *talâk* as not permissible or lawful without the sanction of the *Hâkim ush-sharaa*. They hold that any such case as may justify separation and remove *talâk* from the category of being *forbidden*, should be tested by an unbiassed judge; and, in support of their doctrine, they refer to the words of the Prophet already cited, and to his direction that in case of disputes between the married parties, arbiters should be appointed for the settlement of their differences.

The Hanafîs, the Malikıs, the Shafeïs and the bulk of the Shiahs hold *talâk* to be *permitted*, though they regard the exercise of the power without any cause to be unlawful.

The *Radd ul-Muhtâr*, after stating the arguments against the proposition that *talâk* is unlawful, proceeds to say, "no doubt, it is forbidden, but it becomes *mubâh* (permitted) for certain outside reasons, and this is the meaning of those jurists who hold that it is really forbidden."

Although, "the Fathers of the Church" have taken up the

[1] See *post*,

temporary permission as the positive rule, and ignored many of the principles of equity inculcated by the Master, the rules laid down by the legists are far more humane and just towards women than those of the most perfect Roman law developed in the bosom of the Church.[1] According to the legists, the wife also is entitled to demand a separation on the ground of ill-usage, want of proper maintenance, and various other causes; but unless she showed very good and solid grounds for demanding the separation, she lost her "settlement" or dowry. In every case, when the divorce originated with the husband (except in cases of open infidelity), he had to give up to her everything he settled upon her at her marriage.[2]

The frequent admonitions in the Koran against separations, the repeated recommendation to heal quarrels by private reconciliation, show the extreme sacredness of the marriage tie in the eyes of the Arab Legislator :—

"If a woman fear ill-usage or aversion from her husband, it shall not be blameable in them[3] if they agree with mutual agreement, for reconciliation (or agreement) is best. (Men's) souls are prone to avarice; but if ye act kindly and deal piously, verily

1 Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 368, 369.

2 M. Sédillot also speaks of the condition which (according to the Sunnite doctrines) requires that in such cases of complete separation, prior to the husband and wife coming together again, the latter should marry another, and be divorced anew,—as a very wise measure which rendered separation more rare. Muir censures Mohammed for making such a condition necessary (vol. iii. p. 306). He ignores, that, among a proud, jealous, and sensitive race like the Arabs, such a condition was one of the strongest antidotes for the evil. The very proverb he quotes ought to have shown the disgrace which was attached to the man who would make his wife go through such "a disgusting ordeal." I am afraid, in his dislike towards Mohammed, Sir W. Muir forgot that this condition was intended as a check on that other "revolting" practice rife both among the Jews and the heathen Arabs, and by example also among the Christians, of repudiating a wife on every slight occasion, at every outburst of senseless passion or caprice. This check was intended to control one of the most sensitive nations of the earth, by acting on the strongest feeling of their nature, the sense of honour (compare Sale, *Preliminary Discourse*, p. 134). Sir W. Muir also forgot that many of the Shiite doctors do not recognise the obligation or validity of the wife's being married to a third person, prior to her being taken back (compare Malcolm, *History of Persia*, vol. ii. p. 241, and the *Mabsût*, (*in loco*).

For my part, I believe in the correctness of the construction, namely, that the verse which says, "When ye divorce women, and the time for sending them away is come, send them away with generosity; but retain them not by constraint so as to be unjust towards them" abrogates the preceding verse, which requires the intervention of a third person.

3 The Arabic expression implies "it will be commendable," etc.

God is well acquainted with what ye do. And ye will not have it at all in your power to *to treat your wives alike with equity*, even though you fain wanted to do so;[1] yet yield not to your inclinations ever so much as to leave her in suspense; and if ye agree and act piously, then, verily, God is forgiving and merciful."[2]

And again, in a preceding verse, it is declared :—

"And if ye fear a breach between them (man and wife), then send a judge chosen from his family and a judge chosen from her family; if they desire a reconciliation, God will cause them to agree; verily, God is knowing and apprised of all."[3]

The sanctity attached to the institution of marriage in the Islâmic system has either not been apprehended or sufficiently appreciated by outsiders. "Marriage," says the *Ashbâh wan-Nazâir*, "is an institution ordained for the protection of society, and in order that human beings may guard themselves from foulness and unchastity". "Marriage is a sacrament, insomuch that in this world it is an act of *ibâdat* or worship, for it preserves mankind free from pollution." . . . . . "It is instituted by divine command among members of the human species." "marriage when treated as a contract is a permanent relationship based on mutual consent on the part of a man and a woman between whom there is no bar to a lawful union."

It has been frequently said that Mohammed allowed his followers, besides the four legitimate wives, to take to themselves any number of female slaves. A simple statement of the regulation on this point will show at once how opposed this notion is to the true precepts of Islam. "Whoso among you hath not the means to marry a free believing woman, then let him marry such of your maid-servants whom your right hands possess and who are believers. This is allowed unto him among you who is afraid of committing sin; but if ye abstain from allying yourself with slaves, it will be better for you."

[1] This furnishes another argument against those Mahommedans who hold that the developed laws of Islam allow plurality of wives. It being declared that "equity" is beyond human power to observe, we must naturally infer that the Legislator had in view the merging of the lower in the higher principle, and the abolition of a custom which though necessary in some state of society, is opposed to the later development of thought and morals.

[2] Koran, sura iv. 127, 128.

[3] Koran, sura iv. 39.

On this slender basis, and perhaps on some temporary and accidental circumstances connected with the early rise of the Moslem commonwealth, have our legists based the usage of holding (*jarias*) female slaves. And this, though opposed to the spirit of the Master's precepts, has given rise to some of the strongest animadversions of rival religionists.

Concubinage, the union of people standing to each other in the relation of master and slave, without the sanction of matrimony, existed among the Arabs, the Jews, the Christians, and all the neighbouring nations. The Prophet did not in the beginning denounce the custom, but towards the end of his career he expressly forbade it.

"And *you are permitted to marry* virtuous women who are believers, and virtuous women of those who have been given the Scriptures before you, when you have provided them their portions, living chastely *with them* without fornication, and not taking concubines." [1]

Compare the spirit of the first part of this commandment with the exclusiveness of Christian ecclesiasticism, which refused to recognise as valid or lawful the union of a Christian with a non-Christian. The stake frequently was the lot of the "infidel" who indulged in the temerity of marrying a Christian. Mohammed's rule was a distinct advance in humanity.

The prohibition directed against Moslem women entering iuto marriage with non-Moslems, which has furnished a handle for attacks, was founded upon reasons of policy and the necessities of the early commonwealth.

It cannot be denied that several institutions which the Mussalmans borrowed fron the pre-Islamic period, "the Days of Ignorance," and which exist simply as so many survivals of an older growth, have had the tendency to retard the advancement of Mahommedan nations. Among them the system of the seclusion of females is one. It had been in practice among most of the nations of antiquity from the earliest times. The *gynaikonitis* was a familiar institution among the Athenians; and the inmates of an Athenian *harem* were as jealously guarded from the public gaze as the

[1] Sura v. 7.

members of a Persian household then, or of an Indian household now. The *gynaikonomoi*, like their Oriental counterpart, were the faithful warders of female privacy, and rigorously watched over the ladies of Athens. The seclusion of women naturally gave birth to the caste of *Hetairai*, various members of whom played such an important part in Athenian history. Were it not for the extraordinary and almost inexplicable spectacle presented by the Byzantine empire and modern Europe and America, we should have said that in every society, at all advanced in the arts of civilised life, the growth of the unhappy class of beings whose existence is alike a reproach to humanity and a disgrace to civilisation, was due to the withdrawal of women from the legitimate exercise of their ennobling, purifying, and humanising influence over the minds of men. The human mind, when it does not perceive the pure, hankers after the impure. The Babylonians, the Etruscans, the Athenians and the pre-Islamite Meccans furnish the best exemplification of this view in ancient times. The enormity of the social canker eating into the heart and poisoning the life-blood of nations in modern times is due, however, to the spread of a godless materialism covered with a thin veneer of religion, be it Christianity, be it Mahommedanism, or any other form of creed. Mohammed had, in early life, observed with pain and sorrow the terrible depravity prevailing among the Meccans, and he took the most effective step suited to the age and the people to stamp out the evil. "By his severe laws at first," to use the expressive language of Mr. Bosworth Smith, "and by the strong moral sentiment aroused by these laws afterwards, he has succeeded, down to this very day, and to a greater extent than has ever been the case elsewhere, in freeing all Mohammedan countries "—where they are not overgrown by foreign excrescences—" from those professional outcasts who live by their own misery, and, by their existence as a recognised class, are a standing reproach to every member of the society of which they form a part."

The system of female seclusion undoubtedly possesses many advantages in the social well-being of unsettled and uncultured communities; and even in countries, where the diversity of culture and moral conceptions is great, a modified form of seclusion is not absolutely to be deprecated. It prevails at the present moment, in forms more or less strict, among nations far removed from

Moslem influences, to which is ascribed the existence of the custom in India and other Oriental countries. In Corea, female seclusion is carried to the height of absurdity. In China and among the Spanish colonies of South America, which are not within the immediate ambit of the European social code, the *Purdah* is still observed. The Prophet of Islam found it existing among the Persians and other Oriental communities; he perceived its advantages, and it is possible that, in view of the widespread laxity of morals among all classes of people, he recommended to the women-folk the observance of privacy. But to suppose that he ever intended his recommendation should assume its present inelastic form, or that he ever allowed or enjoined the *seclusion* of women, is wholly opposed to the spirit of his reforms. The Koran itself affords no warrant for holding that the seclusion of women is a part of the new gospel.

"O Prophet! speak to thy wives and to thy daughters, and to the wives of the Faithful, that they let their wrappers fall low. Thus will they more easily be known, and they will not be affronted. God is indulgent, merciful." [1]

"And speak to the believing women, that they refrain their looks and observe continence; and that they display not their ornaments except those which are external, and that they draw their kerchiefs over their bosoms." [2]

Directions easy to understand[3] in the midst of the social and moral chaos from which he was endeavouring, under God's guidance, to evolve order,—wise and beneficent injunctions having for their object the promotion of decency among women, the improvement of their dress and demeanour, and their protection from insult.[4]

[1] Sura xxxiii. 59.

[2] Sura xxiv. 31.

[3] Those who have travelled in Europeanised Egypt and in the Levant will understand how necessary these directions must have been in those times.

[4] Hamilton, the translator of the *Hedâya*, in his preliminary discourse dealing with the *Book of Abominations*, has the following: "A subject which involves a vast variety of frivolous matter, and must be considered chiefly in the light of a treatise upon *propriety* and *decorum*. In it is particularly exhibited the scrupulous attention paid to female modesty, and the avoidance of every act which may tend to violate it, even in thought. It is remarkable, however, that this does not amount to that *absolute seclusion* of women supposed by some writers. In fact, this seclusion is a result of *jealousy* or *pride*, and not of any *legal injunction*, as appears in this and several other parts of the *Hedâya*. Neither is it a custom universally prevalent in Mohammedan countries." Marsden, in his *Travels*, says: "The Arab settlers in Java never observed the custom, and the Javanese Mussulman women enjoy the same amount of freedom as their Dutch sisters."

It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose there is anything in the law which tends to the perpetuation of the custom. Considerable light is thrown on the Lawgiver's recommendation for female privacy, by the remarkable immunity from restraint or seclusion which the members of his family always enjoyed. Âyesha, the daughter of Abu Bakr, who was married to Mohammed on Khadija's death, personally conducted the insurrectionary movement against Ali. She commanded her own troops at the famous "Battle of the Camel." Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet, often took part in the discussions regarding the succession to the Caliphate. The grand-daughter of Mohammed, Zainab the sister of Hussain, shielded her youthful nephew from the Ommeyyades after the butchery of Kerbela. Her indomitable spirit awed equally the ferocious Obaidullah ibn Ziyad and the pitiless Yezîd.

The depravity of morals, which had sapped the foundations of society among the Pre-Islamite Arabs, as well as among the Jews and the Christians, urgently needed some correction. The Prophet's counsel regarding the privacy of women served undoubtedly to stem the tide of immorality, and to prevent the diffusion among his followers of the custom of disguised polyandry, which had evidently, until then, existed among the pagan Arabs.

According to von Hammer, "the *harem* is a sanctuary: it is prohibited to strangers, not because women are considered unworthy of confidence, but on account of the sacredness with which custom and manners invest them. The degree of reverence which is accorded to women throughout higher Asia and Europe (among Mahommedan communities) is a matter capable of the clearest demonstration."

The idealisation of womanhood is a natural characteristic of all the highest natures. But national pride and religious bigotry have given rise to two divergent theories regarding the social exaltation of women among the cultured classes in modern Christendom. The one attributes it to Mariolatry, the other to Mediæval chivalry, alleged to be the offspring of Teutonic institutions. Of Christianity, in its relation to womankind, the less said the better. In the early ages, when the religion of the people, high and low, the ignorant and educated, consisted only of the adoration of the mother of Jesus, the Church of Christ had placed the sex under a ban. Father after father had written upon the enormities of women, their evil tenden-

cies, their inconceivable malignity. Tertullian represented the general feeling in a book in which he described women as "the devil's gateway, the unsealer of the forbidden tree, the deserter of the divine law, the destroyer of God's image—man." Another authority declared with a revolting cynicism, "among women he sought for chastity but found none." Chrysostom, who is recognised as a saint of high merit, "interpreted the general opinion of the Fathers," says Lecky, "when he pronounced women to be a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril, a deadly fascination, a painted ill." The orthodox Church excluded women from the exercise of all religious functions excepting the lowliest. They were excluded absolutely from society; they were prohibited from appearing in public, from going to feasts or banquets. They were directed to *remain in seclusion*, to observe silence, to obey their husbands, and to apply themselves to weaving and spinning and cooking. If they ever went out they were to be clothed from head to foot. Such was the position of women in Christianity when Mariolatry was recognised and practised by all classes. In later times, and in the gloomy interval which elapsed between the overthrow of the Western empire and the rise of modern society in Europe, a period which has been described as one of "rapine, falsehood, tyranny, lust, and violence," Christianity, by introducing convents and nunneries, served, in some respects, to improve the lot of women. This questionable amelioration, however, was only suited for an age when the abduction of women was an every-day occurrence, and the dissoluteness of morals was such as to defy description. But the convents were not always the haunts of virtue, nor the inculcation of celibacy the surest safeguard of chastity. The *Registrum Visitationem*, or the diary of the pastoral visits of Archbishop Rigaud, throws a peculiar light upon the state of morality and the position of the sex during the most glorious epoch of the Age of Faith. The rise of Protestantism made no difference in the social conditions, or in the conception of lawyers regarding the status of women. Jesus had treated woman with humanity; his followers excluded her from justice.

The other theory to which we have adverted is in vogue among the *romanceurs* of Europe. They have represented each historical figure in the Middle Ages to be a Bayard or a Crichton. The age of chivalry is generally supposed to extend from the beginning of the

eighth to the close of the fourteenth century—a period, be it noted, almost synchronous with the Saracenic domination in Spain. But, during this period, in spite of the halo which poetry and romance have cast around the conditions of society, women were the frequent subjects of violence. Force and fraud were the distinguishing characteristics of the golden age of Christian chivalry. Roland and Arthur were myths until the West came in contact with the civilisation and culture of the East. Chivalry was not the product of the wilds of Scandinavia or of the gloomy forests of Germany;—prophecy and chivalry alike were the children of the desert. From the desert issued Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed; from the desert issued Antar, Hamza, and Ali.

The condition of women among the Arabs settled in the cities and villages, who had adopted the loose notions of morality prevalent among the Syrians, Persians, and Romans, was, as we have already stated, degraded in the extreme. Among some of the nomades, however, they enjoyed great freedom, and exercised much influence over the fortunes of their tribes. "They were not, as among the Greeks," says Perron, "the creatures of misery." They accompanied the warriors to battle, and inspired them to heroism; the cavaliers rushed into the fights singing the praises of sister, wife, or lady-love. The guerdon of their loves was the highest prize of their prowess. Valour and generosity were the greatest virtues of the men, and chastity that of the women. An insult offered to a woman of a tribe would set in flame the desert tribes from end to end of the peninsula. The "Sacrilegious Wars," which lasted for forty years, and were put an end to by the Prophet, had their origin in an insult offered to a young girl at one of the fairs of Okâz.

Mohammed rendered a fitful custom into a permanent creed, and embodied respect for women in his revelations. With many directions, which reflect the rude and patriarchal simplicity of the age, his regulations breathe a more chivalrous spirit towards the sex than is to be found in the teachings of the older masters. Islam, like Christianity, is different with different individuals and in different ages, but on the whole, true chivalry is more intimately associated with true Islam than with any other form of positive faith or social institution.

The hero of Islâm, the true disciple of the founder of the *Hilf-*

ul-Fuzûl, was as ready with lance and sword to do battle with God's enemies as to redress the wrongs of the weak and oppressed. Whether on the plains of Irak or nearer home, the cry of distress never failed to bring the mailed knight to the succour of the helpless and suffering. His deeds translated into legends, and carried from the tent to the palace, have served to influence the prowess of succeeding ages. The caliph in his banqueting-hall puts down the half-tasted bowl on being told that an Arab maiden, carried into captivity by the Romans, had cried out, "Why does not Abd ul-Malik come to my help?"—he vows that no wine or water shall wet his lips until he has released the maiden from bondage. Forthwith he marches his troops upon the Roman caitiffs, and only when the maiden has attained her liberty is he freed from his vow. A Mogul emperor,[1] sore pressed by relentless foes, is marching towards the frontiers when he receives the bracelet of an alien queen—the token of brotherhood and call for succour. He abandons his own necessities, retraces his steps, defeats her foes, and then resumes his march.

Oelsner calls Antar "the father of chivalry." Ali was its beau-ideal—an impersonation of gallantry, of bravery, of generosity; pure, gentle, and learned, "without fear and without reproach," he set the world the noblest example of chivalrous grandeur of character. His spirit, a pure reflection of that of his Master, overshadowed the Islamic world, and formed the animating genius of succeeding ages. The wars of the Crusades brought barbarian Europe into contact with the civilisation of the Islamic East, and opened its eyes to the magnificence and refinement of the Moslems; but it was especially the influences of Mahommedan Andalusia on the neighbouring Christian provinces which led to the introduction of chivalry into Europe. The troubadours, the trouveurs of Southern France, and the minnesingers of Germany, who sang of love and honour in war, were the immediate disciples of the *romanceurs* of Cordova, Grenada, and Malaga. Petrarch and Boccaccio, even Tasso and Chaucer, derived their inspiration from the Islamic fountain-head. But the coarse habits and thoughts of the barbarian hordes of Europe communicated a character of grossness to pure chivalry.

[1] The Emperor Humâyûn, pursued by the Afghans. received, on his march to Cabul, the bracelet from the Jodhpur queen, and at once came to her help. I have only mentioned two instances of Moslem chivalry, which might be multiplied by hundreds.

In the early centuries of Islâm, almost until the extinction of the Saracenic empire in the East, women continued to occupy as exalted a position as in modern society. Zubaida, the wife of Harun, plays a conspicuous part in the history of the age, and by her virtues, as well as by her accomplishments, leaves an honoured name to posterity. Humaida, the wife of Faruk, a Medinite citizen, left for many years the sole guardian of her minor son, educates him to become one of the most distinguished jurisconsults of the day.[1] Sukaina, or Sakîna, the daughter of Hussain,[2] and the grand-daughter of Ali, was the most brilliant, most accomplished, and most virtuous woman of her time,—"la dame des dames de son temps, la plus belle, la plus gracieuse, la plus brillante de qualites," as Perron calls her. Herself no mean scholar, she prized the converse of learned and pious people. The ladies of the Prophet's family were noted for their learning, their virtues, and their strength of character. Bûrân, the wife of the Caliph Mâmûn, Umm-ul-Fazl, Mâmun's sister, married to the eighth Imam of the house of Ali, Umm ul-Habîb, Mamun's daughter, were all famous for their scholarship. In the fifth century of the Hegira, the Sheikha Shuhda, designated *Fakhr un-nissa* ("the glory of women"), lectured publicly, at the Cathedral Mosque of Bagdad, to large audiences on literature, rhetoric, and poetry. She occupies in the annals of Islam a position of equality with the most distinguished *ulemas*. What would have befallen this lady had she flourished among the fellow-religionists of St. Cyril can be judged by the fate of Hypatia. Possibly she would not have been torn to pieces by enthusiastic Christians, but she would, to a certainty, have been burnt as a witch. Zat ul-Hemma, corrupted into Zemma, "the lion-heart," the heroine of many battles, fought side by side with the bravest knights.[3]

The improvement effected in the position of women by the Prophet of Arabia has been acknowledged by all unprejudiced writers, though it is still the fashion with bigoted controversialists to say the Islamic system lowered the status of women. No falser

[1] Fârûk was away for twenty-seven years engaged in wars in Khorâsân. His son's name is Râbya ar-Ray.

[2] Hussain was married to one of the daughters of Yezdjard, the last Sassanian king of Persia.

[3] For a full account of the distinguished women who have flourished in Islâm see my article in the May number of the *Nineteenth Century* for 1899 and my *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan).

calumny has been levelled at the great Prophet. Nineteen centuries of progressive development working with the legacy of a prior civilisation, under the most favourable racial and climatic conditions, have tended to place women, in most countries of Christendom, on a higher social level than the men,—have given birth to a code of etiquette which, at least ostensibly, recognises the right of women to higher social respect. But what is their legal position even in the most advanced communities of Christendom? Until very recently, even in England, a married woman possessed no rights independently of her husband. If the Moslem woman does not attain, in another hundred years, the social position of her European sister, there will be time enough to declaim against Islâm as a system and a dispensation. But the Teacher who in an age when no country, no system, no community gave any right to woman, maiden or married, mother or wife, who, in a country where the birth of a daughter was considered a calamity, secured to the sex rights which are only unwillingly and under pressure, being conceded to them by the civilised nations in the nineteenth century, deserves the gratitude of humanity. If Mohammed had done nothing more, his claim to be a benefactor of mankind would have been indisputable. Even under the laws as they stand at present in the pages of the legists, the legal position of Moslem females may be said to compare favourably with that of European women. We have dealt in another place at length with this subject. We shall do no more here than glance at the provisions of the Moslem codes relating to women. As long as she is unmarried she remains under the parental roof, and until she attains her majority she is, to some extent, under the control of the father or his representative. As soon, however, as she is of age, the law vests in her all the rights which belong to her as an independent human being. She is entitled to share in the inheritance of her parents along with her brothers, and though the proportion is different, the distinction is founded on the relative position of brother and sister. A woman who is *sui juris* can under no circumstances be married without her own express consent, "not even by the sultan."[1] On her marriage she does not lose her individuality. She does not cease to be a separate member of society.

[1] Centuries after the principle was laid down by the Moslem jurists, the sovereigns and chiefs of Christendom were in the habit of forcibly marrying women to their subjects.

An ante-nuptial settlement by the husband in favour of the wife is a necessary condition, and on his failure to make a settlement the law presumes one in accordance with the social position of the wife. A Moslem marriage is a civil act, needing no priest, requiring no ceremonial.[1] The contract of marriage gives the man no power over the woman's person, beyond what the law defines, and none whatever upon her goods and property. Her rights as a mother do not depend for their recognition upon the idiosyncracies of individual judges. Her earnings acquired by her own exertions cannot be wasted by a prodigal husband, nor can she be ill-treated with impunity by one who is brutal. She acts, if *sui juris*, in all matters which relate to herself and her property in her own individual right, without the intervention of husband or father. She can sue her debtors in the open courts, without the necessity of joining a next friend, or under cover of her husband's name. She continues to exercise, after she has passed from her father's house into her husband's home, all the rights which the law gives to men. All the privileges which belong to her as a woman and a wife are secured to her, not by the courtesies which "come and go," but by the actual text in the book of law. Taken as a whole, her status is not more unfavourable than that of many European women, whilst in many respects she occupies a decidedly better position. Her comparatively backward condition is the result of a want of culture among the community generally, rather than of any special feature in the laws of the fathers.

Note to Chapter XIII.

While this chapter was in the press, I came across the *Claims of Ishmael*, by the Rev. J. D. Bate of Allahabad, in which I find the author has read my remarks on polygamy, in my former work on the *Life of Mohammed*, in the light of a defence. I regret to find that my philosophical examination of the circumstances which led to polygamy in early times have been so misconstrued. For my own part, I look upon polygamy in the present day as an adulterous connection, and as contrary to the *spirit* of Islam, an opinion which is shared by a large number of Mussalmâns.

[1] The Hindu customs adopted by the Indian Mahommedans and the old pre-Islamite customs in Syria and Egypt which still survive, have nothing to do with the Mussalman law.

CHAPTER V.

SLAVERY.

"And as to your slaves, see that ye feed them as ye feed yourselves and clothe them as ye clothe yourselves."—MOHAMMED.

SLAVERY in some of its features has been aptly compared with polygamy. Like polygamy, it has existed among all nations, and has died away with the progress of human thought and the growth of a sense of justice among mankind. Like polygamy it was the natural product of passion and pride so strongly marked in certain phases of the communal and individual development. But unlike polygamy, it bears from its outset the curse of inherent injustice.

In the early stages, when humanity has not risen to the full appreciation of the reciprocal rights and duties of man ; when laws are the mandates of one, or of the few, for the many ; when the will of the strong is the rule of life and the guide of conduct,—then the necessary inequality, social, physical, or mental, engendered by nature among the human race, invariably takes the form of slavery, and a system springs into existence which allows absolute power to the superior over the inferior.[1] This complete subserviency of the weak to the strong has helped the latter to escape from the legendary curse laid on man—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the ground," and allowed them to employ the leisure thus acquired in congenial pursuits. "The simple wish," says the author of *Ancient Law*, "to use the bodily powers of another person as the means of ministering to one's own ease or pleasure, is doubtless the foundation of slavery, and as old as human nature."[2]

The practice of slavery is co-eval with human existence. Historically, its traces are visible in every age and in every nation. Its germs were developed in a savage state of society, and it continued

[1] Comp. throughout *L'Influence des Croisades sur l'Etat des Peuples de l'Europe*, by Maxime de Choiseul D'Aillecourt, Paris 1809.

[2] Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 104.

to flourish even when the progress of material civilisation had done away with its necessity.

The Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, and the ancient Germans,[1]—people whose legal and social institutions have most affected modern manners and customs,—recognised and practised both kinds of slavery, prædial servitude as well as household slavery.

Among the Hebrews, from the commencement of their existence as a nation, two forms of slavery were practised. The Israelite slave, given into bondage as a punishment for crime or for the payment of a debt, occupied a higher position than a slave of alien birth. The law allowed the former his liberty after six years of servitude, unless he refused to avail himself of his right. But the foreign slaves, whether belonging to the people whom the Israelites had reduced into absolute helotage by a merciless system of warfare, or whether acquired in treacherous forays or by purchase, were entirely excluded from the benefits of this arrangement,—an arrangement made in a spirit of national partiality and characteristic isolation.[2] The lot of these bondsmen and bondswomen was one of unmitigated hardship. Helots of the soil or slaves of the house, hated and despised at the same time, they lived a life of perpetual drudgery in the service of pitiless masters.

Christianity, as a system and a creed, raised no protest against slavery, enforced no rule, inculcated no principle for the mitigation of the evil. Excepting a few remarks on the disobedience of slaves,[3] and a general advice to masters to give servants their due, the teachings of Jesus, as portrayed in the Christian traditions, contained nothing expressive of disapproval of bondage. On the contrary, Christianity enjoined on the slave absolute submission to the will of his or her proprietor. It found slavery a recognised institution of the empire; it adopted the system without any endeavour to mitigate its baneful character, or to promote its gradual abolition, or to improve the status of slaves. Under the civil law, slaves were mere chattels. They remained so under the Christian domination. Slavery had flourished among the Romans from the earliest times. The slaves, whether of native or of foreign birth,

[1] Cæsar (*De Bell. Gall.* lib. vi.), Tacitus (*De Moribus German.* cap. 24, 25), and Pothier (*De Stat. Servor. apud Germ.* lib. i.) all testify to the extreme severity of German servitude.

[2] Lev. xxv. 44,45.

[3] 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

whether acquired by war or purchase, were regarded simply as chattels. Their masters possessed the power of life and death over them. But that gradual improvement which had raised the archaic laws of the Twelve Tables to the comprehensive code of Hadrian, did not fail to introduce some amelioration in the condition of the slaves. In spite, however, of the changes which the humanity or the wisdom of the emperors had effected in the old laws, the person of the slave was absolutely subject to the will of the master. Each magnate of the empire possessed thousands of slaves, who were tortured and subjected to lashings for the most trivial of faults.

The introduction of the religion of Jesus into Europe affected human chattelhood only in its relation to the priesthood. A slave could become free by adopting monachism, if not claimed within three years.[1] But in other respects, slavery flourished as much and in as varied shapes as under the pagan domination. The Digest, compiled under a Christian emperor, pronounced slavery a constitution of the law of nature, and the code fixed the maximum price of slaves according to the professions for which they were intended. Marriages between slaves were not legal, and between the slave and the free were prohibited under frightful penalties.[2] The natural result was unrestrained concubinage, which even the clergy recognised and practised.[3]

Such was slavery under the most advanced system of laws known to the ancient world. These laws reflected the wisdom of thirteen centuries, and towards the close of their development had engrafted upon themselves some faint offshoots of the teachings of one of the greatest moral preceptors of the world.

With the establishment of the Western and Northern barbarians on the ruins of the Roman empire, besides personal slavery, territorial servitude scarcely known to the Romans, became general in all the newly-settled countries. The various rights possessed by the lords over their vassals and serfs exhibited a frightful picture of

1 Comp. Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 358.

2 One of the punishments was, if a free woman married a slave, she was to be put to death and the slave burnt alive. Comp. the splendid though apologetic chapter of Milman on the subject, *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii.

3 Comp. Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 369 ; and also Du Cange, *Concubina*.

moral depravity and degradation.[1] The barbaric codes, like the Roman, regarded slavery as an ordinary condition of mankind; and if any protection was afforded to the slave, it was chiefly as the property of his master, who alone, besides the State, had the power of life and death over him.

Christianity had failed utterly in abolishing slavery or alleviating its evils. The Church itself held slaves, and recognised in explicit terms the lawfulness of this baneful institution. Under its influence the greatest civilians of Europe have upheld slavery, and have insisted upon its usefulness as preventing the increase of pauperism and theft.[2] And it was under the same influences that the highly cultured Christians of the Southern States of North America practised the grossest inhumanities upon the unfortunate beings whom they held as slaves,—many of their own kith,—and shed torrents of blood for the maintenance of the curse of slavery in their midst. The least trace of the blood of an inferior race, however imperceptible, subjected the unfortunate being to all the penalties of slavery. The white Christian could never legitimatise the issue of his illicit connection with his negro slave-women. With her he could never contract a legal union. The mother of his illegitimate children and her descendants, however remote, could be sold by his legitimate white issue at any time. Christianity failed to grasp the spirit of its Master's teachings in regard to the equality of man in the sight of God.

Islâm recognises no distinction of race or colour; black or white, citizens or soldiers, rulers or subjects, they are perfectly equal, not in theory only, but in practice. In the field or in the guest-chamber, in the tent or in the palace, in the mosque or in the market, they mix without reserve and without contempt. The first Muezzin of Islam, a devoted adherent and an esteemed disciple, was a negro slave. To the white Christian, his black fellow-religionist may be his equal in

[1] Comp. De Choiseul, and also consult on this subject the comprehensive chapter of Stephen's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, bk. ii. pt. i. chap. ii. One of the miserable and disgusting privileges possessed by the lord was designated in Britain, the custom of *culiage*, which was afterwards commuted into a fine. This custom, as has been correctly supposed, gave rise to the law of inheritance, prevalent in some English counties, and known by the name of Borough English.

[2] Pufendorff, *Law of Nature and Nations*, bk. vi. c. 3, s. 10; Ulricus Huberus, *Praelect. Jur. Civ.* l. i. tit. 4, s, 6; Pothier, *De Statu Servorum*; and Grotius, *De Jure Bell.* l. ii. c. 5, s. 27.

the kingdom of heaven, but certainly not in the kingdom of this world; in the reign of Chirst, perhaps, but not in the reign of Christianity. The law may compel him, a larger humanity with torrents of blood, may force him to give to his black brother civic rights, but the pride of race and colour acknowledges no equality, and even in the house of God a strict separation is observed.

The Islâmic teachings dealt a blow at the institution of slavery which, had it not been for the deep root it had taken among the surrounding nations and the natural obliquity of the human mind, would have been completely extinguished as soon as the generation which then practised it had passed away.

It has been justly contended that, as the promulgation of the laws, precepts, and teachings of Islam extended over twenty years, it is naturally to be expected many of the pre-Islamite institutions, which were eventually abolished, were, at first, either tacitly permitted or expressly recognised[1]. In one of these categories stood the usage of slavery. The evil was intertwined with the inmost relations of the people among whom Mohammed flourished. Its extinction was only to be achieved by the continued agency of wise and humane laws, and not by the sudden and entire emancipation of the existing slaves, which was morally and economically impossible. Numberless provisions, negative as well as positive, were accordingly introduced in order to promote and accomplish a gradual enfranchisement. A contrary policy would have produced an utter collapse of the infant commonwealth.

The Prophet exhorted his followers repeatedly in the name of God to enfranchise slaves, "than which there was not an act more acceptable to God." He ruled that for certain sins of omission the penalty should be the manumission of slaves. He ordered that slaves should be allowed to purchase their liberty by the wages of their service; and that in case the unfortunate beings had no present means of gain, and wanted to earn in some other employment enough for that purpose, they should be allowed to leave their masters on an agreement to that effect.[2] He also provided that sums should be advanced to the slaves from the public treasury to purchase their liberty. In certain contingencies, it was provided that the slave

1 *Tahzîb ul-Akhlâk* (15th Rajab, 1288), p. 118.
2 Koran xxiv. 33, etc.

should become enfranchised without the interference and even against the will of his master. The contract or agreement in which the least doubt was discovered, was construed most favourably in the interests of the slave, and the slightest promise on the part of the master was made obligatory for the purposes of enfranchisement. He placed the duty of kindness towards the slave on the same footing with the claims of "kindred and neighbours, and fellow-travellers, and way-farers;" encouraged manumission to the freest extent, and therewith the gift of "a portion of that wealth which God hath given you;" and prohibited sensual uses of a master's power over the slave, with the promise of divine mercy to the wronged. To free a slave is the expiation for ignorantly slaying a believer, and for certain forms of untruth. The whole tenor of Mohammed's teaching made "permanent chattelhood" or caste impossible; and it is simply "an abuse of words" to apply the word slavery, in the English sense, to any status known to the legislation of Islâm.

The Lawgiver ordained, that a fugitive fleeing to the territories of Islam should at once become enfranchised; that the child of a slave-woman should follow the condition of the father, while the mother should become free at his death; that the slave should be able to contract with his master for his emancipation; and that a part of the poor-tax should be devoted to the ransom of those held in bondage. The masters were forbidden to exact more work than was just and proper. They were ordered never to address their male or female slaves by that degrading appellation, but by the more affectionate name of "my young man," or "my young maid"; it was enjoined that all slaves should be dressed, clothed, and fed exactly as their masters and mistresses. Above all, it was ordered that in no case should the mother be separated from her child, nor brother from brother, nor father from son, nor husband from wife, nor one relative from another.[1]

In the moral rules laid down for the treatment of those then in bondage, the Arabian Teacher did not prescribe the reciprocal duties of master and slave in the one-sided manner so often visible in

[1] I see no need of quoting authorities on these points, as they are admitted facts. But I may refer the curious reader to the traditions collected in the *Mishkât*, the *Sahîh* of Bukhâri, and the *Bihâr ul-Anwâr*. The latter contains the noblest monument of generosity and charity practised by the Prophet's immediate descendants.

other creeds.[1] With a deeper and truer knowledge of human nature, he saw that it was not so needful to lay down the duties the weak owe to the strong, as those the strong owe to the weak. In Islam no discredit is attached to the status of slavery. It is an accident, and not, as in the civil law and patristic Christianity, "a constitution of nature." Zaid, the freedman of the Prophet, was often entrusted with the command of troops, and the noblest captains served under him without demur; and his son Osama was honoured with the leadership of the expedition sent by Abu Bakr against the Greeks. Kutb ud-dîn, the first king of Delhi, and the true founder, therefore, of the Mussalman empire in India, was a slave. The slavery which was allowed in Islam had, in fact, nothing in common with that which was in vogue in Christendom until recent times, or with American slavery until the holy war of 1865 put an end to that curse.

In Islâm the slave of to-day is the grand vizier of to-morrow. He may marry, without discredit, his master's daughter, and become the head of the family. Slaves have ruled kingdoms and founded dynasties. The father of Mahmud of Ghazni was a slave. Can Christianity point to such records as these? Can Christianity show, in the pages of history, as clear, as humane an account of her treatment of slaves as this?

From all that we have said it is abundantly clear that the Legislator himself looked upon the custom as temporary in its nature, and held that its extinction was sure to be achieved by the progress of ideas and change of circumstances. The Koran always speaks of slaves as "those whom your right hands have acquired," indicating thus the only means of acquisition of bondsmen or bondswomen. It recognised, in fact, only one kind of slavery—the servitude of men made captives in *bonâ fide* lawful warfare, *Jihâd-i-Sharaï*. Among all barbarous nations the captives are spared from a motive of selfishness alone,[2] in order to add to the wealth of the

1 See Col. iii. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1.

2 Comp. Milman, *Latin Christ.* vol. ii. p. 387. The ancient jurists based the right of enslaving the captive on the prior right of killing him. In this they are followed by Albericus Gentilis (*De Jur. Gent. cap. de Servitute*), Grotius, and Pufendorff. Montesquieu, indeed, was the first to deny this mythical right of killing a captive, unless in case of absolute necessity, or for self-preservation. And this the author of the *Spirit of Laws* denied, because of his freedom from the thraldom of the Church.

individual captor, or of the collective nation, by their sale-money or by their labour.[1] Like other nations of antiquity, the Arab of the pre-Islâmite period spared the lives of his captives for the sake of profiting by them. Mohammed found this custom existing among his people. Instead of theorising, or dealing in vague platitudes, he laid down strict rules for their guidance, enjoining that those only may be held in bond who were taken in *bonâ fide* legal war until they were ransomed, or the captive bought his or her own liberty by the wages of service. But even when these means failed, an appeal to the pious feelings of the Moslem, combined with the onerous responsibilities attached to the possession of a slave, was often enough to secure the eventual enfranchisement of the latter. Slave-lifting and slave-dealing, patronised by dominant Christianity,[2] and sanctified by Judaism, were utterly reprobated and condemned. The man who dealt in slaves was declared the outcast of humanity. Enfranchisement[3] of slaves was pronounced to be a noble act of virtue. It was forbidden in absolute terms to reduce Moslems to slavery. To the lasting disgrace of the majority of the followers of Mohammed it must be said, however, that, whilst observing, or trying to observe the letter, they have utterly ignored the spirit of the Teacher's precepts, and allowed slavery to flourish (in direct contravention of the injunctions of the Prophet) by purchase and other means. The possession of a slave, by the Koranic laws, was conditional on a *bonâ fide* struggle, in self-defence, against unbelieving and idolatrous aggressors, and its permission was a guarantee for the safety and preservation of the captives. The cessation of the state of war in which the Moslem community was at first involved, from the animosity of the surrounding tribes and nations, would have brought about the extinction of slavery by a natural process—the stoppage of future acquisition and the enfranchisement of those in bondage. However, whether from contact with the demoralised nations of the East and the West, and the wild races of the North or from the fact that the baneful institution was deeply rooted among

1 Comp. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. iii. p. 48.

2 After the massacre of Drogheda by Cromwell, and the suppression of the insurrection in Ireland, the English Protestants sold the Irish, men and women, wholesale to the colonists in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and other places. The same was done after Monmouth's rebellion.

3 According to an authentic and well-known tradition from Imam Jaafar as-Sadik (*Bihar ul-Anwar*).

all classes of society, many Moslems, like the Christians and the Jews, recognised slavery, and to some extent do so even now. But the wild Turkoman, or the African Arab, who glories in slave-lifting, is no more a representative of Islam than is the barbarous Guacho, who revels on the savage prairies of South America, of Christianity.[1] Like polygamy, the institution of slavery, prevalent universally among mankind at some stage or other of their growth, has, at least among the nations which claim to be civilised, outlived the necessities which induced its practice, and must sooner or later become extinct. It will be seen, therefore, that Islam did not "consecrate" slavery, as has been maliciously affirmed, but provided in every way for its abolition and extinction by circumscribing the means of possession within the narrowest limits. Islam did not deal capriciously with this important question. Whilst proclaiming in the most emphatic terms the natural equality of human beings, it did not, regardless of consequences, enfranchise the men and women already in bondage, which would have only been productive of evil in a world not then ripe for that consummation of human liberty, moral and intellectual.

The mutilation of the human body was also explicitly forbidden by Mohammed, and the institution which flourished both in the Persian and the Byzantine empires was denounced in severe terms. Slavery by purchase was unknown during the reigns of the first four Caliphs. There is at least no authentic record of any slave having been acquired by purchase during their tenure of the office. But with the accession of the usurpring house of Ommeyya a change came over the spirit of Islam. Muawiyah was the first Mussalman

1 In order not to break the letter of his Prophet's commandments, the Turkoman (himself a violent Sunni) forced his captive (whether a Sunni or a Shiah) to acknowledge himself a heretic. And the African Arab calls his murderous *razzias*, on the pagan negroes, *Jihads*. Mr. Joseph Thompson, the well-known African traveller, in a letter to the London *Times* of the 14th of November 1887, thus writes on the subject of slavery in East Africa: "I unhesitatingly affrm, and I speak from a wider experience of Eastern Central Africa than any of your correspondents possess, that if the slave trade thrives it is because Islam has not been introduced in these regions, and for the strongest of all reasons, that the spread of Mahommedanism would have meant the concomitant suppression of the slave trade." His account of "the peaceful and unassuming agencies" by which Islam has been spread in Western Africa and Central Soudan deserves the attention of every reader. "Here," he says "we have Islam as a living, active force, full of the fire and energy of its early days, proselytizing too with much of the marvellous success which characterized its early days."

sovereign who introduced into the Moslem world the practice of acquiring slaves by purchase. He was also the first to adopt the Byzantine custom of guarding his women by eunuchs. During the reigns of the early Abbassides, the Shiah Imam Jaafar as-Sadik preached against slavery.

The time is now arrived when humanity at large should raise its voice against the practice of servitude, in whatever shape or under whatever denomination it may be disguised. The Moslems especially, for the honour of their noble Prophet, should try to efface that dark page from their history—a page which would never have been written but for their contravention of the spirit of his laws, however bright it may appear by the side of the ghastly scrolls on which the deeds of the professors of the rival creeds are recorded. The day is come when the voice which proclaimed liberty, equality, and universal brotherhood among all mankind should be heard with the fresh vigour acquired from the spiritual existence and spiritual pervasion of thirteen centuries. It remains for the Moslems to show the falseness of the aspersions cast on the memory of the great and noble Prophet, by proclaiming in explicit terms that slavery is reprobated by their faith and discountenanced by their code.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IDEA OF FUTURE LIFE.

يَاأَيَّتُهَا النَّفْسُ الْمُطْمَئِنَّةُ * ارْجِعِي إِلَى رَبِّكِ رَاضِيَةً مَّرْضِيَّةً *
فَادْخُلِي فِي عِبَادِي * وَادْخُلِي جَنَّتِي * [1]

THE idea of a future existence—of an existence after the separation of the living principle of our nature from the mortal part—is so generally shared by races of men, otherwise utterly distinct from each other, that it has led to the belief that it must be one of the first elementary constituents of our being. A more careful examination of facts, however, connected with the infancy of races and tribes, leads us to the conclusion that the conception of a future existence is also the result of the natural development of the human mind.

The wild savage has scarcely any idea of a life separate and distinct from that which he enjoys on earth. He looks upon death as the end of existence. Then comes a later stage when man ha passed out of his savage state, his hopes and aspirations are bounded no more by an earthly death ; he now anticipates another course of existence after the course here has been fulfilled. But even in this stage the conception of immortality does not rise out of the groove of daily life. Life after death is a mere continuation of life on earth. This idea of a continued life beyond the grave must have been developed from the yet unconscious longing of the human soul for a more extended sphere, where the separation of dear friends, so painful to both savage and civilised man, should end in reunion.

The next stage is soon reached · man comes to believe that present happiness and misery are not, cannot be, the be-all and end-all of

[1] See translation at end of this chapter

his existence; that there *will be* another life, or that there *is* another life after death, where he will be happy or miserable in proportion to his deserts.

Now we have reached a principle and a law.

The mind of man goes no further towards developing the idea of future existence. The nihilistic philosopher makes no discovery, asserts no new position. He is only treading in the footsteps of our savage ancestor, whose field of vision was restricted to this life alone.

It is a well-authenticated fact, however, that all those ideas which represent the various stages, from a subjective point of view, exist simultaneously not only among different nations but even in the same nation, in different combinations, according to the individual development.

The Egyptians are said to have been the first to recognise the doctrine of a future life, or, at least, to base the principles of human conduct on such a doctrine.[1] With an idea of metempsychosis they joined an idea of future recompense and punishment. Man descended into the tomb only to rise again. After his resurrection he entered on a new life, in company with the sun, the principle of generation, the self-existent cause of all. The soul of man was considered immortal like the sun, and as accomplishing the same pilgrimages. All bodies descended into the lower world, but they were not all assured of resurrection. The deceased were judged by Osiris and his forty-two assessors. Annihilation was often believed to be the lot of those adjudged guilty. The righteous, purified from venial faults, entered into perfect happiness. and as the companions of Osiris, were fed by him with delicious food.[2]

We might naturally expect that the long stay of the Israelites in Egypt would introduce among them some conception of a future life with its concomitant idea of rewards and punishments. But pure Mosaism, (or the teachings which pass under that name), does not recognise a state of existence differing from the present. The pivot on which the entire system of Mosaic legislation turns consists of tangible *earthly* rewards and punishments.[3] The vitality of the laws

1 Rawlinson's *History of Ancient Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 423.

2 Comp. Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, vol. i. pp. 319-322; and Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 102 et seq.

3 Comp. Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 157; also Milman's *Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 21, 25, 75, etc.

is confined within a very small compass. The doctrine of a resurrection, with the ideas arising from it, which appears in later Judaism, —especially in the writings of Daniel and Ezekiel,—is evidently a fruit of foreign growth derived from Zoroastrian sources. Even the descriptions of Sheol, the common sojourn of departed beings, equally of the just and unjust, which appear in comparatively early writings, do not seem of true Hebraic origin. In Sheol man can no longer praise God or remember His loving-kindness.[1] It is a shadow-realm, a Jewish counterpart of the heathen Hades, in which the souls lead a sad, lethargic, comfortless existence; knowing nothing of those who were dear to them on earth, mourning only over their own condition.[2]

But later Judaism is full of the strongest faith in a future life. Tradition revels in the descriptions of the abodes of bliss, or of the horrors of the damned.[3] Zoroastrianism thus acted on the Hebraic race in a double way. It not only developed in them a purer and more spiritual conception of a future existence, but later Mago-Zoroastrianism, itself a product of Chaldæism, strongly coloured the Rabbinical beliefs with materialistic ideas of punishments and rewards hereafter.[4] It was, however, among the Aryan nations of the East that the doctrine of a future life after visible death was distinctly and vividly recognised. In one branch of the Aryan family, it took the shape either of an eternal metempsychosis, a ceaseless whirl of births and deaths, or of utter absorption after a prolonged probation in absolute infinity, or endless unfathomable space, or nothing.[5] In the other branch, this doctrine was clothed in the shape of a graduated scale of rewards and punishments, in the sense in which human accountability is understood by the modern Christian or Moslem. Whether the Mago-Zoroastrian from the beginning believed in a corporeal resur-

1 Ps. vi. 5.

2 Job xiv. 22. Comp. Dollinger, vol. ii. p. 389; and Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, pp. 151, 152 et seq.

See Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 242, notes.

4 See the chapter of Alger, tracing the influence of the Persian system on later Judaism, p. 165 et seq.

5 And yet the Brahminical priests painted the horrors of hell and the pleasures of heaven with the vividness of a thoroughly morbid imagination, The Arabic scholar is referred to the appreciative account of the Buddhistic doctrines (not so much regarding future life as generally) in Shahristanî, p. 446.

rection is a question on which scholars are divided. Döllinger, with Burnouf and others, believes that this notion was not really Zoroastric, and that it is of later growth, if not derived from Hebrews.[1]

However this be, about the time of the Prophet of Arabia, the Persians had a strong and developed conception of future life. The remains of the Zend-Avesta which have come down to us expressly recognise a belief in future rewards and punishments. The Zoroastrianism of the Vendidad and the Bundehesh, enlarging upon the beliefs of the Avesta, holds that after a man's death the demons take possession of this body, yet on the third day consciousness returns. Souls that in their lifetime have yielded to the seductions of evil cannot pass the terrible bridge Chinevad, to which they are conducted on the day following the third night after their death. The good successfully pass it, conducted by the Yazatas (in modern Persian, *Izad*), and, entering the realms of bliss, join Ormuzd and the Amshaspands in their abode, where seated on thrones of gold, they enjoy the society of beautiful fairies (*Hoorân-i-Behisht*) and all manner of delights. The wicked fall over the bridge or are dragged down into the gulf of *Duzakh* where they are tormented by the *Dœvas*. The duration of this punishment is fixed by Ormuzd, and some are redeemed by the prayers and intercessions of their friends. Towards the end of the world a prophet is to arise, who is to rid the earth of injustice and wickedness, and usher in a reign of happiness—the Zoroastrian millennium, Ormuzd's kingdom of heaven.[2] After this, a universal resurrection will take place, and friends and relatives will meet again. After the joys of recognition there will follow a separation of the good from the bad. The torments of the unrighteous will be fearful. Ahriman will run up and down Chinevad overwhelmed with anguish. A blazing comet,

1 Alger has furnished us with strong reasons for supposing that the early Zoroastrians believed in a bodily resurrection. The extreme repugnance with which the Mago-Zoroastrians regarded corpses is no reason for discarding this conclusion, as most probably this repugnance arose under Manichæan influences ; see Alger, p. 138 et seq. *Apropos* of the repugnance with which the Persians in Mohammed's time looked upon corpses, consult Dollinger, vol. ii. p. 409.

2 Shahristânî calls this prophet Ushîzerbekâ (Cureton's ed. p. 188); but according to Western authors, his name is said to be Sosiosch, who is to be preceded by two other prophets, called Oscheder Bami and Oschedermah (Dollinger, v. ii. p. 401). De Sacy calls him Pashoutan (*Sur Div. Ant. de la Perse*, p. 95).

falling on the earth, will ignite the world. Mountains will melt and flow together like liquid metal. All mankind, good and bad alike, will pass through this glowing flood, and come out purified. Even Ahriman will be changed and *Duzakh* purified. Evil thenceforth will be annihilated, and all mankind will live in the enjoyment of ineffable delights.

Such is the summary of a religion which has influenced the Semitic faiths in an unmistakable manner, and especially the eclectic faith of Mohammed.

About the time when Jesus of Nazareth made his appearance, the Phœnicians and Assyrians had passed away. The hellenised Roman ruled the world, checked in the East, however, by triumphant and revived Mago-Zoroastrianism.

The Jew had lost his independence for ever. A miserable sycophant occupied the throne of David. A mightier power than that of the Seleucidæ kept in subjection his spirit of unruliness. Like every nation animated by a fierce love of their country, creed, and individuality, the Jews, as their fate grew darker and darker, became more and more inspired with the hope that some heaven-commissioned ministrant, like Gideon or Maccabeus, would restore their original glory, and enable them to plant their foot on the necks of their many oppressors.[1] The appearance of a Messiah portrayed in vivid colours by all their patriotic seers, the Jewish bards, was founded on one grand aspiration—the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. Under the influences of the Mago-Zoroastrians and Chaldæans in the East, and the Grecian schools of philosophy in the West, among some classes of society (especially among those whom the hellenising tendencies of Herod had withdrawn from the bosom of Israel), the belief in a personal Messiah was either faint and indistinct, or a mere echo from the vulgar masses. But, as Milman beautifully observes, the Palestinian Jews had about this time moulded out of various elements a splendid though confused vision of the appearance of the Messiah, the simultaneous regeneration of all things, the resurrection of the dead, and the reign of Messiah upon earth. All these events were to take place at once, or to follow

[1] It is not necessary, as Alger supposes, that because the Jews looked forward to the reappearance of Elijah or some other prophet among them for these national purposes, we must conclude that they believed in transmigration.

close upon each other.[1] The Messiah was to descend from the line of David; he was to assemble all the scattered descendants of the tribes, and to expel and destroy their hateful alien enemies. Under the Messiah a resurrection would take place, but would be confined to the righteous of their race.[2]

Amidst all this enthusiasm and these vague aspirations, the hopes of eternal life and future bliss were strangely mingled. The extremes of despair and enthusiastic expectation of external relief always tend to the development of such a state of mind among the people. One section appears to look forward to an unearthly kingdom, a reign of peace and law under divine agency, as an escape from the galling yoke of brute force; the other looks forward to the same or cognate means for securing the kingdom of heaven by the blood of aliens and heathens.[3]

The traditions which record the sayings of Jesus have gone through such a process of elimination and selection, that it is hardly possible at the present moment to say which are really his own words and which are not.[4] But taking them as they stand, and on

1 Milman, *History of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 76.

2 The similarity between the Zoroastrian idea of a deliverer and restorer of religion and order on earth, and the Messianic conception among the Jews, is, to say the least, wonderful. The Jews, it is certain, derived this conception from the Zoroastrians; and in their misfortunes developed it in more vivid terms. But I am strongly disposed to think that the idea of a Sosiosch, whatever its prophetic significance, arose among the Persians also when labouring under a foreign yoke—whether of the Semitic Assyrians or the Greek Macedonians it is difficult to say. The very country in which the scene of his appearance is laid—Kanguedez in Khorasan, according to De Sacy, Cansoya, according to Dollinger's authorities—show that the Persians, in their misfortunes, looked to the East, especially to the "Land of the Sun," for assistance and deliverance.

3 Like the modern, though obscure, sect of Christadelphians.

4 Milman himself admits that the traditions regarding the acts and sayings of Jesus, which were floating about among the Christian communities, were not cast into their present shape till almost the close of the first half of the second century (*History of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 126). Necessarily, therefore, the ancient collectors and modellers of the Christian Gospels, or as Milman regards them, rude and simple historians, must have exercised a discretionary latitude in the reception of the traditions. They must have decided everything on dogmatic grounds. "If a narrative or scripture was, in its tone and substance, agreeable to their (preconceived) views, they looked upon defective external evidence as complete; if it was not agreeable, the most sufficient was explained away as a misunderstanding." Hence a great many additions were made, though unconsciously, to the sayings and doings of Jesus. On this point the testimony of Celsus, with every allowance for exaggeration, must be regarded as conclusive when he says the Christians were in the habit of coining and remodelling their traditional accounts (*Origen c. Celsus* ii. 27). And this on the principle laid down by Sir W. Muir in Canon III. p. lxxxi. vol. i. (*Life of Mahomet*).

the same footing as we regard other religious documents (without ignoring their real spirit, yet without trying to find mysterious meanings like the faithful believer), we see that throughout these traditional records the notion of an immediate advent of a new order of things, "of a kingdom of heaven," is so predominant in the mind of Jesus as to overshadow all other ideas. The Son of Man has appeared, the kingdom of God is at hand; such is the burden of every hopeful word.[1] This kingdom was to replace the society and government which the Prophet of Nazareth found so imperfect and evil. At times his words led the disciples to conclude that the new Teacher was born to lead only the poor and the famished to glory and happiness; that under the hoped-for theocratic *regime* these alone would be "the blessed," and would constitute the predominating element, for "woe" is denounced in awful terms against the rich and the well-fed.[2] At other times, the realm of God is undersood to mean the literal fulfilment of the apocalyptic visions or dreams connected with the appearance of the Messiah. Sometimes, however, the kingdom of God is a realm of souls, and the approaching deliverance is merely a spiritual deliverance from the bondage of this mundane existence. All these conceptions appear at one period to have existed in the mind of Jesus simultaneously.[3] But the fierceness and bigotry of the dominant party and the power of the Roman eagle made any immediate social change impossible. As every hope of present amelioration died away, hopes and aspirations of a brighter future took possession of the heart. Jesus felt the present state could not last long; that the time of the regeneration of mankind was at hand,[4]

[1] Matt. iv. 17, x. 7, etc.

[2] Luke vii. 20 et seq. In Matthew "the poor in spirit" are mentioned. But the simpler statement of Luke, from a comparison of all the circumstances, seems more authentic.

[3] Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, p. 282.

[4] Matt. xix. 18.

There can be no doubt that Jesus himself believed in a corporeal resurrection, and in tangible rewards and punishments in a future life. He often spoke of "the blessed" in his kingdom eating and drinking at his table. But whilst in the early traditions passing under the name of the four apostles, the accounts, owing to careful pruning, are meagre enough, later traditionists enlarge upon the descriptions of paradise and hell, and revel in the most gorgeous fantasies, which go under the name of revelations (*vide* Rev. xxi. 8-21, xxii. 1, 2). In puerility even the Christian traditionists do not fall short of the followers of other creeds. The tradition handed down by Irenæus on the authority of John declares Jesus to have said, "Days shall

when he himself would appear in the clouds of heaven, clothed in divine garments, seated on a throne, surrounded by angels and his chosen disciples.[1] The dead would rise from their graves,[2] and the Messiah would sit in judgment. The angels would be the executors of his sentence. He would send the elect to a delightful abode prepared from the beginning of the world, and the unrighteous into "everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels,"[3] where there would be weeping and gnashing of teeth. The chosen, not numerically large,[4] would be taken into an illuminated mansion, where they would partake of banquets presided over by the father of the race of Israel, the patriarchs, and the prophets,[5] and in which Jesus himself will share.[6]

That the inauguration of the new *régime* with the second advent of Jesus and the resurrection of the human race was considered not to be distant, is apparent from the words of the Master himself, when he impressed upon his hearers the approach of the kingdom of God, and the utter futility of every provision for the occupations and exigencies of the present life.[7]

The words of the Teacher, acting in unison with the state of mind engendered by the circumstances of the age,[8] had sunk deep into the hearts of his disciples, and all looked forward, with a vividness of expectation hardly surpassed in the annals of human beliefs, to the literal fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the millennium.

"If the first generation of the Christians had a profound and constant belief, it was that the world was approaching its end, and that the great 'revelation' of Christ was to happen soon."[9] It is only

come in which there shall be vines, which shall have each ten thousand branches, and every one of these branches shall have ten thousand lesser branches, and every one of these branches shall have ten thousand twigs, and every one of these twigs shall have ten thousand clusters of grapes, and in every one of these clusters there shall be ten thousand grapes, and every one of these grapes being pressed shall yield two hundred and seventy-five gallons of wine; and when a man shall take hold of one of these sacred bunches, another bunch shall cry out, I am a better bunch, take me, and bless the Lord by me," etc.

1 Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30, 31, xxv. 31 et seq., etc.
2 Rev. xx. 12, 13. Compare these notions with the Zoroastrian belief.
3 Matt. xxv. 41.
4 Luke xiii. 23.
5 Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28, xxii. 30.
6 Matt. xxvi. 29.
7 Matt x. 23; Mark xiii. 30; Luke xiii. 35; Matt. vi. 25-34, viii. 22.
8 Mark the bitter term which Jesus applies to his generation.
9 Renan, *Vi de Jesus*, p. 287. Comp. also Milman's *History of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 378.

when the Christian Church becomes a regular organisation that the followers of Jesus expand their views beyond the restricted horizon of the Judaic world, and, forgetting their millenarian dream, they pass into the Greek and Roman system, and extend the empire of their creed over untold legions of barbarians fresh from their forests, who looked upon Jesus and his mother as the counterparts of their own Odin and Freya worshipped in their primeval homes.

But ever and anon the Christian world has been agitated in moments of convulsions and disasters by the millenary excitement and fierce expectation of the apocalyptic appearance of the great Prophet of Nazareth. The idea, however, of the realm of God has, with the lapse of ages and progress of thought, taken either a spiritual shape or utterly faded away from the mind, or, where it has been retained, derives its character from the surroundings of the individual believers. The Jew, the Mago-Zoroastrian, and the Christian all believed in a bodily resurrection. The crude notions of primitive Mosaism had made way for more definite ideas derived chiefly from the Chaldæo-Zoroastrian doctrines. We know how among the Persians the old worship of the mountains, the simple teachings of the early teachers, had grown, under the magic wands of the Babylonian wizards, into a complex system of graduated rewards and punishments,—how Chaldæan philosophy had permeated Mago-Zoroastrianism to its innermost core. Primitive Christianity, with its vivid belief in the immediate advent of the material kingdom of Christ, had imbibed notions from Chaldæan, Mago-Zoroastrian, and Alexandrian sources which had considerably altered the old conceptions. Jew, Christian, and Zoroastrian all looked, more or less, to material rewards and punishments in a future existence.

The popular Christian notion, fostered by ecclesiasticism, that Mohammed denied souls to women, is by this time, we believe, exploded. It was a calumny concocted to create an aversion against Islam. But the idea that the Arabian Prophet promised his followers a sensual paradise with *hooris*, and a graduated scale of delights, still lingers. It is a sign alike of ignorance and ancient bigotry. There is no doubt that in the Suras of the intermediate period, before the mind of the Teacher had attained the full development of religious consciousness, and when it was necessary to formulate in language intelligible to the common folk of the desert, the

realistic descriptions of heaven and hell, borrowed from the floating fancies of Zoroastrian, Sabæan, and the Talmudical Jew, attract the attention as a side picture, and then comes the real essence—the adoration of God in humility and love. The *hooris* are creatures of Zoroastrian origin, so is paradise,[1] whilst hell in the severity of its punishment is Talmudic. The descriptions are realistic, in some places almost sensuous; but to say that they are sensual, or that Mohammed, or any of his followers, even the ultra-literalists accepted them as such, is a calumny. The wine "that does not inebriate" and the attendants "that come not nigh," can hardly be said to represent sensual pleasures!

The chief and predominating idea in Islâm respecting a future life is founded upon the belief that, in a state of existence hereafter, every human being will have to render an account of his or her actions on earth, and that the happiness or misery of individuals will depend upon the manner in which they have performed the behests of their Creator. His mercy and grace are nevertheless unbounded, and will be bestowed alike upon His creatures. This is the pivot on which the whole doctrine of future life in Islam turns, and this is the only doctrinal point one is required to believe and accept. All the other elements, caught up and syncretised from the floating traditions of the races and peoples of the time, are mere accessories. Setting aside from our consideration the question of subjectivity involved in all ideas of future rewards and punishments, we may say, in all ideas of a life after death, we must bear in mind that these ideas have furnished to the moral teachers of the world the most powerful instrument for influencing the conduct of individuals and nations. But though every religion, more or less, contains the germ of this principle of future accountability in another state, all have failed thoroughly to realise its nature as a continuous agency for the elevation of the masses. Virtue, for its own sake, can only be grasped by minds of superior development; for the average intellect, and for the uneducated, sanctions, more or less comprehensible, will always be necessary.

To turn now to the nature of these sanctions, it must be remembered that it is scarcely ever possible to convey an idea of

[1] In Persian, *firdous*.

spiritual pleasure or spiritual pain to the apprehensions of the generality of mankind without clothing the expressions in the garb of tangible personalities, or introducing sensible objects into the description of such pleasure or pain. Philosophy has wrangled over abstract expressions, not dressed in tangible phraseology. Such expressions and conceptions have seen their day, have flourished, and have died without making themselves felt beyond a restricted circle of dreamers, who lived in the indefinable vagueness of their own thoughts.

Mohammed was addressing himself not only to the advanced minds of a few idealistic thinkers who happened to be then living, but to the wide world around him engrossed in materialism of every type. He had to adapt himself to the comprehensions of all. To the wild famished Arab, what more grateful, or what more cónsonant to his ideas of paradise than rivers of unsullied incorruptible water, or of milk and honey; or anything more acceptable than unlimited fruit, luxuriant vegetation, inexhaustible fertility? He could conceive of no bliss unaccompanied with these sensuous pleasures. This is the contention of that portion of the Moslem world which, like Sanaï and Ghazzalı, holds that behind the descriptions of material happiness portrayed in objects like trees, rivers, and beautiful mansions with fairy attendants, lies a deeper meaning; and that the joy of joys is to consist in the beatific visions of the soul in the presence of the Almighty, when the veil which divides man from his Creator will be rent, and heavenly glory revealed to the mind untrammelled by its corporeal, earthly habiliments. In this they are upheld by the words of the Koran as well as the authentic sayings of the Prophet. "The most favoured of God," said Mohammed, "will be he who shall see his Lord's face (glory) night and morning, a felicity which will surpass all the pleasures of the body, as the ocean surpasses a drop of sweat." One day, talking to his friend, Abû Huraira, the Prophet said, "God has prepared for His good people what no eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of any one," and then recited the following verse of the Koran; "No soul knoweth the joy which is secretly prepared for it as a reward for that it may have wrought."[1] Another tradition[2] reports that Mohammed declared

1 Koran xxxii. 17; Mishkât, bk. xxiii. chap. xiii. pt. i.
2 From Suhaib.

the good will enjoy the beatific vision of God, to which reference, he said, is made in the following verse of the Koran: "And God inviteth unto the dwelling of peace. . . . . For those who do good there is excellent reward and superabundant addition." [1]

As to the parabolical nature of the Koranic expressions, this school of thinkers bases its convictions on the following passage of the inspired book: "It is He who hath sent down unto thee 'the book.' Some of the signs (verses) are firm (*i.e.* perspicuous or clear to understand)—these are the basis (or fundamental part) of the book—and others are figurative." [2]

Another section looks upon the joys and pains of the Hereafter as entirely subjective. It holds that as extreme mental pain is far more agonising than physical pain, so is mental pleasure of the higher type far more rapturous than any sensuous pleasure; that as, after physical death, the individual soul merges ("returns," in the Koranic expressions) in the Universal Soul, all the joys and pains, portrayed in vivid colours by the inspired Teacher to enable the masses to grasp the truth, will be mental and subjective. This section includes within its bosom some of the greatest philosophers and mystics of the Moslem world.

Another, and by far the largest class, however, believe in the literal fulfilment of all the word-paintings of the Koran.

Without venturing to pass any opinion on these different notions, we may take this occasion to state our own belief with regard to the Koranic conception of future rewards and punishments.

A careful study of the Koran makes it evident that the mind of Mohammed went through the same process of development which marked the religious consciousness of Jesus. Mohammed and Jesus are the only two historic teachers of the world, and for this reason we take them together. How great this development was in Jesus is apparent, not only from the idealised conception towards the end of his earthly career regarding the Kingdom of Heaven, but also from the change of tone towards the non-Israelites. Thoroughly

[1] Koran x. 27. Consult here Zamakhsharî (the *Kashshâf*), Egyp. Ed., pt. i. p. 244; he gives the fullest references to the opinions of the different theologians and schools, and especially mentions the doctrines of the *Mushhabbahâs* and the *Jabarias*.

[2] Koran iii 5.

exclusive at first,[1] with a more developed religious consciousness wider sympathies awaken in the heart.[2]

As with Jesus so with Mohammed.

The various chapters of the Koran which contain the ornate descriptions of paradise, whether figurative or literal, were delivered wholly or in part at Mecca. Probably in the infancy of his religious consciousness, Mohammed himself believed in some or other of the traditions which floated around him. But with a wider awakening of the soul, a deeper communion with the Creator of the Universe, thoughts, which bore a material aspect at first, became spiritualised. The mind of the Teacher progressed not only with the march of time and the development of his religious consciousness, but also with the progress of his disciples in apprehending spiritual conceptions. Hence, in the later *suras* we observe a merging of the material in the spiritual, of the body in the soul. The gardens "watered by rivers," perpetual shade,[3] plenty and harmony, so agreeable to the famished denizen of the parched, shadeless, and waterless desert, at perpetual discord with himself and all around him,—these still form the groundwork of beautiful imageries; 'but the happiness of the blessed is shown to consist in eternal peace and goodwill in the presence of their Creator. "But those," says the Koran, "who are pious shall dwell in gardens, amidst fountains; they shall say unto them, 'Enter ye therein in peace and security;' and all rancour will we remove from their bosoms; they shall sit as brethren, face to face,[4] on couches; weariness shall not affect them therein, neither shall they be repelled thence for ever."[5]

What can be nobler or grander in its conception or imagery, or give a better idea of the belief in Mohammed's mind, (at least towards the latter period of his career), concerning the nature of the present and future life, than the following passage: "It is He who enableth you to travel by land and by sea; so that ye go on board of ships, which sail on with them, with favourable breeze, and they rejoice therein. But if a tempestuous wind overtake, and the waves come on them from every side, and they think they are encompassed

[1] Matt. x. 5, xv. 22-26.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 19, etc.; comp. throughout Strauss, *New Life of Jesus* (1865), vol. i. p. 296 et seq.

[3] Koran xiii. 34, xlvii. 16, 17. Comp. also chaps. ix., x., and xiv.

[4] *I.e.* with peace and good will in their hearts.

[5] Koran xv. 44.

therewith, they call on God, professing unto Him sincere religion; (saying) wouldst Thou but rescue us from this, then we will ever be indeed of the thankful. But when We have rescued them, Behold! they commit unrighteous excesses on the earth. O men! verily the excesses ye commit to the injury of your own souls are only for the enjoyment of this earthly life; soon shall ye return to Us, and We will declare unto you that which ye have done. Verily, the likeness of this present life is not otherwise than the water which We send down from heaven; and the productions of the earth, of which men and cattle eat, are mixed therewith, till the earth has received its beautiful raiment, and is decked out, and they who inhabit it imagine they have power over it! (But) Our behest cometh unto it by night or by day, and We make it as if it had been mown, as though it had not teemed (with fertility) only yesterday. Thus do we make our signs clear unto those who consider. And God inviteth unto the abodes of peace, and guideth whom He pleaseth into the right way.[1] For those who do good is excellent reward and superabundant addition of it; neither blackness nor shame shall cover their faces. These are the inhabitants of paradise; therein do they abide for ever. But those who have wrought evil shall receive the reward of evil equal thereunto;[2] and shame shall cover them (for there will be none to protect them against God) as though their faces were covered with a piece of the night of profound darkness."[3]

Then again, what can be purer in its aspirations than the following:—

"Who fulfil the covenant of God and break not their compact; and who join together what God hath bidden to be joined; and who fear their Lord and dread an ill-reckoning; and who, from a sincere desire to please their Lord,[4] are constant amid trials, and observe prayers and give alms, in secret and openly, out of what We have bestowed on them; and turn aside evil with good: for

1 Baizâwi explains the expression "whom He pleaseth," as "those who repent" (p. 67, n. 1, chap. iv). Compare Zamakhshari (the *Kashshâf*).

2 Observe the reward of virtue will not be confined to an exact measure of man's works; it will far exceed his deserts; but the recompense of evil will be strictly proportioned to what one has done.

3 Koran x. 23-28.

4 This may also be translated as "from a desire to see the face (glory) of their Lord."

them there is the recompense of that abode, gardens of eternal habitation, into which they shall enter, together with such as shall have acted rightly from among their fathers, their wives, and their posterity; and the angels shall go in unto them by every portal, (saying), 'Peace be with you! because ye have endured with patience.' Excellent is the reward in that abode!"[1]

Enough has been said to show the utter falsehood of the theory that Mohammed's pictures of future life were all sensuous. We will conclude this chapter with the following passage from the Koran to show the depth of spirituality in Islam, and the purity of the hopes and aspirations on which it bases its rule of life: "O thou soul which are at rest, return unto thy Lord, pleased and pleasing Him, enter thou among my servants, and enter thou my garden of felicity."[2]

[1] Koran xiii. 20-24. Compare throughout Zamakhshari (the *Kashshâf*).
[2] Koran lxxxix. 27-30.

CHAPTER VII.

THE POLITICAL SPIRIT OF ISLÂM.

"The blood of the *Zimmi* is like the blood of the Moslem"—ALI.

HITHERTO, we have considered the teachings of the Arabian Prophet solely from one point of view—as furnishing the rule of human conduct, and supplying the guide of man's duty to his Creator and to his fellow-creatures. We now propose to examine the influence of Islam on collective humanity,—on nations, and not merely on the individual, in short, on the destiny of mankind in the aggregate.

Seven centuries had passed since the Master of Nazareth had come with his message of the Kingdom of Heaven to the poor and the lowly. A beautiful life was ended before the ministry had barely commenced. And now unutterable desolation brooded over the empires and kingdoms of the earth, and God's children, sunk in misery, were anxiously waiting for the promised deliverance which was so long in coming.

In the West, as in the East, the condition of the masses was so miserable as to defy description. They possessed no civil rights or political privileges. These were the monopoly of the rich and the powerful, or of the sacerdotal classes. The law was not the same for the weak and the strong, the rich and the poor, the great and the lowly. In Sassanide Persia, the priests and the landed proprietors, the *Dehkâns*, enjoyed all power and influence, and the wealth of the country was centred in their hands. The peasantry, and the poorer classes generally, were ground to the earth under a lawless despotism. In the Byzantine Empire, the clergy and the great magnates, courtezans, and other nameless ministrants to the vices of Cæsar and proconsul, were the happy possessors of wealth, influence, and power. The people grovelled in the most abject misery. In the barbaric kingdoms—in fact, wherever feudalism had established

itself—by far the largest proportion of the population were either serfs or slaves.

Villeinage or serfdom was the ordinary status of the peasantry. At first there was little distinction between prædial and domestic slavery. Both classes of slaves, with their families, and their goods and chattels, belonged to the lord of the soil, who could deal with them at his own free will and pleasure.[1] In later times the serfs or villeins were either annexed to the manor, and were bought and sold with the land to which they belonged, or were annexed to the person of the lord, and were transferable from one owner to another. They could not leave their lord without his permission; and if they ran away, or were purloined from him, might be claimed and recovered by action, like beasts or other chattels. They held, indeed, small portions of land by way of sustaining themselves and their families, but it was at the mere will of the lord, who might dispossess them whenever he pleased. A villein could acquire no property, either in lands or goods; but if he purchased either, the lord might enter upon them, oust the villein, and seize them to his own use.

An iron-collar round the neck was the badge of both prædial servitude and domestic slavery. The slaves were driven from place to place in gangs, fed like swine, and housed worse than swine, with fettered feet and manacled hands, linked together in a single chain which led from collar to collar. The trader in human flesh rode with a heavy knotted lash in his hands, with which he 'encouraged' the weary and flagging. This whip when it struck, and that was frequently, cut the flesh out of the body. Men, women, and children were thus dragged about the country with rags on their body, their ankles ulcerated, their naked feet torn. If any of the wretches flagged and fell, they were laid on the ground and lashed until the skin was flayed and they were nearly dead. The horrors of the Middle Passage, the sufferings of the poor negroes in the Southern States of North America before the War of Emancipation, the cruelties practised by the Soudanese slave-lifters, give us some conception of the terrible sufferings of the slaves under Christian domination at the time when Islam was first promulgated, and until the close of the

[1] The Church retained its slaves longest. Sir Thomas Smith in his *Commonwealth* speaks bitterly of the hypocrisy of the clergy.

fifteenth century.[1] And even after the lapse of almost two thousand years of Christ's reign, we still find Christians lashing to death helpless women, imprisoned for real or imaginary political offences by one of the most powerful empires of the civilised world.

The condition of the so-called freemen was nowise better than that of the ordinary serfs. If they wanted to part with their lands, they must pay a fine to the lord of the manor. If they wanted to buy any, they must likewise pay a fine. They could not take by succession any property until they had paid a heavy duty. They could not grind their corn or make their bread without paying a share to the lord. They could not harvest their crops before the Church had first appropriated its tenth, the king his twentieth, the courtiers their smaller shares. They could not leave their homes without the leave of the lord, and they were bound, at all times, to render him gratuitous services. If the lord's son or daughter married, they must cheerfully pay their contributions. But when the freeman's daughter married, she must first submit to an infamous outrage—and not even the bishop, the servant of Christ, when he happened to be lord of the manor, would waive the atrocious privilege of barbarism. Death even had no solace for these poor victims of barbarism. Living, they were subject to the inhumanities of man; dead, they were doomed to eternal perdition; for a *felo-de-se* was the unholiest of criminals, there was no room for his poor body in consecrated ground; he could only be smuggled away in the dead of night and buried in some unhallowed spot with a stake through his body as a warning to others.

Such was the terrible misery which hung over the people! But the baron in his hall, the bishop in his palace, the priest in his cloister, little recked they of the sufferings of the masses. The clouds of night had gathered over the fairest portion of Europe and Africa. Everywhere the will of the strongest was the measure of law and right. The Church afforded no help to the down-trodden and oppressed. Its teachings were opposed to the enfranchisement of the human race from the rule of brute force. "The early Fathers" had

[1] In the first Parliamentary War waged against Charles I., we find both sides selling their opponents as slaves to the colonists. After the suppression of the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion all his followers were sold into slavery. The treatment of the slaves in the colonies at the hands of "the Pilgrim Fathers" and their descendants will not bear description.

condemned resistance to the constituted authorities as a deadly sin. No tyranny, no oppression, no outrages upon humanity were held to justify subjects in forcibly protecting themselves against the injustice of their rulers. The servants of Jesus had made common cause with those whom he had denounced,—the rich and powerful tyrant. They had associated themselves with feudalism, and enjoyed all its privileges as lords of the soil, barons and princes.

The non-Christians—Jews, heretics, or pagans—enjoyed, under Christian domination, a fitful existence. It was a matter of chance whether they would be massacred or reduced to slavery. Rights they had none; enough if they were suffered to exist. If a Christian contracted an illicit union with a non-Christian,—a lawful union was out of the question,—he was burnt to death. The Jews might not eat or drink or sit at the same table with the Christians, nor dress like them. Their children were liable to be torn from their arms, their goods plundered, at the will of the baron or bishop, or a frenzied populace. And this state of things lasted until the close of the seventeenth century.

Not until the Recluse of Hira sounded the note of freedom,—not until he proclaimed the practical equality of mankind, not until he abolished every privilege of caste, and emancipated labour,—did the chains which had held in bond the nations of the earth fall to pieces. He came with the same message which had been brought by his precursors and *he* fulfilled it.

The essence of the political character of Islâm is to be found in the charter, which was granted to the Jews by the Prophet after his arrival in Medîna, and the notable message sent to the Christians of Najran and the neighbouring territories after Islam had fully established itself in the Peninsula. This latter document has, for the most part, furnished the guiding principle to all Moslem rulers in their mode of dealing with their non-Moslem subjects, and if they have departed from it in any instance the cause is to be found in the character of the particular sovereign. If we separate the political necessity which has often spoken and acted in the name of religion, no faith is more tolerant than Islam to the followers of other creeds.[1] "Reasons of State" have led a sovereign

[1] Comp. Gobineau, *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale.*

here and there to display a certain degree of intolerance, or to insist upon a certain uniformity of faith; but the system itself has ever maintained the most complete tolerance. Christians and Jews, as a rule, have never been molested in the exercise of their religion, or constrained to change their faith. If they are required to pay a special tax, it is in lieu of military service, and it is but right that those who enjoy the protection of the State should contribute in some shape to the public burdens. Towards the idolators there was greater strictness in theory, but in practice the law was equally liberal. If at any time they were treated with harshness, the cause is to be found in the passions of the ruler or the population. The religious element was used only as a pretext.

In support of the time-worn thesis that the non-Moslem subjects[1] of Islamic States labour under severe disabilities, reference is made not only to the narrow views of the later canonists and lawyers of Islam, but also to certain verses of the Koran, in order to show that the Prophet did not view non-Moslems with favour, and did not encourage friendly relations between them and his followers.[2] In dealing with this subject, we must not forget the stress and strain of the life-and-death struggle in which Islam was involved when those verses were promulgated, and the treacherous means that were often employed by the heathens, as well as the Jews and the Christians, to corrupt and seduce the Moslems from the new Faith. At such a time, it was incumbent upon the Teacher to warn his followers against the wiles and insidious designs of hostile creeds. And no student of comparative history can blame him for trying to safeguard his little commonwealth against the treachery of enemies and aliens. But when we come to look at his general treatment of non-Moslem subjects, we find it marked by a large-hearted tolerance and sympathy.

Has any conquering race or Faith given to its subject nationalities a nobler guarantee than is to be found in the following words of the Prophet? "To [the Christians of] Najran and the neighbouring territories, the security of God and the pledge of His Prophet are extended for their lives, their religion, and their property—to the present as well as the absent and others besides; there shall be no interference with [the practice of] their faith or their observances; nor any change

1 In the Islâmic system the non-Moslem subjects of Moslem states are called *Ahl-uz-zimmah* or *Zimmis i. e.* "people living under guarantees."

2 See Sell's Essays on Islâm.

in their rights or privileges; no bishop shall be removed from his bishopric; nor any monk from his monastery, nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy every thing great and small as heretofore; no image or cross shall be destroyed; they shall not oppress or be oppressed; they shall not practise the rights of blood-vengeance as in the Days of Ignorance; no tithes shall be levied from them nor shall they be required to furnish provisions for the troops."[1]

After the subjugation of Hîra. and as soon as the people had taken the oath of allegiance, Khalid bin-Walîd issued a proclamation by which he guaranteed the lives, liberty and property of the Christians, and declared that "they shall not be prevented from beating their *nâkûs*[2] and taking out their crosses on occasions of festivals." "And this declaration," says Imâm Abû-Yusuf,[3] "was approved of and sanctioned by the Caliph[4] and his council."[5]

The non-Moslem subjects were not precluded from building new churches or temples. Only in places exclusively inhabited by Moslems a rule of this kind existed in theory. "No new Church or temple", said Abdullah bin Abbas,[6] "can be erected in a town solely inhabited by Moslems; but in other places where there are already *Zimmis* inhabiting from before, we must abide by our contract with them."[7] In practice, however, the prohibition was totally disregarded. In the reign of Mamun, we hear of eleven thousand Christian churches, besides hundreds of synagogues and fire-temples within the empire. This enlightened monarch, who has been represented as "a bitter enemy" of the Christians, included in his Council the representatives of all the communities under his sway,—Moslems, Jews, Christians, Sabæans and Zoroastrians; whilst the rights and privileges of the Christian hierarchy were carefully regulated and guaranteed.

[1] *i. e.* troops be quartered on them; *Futûh ul-Buldân* (Balâzuri) p. 65; *Kitâb-ul-Khirâj* of Imâm Abû Yusuf. Muir gives this guarantee of the Prophet in a somewhat abridged form, vol. II. p. 299; for the text see Appendix.

[2] A piece of wood used in Eastern Christian churches in place of a bell.

[3] The Chief Kazi of Harun ar-Rashîd.

[4] Abu Bakr.

[5] Consisting of Omar, Osman and Ali and the other leading Companions of the Prophet; See the *Kitâb ul-Khirâj*, p. 84.

[6] A cousin of the Prophet and a jurist of recognised authority.

[7] *Kitâb ul-Khirâj*, p. 88.

It is a notable fact, with few parallels even in modern history, that after the conquest of Egypt the Caliph Omar scrupulously preserved in tact the property dedicated to the Christian churches and continued the allowances made by the former government for the support of the priests.[1]

The best testimony to the toleration of the early Moslem government is furnished by the Christians themselves. In the reign of Osman (the third Caliph), the Christian Patriarch of Merv, addressed the Bishop of Fars, named Simeon, in the following terms.—"The Arabs who have been given by God the kingdom (of the earth) do not attack the Christian faith; on the contrary they help us in our religion; they respect our God and our Saints, and bestow gifts on our churches and monasteries."

In order to avoid the least semblance of high-handedness, no Moslem was allowed to acquire the land of a *zimmi* even by purchase. "Neither the Imam nor the Sultan could dispossess a *zimmi* of his property."

The Moslems and the *zimmis* were absolutely equal in the eye of the law. "Their blood," said Ali the Caliph, "was like our blood." Many modern governments, not excepting some of the most civilised, may take the Moslem administration for their model. In the punishment of crimes there was no difference between the rulers and the ruled. Islam's law is that if a *zimmi* is killed by a Moslem, the latter is liable to the same penalty as in the reverse case.[2]

In their anxiety for the welfare of the non-Moslem subjects, the Caliphs of Bagdad, like their rivals of Cordova, created a special department charged with the protection of the *zimmis* and the safeguarding of their interests. The head of this department was called, in Bagdad, *Kâtib-ul-Jihbâzeh*; in Spain, *Kâtib-uz-Zimâm*.[3]

Mutawakkil, who rased to the ground the mausoleum of the martyr Hussain and forbade pilgrimages to the consecrated spot, excluded non-Moslems, as he excluded the Moslem Rationalists,

1 Makrîsi, pp. 492, 499.

2 Zailye in his *Takhrîj-ul-Hedâya* mentions a case which occurred in the Caliphate of Omar. A Moslem of the name of Bakr bin Wail killed a Christian named Hairut. The Caliph ordered that "the killer should be surrendered to the heirs of the killed". The culprit was made over to Honain, Hairut's heir, who put him to death, p. 338, Delhi edition. A similar case is reported in the reign of Omar bin Abdul Azîz.

3 With a *Zâl*; see *Short History of the Saracens*.

from the employment of the state and subjected them to many disabilities. In the later works of law, written whilst the great struggle was proceeding between Islam and Christendom, on one side for life—on the other for brute mastery, there occur no doubt passages which give colour to the allegation that in Islâm *zimmis* are subject to humiliation. But no warrant for this statement will be found in the rules inculcated by the Teacher, or his immediate disciples or successors. It must be added, however, that the bigoted views of the later canonists were never carried into practice; and the toleration and generosity with which the non-Moslems were treated are evidenced by the fact that *zimmis* could be nominated as executors to the wills of Moslems; that they often filled the office of rectors of Moslem universities and educational institutions, and of curators of Moslem endowments so long as they did not perform any religious functions. And when a non-Moslem of worth and merit died, the Moslems attended his funeral in a body.

In the beginning military commands, for obvious reasons, were not entrusted to non-Moslems, but all other posts of emolument and trust were open to them equally with Islamists. This equality was not merely theoretical, for from the first century of the Hegira we find important offices of state held by Christians, Jews and Magians. The Abbassides, with rare exceptions, recognised no distinction among their subjects on the score of religion. And the dynasties that succeeded them in power scrupulously followed their example.

If the treatment of non-Moslems in Islâmic countries is compared with that of non-Christians under European Governments, it would be found that the balance of humanity and generosity, generally speaking, inclines in favour of Islam. Under the Mogul Emperors of Delhi, Hindoos commanded armies, administered provinces and sat in the councils of the soverəign. Even at the present time, can it be said that in no European empire, ruling over mixed nationalities and faiths, is any distinction made of creed, colour or race?

That which Islâm had almost exclusively in view was to inculcate among mankind the principle of divine unity and human equality

preached by the Prophet. So long as the central doctrine of the unity of God and the message of the Prophet is recognised and accepted, Islam allows the widest latitude to the human conscience. Consequently, wherever the Moslem missionary-soldier made his appearance, he was hailed by the down-trodden masses and the persecuted heretics as the harbinger of freedom and emancipation from a galling bondage. Islam brought to them practical equality in the eye of the law, and fixity of taxation.

The battle of Kâdessia, which threw Persia into the hands of the Moslems, was the signal of deliverance to the bulk of the Persians, as the battles of Yermuk and Ajnadin were to the Syrians, the Greeks, and the Egyptians. The Jews, whom the Zoroastrians had massacred from time to time, the Christians, whom they hunted from place to place, breathed freely under the authority of the Prophet, the watch-word of whose faith was the brotherhood of man. The people everywhere received the Moslems as their liberators. Wherever any resistance was offered, it was by the priesthood and the aristocracy. The masses and the working classes in general, who were under the ban of Zoroastrianism, ranged themselves with the conquerors. A simple confession of an everlasting truth placed them on the same footing as their Moslem emancipators.

The feudal chiefs of the tribes and villages retained all their privileges, honours, and local influence,—"more than we believe," says Gobineau, "for the oppressions and persecutions of the Mussulmans have been greatly exaggerated."

The conquest of Africa and Spain was attended with the same result. The Arians, the Pelagians, and other heretics hitherto the victims of orthodox fury and hatred,—the people at large, who had been terribly oppressed by a lawless soldiery and a still more lawless priesthood,—found peace and security under Islam. By an irony of fate, which almost induces a belief in the Nemesis of the ancients, the Jews, whose animosity towards the Prophet very nearly wrought the destruction of the Islamic commonwealth, found in the Moslems their best protectors. "Insulted, plundered, hated and despised by all Christian nations," they found that refuge in Islam, that protection from inhumanity, which was ruthlessly denied to them in Christendom.

Islâm gave to the people a code which, however archaic in its

simplicity, was capable of the greatest development in accordance with the progress of material civilisation. It conferred on the State a flexible constitution, based on a just appreciation of human rights and human duty. It limited taxation, it made men equal in the eye of the law, it consecrated the principles of self-government. It established a control over the sovereign power by rendering the executive authority subordinate to the law,—a law based upon religious sanction and moral obligations. "The excellence and effectiveness of each of these principles," says Urquhart, "(each capable of immortalising its founder), gave value to the rest; and all combined, endowed the system which they formed with a force and energy exceeding those of any other political system. Within the lifetime of a man, though in the hands of a population, wild, ignorant, and insignificant, it spread over a greater extent than the dominions of Rome. While it retained its primitive character, it was irresistible."[1]

The short government of Abû Bakr was too fully occupied with the labour of pacifying the desert tribes to afford time for any systematic regulation of the provinces. But with the reign of Omar—a truly great man—commenced that sleepless care for the welfare of the subject nations which characterised the early Moslem governments.

An examination of the political condition of the Moslems under the early Caliphs brings into view a popular government administered by an elective chief with limited powers. The prerogatives of the head of the State were confined to administrative and executive matters, such as the regulation of the police, control of the army, transaction of foreign affairs, disbursement of the finances, etc. But he could never act in contravention of the recognised law.

The tribunals were not dependent on the government. Their decisions were supreme; and the early Caliphs could not assume the power of pardoning those whom the regular tribunals had condemned. The law was the same for the poor as for the rich, for the man in power as for the labourer in the field.

As time advances the stringency of the system is relaxed but the form is always maintained. Even the usurpers, who, without right, by treachery and murder seized the reins of government, and who

[1] Urquhart, *Spirit of the East*, vol. i. Introd. p. xxviii.

in their persons represented the pagan oligarchy which had been displaced by the teachings of Islam, observed more or less the outward semblance of law-abiding executive heads of a representative government. And the rulers of the later dynasties, when they overstepped the bounds, often unlimited, of arbitrary power, were restrained by the sentence of the general body of jurisconsults, which in all Mussalman States serves as a constitutional check on the sovereign. In the early times, however, the "Companions" of the Master formed as it were, an effective Council of State. The consideration attached to the title of "Companion of the Prophet" was as great in the camp as in the city. The powerful influence which they possessed increased with the conquests of the Moslems. The quality of *ashâb* carried with it a character of sanctity and nobleness. When a person bearing this title was in an action, the crowd flocked to his side and followed his lead. In the first degree were those who had accompanied the Prophet from Mecca—the Exiles, and the Ansar who had received him with devotion, and who had battled in defence of the Faith at Badr and Ohod ; those who were charged with any work by him and those who had talked with him, seen him, or heard him. In the last rank came those who had served under any of the *sahâba*, and thus came indirectly within the magic influence of the Master.

An incident which occurred during the Caliphate of Omar shows the absolute equality of all men in Islam. Jabala, king of the Ghassanides, having embraced the Faith, had proceeded to Medîna to pay his homage to the Commander of the Faithful. He had entered the city with great pomp and ceremony, and been received with much consideration. Whilst performing the *tawâf*, or circumambulation of the Kaaba, a humble pilgrim engaged in the same sacred duties accidentally dropped a piece of his pilgrim's dress over the royal shoulders. Jabala turned round furiously and struck him a blow which knocked out the poor man's teeth. The rest of this episode must be told in the memorable words of Omar himself to Abu Obaidah, commanding the Moslem troops in Syria. "The poor man came to me," writes the Caliph, "and prayed for redress ; I sent for Jabala, and when he came before me I asked him why he had so ill-treated a brother-Moslem. He answered that the man had insulted him, and that were it not for the sanctity of the place he would have killed him on the spot. I answered that his words added to the

gravity of his offence, and that unless he obtained the pardon of the injured man he would have to submit to the usual penalty of the law. Jabala replied, 'I am a king, and the other is only a common man.' 'King or no king, both of you are Mussalmans, and both of you are equal in the eye of law.' He asked that the penalty might be delayed until the next day; and, on the consent of the injured, I accorded the delay. In the night Jabala escaped, and has now joined the Christian dog.[1] But God will grant thee victory over him and the like of them. . . ."

This letter was read by Abû Obaidah at the head of his troops. These communications appear to have been frequent under the early Caliphate. No person in the camp or in the city was a stranger to public affairs. Every Friday after divine service, the Commander of the Faithful mentioned to the assembly the important nominations and events of the day. The prefects in their provinces followed the example. No one was excluded from these general assemblies of the public. It was the reign of democracy in its best form. The Pontiff of Islam, the Commander of the Faithful, was not hedged round by any divinity. He was responsible for the administration of the State to his subjects. The stern devotion of the early Caliphs to the well-being of the people, and the austere simplicity of their lives, were in strict accordance with the example of the Master. They preached and prayed in the mosque like the Prophet; received in their homes the poor and oppressed, and failed not to give a hearing to the meanest. Without cortege, without pomp or ceremony, they ruled the hearts of men by the force of their character. Omar travelled to Syria to receive the capitulation of Jerusalem, accompanied by a single slave. Abu Bakr on his death-bed left only a suit of clothes, a camel, and a slave to his heir. Every Friday, Ali distributed his own allowance from the public treasury among the distressed and suffering; and set an example to the people by his respect for the ordinary tribunals. Whilst the Republic lasted none of the Caliphs could alter, or act contrary to, the judgment of the constituted courts of justice.[2]

1 Such was the designation usually given to the Byzantine emperors by the early Moslems.

2 The first sentence of a court of justice which was not carried into execution was under Muawiyah, who pardoned a man found guilty by the judge upon the criminal reciting a poem in praise of the usurper.

Naturally, it is difficult for a new government, introduced by force of arms, to conciliate the affection of the people at once. But the early Saracens offered to the conquered nations motives for the greatest confidence and attachment. Headed by chiefs of the moderation and gentleness of Abu Obaidah, who tempered and held in check the ferocity of soldiers like Khalid, they maintained in tact the civil rights of their subjects. They accorded to all the conquered nations the completest religious toleration. Their conduct might furnish to many of the civilised governments of modern times the noblest example of civil and religious liberty. They did not lash women to death. They did not condemn innocent females to the outrages of the Siberian mines and their guards. They had the sagacity not to interfere with any beneficent civil institution, existing in the conquered countries, which did not militate with their religion.

The measures taken by Omar to secure the agricultural prosperity of the people evince an ever-present solicitude to promote their well-being and interests. Taxation on land was fixed upon an equable and moderate basis; aqueducts and canals were ordered to be made in every part of the empire. The feudal burdens, which had afflicted the cultivators of the soil, were absolutely withdrawn, and the peasantry were emancipated from the bondage of centuries. The death of this remarkable man at the hands of an assassin was an undoubted loss to the government. His character, stern and yet just, his practical commonsense and knowledge of men, had eminently fitted him to repress and hold in check the ambitious designs of the children of Ommeyya. On his deathbed Omar entrusted to six electors the task of nominating a successor to the office. The Caliphate was offered to the son of Abu Talib, but Ommeyyade intrigue had annexed to the proposal a condition which they knew Ali would not accept. He was required to govern, not only in accordance with the laws and precedents of the Prophet, but also with those established by his two predecessors. With characteristic independence Ali refused to allow his judgment to be so fettered. The Caliphate was then offered, as it was expected by the Ommeyyades, to their kinsman Osman. The accession of this venerable chief to the vicegerency of the Prophet proved in the sequel an unqualified disaster to the commonwealth of Islam. He was a member of that family which

had always borne a deep-rooted animosity towards the children of Hashim. They had persecuted the Teacher with rancorous hatred, and had driven him from his home. They had struggled hard to crush the Faith in its infancy, and had battled against it to the last. Strongly united among themselves, and exercising great influence among all the tribes of Mozar,[1] of which they were the prominent members, the Ommeyyades had watched with ill-concealed jealousy the old power and prestige slip away from their hands. After the fall of Mecca they had accepted the inveitable, but never forgave the house of Hashim or Islam for the ruin which the son of Abdullah had wrought to them. Whilst the Prophet lived, his commanding personality overawed all these traitors. Many of them had made a nominal profession of the Faith from self-interest [2] and a greed to secure a part of the worldly goods which the success of the Moslems brought to the Islamic commonwealth. But they never ceased to hate the democracy proclaimed by Mohammed. Libertines and profligates, unscrupulous and cruel, pagans at heart, they chafed under a religion of equal rights, a religion which exacted strict observance of moral duties and personal chastity. They set themselves, from the commencement, to undermine the government to which they had sworn allegiance, and to destroy the men upon whom the Republic depended. The first two successors of the Prophet had kept their ambition within bounds, and repressed their intrigues and treacherous designs. With the election of Osman, they flocked to Medîna like vultures scenting the prey. His accession was the signal for that outburst of hatred, that pent-up profligacy on the part of the Ommeyyades, which convulsed the Islamic world to its innermost core, and destroyed its noblest and most precious lives.

Under Osmân there was a complete reversal of the policy and administration of his two predecessors, whose decisions he had engaged to follow. All the old governors and commanders taken from among the immediate disciples of the Prophet and his companions were displaced. Merit and faithful service were wholly disregarded. All offices of trust and emolument were seized by the Ommeyyades. The governorships of the provinces were bestowed on men who had proved themselves most

[1] With a *Zad*.

[2] They were, therefore, called the *Mualafat ul-kulûb*.

inimical to Islâm, and the treasury was emptied in their favour. We shall have to describe the subsequent events in some detail when dealing with the divisions in the Church of Mohammed; suffice it for us to say, that the corruptness of the administration, the total disregard of all precedent, the gross favouritism displayed by the old Caliph towards his kinsmen, and his refusal to listen to any complaint, gave rise to serious disaffection among the old companions of the Prophet and the general body of the Moslems, ending in revolt in which Osman lost his life. On Osman's tragical death, Ali was elected to the vacant Caliphate by the consensus of the people. The rebellions which followed are matters of history. "Had Ali been allowed to reign in peace," says Oelsner, "his virtues, his firmness, and his ascendency of character would have perpetuated the old republic and its simple manners."[1] The dagger of an assassin destroyed the hope of Islam. "With him," says Major Osborn, "perished the truest-hearted and best Moslem of whom Mohammedan history has preserved the remembrance." Seven centuries before, this wonderful man would have been apotheosised; thirteen centuries later his genius and his talents, his virtues and his valour, would have extorted the admiration of the civilised world. As a ruler, he came before his time. He was almost unfitted by his uncompromising love of truth, his gentleness, and his merciful nature, to cope with the Ommeyyades' treachery and falsehood.

With the establishment of an autocracy under Muâwiyah the political spirit of Islam underwent a great change. The sovereigns were no more the heads of a commonwealth, elected by the suffrages of the people, and governing solely for the welfare of their subjects and the glory of the Faith. From the time of Muawiyah the reigning Caliph nominated his successor; and the oath of fealty taken by the people in his presence, or in that of his proxy, confirmed his nomination. This system combined the vices of democrary and despotism without the advantages of either. Under the Republic not only were the Caliphs assisted by a council of the Companions of the Prophet, but the provincial governors had similar advisory bodies. During the Ommeyyade rule the government was a pure autocracy tempered by the freedom of speech possessed by the desert Arabs

[1] Oelsner, *Des Effects de la religion de Mohammed.*

and the learned or holy, which enabled them, often by a phrase or verse from the Koran or from the poets, to change the mood of the sovereign. Under the first five Caliphs of the Abbasside dynasty also the government continued to be more or less autocratic, although the departmental ministers and prominent members of the family formed a body of unauthorised councillors. A regular Council composed of the leading representatives of communities owning allegiance to the Caliph was for the first time established in the reign of Mamun the Great. The Buyides, the Samanides, the Seljukides, and the Ayubides all had their councils in which the people were more or less represented.

But absolutism in the hands of the early Abbassides helped in the intellectual development and material prosperity of the Islamic nations. In the vigor of their rule and the firmness with which they held the reins of government they may be compared with the Tudors of England. The political and administrative machinery of the Abbasside Caliphate, which was afterwards adopted by the succeeding dynasties, owes its origin to the genius of Mansur, the founder of Bagdad. In its effective distribution of work and its control of details it ranks with the most perfectly organised systems of modern times.

At the very commencement of their rule, which lasted for several centuries, they established a Chamber of Finance and a Chancellery of State, the first being charged with the duty of receiving the taxes and disbursing the expenses of the empire, the second with the duty of impressing a character of authenticity on the mandates of the sovereigns. Later, for the better subdivision of work, other departments of state (called *diwâns*) were created, of which the following are the principal:—the *Diwân-ul-Kharâj* (Central Office of Taxes) or Department of Finance; the *Diwân-ud-Dia* (Office of the Crown property); the *Diwân-uz-zimâm* (Audit or Accounts Office); the *Diwân-ul-Jund* (War Office); the *Diwân-ul-Mawâli wa'l Ghilmân* (Office for the Protection of Clients and Slaves), where a register was kept of the freedmen and slaves of the Caliph, and arrangements made for their maintenance; the *Diwân-ul-Barîd* (the Post Office); *Diwân-uz-Zimâm an-Nafakât* (Household Expense Office); the *Diwân-ur-Rasâil* (Board of Correspondence or Chancery Office); the *Diwân-ut-Toukia* (Board of Requests); the *Diwân aan nazr fi'l Mazâlim* (Board for the Inspection

of Grievances); the *Diwân-ul-Ahdâs w'ash-Shurta* (Militia and Police Office); and the *Diwân-ul-Aatâ* (Donation Office), analogous to the paymaster-general's department, charged with the payment of the regular troops. The protection of the interests of non-Moslems was entrusted to a special office, the head of which was called the *Kâtib-ul-jizhâzèh*.

Each Government office was presided over by a director who was designated the *Rais*, or *Sadr*, and the practical work of control and supervision was carried on by inspectors, called *Mushrifs, or Nâzirs*.[1]

To this organisation the Abbasside Caliphs added the appointment of an officer with the designation of *Hâjib*, who introduced the foreign ambassadors, and also formed a Court of Appeal from the decrees of the Kazis. They instituted the office of *Vizier*, or Prime Minister, whose duty it was to submit for the consideration of the sovereign the various matters requiring his decision. They gave regularity to the provincial administration, and fixed definitely the contributions due from the provinces. They constructed caravanserais, built cisterns and aqueducts along the road from Bagdad to Mecca, planted trees along the route, and everywhere founded wayside resting-places for the travellers and pilgrims. They made a route between Mecca and Medîna, and laid relays of horses and camels between Hijaz and Yemen to facilitate communication between these two provinces. They established couriers in every city for the despatch of the post. They formed a central office in the metropolis for the custody and preservation of the archives of the empire, and created an efficient police in every part of their dominions. They formed a syndicate of merchants, charged with the supervision of commercial transactions, the decision of disputes between mercantile men, and the duty of suppressing fraud. Not only did each centre of commerce possess its corporation of merchants but most cities of importance had their town-councils. They created the office of *Muhtesib*, or intendant of the market, who went round daily to examine the weights and measures of the tradespeople. They fostered self-government and protected and encouraged municipal institutions. Agriculture was promoted by advances to the peasantry, and periodical reports were required from the provincial officers

1 For a full account of the political and administrative machinery of the Abbassides, see *Short History of the Saracens*, pp. 402-443.

respecting the prosperity of the people and the state of the country. Many of them, in the midst of their pomp and circumstance, tried to maintain a semblance of republican virtue. Books written by them, baskets woven by them, used to be sold in the market, and the proceeds were supposed to supply the personal expenses of the Caliphs. Their zeal to promote the well-being of their subjects may perhaps be taken into the great Account against their cruelties towards the Alides. Under Mamun and his two immediate successors the Abbasside empire attained the zenith of prosperity.

Spain furnishes one of the most instructive examples of the political character of Islam and its adaptability to all forms and conditions of society. This country had suffered frightfully under the barbarian hordes which had swept over the land, destroying and levelling every institution they found existing. The kingdoms they had formed over the ruins of the Roman administration had effaced the germs of political development. Their subjects were weighted down with feudal burdens, and all the terrible consequences flowing therefrom. Vast areas were completely denuded of population. The introduction of the Islamic Code enfranchised the people as well as the land from feudal bondage. The desert became fruitful, thriving cities sprang into existence on all sides, and order took the place of anarchy. Immediately on their arrival on the soil of Spain, the Saracens published an edict assuring to the subject races, without any difference of race or creed, the most ample liberty. Suevi, Goth, Vandal, Roman, and Jew were all placed on an equal footing with the Moslem. They guaranteed to both Christian and Jew the full exercise of their religions, the free use of their places of worship, and perfect security of person and property. They even allowed them to be governed, within prescribed limits, by their own laws, to fill all civil offices and serve in the army. Their women were invited to intermarry with the conquerors. Does not the conduct of the Arabs in Spain offer an astonishing contrast to that of many European nations, even in modern times, in their treatment of conquered nationalities? Whilst to compare the Arab rule with that of the Normans in England, or of the Christians in Syria during the Crusades, would be an insult to commonsense and humanity. The fidelity of the Arabs in maintaining their promises, the equal-

handed justice which they administered to all classes, without distinction of any kind, secured them the confidence of the people. And not only in these particulars, but also in generosity of mind and in amenity of manner, and in the hospitality of their customs, the Arabians were distinguished above all other people of those times.[1] The Jews had, owing to the influence of the Christian priesthood, suffered bitterly under the barbarians, and they profited most by the change of government. Spanish ladies of the highest rank, among them the sister of Pelagius and the daughter of Roderick, contracted marriages with "the Infidels," as the orthodox Jean Mariana cals the Moslems. They enjoyed all the rights and privileges which their rank gave them with the fullest liberty of conscience. The Moslems invited all the landed proprietors, whom the violence of Roderick had driven into the mountains, to abandon their retreats. Unhapily the depopulation was so great that this measure had no effec in supplying inhabitants to the soil. They, accordingly, held forth the greatest advantages to foreign cultivators who wished to establish themselves in the Peninsula. These offers brought large and idustrious colonies from Africa and Asia. Fifty thousand Jews a one time, accompanied by their women and children, settled in Andusia.

For seven centuries the Moslems held Spain, and the benecence of their rule, in spite of intestine quarrels and dynastic disptes, is testified to and acknowledged even by their enemies. Te high culture attained by the Spanish Arabs has been sometimes ccsidered as due principally to frequent marriages between Moslems a Christians. This circumstance undoubtedly exercised a great ifluence on the development of the Spanish Moslems and the growt of that wonderful civilisation to which modern Europe owes so mh of its advance in the arts of peace.[2] What happened in Spain hapned also in other places. Wherever the Moslems entered a changeame over the countries; order took the place of lawlessness, and peacand plenty smiled on the land. As war was not the privileged profeion of one caste, so labour was not the mark of degradation to arther. The pursuit of agriculture was as popular with all classes a the pursuit of arms.[3]

1 Conde's *History of the Spanish Moors.*
2 Renan, *Averroes et Averroisme.*
3 Oelsner.

The importance which Islâm attaches to the duties of sovereigns towards their subjects, and the manner in which it promotes the freedom and equality of the people and protects them against the oppression of their rulers, is shown in a remarkable work[1] by the celebrated publicist, Imam Fakhr ud-dîn Razî (*i. e.* of Rhages), on the Reciprocal Rights of Sovereigns and Subjects, edited and enlarged afterwards by Mohammed bin Ali bin Taba Taba, commonly known as Ibn ul-Taqtaqa.

This work deals first with the duties of sovereigns to their subjects, and secondly with the rules for the administration of public affairs and political economy. The author describes the qualities essential for a sovereign,—wisdom, justice, knowledge of the wants and wishes of his people, and the fear of God ; and adds emphatically that this latter quality is the root of all good, and the key to all blessings, "for when the king is conscious of the presence of God, His servants will enjoy the blessings of peace and security."

وهذه الخصلة هي أصل كل خير ومفتاح كل بركة إن الملك متى خاف الله أمنه عباد الله

The sovereign must also possess the quality of mercy, العفو عن الذنوب and "this is the greatest of all good qualities." He must have an ever-present desire to benefit his subjects, and consult with them on their wants ; for the Prophet consulted always with his Companions, and God hath said,[2] "Consult with them[3] on every affair." In the administration of public affairs, it is the sovereign's duty to superintend the public income, guard the lives and property of his subjects, maintain peace, check the evil-doer, prevent injuries. He must always keep his word, and then, adds the author significantly, "the duty of the subject is obedience, but no subject is bound to obey a tyrant." Ibn Rushd (the great Averroes) says, "the tyrant is he who governs for himself, and not for his people."

1 This work is generally known as the *Kitâb-i-Târîkh-ud-Dawal* Hist. of Dynasties ; but its proper title is *Kitab-ul-fakhrî fi'l âdâb-ul-Saltaniyat wa dawal ul-Islâmia*, "the book of Fakhri, concerning the conduct of sovereigns and the Mahommedan dynasties."

2 In the Koran

3 *I. e.* The peopl

The laws of the Moslems, based on equitable principles, and remarkable for their simplicity and precision, did not demand an obedience either difficult to render or incompatible with the intelligence of mankind. The countries where the Moslems established themselves remained exempt from the disastrous cosequences of the feudal system and the feudal code.[1] "Admitting no privilege, no caste, their legislation produced two grand results,—that of freeing the soil from factitious burdens imposed by barbarian laws, and of assuring to individuals perfect equality of rights." [2]

[1] In Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and Lower Italy, the feudal system was introduced after the expulsion of the Arabs.

[2] Oelsner.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE POLITICAL DIVISIONS AND SCHISMS OF ISLÂM.

جنگ هفتاد و دو ملت همه را عذر بنه
چون ندیدند حقیقت ره افسانه زدند

HÂFIZ.

TO every philosophical student of the history of religion the heading of this chapter must cause surprise, if not pain; to every Islamist devoted to the Founder of his Faith it must cause sorrow and shame. Alas! that the religion of humanity and universal brotherhood should not have escaped the curse of internecine strife and discord; that the Faith which was to bring peace and rest to the distracted world should itself be torn to pieces by angry passions and the lust of power. The evils, which we deplored in Christianity arose from the incompleteness of the system, and its incompatibility with human wants; in Islam, the evils that we shall have to describe arose from the greed of earthly advancement, and the revolutionary instincts of individuals and classes impatient of moral law and order.

Nothing evinces so clearly the extraordinary genius of the Arabian Teacher, his wonderful personality, and the impressiveness of his call to religious unity and universal citizenship, as the world-movement of which he was the cause, and which, in spite of internal dynastic wars, carried his people on a tidal wave of conquest from one end of the globe to the other. Arabia, hitherto the home of warring tribes and clans, each with its blood-feud of centuries, was suddenly animated with a common purpose. Until now the wars of the Arabs and their alliances, their virtues and their vices, their love of independence and their clannish feeling, had alike prevented community of action. Suddenly a nation of shepherds is turned into a nation of kings, a race of semi-nomades transformed into masters

of "a world-faith and law." With unexampled energy and self-mastering devotion the congeries of wandering clans planted between three continents take up the banner of the Faith and bear it aloft to every quarter of the earth. "You have been elected to carry to all mankind the message of mercy, the announcement of divine unity," is the call addressed to them, and they respond to it with a determination which acknowledges no obstacle. The intensity of conviction, which alone could carry them through the barriers of hostile creeds and races, explains the mystery of the revolution!

Truth is eternal: Mohammed's message was not new. It had been delivered before, but had not reached the heart of man. *His* voice quickened the dead into life, revived the dying, and made the pulse of humanity beat with the accumulated force of ages. The exodus of the Saracens under this mighty impulse, its magnitude and its far-reaching effects, form the most marvellous phenomenon of modern times. They issued from their desert-fastnesses as the preceptors of of humanity. Within thirty years—the term prophesied for the true Caliphate—they were knocking at the gate of every nation, from the Hindoo Koh to the shores of the Atlantic, to deliver their message. In the short space of time which elapsed from the death of the Prophet to the subversion of the Republic, they built up an empire, which, in its vastness, exceeded that achieved by the Romans after thirteen centuries of continuous expansion. Turn over the pages of Ibn ul-Athir, Tibri, or Abulfeda, you will find a continuous record of the wave rolling onward, fertilising every soil over which it passes, assimilating in its way all that is good.

The same causes, however, which, until the advent of the Prophet, had prevented the growth of the Arabs into a nation,—the same tribal jealousies, the same division of clan and clan, the marks of which are still visible throughout the Moslem world,—led eventually, not only to the ruin of the Republic, but also to the downfall of the Saracenic empire. "Had the followers of Mohammed marched on the lines of the Master and adopted the character of the early Caliphs", says d'Ohsson, "their empire would have been still more vast and more durable than that of the Romans." But the greed of the Ommeyyade, the unruliness of the Arab, and his spirit of individualism, which showed itself even when arrayed against a common foe, caused the overthrow of the stupendous fabric which the heroism and

devotion of the early Moslems had raised. Owing to this, they lost Tours, even whilst victory was within their grasp; they were driven out of Spain because they could not forget the old jealousies of the desert, and make common cause against the enemy.

But though the Republic fell, and the imperial sceptre passed from the hands of the Saracens, the Faith lived. It was the outcome of ages of evolution. It represented the latest phase in the religious development of man; it did not depend for its existence or its growth on the life of empires or men. And as it spread and fructified, each race and each age profited by its teachings according to their own spiritual necessities and intellectual comprehension!

The Church of Mohammed, like the Church of Christ, has been rent by intestine divisions and strifes. Difference of opinion on abstract subjects, about which there cannot be any certitude in a finite existence, has always given rise to greater bitterness and a fiercer hostility, than ordinary differences on matters within the range of human cognition. The disputes respecting the nature of Christ deluged the earth with the blood of millions; the question of Free-will in man caused, if not the same amount of bloodshed, equal trouble in Islam. The claim to infallibility on the part of the Pontiffs of Rome convulsed Christendom to its core; the infallibility of the people and of the Fathers became in Islam the instrument for the destruction of precious lives.

Most of the divisions in the Church of Mohammed owe their origin primarily to political and dynastic causes,—to the old tribal quarrels, and the strong feeling of jealousy which animated the other Koraishites against the family of Hashim. It is generally supposed that the Prophet had not expressly designated any one as his successor in the spiritual and temporal Government of Islam; but this notion is founded on a mistaken apprehension of facts, for there is abundant evidence that many a time Mohammed had indicated Ali for the vicegerency. Notably on the occasion of the return-journey from the performance of "the Farewell Pilgrimage," during a halt at a place called Khumm, he had convoked an assembly of the people accompanying him, and used words which could leave little doubt as to his intention regarding a successor. "Ali," said he, "is to me what Aaron was to Moses. Almighty God! be a friend to his friends and a foe to his foes; help those who help him, and frustrate the

hopes of those who betray him !" [1] On the other hand, the nomination of Abû Bakr to lead the prayers during the Prophet's illness might point to a different choice. The question came up for discussion and settlement on his decease, when it became necessary to elect a leader for Islam. The Hashimites maintained that the office had devolved by appointment as well as by succession upon Ali. The other Koraishites insisted upon proceeding by election. Whilst the kinsmen of Mohammed were engaged in his obsequies, Abu Bakr was elected to the Caliphate by the votes of the Koraish and some of the Medinite Ansar. The urgency of an immediate selection for the headship of the State might explain the haste. With his usual magnanimity and devotion to the Faith, scrupulously anxious to avoid the least discord among the disciples of the Master, Ali at once gave in his adhesion to Abu Bakr. Three times was he set aside, and on every occasion he accepted the choice of the electors without demur. He himself had never stood forth as a candidate for the suffrages of the electors, and whatever might have been the feeling of his partisans, he had never refrained from giving to the first two Caliphs his help and advice in the governance of the Commonwealth : and they on their side had always deferred to his counsel and his exposition of the Master's teachings. We have already referred to the circumstances connected with the elevation of Osman to the Caliphate. We will here trace the events which followed upon his accession, to elucidate the history of the deplorable schism which at present divides the Moslem world into two sects. Osmân possessed neither the shrewdness of Abû Bakr nor the intellectual vigour or the moral fibre of Omar. His amiability and easy good nature made him a pliable tool in the hands of his kinsfolk. The venerable Caliph surrounded by his hungry kinsmen, the provinces crying for redress, and the general body of Moslems sullenly watching the proceedings of the head of the State, form an instructive though sad picture of the times. The character of the deluded Pontiff has been graphically portrayed

1 Ibn Khallikân, vol. i. p. 383. "According to Al-Hâzimi," says Ibn-Khallikan, "Khumm is the name of a valley lying between Mecca and Medîna, and in the neighbourhood of al-Tuhfa. It contains a pond (*Ghadîr*) near which the Prophet pronounced his invocation." This took place on the 18th of Zu'l-Hijja, for Ibn-Khallikan says the 18th of that month "is the anniversary of the *Feast of Ghadîr (Id-ul-Ghadîr)*, which is the same as that of *Ghadîr-i-Khumm*" See also p. 96 *ante*.

by Dozy. "The personality of Osmân did not justify his election to the Caliphate. It is true he was rich and generous, had assisted Mohammed and the religion by pecuniary sacrifices, and that he prayed and fasted often, and was a man of amiable and soft manners. He was, however, not a man of spirit, and was greatly enfeebled by old age. His timidity was such that when placed on the pulpit he knew not how to commence his sermon. Unhappily for this old man, he possessed an inordinate fondness for his kinsmen, who formed the Meccan aristocracy, and who, for twenty years, had insulted, persecuted, and fought against Mohammed. Soon they dominated over him completely. His uncle, Hisham, and especially Hisham's son, Merwan, in reality governed the country, only allowing the title of Caliph to Osman, and the responsibility of the most compromising measures, of which he was often wholly ignorant. The orthodoxy of these two men, especially of the father, was strongly suspected. Hisham had been converted only when Mecca was taken. Having betrayed state-secrets, he had been disgraced and exiled. Abu Bakr and Omar had maintained the order passed (by the Prophet). Osman, on the contrary, not only recalled him from his exile, but gave him on his arrival a hundred thousand pieces of silver from the public treasury, and a piece of land belonging to the State. He made Merwan his secretary and vizier, and married him to one of his daughters, and enriched him with the spoils of Africa."[1] . . . He appointed Muâwiyah, the son of Abû Sufiân and Hind, who had fought against Mohammed with such ferocity at Ohod, to the governorship of Syria ; and his foster-brother, Abdullah ibn Saad ibn Surrah, to the satrapy of Egypt. This Abdullah was at one time a secretary to the Prophet, and when the Master dictated his revelations, he used to change the words and "denaturalise" their meaning. His sacrilege being discovered, he had fled, and had relapsed into idolatry. Walîd, an uterine brother of the old Caliph, was made governor of Kûfa. His father had often ill-treated Mohammad, and once nearly strangled him. An abandoned debauchee, a profligate drunkard, his life was a scandal to the Moslems. He appeared in the mosque at the time of morning-prayers helpless from intoxication, falling prostrate on the ground as he attempted

1 Dozy, *Hist. des Mussulmans dans l' Espagne*, vol. i. p. 44.

to perform the duties of an Imâm, or leader of prayer; and when the by-standers hurried up to assist him to his feet, shocked them by demanding more wine, in a husky and stammering voice. These were the men whom the Caliph favoured! They fastened upon the provinces like famished leeches, heaping up wealth by means of pitiless extortion. Complaints poured into Medîna from all parts of the empire. But the complaints were invariably dismissed with abuses and hard words.[1] A deputation, consisting of twelve thousand men, headed by Mohammed, the son of the Caliph Abu Bakr, came to the capital to lay before Osman the grievances of the people, and to seek redress. Sore pressed at their demands for justice, he had recourse to the intervention of the son-in-law of the Prophet, whose advice he had hitherto persistently refused to heed. Ali persuaded the deputation to depart to their homes, by giving them a pledge that their complaints should be redressed. On their way back, and hardly at a day's journey from Medîna, they intercepted a letter written by Osman's secretary, which bore the Caliph's own seal, containing a mandate to the unscrupulous Muawiyah to massacre them in a body. Enraged at this treachery, they returned to Medîna, entered the old Caliph's house, and killed him. His death furnished to the Ommeyyades what they were long thirsting for, a plea for a revolt against Islam,—against its democracy, its equal rights, and its stern rules of morality. It furnished to the Meccans and their allies an excuse for organising a conspiracy against Medinite dominance, which they hated so bitterly. Ali had tried hard to save Osman, at first by wise counsels not to abandon himself absolutely into the hands of his unprincipled kinsmen, and at the last crisis by placing himself before the infuriated soldiery, and asking for consideration for the venerable though misguided Pontiff. He had nearly sacrificed his own sons in his endeavours to protect Osman. On Osman's death he was raised to the Caliphate by the unanimous voice of the people. Since the death of the Prophet, Ali, though he had never failed to attend the councils of State, had always maintained a dignified reserve and a noble independence of character. In his retirement he had chiefly devoted himself to study and the peaceable occupations of domestic life. Called to the helm of the State, he

[1] Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. iii, p. 125.

received the oath of fealty with his usual simplicity, declaring his readiness to resign the office to any one more worthy.

"Had," says Sédillot, "the principle of hereditary succession (in favour of Ali) been recognised at the outset, it would have prevented the rise of those disastrous pretensions which engulfed Islam in the blood of Moslems. . . . The husband of Fâtima united in his person the right of succession as the lawful heir of the Prophet, as well as the right by election. It might have been thought that all would submit themselves before his glory; so pure and so grand. But it was not to be." Zubair and Talha, who had hoped that the choice of the people might fall on either of them for the Caliphate, baulked in their ambitious designs, and smarting under the refusal of the new Caliph to bestow on them the governorships of Bussorah and Kûfa, were the first to raise the standard of revolt. They were assisted by Ayesha, the daughter of Abu Bakr, who had taken a decisive part in the former elections. This lady had always borne an inveterate dislike towards the son-in-law of Khadîja, and now this feeling had grown into positive hatred. She was the life and soul of the insurrection, and herself accompanied the insurgent troops to the field, riding a camel. The Caliph, with his characteristic aversion to bloodshed, sent his cousin Abdullah bin Abbas to adjure the insurgents by every obligation of the Faith to abandon the arbitrament of war. But to no avail. Zubair and Talha gave battle at a place called Khoraiba, and were defeated and killed.[1] Âyesha was taken prisoner. She was treated with courtesy and consideration, and escorted with every mark of respect to Medîna. Hardly had this rebellion been suppressed, when Ali learnt of the insurrection of Muawiyah in Syria. The son of Abu Sufian, like most of his kinsmen whom Osman had appointed to the governorships of the provinces, had, with the gold lavished upon him by the late Pontiff and the wealth of Syria, collected round him a large band of mercenaries. Ali had been advised by several of his councillors to defer the dismissal of the corrupt governors appointed by the late Caliph until he himself was secure against all enemies. "The Bayard of Islam, the hero, without fear and without

[1] The battle is called the "Battle of the Camel," from Âyesha's presence in a litter on a camel. The place where the fight actually took place and where these men were killed, is called *Wâdi us-Sabâa*, "Valley of the Lion."

reproach,"[1] refused to be guilty of any duplicity or compromise with injustice. The fiat went forth removing from their offices all the men whom Osman had placed in power, and who had so grossly betrayed the public trust. Muawiyah at once raised the standard of revolt. Defeated in several consecutive battles on the plains of Siffîn, on the last day when his troops were flying like chaff before the irresistible charge of Malek al-Ashtar, he bethought himself of a ruse to save his men from impending destruction. He made some of his soldiers tie copies of the Koran to their spears, and advance towards the Moslems shouting, "Let the blood of the Faithful cease to flow; if the Syrian army be destroyed, who will defend the frontier against the Greeks? If the army of Irak be destroyed, who will defend the frontier against the Turks and Persians? Let the Book of God decide between us." The Caliph, who knew well the character of the arch-rebel and his fellow-conspirator, Amr the son of al-Aâs, saw through the artifice, and tried to open the eyes of his people to the treachery; but a large body of his troops refused to fight further, and demanded that the dispute should be referred to arbitration. In answer to the Caliph's assurances that the son of Abu Sufian was only using the Koran as a device for delivering himself from the jaws of death, these refractory spirits threatened open defection.[2] Malek al-Ashtar was recalled, the battle was stopped, and the fruits of a victory already won were irretrievably lost.[3] An arbitration was arranged. The bigots, who had compelled Ali to sheath the sword at the moment of victory, forced upon him, against his own judgment and wishes, Abu Musa al-Ashaari as the representative of the House of Mohammed. This man, who was also secretly hostile to Ali, was altogether unfitted by his vanity and religious conceit and a somewhat simple nature to cope with the astute and unscrupulous Amr the son of al-Aas, who acted as the representative of Muawiyah, and he soon fell into the trap laid for him by the latter. Amr led Abu Musa to believe that the removal of both Ali and Muawiyah (of the one from the Caliphate and of the other from the governorship of Syria), and the nomination of another person to the Headship of Islam, was necessary to the well-being of the Moslems. The trick succeeded; Abu Musa ascended the pulpit and solemnly

[1] These are the designations given to Ali by Major Osborn.
[2] Shahristani, Pt. i. p. 85. [3] *Ibid.*

announced the deposition of Ali. After making this announcement he descended aglow with the sensation of having performed a virtuous deed. And then Amr smilingly ascended the pulpit vacated by Abu Musa the representative of Ali, and pronounced that he accepted the deposition of Ali, and appointed Muawiyah in his place. Poor Abu Musa was thunder-struck; but the treachery was too patent, and the Fatimides refused to accept the decision as valid.[1] This happened at Dumat ul-Jandal. The treachery of the Ommeyyades exasperated the Fatimides, and both parties separated vowing undying hatred towards each other. Ali was shortly after assassinated whilst engaged in prayer in a mosque at Kufa.[2] His assassination enabled the son of Abû Sufiân to consolidate his power both in Syria and Hijaz. On the death of Ali, Hassan, his eldest son, was raised to the Caliphate. Fond of ease and quiet, he hastened to make peace with the enemy of his House, and retired into private life. But the Ommeyyade's animosity pursued him even there, and before many months were over he was poisoned to death. The star of Hind's son was now in the ascendant, and Abu Sufian's ambition to become the king of Mecca was fulfilled on a grander scale by Muawiyah. Thus was the son of the two most implacable foes of the Prophet, by the strangest freak of fortune recorded in history, seated on the throne of the Caliphs. Lest it be considered our estimate of Muawiyah's character is actuated by prejudice, we give the words of a historian who cannot be accused of bias in favour of of either side. "Astute, unscrupulous, and pitiless," says Osborn, "the first Khalif of the Ommayas shrank from no crime necessary to secure his position. Murder was his accustomed mode of removing a formidable opponent. The grandson of the Prophet he caused to be poisoned; Malek-al-Ashtar, the heroic lieutenant of Ali, was destroyed in a like way. To secure the succession of his son Yezid, Muawia hesitated not to break the word he had pledged

[1] Those very men who had forced upon the Caliph the arbitration afterwards repudiated it, and rose in rebellion against him for consenting to their demand for arbitration. They were the original *Khawârij* (insurgents), who became afterwards an enormous source of evil to Islam; see *post.*

[2] With the chivalrous generosity which distinguished him, the Caliph Ali, even in his war against his treacherous foe, always ordered his troops to await the enemy's attack, to spare the fugitive, and respect the captive, and never to insult the women. With his dying breath he commanded his sons to see that the murderer was killed with *one* stroke of the sword, and that no unnecessary pain might be inflicted on him.

to Hosain, the surviving son of Ali. And yet this cool, calculating, thoroughly atheistic Arab ruled over the regions of Islam, and the sceptre remained among his descendants for the space of nearly one hundred and twenty years. The explanation of this anomaly is to be found in two circumstances, to which I have more than once adverted. The one is, that the truly devout and earnest Muhammadan conceived that he manifested his religion most effectually by withdrawing himself from the affairs of the world. The other is the tribal spirit of the Arabs. Conquerors of Asia, of Northern Africa, of Spain, the Arabs never rose to the level of their position. Greatness had been thrust upon them, but in the midst of their grandeur they retained, in all their previous force and intensity, the passions, the rivalries, the petty jealousies of the desert. They merely fought again on a wider field 'the battles of the Arabs before Islâm' "

With the rise of Muâwiyah the oligarchical rule of the heathen times displaced the democratic rule of Islam. Paganism, with all its attendant depravity revived, and vice and immorality followed everywhere in the wake of Ommeyyade governors and the Syrian soldiery. Hijaz and Irak groaned under the usurper's rule ; but his hold on the throat of Islam was too strong to be shaken off with impunity. The wealth which he pitilessly extracted from his subjects, he lavished on his mercenaries, who in return helped him to repress all murmurings. Before his death, he convened the chief officers of his army and made them take the oath of fealty to his son Yezîd, whom he had designated as his successor to the throne. This was Yezîd's title to the Caliphate ! On Muawiyah's death, the Domitian of the house of Ommeyya ascended the throne founded by his father on fraud and treachery. As cruel and treacherous as Muawiyah, he did not, like his father, possess the capacity to clothe his cruelties in the guise of policy. His depraved nature knew no pity or justice. He killed and tortured for the pleasure he derived from human suffering. Addicted to the grossest of vices, his boon companions were the most abandoned of both sexes. Such was the Caliph—the Commander of the Faithful ! Hussain, the second son of Ali, had inherited his father's chivalric nature and virtues. He had served with honour against the Christians in the siege of Constantinople. He united in his person the right of descent from Ali, with the holy character of grandson of the Apostle. In the terms of peace signed

between Muâwiyah and Hassan, his right to the Caliphate had been expressly reserved. Hussain had never deigned to acknowledge the title of the tyrant of Damascus, whose vices he despised, and whose character he regarded with abhorrence ; and when the Moslems of Kufa besought his help to release them from the curse of the Ommeyyade's rule, he felt it his duty to respond to the Irakians' appeal for deliverance. The assurances he received, that all Irak was ready to spring to its feet to hurl the despot from his throne the moment he appeared on the scene, decided him to start for Kufa with his family. He traversed the desert of Arabia unmolested, accompanied by his brother Abbas, a few devoted followers, and a timorous retinue of women and children ; but as he approached the confines of Irak he was alarmed by the solitary and hostile face of the country, and suspecting treachery, the Ommeyyade's weapon, he encamped his small band at a place called Kerbela near the western bank of the Tigris. No event in history surpasses in pathos the scenes enacted on this spot. Hussain's apprehensions of betrayal proved to be only too true. He was overtaken by an Ommeyyade army under the brutal and ferocious Obaidullah ibn-Ziad. For days their tents were surrounded ; and as the cowardly hounds dared not come within the reach of the sword of Ali's son they cut the victims off from the waters of the Tigris. The sufferings of the poor band of martyrs were terrible. In a conference with the chief of the enemy, Hussain proposed the option of three honourable conditions : that he should be allowed to return to Medina, or be stationed in a frontier garrison against the Turks, or safely conducted to the presence of Yezîd.[1] But the commands of the Ommeyyade tyrant were stern and inexorable—that no mercy should be shown to Hussain or his party, and that they must be brought as criminals before the "Caliph" to be dealt with according to he Ommeyyade sense of justice. As a last resource, Hussain besought these monsters not to war upon the helpless women and children, but to kill him and be done with it. But they knew no pity. He pressed his friends to consult their safety by a timely flight ; they

1 The author of the *Rouzat-us-Safâ*, after stating the above, adds that an attendent of Hussain, who by chance escaped the butchery of Kerbela, denied that his master, so far as he was aware, ever made any such proposal to the Ommeyyade leader. It is possible, however, that such denial was made in order to show that Hussain did not lower himself by proposing terms to the enemy. To my mind, however, it detracts in no way from the grandeur of Hussain's character, that he proposed terms to the Ommeyyades.

unanimously refused to desert or survive their beloved master. One of the enemy's chiefs, struck with horror at the sacrilege of warring against the grandson of the Prophet, deserted with thirty followers "to claim the partnership of inevitable death." In every single combat and close fight the valour of the Fatimides was invincible. But the enemy's archers picked them off from a safe distance. One by one the defenders fell, until at last there remained but the grandson of the Prophet. Wounded and dying he dragged himself to the river-side for a last drink; they turned him off with arrows from there. And as he re-entered his tent he took his infant child in his arms; him they transfixed with a dart. The stricken father bowed his head to heaven. Able no more to stand up against his pitiless foes, alone and weary, he seated himself at the door of his tent. One of the women handed him a cup of water to assuage his burning thirst; as he raised it to his lips he was pierced in the mouth with a dart; and his son and nephew were killed in his arms. He lifted his hands to heaven,—they were full of blood,—and he uttered a funeral prayer for the living and the dead. Raising himself for one desperate charge, he threw himself among the Ommeyyades, who fell back on every side. But faint with loss of blood he soon sank to the ground, and then the murderous crew rushed upon the dying hero. They cut off his head, trampled on his body, and subjected it to every ignominy in the old spirit of Hind. They carried the martyr's head to the castle of Kufa, and the inhuman Obaidullah struck it on the mouth with a cane: "Alas!" exclaimed an aged Mussalman, "on these lips have I seen the lips of the Apostle of God." "In a distant age and climate," says Gibbon, "the tragic scene of the death of Hussain will awaken the sympathy of the coldest reader." It will now be easy to understand, if not to sympathise with, the frenzy of sorrow and indignation to which the adherents of Al and his children give vent on the recurrence of the anniversary of Hussain's martyrdom.

Thus fell one of the noblest spirits of the age, and with him perished all the male members of his family,—old and young,—with the solitary exception of a sickly child, whom Hussain's sister, Zainab (Zenobia), saved from the general massacre. He, too, bore the name of Ali, and in after-life received the noble designation of Zain ul-Aâbidîn, "the Ornament of the Pious." He was the son of

Hussain by the daughter of Yezdjard, the last Sassanide king of Persia, and in him was perpetuated the house of Mohammed. He represented also, in his mother's right, the claims of the Sassanians to the throne of Irân.

The tragical fate of Hussain and his children sent a thrill of horror through Islam; and the revulsion of feeling which it caused proved eventually the salvation of the Faith. It arrested the current of depravity which flowed from the Ommeyyade court of Damascus. It made the bulk of Moslems think of what the Master had done, and of the injuries which the children of his enemies were inflicting on Islam. For a hundred years, however the Ommeyyades ruled with the free help of the sword and poison. They sacked Medîna, and drove the children of the Helpers into exile in far-away lands. The city which had sheltered the Prophet from the persecution of of the idolaters, and which he loved so dearly, the hallowed ground he had trod in life, and every inch of which was sanctified by his holy work and ministry, was foully desecrated; and the people who had stood by him in the hour of his need, and helped him to build up the arch of the Faith, were subjected to the most terrible and revolting atrocities, which find a parallel only in those committed by the soldiers of the Constable of France and the equally ferocious Lutherans of George Frundsberg at the sack of Rome. The men were massacred, the women outraged, the children reduced into slavery. The public mosque was turned into a stable, the shrines demolished for the sake of their ornaments. During the whole period of Ommeyyade domination the holy city remained a haunt of wild beasts.[1] The paganism of Mecca was once more triumphant. And "its reaction," says Dozy, "against Islâm was cruel, terrible, and revolting." The Meccans and the Ommeyyades thus repaid the clemency and forbearance shown to them in the hour of Islam's triumph! For nearly a century the earth bore its curse in the persons of these pagan Ommeyyades. Then came the Avengers. God in His wrath raised Saffah to rid the world of the miscreants. One solitary member of the doomed family escaped into Spain. And now the earth knows them no more.[2]

[1] Abdul Malik ibn-Merwân went so far as to issue an edict forbidding pilgrims to visit the sepulchre of the Prophet at Medîna.

[2] From the indictment against the Ommeyyades, we must exclude Omar ibn-Abdul Azîz, a virtuous sovereign, a good ruler, and a God-fearing

But for the Ommeyyades, the difference between the followers of the *Ahl-ul-Bait*,[1] the upholders of Ali's right to the apostolical succession, and those who maintained the right of the people to elect their own *spiritual* as well as temporal chiefs, would never have grown into a schism; it would have ended in a compromise or coalition after the accession of Ali to the Caliphate. The violence and treachery of the children of Ommeyya rendered this impossible. They had waded to the throne through oceans of blood and manifold crimes; it was necessary for them to impart a semblance of validity to their tenure of the office of Caliph. They claimed to have the title of *Ameer-ul-Mominin* by right of election—election by their own mercenaries and pagan partisans. After the sack of Medina and the destruction and dispersion of the family of Mohammed and the Muhajirîn and Ansar, it was easy to draw precedents from the early Caliphate, and when that failed, to manufacture traditions. Nor was it difficult to appropriate a title which might have been assumed, but was not, by those who supported the right of the universality of the people to elect their chiefs. The giants who had built up the Republic were dead or destroyed; their children were fugitives or slaves; who was to question the validity of the title so adroitly usurped? The Ommeyyade policy was pursued by the dynasty which took its place. The same fierce jealousy with which the Banu-Ommeyya had pursued or persecuted the Banî-Fatima, characterised the conduct of the Bani-Abbas towards the descendants of Mohammed. They had no claim to the Caliphate themselves; they made the affection of the people for the children of Fatima the means for their own elevation, and when they had attained the desired end they rewarded the Fatimides with bitter persecution. Their title also was founded on quasi-election, and naturally they hunted, like the Ommeyyades, all who questioned the legality of their claim, or who upheld in explict terms the doctrine of the devolution of the Imamate by succession in the line of Mohammed. Every difference of opinion was strictly repressed; even the jurists of the time were punished if they ventured to express

Mussalmân; but his virtues were not appreciated by his kinsmen. There were many other equally pious and God-fearing men among the descendants of Ommeyya. In speaking of them in the terms I have, I refer of course to the characteristics of the clan and not of individuals.

[1] For the meaning of this word see note 2 page 285.

opinions which did not find favour with the sovereigns.[1] If we did not keep in view the circumstances which led to the sudden and unexpected rise of the Abbassides, we would be apt to regard it as phenomenal. The terrible cruelties inflicted by the Ommeyyades on the children of Fatima, and the sublime patience with which they had borne their sufferings and their wrongs, had given rise to a universal feeling of horror against the tyrants, and had invested the objects of persecution, in the eyes of their followers and disciples, with a superhuman halo. Persecution, however fierce, has always failed to achieve its end; instead of stamping out the faith or devotion of a sect or community, it has diverted it into new channels and imparted to it greater vitality. In Islâm, as in Christianity, the dangers of the battle-field and the pains of persecution have "clothed with more than earthly splendour the objects for whom they were endured." And the children of Fatima, saints who had submitted to the injustice of man and devoted themselves to intellectual pursuits and the practice of religion,—without arms, without treasure, and without subjects,—ruled more firmly over the hearts of their followers, and enjoyed the veneration of the people to a greater degree, than the caliph in his palace, the master of legions. The cup of Ommeyyade iniquity was full to overflowing, and men were crying aloud in the anguish of their hearts, O Lord, how long! On every side there was an eager and passionate longing engendered by the vices and misrule of the pseudo-caliphs that the House of Mohammed might be restored to its rights. They looked wistfully to the Imams to give the sign, but these saints had retired from the world; their domain was no more of this earth. Successive avengers[2] of their wrongs had risen in arms, and gone down before the serried ranks of their Syrian enemies. The people waited for authority from the divinely-appointed leaders of the Faithful, but they condemned the use of force. What was to be done? Several scions of the House who had risen against the Banî-Ommeyya, contrary to the counsel and without the sanction of the heads of the family, had sacrificed themselves to their ambition or their religious zeal. It was at this juncture, at this moment of unrest, when the

1 Imâm Mâlik ibn Anas, the third pillar of the Sunni Church, was publicly punished for an offence of this nature.

2 Sulaiman ibn Surrad, al-Mukhtar, and Yezîd ibn Muhallib.

Moslems were longing for a sign from the House of Mohammed, that the Banu-Abbas appeared on the scene. The Banu-Abbas were the descendants of Abbas, an uncle of the Prophet. Abbas had always taken a deep interest in the progress of Islam; he was Mohammed's companion when the famous "Pledge of the Women" was taken from the Medînites. But from some weakness of character or from policy, he did not embrace Islam definitely until about the time Mecca fell. He was, however, always treated with the greatest affection and consideration by Mohammed. The Prophet's example was imitated by Abu Bakr, Omar, and Osmân. They dismounted if they met him walking; and not unfrequently would accompany him to his residence.[1] He died in A. H. 32,—according to some, two years later.—leaving four sons, Abdullah (*Abu l Abbas* Abdullah *ibn Abbas*), Fazl, Obaidullah, and Kaithan. Abdullah, better known in history and tradition as Ibn Abbas, was born at Mecca in A.C. 619, three years before the Hegira. He was instructed in the Koran and jurisprudence by Ali himself. His reputation as a scholar and expounder of the Koran and of the decisions of the Caliphs stood so high that crowds flocked from all parts to hear his lectures. He gave public lessons one day in the week on the interpretation of the Koran; another day, on law; the third, on grammar; the fourth, on the history of the Arabs, and the fifth on poetry. He gave an impulse to the study and preservation of pre-Islamic Arab literature and history by frequently quoting verses from the ancient poets to explain and illustrate the difficult and obscure passages of the Koran. He was wont to say, "When you meet with a difficulty in the Koran, look for its solution in the poems of the Arabs, for these are the registers of the Arab nation." The steady and unvarying devotion of Ibn Abbas and his brothers to Ali was proverbial. All four brothers were present at "the Battle of the Camel," and at Siffîn, Ibn Abbas, who was no less an accomplished soldier than a scholar, commanded the cavalry of Ali. He acted frequently as the envoy of the Caliph, and it was he whom Ali desired to nominate as the representative of the House of Mohammed when forced by the refractory troops to refer the dispute

1 Abbâs may be called the John of Gaunt of Moslem history.

2 Once he was asked how he had acquired his extensive knowledge: his reply was, "By means of an inquiring tongue and an intelligent heart."

between himself and Muâwiyah to arbritration.[1] Ibn Abbâs died at Tâyef of a broken heart, after the murder of Hussain, in A.H. 67, in the seventieth year of his age. His son, who was named Ali after the great Caliph, walked in the footsteps of his father in his zealous attachment to the children of Fatima. He died in A.H. 117, and was succeeded in the headship of his family by his son Mohammed.

At this time, Persia, Irak, and Hijaz, which had suffered most from the atrocities of the Banî-Ommeyya, were honeycombed by secret organisations for the overthrow of the hated family. The Banu-Abbas were the most active in the movement to subvert the Ommeyyade rule, at first, perhaps, from a sincere desire to restore to the Fatimides their just rights, but afterwords in their own interests. Mohammed, the son of Ali ibn Abdullah, was the first to conceive the project of seizing the Caliphate for himself. He was a man of great ability and unbounded ambition. Whilst working ostensibly for the Fâtimides, he contrived gradually to establish the pretensions of his own family. He started a new doctrine to justify the claims of his house to the Imamate : that on the murder of Hussain at Kerbela, the spiritual headship of Islam was not transmitted to his surviving son Ali (Zain ul-Aabidin), but to Mohammed ibn al-Hanafiya, a son of the Caliph Ali by a different mother, whom he had married after the death of Fatima, belonging to the tribe of Hanifa ; that upon his death the office descended upon his son Hashim, who had assigned it formally to the Abbasside Mohammed. This story received credence in some quarters ; but for the bulk of the people, who clung to the descendants of the Prophet, the *dâis*[2] of the Abbassides affirmed that they were working for the *Ahl-ul-bait*. Hitherto, the Abbassides had professed great devotion to the House of Fâtima, and had ascribed to all their movements and plans the object of securing justice for the descendants of Mohammed. The representatives and adherents of the *Ahl-ul-bait*, little suspecting the treachery which lay behind their professions, extended to Mohammed bin Ali and to his party the favour and protection which was needed to impress upon his action the sanction of a recognised authority. The attachment of the Persians to the Fatimide cause was due to historical and national associations. The Fatimides

[1] Shahristâni, Pt. i. p. 86.
[2] Missionaries or political agents.

represented in their persons, through the daughter of Yezdjard, the right to the throne of Iran. From the first commencement of the Islamic preachings, Ali had extended the utmost consideration and friendship to the Persian converts. Salman the Persian, one of the most notable disciples of the Prophet, was long the associate and friend of the Caliph. After the battle of Kadessia, Ali used to devote his share of the prize-money to the redemption of the captives, and repeatedly by his counsel induced Omar to lighten the burden of the subjects. The devotion of the Persians to his descendants was intelligible. Mohammed bin Ali beguiled the Persians by preaching to them their approaching deliverance from the hated rule of their Arab oppressors. To the Yemenites settled in Khorasan, Fars, and other provinces of Iran, who were equally attached to the *Ahl-ul-bait*, and whose animosity against their old enemies, the descendants of Mozar, was inflamed by many recent injuries, he proclaimed he was acting solely on behalf of the Imams of the House of Mohammed. He succeeded in winning over to his side Abu Muslim, the ablest general of his time, and hitherto a devoted partisan of the children of Ali. Before his death, which took place in 125 A. H., he named his sons Ibrahim, Abdullah Abu'l Abbas (surnamed *Saffâh*), Abdullah Abû Jaafar (surnamed *al-Mansûr*) as his successors, one after the other.

The furious struggle which broke out about the middle of the eighth century between the Yemenites and Mozarites in Khorasan served as a signal to apply the torch to the well-laid mine. Abu Muslim sent word to his partisans in every city and village of the Province to raise at once the standard of revolt. The cause proclaimed was "the rights of the *Ahl-ul-bait*" against the usurping Bani-Ommeyya. A short time previously, Yahya, a grandson of the Imam Ali Zain-ul-Aabidin, had revolted and been killed, and his body was exposed, by the order of Merwan, upon a gibbet. Abu Muslim ordered the remains of the young chief to be taken down and buried with every mark of respect; and his followers clothed themselves in black in token of their sorrow, and their determination to avenge the death of Yahya. From that day black became the distinguishing symbol of the Abbasside cause. And when the order went forth summoning the people to arms against the usurpers, the crowd, clothed in black, which flocked to the trysting-places showed the widespread character

and strength of the revolt. The gathering was to take place on the night of the 25th of Ramazan A. H. 127, and the people were to be summoned by large bonfires lighted on the tops of the hills. Vast multitudes poured from every quarter into Merv, where Abu Muslim was dwelling at the time. Ibrahim, who had succeeded Mohammed bin Ali as the head of the Abbassides, was seized by Merwan and killed; but before his death he contrived to pass to his second brother, Abu'l Abbas, a document assigning him the authority in accordance with the testament of their father. Abu Muslim soon made himself master of the whole of Khorasan, and marched his victorious troops towards Irak. Nothing as yet was divulged as to the ultimate purpose of the movement. The *Ahl-ul-bait* was the watch-word which rallied all classes of people round the black standard. Kufa surrendered at once. Hassan ibn Kahtaba, the lieutenant of Abû Muslim, entered the city at the head of his troops, and was joined at once by Abu Salma Jaafar ibn Sulaiman al-Khallal, "who," says the author of the *Rouzat-us-Safâ*, "was designated the vizier of the descendants of Mahammed." Apparently this man acted as the agent of the head of the family. He was received with the greatest consideration by the Abbasside general, "who kissed his hand, and seated him in the place of honour,"[1] and told him that it was Abu Muslim's orders that he should be obeyed in all things. Abu Salma's vanity was flattered, but as yet he was wholly unaware of the Abbasside design. A proclamation was issued in the joint names of Abu Salma and Hassan ibn Kahtaba, inviting the inhabitants of Kufa to assemble the next day at the *Masjid-ul-Jâmaa* (the public mosque). The people flocked to the mosque expecting some announcement; but the plot had not yet thickened, and Hassan and the other Abbasside partisans considered the moment inopportune for the proclamation of their design. In the meantime, Abu'l Abbas, with his brother Abu Jaafar, had successfully evaded the Ommeyyade guards, and had arrived at Kufa, where they kept themselves concealed, waiting for the next event of the drama. Abu Salma, who was still faithful to the masters he purported to serve, sent a message secretly to the Imam (Jaafar us-Sadik) to come and take up his right. The Imam, knowing well the nature of Irakian communications, burnt the missive unopened. But before any answer could reach Abu Salma, he had

[1] *Rouzat-us-Safâ*; Ibn ul-Athîr, vol. v. p. 312 et seq.

already accepted Abu'l Abbâs as the Caliph. He then issued a proclamation, still acting ostensibly in the name of the *Ahl-ul-bait*, inviting the inhabitants, one and all, to assemble on the following day, which was a Friday, to elect a Caliph. On that day Kûfa presented a strange aspect. Large crowds of people, clothed in the sable garments of the Bani-Abbas, were hastening from every quarter to the *Masjid-ul-jâmaa* to hear the long-deferred announcement. In due time Abu Salma appeared on the scene, and, strangely, dressed in the same sombre black. Few, excepting the partisans of Abu l Abbas, knew how he had come to sell himself to the Abbasside cause. He preferred his head to the interests of his masters. After leading the prayers he explained to the assemblage the object of the meeting. Abu Muslim, he said, the defender of the Faith and the upholder of the right of the House, had hurled the Ommeyyades from the height of their iniquity; it was now necessary to elect an Imam and Caliph; there was none so eminent for piety, ability, and all the virtues requisite for the office as Abu'l Abbas; and him he offered to the Faithful for election. Up to this Abu Salma and the Abbassides were dubious of the impression on the people. They were afraid that even the Kufians might not view their treachery to the house of Ali with approbation. But the proverbial fickleness of the Irakians was now proved. They had again and again risen in arms in support of the Fatimide cause, and as often betrayed those whom they had pledged themselves to help or whose help they had invoked. Swayed by the passing whim of the moment, they had as often shown themselves to be traitors, as the defenders of truth. After the massacre of Kerbela they had been so struck with remorse that twenty thousand of them, after spending a night over the tomb of Hussain praying for forgiveness, had hurled themselves against the serried legions of Yezid. But the remorse did not last long; fickle and turbulent, faithless and unreliable, Hajjaj ibn-Yusuf, the veritable "Scourge of God," had alone kept them in order. And now, no sooner had the words passed from the lips of Abu Salma, proposing Abu'l Abbas as the Caliph, than they burst forth with loud acclamations of the *takbîr*[1] signifying their approval. A messenger was sent in haste to fetch Abu'l Abbas from

[1] *I. e. Allâho-Akbar*, God is great.

his concealment, and when he arrived at the mosque there was a frantic rush on the part of the multitude to take his hand and swear fealty. The election was complete. He ascended the pulpit, recited the *khutba*, and was henceforth the Imam and Caliph of the Moslems.[1] Thus rose the Abbassides to power on the popularity of the children of Fâtima, whom they repaid afterwards in a different coin. The greed of earthly power is the worst form of ambition. It has caused greater disasters to humanity than any other manifestation of human passion. It never hesitates as to the choice of means to attain its object; it uses indiscriminately both crime and virtue, the one to disguise its design, the other to achieve its ends. It has even pressed religion into its service. Ambition disguised in the cloak of religion has been productive of fearful calamities to mankind. The popes of Rome, in their incessant endeavour to maintain unimpaired their temporal power, deluged the civilised world with human blood. The pontiffs of Islam, Abbasside, Egyptian, Fatimide, and Ommeyyade, seized with avidity upon the claim prepared by willing minions to supreme spiritual and temporal rule, and in their desire to maintain the undivided allegiance of their subjects, caused equal bloodshed and strife in the bosom of Islâm.

The early Abbasside Caliphs were men of great ability, and possessed of vast foresight and statesmanship. From the moment they were raised to the Caliphate by the acclamation of the people of Kufa, they directed their whole energy towards consolidating the spiritual and temporal power in their hands, and to give shape and consistency to the doctrine of divine sanction to popular election. Henceforth it became a point of vital importance to disavow the principle of apostolical succession by descent, and to make the election by the people almost sacramental.

During Saffâh's[1] reign, Abû Muslim enjoyed some consideration, but the king-maker was hated and suspected for his ill-concealed Fatimide proclivities. Under Saffah's successor he was accused of heresy—stigmatised with the opprobrious epithet of

[1] For a full account see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan).

[2] Abu'l Abbas Abdullah received the title of Saffah, "blood-spiller," or "sanguinary," on account of his unsparing use of the sword against his enemies; one of his successors (Mutazid b'illah) received the title of Saffah as-Sani (Saffah II.), and the Ottoman, Selim I., bore the same designation.

Zendîk[1]—and killed. The pure and unsullied lives of the leading representatives of the House of Mohammed, the extreme veneration in which they were held by the people, frequently evoked the jealousy of the Abbassides, and exposed the children of Fatima to periodic outbursts of persecution. Harun destroyed the Barmekides, who were the bulwarks of his empire and had made for him the fame which he so largely appropriated, solely on suspicion of conspiracy with the Fatimides. This state of affairs lasted until the reign of Abdullah al-Mamun, the noblest Caliph of the house of Abbas, who, on his accession to the Caliphate, resolved to restore to the children of Fâtima their just rights. He accordingly named Ali ibn Mûsa, surnamed Razâ ("the acceptable or agreeable"), the eighth Imam of the Fatimides, as his successor, and gave his sister Umm ul-Fazl in marriage to this prince. He also abandoned the black, the Abbasside colour, in favour of the green, which was the recognised standard of the Fatimides.[2] Ali ibn Musa ar-Raza was poisoned by the infuriated Abbassides, and Mamun was forced to resume the black as the colour of his house. The tolerance shown by him to the Fâtimides was continued by his two immediate successors (Mutassim and Wasik).[3] The accession of Mutawakkil was the signal for a new and fierce persecution, which lasted during the whole fifteen years of a reign signalised by gross cruelty and debauchery. He was succeeded by his son Muntassir, whose first care was to restore the tombs of Ali and Hussain, destroyed by Mutawakkil, and to re-establish the sacredness of their memory so wantonly outraged by his father The sagacity of this Caliph was imitated by his successors, and some degree of toleration was thenceforward extended to the Shiahs. In the year 334 A.H. (A.C. 945) Muiz uddowla (the Deilemite), of the House of Buwaih, became the Mayor of the Palace at Bagdad. An enthusiastic partisan of the Fatimides, he entertained at one time the design of deposing the Abbasside Caliph Muti ullah, and placing in his stead some scion of the house of Ali, but was restrained by motives of policy from carrying this project into effect. Muiz ud-dowla also instituted the *Yeum-i-*

[1] *I. e.* a Magian, Guebre, from *Zend.*

[2] The Fâtimides had adopted green, the colour of the Prophet, as the symbol of their cause; the Banu-Ommeyya, the white; and the Banu-Abbas, black.

[3] Mutassim-b'illah (Mohammed) and Wâsik b'illah (Harun).

aâshûra, the day of mourning, in commemoration of the martyrdom of Hussain and his family on the plains of Kerbela. In the year A.H. 645 (A.C. 1247), under Mustaasim b'illah, another fierce persecution of the Shiahs broke out, the consequences of which proved in the end disastrous to Saracenic civilisation, engulfing in one common ruin the Western Asians. Impelled by the perfidious counsels of the fanatics who surrounded him, this imbecile pontiff of the Sunni Church doomed the entire male population of the Shiahs to massacre. By a terrible edict, which reminds us of the fate of the Albigenses and the Huguenots, he permitted the orthodox to plunder the goods, demolish the houses, ravage the fields, and reduce to slavery the women and children of the Shiahs. This atrocious conduct brought upon the ill-fated city of Bagdad the arms of the avenging Hulaku, the grandson of Chengiz. For three days the Tartar chief gave up the town to rapine and slaughter. On the third day the thirty-seventh Caliph of the house of Abbas was put to death with every circumstance of ignominy; and so ended the Abbasside dynasty![1]

Until the time of Muâwiyah the adherents of the *Ahl-ul-bait*[2] had not assumed or adopted any distinctive appellation. They were known simply as the Banî-Hâshim. There was no difference between the Bani-Fatima and the Bani-Abbas; they were all connected with each other by the closest ties of blood. After Muawiyah's seizure of the sovereign power the followers of the House of Mohammed began to call themselves *Shiahs* (adherents) and their enemies either *Nawâsib* (rebels) or *Khawârij* (insurgents or de-

[1] A scion of the house of Abbâs escaped into Egypt, and the titular Caliphate flourished there until the Ottoman Selim obtained a renunciation in his favour from the last of the Abbassides.

[2] The *Ahl-ul-bait*, "People of the House" (of Mohammed), is the designation usually given to Fatima and Ali and their children and descendants. This is the name by which Ibn-Khaldun invariably designates them, and their followers and disciples,—the Shiahs or *adherents* of the "People of the House". Sanaï represents the general feeling with which the descendants of Mohammed were regarded in the following verses :—

جز کتاب الله و عترت ز احمد مرسل نماند

یادگاری کو توان تا روز محشر داشتن

"Excepting the Book of God and his family (descendants) nothing has been left by Ahmed the Prophet, memorials such as these can never be btained till the Day of Judgment."

serters).[1] The Ommeyyades called themselves *Amawis* (children of Ommeyya). As yet the name of *Ahl-us-Sunnat wa'l Jamâet* was wholly unknown. Under Mansûr and Hârûn this designation first came into existence. In the tenth century, a member of the house of Ali wrested Egypt from the Abbassides, and established a dynasty which ruled over that country and Syria until the rise of Saladin. The anathemas which the Caliphs of Bagdad and Cairo hurled at each other, the multitudinous traditions which were unearthed to demolish the claims of the one and the other, and the *fatwas* emanating from the doctors of the two Caliphates, accentuated the strife and bitterness of partisans. Saladin overthrew the Fatimide dynasty in Egypt, and restored the predominance of the Sunni Church in Eastern Africa. Various other branches of the Bani-Fatima, however, succeeded in establishing the supremacy of their family in different parts of the two continents.[2] The *Asnâ-aasharias*[3] alone, the followers of the saintly Imams, who reprehended the use of force, and who claimed and exercised only a spiritual dominion, maintained an attitude of complete withdrawal from temporal interests, until Shah Ismail the great Seffavian monarch made *Asnâ-aashariaism* the State religion of Persia. Himself a philosopher and a Sufi,[4] he perceived in the sympathy and devotion of the people to the House of Mohammed, whose descendant he was, a means of national awakening and consolidation. Since then *Asnâ-aashariaism* is the national church of Persia.

The Bahmani and Aâdil Shâhi dynasties of Southern India which Aurungzeb overthrew, thus paving the way for the rise of the Mahratta marauders whom the Bahmani sovereigns had kept in check with an iron hand, were attached to the doctrines of the Imams. Such has been the political fate of the Fatimides, which has left its impress on their doctrines.

The name of Khâwarij was especially given to the troops who deserted Ali at Dumat ul-Jandal and formed a confederacy hostile to Islam, and was afterwards applied to those who adopted their pernicious doctrines ; see *post*.

2 Besides the Banu-Fatima of Egypt, other branches of Fatimides have ruled under the different denominations of Ameer, Imam, Sharif, and Caliph in different parts of the Mussalman world, such as the Banu-Ukhaydur, the Banû-Mûsa, the Banu-Kitadah at Mecca, the Banu-Taba-Taba in Northern Yemen, the Banu-Ziyad in Southern Yemen, and the Banu Idrîs in Morocco.

3 See *post*.

4 Hence the name of the dynasty.

The title of the Banî-Abbâs to the spiritual and temporal headship of Islam was founded on *biat* or nominal election. Since Saffah's accession, the Abbasside Caliphs had taken the precaution of obtaining during their lifetime the fealty of the chiefs for their intended successors. And it became necessary to impress on the doctrine of election a sanctity derived from precedent and ancient practice. The rise of the Fâtimides in Egypt, their persistent endeavour to wrest the dominion of the East from the Caliphs of Bagdad, made it doubly necessary to controvert the pretensions of the children of Fatima, and to give form and consistency to the orthodox doctrines recognising the Abbasside Pontiffs as the spiritual chiefs of Islâm.[1]

Every corner of Irâk and Hijâz was ransacked for traditions in support of the right of the house of Abbas. The doctors of law were required to formulate the principles of orthodoxy in explicit terms : and gradually the grand superstructure of the Sunni church was raised on the narrow foundations of Abbasside self-interest. Much of the success of the doctors and legists who assisted in the growth and development of Sunnism was due to the Manichæism of the Egyptian Fatimides. The nature of their doctrines, which were at variance with the teachings of both the Shiah Imams and the Sunni doctors ; the assassinations of the best men committed at the instance of Hassan Sabah ("the Old Man of the Mountain") ; the disintegrating character of the heresies, which under the influence of the ancient Chaldæo-Magism had sprung up in various quarters, and which were subversive of all order and morality,—added greatly to the strength of a system which formed, in the opinion of the masses, a bulwark against the enemies of Islam. The Shiah Imams strongly condemned the im-

1 Aâslân al-Bassasiri, a general in the service of the Abbassides, but an adherent of the Egyptian Fatimides, drove al-Kaim-ba-amr illah, the then Caliph of Bagdad, from the city, and compelled him to take refuge with the phylarch of the Arabs (the Ameer-ul-Arab, a title analogous to the Il-Khani of Persia), until restored by Tughril the father of Alp Arslan and the founder of the Seljukide dynasty. During the whole of this period the *Khutba* was read in Bagdad itself in the name of the Fatimide Caliph. The *Khutba* is the name given to the sermon pronounced on Fridays from the pulpits of the great mosques in all Moslem countries ; it begins by a declaration of God's attributes and unity, and an invocation of His blessings upon the Prophet, his family, and successors ; then follows a prayer for the reigning Caliph and for the prince who exercises civil power in the State. The right of being named in the *Khutba* and that of coining money are two of the principal privileges possessed by the temporal sovereign, and the special marks of his legitimacy.

pious or communistic doctrines of the antitypes of Mâni and Mazdak, but they lacked the power, even if willing to use it, to suppress heresy or enforce uniformity. Sunnism, associated with the temporal power of the Abbasside Caliphs, possessed the means and used it, and thereby won the sympathy and acceptance of all who cared little about the disputes on the abstract question of apostolical descent.

Until the rise of the House of Abbâs there was little or no difference between the assertors of the right of the *Ahl-ul-bait* to the pontificate and the upholders of the right of the people to elect their own spiritual and temporal chiefs. The people of Hijaz and the Medinite Ansar especially, who were so ruthlessly destroyed by the Ommeyyades, whilst they insisted on the principle of election, abhorred the injustice done to the children of Fatima. After the murder of Hussain, a cry of horror had gone forth from the heart of Islam, and the people of the holy cities had risen in arms againt the tyrant, and suffered bitterly for it. The adherents of the *Ahl-ul-bait* and the followers of the first three Caliphs together underwent fearful cruelties in the cause of the common Faith. But when it became necessary for dynastic reasons to create a gulf between the two parties the elements of divergence came ready to hand on both sides. Their doctrinal and legal differences began from this time to assume the type and proportions they retain at the present moment.

During the enlightened rule of Mâmûn and of his two immediate successors, when humanitarian science and philosophy influenced the conceptions of all classes of society, there was a break in the development of the Sunni Church. With the exception of this period the entire duration of the Abbasside Caliphate [1] was occupied in the consolidation of its dogmas. The Church and State were linked together ; the Caliph was the Imam—temporal chief as well as spiritual head. The doctors of law and religion were his servants. He presided at the convocations, and guided their decisions. Hence the solidarity of the Sunni church. Many of the sects [2] into which it was originally split up have gradually disappeared, but it is still divided into four principal denominations, differing from each other on many questions of dogma and ritual. Their differences may

[1] From 750 A. C. to 1252 A. C.

[1] According to Imâm Jaafar Tûsi (quoted in the *Dabistân*), the Sunnis were originally divided into sixty-five sects.

perhaps, be likened to those existing between the Roman Catholic and the Greek, Armenian, and Syrian orthodox churches.

Shiahism, on the other hand, shows how the Church and the State have become dissociated from each other, and how the "Expounders of the Law" have assumed, at least among a section, the authority and position of the clergy in Christendom. The freedom of judgment, which in Protestantism has given birth to one hundred and eighty sects, has produced an almost parallel result in Shiahism, and the immense diversity of opinion within the church itself is due to the absence of a controlling temporal power, compelling uniformity at the point of the sword.

The question of tbe Imâmate,[1] or the spiritual headship of the Mussalman commonwealth, is henceforth the chief battle-ground of the two sects.[2] The Shiahs hold that the spiritual heritage bequeath-

1 A very good definition of the word "Imâm" is given by Dr. Percy Badger: "The word 'Imam' comes from an Arabic root signifying to aim at, to follow after,—most of the derivatives of which partake, more or less, of that idea. Thus *Imam* means, primarily, an exemplar, or one whose example ought to be imitated. It is applied in that sense, κατ ἐξοχήν, to Mohammed, as being the leader and head of the Muslims in civil and religious matters, and also to the Khalîfahs, or legitimate *Successors*, as his representatives in both capacities. It is also given—in its religious import only—to the heads of the four orthodox sects, namely, the el-Hanafy, esh-Shafa'iy, el-Maliky, and el-Hanbaly; and, in a more restricted sense still, to the ordinary functionary of a mosque who leads in the daily prayers of the congregation,—an office usually conferred on individuals of reputed piety, who are removable by the *Nâzirs* or wardens, and who, with their employment and salary, lose the title also."

"The term is used in the Kûrân to indicate the Book, or Scriptures, or record of a people; also, to designate a teacher of religion. Hence, most probably, its adoption by the Muslims in the latter sense. 'When the Lord tried Abraham with certain words, which he fulfilled, He said, I have made thee an Imam to the people.' Again, referring to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, 'We have made them Imams, that they may direct others at our command.' And again, 'We delivered to Moses the Book, therefore be not in doubt of his receptiou thereof, and we ordained it to be a guide unto the children of Israel. And we appointed some of them to be Imams, to direct the people according to our command."—Badger's *Imams and Seyyids of Oman*, App. A.

2 "The question of the Imamate forms a subject of controversy," says Masudi, "between the followers of different sects, particularly between those who adhere to the doctrine of appointment, القائلون بالنص and the followers of the doctrine of election, اصحاب الاختيار. The defenders of the doctrine of appointment are the Imamias, اهل الامامة who form a section of the Adherents, Shiahs الشيعة of Ali ibn Abi Talib and his holy children (by Fatima) الطاهرون من ولده. They believe that God does not leave mankind at any time without a man who maintains the religion of God (and acts

ed by Mohammed devolved on Ali and his descendants. They naturally repudiate the authority of the *Jamâat* (the people) to elect a spiritual head who should supersede the rightful claims of the Prophet's family. According to the Shiahs, therefore, the Imamate descends by divine appointment in the apostolical line. The Imam, besides being a descendant of the Prophet, must possess certain qualities,—he must be *Maasûm* or sinless, bear the purest and most unsullied character, and must be distinguished above all other men for truth and purity. It is not proper, nor could it be the intention of the Almighty, they argue, that a man whose character is not unimpeachable should have the direction of the human conscience. Human choice is fallible, as is proved by the history of mankind ; and the people have often accepted the worst men for their leaders. God could never have left the religious needs of man to his unaided faculty. If an Imam be needed, he must be one whom the conscience must accept. Accordingly they declare that if the choice of an Imam be left to the community, it would be subversive of all morality ; and consequently the spiritual guidance of mankind has been entrusted to divinely-appointed persons.[1]

According to the Sunnis, the Imamate is not restricted to the

as their Imâm). Such men are either prophets or their legates. The doctrine of election is defended by a section of the Khawarij الخوارج, the Marjias المرجية, by many of those *who admit the traditions and the generally received opinions (Ahl-us-Sunnat)*, by some of the Mutazalas, and by a section of the Zaidias, الزيديون. They believe that it is the will of God and his Prophet that the nation should choose a man amongst themselves, and make him their Imam, for there are times when God does not send a legate. The Shiahs consider such Imams as usurpers of the dignity."—*Murûj-uz-zahab.*

[1] "It is neither the beauty of the sovereign," says Ibn-Khaldun, " nor his great learning, perspicacity, or any other personal accomplishment which is useful to his subject. . . . The sovereign exists for the good of his people." "The necessity of a ruler," continues this remarkable writer, whose keenness of observation was equalled by his versatility, " arises from the fact that human beings have to live together, and unless there is some one to maintain order, society would break to pieces. A temporal sovereign only enforces such orders as are promulgated by man, but the laws framed by a divinely-inspired legislator have two objects in view—the moral as well as social well-being of mankind. The Caliph is the Vicar and Lieutenant of the Prophet. He is more than a temporal ruler, he is a spiritual chief as well. The Caliph is thus designated the Imam, his position being similar to that of the leader of the congregation at the public prayers."

"This establishment of an Imam," continues Ibn-Khaldun, " is a matter of obligation. The law which declares its necessity is founded on the general accord of the Companions of the Prophet. The Imam is the spiritual head, whilst the Caliph or Sultan represents the temporal power."

family of Mohammed. But no one can be elected to the office unless he is a Koraishite.[1] The Imâm need not be just, virtuous, or irreproachable *(Maasûm)* in his life, nor need he be the most excellent or eminent being of his time افضل الناس ; so long as he is free, adult, sane, and possessed of the capacity to attend to the ordinary affairs of State, he is qualified for election. Another doctrine in which they agree with the Church of Rome was full of momentous consequences to Islam. They hold that neither the vices nor the tyranny of the Imam would justify his deposition ;[2] nor can the perversity or evil conduct of the Imam or those who preside at the public divine service invalidate the prayers of the Faithful.[3]

They also hold that the Imâmate is indivisible, and that it is not lawful to have two Imams at one and the same time. As Christianity could yield obedience to but one Pope, so the Moslem world could yield obedience to but one lawful Caliph. But as three Popes have often pretended to the triple crown, so have three Caliphs laid claim to the supreme rule of three portions of the earth.[4] After the destruction of the Ommeyyade power in Asia a member of that house succeeded in setting up a Caliphate in Spain, whilst the family of Abbas exercised it on the banks of the Tigris, and that of Fatima

1 There is great difference of opinion, however, on this point. Ibn-Khaldun, being a Yemenite himself, maintained that it was not necessary for the Imam to be a Koraishite ; and many Sunni doctors have held the same view. The Sultans of Turkey have since the time of Selim I., the father of Solyman the Magnificent, assumed the title of Caliph. They base their title upon a renunciation of the Caliphate and Imamate in favour of Selim by the last Abbasside Caliph of Egypt, whom the Mamluke Sultans were maintaining at Cairo as a shadow of the past. When Akbar assumed the title of *Imâm-i-aâdil*, it was under a fatwa signed by the leading Mullas.

2 In spite of this doctrine, promulgated at the order of tyrants anxious to avoid the penalty of their oppression, the people have never approved of it entirely. Under the Ommeyyade Walîd, surnamed for his vices (the *Fâsik*, the Wicked) they rose in revolt and deposed him. Similarly, when the iniquities of Mutawakkil (the Abbasside) became intolerable, he was deposed by his own son, Muntassir the Good. The history of the Ottoman Turks contains many examples of the people rising in revolt against a vicious or incapable sovereign, the last being under the unhappy Abdul Azîz.

3 Against this doctrine there is now a widespread revolt in the Sunni Church ; the *Ghair-Mukallidîn* whom we shall describe later, holding that if the Imam is not chaste in his life, the prayers of the congregation are invalid.

4 As formerly, the Ommeyyades, the Abbassides, and the Fatimides reigned contemporaneously at Grenada, Bagdad, and Cairo ; so at the present day the sovereigns of the house of Kajar and Osman possess the dignity of Caliph at Teheran and Constantinople, and the rulers of Morocco in West Africa. It must be said, however, that the Sultan of Turkey, the custodian of the holy cities, and the holder of the insignia of the Caliphate,—the banner, the sword, and the mantle of the Prophet—has the best claim to the dignity.

on the Nile. The fact that at various times two or three sovereigns have assumed the title of Imâm and Caliph simultaneously, has given rise to an opinion that the rule of indivisibility applies only to one and the same country, or to two countries contiguous to each other; but when the countries are so far apart that the power of one Imam cannot extend to the other, it is lawful to elect a second Imam. The Imam is the patron and syndic of all Mussalmans, and the guardian of their interests during their lives as well as after their death. He is vested with the power to nominate his successors, subject to the approval of the Moslems. As the office is for the temporal and spiritual benefit of the community, the nomination is dependent on the choice of the people.[1]

It might have been expected that persecution would keep the Shiahs united among themselves; but although all were agreed on the question that the supreme pontificate of Islam is confined to the line of the Prophet, many of them fell away from the recognised heads of the family, and attached themselves from design or predilection to other members of the House. Whilst the acknowledged Imâms and their disciples lived in holy retirement, the others found leisure amidst their foreign hostilities for domestic quarrels. They preached, they disputed, they suffered.

Shahristâni divides the Shiahs into five sects, viz. the *Zaidia*, the *Ismailia*, the *Asná-Aasharia* or *Imámia*, the *Kaisánia*, and the *Ghâlîia* or *Ghullât*. As a matter of fact, however, as we shall show hereafter, some of these sects, and especially the branches into which they bifurcated, had, excepting in a more or less exaggerated attachment to Ali, nothing in common with Shiahism proper. On the contrary, they derived their origin from sources other than Islâmic.

The *Zaidias*, says Shahristâni, are the followers of Zaid, son of Ali II. (Zain-ul-Aabidîn), son of Hussain. They affirm that the Imamate descended from Ali to Hassan, then to Hussain; from Hussain it devolved upon Ali II. (Zain-ul-Aabidîn); and from him it passed to Zaid, and not, as is held by the *Asná-Aasharias*, and, in fact, by most Moslems, to Mohammed al-Bakir. In their doctrines they closely approch the *Ahl us-Sunnat*. They hold that the people have the right of choosing from among the descendants

[1] Ibn-Khaldûn.

of the Prophet their spiritual head, combining thus the principle of election with the principle which restricts the Imamate to the family of Mohammed. They also affirm that it is lawful to elect the *mafzûl* (*the less eminent*) whilst the *afzal* (*the most eminent*) is present. As a consequence of this principle, they accept the Imâmate of the first three Caliphs, whose pontificate is generally disclaimed by the other Shiahs. They hold that though Ali was the most eminent of all the Companions of the Prophet, and by right of descent as well as by his *qualities* entitled to the Imamate, yet for reasons of policy, and to allay the disorders which had broken out upon the death of the Prophet, to settle the minds of the people and to compose the differences among the tribes, a man of a maturer age was required to fill the office. Besides, owing to the struggle in which Ali had been engaged in defence of the Faith, the feeling of retaliation was strong in the bosom of those who had fought against Islam, and who had been only recently reduced to subjection; and these people would not willingly have bowed before the grandeur of Ali. They hold that the same reason applies to the election of Omar.[1] Their acceptance of the Imâmate of the first two Caliphs brought upon the Zaidias the name of *Rawâfiz*, or Dissenters, by the other Shiahs. Another doctrine held by them is too important to escape notice. They maintain that in addition to piety, truth, knowledge, and innocence or sinlessness, qualities required by the Shiahs proper for the pontifical office, the Imam should possess bravery, and the capacity to assert by *force of arms* his right to the Imâmate. The Imâm Mohammed al-Bâkir, who had succeeded his father Ali II., maintained that the use of force was reprehensible. Zaid differed from his brother in this opinion. He rose in arms against the tyrants in the reign of Hisham ibn Abdul Malik (the Ommeyyade), and was killed in the neighbourhood of Kufa. He was succeeded by Yahya, his son, who followed the example of his father, and, against the advice of Imam Jaafar as-Sadik, proceeded to assert his right by force of arms. He collected a large following in Khorasan, but was defeated and killed by one of the generals of Hishâm.

On the death of Yahya, the Imâmate, say the *Zaidias*, passed

[1] Shahristâni, Pt. i. p. 115.

to another member of the family, Mohammed ibn Abdullah, surnamed *an-Nafs-uz-Zakiya* (" the Pure Soul "). Mohammed assumed the title of Mahdi, and rose in arms in Hijaz against the Abbasside Mansûr. He was defeated and killed at Medîna by Isa, Mansur's nephew. He was succeeded by his brother Ibrahîm, who lost his life similarly in a vain struggle against the Abbassides. Isa, another brother, who also endeavoured to assert his claims by force, was seized by Mansur, and imprisoned for life. After mentioning these facts, Shahristani adds that " what ever befell them was prognosticated by Jaafar as-Sadik, who said that temporal dominion was not for their family, but that the Imamate was to be a toy in the hands of the Abbassides."

According to a branch of the *Zaidias*, the Imâmate passed from Ibrahîm to Idrîs, the founder of the Idriside dynasty in Mauritania (مغرب الاقصى), and of the city of Fez. After the fall of the Idrisides, the *Zaidias* became disoganised, but members of this sect are still to be found in different parts of Asia and Africa. A branch of the *Zaidias* ruled in Tabaristan for a long time. The *Zaidias*, according to Shahristani, were divided into four subsections, *viz.* the *Jârudias*, *Sulaimânias*, *Tabarias*, and *Sâlehias*. They differ from each other about the devolution of the Imamate from Zaid's grandson. The *Jârudias*, who upheld the claims of Mohammed *Nafs-uz-Zakiya* in supersession of Isâ, suffered bitterly under Mansûr. The *Sulaimânias* were named after their founder, Sulaimân ibn Jarîs who declared that the Imamate depended upon the consensus of the people ; ..... "that the Imâmate is not intended for regulating religion or for the acquisition of a knowledge of the Deity, or His unity or the laws which He has made for the government of the world, for these are acquired through Reason. The Imamate is intended for the government of the earth, inflicting punishments on wrong-doers, dealing out justice, and defending the State. It is not necessary for the Imâm to be *afzal*. . . ." "A section of the *Ahl-us-Sunnat* hold similar opinions, for they say that it is not required for the Imâm to be learned or a *Mujtahid*, so long as he is wise and has some one with him capable of expounding the law." [1] The *Sulaimânias* and the *Sâlehias* agree in accepting the Imamate

1 Shahristâni, Pt. i. pp. 119, 120.

of the first two Caliphs; the latter hold that Ali, having himself abandoned his preferential claim in favour of Abu Bakr and Omar, the people have no right to question *their* Imamate: but as regards Osman they are in doubt, for they say "when we see how he travailed for the support of the Banî Ommeyya, we find his character different from the other *Sahâba*."

The *Ismaïlias*, also sometimes called *Sabiûn* (*Seveners*),[1] derive their names from Ismail, a son of Imam Jaafar as-Sadlk, who predeceased his father. They hold that upon the death of Imam Jaafar as-Sadik, the Imamate devolved on Ismail's son, Mohammed (surnamed *al-Maktum*,[2] the *hidden or unrevealed*), and not on Jaafar's son, Musa al-Kazim, as believed by the *Asnâ-Aasharias* and generally by the other Moslems. Mohammed *al-Maktum* was suceeeded, according to the *Ismaïlias*, by Jaafar *al-Mussadak* whose son Mohammed *al-Habîb*, was the last of the *unrevealed Imâms*.

His son, Abû Mohammed Abdullah, was the founder of the Fatimide dynasty which ruled Northern Africa for three centuries. He had been thrown into prison by the Abbasside Caliph, Mutazid-b'illah Saffah II., but, escaping from his dungeon at Segelmessa, he appeared in Barbary, where he assumed the title of *Obaidullah* and *Mahdi* (*the promised Guide*). Followers gathered round him from all sides, and, assisted by a Sûfi, he soon overthrew the Aglabites, who were ruling the African provinces in the name of the Caliphs of Bagdad, and founded an empire which extended from Mauritania to the confines of Egypt. One of his successors (Maad Abu Temim), *al-Muiz-le-dın-illâh* (*Exalter of the Faith of God*), wrested Egypt and a portion of Syria from the Abbassides. Muiz, to mark his victory over the enemies of his House, founded Cairo (*Kâhira, the Victorious City*), and removed his capital from Mahdièh, near

1 Because they acknowledge only seven Imâms—(1) Ali, (2) Hassan, (3) Hussain, (4) Ali II., (5) Mohammed al-Bakir, (6) Jaafar as-Sadik (the True), and (7) Ismâil.

2 So called, says Makrîsi, because his followers kept him "concealed" to escape the persecution of the Abbassides. Ismail was the eldest son of Imam Jaafar as-Sadik, and a man of sweet disposition and engaging manners, and according to Makrısi, had a cconsiderable following in Yemen, in Ketama, and the African provinces. During the lifetimc of Ismail's mother, says Shahristani, the Imam Jaafar never had any other wife, "like the Prophet with Khadîja, and Ali with Fâtima."

Kairwân, established by Obaidullah al-Mahdi, to the new city. At this time his dominions included, besides the whole of Northern Africa, the islands of Sardinia and Sicily. He founded in Cairo the mosque of *al-Azhar* (*Jâmaa-al-azhar, the Brilliant Mosque*) a vast public library, and several colleges, and endowed them richly. At these colleges, students received instruction in grammar, literature, the interpretation of the Koran, jurisprudence, medicine, mathematics, and history. "The distinctive character of his reign," says the historian, "was justice and moderation."[1]

Almost all the accounts we possess of the Egyptian Fâtimides have come down to us from hostile sources. Since Jouhar, the general of Muiz, conquered Egypt and Syria from the Caliphs of Bagdad, there was an incessant struggle between the two Caliphates as to the legitimacy of their respective titles. The hold which the claim of the Fatimides to be descended from Mohammed enabled them to acquire over the people, gave rise to an unceasing desire on the part of the Abbassides to annihilate the genuineness of thir rivals' genealogy, and to impress on the world the anti-Islamic character of the doctrines adoped bv them. In the reign of Kadir b'illah, a secret assemblage of the doctors of the law was held at Bagdad at the instance of the frightened Caliph, to fulminate against the Fatimides an anathema declaring that thev were not the genuine descendants of Fatima. The Fatimides, on their side, replied by a counter-anathema, signed by the leading doctors of Cairo, among them many belonging to the Maliki and Shafeï persuasions. In spite, however, of the doubts thrown on their legitimacy by the Abbasside doctors, great historians like Makrîsi, Ibn Khaldun, aud Abulfeda have accepted the genuineness of the claims of the Fâtimides.

Makrîsi is extremely outspoken on the subject, and plainly

1 Marcel. The orthodox Jamâl ud-din bin Togra-bardi (in his *Maured ul-Latâfat*, مورد اللطافة) say, " though Muiz was a schismatic, he was wise, learned, generous, and just to his subjects,"

و كان المعز افضليا الا انه كان فاضلاً عاقلاً اديبا حازما جوادا ممدحا فيه عدل الرعية

For a full account of the Fâtimide dynasty, see *Short History of the Saracens*, (Macmillan).

charges the partisans of the Banî-Abbâs with misrepresentation and forgery. Dealing with the Abbasside statement that Obaidullah al-Mahdi was not a descendant of Mohammed, he goes on to say, "a little examination of facts will show that this is a fabrication. The descendants of Ali, the son of Abû Talib, at that time were numerous, and the Shiahs regarded them with great veneration. What was it then that could have induced their partisans to forsake them, the descendants of Mohammed, and to recognise in their stead as Imam an offspring of the Magi, a man of Jewish origin? No man, unless absolutely devoid of commonsense, would act thus. The report that Obaidullah al-Mahdi was by descent a Jew or a Magi owes its origin to the artifices of the feeble Abbasside princes, who did not know how to rid themselves of the Fatimides, for their power lasted without interruption for 270 years, and they despoiled the Abbassides of the countries of Africa, Egypt, Syria, the Diar-bakr, the two sacred cities (Mecca and Medina), and of Yemen. The *Khutba* was even read in their names at Bagdad during forty weeks. The Abbasside armies could not make head against them ; and, therefore, to inspire the people with aversion against the Fatimides, they spread calumnies about their origin. The Abbasside officers and Ameers who could not contend successfully with the Fatimides gladly adopted these slanders as a means of revenge. The Kazis, who attested the act of convocation under Kadir b'illah, acted under the orders of the Caliph, and only upon hearsay ; and since then historians have heedlessly and without reflection given currency to a calumny which was invented by the Abbassides." Nothing can be more explicit than this statement by a critical historian and a distinguished jurisconsult whose reputation stands high among all Orientalists.[1]

[1] Makrîsi died in 845 A. C. Jamâl ud-din Abu'l Mahâsin Yusuf bin Togra-bardi, in his النجوم الزاهرة في ملوك مصروالقاهرة, speaks of Makrîsi thus :—

توفى الشيخ الامام العالم المحدّث المفنّن عمدة المؤرّخين
وراس المحدثين تقيّ الدين احمد بن على بن عبد القادر
بن محمد بن ابراهيم بن محمد بن تميم بن عبد الصمد البعلبكى
الاصل المصري المولد

"In this year died the learned sheikh and Imâm, jurisconsult, and that eminent historian and traditionist, Taki ud-din Ahmed, son of Ali," etc. etc.

Probably the doctrines professed by the Egyptain Fâtimides were subjected to the same process of misrepresentation. Still there can be little doubt that they adopted largely the esoteric doctrines of Abdullah ibn Maimun, surnamed the *Kaddâh* (the *Oculist*), and made use of his degrees of initiation for the purposes of a political propaganda.

The protracted struggle between pope and emperor for the suzerainty of Christendom; the Thirty Year's War, with its concomitant miseries; the persecution of the Huguenots, in which dynastic ambitions played as important a part as religious bigotry,—give us some conception of the evils that have flowed from the greed of earthly power. In Islam it has been the same. The Abbassides battling with the Ommeyyades, and then with the Egyptian Fâtimides, produced the same disastrous results.

The eastern provinces of the ancient Persian empire were at this time the home of a variety of congenial spirits. Here had gathered not only the Mago-Zoroastrians, fleeing before the Islamic wave, but also the representatives of various Indian sects, with their ideas of metempsychosis, the incarnation of Vishnu, the descent of Krishna from heaven, and his free and easy intercourse with the *gopis*. The revolutionary opinions and heresies which under the later Sassanides, had shaken the temple and palace alike, and which Kesra Anushirvan had endeavoured to exterminate with fire and sword, had survived all persecutions. At least they retained sufficient vitality to reappear in Islam in various shapes and forms.

The *Râwendis*, an Indo-Magian sect who maintained the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and the *Safidjâmagân*,[1] founded by Hakim bin Hashim, the infamous Mokanna,[2] revolted in Khorasan, and were suppressed by the Caliph Al-Mahdi. Mokanna taught that God had assumed the human form, since He had commanded the angels to adore the first man; and that, since that period, the

[1] So called because they dressed themselves in white, like the Taborides of Europe.

[2] This is the impostor whom Moore has made famous as "the Veiled Prophet of Khorasan." He was called *Mokanna* because, either to conceal his ugliness, or to impress his followers with a sense of inaccessibility, he always wore a veil. He was also called the *Sâzendeh-i-Mah* (Moon-maker), because on one occasion he had, by a piece of jugglery caused an illumination, like that of the moon, at Naksheb.

divine nature had passed from prophet to prophet until it had descended to himself.[1]

About the same time Mazdakism, which, two centuries and a half before, had involved the empire of the Chosroes in a general conflagration, and was ruthlessly trampled under foot by the great Anushirvan, raised its head again under the Caliphs. The snake had only been half killed. Babek, surnamed Khurrami (from Khurram, his place of birth), preached, like his prototype Mazdak, the same nihilistic doctrines,—the community of women and goods, and the indifference of all human actions. For a space of twenty years he filled the whole circuit of the Caliphate with carnage and ruin, until at length, in the reign of Mutassim b'illah, he was overthrown, taken prisoner, and put to death in the Caliph's presence. It was a repetition of the old story. Islam had to pass through the same throes as Christianity. From the beginning of the second to the end of the ninth century there was an unceasing struggle in Christianity with the ancient cults, which were appearing in diversified characters throughout the wide area in which the religion of Jesus was professed. After this struggle was over, a deadly pall settled over Christendom; orthodoxy had succeeded in crushing not only the revolutionary Montanists, the Manichæan Paulicians, but also the rationalistic Arians. Ecclesiasticism and orthodoxy, convertible terms, held in bondage the mind of man until the Reformation. Islâm had to pass through the same ordeal, but *its* Reformation is only just commencing.

Islâm required from its votaries a simple confession of an eternal truth, and the practice of a few moral duties. In other respects it allowed them the widest latitude of judgment. In the name of divine unity it held forth to all creeds and sects the promise of a democratic equality. Naturally the persecuted heretics of every faith rallied round the standard of the Prophet who had emancipated human judgment from the bondage of priesthood; and "Avestan scripturalists" and Zoroastrian free-thinkers, Manichæans, Christians, Jews, and Magi all hailed the advent of a new dispensation which realised the dream of religious unity. The swarms of gnostic sects which had distracted the Church of Jesus from the second to the sixth century had either merged in the Church of Mohammed, or lived

[1] Ibn Khaldûn's *General History*, *Kitâb ul-Ibr.* &c., (Egypt. ed.), vol. iii. p. 206.

in peace, unmolested by the orthodox Greeks or Catholics, under the large tolerance of the Caliphs. The former, whilst they adopted the Faith of Mohammed, retained their primitive conceptions, and gave birth to the docetic sects of Islam, which we shall describe later on.

The national characteristics of a people, the climatic conditions under which they exist, the natural features of the country in which they dwell, the influence of older cults, all give a colour and a complexion to their faiths and doctrines. It is the same in Christendom and Islam. Iran gave birth to gnosticism ; from there emanated the docetic conceptions which permeated the Roman world and impressed upon the primitive belief of the judaical Christians the conception of a divinity who discoursed familiarly with mankind on earth. Manichæism, that wonderful mixture of fancy and philosophy, to which Christianity owes so much and acknowledges so little, was, in spite of the persecution of Zoroastrian and Christian, alive, not dead. Will it ever die, that child of a bizarre genius, the outcome of a nation's character ? Theologians may try, but will never kill it. The morbidism of the Fathers of the Sunni Church gave place in Iran to imaginative philosophy. Ali's personality fired the imagination of Manichæism. He took the place of the docetic Christ among the people The process of deification was not confined to Ali. His successors were deified with him. Shiahism, like Sunnïsm, presents therefore two aspects. One is the pure, simple *Shiahism* of Mohammed's immediate descendants, which we shall describe shortly. The other is docetic Shiahism, fantastic and transmogrified according to the primitive beliefs of the people among whom it spread. Ultra-Shiahism is again as different from docetic Shiahism as ultra-Sunnïsm or *Nawâsibism* is from docetic Sunnïsm. Narrow-minded exclusiveness is not the peculiar characteristic of any one faith or creed ; nor are the thunders of the Athanasian Creed confined to Christianity. In Islam also (be it said with certain exceptions) each sect condemns the others to perdition, not eternal (as the orthodox Christian charitably hopes it will be), but sufficiently prolonged to make them feel the evils of a different doxy from its own. Still, notwithstanding the anathemas of hell-fire and brimstone which have been hurled by contending parties and sects against each other, the philosophical student will not fail to observe the universality of Islâm.

About the middle of the seventh century Constantine Sylvanus founded the Manichæan sect of Paulicians, who derived their name from St. Paul, whose disciples they professed themselves to be. The Paulicians disclaimed the designation of Manichæan; but their doctrines bear the closest analogy to those taught by Mani, and all the Christian writers, with the exception of Milner, ascribe their origin to Manichæism. The Paulicians were the real progenitors of the Reformed Churches of Europe. Their abhorrence of images and relics was probably a reflex of Islamic influences. In their aversion towards Mariolatry and saint-worship, and in the repudiation of all visible objects of adoration, they closely approached the Moslems. They believed, however, with Mani, that Christ was a pure spirit which bore on earth only the semblance of a body, and that the crucifixion was a mere delusion. They maintained the eternity of matter; the origin of a second principle, of an active being, who has created this visible world, and exercises his temporal reign till the final consummation of death and sin. In the interpretation of the Christian Gospels, they indulged in allegories and figures, and claimed, like Mani, an esoteric insight into the meaning of words. An outward and expedient profession of another faith, a doctrine which in modern Persia has become famous as *ketmân* or *takiyyè*,[1] was held to be commendable.

The Paulicians were persecuted by the Greek Church and the Byzantine Court with terrible fury, and for nearly two hundred years they waged a not unequal contest in North Armenia and Cappadocia with the fanatics and despots of Byzantium, in which both sides perpetrated the most fearful atrocities.[2] At last they succumbed to superior force; but though their fortresses were razed and their cities ruined, the sect lived. It passed its doctrines to the Bulgarians, whose name became as infamous in the history of Christian orthodoxy as the term *Zendîk* in Islam. The Paulicians after their destruction in Asia appeared in South Provence and Savoy in the thirteenth century. Their fate in those countries is known to every reader of European history. They were annihilated with fire and

1 See *post*, p. 306.

2 A hundred thousand Paulicians are said to have been destroyed under the orders of the second Theodora, the mother of Manuel, by the sword, the gibbet, or the flames.

sword,—not even women and children were spared; such of the latter as escaped were reduced to slavery. But Paulicianism did not die; it showed itself in England, where its followers, under the name of Lollards, suffered like their predecessors in Asia, in Savoy, and in Provence; it reappeared in Bohemia under Huss; and finally it triumphed under Luther and Calvin over its orthodox persecutors. We have traced so far the fate of this peculiar sect, as in its original home it exercised no inconsiderable influence over the religio-political movements which were proceeding about the same time in Islâm.

During the tempestuous epoch, when Chyroseir the Paulician was devastating the eastern portion of the Byzantine dominions, and had filled the cities of Asia Minor with carnage and ruin, there lived at Ahwas, in Fars, a man who equalled Mani in the versatility of his genius, the variety of his information, and the profundity of his knowledge, and who was destined to play an almost equal part in the history of religion. Abdullah ibn Maimûn al-Kaddâh has been represented by his enemies as a Magian by birth: whilst his disciples have declared him to be a descendant of Ali.[1] However that may be, it is clear that he was a devoted adherent of the House of Mohammed. Considering the disastrous consequences which directly or indirectly have flowed from his teachings, it was impossible for even historians like Ibn Khaldun[2] to avoid viewing the man and his doctrines with an unfavourable bias. They think Abdullah ibn Maimun was animated by a desire to subvert the dominion of Islam by the same insidious means which were adopted by his great prototype against Christianity. Aware of the risk attendant upon an open war against constituted authority so long as the conscience of the people and temporal power were at its back, he determined (they say) to work in secret like Mani. He accordingly enveloped his system in a veil of mystery, and, in order to annihilate all positive religion and authority, he resolved to divide his followers into seven degrees, like the Pythagoreans. The last degree inculcated the vanity of all religion,—the indifference of actions, which, according to him, are neither visited with recompense nor chastisement, either now or hereafter. He appointed emissaries whom he despatched to enlist

1 Abdullah ibn Maimûn is stated to have been at one time in the service of Imàm Jaafar as Sadik.

2 Pronounced in Arabic Ibn (u) Khaldun; in Persian, Ibn (i) Khaldun.

disciples, and to initiate them according to their capacity in some or all of the degrees. The pretensions of the son of Ismail served them as a political mask; whilst working ostensibly for him, they were secretly, but in reality, the apostles of impiety.[1]

Shahristâni's account,[2] however, of the tenets of the sect is in a more philosophical spirit; whilst Mohsin Fani's description in the *Dabistân*, derived from members of the fraternity, is coloured with a slightly roseate hue. But, studied carefully, they render it more than probable that Abdullah ibn Maimun was a materialistic theist; that like Mani, he was fired with the ambition of creating an eclectic naturalism, which would reconcile philosophy with positive religion; and that his degrees of initiation were analogous to the mystical degrees of the Sufis. It is evident from what Mirkhond states that the Egpptian Fatimides adopted most of their mystical doctrines from Abdullah ibn Maimûn.[3]

Abdullah proceeded from Ahwâs to Bussorah, and thence to Syria, where he settled at Salemiye. In the course of his travels he came in contact with the Paulicians, and imbibed many of their doctrines. The long-continued struggle of the Paulicians with the Byzantines, and the success of their proselytising endeavours, undoubtedly influenced him in his project of religion. He moulded his doctrines partly upon those actually taught by Mani and partly upon those of the Moslem mystics. Manichæism itself was essentially pantheistic, founded upon a substratum of Pythagorean philosophy, Zervanism, and Christianity. Abdullah's followers have received the designation of *Bâtinias* or *Esotericians*, on account of their claim to an esoteric insight into the precepts of positive religion —a claim similar to that advanced by the Manichæans and Paulicians.

Abdullah ibn Maimûn seems to have affirmed the eternity of matter. He declared further "that God is not separate from His manifestations; that it cannot be predicted of him independently that He is existent or non-existent, omniscient or non-omniscient,

1 Nuwairi, *Journal Asiatique*, vol. iv. p. 298.
2 Shahristani, part i. p. 147.
3 The Egyptian Fatimides differed from the general body of the *Ismailias* in one essential feature. Whilst the latter held that Ismail, their last Imâm, had only disappeared, and would reappear in the fullness of time when "the kingdom of heaven" would be revealed, the Egyptians taught that he had reappeared in the person of Obaidullah al-Mahdi and his successors.

for to affirm regarding Him any of these things is to assume that there is some resemblance between Him and His creatures; that the First Cause evolved by a simple command (*amr-i-wâhid*), or a mere act of volition, a Principle which was embosomed in Eternity, and is called *Akl* or Reason, and *this* Principle evolved a subordinate Principle called the *Nafs* or soul, whose relation to the other is that of a child to the parent; that the essential attribute of this Principle is *Life*, as that of Reason is *Knowledge*; that this second Principle gave shape to pre-existent Matter, the essential attribute of which is passivity, and afterwards created Time and Space, the elements, the planets, and the astral bodies, and all other objects in creation; that in consequence of an incessant desire on the part of the Second Principle (*the Demiurgus*) to raise itself to the level of the First Created Principle, it manifested itself in matter in the shape of human beings; that the aim of all human souls is to struggle upwards to the Creative Principle or Wisdom; that the Prophets are embodiments or manifestations of that Principle to help the human soul to struggle with matter; the Prophets are therefore called *Nâtik*, ناطق, 'speaking apostles;' that they are seven in number like the planets; that the progress of the world is in cycles, and at the last stage will occur the Resurrection (قیامت کبریٰ), when the sanctions of positive religion and law will be withdrawn, for the motion of the heavens and the adoption of the precepts of religion are for the purpose that the Soul may attain Perfection, and its perfection consists in attaining to the degrees of Reason and its junction or assimilation with it in fact; and this is the great Resurrection (قیامت کبریٰ), when all things, the heavens, the elements, and organic substances, will be dissolved; and the earth will be changed, and the heavens will be closed like a written book, and the good will be differentiated from the bad, and the obedient from the disobedient, and the good will be merged in the Universal Soul, and the bad will join with the Principle of Evil; thus from the commencement of motion to its cessation (according to Abdullah ibn Maimûn) is the initial stage (مبدأ), and from the cessation of motion or activity to amalgamation with infinity is the stage of perfection;[1] that all the precepts of religion and law have their

1 كما تحركت الافلاك بتحريک النفس و العقل و الطبائع
كذلک تحركت النفوس و الاشخاص بالشرائع بتحريک النبی

measures" . . . "and that each letter and word have two meanings, for every revelation (*tanzîl*) has an interpretation (*tâvîl*), and everything visible has its counterpart in the invisible world; that knowledge of truth cannot be acquired by reason but by instruction." Abdullah ibn Maimun's disciples developed his doctrines still further by declaring that Resurrection means the Advent or Revelation of the Imam and of a Heavenly Kingdom in which all the burdens of positive religion and traditions would be removed; that deception in religion is allowable; that all the precepts of the Koran have an esoteric sense; that religion does not consist in external observances, but in an inner sense and feeling; that every thing or act which is not injurious is lawful; that fasting is nothing but keeping the secret of the Imam; that the prohibition against fornication implies that the disciple must not disclose the mysteries of the faith; and that *zakât* means the giving of the tithes to the Imâm *maasûm*—a peculiar and fantastical medley of many cults and philosophies, and in its tendency subversive of law and morality.

Abdullah ibn Maimûn settled in Syria, the home of Christian Gnosticism, where he still further developed his doctrines. Here he converted Hamadan, also called Karmath, whose name has become infamous in the annals of Islâm.

والوصي في كل زمان دائرا على سبعة سبعة حتى ينتهى
الى الدور الاخير و يدخل زمان القيامة و ترتفع التكاليف
و تضمحل السنن و الشرائع و انما هذه الحركات الفلكية و السنن
الشرعية لتبلغ النفس الى حال كمالها و كمالها بلوغها الى
درجة العقل و اتحادها به و وصولها الى مرتبة فعلاً و ذلك هو
القيامة الكبرى فتنحلّ تراكيب الافلاك و العناصر والمركبات
و ينشق السماء و تتناثر الكوكب و تبدل الارض غير الارض
و تطوى السماوات كطي السجل لكتاب المرقوم فيه و يحاسب
الخلق و يتميز الخير عن الشر والمطيع عن العاصى و يتصل
جزئيات الحق بالنفس الكل و جزئيات الباطل بالشيطان
المبطل etc.

—Shahristani, Pt. i. pp. 148, 149.

The method of proselytising adopted by the followers of Abdullah ibn Maimun was the old Manichæan one of throwing the acolyte into a sea of doubt with insidious questions and equivocal replies, "not," says Mohsin Fani's informant, "with any evil object, but simply to bring the seeker after truth and wisdom to the goal of perfection." [1] The process varied with the religious standpoint of the person whom they desired to convert. The *Dâi*[2] (the missionary) would at first give a tacit recognition to the faith of the intended proselyte, and then by an insinuation of doubt and difficulties, gradually unsettle his mind, and end by suggesting as the only possible solution the peculiar tenets of the *Bâtinia* system. For example, if the *Dâi* had to proselytise a Shiah, he would represent himself as a devoted partisan of the House of Mohammed. He would expatiate on the cruelty and injustice with which they were treated—on the martyrdom of Hussain and the butchery of Kerbela; having thus prepared the way, he would instil into the now receptive mind the esoteric doctrines of the *Bâtinias*. If he had a Jew to deal with, he spoke disparagingly of the Christians and the Mussalmans, and while agreeing with his intended convert in still looking forward to a promised Messiah, by degrees persuaded the neophyte that this promised Messiah can be none other than the *Ismailite* Imam. If it was a Christian whom he hoped to win over, he enlarged on the obstinacy of the Jews and the ignorance of the Mussalmans, he conformed to all the chief articles of the Christian creed, at the same time hinting that they were all symbolic, and pointed to a deeper meaning which the *Bâtinia* system alone could solve. And after the mind of the neophyte had been so far moulded he would suggest that the Christians had misinterpreted the doctrine of the Paraclete, and that the *Ismailia* Imam was the real Paraclete.[3] Abdullah ibn Maimun also formulated in precise terms the doctrine of *takeyyè*—outward conformity with an alien religious belief or practice. It had been in vogue among all the Manichæan sects—not excepting the Paulicians. It was re-introduced by Abdullah ibn Maimun, partly to escape persecution, partly to facilitate the work of proselytism. *Takeyye* is the natural defence of the weak and suffering against the strong. All people have not the fibres of a

[1] *Dabistân*, p. 356.

[2] داعي, one who invites.

[3] Mâni, in fact, claimed to be the Paraclete.

martyr; and the majority of them have to submit where they cannot oppose. The primitive Christians had to practise *takeyye*. The *Ismailias* had special reasons for concealing their religious views in all countries within the sway of the Abbasside Caliphs; and this long-enforced habit became at last a second nature with them. From them the Shiahs proper borrowed the practice of *takeyye*. Before Persia and Turkey had entered upon terms of amity, a Shiah was unable to perform the Hajj unless he conformed to the Sunni rites, and *takeyye* in such cases was almost a necessity with the devout Shiah wishing to visit the holy shrines. But *takeyyè*, "the natural offspring of persecution and fear," has become so habitual with the Persians that they indulge in it even in circumstances when there is no necessity. They practise it to avoid giving offence or wounding susceptibilities, just as the modern Protestant shows a certain deference to Romish rites in Catholic countries.

Hamadân, otherwise called Karmath, had broken away from his master and formed a sect of his own. Abdullah ibn Maimûn had disavowed the use of force in his proselytism; Karmath advocated it as the corner-stone of his sect. Possibly, like Chyroseir, he was driven to it by the persecution of the orthodox. He raised an insurrection at al-Ahsa and al-Bahrain. The weakness of the Caliph's troops gave him the victory. Collecting a large following he issued from al-Bahrain, and, like the Paulician Chyroseir, marked his progress by slaughter and ruin. The Karmathites, from their fastnesses in al-Bahrain and al-Ahsa, waged for nearly a hundred years a sanguinary contest with the Pontiffs of Bagdad. They pillaged even Mecca, and carried away the sacred stone, the symbol of Abrahamitic antiquity, like the Wahabis 900 years later. In this sacrilege they imitated the example of their *congeners*, the Paulicians, who had pillaged Ephesus, destroyed the sepulchre of St. John, and turned his cathedral into a stable for mules and horses. They were destroyed ultimately by the Caliph Mutazid b'illah.

After the destruction of the Karmathites, *Ismailism* was proscribed; its votaries were placed under the ban, and hunted like vermin. *Ismailism* had to hide itself on all sides until Obaidullah al-Mahdi wrested Africa from the Abbassides.

The Fâtimides of Egypt were grand supporters of learning and science. Yet in their desire to promote the diffusion of knowledge

among their subjects, they did not ignore the political advantages of the propaganda established by Abdullah ibn Maimun, whose esoteric and Manichæan doctrines they partially adopted for their own purposes. They established colleges, public libraries, and scientific institutes (*Dâr ul-hikmat*), which were richly furnished with books, mathematical instruments, professors, and attendants. Access to, and the use of these literary treasures, was free to all, and writing materials were afforded gratis.[1] The Caliphs frequently held learned disputations, at which the professors of these academies appeared, divided according to their different faculties,—logicians, mathematicians, jurists, and physicians, dressed in their *Khalaa*, or doctoral mantles. The gowns of the English universities still retain the original form of the Arabic *Khalaa or Kaftan.*

Two hundred and fifty-seven thousand ducats, raised by a carefully regulated taxation, was the amount of the annual revenue of the institutes, for the salaries of the professors and officials, for the provision of the requisites for teaching, and other objects of public scientific instruction. In these institutes they taught every branch of human knowledge. To the central *Dâr ul-hikmat* was attached a grand Lodge, where the candidates for initiation into the esoteric doctrines of *Ismailism* were instructed in the articles of the faith. Twice a week, every Monday and Wednesday, the *Dâi ud-daawât*, the Grand Prior of the Lodge, convened meetings, which were frequented by both men and women, dressed in white, occupying separate seats. These assemblages were named *Majâlis ul-hikmat*, or Conferences of Wisdom. Before the initiation the *Dai ud-daawât* waited on the Caliph, who was the Grand Master, and read to him the discourse he proposed to deliver to the neophytes, and received his sign-manual on the cover of the manuscript.[2] After the lecture the pupils kissed the hands of the Grand Prior, and touched the signature of the Master reverently with their foreheads. Makrîsi's account of the different degrees of initiation adopted in this Lodge forms an invaluable record of freemasonry. In fact, the Lodge at Cairo became the model of all the Lodges created afterwards in Christendom. Abdullah ibn Maimun had established seven degrees of initiation. Seven was the sacred number: there were seven

1 Makrisi; Chrestomathie Arabe (De Sacy), vol. i. p. 158.

2 Makrî

planets, seven days in the week, and seven Imâms. At Cairo, where Egyptian hierophantism with the old mystic ceremonies became superimposed on the Manichæan foundation, the number was increased to nine.[1] The first degree was the most difficult of all, and required the longest time to mould the mind of the neophyte, and to incline him to take that most solemn oath by which he bound himself to the secret doctrine with blind faith and unconditional obedience. After this the process was simple enough: the acolyte was led gradually to recognise all the doctrines, and to become the instrument of insatiable ambition.

The Grand Lodges of Mahdia and afterwards of Cairo, became thus the centres of a vast and far-reaching political propaganda.

[1] A very good description of the different stages of initiation is given by De Sacy in the *Journal Asiatique*, vol. iv. p. 298. In order to induce the neophyte to take the oath of the first degree, his mind was perplexed by the Daï with doubts. The contradictions of positive religion and reason were dwelt upon, but it was pointed out that behind the apparent literal signification there lay a deeper meaning, which was the kernel, as the words were mere husks. The curiosity of the novice was, however, not satisfied until he had taken an unrestricted oath; on this he was admitted to the second degree. This inculcated the recognition of divinely-appointed Imams, who were the source of all knowledge. As soon as the faith in them was well established, the third degree taught their number, which could not exceed the holy seven; for, as God had created seven heavens, seven earths, seven seas, seven planets, seven colours, seven musical sounds, and seven metals, so had He appointed seven of the most excellent of His creatures as revealed Imams: these were Ali, Hassan, Hussain, Ali II (Zain ul-Aabidîn) Mohammed al-Bâkir, Jaafar as-Sâdik, and Ismâil his son, as the last and seventh. In the fourth degree they taught that since the beginning of the world there have been seven speaking apostles (ناطق), embodiments of the Logos, each of whom had always, by the command of Heaven, altered the doctrine of his predecessor; each of these had seven coadjutors, who succeeded each other in the epoch from one Natik to another, but who, as they did not manifest themselves, were called *Sâmit* (صامت) or *Silent*. The seven *Nâtiks* were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, and Ismâil (the son of Jaafar as-Sâdik) or *Imâm-i-zamân* (Lord or Imâm of all times). Their seven colleagues were Seth, Shem, Ishmael son of Abraham, Aaron, Simeon, Ali, and Mohammed son of Ismail. The object of having a *Sâmit* attached to a *Nâtik* was to allow a free hand to the teachers and emissaries to put forward any one they liked as the *Sâmit* apostle of the time The fifth degree inculcated that each of the seven *Sâmits* had twelve *Nakîbs* or delegates for the extension of the true faith, for the number twelve is the most excellent after seven; hence the twelve signs of the Zodiac, the twelve months, the twelve tribes of Israel, etc. In the sixth degree, the principles of Manichæan philosophy were instilled into the heart of the neophyte, and only when he was fully impressed with the wisdom of those doctrines was he admitted to the seventh, where he passed from philosophy to mysticism. He then became one of the *knowers* (*aârifîn*). In the eighth he shook off the trammels of positive religion: The "veil" was lifted, and henceforth "everything was pure to the pure." The tendency of these doctrines can be better imagined than described.

But the knowledge of the doctrines upon which they worked was confined to a few. Like the mysteries of Eleusis, or the secret principles of the Templars, the Illuminati, and the Revolutionists of France, they were imparted only to the adepts—in whole or in part; wholly to those alone who were intended to be used for the purpose of undermining the power of their enemies. For the masses and the uninitiated, the State-religion was Islam, and its moral precepts and religious observances were enforced in all its austerity. Most of the Caliphs, especially al-Muiz, were in their lives and practice strict religionists and observers of the duties enjoined by the moral law.[1] The doctors of law and the officers of State were pious Moslems. Nevertheless the fact of the existence of a secret body working on mysterious lines loosened the bonds of society. The organisation of secret emissaries weakened the control of the Abbassides without permanently strengthening the hold of the Fâtimides or extending their temporal power.

The Fâtimides of Egypt have been called the Western Ismailias, in contradistinction to the followers of Hassan ibn Mohammed, Sabah Humairi, commonly known as Hassan Sabah, infamous in the history of the West as the founder of the order of the Assassins,[2]

1 Mohsin Fâni says :—

ایمهٔ اسمعیلیهٔ مغرب همه مقید بامور ظاهر شرعی بودند

Hâkim ba-amr-illâh, the sixth Fâtimide Caliph of Cairo, who is regarded, even at the present day by the Druses (a branch of the Ismailias) as an incarnation of the Divinity, has been represented as "a monster of iniquity." His was a strangely contradictory character; and, as Makrîsi rightly thinks, his mind was probably affected. He was at times atrociously cruel; at other times, a wise and humane sovereign. He abolished all distinction of race and creed in his dominions; he introduced the system of lighting up the streets in Cairo for the protection of wayfarers; he organised a system of police; he repressed violence. For an account of Hakim ba-amr-illah, see *Short History of the Saracens*, p. 602. It may be noticed, as a remarkable coincidence that Ivan the Terrible, who has been termed just such another monster, was regarded by the average Russian of his day as a monarch of singular force of character and ability. The fact is that the cruelties practised by Galeazzo Maria Sforza, by the Norman chief of Sicily who was in the habit of disembowelling his victims, by the Popes Paul and Alexander VI, by the Kings of England, Richard and John, and others, show only too clearly how little difference creed or country is apt to make in the misdeeds of irresponsible power joined to an innately cruel nature.

2 His disciples were generally called *Hassani*, whence the word "Assassin." Mohsin Fani describes this man's life and doctrines according to the Ismailias themselves, "as hitherto his life had been written with the pen of prejudice."

چون احوال او در تواریخ باقلام تعصب نگارش یافته لا جرم

but known to his followers as "*Syedna*" "our lord." His disciples are sometimes designated as the *Eastern Ismailias* or *Alamûtias*, or the *Mulâhida* of Kuhistân ("the impious atheists" of Kuhistân).

Hassan was the son of a learned Shiah doctor, an Arab by descent, as his name betokens, residing in the city of Khoi in Persia. He had been carefully trained in all the learning of his time. He had for his fellow-students, Nizam ul-Mulk (afterwards the renowned minister of Alp Arslan and of Malik Shah, the two great Seljukian sovereigns of the East) and the famous mystical poet Omar Khayyam. Baulked in his ambition at the court of Malik Shah, he proceeded to the pontifical court at Cairo, and was there initiated into the mysteries of the Cairene Lodge. Persia at that time was in the most rigid bonds of Sunni orthodoxy, the Seljukian Sultans having always been among the most devoted upholders of the straitest traditions of Islam. Hassan returned from Egypt to Asia, and partly by force and partly by fraud possessed himself of an almost invulnerable fortress called in the Turkish language Alamût, or the Eagles' Nest,[1] seated on one of the most inaccessible mountain-fastnesses of Upper Persia;[2] and during the thirty-five years that he held the dominion of that place, he organised from there a system of terror throughout Asia and Africa[3] and Eastern Europe, fighting the sword with the dagger, and avenging persecution with assassination. He himself was a strict observer of all the precepts of religion, and would not allow drunkenness or dancing or music within the circuit of his rule. His esotericism appears to have been different from that of the Western Ismailias, and is explained in detail by Shahristani and Mohsin Fani, both of whom speak of him with some awe, which induces the conviction that they were not quite unapprehensive of the dagger of his *fidâis*.[4] Leaving the

[1] Wassâf, قلعه الموت يعنى آن اشيانه عقابست

[2] Near Kazwîn.

[3] Wassaf says :—

و از قتل و هتک و نهک وفتک ملاحده امن و امان از ميان مسلمانان مرفوع شد

[4] That their apprehensions were not unjustified will be apparent from the following anecdote concerning Imam Fakhr ud-din Razi. This learned Imam used to lecture on jurisprudence in his native city of Rai (Rhages). Once he

mystical portion of his doctrines aside, it may be said that he admitted only four degrees of initiation. Those who had obtained the first three degrees were named respectively *Fidâi*, *Rafik*, and *Dâi*,—fellows, companions, and knights,—to use the terms of a system to which Hassan's institution bears the closest resemblance, viz. that of the Templars. Hassan was the first Grand Master of this institution, though he always paid a formal homage to the Egyptian Caliphs. The fourth Grand Master of the Alamutia Lodge, who, in order to further his ends, did not hesitate to claim an illegitimate descent from the Caliph Mustansir of Cairo, abolished all the ordinances of religion. The Resurrection had arrived; the revelation of the Imâm had taken place in his person; and the Kingdom of Heaven was ushered in with freedom and licence from the ordinary trammels of the moral law.[1] This mad revolutionist

had occasion to denounce the Ismailias from his professorial chair The news of this audacious conduct was carried to the Eagle's Nest, and a Fidai was promptly deputed to bring the careless professor to reason. The Fidai on his arrival at Rai entered himself as a student in the Imam's college. For seven months he waited for an opportunity to carry his design into effect. At last one day he found the Imam alone in his chamber; he locked the door, and throwing the Imam on the ground pointed the dagger at his throat. "Why kill me?" asked the frightened Professor. "Because you have cursed the Ismailias," answered the Fidai. The Imâm offered to bind himself solemnly never again to disparage the brotherhood. The Fidai refused to accept the Imam's word unless he agreed to receive a pension from the Grand Master, thus binding himself by the debt of "bread and salt."

[1] Hassan died in 508 A.H. Wassâf, following Juwaini, the vizier of Hûlaku and the author of the Jahan-Kusha, gives an extremely bitter but not unjust account of these Ismailias.

چون امام غشوم بمنبر برآمد و چون مرغ شوم بر درخت
زقوم نشست و از تحمیدی فرا خور معتقد مذموم فارغ شده مژده
داد که ابواب رحمت بمفتاح هدایت کشاده است و قیامت
موعود منقود شده و قبیح بن مُذمّم اعنی حسن ابن محمد
امام بحق و خلیفه مطلق است و مولانا فاهاً بفهم ایشانرا
بخدای رسانید و انواع تکلیف برداشت و چون از منبر نزول
کرد سماط عید گسترد وانرا عید قیام خواند و بشرب خمور

is known in the history of the Alamûtias as *aala-Zikrihi-as-Salâm*, "may his name be blessed"—corrupted into *Zikr-us-Salâm*. From this time, until the destruction of Alamut, the disciples of the two Hassans maintained a remorseless fight with civil society, in which no quarter was shown to either side. They were, in fact, the Nihilists of Islam. Under their stilettoes fell both Christians and Moslems. They were attacked by Hulâku, and after the destruction of their fortresses in the mountains, they were hunted and killed like vermin.[1]

From the Ismailias the Crusaders borrowed the conception which led to the formation of all the secret societies, religious and secular, of Europe. The institutions of Templars and Hospitallers; the Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola, composed of a body of men whose spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to their cause can hardly be surpassed in our times; the ferocious Dominicans, the milder Franciscans,—may all be traced either to Cairo or to Alamut. The Knights Templars especially, with their system of grand masters, grand priors, and religious devotees, and their degrees of initiation, bear the strongest analogy to the Eastern Ismailias. Small sections of the Western Ismailias are still to be found in Yemen, in Egypt, and Barbary, where they cannot be distinguished from the general body of Moslems. On the western coast of India there exists, however, a large community called Khojahs, who are the direct representatives of the original Eastern Ismailias. Hindoos by origin, they were converted to Ismailism, in the eleventh or twelfth century of the Christian era, by one Pîr Sadr ud-dîn, an Ismailian *Dai*. His teachings fitted in with their own religious conceptions, for part of the old cult was incorporated with the Ismailia doctrines. At the present moment an alleged or real descendant of Hassan (*Aala-Zikrihi-as-Salâm*) rules the conscience of these Indian Ismailias; and credulity accepts, and superstition trembles at, the fantasies invented by designing brains to control and keep in chain the human mind. But for the presence

[1] For a full account of the Alamûtias and their crimes against humanity, see Von Hammer's *History of the Assassins*, translated into English by Wood. Even the Christian sovereigns frequently availed themselves of the services of the Alamutia assassins to get rid of their enemies. Richard of England had Conrad of Montferrat assassinated by a *Fidâi* of Alamut; and one of the Popes employed another, though unsuccesfully, to remove Frederick Barbarossa. After the destruction of Alamut, Rudbar, and the other castles of the Assassins, the Alamutias were massacred without compunction by the Tartars.

of this representative of the Grand Master of Alamût, the Ismailias, at least in India, would have long ago merged in the general body of the Shiahs proper.[1]

The *Kaisânias* and *Hâshimias*, both of them exclusively political in their character, but tinted by Magianism, are now completely extinct, and hardly require any mention.

The *Ghâllias* or the *Ghullât* (Extravagantists), supposed by Ibn-Khaldun and Shahristani to be a sect of the Shiahs, are in reality the descendants of the old Gnostics, whose Islam consisted merely in the substitution of Mohammed or Ali, chiefly the latter, for Christ. They are, in fact, the Docetes of Islam. The *Nusairis*, who believe in the divinity of Ali, the *Ishâkias*, the *Numânias*, the *Khitâbias*, and others, anthropomorphists, believers in incarnations and metempsychosis,—represent the notions which were prevalent among the Marcionites, the Valentinians, and the other docetic Christians. Some of these have replaced the Christian triad by a pentad. These believe that Mohammed, Ali, Fatima, Hassan, and Hussain jointly represent the Divinity. A form of Docetism is in vogue also in Sunnïsm. In the mountains of Kurdistan a Sunni Saint[2] occupies almost a similar place in the popular faith as Jesus among the Gnostics.

The *Roushenias*, as their name implies, were the exact counterparts of the Illuminati of Christendom. This sect had its origin in Afghanistan in that dark, turbulent, and sanguinary period which preceded the accession of Akbar to the throne of India. Their founder, Bayezıd,[3] by birth an Afghan, but of Arab extraction, appears to have been a man of great natural abilities and extreme subtlety of genius. In his early youth he acquired a taint of Manichæism from the Ismailias who still flourished in considerable numbers in some of the mountainous districts of Khorasan. The doctrines which he first propagated seem not to have differed

1 Numbers of Ismailias are also to be found in the mountains of Gilgit and Hunza.

2 Sheikh Abdul Kâdir Ghilâni. There are Sunnis who pay an extravagant veneration, verging on adoration, to this Saint. He has received the title among them of *Ghous-i-âazam*, *Mahbub-i-Subhâni*, *Kutub-i-Rabbâni*—"The great Saint, the beloved of God, the Pole-star of holiness" (see the *Guldastai-Kerâmat*). Sheikh Abdul Kâdir was a mystic, and a Fâtimide by descent. He takes a high position in the hierarchy of the mystics and the dervishes.

3 Afterwards called Mian *Roushan* Bayezîd.

essentially from those of the *Sufis*; but as he proceeded, he diverged wider and wider from the pale of dogmatic Islam. As his sect increased in numbers and power, it assumed a political as well as a religious aspect; and soon made such formidable progress, that, at last, it embraced nearly the whole of Afghânistân.

The doctrines taught by Bâyezîd, when examined critically, show a superstructure of mysticism and pantheism upon a basis of Ismailism. The observant reader, however, will not fail to perceive a strange and fantastic analogy between his teachings and the practices and theories of the brotherhood of Fakirs. He taught that God is all-pervading, and that all existing objects are only forms of the Deity; that the *Pîrs* or religious teachers were the great manifestations of the Divinity; that the sole test of right and wrong was to follow the path pointed out by the *Pîr*, who is the representative of the Divinity; that the ordinances of the law have therefore a mystical meaning, and are ordained only as the means of acquiring religious perfection; and that the mystic sense of the law is only attainable by religious exercises and through the instructions of a *Pîr*; it is the source of religious perfection, and this perfection being attained, the exterior ordinances of the law cease to be binding, and are virtually annulled.

The *Bâtinias*, the *Ismailias*, and all the cognate sects differ from the general body of Moslems in making *faith* the keystone of their doctrines. In this they closely approach most of the Reformed Churches of Christendom. They "believe," like Luther, in "justification by faith." Luther has strenuously inculcated that "faith in Christ" would save all sinners. The Batinias and the Ismailias with their offshoots made "faith" or "*îmân*," which included a firm reliance on the divine Imâm, an essential factor in their creed. So long as an individual was blessed with *îmân*, his outward acts were immaterial.

We now come to the Shiahs proper, the followers of the Imâms of the house of Mohammed, generally known as the *Asnâ-Aasharias* (the *Duo-decemians*), so named because they accept the leadership of twelve Imams. The *Asnâ-Aasharias* hold that the Imamate descended by express appointment in the following order:—

1. Ali, the Caliph, usually styled *Murtaza Asad-ullah al-Ghâlib, the Chosen, the Lion of God, the Victorious* (d. A.H. 40. A.C. 661).

2. Hassan, styled *Mujtaba, the approved*, (A. H. 44, A.C. 664).

3. Hussain, *Shahîd-i-Kerbela, the martyr of Kerbela*, (A.H. 60, A.C. 679).

4. Ali II. surnamed for his piety *Zain ul-Ábidîn*, the *Ornament of the Pious*, (died A.H. 94, A.C. 713).

5. Mohammed *al-Bâkir, the explainer of mysteries, or the profound*, a man of great learning and ascetic austerity (born A.H. 57, A. C. 676; died A.H. 113, A.C. 731).

6. Jaafar *as-Sâdik* (*the True*) was the eldest son of Mohammed *al-Bâkir*. Jaafar was born in Medîna, in the year of the Hegira A.H. 80 (A.H. 699). As a scholar, a littérateur, and a jurisconsult, his reputation stands high among all sects of Moslems. His learning and his virtues, the transcendental purity and truth of his character, won him the veneration of even the enemies of his family. He died at an advanced age in his native town, in the reign of Abu Jaafar al-Mansur, the second Abbasside Caliph, in the year of the Hegira 148 (A.C. 765).

7. *Abu'l-Hassan* Mûsa *al-Kâzim*, the son of Jaafar as-Sâdik, was also surnamed *al-Abd us-Sâleh*, (*the holy servant*) on account of his piety and "his efforts to please God." He was born at Medîna in the year 129 A.H. (A.C. 746—747). He died at Bagdad on the 25th of Rajjab 183 (1st September 799 A.C.) in a prison where he was confined for a number of years by Harun, who was extremely jealous of the veneration in which the Imam was held in Hijaz. De Sacy says Musa was put to death secretly in his confinement by order of Hârûn. His sufferings and his pure and exalted character endeared him greatly to all classes of people, and gained for him the title of *Kâzim*, "*the Patient.*"

8. Ali III., *Abu'l Hassan* Ali, surnamed *ar-Raza, the Acceptable*, for the purity of his character. He was a scholar, a poet, and a philosopher of the first rank. He was born in Medina in the year 153 A.H. (A.C. 770), and died at Tus in Khorasan in A.H. 202 (A.C. 817). He married a sister of Mamun, named Umm ul-Fazl.

9. *Abû Jaafar* Mohammed, surnamed *al-Jawwâd* for his munificence and generosity, and *Taki* for his piety. He was a nephew of Mamun, and was also married to his daughter, named Umm ul-Habîb. He was held in the highest estimation by that

Caliph and his successor Mutassim; (born A.H. 195, A.C. 811; and died in A.H. 220, A.C. 835).

10. Ali IV., surnamed *Nakî* (*the pure*), died A.H. 260, A.C. 868.

11. Abu Mohammed al-Hassan ibn Ali *al-Aaskari*, surnamed *al-Hâdi* (*the Director*), and called *Aaskari* from his long residence under the surveillance of Mutawakkil at Surra man-Raâ [1] which also went by the name of al-Aasker "the Encampment." He was a man of eminent piety and great nobility of character, a distinguished poet and *littérateur*. He was born at Medîna A.H. 231 (A.C. 845-6), and died at al-Aasker in A.H. 260 (A.C. 874). He is said to have been poisoned by Mutawakkil.

12. Mohammed *al-Mahdi* (A.H. 265, A.C. 878-9). This last Imâm disappeared, according to the Shiah belief, in a grotto at Surra man-Raâ in the twelfth year of his age.[2] He is believed to be still alive, and they look forward with earnest anticipation to his reappearance to re-establish the universal Caliphate, and to restore the purity of the human race. The Sunnis believe that the *Mahdi*, the last Imam, is not born yet, and that he will appear towards the close of the world with Jesus Christ.

He is styled the Imâm *Ghâib* (the absent Imâm), the *Muntazzar*, "the Expected," and the *Kâim*, "the Living." The Asna-Aasharia belief is by no means peculiar. The philosophical student of religions will not fail to observe the strange similarity which the Shiah and the Sunni beliefs bear to older ideas. Among the Zoroastrians the persecution of the Seleucidæ engendered the belief that a divinely-appointed Saviour, whose name was Sosiosch, would issue from Khorasan to redeem them from the hated bondage of the foreigners. The same causes gave birth to that burning anticipation in the advent of the Messiah which gives such life and colour to the religion of the Jews. The Jew believes that the Messiah is yet to come; the Sunni, like him, believes that the Saviour of Islam is still unborn. The Christian believes that the Messiah has come and gone, and will come again;[3] the *Asnâ-Aasharia*, like the

1 A place several days' journey to the nort-west of Bagdad.

2 For an account of this pathetic incident see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan), p. 295. Some say he was only five years of age when he was lost.

3 Compare especially the belief of the Christadelphians, according to whom Christ will reappear to bring about an earthly kingdom.

Christian, awaits the re-appearance of the *Mahdi*, the *Guide*, who is to save the world from evil and oppression.

The origin of these conceptions and the reasons of their diversity are traceable to like causes. The phenomena of the age in which the idea of the *Mahdi* took shape in its two distinct forms were similar to those visible in the history of the older faiths. Every eventide goes up the prayer to heaven in Islam, as in Judaism and Christianity, for the advent of the divinely-appointed Guide, to redeem the world from sorrow and sin.

The Asnâ-Aasharias, now called Shiahs or Imâmias *par excellence*, are divided into two sub-sects—*Usûlis* and *Akhbâris* (*i.e. the followers of principles* and *the followers of traditions*). There is no difference between them on the question of the Imâmate or its descent to the last Imam. But they differ on the amount of authority to be attached to the exposition of the *Mujtahids*, who call themselves the representatives of the Imam. The Usuli repudiates entirely the authority of the expounders of the law to fetter his judgment. He contends that the law is clear, and that it is his duty to construe it for himself with the light of reason and progress of human thought, and not to be guided in his judgment by the dictates of men as fallible as himself, and interested in maintaining the world in ignorance. He holds that God's revelations had not the object of hiding the Divine meaning in words difficult to apprehend. They were addressed through his Prophet to humanity to apprehend and to obey. Thus God's teachings delivered through His Messenger do not require the interpretation of priest or lawyer. The Akhbari, on the other hand, obeys slavishly the expositions of the Mujtahids.

According to the Usuli doctrines, the oral precepts of the Prophet are in their nature supplementary to the Koranic ordinances, and their binding effect depends on the degree of harmony existing between them and the teachings of the Koran. Thus, those traditions which seem to be in conflict with the spirit of the Koranic precepts are considered apocryphal. The process of elimination is conducted upon recognised principles, founded upon logical rules and definite data. These rules have acquired a distinctive type among the Mutazalas, who have eliminated from the *Hadîs Kudsî* (*the holy traditions*) such alleged sayings of the Prophet as appeared incompatible and out of harmony with his developed teachings as

explained and illustrated by the philosophers and jurists of his race.

The Usulis divide the traditions under four heads, viz.:—(*a*) *Sahîh*, "authentic;" (*b*) *Hasan* "good;" (*c*) *Mûsik*, "strong;" and (*d*) *Zaîf*, "weak." A *hadîs sahîh*, or an authentic tradition, is one, the authority of which can be conclusively traced to the *Aimma-i-Maasûm* (*the sinless Imâms*), according to the narration of an *Imâm aâdil*, "*a just or trustworthy Imâm*," about whose integrity there is a consensus among the "masters of history" (*arbâb-i-hadîs*). The narration must be through a succession of such *aâdils*. A *hadîs-hasan*, or a good tradition, is one, the authority of which goes back, like that of the *hadîs-sahîh*, to the *Maasûm*; but, according to the narrative of a venerable Imam, in this way, that although, in regard to the narrator of it, the words *sikah aâdil*, "*trustworthy and just*," have not been used by the historians, yet they have praised him in other words. A *hadîs-mûsik*, or a *strong tradition*, is one handed down by people who are acknowledged to be *sikah* and *aâdil*, "*virtuous and just*," by the historians, though some or all of the narrators might not be *Imâmias*, "followers of Ali." A *hadîs-zaîf*, or a *weak tradition*, is one which complies with neither of these conditions. It is only the first three kinds of *hadîs* that are accepted or relied upon by the Usûlis.

Again, a tradition before it can be accepted must have been handed down in *regular succession*. A tradition is in regular succession when a large number of people in the regular course of time make the same narration until it is traced to the *Maasum*, subject to the condition that the number of narrators, in each particular age, is so great as to exclude the idea of their having combined in telling a falsehood. A tradition is without a regular succession, when the number of narrators does not, in all or several stages, reach to such a body of witnesses; and this kind of tradition is called, "in the peculiar idiom of the masters of history, *the information of one*"

The *Usuli* exercises his own judgment in the construction of the law, and the reception, application, and interpretation of the traditions. He does not consider himself bound to follow the exposition of a Mujtahid, if his judgment and conscience tell him that that exposition is against the revealed or natural law, or justice, or reason. They protest against the immoderate number of traditions accepted by the Akhbaris without any criticism, or any appli-

cation of the rules of exegesis. The Usûlis represent the Broad Church, if not of Islâm, at least of Shiahism.

According to the *Dabistân*, the Akhbâris derive their title from the fact that they rely entirely upon *akhbâr*, or traditions, and repudiate *ijtihad* (the exercise of private judgment) as they consider it contrary to the practice of the Imams. They accept as authentic whatever tradition happens to be current, if only it is labelled with the name of an Imam or of the Prophet. It is enough that it is called a *hadîs*; it becomes *ipso facto* authentic in their eyes,[1] and further inquiry is not required to test the source from which it emanates. It need not be said that under colour of this easy principle a vast number of traditions and maxims have become incorporated with the Islamic teachings which have little in common with them. The ancient faith had never completely died out of the hearts of the masses, and it was impossible that with the growth of a national Church many of the old thoughts should not find expression in new and more approved garbs. Gobineau has, somewhat harshly, but not quite without reason, charged ultra-Akhbarïsm with having converted the great hero of Islam into an Ormuzd, and his descendants into Amshaspands.

Akhbârïsm is the favourite creed of the uneducated, who require a leading string for their guidance, and of the half-educated Mullas. Usulism finds acceptance among the most intellectual classes of the people and the most learned of the clergy. One of the most notable advocates of the Usuli doctrines within recent times was Mulla Sadra[2] (Mohammed bin Ibrahim), a native of Shiraz, and probably the ablest scholar and dialectician of his time. He was the reviver of philosophy and humanitarian science among the Persians. From the fall of the Buwaihs to the rise of the Seffevys, Iran had remained under a cloud. Patristic orthodoxy had proscribed philosophy and science; the very name of Avicenna had become hateful, and his works were publicly burnt. During these centuries many Mazdeistic traditions dressed in Islamic garb naturally had found acceptance among the uneducated classes. The true Fatimide scholars had retired into seclusion, and a body of ecclesias-

1 *Adilla-i-Katai*, conclusive evidence, which admits of no questioning, and requires no exercise of judgment.

2 Mulla Sadra flourished in the reign of Shah Abbas II.

tics strongly tinged with national predilections and prejudices had sprung up to maintain the people in ignorance. Mulla Sadra had thus to contend against a clergy as tenacious of their rights as those of Christendom, and as ready to take offence at the slightest approach to an attack on their preserve of orthodoxy. But Mulla Sadra was gifted with great perseverance and tact, and succeeded after considerable difficulty in reviving the study of philosophy and science. Usulïsm came to the front once more. Its philosophical counterpart, Mutazalaism, is unquestionably the most rationalistic and liberal phase of Islam. In its liberalism, in its sympathy with all phases of human thought, its grand hopefulness and expansiveness, it represents the ideas of the philosophers of the House of Mohammed who reflected the thoughts of the Master.

The political factions which have hitherto kept the Shiahs divided among themselves are disappearing, and the rest of the sects are fast merging into the Asna-Aasharias. The Shiahs of Persia, Arabia, West Africa, and India belong for the most part to this sect, and were it not for the fact that the head of the Eastern Ismailias still maintains his hold over the superstitious credulity of his followers, Ismailism would also soon vanish. *Asna-Aashariaism* has thus become synonymous with Shiahism.

Like the Akhbâris, the Sunnis base their doctrines on the entirety of the traditions. But they differ from them in accepting such only of the traditions as can stand the test of certain rules of criticism peculiar to their school. In this they approach the Usûlis. They regard the concordant decisions of the successive Caliphs and of the general assemblies (*Ijmaa-ul-Ummat*) as supplementing the Koranic rules and regulations, and as almost equal in authority to them.

The Sunnis are divided into several sub-sects, each differing from the other on various points of dogma and doctrine. These minor sectarian differences have often given rise to great bitterness and persecutions. In the main, however, they are agreed on the fundamental bases of their doctrines and laws, deriving them from four unvarying sources, viz. :—(1) The *Koran*; (2) The *Hadîs* or *Sunnat* (traditions handed down from the Prophet); (3) the *Ijmâa-ul-Ummat* (concordance among the followers); and (4) the *Kiyâs* (private judgment). The *Hadîs* (*pl. Ahâdis*) embraces (*a*) all the words, counsels, and oral laws of the Prophet (*Kawl*); (*b*)

his actions, his works, and daily practice (*Fyl*); (*c*) and his silence (*Takrîr*), implying a tacit approbation on his part of any individual act committed by his disciples. The rules deduced from these subsidiary sources vary considerably in respect of the degree of authority which is attached to them. If the rules, or traditional precepts, are of public and universal notoriety (*Ahadîs-i-Mutwatireh*), they are regarded as absolutely authentic and decisive. If the traditions, though known publicly by a great majority of people, do not possess the character of universal notoriety, they are designated *Ahâdîs-i-Mashhûra*, and stand next in rank to the *Ahâdîs-i-Mutwâtireh*; whilst the *Akhbâr-i-wâhid.* which depend for their authenticity upon the authority of isolated individuals, have little or no value attached to them. Thus every tradition purporting to be handed down by the contemporaries and companions of the Prophet, regardless of their actual relationship to him, is considered to be authentic and genuine, provided certain arbitrary conditions framed with the view of testing the value of personal testimony are complied with. The expression *Ijmâa-ul-Ummat* implies general concordance. Under this collective name are included all the apostolic laws, the explanations, glosses, and decisions of the leading disciples of the Prophet, especially of the first four Caliphs (the *Khulafai Rashidîn*), on theological, civil, and criminal matters.

Since the eighth century of the Christian era, however, all these sources of law and doctrine have been relegated to the domain of oblivion. And each sect has followed blindly its own doctors on the interpretation of the law and the exposition of doctrines. This is called *Taklîd.* No man is considered "orthodox" unless he conforms to the doctrines of one or the other of the principal doctors.

The four most important persuasions or sects[1] among the Sunnis are designated Hanafi, Shafeï, Maliki, and Hanbali, after their respective founders.

Abû Hanîfa,[2] who gave his name to the first school, was born in the year 80 of the Hegira, during the reign of Abdul Malik ibn Merwan. He was educated in the Shiah school of law, and received his first instructions in jurisprudence from Imâm Jaafar as-Sadik, and heard traditions from Abu Abdullah ibn al-Mubarak and

1 Called the *Mazâhib-arbaa.*
2 Abû Hanîfa an-Noman ibn Sabit (A. C. 699–769).

Hâmid ibn Sulaimân. Abû Hanîfa often quotes the great Shiah Imam as his authority. On his return to his native city of Kufa, though he continued to remain a zealous and consistent partisan of the house of Ali, he seceded from the Shiah school of law and founded a system of his own, diverging completely in many important points from the doctrines of the Shiahs; and yet, so close is the resemblance between his exposition of the law and their views, that there is no reason for doubt as to the source from which he derived his original inspiration. The latitude which he allows to private judgment in the interpretation of the law seems to be unquestionably a reflex of the opinions of the Fatimide doctors. He is called by his followers the *Imâm-ul-Aazam* (the great Imâm). He died in the year A. H. 150. The doctrines taught by him are in force among the major portion of the Indian Mussalmans, among the Afghans, Turkomans, almost all Central Asian Moslems, the Turks, and the Egyptians. His school owns by far the largest number of followers.

The founder of the second school was (Abû Abdullah) Mâlik ibn Anas, who died in the year A. H. 179, in the Caliphate of Harun ar-Rashîd.

Shâfeï was the originator of the third school. He was born at Ghizeh in Syria, in the same year in which Abu Hanîfa died. He died in Egypt in the yeai A. H. 204 (A. C. 819), during the Caliphate of Mâmûn. He was a contemporary of the Fâtimide Imâm Ali ibn Mûsa ar-Râza. Shâfeî's doctrines are generally followed in Northern Africa, partially in Egypt, in Southern Arabia, and the Malayan Peninsula, and among the Mussalmâns of Ceylon. His followers are also to be found among the Borahs[1] of the Bombay Presidency.

The fourth school was originated by Ibn-Hanbal. He flourished during the reigns of Mamun and his successor Mutassim b'illah. These two Caliphs were Mutazalas. Ibn Hanbal's extreme fanaticism, and the persistency with which he tried to inflame the bigotry of the masses against the sovereigns, brought him into trouble with the rulers. He died in the odour of great sanctity in the year A. H. 241. Ibn Hanbal and his patristicism are responsible for the ill-success of Mamun in introducing the Mutazala doctrines

[1] These Borahs are partly Shâfeïs and partly Ismailias of the Egyptian type.

throughtout the empire, and for the frequent outbursts of persecution which deluged the Mahommedan world with the blood of Moslems.

I have in another place[1] described the legal differences of the various Sunni schools: their doctrinal divergences run into the minutiæ of the ceremonials of worship, unnecessary to detail in a work intended for the general student. It may be said, however, that the Hanbalites were the most pronounced anthropomorphists. To them God was a human being enthroned in heaven. Among the other sects the conceptions varied considerably according to the age and the people. Anthropomorphism was, however, the predominating element. There is no doubt that Hanafism was originally the most liberal of these sects, whilst Shafeïsm and Malikïsm were both exclusive and harsh in their sympathies and ideas. With the advance of time, and as despotism fixed itself upon the habits and customs of the people, and the Caliph or Sovereign became the arbiter of their fate without check or hindrance from jurisconsult or legist, patristicism took hold of the mind of all classes of society. The enunciations of the Fathers of the Church became law. The Hanafis, who styled themselves, and were styled by their brethren of the rival sects, *ahl-ur-rai w'al kiyâs*, "people of judgment and analogy," in contradistinction to the others, who were called *ahl-ul-hadîs*, traditionists *par excellence*, have long ceased to exercise their judgment in the domains of law or doctrine. What has been laid down by the Fathers is unchangeable, and beyond the range of discussion. The Faith may be carried to the land of the Esquimaux, but it must go with rules framed for the guidance of Irâkians!

Patristicism has thus destroyed all hope of development among the Sunnis. But its endeavours to ensure uniformity of faith and practice has led within the last hundred years to two notable revolts within the bosom of the Sunni Church. Wahabïsm, which made its appearance at the beginning of the century, derived its breath from the Desert. *Ghair-mukallidism* springs from the innermost recesses of the human heart, seeking an escape from the strait-laced pharisaism of the established Church. The *Ghair-mukallid* is a non-conformist, though he has been wrongly and unjustly confounded with the Wahabis. He is undoubtedly more philosophical and rationalistic

[1] Mahommedan Law.

than the followers of the other denominations of Sunnïsm. Narrow, no doubt, admittedly limited and unsympathetic in its scope, *Ghair-mukallidism* is nevertheless the one movement in the Sunni Church which contains the greatest promise.

The dispute which ushered in the Reformation in Europe has already commenced among the Hanafis, and is sure before long to make itself felt among all sects and schools of Moslems. Does the translation of the Koran stand on the same footing as the Arabic Koran; are prayers offered in the vulgar tongue, in the tongue of the worshipper ignorant of Arabic, as meritorious as those offered in the language of Hijaz—such are the questions which are now agitating the Moslem world in India. The controversy has already caused much bitterness and given rise to a few anathemas on the side of the orthodox, and the reformers may well be congratulated that the movement which they have set on foot is conducted under a neutral Government. To the old plea, which vested interests have always urged against every innovation, the leaders of the reform answer by asking, Is Arabic the sole language which God understands? If not, what is the purpose of the prayer instituted by the Prophet? If it is to bring the worshipper nearer to God, and to purify and ennoble his heart, then how can he feel the elevating effect of prayer if he only mumbles what he cannot understand? From reason they appeal to the example of the Prophet, who allowed his Persian converts to offer their prayers in their own tongue.[1] This movement, still unknown to Europeans, contains the germ of the greatest development. It is the beginning of the Reformation. Hitherto the theologians of Islâm, like the Christian clergy in the Middle Ages, have exercised, through the knowledge of a language not known to the masses or the sovereigns, a dominating influence. Once the principle for which the reformers are working is accepted, the prescriptions framed in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Christian era, for people utterly apart from the culture and civilisation of the present day, will have to be understood and explained with the light of a thousand years.

Khawârijïsm has been often regarded as a branch of Sunnïsm, though in reality it came into existence long before the foundations of the Sunni Church were laid. The refractory troops, who

[1] See *ante* p. 164.

had forced the Caliph Ali to abandon the fruits of the well-earned victory at Siffîn, and who afterwards rose in arms against him at Nahrwan, were the first to receive the name of *Khawârij* (deserters or rebels). Shahristani has given a very lucid account of this insurrection. These were the men who were most eager in referring to arbitration the disputes of the arch-rebel Muawiyah with the Caliph. They had forced upon their chief, against his own judgment, Abu Musa as the representative of the House of Mohammed; but no sooner had the terms been settled than these soldier-theologians, these Covenanters of Islam, fell into a hot controversy amongst themselves about the sinfulness of submitting any cause to human judgment. In order to prevent the spectacle of Moslems slaughtering each other in the presence of the enemy, Ali retired to Kufa with the greater part of his army, leaving a small detachment at Dumat ul-Jandal to await the result of the arbitration. The rebels to the number of twelve thousand deserted the Caliph at Kufa, and, retiring to Nahrwan, took up a formidable position from which they threatened the Caliphate. With the repugnance to shed blood which was ever the distinguishing trait in Ali's character, he besought them repeatedly to return to their allegiance. In reply, they threatened him with death. Human patience could not bear this contumacy longer. They were attacked and defeated in two successive battles. A few of the rebels escaped, says Shahristani, and betaking themselves to al-Bahrain, that harbour of refuge for all the free lances of Islam, spread their noxious doctrines among the wild inhabitants of that tract. They reappeared in the time of Abdul Malik, who drove them back into their fastnesses in al-Ahsa and al-Bahrain. They issued again under Merwan II., and spread themselves in Yemen, Hijaz, and the Irak. They were attacked and defeated, and forced to take refuge in Oman, where they have remained settled ever since. Under the Abbassides they spread their doctrines among the Berbers of Africa, whom they raised repeatedly against the Pontiffs of Bagdad. The Khawarij are the Calvinists of Islam. Their doctrines are gloomy and morose, hard and fanatical. They are strict predestinarians. They do not accept the Imamate of any of the Caliphs, after Omar, their own chiefs being, according to them, the lawful Imams. They differ from the other Sunnis, in maintaining that it is not requisite for a person to be either a Koraishite or a free man for elec-

tion as Imâm of the Moslems. Slaves and non-Koraishites were eligible for the Imamate equally with Koraishites and free men. According to Shahristani, the Khawarij are divided into six groups, the most important of whom are the *Azarika* (the followers of Abu Rashid Nafe ibn Azrak); the *Ibadhia* (the followers of Abdullah ibn Ibadh, who appeared in the reign of Merwan II, the last of the Ommeyyades); the *Nejdat Azaria* (the followers of Nejdat ibn Âamir); the *Ajardia* (of Abdul Karım bin Ajrad); and the *Sufâruz Ziadia.*

Of these the *Azarika* are the most fanatical, exclusive, and narrow. According to them, every sect besides their own is doomed to perdition, and ought to be forcibly converted or ruthlessly destroyed. No mercy ought to be shown to any infidel or *Mushrik* (an expansive term, including Moslems, Christians, and Jews). To them every sin is of the same degree: murder, fornication, intoxication, smoking, all are damning offences against religion. Whilst the other Moslems, Shiah as well as Sunni, hold that every child is born into the world in the faith of Islam,[1] and remains so until perverted by education, the Azraki declares that the child of an infidel is an infidel. The orthodox Christian maintains that every child who is not *baptized* goes to perdition; the Khariji, like the Christian, declares that every child who has not pronounced the formula of the Faith is beyond the pale of salvation. The *Azarika* were destroyed by Hajjaj ibn Yusuf; but their sanguinary, fierce, and merciless doctrines found expression nine centuries later in Wahabïsm.

The *Ibadhia* were decidedly less fanatical. They were, for the most part, settled in Oman, and are still to be found in the principality of Muscat. The *Azarika*, and afterwards the Wahabis, were at deadly feud with the *Ibâdhias.*

According to them, the general body of Moslems are unbelievers, but not *Mushrik* (polytheists), and that consequently they can intermarry with them. They differ from the *Azarika* in this and in other respects. They accept the evidence of Moslems against their people; hold that the taking of the goods of the Moslems except in time of war, is unlawful, and "pronounce no opinion," says Shahristani, "on the infidelity of the children of infidels;" but they agree

[1] كل مولود يولد على فطرة الاسلام

with their brethren, the *Azârika*, in denouncing and anathematising the chief companions of the Prophet (the *Ashâb-i-Kabâr*).

The *Ibâdhias* have held Oman until now. Sore pressed by the Wahâbis, they have succeeded in maintaining their power on the coast of Eastern Arabia, but they seem to be fast merging into the general body of Sunnis.

The Wahâbis have been depicted in rather favourable colours by Mr. Palgrave, in his *Travels in Central Arabia*, but, in fact, they are the direct descendants of the *Azârika*, who, after their defeat by Hajjaj ibn Yusuf, had taken refuge in the recesses of Central Arabia. Abdul Wahab's doctrines bear the closest resemblance to those held so fiercely by the followers of Nafe ibn-al-Azrak. Like them, the Wahabis designate all other Moslems, as unbelievers, and permit their despoilment and enslavement. However commendable their revolt against the anthropolatrous usages in vogue among the modern Moslems, their views of religion and divine government are intensely morose and Calvinistic, and in absolute conflict with progress and development.

Bâbism has been represented in widely divergent colours. According to the Moslem authorities, it is nothing but a new form of Mazdakism, an Eastern socialistic communism. Its mixed gatherings of men and women are regarded in the same light as the ancient *Agapæ* of the primitive Christians were considered by the followers of the older faiths. On the other hand, a European scholar [1] of great research and learning, who has studied the religious literature of the Babis, and mixed familiarly with them, represents Babism as the latest expression of an eclectic evolution growing out of the innate pantheism of the Iranian mind.

During the reign of Mohammed Shah, the hypocrisy and vices of the national clergy, says this writer, had reached such a pitch that a change was inevitable. The political and social condition of the people was deplorable. In this state of affairs a young Mullah of Shiraz, Mirza Ali Mohammed, supposed to be a Fatimide by descent, who had studied much, had travelled a great deal and made the pilgrimage to the holy cities, and had for many years resided in Arabia and Syria, began to preach a social and moral reform. He denounced the hypocrisy of the ordinary Mullahs, and

[1] Gobineau.

their reception of the most doubtful traditions to justify practices condemned by Islam. His words struck on minds already prepared for the reception of his views, and evoked extraordinary enthusiasm. He obtained numerous disciples, among them a young lady of Kazwin, whose learning and eloquence supplied a powerful support to his cause. She is venerated now as *Qurrat-ul-Ayn*, "Light of our Eyes." Mirza Ali Mohammed, either carried away by the enthusiasm of his followers, or unhinged by his own exaltation, in a fit of pantheistical insanity, assumed the title of *Bab Hazrat-i-aala*, and styled himself a part of the Divinity. His followers rose in arms against the constituted authorities and failed. The fanaticism of the clergy and political expediency gave rise to a persecution, for which even Gobineau thinks the Babis were primarily responsible. The Bab was killed with most of his prominent disciples. But his teachings have survived. His social precepts are said by Gobineau to be much in advance of the received doctrines. He attached great importance to the marriage-relations, and during the continuance of the first marriage he allowed the taking of a second wife only under certain conditions. He absolutely interdicted concubinage, forbade divorce, and allowed the appearance of women in public. The custom of seclusion, as Gobineau justly observes, creates infinite disorders, and exercises a pernicious influence on the early education of children. The usage itself does not depend on any religious prescription, it is simply a convenience. The ancient kings of Persia observed it as a sign of grandeur, and the Moslem sovereigns and chiefs imitated their example, and adopted the custom. Among the Arabs the women of the tribes are perfectly free to move about as they wish. The ladies of Mohammed's family conversed with the disciples, received their visits, and often assisted in the repasts of the men. Mirza Ali Mohammed therefore, says Gobineau, made no innovation in endeavouring to free women from the bondage of a mischievous custom. His religious doctrines are essentially pantheistic, and his code of morals, instead of being lax, is strict and rigid.[1]

[1] The most recent account of this remarkable religious movement, from the Babi point of view, is to be found in Mr. E. G. Browne's "New History of the Bab," which purports to be a translation of a Babi work called *Târîkh-i-Jadîd*. Mr. Browne's Introduction, though he does not hold the balance with the same judicial evenness as Gobineau, is extremely interesting. From the *Târîkh* one can picture the fascinating personality of *Qurrat-ul-Ayn*; see Appendix II.

Some Moslem writers have divided the religious sects into two comprehensive groups, viz. the *Ahl-ul-bâtin* and the *Ahl-uz-zâhir*, *those who look into the meaning of precepts*, and *those who look only to the literal sense.* The *Ahl-ul-bâtin*, however, must not be confounded with the *Bâtiniâs.* The *Ahl-ul-bâtin* include the mystical Sufis, the philosophical *mutakallimîn*, and the Idealists in general, "all those," to use the words of Zamakhsharî's comment, "who strive to implant in their hearts the roots of divine perfection," who strive and struggle to attain the highest standard of human excellence, and who, whilst conforming to the prescriptions of the law, perceive in them the divine intent to promote concord and harmony among the races of the earth, peace and goodwill among mankind.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF ISLÂM.

تعلموا العلم فان تعلمه لله حسنة و دراسته تسبيح والبحث عنه
جهاد و طلبه عبادة و تعليمه صدقة و بذله لاهله قربة [1]

WE have already referred to the Arabian Prophet's devotion to knowledge and science as distinguishing him from all other Teachers, and bringing him into the closest affinity with the modern world of thought. Medîna, the seat of the theocratic commonwealth of Islam, had, after the fall of Mecca, become the centre of attraction, not to the hosts of Arabia only, but also to inquirers from abroad. Here flocked the Persian, the Greek, the Syrian, the Irakian, and African of diverse hues and nationalities from the north and the west. Some, no doubt, came from curiosity, but most came to seek knowledge and to listen to the words of the Prophet of Islam. He preached of the value of knowledge: "Acquire knowledge, because he who acquires it in the way of the Lord performs an act of piety; who speaks of it, praises the Lord; who seeks it, adores God; who dispenses instruction in it, bestows alms; and who imparts it to its fitting objects, performs an act of devotion to God. Knowledge enables its possessor to distinguish what is forbidden from what is not; it lights the way to Heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when bereft of friends; it guides us to happiness; it sustains us in misery; it is our ornament in the company of friends; it serves as an armour against our enemies. With knowledge, the servant of God rises to the heights of goodness and to a noble position, associates with sovereigns in this world, and attains to the perfection of happiness in the next."[2]

He would often say, "the ink of the scholar was more holy than

[1] The translation of this *Hadîs* is given in the text, "Acquire knowledge &c."

[2] Tradition from the *Bihâr-ul-Anwâr*, vol. i. chap. on Knowledge, handed down by the Imam Jaafar as-Sadik, also quoted from Muaz ibn-Jabal in the *Mustatrif*, chap. iv.; also in the *Kashf uz-Zunûn* of Hâji Khalîfa, Fluegel's ed. p. 44.

the blood of the martyr;" and repeatedly impress on his disciples the necessity of seeking for knowledge "even unto China."[1] "He who leaves his home in search of knowledge, walks in the path of God." "He who travels in search of knowledge, to him God shows the way to paradise."[2]

The Koran itself bore testimony to the supreme value of learning and science. Commenting on the *Surat-ul-aalak*[3] Zamakhsharî thus explains the meaning of the Koranic words: "God taught human beings that which they did not know, and this testifieth to the greatness of His beneficence, for He has given to His servants knowledge of that which they did not know. And He has brought them out of the darkness of ignorance to the light of knowledge, and made them aware of the inestimable blessings of *the knowledge of writing*, for great benefits accrue therefrom which God alone compasseth; and without the knowledge of writing no other knowledge (*ulûm*) could be comprehended, nor the sciences placed within bounds, nor the history of the ancients be acquired and their sayings be recorded, nor the revealed books be written; and if that knowledge did not exist, the affairs of religion and the world, امور الدين و الدنيا, could not be regulated."

Up to the time of the Islâmic Dispensation, the Arab world, properly so called, restricted within the Peninsula of Arabia and some outlying tracts to the north-west and the north-east, had shown no signs of intellectual growth. Poetry, oratory, and judicial astrology formed the favourite objects of pursuit among the pre-Islamite Arabs. Science and literature possessed no votaries. But the words of the Prophet gave a new impulse to the awakened energies of the race. Even within his lifetime was formed the nucleus of an educational institution, which in after years grew into universities at Bagdad and Salerno, at Cairo and Cordova. Here preached the Master himself on the cultivation of a holy spirit; "One hour's meditation on the work of the Creator [in a devout spirit] is better than seventy years of prayer."[4] "To listen to the instructions of science and learning for one hour is more meritorious than attending the funerals of a thousand martyrs,—more meritorious than

1 *Misbâh ush-Shariyèt.*
2 *Jâmaa ul-Akhbâr.*
3 Koran, sura xcvi.; see also other suras.
4 *Jâmaa ul-Akhbâr.*

standing up in prayer for a thousand nights;" "To the student who goes forth in quest of knowledge, God will allot a high place in the mansions of bliss; every step he takes is blessed, and every lesson he receives has its reward;" "The seeker of knowledge will be greeted in Heaven with a welcome from the angels;" "to listen to the words of the learned, and to instil into the heart the lessons of science, is better than religious exercises, . . . better than emancipating a hundred slaves;" "Him who favours learning and the learned, God will favour in the next world;" "He who honours the learned honours me." Ali lectured on branches of learning most suited to the wants of the infant commonwealth. Among his recorded sayings are the following: "Eminence in science is the highest of honours;" "He dies not who gives life to learning;" "The greatest ornament of a man is erudition." Naturally such sentiments on the part of the Master and the chief of the Disciples gave rise to a liberal policy, and animated all classes with a desire for learning. The art of Kufic writing, which had just been acquired by a disciple at Hira, furthered the primitive development of the Moslems. It was, however, pre-eminently an age of earnestness and faith, marked by the uprise of the soul against the domination of aimless, lifeless philosophy. The practice of religion, the conservation of a devotional spirit, and the special cultivation of those branches of learning which were of practical value in the battle of everyday life, were the primary objects of the Moslem's attention.

The age of speculation was soon to commence; its germs were contained in the positive precepts of the Master; and even whilst he was working, the scholarly Disciple was thinking. The Master had himself declared that whosoever desired to realise the spirit of his teachings must listen to the words of the Scholar.[1] Who more able to grasp the meaning of the Master's words than Ali, the beloved friend, the trusted disciple, the devoted cousin and son? The gentle, calm teachings instilled in early life into the young mind bore their fruit.

In spite of the upheaval of the Arab race under the early Caliphs, literature and arts were by no means neglected in the metropolis

[1] انا مدينة العلم علي بابها

"I am the city of learning, Ali is its gate."

of primitive Islâm. Ali and Ibn Abbâs, his cousin, gave public lectures on poetry, grammar, history, and mathematics; others taught the art of recitation or elocution; whilst some gave lessons in caligraphy,—in ancient times an invaluable branch of knowledge.

On Osman's tragical death the Scholar was called by the voice of the people to the helm of the State. During his retirement Ali had devoted himself to the study of the Master's precepts by the light of reason. "But for his assassination," to quote the language of a French historian, "the Moslem world might have witnessed the realisation of the Prophet's teachings, in the actual amalgamation of Reason with Law, and in the impersonation of the first principles of true philosophy in positive action." The same passionate devotion to knowledge and learning which distinguished Mohammed, breathed in every word of his Disciple. With a liberality of mind—far beyond that of the age in which he lived—was joined a sincere devoutness of spirit and earnestness of faith. His sermons, faithfully preserved by one of his descendants, and his litanies or psalms, portray a devout uplooking toward the Source of All Good, and an unbounded faith in humanity. The accession of the Ommeyyades to the rulership of Islam was a blow to the progress of knowledge and liberalism in the Moslem world. Their stormy reigns left the nation little leisure to devote to the gentler pursuits of science; and to this, among the sovereigns, was joined a characteristic idolatry of the past. Their thoughts were engrossed by war and politics. During the comparatively long rule of a century, the House of Ommeyya produced only one man devoted to the cultivation of letters; and this man was Abu Hashim Khalid ibn Yezîd, "the philosopher of the Merwânian family,"[1] as he has been called, who was set aside from the succession on account of his learning.

The jealous suspicion and the untiring animosity of the children of Hind and Abu Sufîan had obliged the descendants of the Prophet to live a life of humble retirement. "In the night ot misery and unhappiness" they followed truly and faithfully the precepts of their ancesstor, and found consolation in intellectual pursuits. Their ardent love of knowledge, their passionate devotion to the cause of humanity,—their spirit looking upwards far above the literalness

[1] *Mâkhaz-i-ulûm.*

of common interpretations of the law,—show the spirituality and expansiveness of Islam.[1] The definition by the Imam Jaafar as-Sadik of science or knowledge gives some idea of their faith in the progress of man: "The enlightenment of the heart is its essence; Truth, its principal object; Inspiration, its guide; Reason, its accepter; God, its inspirer; and the words of man its utterer."[2]

Surrounded by men whom love, devotion, and sympathy with their patience had gathered around them, the early descendants of the Prophet were naturally more or less influenced by the varied ideas of their followers. Yet their philosophy never sinks to that war of words without life and without earnestness which characterised the schools of Athens or Alexandria under the Ptolemies.

But though literature and philosophy were at a discount among the rulers, the example of the Imams naturally exercised no small influence on the intellectual activity of the Arabs and the subject races. Whilst the Ommeyyades discouraged the peaceful pursuits of the mind, the children of Fatima, with remarkable liberalism, favoured learning. They were not devoted to the past,—the *salaf* was not their guide. With the Master's precepts to light their path, they kept in view the development of humanity, and devoted themselves to the cultivation of science and learning in all its branches. Like the Master and the early Caliphs, the "Philosophers of the House of Mohammed"[3] received with distinction the learned men whom the fanatical persecution of Justinian's successors drove for refuge into foreign lands. The academies of philosophy and medicine, founded by the Nestorians at Edessa and Nisibis, had been broken up; its professors and students were refugees in Persia and Arabia. Many betook themselves—as their predecessors had done before, in the time of the Prophet and the Caliph Abu Bakr—to Medîna, which, after its sack by the Ommeyyades, had again gather-

1 See the *Hadîs-i-Ahlilaj*, from the Imâm Ali bin-Mûsa ar-Raza, reported by Muffuzzil bin-Omar Joufi, *Bihar ul-Anwar*.

2 *Târikh ul-Hukama*, by Jamal ud-dîn al-Kifti, founded upon another work bearing the same name, by Shahab ud-dîn Saharwardi; Shahâb ud-din was a Platonist—an Ishraki—an idealist, and was condemned and put to death by the orthodox synod in the reign of Saladin's son. Compare the first *Khutba* of the *Nahj-ul-Balâghat*, and the traditions on knowledge in the *Bihar ul-Anwar*.

3 *Mâkhaz-i-ulum*.

ed round Jaafar as-Sâdik a galaxy of talented scholars. The concourse of many and varied minds in the City of the Prophet gave an impetus to the cultivation of science and literature among the Moslems. From Medina a stream of unusual intellectual activity flowed towards Damascus. Situated on the northern confines of the Arabian Desert, along the trade-route from Mecca and Medîna to Syria, Damascus had been associated from ancient times with the Ommeyyades ; and the Syrian Arabs were closely allied by interest and kinship to the family whom they had assisted to elevate to the rulership of Islam. The Ommeyyades had naturally fixed upon this city as the seat of their empire ; and though shunned with horror by the devout Moslems, it formed the gathering place for the representatives of the many races who had come under the sway of Islam. The controversies of Greek and Saracen furnished a strong incentive to the study of dialectics and Greek philosophy ; and the invention of the diacritical and vowel points furthered the cultivation of grammar and philology. At this time flourished two Christian writers of note, who, fleeing before their orthodox persecutors, had taken shelter in Damascus. These were Johannes Damascenus and Theodorus Abucara. Their polemical writings against the Moslems, their rationalistic and philosophical disputes with their own orthodox brethren, joined to the influence of the Medinite school, which flourished under Mohammed al-Bakir and Jaafar as-Sadik, soon led to the growth of philosophical tendencies among the Saracens. For centuries Greek philosophy had been known to the Persians and the Arabs ; the Nestorians had spread themselves in the dominions of the Chosroes since the beginning of Justinian's reign, but it was not until all the varied elements had been fused into an organic whole by Islam that Greek science and culture exercised any real effect on the intellectual development of Western Asia. It was towards the close of the Ommeyyade rule that several Moslem thinkers came into prominence, whose lectures on subjects then uppermost in the minds of people attracted great attention. And their ideas and conceptions materially moulded the thoughts of succeeding generations.

It was in the second century, however, that the literary and scientific activity of the Moslems commenced in earnest, and the chief impulse to this was given by the settlement of the Arabs in towns. Hitherto they had lived in camps isolated from the races they had

subjugated. Osmân had laid a prohibition on their acquiring lands in the conquered countries, or contracting marriages with the subject nations. The object of this policy was apparent; it has its parallel in the history of all nations, ancient and modern. In British India and in French Algeria it is still in force. During the whole period of the Ommeyyade rule the Arabs had constituted the dominant element,—the aristocratic military caste amongst their subjects. The majority of them were occupied in warlike pursuits. The gentler avocations of learning and science were left to the suspected Hashimis and the children of the Ansar,—to the descendants of Ali, Abu Bakr, and Omar. The Arabs had carried with them into distant regions the system of clientage which had existed in Arabia, as it had existed among the Romans, from ancient times. Clientage afforded to the subjects protection and consideration; to the conquerors, the additional strength gained by numbers. Thus, both in the East and the West, the leading families allied themselves with members of the prominent desert clans, and became the *maulas* or *clients*, not *freedmen*, as has been incorrectly supposed, of their conquerors. To these *clients*, besides the Hâshimites and the children of the Ansâr and Muhajirîn, such as had survived the sack of Medina, was left scholarship and the cultivation of arts and sciences during the Ommeyyade rule. With the rise of the Abbassides commenced a new era. They rose to power with the assistance of the Persians; and they relied for the maintenance of their rule more upon the attachment of the general body of their subjects, than the fickle affection of the military colonists of Arabia. Abu'l Abbas Saffah held the reins of government for but two years. His brother and successor, al-Mansûr, though cruel in his treatment of the Fâtimides, was a statesman of the first rank. He organised the State, established a standing army and a corps of police, and gave firmness and consistency to the system of administration. The Arabs had hitherto devoted themselves almost exclusively to the profession of arms; the method of government adopted by al-Mansur gave a new bent to their genius. They settled in cities, acquired landed properties, and devoted themselves to the cultivation of letters with the same avidity which they had displayed in the pursuit of war.

The rich and fertile valley of the Euphrates, watered by the two great rivers of Western Asia, has, from the most ancient times,

been the seat of empire and the centre of civilisation. It was in this region that Babylon, Ctesiphon, and Seleucia had risen successively. Here existed at this epoch Bussorah and Kufa, with their unruly and volatile inhabitants. Bussorah, or more properly Basra, and Kûfa had, from the first conquest of the Moslems, formed important centres of commercial activity. The latter city was at one time the seat of government. To Bussorah and Kufa had come all the active spirits of the East, who either could not or would not go to the depraved capital of the Ommeyyades. For the Abbassides, Damascus had not only no attraction, but was a place of peril; and the uncertain and fickle temperament of the people of Bussorah and Kufa made those cities undesirable as the seat of government. Al-Mansur cast about for a site for his capital, and at last fixed upon the locality where Bagdad now stands—a six days' journey by river from Bussorah.

Bagdad is said to have been a summer retreat of Kesrâ Anûshirvan, the famous monarch of Persia, and derived from his reputation as a just ruler the name it bears,—the "Garden of Justice." With the disappearance of the Persian monarchy had disappeared the famous Garden where the Lord of Asia dispensed justice to his multitudinous subjects; tradition, however, had preserved the name. The beautiful site, central and salubrious, attracted the eyes of Mansur, and the glorious city of the Caliphs arose, like the sea-goddess issuing from the waves, under the magic wand of the foremost architects of the day.

The Bagdad of Mansûr was founded in the year 145 of the Hegira on the western bank of the Tigris. Soon, however, another city—a new Bagdad—sprung up on the eastern bank under the auspices of the heir-apparent, the Prince Imperial of the Caliphate, who afterwards assumed the title of al-Mahdi. This new city vied in the splendour of its structures with the beauty and magnificence of the Mansurieh. In the days of its glory, before the destroying hordes of Chengiz sweeping over Western Asia had engulfed in ruin every vestige of Saracenic civilisation, Bagdad presented a beautiful and imposing appearance—a fit capital for the Pontiffs of Islâm.[1]

[1] For a description of Bagdad under the Abbassides, see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan) p. 444.

The beauty and splendour of the city, before its sack by the Mongols, have been immortalised in glowing lines by Anwarı—most brilliant of panegyrists[1] :—

" Blessed be the site of Bagdad, seat of learning and art—
None can point in the world to a city equal to her,
Her suburbs vie in beauty with the blue vault of heaven,
Her climate in quality equals the life-giving breezes of heaven,
Her stones in their brightness rival gems and rubies,
Her soil in beneficence has the fragrance of the amber,
The morning breeze has imparted to the earth the freshness of *Túba* (the tree of Paradise),
And the winds have concealed in her water the sweetness of *Kausar* (the spring of Eden),
The banks of the Tigris with their beautiful damsels surpass (the city of) *Khullakh*,[2]
The gardens filled with lovely nymphs equal Cashmere,
And thousands of gondolas on the water,
Dance and sparkle like sunbeams in the sky.

1 This English rendering gives no idea of the beauty of the original :—

خوشا نواحی بغداد جای فضل و هنر
که کس نشان ندهد در جهان چنان کشور
سواد او بمثل چون سپهر میدا رنگ
هوای او بصفت چون نسیم جان پرور
بخاصیت همه سنگش عقیق لولو بار
بمنفعت همه خاکش عبیر غالیه بر
صبا سرشته بخاکش طراوت طوبی
هوا نهفته در آبش حلاوت کوثر
کنار دجله ز ترکان سیمتن خلخ
میان رحبه ز خوبان ماهرخ کشمر
هزار زورق خورشید شکل بر سر آب
بدان صفت که پراگنده بر سپهر شرر

2 A city in Cathay famous for the beauty of its women.

Its designation of the *City of Peace, Dâr us-Salâm*, was derived from a prophecy made by the astronomer-royal Noubakht, that none of the Caliphs would die within the walls of the city, and the strange fulfilment of this prognostication in the case of thirty-seven Caliphs. The great number of holy men who have found their last resting place within or about its walls, and whose tombs are objects of veneration to all Moslems, gave to Bagdad the title of *Bulwark of the Holy*. Here are the mausoleums of the greatest Imâms and the most pious Sheikhs. Here reposes the Imâm Mûsa al-Kâzim, and here lie buried Abu Hanifa, the Sheikhs Junaid, Shibli, and Abdul Kâdir Ghilâni, the chiefs of the Sûfis.

In the midst of the monuments of the Imâms and Sheikhs stood those of the Caliphs and their consorts. Of the numerous academies, colleges, and schools which filled the city, two institutions surpassed all others in importance by their wealth and the number of their students. These were the Nizamieh and Mustansarièh; the first established in the first half of the fifth century of the Hegira by Nizam ul-Mulk, the great Vizier of Malik Shah, Sultan of the Seljuks; and the second, built two centuries later, by the Caliph Al-Mustansir b'illâh.

"It is a remarkable fact," says the historian of *Culture under the Caliphs*, "that the sovereign who makes us forget some of the darker sides of his nature by his moral and mental qualities, also gave the impetus to the great intellectual movement which now commenced in the Islamic world."[1] It was by Mansur's command that literary and scientific works in foreign languages were first translated into Arabic. Himself no mean scholar and mathematician he had the famous collections of Indian fables (the Hitopadesa), the Indian treatise on astronomy called the *Siddhanta*, several works of Aristotle, the *Almagest* of Claudius Ptolemy, the books of Euclid, as well as other ancient Greek, Byzantine, Persian, and Syrian productions, translated into the language of the Arabs. Masudi mentions that no sooner were these translations published than they were studied with much avidity. Mansur's successors were not only warm patrons of the learned, who flocked to the metropolis from all quarters, but were themselves assiduous cultivators of every branch of knowledge. Under them the intellectual development

[1] Kremer, *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, vol. ii. p. 412.

of the Saracens, in other words of the conglomerate races of the vast empire which constituted the Caliphate, proceeded with wonderful rapidity.

Each great nation of the world has had its golden age. Athens had her Periclean era; Rome, her Augustan age; so, too, had the Islamic world its epoch of glory; and we may with justice look upon the period which elapsed from the accession of Mansur to the death of Mutazid-b'illah, with only a brief intermission during the reign of Mutawakkil, as an epoch of equal, if not of superior greatness and magnificence. Under the first six Abbasside Caliphs, but especially under Mamûn, the Moslems formed the vanguard of civilisation. The Saracenic race by its elastic genius as well as by its central position,—with the priceless treasures of dying Greece and Rome on one side, and of Persia on the other, and India and China far away sleeping the sleep of ages,—was pre-eminently fitted to become the teacher of mankind. Under the inspiring influences of the great Prophet, who gave them a code and a nationality, and assisted by their sovereigns, the Saracens caught up the lessons of wisdom from the East and the West, combined them with the teachings of the Master, and "started from soldiers into scholars." "The Arabs," says Humboldt, "were admirably situated to act the part of mediators, and to influence the nations from the Euphrates to the Guadalquivir and Mid-Africa. Their unexampled intellectual activity marks a distinct epoch in the history of the world."

Under the Ommeyyades we see the Moslems passing through a period of probation, preparing themseves for the great task they were called upon to undertake. Under the Abbassides we find them the repositaries of the knowledge of the world. Every part of the globe is ransacked by the agents of the Caliphs for the hoarded wealth of antiquity; these are brought to the capital, and laid before an admiring and appreciating public. Schools and academies spring up in every direction; public libraries are established in every city free to every comer; the great philosophers of the ancient world are studied side by side with the Koran. Galen, Dioscorides, Themistius, Aristotle, Plato, Euclid, Ptolemy, and Apollonius receive their due meed of appreciation. The sovereigns themselves assist in literary meetings and philosophical disquisitions. For the first time in the history of humanity a religious and autocratic govern-

ment is observed to ally itself with philosophy, preparing and participating in its triumphs.

Every city in the empire sought to outrival the other in the cultivation of the arts and sciences. And governors and provincial chiefs tried to emulate the sovereign. Travelling in search of knowledge was, according to the precept of the Master, a pious duty. From every part of the globe students and scholars flocked to Cordova, to Bagdad, and to Cairo to listen to the words of the Saracenic sages. Even Christians from remote corners of Europe attended Moslem colleges. Men who became in after-life the heads of the Christian Church,[1] acquired their scholarship from Islamic teachers. The rise of Cairo under al-Muiz li-dîn-illah added a spirit of rivalry to the patronage of learning on the part of the Caliphs of the Houses of Abbas and Fatima. Al-Muiz was the Mamun of the West—the Mæcenas of Moslem Africa, which then embraced the whole of the continent from the eastern confines of Egypt to the shores of the Atlantic and the borders of the Sahara. During the reign of al-Muiz and his first three successors, the arts and sciences flourished under the especial and loving protection of the sovereigns. The free university of Cairo, the *Dâr-ul-Hikmat*—Scientific Institute—established by al-Muiz, 'anticipated Bacon's ideal with a fact." The Idrisides at Fez, and the Moorish sovereigns in Spain, outvied each other in the cultivation of arts and letters. From the shores of the Atlantic eastward to the Indian Ocean, far away even to the Pacific, resounded the voice of philosophy and learning, under Moslem guidance and Moslem inspiration. And when the House of Abbas lost its grasp on the empire of the East, the chiefs who held the reins of government in the tracts which at one time were under the undivided temporal sway of the Caliphs, extended the same protection to science and literature as the Pontiffs from whom they still derived their title to sovereignity. This glorious period lasted, in spite of the triumph of patristicism and its unconcealed jealousy towards scientific and philosophical pursuits, until the fall of Bagdad before the Tartaric hordes. But the wild savages who overturned the Caliphate and destroyed civilisation, as soon as they adopted Islâm became ardent protectors of learning!

What was the condition of learning and science in Christendom

1 Such as Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., who studied in Cordova.

at this epoch? Under Constantine and his orthodox successors the Æsclepions were closed for ever; the public libraries established by the liberality of the pagan emperors were dispersed or destroyed; learning was "branded as magic or punished as treason;" and philosophy and science were exterminated. The ecclesiastical hatred against human learning had found expression in the patristic maxim, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion;" and Pope Gregory the Great, the founder of ecclesiastical supremacy, gave effect to this obscurantist dogma by expelling from Rome all scientific studies, and burning the Palatine Library founded by Augustus Cæsar. He forbade the study of the ancient writers of Greece and Rome. He introduced and sanctified the mythologic Christianity which continued for centuries the predominating creed of Europe, with its worship of relics and the remains of saints. Science and literature were placed under the ban by orthodox Christianity, and they succeeded in emancipating themselves only when Free Thought had broken down the barriers raised by orthodoxy against the progress of the human mind.

Abdullah al-Mâmûn has been deservedly styled the Augustus of the Arabs. "He was not ignorant that they are the elect of God, his best and most useful servants, whose lives are devoted to the improvement of their rational faculties . . , that the teachers of wisdom are the true luminaries and legislators of the world." [1]

Mâmûn was followed by a brilliant succession of princes who continued his work. Under him and his successors, the principal distinguishing feature of the school of Bagdad was a true and strongly marked scientific spirit, which dominated over all its achievements. The deductive method, hitherto proudly regarded as the invention and sole monopoly of modern Europe, was perfectly understood by the Moslems. "Marching from the known to the unknown, the school of Bagdad rendered to itself an exact account of the phenomena for the purpose of rising from the effect to the cause, accepting only what had been demonstrated by experience; such were the principles taught by the (Moslem) masters." "The Arabs in the ninth century," continues the author we are quoting, "were in the possession of that fecund method which was

[1] Abu'l Farâj.

to become long afterwards, in the hands of the moderns, the instrument of their most beautiful discoveries."

Volumes would be required to enumerate the host of scientific and learned men who flourished about this epoch, all of whom have, in some way or other, left their mark on the history of progress. Mashallah and Ahmed ibn Mohammed al-Nehavendi, the most ancient of the Arab astronomers, lived in the reign of Mansur. The former, who has been called the Phœnix of his time by Abu'l Faraj, wrote several valuable treatises on the astrolabe and the armillary sphere, and the nature and movements of celestial bodies —works which still evoke the admiration of scientists. Ahmed al-Nehavendi wrote from his own observations an astronomical table, *al-Mustamal*, which was a decided advance upon the notions of both the Greeks and the Hindus. Under Mâmûn, the *Almagest* of Ptolemy was re-translated, and the *Verified Tables* prepared by famous astronomers like Send ibn Ali, Yahya ibn Abi-Mansur, and Khalid ibn Abdul Malik. The observations connected with the equinoxes, the eclipses, the apparitions of the comets, and other celestial phenomena, were valuable in the extreme, and added greatly to human knowledge.

Mohammed ibn Mûsa al-Khwârismi made a new translation, under the orders of Mamun, of the *Siddhanta*, or the Indian Tables, with notes and observations. Alkindi wrote two hundred works on various subjects—arithmetic, geometry, philosophy, meteorology, optics, and medicine. Thoroughly versed in the language of the Greeks, he derived from the schools of Athens and Alexandria part of the information which he embodied in his invaluable treatises. "His works," says Sedillot, "are full of curious and interesting facts." Abû-Maashar (corrupted by the Europe of the Middle Ages into Albumazar) made the celestial phenomena his special study; and the *Zîj-abî-Maashar*, or the Table of Abu-Maashar, has always remained one of the chief sources of astronomical knowledge. The discoveries of the sons of Musa ibn Shakir,[1] who flourished under Mamun and his two immediate successors, especially with respect to the evaluations of the mean movement of the sun and other astral bodies, are almost as exact as the latest discoveries of Europe. They ascertained with

[1] Mohammed, Ahmed and Hassan.

wonderful precision, considering the appliances they possessed, the obliquity of the ecliptic, and marked for the first time the variations in the lunar altitudes. They also observed and determined with remarkable accuracy the precession of the equinoxes, and the movements of the solar apogee (which were utterly unknown to the Greeks). They calculated the size of the earth from the measurement of a degree on the shore of the Red Sea—this at a time when Christian Europe was asserting the flatness of the globe. Abu'l Hassan invented the telescope, of which he speaks as "a tube to the extremities of which were attached diopters." These "tubes" were improved and used afterwards in the observatories of Maragha and Cairo with great success. Al-Nairezi and Mohammed ibn Isa Abu Abdullah continued the great work of Musa ibn Shakir's sons.[1] By the time al-Batani appeared, the Moslems had evolved from the crude astronomy of the ancients a regular and harmonious science. Al-Batani,[2] though surpassed by his successors, occupies a high position among astronomers, and a competent judge pronounces his *rôle* to be the same among the Saracens as that of Ptolemy among the Greeks. His Astronomical Tables, translated into Latin, furnished the groundwork of astronomy in Europe for many centuries. He is, however, best known in the history of mathematics as the introducer of the sine and co-sine instead of the chord in astronomical and trigonometrical calculations.

Among the numerous astronomers who lived and worked in Bagdad at the close of the tenth century, the names of two men, Ali ibn Amajur and Abu'l Hassan Ali ibn Amajur, generally known as Banu-Amajur, stand prominently forward. They are noted for their calculation of the lunar movements.

Owing to the weakness of the central power, and an increasing inability to maintain the sway of the Caliphate in outlying and distant parts, there arose on the confines of the empire, towards the end of the tenth century, several quasi-independent chiefs. Spain had been lost to the Abbassides at the commencement of their rule; about this period the Banù-Idrîs established themselves at Fez, the

[1] For their names see *ante* p. 337. Mohammed ibn Musa ibn Shâkir died in A.H. 259 (A.C. 873).

[2] Abû Abdullah Mohammed ibn Jâbir ibn Sinân al-Batâni was a native of Harran, died A.H. 317 (A.C. 929-30).

Banû-Rustam at Tahârt, and the Banû-Aghlab at Kairowân in Africa. Soon, however, the whole of the northern part of that continent was brought under the domination of the Banî-Fatima, and then another era of glory for arts and literature commenced. Fez, Miknasa, Segelmessa, Tahart, Tlemcen, Kairowan, but above all, Cairo, became centres of culture and learning. In Khorasan the Taherides, in Transoxiana the Samanides, the Buyides in Tabaristan and afterwards in Persia and Bagdad, as mayors of the palace, extended a lavish partronage to scientists and scholars. Abdur Rahman Sufi, one of the most brilliant physicists of the age, was an intimate friend of the Buyide Ameer Azd ud-Dowla, deservedly called the second Augustus of the Arabs. Abdur Rahman improved the photometry of the stars. Azd ud-Dowla,[1] himself a scholar and a mathematician, welcomed to his palace as honoured guests the learned men who flocked to Bagdad from every part of the globe, and took part in their scientific controversies. Jaafar, the son of the Caliph Muktafi b'illah, made important observations regarding the erratic movements of comets, and wrote a treatise on them; and other princes cultivated the sciences side by side with their subjects.

Under the Buyides flourished a host of astronomers, physicists, and mathematicians, of whom only two need be mentioned here, Alkohî and Abu'l-Wafa. Alkohi studied and wrote on the movements of the planets. His discoveries concerning the summer solstice and the autumnal equinox added materially to the store of human knowledge. Abu'l-Wafa was born in 939 A.C. at Buzjan in Khorasan; he established himself in Irak in 959, where he applied himself chiefly to mathematics and astronomy. His *Zîj-ush-Shâmil* (*the Consolidated or General Table*) is a monument of industry and keen and accurate observation. He introduced the use of the secant and the tangent in trigonometry and astronomical observations. "But this was not all," says M. Sedillot; 'struck by the imperfection of the lunar theory of Ptolemy, he verified the ancient observations, and discovered, independently of *the equation of the centre and the eviction*, a third inequality, which is no

1 To Azd ud-Dowla, Bagdad owed several hospitals for the sick and refuges for orphans. He built magnificent mausoleums over the tombs of Ali and Hussain at Najaf and Kerbela. He rendered navigable the river which flows by Shiraz by erecting the famous dyke called *Bend-emir*.

other than the variation determined six centuries later by Tycho Brahe."[1]

Under the Fâtimides of Egypt, Cairo had become a new intellectual and scientific centre. Here flourished, in the reigns of Azîz b'illah[2] and Hakim bi-amr-illah, one of the master-spirits of the age, Ibn Yunus,[3] the inventor of the pendulum and the measurement of time by its oscillations. He is, however, famous for his great work named after his patron and sovereign, *Zîj-ul-Akbar-al-Hâkimi*, which soon displaced the work of Claudius Ptolemy. It was reproduced among the Persians by the astronomer-poet Omar Khayyâm (1079); among the Greeks, in the syntax of Chrysococca; among the Mongols by Nasir ud-dîn Tûsi, in the *Zîj-îl-Khâni*; and among the Chinese, in the astronomy of Co-Cheou-king in 1280; and thus what is attributed to the ancient civilisation of China is only a borrowed light from the Moslems.[4]

Ibn Yunus died in 1009, and his discoveries were continued by Ibn un-Nabdi, who lived in Cairo in 1040, and Hassan ibn Haithem, commonly called in Europe Alhazen, and famous for the discovery of atmospheric refraction. He flourished about the end of the eleventh century, and was a distinguished astronomer and optician. He was born in Spain, but resided chiefly in Egypt. He is best known in Europe by his works on optics, one of which has been translated into Latin by Risner. He corrected the Greek misconception as to the nature of vision, and demonstrated for the first time that the rays of light come from external objects to the eye, and do not issue forth from the eye, and impinge on external things. He determined the retina as the seat of vision, and proved that the impressions made upon it were conveyed along the optic nerves to the brain. He explained the phenomena of a single vision by the formation of visual images on symmetrical portions of the two retinas. He discovered that the refraction of light varies with the density of the atmosphere, and that atmospheric density again varies with the

1 Abu'l Wafâ died in A.H. 387 (A.C. 997).

2 Azîz b'illah was one of the greatest sovereigns Egypt ever had. "He loved his people as they loved him." He was married to a Christian lady, whose brothers, Jeremiah and Arvenius, held the posts of patriarchs, one of Jerusalem and the other of Alexandria. Both of them belonged to the orthodox or *melkite* sect.

3 See Appendix II.

4 Sédillot.

height. He explained accurately and clearly how, in consequence of this refraction, astral bodies are seen before they have actually risen and after they have set, and demonstrated that the beautiful phenomenon of twilight was due to the effect of atmospheric refraction combined with the reflecting action of the air upon the course of the rays of light. In his book called the *Balance of Wisdom* he discusses dynamical principles, generally supposed to be the monopoly of modern science. He describes minutely the connection between the weight of the atmosphere and its density, and how material objects vary in weight in a rare and in a dense atmosphere. He discusses the submergence of floating bodies, and the force with which they rise to the surface when immersed in light or heavy media; he fully understands the principle of gravitation, and recognises gravity as a force. He knows correctly the relation between the velocities, spaces, and times of falling bodies, and has very distinct ideas of capillary attraction.[1]

In Spain the same activity of mind was at work from the Pyrenees to the Straits: Seville, Cordova, Grenada, Murcia, Toledo, and other places possessed their public libraries and colleges, where they gave free instruction in science and letters. Of Cordova, an English writer speaks thus: "Beautiful as were the palaces and gardens of Cordova, her claims to admiration in higher matters were no less strong. The mind was as lovely as the body. Her professors and teachers made her the centre of European culture: students would come from all parts of Europe to study under her famous doctors, and even the nun Hroswitha far away in her Saxon convent of Gaudersheim, when she told of the martyrdom of St. Eulogius, could not refrain from singing the praises of Cordova, 'the brightest splendour of the world.' Every branch of science was seriously studied there, and medicine received more and greater additions by the discoveries of the doctors and surgeons of Andalusia than it had gained during all the centuries that had elapsed since the days of Galen. . . . Astronomy, geography, chemistry, natural history all were studied with ardour at Cordova; and as for the graces of

1 The annalist Ayni says that at this period the public library of Cairo contained over two million books, of which six thousand treated exclusively of mathematics and astronomy. I have only mentioned a few of the names among the thousands of mathematicians and physicists who flourished during this epoch, when the scientific spirit of Islam was at its zenith.

literature there never was a time in Europe when poetry became so much the speech of everybody—when people of all ranks composed those Arabic verses which perhaps suggested models for the ballads and canzonettes of the Spanish minstrels and the troubadours of Provence and Italy. No speech or address was complete without some scrap of verse, improvised on the spur of the moment by the speaker, or quoted by memory from some famous poet."[1] To these we may add the words of Renan: "The taste for science and literature had, by the tenth century, established, in this privileged corner of the world, a toleration of which modern times hardly offer us an example. Christians, Jews, and Mussulmans spoke the same tongue, sang the same songs, participated in the same literary and scientific studies. All the barriers which separated the various peoples were effaced; all worked with one accord in the work of a common civilisation. The mosques of Cordova, where the students could be counted by thousands, became the active centres of philosophical and scientific studies."[2]

The first observatory in Europe was built by the Arabs. The Giralda, or tower of Seville, was erected under the superintendence of the great mathematician Jaabir ibn Afiah in 1190 A.C. for the observation of the heavens. Its fate was not a little characteristic. After the expulsion of the Moors, it was turned into a belfry, the Spaniards not knowing what else to do with it!

Omar ibn Khaldûn, Yaakûb ibn Târik, Muslimah al-Maghrabi, and the famous Averroes (Abu'l Walîd Mohammed ibn Rushd) are some of the physicists whom we may mention here. Nor was Western Africa inactive during this period: Ceuta and Tangier, Fez, and Morocco, rivalled Cordova, Seville, and Grenada; their colleges sent out able professors, and numerous learned works testified to the indefatigable ardour of the Moslem mind in all departments of learning.

1 Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Moors in Spain*, p. 144. For a full account of Cordova, see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan), p. 515.

2 Renan, *Averroes et Averroism*, p. 4. The golden age of literature and science in Spain was under Hakam *al-Mustansir b'Illâh* who died in 976 A.C. The catalogue of his library consisted of forty-four quartos. He employed agents in every quarter of the globe to procure for him, at any price, scientific works, ancient and modern. He paid to Abu'l Faraj al-Isphahâni 1000 dinars of gold for the first copy of his celebrated Anthology (*Kitâb ul-Aghâni*).

The beginning of the eleventh century saw a great change in the political condition of Central Asia. The rise of Mahmud,[1] the great Ghaznavide conqueror, *Yemîn ud-Dowla* and *Amîn ul-Millat*, "right hand of the empire" and "custodian of the Faith," brought Transoxiana, Afghanistan, and Persia under the sovereignty of Ghazni. He collected round him a body of scholars and *litterateurs*, who shed a glorious lustre on his brilliant reign. Attached to the renovated "orthodoxy" of al-Ashaari, and consequently piously inimical to the rationalistic school of thinkers, chary in his munificence to the poets who made his name famous in the annals of the world, he yet had the genius to perceive the merits of men like *Abu Raihán Mohammed ibn Ahmed* al-Beirûnî, philosopher, mathematician, and geographer. Firdousi, the prince of poets, Dakîki, and Unsari. Al-Beirûnî's mind was encyclopædic. His work on astronomy, entitled after his patron Sultan Masud,[2] *al-Kanun-Masudi, Canon Masudicus*, is a monument of learning and research. He travelled into India, and studied the language of the Hindus, their sciences, their philosophy and literature, and embodied his observations in a work which has recently been furnished to us in an English garb. The philosophical and scientific, not to say sympathetic, spirit which animates al-Beirunî in the treatment of his subject is in marked contrast to the mode still in vogue among Western nations, and serves as an index to the intellectual character of Islam. The *Ινδικα*[3] of al-Beiruni, shows the extent to which the Moslems had utilised the treasures of Greek learning, and turned them to fruitful purposes. Besides these two great works, he wrote on mathematics, chronology, mathematical geography, physics, and chemistry.

Al-Beirûnî communicated to the Hindus the knowledge of the Bagdadian school in return for their notions and traditions. He found among them the remains of Greek science, which had been transported to India in the early centuries of the Christian era, or perhaps earlier, during the existence of the Græco-Bactrian dynasties. The Hindus do not seem to have possessed any advanced astronomical science of their own ; for, had it been otherwise, we

[1] A. C. 996–1030. [2] The son and successor of the Conqueror.

[3] *Fi't Tahkîk ma li'l Hind* ; see *Short History of the Saracens*, (Macmillan), p. 463. Another remarkable work of his is the *Asâr ul-Bâkièh* or the Vestiges of the Past, translated into English by Dr. Sachau.

doubtless would have heard about it, as Sédillot rightly observes, from the Greek writers of the times of Alexander and the Seleucidæ. They, like the Chinese, borrowed most of their scientific ideas from foreign sources, and modified them according to their national characteristics.

Under the successors of Mahmûd learning and arts flourished abundantly. The rise of the Seljukides and their grand munificence towards scholarship and science rivalled that of the golden days of the Abbasside rule. Tughril, Alp Arslan, Malik Shah, and Sanjar were not only remarkable for the greatness of their power, the clear comprehension of what constituted the welfare of their subjects, but were equally distinguished for their intellectual gifts and ardent enthusiasm in the cause of learning. *Jâlal ud-dîn* Malik Shah [1] and his vizier, Khwaja Hassan *Nizam ul-Mulk*,[2] collected round them a galaxy of astronomers, poets, scholars, and historians. The astronomical observations conducted in his reign by a body of savants, with Omar Khayyam and Abdur Rahman al-Hazini at their head, led to the reform of the Calendar which preceded the Gregorian by six hundred years, and is said by a competent authority to be even more exact.[3] The era which was introduced upon these observations was named after Malik Shah, the *Jalâlian*.

The destructive inroads of the Christian marauders who called themselves Crusaders, was disastrous to the cause of learning and science in Western Asia and Northern Africa. Barbarous savages, hounded to rapine and slaughter by crazy priests, they knew neither mercy for the weakness of sex or age, nor the value of letters or arts. They destroyed the splendid library of Tripoli without compunction; they reduced to ashes many of the glorious centres of Saracenic culture and arts. Christian Europe has held up to obloquy the apocryphal destruction of the Alexandrian library, which had already been burned in the time of Julius Cæsar, but it has no word of blame for the crimes of her Crusaders five centuries later. The calamities inflicted by the Crusaders were lasting in their effect; and in spite of the endeavours of Saladin and his sons to restore the intellectual life of Syria, it has remained dead, from that day to this.

1 1073-1092 A. C. 2 i.e. the Administrator of the Empire. 3 Sédillot,

In the interval which elapsed between the rise of Mahmûd and the fall of Bagdad, there flourished a number of philosophers and scientists, among whom shine the great Avicenna (*Abû Ali* Hussain Ibn-Sîna),[1] Fath ibn Nabeghah Khakani,[2] Mubash-shar ibn Ahmed,[3] and his son Mohammed.[4]

The eruption of the Mongols upon the Saracenic world was not like the invasion of the Roman empire by the northern barbarians. These had proceeded slowly; and in their comparatively gradual progress towards the heart of the empire they had become partially softened, and had to some extent cast off their pristine ferocity. The case was otherwise with the hordes of the devastator Chengiz. They swept like overwhelming torrents over Western Asia. Wherever they went they left misery and desolation.[5] Their barbarous campaigns and their savage slaughters put an end for a time to the intellectual development of Asia. But the moment the wild savages adopted the religion of the Prophet of Arabia a change came over them. From the destroyers of the seats of learning and arts they became the founders of academies and the protectors of the learned. Sultan Khoda-Bendah (Uljaitu-Khan), sixth in descent from Chengîz, was distinguished for his attainments and his patronage of the sciences. But the fearful massacres which the barbarians had committed among the settled and cultured population of the towns destroyed most of the gifted classes, with the result that, though the great cities like Bokhara and Samarcand rose again into splendour, they became, nevertheless, the seats of a narrower culture, more casuistical and theological than before. And yet the Mongols protected philosophers like Nasir ud-dîn Tusi, Muwaid ud-dîn al-Orezi of Damascus, Fakhr ud-dîn al-Maraghi, Mohi ud-dîn al-Maghrabi, Ali Shah al-Bokhari, and many others. The successors of Hulaku tried thus to restore to Islam what their ancestor had destroyed. Whilst the Mongols in Persia were employed in making some amends to civilisation, Kublai Khan transported to China the learning of the Arabs. Co-Cheou-king received in 1280 from Jamal ud-dîn the tables of Ibn-Yunus, and appropriated them for Chinese purposes.

1 Died in 1037 A.C.
2 Died in 1082 A.C.
3 Died in 1135 A.C.
4 Died in 1193 A.C.
5 For a full account of the havoc and ruin caused by the Tartars, see *Short History of the Saracens*, pp. 391-400.

Ibn-Shâthir, who lived in the reign of Mohammed ibn Talâun, the Mameluke sovereign of Egypt, developed still further the mathematical and astronomical sciences. And now arose on the eastern horizon the comet-like personality of Timûr. "From his throne in Samarcand this Titan of the fourteenth century called into being the greatest empire ever seen in Asia, and seemed to extinguish in his one resistless will the immemorial antagonism of Iran and Tûran." He was a patron of science and poetry, himself fond of the society of the scholars and artists of his day, an author, as well as a legislator of no mean order.[1] Magnificent colleges, splendid mosques, vast libraries, testified to the taste for letters of this remarkable man. His vast system of colonisation filled the great cities of Eastern Asia, especially Samarcand, with the splendour of all the arts and sciences known to the West. Timur established "the most brilliant empire known to the history of Islâm, except that of the Ommeyyads in Spain, and that of the first Abbassides in Arabistan." Jami, master of sciences; Suhaili, translator of Pilpay; Ali Sher Ameer, were some of the men who shed lustre on Timur's reign. The college founded by his consort, Bibi Khanum, and known by her name, still strikes the observer as one of the most imposing and most beautiful products of Saracenic architecture. Timur's son, Shah Rukh Mirza, imitated his father in the cultivation and patronage of arts and letters. His peaceful reign of nearly half a century was remarkable for high intellectual culture and scientific study. When he transported his government from Samarcand to Herat, the former city lost none of its splendour. Ulugh Beg, his son, charged with the government of Transoxiana, maintained the literary and scientific glories of Samarcand. Himself an astronomer of a high rank, he presided at the observations which have immortalised his name. The tables in which those observations were embodied complete the cycle of Arabian thought. Ulugh Beg is separated by only a century and a half from Kepler, the founder of modern astronomy.

It was, however, not astronomy only which the Moslems cultivated and improved. Every branch of higher mathematics bears traces of their genius. The Greeks are said to have invented algebra, but among them, as Oelsner has justly remarked, it was

[1] The *Malfûzât-i-Timûri*, ("The Institutes of Timûr"), are couched in the style of the old Assyrian and Kyanian monarchs.

confined to furnishing amusement "for the plays of the goblet." The Moslems applied it to higher purposes, and thus gave it a value hitherto unknown. Under Mamun they had discovered the equations of the second degree, and very soon after they developed the theory of quadratic equations and the binomial theorem. Not only algebra, geometry, and arithmetic, but optics and mechanics made remarkable progress in the hands of the Moslems. They invented spherical trigonometry; they were the first to apply algebra to geometry, to introduce the tangent, and to substitute the sine for the arc in trigonometrical calculations. Their progress in mathematical geography was no less remarkable. The works of Ibn-Haukal, of Makrîzi, al-Istakhri, Masudi, al-Beiruni, al-Kumi and al-Idrisi, Kazwîni, Ibn ul-Wardi, and Abu'l Feda, show what the Saracens attained in this department of science, called by them the *rasm-ul-arz*. At a time when Europe firmly believed in the flatness of the earth, and was ready to burn any foolhardy person who thought otherwise, the Arabs taught geography by globes.

The physical sciences were as diligently cultivated. The method of *experimentation* was substituted for theorising; and the crude ideas of the ancients were developed into positive sciences.[1] Chemistry, botany, geology, natural history, among others occupied the attention and exercised the energies of the ablest men.

Chemistry, as a science, is unquestionably the invention of the Moslems. Abu Musa Jaabir (the Geber of Christian writers)[2] is the true father of modern chemistry. "His name is memorable in chemistry, since it marks an epoch in that science of equal importance to that of Priestley and Lavoisier." He was followed by others, whose originality and industry, profoundness of knowledge, and keenness of observation, evoke the astonishment of students, and make them look with regret upon the inertness of the latter-day Moslem.

The science of medicine and the art of surgery, the best index to a nation's genius and a severe test to the intellectual spirit of a faith, were developed to the highest degree. Medicine had undoubtedly

1 Humboldt calls the Arabs the real founders of the physical sciences.

2 Abu Musa Jaabir ibn Haiyan was a native of Tarsus. Ibn Khallikân says "Jaabir compiled a work of two thousand pages in which he inserted the problems of his master (the Imâm) Jaafar as-Sâdik which formed five hundred treatises"; see also the *Târîkh-ul-Hukama*.

attained a high degree of excellence among the Greeks, but the Arabs carried it far beyond the stage in which their predecessors in the work of civilisation had left it, and brought it close to the modern standard. We can give here but a small conception of the work done by the Saracens for several centuries in this department of human study, and in the development of the natural sciences.

The study of medical substances, the idea of which struck Dioscorides in the Alexandrian school, is, in its scientific form, a creation of the Arabs. They invented chemical pharmacy, and were the first founders of those institutions which are now called *dispensaries*.[1] They established in every city public hospitals, called *Dâr ush-Shafa*, "the house of cure," or *Mâristân* (an abbreviation of *bîmâristan*, "the patients' house"), and maintained them at the expense of the State.

The names of the Arab physicians in the biographical dictionary of Abu Usaiba fill a volume. Abu Bakr Mohammed ibn Zakaria ar-Râzi (known to mediæval Europe as Rhazes), who flourished in the beginning of the tenth century,[2] Ali ibn-Abbâs,[3] Avicenna (Abû Ali Hussain ibn-Sîna), Albucasis (Abû'l Kâsim Khalâf ibn Abbâs), Aven-Zoar[4] (Abu Merwan ibn Abdul Malik *ibn Zuhr*), Averroes

[1] The persons in charge of the dispensaries were under the control of Government. The price and quality of medicine were strictly regulated. Many dispensaries were maintained by the State. There were regular examinations for physicians and pharmacists, at which licences were given to passed candidates. The license-holders were alone entitled to practise. Compare Kremer and Sedillot.

[2] This great physician, surnamed Razi, from the place of his birth, Rai (ancient Rhages), filled successively the office of principal of the public hospitals at Rai, Jund-Shapur, and Bagdad. He wrote the *Hâwî*, which Sédillot calls "un corpus medical fort estime." His treatises on smallpox and measles have been consulted by the physicians of all nations. He introduced the use of *minoratives*, invented the seton, and discovered the nerve of the larynx. He wrote two hundred medical works, some of which were published in Venice in 1510. Ar-Razi died in A.H. 311 (A.C. 923-4.)

[3] Ali ibn-Abbas flourished fifty years later than Rhazes. He published a medical work, consisting of twenty volumes, on the theory and practice of medicine, which he dedicated to the Buyide Ameer Azd ud-dowla. This work was translated into Latin in 1227, and printed at Lyon in 1523 by Michel Capella. Ali ibn-Abbas corrected many of the errors of Hippocrates and Galen.

[4] Ibn Zuhr or Aven-Zoar was one of the most distinguished physicians of his age. Born at Penaflor, he entered, after finishing his medical and scientific studies, the service of Yusuf bin Tashfin, the great Almoravide monarch of Africa, who covered the rising physician with honours and riches. Ibn Zuhr joined, like Albucasis, the practice of medicine with surgery. He was the first to conceive the idea of bronchotomy, with exact indications of the luxations and fractures, and discovered several important maladies with their treatment. His son followed in his father's steps and was the chief surgeon and physician of Yusuf bin Tashfîn's army.

(Abu'l Walîd Mohammed *ibn Rushd*), [1] and Aben-Bethar (Abdullah ibn Ahmed ibn Ali *al-Beithar*, the *veterinary*),[2] are some of the most brilliant and most distinguished physicians who have left an enduring impression on the world of thought. Albucasis was not only a physician but a surgeon of the first rank. He performed the most difficult surgical operations in his own and the obstetrical department. In operations on women, we are informed by him, in which considerations of delicacy intervened, the services of properly instructed women were secured. The ample description he has left of the surgical instruments employed in his time give an idea of the development of surgery among the Arabs.[3] Avicenna was unquestionably the most gifted man of his age; a universalist in genius, and encyclopædic in his writings. A philosopher, mathematician, astronomer, poet, and physician, he has left his influence impressed on two continents, and well deserves the title of Aristotle of the East. In spite of patristic jealousy, his philosophic ideas exercised an undisputed sway for several centuries in the schools of the East as well as of Europe. Avicenna is commonly known in Asia as *the Shaikh par excellence.* He was born in the year 980 A. C. at a village called Afshânah, near Shirâz, of which place his father was the governor. He finished his medical studies in Bokhara at the age of eighteen, when commenced an extraordinary political and philosophical career. His tenacity in refusing the liberal offers of Mahmud the Conqueror to join his service led to his expulsion from the Ghaznavide dominions. He soon became the vizier of Shams ud-dowla, Ameer of Hamadan, aud afterwards of Ala ud-dowla, Ameer of Isphahan, where he pursued his scientific and philosophical studies, and wrote his great works, the *Canon* and the *Arjúza*, afterwards the foundation of all medical knowledge.

[1] Averroes was the Avicenna of the West. His life and writings have been given to the world by Renan. He was a contemporary of Ibn Zuhr, Ibn Baja, and Ibn Tufail. Of Averroes and his contemporaries we shall have to speak in the next chapter.

Besides these may be mentioned Abu'l Hassan ibn Tilmîz, author of *Almalihi*; Abû Jaafar Ahmed ibn Mohammed at-Tâlib, who wrote on pleurisy, etc, ; and Habatulla.

[2] Al-Beithar travelled all over the East to find medicinal herbs, on which he wrote an exhaustive treatise. The Arab physicians introduced the use of the rhubarb, the pulp of the tamarind (*tamar—تمر—i-Hind*, the fruit of India), cassia, senna, camphor, etc.

[3] In lithotomy he was equal to the foremost surgeons of modern times.

The Greeks possessed crude notions of anatomy, and their knowledge of pharmacy was restricted within a very narrow compass. The Moslems developed both anatomy and pharmacy into positive sciences. The wide extent of the empire enabled researches and investigations in every quarter of the globe, with the result that they enriched the existing pharmacopæia by innumerable and invaluable additions. Botany they advanced far beyond the state in which it had been left by Dioscorides, and augmented the herbalogy of the Greeks by the addition of two thousand plants. Regular gardens existed both in Cordova and Bagdad, at Cairo and Fez for the education of pupils, where discourses were delivered by the most learned in the sciences.

Aldemri is famous in the Moslem world for his history of animals —a work which forestalled Buffon by seven hundred years.

Geology was cultivated under the name of *Ilm-i-Tashrîh-ul-Arz*, "the science of the anatomy of the earth."

The superiority of the Moslems in architecture requires no comment, for the glorious remains of Saracenic art in the East and in the West still evoke the admiration of the modern world. Their religion has been charged with their backwardness in painting and sculpture, but it must be borne in mind that the prohibition contained in the Koran is similar to the Levitical commandment. It was but a continuation of the Mosaic Law, which had so effectually suppressed the making of "graven images" among the Jews, and its signification rests upon the inveterate idolatry of the pre-Islâmite Arabs. To the early Moslems, therefore, painting and statuary were odious and unlawful, as emblematic of heathenism, and this deeply implanted iconoclasm undoubtedly saved them from relapsing, as other nations had done, into idolatry. But with the gradual development of the primitive commonwealth into a civilised and cultured empire, and with the ascendency of learning and science, the Moslems grasped the spirit of the prohibition, and cast off the fetters of a narrow literalism. No doubt the spirit of rationalism, which so deeply influenced the early Abbasside and Spanish Caliphs, was the actual cause of the impetus given by them to art. Hence throughout the Moslem world a taste for painting and sculpture arose simultaneously with the progress of literature and science. The palaces of the Caliphs, the mansions of the sovereigns who followed in their footsteps, and

the houses of the grandees were decorated with pictures and sculptures.

To Mohammed's prohibition of graven images or painting in mosques the world is indebted for the art of arabesque—which possesses such peculiar charm in the decoration of Oriental buildings, and which has been widely adopted by Western art. With the gradual enlightenment of the Moslems by contact with the arts of other nations, animals and flowers, birds and fruits were introduced into arabesque; but the figures of animated beings were throughout absolutely interdicted in the decoration of places of worship. In purity of form and simplicity of outline, in the gracefulness of design and perfection of symmetry, in the harmony of every detail, in the exquisiteness of finish and sublimity of conception, Moslem architecture is superior to any in the world, and the chaste and graceful ornamentation with which so many of the grandest monuments are adorned, indicate a refinement of taste and culture surpassing any of the great monumental relics of ancient Greece or modern Europe. Another branch of Moslem decorative art is that of ornamental writing, which is so often utilised with marvellous effect in the adornment of mosques, mausolea, and palaces, where whole chapters of the Koran are carved or inlaid round domes and minarets, doors and arches, testifying to the same religious earnestness, yet in a purely monotheistic spirit, as the pictures of saints and martyrs which decorate Christian churches.

Before the promulgation of Islam the profession of music among the Arabs was confined to the slaves of both sexes imported from Syria and Persia, or to the class of hetairai called *Kyan*. The Prophet had discountenanced, for obvious moral reasons, the songs and dances of these degraded women. But under the Abbassides and the Spanish Arab kings, when music was elevated to the rank of a science, and its cultivation was recognised as an art, a love for music spread among all classes of society. A large literature grew upon the subject; songs were collected and classified according to their melodies and keys, and the musical instruments of the ancients were improved and new ones invented. The sharp conflict between Rationalism and Patristicism, between Idealism and Literalism, which marked the middle of the twelfth century, drove this sweetest of arts back into the arms of the servile classes or forced it to seek a refuge in the chapels of the dervishes.

A large general literature existed on the subject of commerce, agriculture, handicraft and manufacture, the latter including every conceivable subject, from porcelain to weapons of war.

In historical research the Moslems have not been behind any other nation, ancient or modern. At first attention was devoted chiefly to the history of the Prophet, but soon the primitive idea widened into a vast conception. Archæology, geography, and ethnology were included in history, and the greatest minds applied themselves to the pursuit of this captivating branch of study. Between the simple work of Ibn-Ishak to the universal history of Ibn-Khaldun there is a great difference, but the intervening space is occupied by a host of writers, the product of whose labours supplies some index to the intellectual activity of the Saracenic nations under the inspiration of Islâm.

Balâzuri, who died in 279 A.H. (A.C. 892), was born at Bagdad, where he lived and worked. His "Conquest of the Countries" (*Futûh ul-Buldân*) is written in admirable style, and marks a distinct advance of the historical spirit.

Hamdâni, who flourished towards the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century of the Hegira, gave to the world a comprehensive history of Southern Arabia, with an account of its tribes, its numerous ruins of interest, with explanations of their inscriptions, as well as the ethnography and geography of Yemen. It is, however, in the monumental works of Masudi, of al-Beiruni, of Ibn ul-Athîr, of Tibri, of Ibn-Khaldun, called by Mohl the Montesquieu of Islam, of Makrisi, Makkari, Abu'lfeda, Nuwairi, and Mirkhond that the mental vigour of the Moslem races in this department of knowledge is found in full play. These men were not specialists only ; they were encyclopædists—philosophers, mathematicians, geographers, as well as historians. Masûdi was a native of Bagdad, but by descent a Northern Arab, who in his early youth travelled and saw the greater part of the Mahommedan world. He first went to India, visited Multan and Mansura, then travelled over Persia and Kerman, again went to India, remained for some time at Cambay (Kambaja) and the Deccan, went to Ceylon, sailed from there to Kambalu (Madagascar), and went from there to Oman, and perhaps even reached the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and China. He had travelled far in Central Asia, and reached the Caspian Sea.

After finishing his travels, he lived for some time in Tiberias and Antioch, and afterwards took up his abode in Bussorah, where he first published his great work, called the *Murûj-uz-Zahab* (مروج الذهب). Afterwards he removed to Fostat (old Cairo), where he published the *Kitab ut-Tanbih*, and later the *Mirat-uz-Zaman*, or the *Mirror of the Times*, a voluminous work, which is only partially preserved. In the *Murûj-uz-Zahab* (the "Golden Meadows") "he tells the rich experiences of his life in the amiable and cheerful manner of a man who had seen various lands, experienced life in all its phases, and who takes pleasure, not only in instructing, but in amusing his reader. Without burdening us with the names of the authorities, without losing himself in long explanations, he delights in giving prominence to that which strikes him as wonderful, rare, and interesting, and to portray people and manners with conciseness and anecdotic skill."

Tibrî, or Tabari (Abû Jaafar Mohammed ibn Jarîr), surnamed the Livy of the Arabs, who died in Bagdad in 922 A.C., brought his work down to the year 302 of the Hegira (914 A.C.). It was continued to the end of the twelfth century by al-Makın or Elmacin.

Ibn ul-Athîr (ابن الاثير), surnamed *Iz ud-din*, "glory of religion," was a native of Jazîreh-banî-Omar, in Irak, but resided chiefly at Mosul, where his house was the resort of the most distinguished scholars and savants of the time. His universal history, known as the *al-Kâmil*, which ends with the year 1231 A.C., may be compared with the best works of modern Europe.

Makrîsî[1] (Taki ud-din Ahmed) was a contemporary of Ibn-Khaldun. His works on Egypt furnish a vivid picture of the political, religious, social, commercial, archæological, and administrative condition of the country.

Abu'lfedâ, whom we have already mentioned as a geographer, was the Prince of Hamah at the commencement of the fourteenth century. Distinguished alike in the pursuit of arms as well as letters, gifted with eminent qualities, he occupies a prominent place among the scholars and scientists of the East. The portion of his great work which deals with the political and literary history of Islam, and its relations to the Byzantines from the eighth to the twelfth century, is extremely valuable.

[1] Died in 1442 A. C.

Ibn Khaldûn flourished in the fourteenth century of the Christian era. Born in Tunis in 1332, he was in the midst of all the revolutions of which Africa was the theatre in the fourteenth century. His magnificent history is preceded by a Prolegomena, in itself a store-house of information and philosophical dissertation. In the Prolegomena he traces the origin of society, the development of civilisation, the causes which led to the rise and fall of kingdoms and dynasties; and discusses among other questions, the influence of climate on the formation of a nation's character. He died in the year 1406 A.C.

The Arabs invented the mariner's compass, and voyaged to all parts of the world in quest of knowledge or in the pursuit of commerce. They established colonies in Africa, far to the south in the Indian Archipelago, on the coasts of India, and on the Malayan Peninsula. Even China opened her barred gates to Moslem colonists and mercenaries. They discovered the Azores, and, it is even surmised, penetrated as far as America. Within the confines of the ancient continents they gave an unprecedented and almost unparalleled impulse in every direction to human industry. The Prophet had inculcated labour as a duty; he had given the impress of piety to industrial pursuits; he had recommended commerce and agriculture as meritorious in the sight of the Lord. These precepts had their natural result; the merchants, the traders, the industrial classes in general, were treated with respect; and governors, generals, and savants disdained not to call themselves by the title of their professions. The peace and security with which caravans traversed the empire; the perfect safety of the roads; the cisterns, and tanks, and reservoirs, and rest-houses which existed everywhere along the routes—all aided in the rapid development of commerce and trade, and arts and manufactures.

The Arabs covered the countries where they settled with networks of canals. To Spain they gave the system of irrigation by flood-gates, wheels, and pumps. Whole tracts of land that now lie waste and barren were covered with olive groves, and the environs of Seville alone, under Moslem rule, contained several thousand oil-factories. They introduced the staple products, rice, sugar, cotton, and nearly all the fine garden and orchard fruits, together with many less important plants, such as ginger, saffron, myrrh, etc. They opened up the mines

of copper, sulphur, mercury, and iron. They established the culture of silk, the manufacture of paper and other textile fabrics; of porcelain, earthenware, iron, steel, and leather. The tapestries of Cordova, the woollen stuffs of Murcia, the silks of Grenada, Almeria, and Seville, the steel and gold work of Toledo, the paper of Salibah were sought all over the world. The ports of Malaga, Carthagena, Barcelona, and Cadiz were vast commercial emporiums for export and import. In the days of their prosperity the Spanish Arabs maintained a merchant navy of more than a thousand ships. They had factories and representatives on the Danube. With Constantinople they possessed a great trade, which ramified from the Black Sea and the eastern shores of the Mediterranean into the interior of Asia, and reached the ports of India and China, and extended along the African coast as far as Madagascar. "In the midst of the tenth century, when Europe was about in the same condition that Caffraria is now, enlightened Moors, like Abul Cassem, were writing treatises on the principles of trade and commerce.". In order to supply an incentive to commercial enterprise, and to further the impulse to travel, geographical registers, gazetteers, and itineraries were published under the authority of Government, containing minute descriptions of the places to which they related, with particulars of the routes and other necessary matters. Travellers like Ibn-i-Batuta visited foreign lands in quest of information, and wrote voluminous works on the people of those countries, on their fauna and flora, their mineral products, their climatic and physical features, with astonishing perspicacity and keenness of observation.

The love of learning and arts was by no means confined to one sex. The culture and education of the women proceeded on parallel lines with that of the men, and women were as keen in the pursuit of literature and as devoted to science as men. They had their own colleges;[1] they studied medicine and jurisprudence, lectured on rhetoric, ethics, and belles-lettres, and participated with the stronger sex in the glories of a splendid civilisation. The wives and daughters of magnates and sovereigns spent their substance in founding colleges and endowing universities, in

1 One well-known institution of this kind was established in Cairo in 684 A. H. by the daughter of the Mameluke Sultan Malik Taher.

establishing hospitals for the sick, refuges for the homeless, the orphan, and the widow.[1]

The division and jealousy of the Arab tribes, which had prevented the assimilation and fusion of their several dialects, had nevertheless conduced to the enrichment of the national language as spoken in Hijaz, and the annual conflux of people at Okaz, with the periodical contest of the poets, had imparted to it a regularity and polish. But it was the Koran—"a book by the aid of which the Arabs conquered a world greater than that of Alexander the Great, greater than that of Rome, and in as many tens of years as the latter had wanted hundreds to accomplish her conquests; by the aid of which they alone of all the Shemites came to Europe as kings, whither the Phœnicians had come as tradesmen, and the Jews as fugitives or captives; came to Europe to hold up, together with these fugitives, the light to humanity;—they alone, while darkness lay around, to raise up the wisdom and knowledge of Hellas from the dead, to teach philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and the golden art of song to the West as to the East, to stand at the cradle of modern science, and to cause us late epigoni for ever to weep over the day when Grenada fell."[2]—it was this book which fixed and preserved for ever the Arabic tongue in all its purity. The simple grandeur of its diction, the chaste elegance of its style, the variety of its imageries, the rapid transitions, like flashes of lightning, which show the moralist teaching, the philosopher theosophising, the injured patriot denouncing in fervid expressions the immorality and degradation of his people, and withal the heavenly Father calling back through His servant His erring children,—all mark its unique character among religious records. And the awe and veneration with which the greatest poets of the day listened to its teachings, show how deeply it must have moved the people. Delivered at different times,—in moments

1 Zubaida, the wife of Hârûn, founded several such refuges; and the hospital built by the wife of Azd ud-dowla rivalled her husband's. The daughter of Malik Ashraf, known as the Khâtun, erected a splendid college at Damascus. Another college was founded by Zamurud Khâtun, wife of Nasir ud-dowla of Hems.

Many Moslem ladies were distinguished in poetry. Fâtima, the Prophet's daughter, holds a high rank among poets So does the daughter of Aurangzeb, Zeb un-nissa, surnamed *Makhfi*. When Urquhart travelled in Turkey, three of the most celebrated living poets were ladies, and one of them, Perishek Khânam, acted as private secretary to Sultan Mustafa.

2 Deutsch.

of persecution and anguish, or of energetic action, or enunciated for purposes of practical guidance,—there is yet a vitality, an earnestness and energy in every word, which differentiates it from all other Scriptures. Lest it be thought we are biassed in our opinion, we give the words of the great orientalist whom we have already quoted: "Those grand accents of joy and sorrow, of love, and valour, and passion, of which but faint echoes strike on our ears now, were full-toned at the time of Mohammed; and he had not merely to rival the illustrious of the illustrious, but excel them; to appeal to the superiority of what he said and sang as a very sign and proof of his mission. . . The poets before him had sung of love . . . Antara, himself the hero of the most famous novel, sings of the ruin, around which ever hover lovers' thoughts, of the dwelling of Abla, who is gone, and her dwelling-place knows her not. Mohammed sang none of these. No love-minstrelsy his, not the joys of this world, nor sword nor camel, not jealousy or human vengeance, not the glories of tribe or ancestors, nor the unmeaning, swiftly and forever-extinguished existence of man, were his themes. He preached *Islam*. And he preached it by rending the skies above and tearing open the ground below, by adjuring heaven and hell, the living and the dead."

Another great writer speaks of the Koran in the following terms: "If it is not poetry,—and it is hard to say whether it be or not,—it is more than poetry. It is not history, nor biography. It is not anthology, like the Sermon on the Mount; nor metaphysical dialectics, like the Buddhist Sutras; nor sublime homiletics, like Plato's conferences of the wise and foolish teachers. It is a prophet's cry, Semitic to the core; yet of a meaning so universal and so timely that all the voices of the age take it up, willing or unwilling, and it echoes over palaces and deserts, over cities and empires, first kindling its chosen hearts to world-conquest, then gathering itself up into a reconstructive force that all the creative light of Greece and Asia might penetrate the heavy gloom of Christian Europe, when Chrsitianity was but the Queen of Night." [1]

In general literature, embracing every phase of the human intellect, ethics, metaphysics, logic, rhetoric, the Moslem writers may be counted by hundreds. In poetry, the fertility of the Moslem

[1] Johnson.

mind has not been yet surpassed. From Mutannabi the Arab (not to go back to the poets who flourished in the time of the Prophet) to Halî the Indian, there is an endless succession of poets. Mutannabi flourished in the ninth century, and enjoyed the patronage of Ameer Saif ud-dowla (Abu'l Hassan Ali bin Hamdan). He was followed by Ibn-Duraid,[1] Abu-Ula,[2] Ibn Faridh,[3] Tantarâni,[4] and others. The Spanish Arabs were nature's poets ; they invented the different kinds of poetry, which afterwards were adopted as models by the Christian nations of southern Europe. Among the great poets who flourished in Spain the name of Ahmed ibn Mohammed (Abu-Omar)[5] is the most famous. We have already mentioned the poets who lived under Mahmûd ; Firdousi, who brought back to life the dead heroes of Iran, rivals the fame of the sovereign whom first he praised and and afterwards satirised. Under the later Ghaznavides and the Seljukides flourished the lyric poets Suzeni,[6] the creator of the Persian metrical system, and Watwat ; the panegyrists Anwarı,[7] Khakanı,[8] and Zuhair Faryabi :[9] the great mystics, Sanaï, [10] whose *Hadîka* is valued wherever the Persian language is known and appreciated, and Farîd ud-dîn Attar ; [11] and the romancist Nizâmi, the immortal bard of Khusrû and Shîrîn and of Alexander. Under the Atâbegs, who rose to power on the decline of the Seljukides, flourished the moralist Saadi and the mystic Jalal ud-din Rumi. Under Timur lived the sweet singer Hafiz (Shams ud-dın), called the Anacreon of Persia. These are but a very few of the names famous in the realm of poetry. The pages of Ibn-Khallikan, and of Lutf Ali Azar[12] speak more eloquently of the poetical genius of the Moslems.

Such were the glorious achievements of the Moslems in the field of intellect ; and all was due to the teachings of one man. Called by his voice from the abyss of barbarism and ignorance in which they had hitherto dwelt, with little hope of the present, with

[1] Died in A.C. 933.
[2] Died in A.C. 1057.
[3] Died in A.C. 1255.
[4] Died in A.C. 1092.
[5] A. C. 1175, A. H. 569.
[6] A. C. 1177, A. H. 573.

[7] Anwarî's panegyric on Sultan Sanjar is one of the finest poems in the Persian language. The Hindustani poet Sauda in the *Kasîda* in honour of Asaf ud-Dowla of Oudh has imitated Anwarî with great success.

[8] A. C. 1186, A. H. 582.
[9] A. C. 1201, A. H. 598.
[10] A. C 1180, A. H. 576.
[11] A. C. 1190, A. H. 586.

[12] The *Âtesh-Kadèh* ("Fire Temple") of Lutf Ali Âzar is the lives of the Persian poets from the earliest times, with specimens of their poetry.

none of the future, the Arab went into the world, to elevate and civilise. Afflicted humanity awoke into new life. Whilst the barbarians of Europe, who had overturned an effete empire, were groping in the darkness of ignorance and brutality, the Moslems were building up a great civilisation. During centuries of moral and intellectual desolation in Europe, Islam led the vanguard of progress. Christianity had established itself on the throne of the Cæsars, but it had failed to regenerate the nations of the earth. From the fourth century of the Christian era to the twelfth, the gloom that overshadowed Europe grew deeper and deeper. During these ages of ferocious bigotry Ecclesiasticism barred every access through which the light of knowledge, humanity, or civilisation could enter. But though jealously shut out from this land of fanaticism, the benignant influences of Islâmic culture in time made themselves felt in every part of Christendom. From the schools of Salerno, of Bagdad, of Damascus, of Grenada, of Cordova, of Malaga, the Moslems taught the world the gentle lessons of philosophy and the practical teachings of stern science. [1]

The first outburst of Rationalism in the West occurred in the province most amenable to the power of Moslem civilisation. Ecclesiasticism crushed this fair flower with fire and with sword, and threw back the progress of the world for centuries. But the principles of Free Thought, so strongly impressed on Islâm, had communicated their vitality to Christian Europe. Abelard had felt the power of Averroes' genius, which was shedding its light over the whole of the Western world. Abelard struck a blow for Free Thought which led to the eventual emancipation of Christendom from the bondage of Ecclesiasticism. Avenpace and Averroes were the precursors of Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke.

The influence of Abelard and of his school soon penetrated into England. Wycliffe's originality of thought and freedom of spirit took their rise from the bold conceptions of the former thinkers. The later German reformers, deriving their notions on one side from the iconoclasts of Constantinople, and on the other from the movements

[1] The impetus which Islâm gave to the intellectual development of mankind is evidenced by the fact that the Arabs were joined in the race for progress by members of nationalities which had hitherto lain absolutely dormant. Islam quickened the pulse of humanity and awakened new life in communities which were either dead or dying ; see Appendix II.

of the Albigenses and the Wycliffites, completed the work which had been commenced by others under foreign rationalistic influence.

While Christian Europe had placed learning under the ban of persecution; while the Vicar of Christ set the example of stifling the infant lispings of Free Thought; while the priests led the way in consigning to the flames thousands of inoffensive beings for mere aberration of reason; while Christian Europe was exorcising demons and worshipping rags and bones—learning flourished under the Moslem sovereigns, and was held in honour and veneration as never before. The Vicegerents of Mohammed allied themselves to the cause of civilisation, and assisted in the growth of Free Thought and Free Inquiry, originated and consecrated by the Prophet himself. Persecution for the sake of the faith was unknown; and whatever the political conduct of the sovereigns, the world has never had superior examples in their impartiality and absolute toleration of all creeds and religions. The cultivation of the physical sciences—that great index to the intellectual liberty of a nation—formed a popular pursuit among the Moslems.

The two failures of the Arabs, the one before Constantinople and the other in France, retarded the progress of the world for ages, and put back the hour-hand of time for centuries. Had the Arabs been less keen for the safety of their spoils, less divided among themselves, had they succeeded in driving before them the barbarian hosts of Charles Martel, the history of the darkest period in the annals of the world would never have been written. The Renaissance, civilisation, the growth of intellectual liberty, would have been accelerated by seven hundred years. We should not have had to shudder over the massacre of the Albigenses or of the Huguenots, or the ghastly slaughters of the Irish Catholics by the English Protestants under the Tudors and the Protectorate. We should not have had to mourn over the fate of a Bruno or of a Servetus, murdered by the hands of those who had revolted from their mother-church. The history of the *auto-da-fe*, of the murders of the Inquisition, of the massacres of the Aztecs and the Incas; the tale of the Thirty Years' War, with its manifold miseries,—all this would have remained untold. Above all, Spain, at one time the favoured haunt of learning and the arts, would not have become the intellectual desert it now is, bereft of the glories of centuries. Who has not mourned

over the fate of that noble race, exiled by the mad bigotry of a Christian sovereign from the country of its adoption, which it had made famous among nations? Justly has it been said, "In an ill-omened hour the Cross supplanted the Crescent on the towers of Grenada." The shades of the glorious dead, of Averroes and Avenpace, of Waladeh[1] and Âyesha, sit weeping by the ruined haunts of their people—haunts silent now to the voice of minstrelsy, of chivalry, of learning, and of art,—only echoing at times the mad outcries of religious combatants, at times the fierce sounds of political animosities. Christianity drove the descendants of these Moslem Andalusians into the desert, sucked out every element of vitality from beautiful Spain, and made the land a synonym for intellectual and moral desolation.[2]

If Maslamah had succeeded in capturing Constantinople,—the capital of Irene, the warm advocate of orthodoxy and cruel murderess of her own son,—the dark deeds which sully the annals of the Isaurians, the Comneni, the Palæologi, the terrible results which attended the seizure of Byzantium by the Latins, above all, the frightful outburst of the unholy wars, in which Christian Europe tried to strangle the nations of Asia, would probably never have come to pass. One thing at all events is certain, that if Constantinople had fallen into the hands of the Moslems, the iconoclastic movement would not have proved altogether abortive, and the reformation of the Christian Church would have been accomplished centuries earlier. Providence willed otherwise. The wave of Free Thought, which had reached the Isaurian emperors from the Islamic regions, broke upon the rocks of ignorance, superstition, and bigotry; its power was not felt until the combined action of the schools of Salerno and Cordova—the influence of Averroes, and perhaps of some Greeks who had imbibed learning at the Saracenic fountain—had battered down the rampart of Ecclesiasticism.

Islâm inaugurated the reign of intellectual liberty. It has been truly remarked, that so long as Islam retained its pristine character, it proved itself the warm protector and promoter of knowledge and civilisation,—the zealous ally of intellectual freedom. The

1 See *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan) p. 528 *note*.
2 For the economic condition of Spain and the state of arts and learning under the Arabs, see *ibid* pp. 474—580.

moment extraneous elements attached themselves to it, it lagged behind in the race of progress.

But, to explain the stagnation of the Moslems in the present day, it is necessary to glance back for a moment at the events that transpired in Spain, in Africa, and in Asia between the twelfth and the seventeenth centuries. In the former country, Christianity destroyed the intellectual life of the people. The Moslems had turned Spain into a garden; the Christians converted it into a desert. The Moslems had covered the land with colleges and schools; the Christians transformed them into churches for the worship of saints and images. The literary and scientific treasures amassed by the Moslem sovereigns were consigned to the flames. The Moslem men, women, and children were ruthlessly butchered or burnt at the stake; the few who were spared were reduced to slavery. Those who fled were thrown on the shores of Africa helpless beggars. It would take the combined charity of Jesus and Mohammed to make Islam forget or forgive the terrible wrongs inflicted by the Christians of Spain upon the Andalusian Moslems. But the punishment was not long in coming. Before the world was a century old, Spain's fire had sunk into a heap of ashes!

In Western Africa, the triumph of Patristicism under the third Almohade sovereign[1], and the uprise of Berber fanaticism turned back the tide of progress, arrested the civilisation of centuries, and converted the seats of learning and arts into centres of bigotry and ignorance. The settlement of the Corsairs on the Barbary coast and the anarchy which prevailed in Egypt under the later Mamelukes, discouraged the cultivation of peaceful knowledge. In Asia the decadence of the Timuride dynasty, the eruption of the wild and fanatical Uzbegs, and the establishment of their power in the capital of Timur, destroyed the intellectual vitality of the people.

1 On the decadence of the Fâtimide power in Western Africa there arose a dynasty descended from a *Marabout* or saint of the country, hence called Almoravide or *al-Marâbatia* (المرابطة). To this family belonged Yusuf ibn Tashfin, the patron of Ibn-Zuhr. His son and successor was defeated and killed by Abdu'l Momin, the founder of the dynasty of Almohades (*al-Muwahidîn*, الموحدين, the *Unitarians*), who sacked and destroyed Morocco and Fez. They were akin to the Wahâbis of Central Arabia, and probably not very different from the Mahdists of Central Africa. The first two sovereigns of this dynasty, Abdu'l Momin and Yusuf, encouraged learning and arts; in the reign of Yaakub al-Mansur, the third Almohade king, fanaticism became rampant.

In Persia, under the Seffavians, literature and science had begun to breathe once more; but this renaissance was only temporary, and with the invasion of the barbarous Afghans the renovated life of Iran came to an end. A deathlike gloom settled upon Central Asia, which still hangs heavy and lowering over these unhappy countries.

Under Selim, I., Solyman and the Murads, learning received support in the Ottoman dominions; but the Osmanlis were on the whole a military race. At first from ambition, afterwards from sheer necessity and for self-preservation, they have been at war with a relentless foe, whose designs know no slackening, whose purpose is inscrutable. Letters and arts, under such conditions, can make but little progress. Dealing with the charge of obscurantism which Christians are in the habit of levelling against Islam, (a charge which we trust, has been sufficiently refuted in the foregoing pages), M. Gobineau makes the following pregnant observation: "Imagine in any European country the absolute predominance of military and administrative despotism during a period of two hundred and fifty years, as is the case in Turkey; conceive something approaching the warlike anarchy of Egypt under the domination of foreign slaves—Circassians, Georgians, Turks, and Albanians; picture to yourself an Afghan invasion, as in Persia after 1730, the tyranny of Nâdir Shah, the cruelties and ravages that have marked the accession of the dynasty of the Kajars,—unite all these circumstances with their naturally concomitant causes, you will then understand what would have become of any European country although European, and it will not be necessary to look further for any explanation of the ruin of Oriental countries, nor to charge Islâm with any unjust responsibility."

From the time of its birth in the seventh century up to the end of the seventeenth, "not to descend later," Islam was animated by a scientific and literary spirit equal in force and energy to that which animates Europe of our own day. It carried the Moslems forward on a wave of progress, and enabled them to achieve a high degree of material and mental development. Since the eruption of the Goths and the Vandals, the progress of Europe has been on a continuous scale. No such calamity as has afflicted Asia, in the persons of the Tartars or the Uzbegs, has befallen Christendom since Attila's retreat from

France. Her wars, cruel and bitter, fierce and inhuman, have been waged on equal terms of humanity or inhumanity. Catholics and Protestants have burnt each other; but Europe has never witnessed, since the wholesale butcheries of the poor Spanish Moors, the terrible massacres committed by the Tartars in all the centres of civilisation and culture, in which fell the gifted classes who formed the backbone of the nation.[1]

And now,

پرده داری می کند در قصر قیصر عنکبوت
بوم نوبت می زند بر گنبد افراسیاب

The spider holds watch in the palace of Cæsar,
The owlet beats the drum on the tower of Afrasiab.

Who shall say that the Moslems of India may not, under the auspices of a great European power, be destined to restore to Western and Central Asia something of what their forefathers gave to Europe in the Middle Ages!

[1] The sack of Bagdad by the Mongols exemplifies what happened in other cities, but in order to give a true conception of the fearful atrocities perpetrated by the savages, it requires to be painted by another Gibbon. For three days the streets ran with blood, and the water of the Tigris was dyed red for miles along its course. The horrors of rapine, slaughter, and outraged humanity lasted for six weeks. The palaces, mosques, and mausoleums were destroyed by fire or levelled to the earth for their golden domes. The patients in the hospitals and the students and professors in the colleges were put to the sword. In the mausoleums the mortal remains of the sheikhs and pious imams, and in the academies the immortal works of great and learned men, were consumed to ashes; books were thrown into the fire, or, where that was distant and the Tigris near, were buried in the waters of the latter. The accumulated treasures of five centuries were thus lost for ever to humanity. The flower of the nation was completely destroyed.

CHAPTER X.

THE RATIONALISTIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL SPIRIT OF ISLÂM.

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّىٰ يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنْفُسِهِمْ [1]

LIKE all other nations of antiquity, the pre-Islâmite Arabs were stern fatalists. The remains of their ancient poetry, sole record of old Arab thought and manners, show that before the promulgation of Islam the people of the Peninsula had absolutely abandoned themselves to the idea of an irresistible and blind fatality. Man was but a sport in the hands of Fate. This idea bred a reckless contempt of death, and an utter disregard for human life. The teachings of Islam created a revolution in the Arab mind: with the recognition of a supreme Intelligence governing the universe, they received the conception of self-dependence and of moral responsibility founded on the liberty of human volition. One of the remarkable characteristics of the Koran is the curious, and, at first sight, inconsistent, manner in which it combines the existence of a Divine Will, which not only orders all things, but which acts directly upon men and addresses itself to the springs of thought in them, with the assertion of a free agency in man and of the liberty of intellect. Not that this feature is peculiar to the Moslem scripture; the same characteristic is to be found in the Biblical records. But in the Koran the conception of human responsibility is so strongly developed that the question naturally occurs to the mind, How can these two ideas be reconciled with each other? It seems inconsistent at first sight that man should be judged by his works, a doctrine which forms the foundation of Islamic morality, if all his actions are ruled by an all-powerful Will. The earnest faith of Mohammed

1 "God changes not as to what concerns any people until they change in respect to what depends upon themselves."

in an active ever-living Principle, joined to his trust in the progress of man, supplies a key to this mystery. I propose to illustrate my meaning by a reference to a few of the passages which give expression to the absolutism of the Divine Will and those which assert the liberty of human volition: "And God's ordering is in accordance with a determined decree ; . . . and the sun proceeding to its place of rest—that is an ordinance (تقدير) of the Almighty, the All-wise ;[1] . . . and among His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and of the animals which He hath distributed therein, which He has sovereign power to gather when He will ;[2] . . . and do they not see that God who created the heavens and the earth, and faltered not in creating these, has power to vivify the dead—nay, He has sovereign control over all things ;[3] and other things which are not at your command, but which are truly within His grasp, inasmuch as God is sovereign disposer of all things (على كل شيء قديرا) ;[4] nor is there anything not provided beforehand by Us, or which We send down otherwise than according to a fore-known decree ;[5] . . . the secrets of the heavens and the earth are God's ; . . . God has all things at command ;[6] . . . and propound to them a similitude of this present life, which is like water sent down by Us from heaven, so that the plants of the earth are fattened by it, and on the morrow become stubble, scattered by the winds,—God disposes of all things ;[7] . . . and it pertains to God's sovereignty to defend them ;[8] . . . God creates what He will ;[9] . . . and who created all things, and determined respecting the same with absolute determination ;[10] . . . and thy Lord is a supreme sovereign ;[11] . . . behold thou the imprints of the mercy of God : how He vivifies the earth, after it has died—in very deed, a restorer of life to the dead is there, and all things are at His bidding ;[12] . . . to God belongs whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is on the earth ; and whether ye disclose that which is within you or conceal it, God will reckon with you for it ; and He pardons whom He will, and punishes whom He will—inasmuch as God is a Supreme Sovereign ;[13] . . . say thou :

[1] xxxvi. 38. [2] xlii. 28. [3] xlvi. 32.
[4] xlviii. 21. [5] xv. 21. [6] xvi. 79. [7] xviii. 43.
[8] xxii. 40. [9] xxiv. 44. [10] xxv. 2. [11] xxv. 56.
[12] وهو على كل شيء قدير, xxx. 49. [13] ii. 284.

O God, Sovereign Disposer of dominion, Thou givest rule to whom Thou wilt, and takest away power from whom Thou wilt, Thou exaltest whom Thou wilt, and humblest whom Thou wilt: all good is at Thy disposal—verily, Thou art a Supreme Sovereign;[1] . . . God punishes whom He will, and pardons whom He will;[2] . . . to God belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and whatsoever they contain is His, and He is Sovereign over all things.[3] . . . Verily, God accomplishes what He ordains—He hath established for everything a fixed decree;[4] . . . but God has the measuring out (يقدّر) of the night and the day;[5] . . . extol the name of thy Lord, the Most High, who made the world, and fashioned it to completeness, who fore-ordained, and guides accordingly;[6] . . . as for the unbelievers. it matters nothing to them whether thou warnest them or dost not warn them; they will not believe; God hath sealed up their hearts and their ears;[7] . . . and the darkness of night is over their eyes;[8] . . . and God guides into the right path whomsoever He will;[9] . . . God is pleased to make your burthens light, inasmuch as man is by nature infirm. . . . God changes not as to what concerns any people until they change in respect to what depends upon themselves;[10] . . . say thou; Verily, God leads astray whomsoever He will, and directs to Himself those who are pentient."[11]

It will be noticed that, in many of these passages by "the decree of God" is clearly meant the law of nature. The stars and planets have each their appointed course; so has every other object in creation. The movements of the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of nature, life and death, are all governed by law. Other passages unquestionably indicate the idea of Divine agency upon human will; but they are again explained by others, in which that agency is "conditioned" upon human will. It is to the seeker for Divine help that God renders His help; it is on the searcher of his own heart, who purifies his soul from impure longings, that God bestows grace. To the Arabian Teacher, as to his predecessors, the existence of an Almighty Power, the Fashioner of the Universe, the Ruler of His

1 iii. 25. v. 44. 3 v. 120. 4 lxv. 3. 5 lxxiii. 20.
6 lxxxvii. 1-3. 7 ii. 5-6. 8 ii. 209 9 iv. 32.
10 إنّ الله لا يغيّر ما بقوم حتّى يغيّروا ما بانفسهم, xiii. 12. 11 xiii. 27.

creatures, was an intense and vivid reality. The feeling of "an assured trust" in an all-pervading, ever-conscious Personality, has been the motive power of the world in every age. To the weary mariner, "sailing on life's solemn main," there is nothing more assuring, nothing that more satisfies the intense longing for a better and purer world, than the consciousness of a Power above humanity to redress wrongs, to fulfil hopes, to help the forlorn. Our belief in God springs from the very essence of Divine ordinances. They are as much laws, in the strictest sense of the word, as laws which regulate the movements of the celestial bodies. But the will of God is not an arbitrary will: it is an educating will, to be obeyed by the scholar in his walks of learning as by the devotee in his cell.

The passages, however, in which human responsibility and the freedom of human will are laid down in emphatic terms define and limit the conception of absolutism. "And whosoever gets to himself a sin, gets it solely on his own responsibility; [1] . . . and let alone those who make a sport and a mockery of their religion, and whom this present world has deluded, and thereby bring to remembrance that any soul perishes for what it has got to itself; [2] and when they commit a deed of shame they say: We have found that our fathers did so, and God obliges us to do it; say thou: Surely, God requireth not shameful doing: [3] . . . they did injustice to themselves; [4] yonder will every soul experience that which it hath bargained for; [5] . . . so then, whosoever goes astray, he himself bears the whole responsibility of wandering."[6]

Man, within the limited sphere of his existenee, is absolute master of his conduct. He is responsible for his actions, and for the use or misuse of the powers with which he has been endowed. He may fall or rise, according to his own "inclination." There was supreme assistance for him who sought Divine help and guidance. Is not

[1] ومن يكسب إثما فانّما يكسبه على نفسه iv. 111.
[2] ان تبسل نفس بما كسبت, vi. 69.
[3] انّ الله لا يأمر بالفحشاء, vii. 69.
[4] ولكن كانوا انفسهم يظلمون, ix. 71.
[5] هنالك تبلوا كلّ نفس ما اسلفت, x. 31.
[6] فمن اهتدى فانما يهتدى لنفسه ومن ضلّ فانما يضلّ عليها, x. 108.

the soul purer and better in calling to its Lord for that help which He has promised? Are not the weak strengthened, the stricken comforted—by their own appeal to the Heavenly Father for solace and strength? Such were the ideas of the Teacher of Islam with regard to Divine sovereignty and the liberty of human volition. His recorded sayings handed down from sources which may be regarded as unquestionably authentic, help in explaining the conception he entertained about freewill and predestination (قضا و قدر or حبر و اختيار). Not only his own words, but those of his son-in-law, "the legitimate heir to his inspiration," and his immediate descendants, who derived their ideas from him, may well furnish us with a key to the true *Islamic* notion on the question of the free agency of man—a subject which has for ages, both in Islam and in Christianity, been the battle-ground of sectarian disputes. In discussing this subject, we must not, however, lose sight of of the fact that most of the traditions which have supplied to Patristicism its armoury of weapons against the sovereignty of reason, bear evident traces of being 'made to order.' They tell their own story of how, and the circumstances under which, they came into existence. Some of the traditions which purport to be handed down by men who came casually in contact with the Teacher, show palpable signs of changes and transformations in the minds and in the memories of the mediaries. The authentic sayings, however, are many, and I shall refer only to a few to explain what I have already indicated, that in Mohammed's mind an earnest belief in the liberty of human will was joined to a vivid trust in the personality of the heavenly Father. Hereditary depravity and natural sinfulness were emphatically denied. Every child of man was born pure and true; every departure in after-life from the path of truth and rectitude is due to education. "Every man is born religiously constituted; it is his parents who make him afterwards a Jew, Christian, or a Sabæan, like as ye take up the beast at its birth—do ye find upon it any mutilation, until ye yourselves mutilate it?" [1] Infants have no positive moral character: for about those who die in early life, "God

[1] قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ما من مولود الا يولد على الفطرة فابواه يهوّدانه و ينصرّانه و يمجّسانه كما تنتج البهيمة بهيمة جمعاء هل تحسّون

best knows what would have been their conduct" [had they lived to maturity]. "Every human being has two inclinations,—one prompting him to good and impelling him thereto, and the other prompting him to evil and thereto impelling him ;[1] but the godly assistance is nigh, and he who asks the help of God in contending with the evil promptings of his own heart obtains it." "It is your own conduct which will lead you to paradise or hell, as if you had been destined therefor." No man's conduct is the outcome of fatality, nor is he borne along by an irresistible decree to heaven or hell ; on the contrary, the ultimate result is the creation of his own actions, for each individual is primarily answerable for his future destiny. "Every moral agent is furthered to his own conduct," or, as it is put in another tradition : "Every one is divinely furthered in accordance with his character."[2] Human conduct is by no means fortuitous ; one act is the result of another ; and life, destiny, and character mean the connected series of incidents and actions which are related to each other, as cause and effect, by an ordained law, "the assignment" of God. In the sermons of the Disciple we find the doctrine more fully developed. "Weigh your own soul before the time for the weighing of your actions arrives ; take count with yourself before you are called upon to account for your conduct in this existence ; apply yourself to good and pure actions, adhere to the path of truth and rectitude before the soul is pressed to leave its earthly abode : verily, if you will not guide and warn yourself, none other can direct you." [3] "I adjure you to worship the Lord in purity and holiness. He has pointed out to you the path of salvation and the temptations of this world. Abstain from foulness, though it may be fair-seeming to your sight ; avoid evil, however pleasant. . . . For ye knoweth how far it takes you away from Him. . . . Listen, and take warning by the words of the Merciful Guardian." . . . And again, "O ye servants of my Lord, fulfil the duties that are imposed on you, for in their neglect is abasement : your good works alone will render easy

1 Bukhâri's *Collections*, chapter on the Hadîs, "He is secured whom God helps ;" reported by Abu Saîd al-Khazri.

2 اعملوا فكلّ ميسّر لما خلق له

3 *Nahj ul-Balâghat*, p. 43 (a collection of the *Khutbas* of the Caliph Ali by one of his descendants, named Sharîf Raza, mentioned by Ibn-Khallikan), printed at Tabriz in 1299 A H.

4 *Ibid*, p. 136.

the road to death. Remember, each sin increases the debt, and makes the chain [which binds you] heavier. The message of mercy has come; the path of truth is clear; obey the command that has been laid on you; live in purity, and work in piety, and ask God to help you in your endeavours, and to forgive your past transgressions."[1] "Cultivate humility and forbearance: comport yourself with piety and truth. Take count of your actions with your own conscience (نفس), for he who takes such count reaps a great reward, and he who neglects incurs great loss. He who acts with piety gives rest to his soul; he who takes warning understands the truth; he who understands it attains the perfect knowledge." These utterances convey no impression of predestinarianism; on the contrary, they portray a soul animated with a living faith in God, and yet full of trust in human development founded upon individual exertion springing from human volition. Mohammed's definition of reason and knowledge, of the cognition of the finite and infinite, remind us of Aristotelian phraseology and thought, and Ali's address to his son may be read with advantage by the admirer of Aristotelian ethics.

The *Ihtijâj ut-Tibrisi*[2] supplies further materials to form a correct opinion on the question of predestinarianism in Islam. The Caliph Ali was one day asked the meaning of *Kaza* (قضا) and *Kadar* (قدر); he replied, "The first means obedience to the commandments of God and avoidance of sin; the latter, the ability to live a holy life, and to do that which brings one nearer to God and to shun that which throws him away from His perfection . . . Say not that man is *compelled*, for that is attribution of tyranny to God; nor say that man has absolute discretion,[3]—rather that we are furthered by His help and grace in our endeavours to act righteously, and we transgress because of our neglect (of His commands)." One of his interlocutors, Utaba ibn Rabaa Asadi, asked him once as to the meaning of the words "there is no power nor help but from God,' لا حول و لا قوة الا بالله "It means," said the Caliph, "that I am not afraid of God's anger, but I am afraid of His purity; nor have I the power to observe His commandment, but my strength is

[1] *Nahj ul-Balâghat*, p. 170.

[2] *Evidences of Tibrisi*, a collection of traditions by the Shaikh ut-Tibrisi.

[3] *I.e.* to decide what is right and what is wrong.

in His assistance."[1] . . . God has placed us on earth to try each according to his endowments. Referring to the following and other passages of the Koran, the Caliph went on to say, "God says, 'We will try you to see who are the *strivers* (مجاهدين) [after truth and purity], and who are the forbearing and patient, and We will test your actions.' . . . and 'We will help you by degrees to attain what ye know not.'[2] . . . These verses prove the liberty of human volition."[3] Explaining the verse of the Koran, "God directs him whom He chooses, and leads astray him whom He chooses," the Caliph said that this does not mean that He compels men to evil or good, that He either gives direction or refuses it according to His caprice, for this would do away with all responsibility for human action; it means, on the contrary. that God points out the road to truth, and lets men choose as they will.[4]

Arabian philosophy, nurtured afterwards in other cradles, drew its first breath in the school of Medîna. The freedom of human will, based on the doctrine that man would be judged by the use he had made of his reason, was inculcated in the teachings of the Master, along with an earnest belief in a Supreme Power ruling the universe. The idea assumed a more definite shape in the words of the Disciple, and grew into a philosophy. From Medîna it was carried to Damascus, Kufa, Bussorah, and Bagdad, where it gave birth to the eclectic schools, which shed such lustre on the reigns of the early Abbassides.

The butchery of Kerbela and the sack of Medîna had led to the closing of the lecture-room of the Imams. With the appearance of Jaafar as-Sadik as the head of Mohammed's descendants, it acquired a new life. Extremely liberal and rationalistic in his views,—a scholar, a poet, and a philosopher, apparently well read in some of the foreign languages,—in constant contact with cultured Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians, with whom metaphysical disputations were frequent,—he impressed a distinct philosophical character on the Medînite school. Some of his views respecting predestination deserve to be mentioned.

1 *Ihtijâj ut-Tibrisi*, p. 236.

2 ولنبلونكم حتى نعلم المجاهدين منكم والصابرين ونبلو اخباركم وفى نولد ونستدرجهم من حيث لا يعلمون

3 *Ibid.* p. 237.

4 *Ibid.*

Speaking of the doctrine of *Jabr (compulsion* or predestinarianism), which had about this period made its appearance in Damascus, he expressed the following opinion: "Those who uphold *Jabr* make out God to be a participator in every sin they commit, and a tyrant for punishing those sins which they are impelled to commit by the compulsion of their being: this is infidelity." Then (giving the analogy of a servant sent by his master to the market to purchase something which he, the master, knows well that he cannot bring, not possessing the wherewithal to buy it, and, nevertheless, the master punishes him) the Imam adds, "the doctrine of *Jabr* converts God into an unjust Master." [1] As regards the opposite doctrine of *absolute liberty* (*Tafwîz, delegation of authority*)—meaning not the freedom of human will, but unqualified discretion in the choice of wrong and right, he declared that to affirm such a principle would destroy all the foundations of morality, and give to all human beings absolute licence in the indulgence of their animal propensities; for if each individual is vested with a discretion to choose what is right or wrong, no sanction, no law can have any force.[2] *Ikhtiâr* (اختيار) is therefore different from *Tafwîz* (تفويض), "God has endowed each human being with the capacity to understand His commands and to obey them. They who exert themselves to live purely and truly, them He helps: they are those who please Him; whilst they who disobey Him are sinners." These views are repeated with greater emphasis by the eighth Imâm, Ali ar-Razâ, who denounced *Jabr* (predestinarianism) and *Tashbîh* (anthropomorphism) as absolute infidelity,[3] and declared the upholders of those doctrines to be "the enemies of the Faith." He openly charged the advocates of *Jabr* and *Tashbih* with the fabrication of traditions. At the same time he warned his followers against the doctrine of *discretion* or *Tafwîz*. He laid down in broad terms, "God has pointed out to you the two paths, one of which leads you to Him, the other takes you far away from His perfection; you are at liberty to take the one or the other; pain or joy, reward or punishment, depend upon your own conduct. But man has not the capacity of turning evil into good, or sin into virtue"

1 *Ihtijâj ut-Tibrsi*, p. 236. 2 *Ibid.* p. 235.

3 He who believes in *Jabr* is a *Kafir; Ihtijâj ut-Tibrisi*, p. 214.

The Ommeyyades, many of whom remained pagans at heart even after the profession of Islam, were, like their forefathers, fatalists. Under them arose a school which purported to derive its doctrines from the "ancients," the *Salaf*, a body of primitive Moselms. All of them were dead; it was consequently easy to fabricate any tradition and pass it as handed down by one or other of them. Jahm bin Safwan was the founder of this school, which was called *Jabaria*. The *Jabarias*[1] rivalled Calvin in the absolute denial of free-will to man. They maintained "that man is not responsible for any of his actions which proceed entirely from God;[2] that he has no determining power to do any act, nor does he possess the capacity of free volition; that he is the subject of absolute Divine sovereignty in his actions, without ability on his part, or will or power of choice; and that God absolutely creates actions within him just as He produces activity in all inanimate things;.....and that reward and punishment are subject to absolute Divine sovereignty in human actions." The *Jabarias* maintained certain views regarding Divine attributes which have no particular significance.[3] According to Shahristani, the *Jabarias* were divided into three sects, *viz.*: the *Jahmia*, the *Najjâria*, and the *Zirâria*, differing from each other on minor points; but, so far as the doctrine of predestination was concerned, all of them were agreed in denying free agency. The *Najjârias*, who, after undergoing several transformations, developed two centuries later into the Ashaarias, maintained that God creates the conduct of His creatures, good and bad, virtuous and vicious, while man appropriates the same. The *Jabaria* doctrines found favour with the Ommeyyade rulers, and soon spread among the people.

The uncompromising fatalism of the *Jabarias* occasioned among the thinking classes a revolt, which was headed by Maabad al-Juhni, Eunas al-Aswari, and Gilan Dimishki (*i. e.* of Damascus), who had

[1] Shahristâni divides the *Jabarias* into two branches, one being *Jabarias* pure and simple, and the other more moderate. The first maintained that neither action nor the ability to act belongs in any sense to man (نسبت للعبد فعلا ولا قدرة على الفعل اصلا); the latter held that man has an ability which is not at all efficacious (تثبت للعبد قدرة غير مؤثرة اصلا).

[2] الجبر هو نفى الفعل حقيقة عن العبد و اضافته الى الرب تعالى

[3] Shahristâni, part i. p. 59.

evidently derived many of their ideas from the Fâtimides. They boldly asserted in the capital of the Ommeyyades, in the very stronghold of predestinarianism, the free agency of man.[1] But in the assertion of human liberty they sometimes verged on the doctrine of *Tafwîz*. From Damascus the dispute was carried to Bussorah, and there the differences of the two parties waxed high. The *Jabarias* merged into a new sect, called the *Sifâtias*,[2] who, with predestinarianism, combined the affirmation of certain attributes in the Deity as distinct from His Essence, which the *Jabarias* denied. The *Sifâtias* claimed to be the direct representatives of the *Salaf*. According to Shahristâni, these followers of the *Salaf* "maintained that certain eternal attributes pertain to God, namely, knowledge, power, life, will, hearing, sight, speech, majesty, magnanimity, bounty, beneficence, glory, and greatness,—making no distinction between attributes of essence and attributes of action. . . . They also assert certain descriptive attributes (صفات خبريه), as, for example, hands and face, without any other explanation than to say that these attributes enter into the *revealed* representation of the Deity, and that, accordingly, they had given them the name of descriptive attributes." Like the *Jabarias*, they adhered to the doctrine of predestination in all its gloominess and intensity. From the *Sifâtias* sprung the *Mushabbahas*, "who likened the Divine attributes to the attributes of created things," [3] and turned God into a similitude of their own selves,[4] At this period one of the most noted professors belonging to the anti-predestinarian party was Imam Hassan, surnamed al-Basri (from his place of residence). He was a Medinite by birth, and had actually sat at the feet of "the Philosophers of the family of Mohammed." He had imbibed their liberal and rationalistic ideas, and, on settling at Busssorah, had started a lecture-room, which was soon thronged by the students of Irak.

1 Shahristâni, part i. pp. 59–63.

2 *Lit.* Attributists.

3 التشبيه بصفات المحدثات

4 Shahristâni draws a distinction between the *Sifâtia* anthroponiorphists and those who came into existence later. "At a later period certain persons went beyond what had been professed by any who held to the primitive faith, and said that undoubtedly those expressions [denoting the attributes] are used in the literal sense, and are to be interpreted just as they stand, without resort to figurative interpretation, and at the same time, without insisting upon the literal sense alone, whereby they fell into pure anthropomorphism (التشبيه الصرف) in violation of the primitive Moslem faith."

Here he discoursed on the metaphysical questions of the day in the spirit of his masters.

One of his most prominent pupils was Abû Huzaifa Wâsil bin Aatâ al-Ghazzal, [1] a man of great mental powers, thoroughly versed in the sciences and traditions, who had also studied in the lecture-room of Medîna. He seceded from Imam Hassan on a question of religious dogma, and founded a school of his own. His followers have, from the fact of his secession, been called *Mutazalas*, or *Ahl-ul-Itizâl*, Dissenters. [2] He soon rivalled the fame of his master, whose school before long practically merged in that of the pupil. Impulsive, like Luther, he often overstepped the bounds of moderation in his antagonism against intellectual tyranny, and gave utterance to views, especially on the disputes raised by Muawiyah against the Caliph Ali, which were in conflict with those entertained at Medîna. Yet the general rationalism of his school rallied the strongest and most liberal minds round his standard. Proceeding upon the lines of the Fatimide philosophers, and appropriating the principles which they had laid down and the ideas to which they had often given forcible expression, he formulated into theses the doctrines which constitute the basis of his difference from the predestinarian schools and from Patristicism generally. For several centuries his school dominated over the intellects of men, and with the support of the enlightened rulers who during this period held the reins of government, it gave an impetus to the development of national and intellectual life among the Saracens such as had never been witnessed before. Distinguished scholars, prominent physicists, mathematicians, historians—all the world of intellect in fact, including the Caliphs, belonged to the Mutazalite school. [3]

Men like Abu'l Huzail Hamdân, [4] Ibrâhîm ibn Saiyâr an-Nazzâm, [4] Ahmed ibn Hait, Fazl al-Hadasi, and Abu Ali Mohammed al-Jubbaï, [5]

[1] ابو حذيفه واصل بن عطا الغزال. He lived in the days of Abd ul-Malik, Walîd and Hishâm. He was born in 83 A. H. (699-700 A. C.) and died in 131 A.H. (748-9 A. C.)

[2] Shahristani, p. 31 ; *Gouhar-i-Murad (vide post)*.

[3] We may mention here two or three prominent Mutazalas whose names are still famous, *e. g.* Imam Zamakhshari, the author of the *Kashshâf*, admittedly the best and most erudite commentary on the Koran ; Masudi, "Imam, historian, and philosopher ;" the famous Al-Hazen, Abu'l Wafa, and Mirkhond.

[4] Died A.H 235 (A.C. 849–850), in the beginning of al-Mutawakkil's Caliphate.

[5] A nephew of Abu'l Huzail. [6] Born in 861 ; died in 933.

well read in Greek philosophy and logic, amalgamated many ideas borrowed from those sources with the Medinite conceptions, and impressed a new feature on the philosophical notions of the Moslems. The study of Aristotle, Porphyry, and other Greek and Alexandrian writers gave birth to a new science among the Mutazalas, which was called *Ilm-ul-Kalâm*, "the science of reason" (*Kalâm*, *logos*),[1] with which they fought both against the external as well as the internal enemies of the Faith,—the non-Moslems who assailed the teachings of Islam from outside, and the patristic Moslems who aimed at its degradation from within. The extreme views of Wasil on the political questions which had agitated the Caliphate of Ali were before long abandoned, with the result that moderate Mutazalaism became substantially amalgamated with the rationalism of the Fatimide school, whence it had sprung. It is a well-known fact that the chief doctors of the Mutazalite school were educated under the Fatimides, and there can hardly be any doubt that moderate Mutazalaism represented the views of the Caliph Ali and the most liberal of his early descendants, and probably of Mohammed himself. A careful comparison of the Mutazalite doctrines will show that they were either word for word the same as were taught by the early Fatimides, or were modifications of those doctrines induced by the requirements of a progressive society, and partly, perhaps, by the study of Greek and Alexandrian philosophy.

The Caliph Ali had condemned in emphatic language all anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conceptions of the Deity. "God was not like any object that the human mind can conceive; no attribute can be ascribed to Him which bore the least resemblance to any quality of which human beings have perception from their knowledge of material objects. The perfection of piety consists in *knowing* God; the perfection of knowledge is the affirmation of His verity; the perfection of verity is to acknowledge His unity in all sincerity; and the perfection of sincerity is to deny all attributes to the Deity . . . و كمال الاخلاص له نفي الصفات عنه. He who refers an attribute to God believes the attribute to be God, and he who so believes an attribute to be God, regards God as two or part of one. . . . He who asks where God is, assimilates Him with some object. God is the Creator, not because He Himself is created; God is ex-

1 Shahristâni, p. 18; Ibn-Khaldûn.

istent, not because He was non-existent. He is with every object, not from resemblance or nearness; He is outside of everything not from separation. He is the Primary Cause (فاعل), not in the meaning of motion or action; He is the Seer, but no sight can see Him. He has no relation to place, time, or measure.[1] . . . God is Omniscient, because knowledge is His Essence; Mighty, because Power is His Essence; Loving, because Love is His Essence . . . not because these are attributes apart from His Essence. . . . The conditions of time or space were wholly inapplicable to Him." . . .[2] *Takdîr* (تقدير), construed by the followers of the *Salaf* to mean predestination, meant "weighing," "probation," "trial."

Let us see now what Mutazalaism is. On many minor and subsidiary points the prominent Mutazalite doctors differed among themselves; but I shall give here a sketch of the doctrines on which they were in accord. According to Shahristani, the Mutazalas[3] declare that "eternity is the distinguishing attribute of the Divine Being; that God is Eternal, for Eternity is the peculiar property of His Essence; they unanimously deny the existence of eternal (Divine) qualities (الصفات القديمة) [as distinct from His being], and maintain that He is Omniscient as to His being; Living as to His being; Almighty as to His being; but not through any knowledge, power, or life existing in Him as eternal attributes; for knowledge, power, and life are part of His Essence. Otherwise, if they are to be looked upon as eternal attributes of the Deity (separate from His Essence), it would tend to the affirmation of a multiplicity of eternal entities. . . . They also maintain that the WORD of God is created, and when created, is expressed in letters and sounds. . . . In like manner they unanimously denied that willing, hearing, and seeing are ideas

1 *Nahj-ul-Balâghat*; see the comment of Ibn-i-Abi'l Hadîd, the Mutazalite.

2 From the Imam Jaafar as-Sadik, *ibid.*

3 "The Mutazalas called themselves," says Shahristani, "*Ashâb-ul-aadl wa't-tauhîd*, 'people of justice and unity,' and sometimes *Kadarias.*" As a matter of fact, however, the designation of *Kadaria* was never applied by the Mutazalas to themselves; it was applied by their enemies to the extreme Mutazalas who maintained the doctrine of *Tafwîz*, and which was condemned by the Fâtimide Imâms. They always repudiated that designation, and applied it to the predestinarians, who asserted that God is the Creator of every human action. Shahristani admits this, and says,—

و قالوا لفظ القدرية يطلق على من يقول بالقدر خيره و شره من الله تعالى

But he tries to refute the applicability of the word *Kadaria* to the predestinarians. "How can it apply to those who *trust* in God;" Shahristani, p. 30.

subsistent in the Divine Being, though differing as to the modes of their existence and their metaphysical grounds."[1] "They deny unanimously that God can be beheld in the *Dâr-ul-Karâr* (in the Abode of Rest) with the corporeal sight. They forbid the describing of God by any quality belonging to material objects, either by way of direction, or location, or appearance, or body, or change, or cessation of action, or dissolution; and they have explained the passages of the Koran in which expressions implying these qualities have been used, by asserting that the expressions are used figuratively and not literally. And this doctrine they call *Tauhîd*, 'assertion of Divine unity.' . . . They also agree in believing that man is the creative efficient of his actions, good and bad (ان العدد قادر خالق لافعاله خيرها و شرها), and gets reward and punishment in the future world by merit for what he does; and that no moral evil, or iniquity of action, or unbelief, or disobedience, can be referred to God, because, if he had caused unrighteousness to be, He would be Himself unrighteous (لانه لو خلق الظلم كان ظالما) . . . . They also unanimously maintain that the All-wise does only that which is beneficial and good (لا يفعل الا الصلاح و الخير), and that a regard in the light of wisdom (من حيث الحكمة) for the good of humanity (مصالح العباد) is incumbent upon Him, though they differed as to His being obligated to secure the highest good, and to bestow grace (و اما الاصلح و اللطف وفي وجوبه خلاف عندهم). And this doctrine they call the doctrine of *aadl*, or justice."

They further hold that there is no eternal law as regards human actions; that the Divine ordinances which regulate the conduct of men are the result of growth and development; that God has commanded and forbidden by a law which grew gradually. At the same time, they say that he who works righteousness merits rewards, and he who works evil deserves punishment; and this, they say, is consonant with reason. The Mutazalas also say that all knowledge is attained through reason, and must necessarily be so obtained. They hold that the cognition of good and evil is also within the province of reason; that nothing is known to be wrong or right until reason has enlightened us as to the distinction; and that thankfulness for the blessings of the Benefactor is made obligatory by reason, even

[1] Shahristâni, p. 30.

before the promulgation of any law on the subject. They maintain that the knowledge of God is within the province of reason ; and, with the exception of Himself, everything else is liable to change or to suffer extinction. "They also maintain that the Almighty has sent His Prophets to explain to mankind His commandments. . . . They differ among themselves as to the question of the Imâmate ; some maintaining that it descended by appointment, others holding to the right of the people to elect." The Mutazalas are, therefore, the direct antitheses of the *Sifatias*, for "these and all *other Ahl-us-Sunnat* hold that God does whatever He pleases, for He is the Sovereign Lord of His dominions, and whatever He wishes He orders . . . and this is *aadl* (justice) according to them. According to the *Ahl-ul-Itizâl*, what accords with Reason and Wisdom only is justice (*aadl*), and the doing of acts for (or according to) the good and well-being [of mankind], على وجه الصواب و المصلحة . The *Ahl-ul-aadl* say that God has commanded and forbidden by created words. According to the *Ahl-us-Sunnat* (the Sifâtias), all that is obligatory is known from hearsay (سمع) ; (secular) knowledge only is attained by reason; Reason cannot tell us what is good, or what is bad, or what is obligatory. The *Ahl-ul-aadl* say (on the contrary) that *all* knowledge comes through reason.[1] They referred that term of tradition 'pre-destination' to trial and deliverance, adversity and prosperity, sickness and health, death and life, and other doings of God, exclusive of moral good and evil, virtue and vice, regarding men as responsible for the latter, (دون الخير و الشر و الحسن و القبيح الصادرين من اكساب العباد) and it is in the same sense that the whole community of the Mutazala employ that term."

Thus far we have given the views of the school as a body ; but there were certain opinions held by the prominent doctors individually, which, though not accepted beyond the immediate circle of their particular disciples, are yet deserving of notice. For example Abû-Huzail Hamdân maintained that the Creator is knowing by virtue of knowledge, but that His knowledge is His Essence ; powerful by virtue of power, but that His power is His Essence ; living by virtue of life, but that His life is His Essence. "A view," says Shahristani, "adopted from the Philosophers," but really taken from

[1] Shahristâni, p. 31.

the Medînite school. He also affirmed that free will (السلامة) is an accident (عرض), additional to perfection of development and soundness (الصحة). Ibrahim ibn Saiyar an-Nazzam, "a diligent student of the books of the Philosophers," maintained "that without a revelation, man is capable, by reflection, of recognising the Creator, and of distinguishing between virtue and vice . . . and that the Doer of Righteousness possessed not the capacity to do wrong." Muammar ibn Abbad as-Sulami advanced the Platonic theory of "archetypes." He maintained that accidents are permanent in the several species of things to which they belong (فى كل نوع لاتناهى), and that every accident subsists in a subject, though its subsistence therein is only by virtue of some idea (in the human mind). Muammar and his followers were in consequenee of this doctrine called Idealists (اصحاب المعانى). Abu Ali Mohammed ibn Abdul Wahhab, known as Abu Ali al-Jubbai, maintained that action pertains to man in the way of origination and first production; and ascribed to man moral good and evil, obedience and disobedience, in the way of sovereignty and prerogative; and that free will (الاستطاعة) is a pre-requisite to action, and a power additional to bodily completeness and soundness of the members. Abu'l Maali aj-Juwaini,' [1] *Imâm-ul-Haramain* (*i. e.* of the two sacred cities), who, however, did not call himself a Mutazala, and is generally claimed by the upholders of the opposite doctrine as belonging to their body, held that the denial of ability and free will is something which reason and consciousness disavow; that to affirm an ability without any sort of efficacy is equivalent to denying ability altogether, and that to affirm some unintelligible influence (of ability), which constitutes *a motive cause*, amounts to the denial of any special influence, and that, inasmuch as *conditions and states*, on the principle of those who maintain them, are not to be characterised as existing or non-existing (but must be explained by reference to their origin), action on the part of man (regarded as an existing state) is to be attributed really to his own ability,—though not in the way of origination and creation, for by creation is meant the causing of something to come into being by supreme power which was not previously in existence; and that action depends for its existence upon ability (in man), which

[1] Died 1085.

itself depends for its existence upon some other cause, its relation to that cause being the same as the relation of (human) action to (man's) ability, and so one cause depends upon another until the *causa causans* (مسبب الاسباب), the Creator of causes and of their operations, the Absolute Self-sufficing, is reached. "This view," adds Shahristani, "was borrowed by Abu'l Maali from the Philosophers of the theistic school, but he presented it in the garb of the *Kalâm* (scholastic theology)."[1]

This is the general outline of the philosophical notions of the Mutalazas respecting some of the most burning questions which have agitated the mind of man in every age and country, and have so frequently led to sanguinary strifes and fratricidal wars both in the East and in the West.

As the assertors of divine Unity, shorn of all anthropomorphic conceptions, and the advocates of moral responsibility, they naturally called themselves *ashab-ul-aadl wa't-tauhîd*, "upholders of the Unity and Justice of God," and designated their opponents *Mushabbahas* ("assimilators" or anthropomorphists). They reasoned thus: If sin emanated from, or was created by God, and man was pre-ordained to commit it, the imposition of any penalty for its commission would make the Creator an Unrighteous God,—which is infidelity: thus reason and revelation both tell us that piety and sin, virtue and vice, evil and good, are the product of human volition; man has absolute control over his actions, though he has been told what is right and what is wrong. Evil and good depend upon what is just; for God's creation is ruled by justice. Reason and justice are the guiding principles of human actions; and general usefulness and the promotion of the happiness of mankind at large, the chief criterion of right and wrong. Has not God Himself declared that "the two Paths were shown to mankind for their own good? Has He not Himself called upon them to exercise their understanding?" Rationalists and Utilitarians, they based the foundations of the moral law on the concordance of Reason with positive revelation. They walked in the footsteps of the Master and his immediate descendants. They upheld the doctrine of Evolution in

[1] Comp. Juwaini's views with those of Ibn-Rushd (Averroes). Shahristâni evidently had not made himself acquainted with the views of the Fatimide Imams; Shahristani, part i. pp. 70, 71. The views of Abu'l Maali do not commend themselves to the "orthodox" Shahristani.

regarding every law that regulates the mutual relations of man to man as the result and outcome of a process of continuous development. In their ideas of the long antiquity of man on earth,[1] they occupy a vantage ground in relation to the natural philosophers of the modern world.

Mutazalaism spread rapidly among all the thinking and cultured classes in every part of the Empire, and finding its way into Spain took possession of the Andalusian colleges and academies. Mansûr and his immediate successors encouraged Rationalism, but made no open profession of the Mutazalite doctrines. Mamun, who deserves more justly than any other Asiatic sovereign the title of "Great," acknowledged his adhesion to the Mutazalite school; and he and his brother Mutassim and nephew Wasik, endeavoured to infuse the rationalistic spirit into the whole Moslem world. Under them Rationalism acquired a predominance such as it has not gained perhaps even in modern times in European countries. The Rationalists preached in the mosques and lectured in the colleges; they had the moulding of the character of the nation's youth in their hands; they were the chief counsellors of the Caliphs, and it cannot be gainsaid that they used their influence wisely. As professors, preachers, scientists, physicians, viziers, or provincial governors, they helped in the growth and development of the Saracenic nation. The rise of the Banı-Idrîs in Western Africa, and the establishment of the Fatimide power imparted a new life to Mutazalaism after its glory had come to an end in Asia.

The question now naturally occurs to the mind, how is it that predestinarianism and the subjection of Reason to blind authority, though discountenanced by the Prophet and the Philosophers of his family, became finally predominant in the speculations and practice of the Moslem world? Before we furnish an answer to this inquiry, let us trace the development of another phase of the Moslem intellect. Mutazalaism has been, with considerable plausibility, compared to the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages in Europe. Scholasticism is said to have been "the movement of the intellect to justify by reason several of the dogmas of the Faith." Mutazalaism also directed its endeavours to establish a concordance

1 They derived this notion from a *Hadîs* reported from Ali, *Bihâr-ul-Anwâr*, chapter on Creation.

between Reason and positive revelation. But there the parallel ends. In the Christian Church, the dogmas requiring explanation and justification were many. The doctrine of the trinity in unity, of the three "Natures" in one, of original sin, of transubstantiation, all gave rise to a certain intellectual tension. The dogmas of the Church accordingly required some such "solvent" as scholasticism before science and free thought could find their way into Christendom. In Islam the case was otherwise; with the exception of the unity of God—the doctrine of *Tauhîd*, which was the foundation of Mohammed's Church—there was no *dogma* upon which insistence was placed in any such form as to compel Reason to hold back its acceptance. The doctrine of "origin and return"—*mabdâ* (مبدأ) and *maâd* (معاد), "coming (from God) and returning (to Him)"—and of the moral responsibility of man, was founded on the conception of a Primal Cause—the Originator of all things. That the *Ego* will not be entirely lost after it has been set apart from its earthly habiliments, that it will exist as a self-conscious entity after the dissolution of the body, is a notion which has been shared alike by the wise and the ignorant. Some few have denied a future existence, but the generality have believed in it, though all have differed as to the nature of that existence. So also as regards moral responsibity, there is great divergence of opinion on the mode in which man shall discharge the obligation; but there is little difference on the question that he is responsible for the use or misuse of his powers. On both these questions the words of the Teacher allow the greatest latitude of judgment; so long as the original conceptions were retained and accepted, Mohammed's Church permitted the broadest and most rationalistic view. Hence it was that Islam passed at once from the Age of Receptivity into the Age of Activity, from the Age of Faith into the Age of Reason, without any such intermediate stage as was required in Christianity.

In the Prophet's time, as well under the *Rashidîn* Caliphs, no doubt, free independent inquiry was naturally. and perhaps rightly, discouraged. But no questioning was avoided, no doubt was silenced by the terror of authority, and if the teacher was unable to answer the question, the inability was avowed in all humility.[1] Mutazalaism holds therefore a distinctive place in the development of

[1] The answer was, "God knows best."

the human intellect. It bears an analogy to European scholasticism, but in reality it is akin in genius to modern rationalism. Scholasticism worked under the shadow of the Church. Mutazalaism worked in conjunction with the heads of the Church. The real scholasticism of Islâm came later.

The cultivation of the physical sciences gave a new direction to Saracenic genius. A body of thinkers sprang up, who received the generic name of *Hukama* (pl. of *hakîm*, a scientist or philosopher), whose method of reasoning was analogous to that of modern science. They were mostly Mutazalas, but the conceptions of a few were tinged by the philosophical notions of Aristotle and the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria. Though bigotry and ignorance stigmatised them with the opprobrious epithets of infidel and heretic, historical verity must admit that they did not exclude themselves from Islam, nor advance any theory for which they were unable to find a warrant in the sayings of the Founder of the Faith or his immediate descendants.

The doctine of evolution and progressive development to which these philosophers adhered most strongly has been propounded in clear terms by one of their prominent representatives, the famous Al-Hazen. The philosophical notions on this subject may be summarised thus: "In the region of existing matter, the mineral kingdom comes lowest, then comes the vegetable kingdom, then the animal, and finally the human being. By his body he belongs to the material world, but by his soul he appertains to the spiritual or immaterial. Above him are only the purely spiritual beings,—the angels,[1]—above whom only is God; thus the lowest is combined by a chain of progress to the highest. But the human soul perpetually strives to cast off the bonds of matter, and, becoming free, it soars upwards again to God, from whom it emanated." And these notions found expression later in the *Masnavi* of Moulana Jalal ud-dın, whose "orthodoxy" can hardly be questioned,—

از جمادي مردم و نامی شدم
وز نما مردم بحیـــوان ســـ وزدم
مردم از حیوانی و آدم شدم

[1] The author of the *Gouhar-i-Murâd*, to which I shall refer later in some detail, explains that what are called in "the language of theology" "angels," are the forces of nature in the language of *Hikmat*.

پس چه ترسم کی ز مردن کم شوم
حملهٔ دیگر بمیرم از بشر
تا بر آرم از ملائک بال و پر
بار دیگر از ملک پران شوم
آنچه اندروهم ناید آن شوم
پس عدم گردم عدم چون ارغنون
گویدم کانا الیه راجعون

"Dying from the inorganic we developed into the vegetable kingdom. Dying from the vegetable we rose to the animal. And leaving the animal we became men. Then what fear that death will lower us? The next transition will make us angels. From angels we shall rise and become what no mind can conceive; we shall merge in Infinity as in the beginning. Have we not been told, 'All of us will return unto Him'?"

The greatest of the philosophers were al-Kindi, al-Fârâbi, Ibn-Sîna, Ibn-Bâja, Ibn-Tufail, and Ibn-Rushd.[1]

Al-Kindi[2] (Abû Yusuf Yaakûb ibn Ishâk), surnamed the Philosopher *par excellence*, was a descendant of the illustrious family of Kinda, and counted among his ancestors several of the princes of Arabia. His father, Ishak bin as-Sabbah, was the governor of Kufa under al-Mahdi, al-Hâdi, and Hârûn. Al-Kindi, who prosecuted his studies at Bussorah and Bagdad, rendered himself famous under the Caliphs Mamun and Mutassim by the versatility of his genius and the profoundness of his knowledge. He wrote on philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, politics, music, etc. Versed in the languages of the Greeks, the Persians and the Indians, thoroughly acquainted with their sciences and philosophy, he was selected by Mamun for the work of translating Aristotle and other Greek writers into Arabic. "Cardan," says Munk, "places him among the twelve geniuses of the first order who had appeared in the world up to the sixteenth century."

1 Shahristâni mentions several others, such as—Yahya al-Nahwy, Abu'l Faraj al-Mufassir, Abu Sulaiman al-Sajzy, Abu Bakr Sabit bin Kurrah, Abu Sulaiman Mohammed al-Mukaddasi, Abu Tamam Yusuf bin Mohammed Nishapuri, Abu Zaid Ahmed bin Saha al-Balkhî, Abu Muharib al-Hassan bin-Sahal bin Muharib al-Kumy, Ahmed bin Tyeb al-Sarrakhsy, Talha bin Mohammed al-Nafsy, Abu Hamid Ahmed bin Mohammed al-Safzari, Isa bin Ali al-Wazîr, Abu Ali Ahmed bin Muskuya, Abu Zakaria Yahya bin Aadi al-Zumairi, Abu'l Hassan al-Aamri. He does not mention a single Spanish philosopher.

2 813 to 842 A.C; see Appendix II.

Abû Nasr *Fârâbi* (Abû Nasr Mohammed bin Mohammed Turkhan *al-Farâbi*), so called from his native city of Farab in Transoxiana, was a distinguished physician, mathematician, and philosopher. He is regarded as the most learned and subtle of the commentators of Aristotle. He enjoyed the patronage of Saif ud-dowla Ali bin Hamdan, Prince of Aleppo, and died at Damascus in the month of Rajab 339 A. H., (December 950 A.C.). Among his various works some may be mentioned here to show the tendency of the Arab mind in that prolific age. In the *Encyclopædia of Science* (*Ihsâ ul-ulûm*) he gives a general review of all the sciences. A Latin epitome of this work gives an idea of the range over which it extends, being divided into five parts dealing with the different branches of science, viz. language, logic, mathematics, natural sciences, and political and social economy. Another celebrated work of Farabi, largely utilised by Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus, was his commentary on Aristotle's *Organon*. His *Tendency of the Philosophies of Plato and Aristotle*, his treatise on ethics, entitled *as-Sîrat ul-Fâzila*, and another on politics, called *as-Sîâsat ul-Medîneyya*, which forms part of a larger and more comprehensive work bearing the name of *Mabâdi-ul-Moujûdât*, show the versatile character of his intellect. Besides philosophy and medicine, Farabi cultivated music, which he elevated into a science. He wrote several treatises both on the theory and the art of music, as well as the manufacture of musical instruments. In one he compared the systems of music among the ancients with that in vogue in his own time. Abu'l Kasim Kinderski, no mean judge, places Farabi on a level with his great successor, Ibn-Sîna.[1]

Of Ibn-Sîna I have already spoken as a physician. As a philosopher he occupies a position hardly inferior to that of the great Stagyrite. He was unquestionably the master-spirit of his age, and in spite of the opposition raised against him by fanaticism and self-interest, he left his impress in undying characters on the thoughts of succeeding ages. His voluminous works testify to the extraordinary activity of his mind.[2] He systematised Aristotelian philosophy, and filled "the void between God and man" in Aristotle's fragmentary psychology by the doctrine of the intelli-

[1] See Appendix II.

[2] His two greatest works on philosophy and science, the *Shafa* and the *Najât*, still exist intact.

gence of the spheres conceived after a scientific method. The great object of the Arabian philosophers was to furnish the world with a complete theory of the unity of the Cosmos which would satisfy, not the mind only, but also the religious sense. And accordingly they endeavoured to reconcile the ethical and spiritual with the philosophical side of science. Hence the development of the theory of the two intellects—the passive Reason, or Abstract Soul, in contact with material forms, and subject through them to change and death; and the Active Reason (*Akl-i-faal*), conversant with the immutable, and so remaining unchanged in itself. By patient discipline of the heart and soul man can elevate himself to conjunction with this Higher Reason. But the discipline needed was as much moral and spiritual as intellectual. Ibn-Sîna represented these ideas in the highest degree. He was the truest and most faithful exponent of the philosophical aspirations of his time. "For ethical earnestness it would be hard to find anything more impressive than the teaching of Avicenna." A severely logical treatment of his subjects is the distinctive character of his writings. His main endeavour was directed towards the demonstration of the theory that their existed an intimate connexion between the human Soul and the Primary Absolute Cause—a conception which is traced in every line of Jalâl ud-dîn Rûmi.

Shahristâni gives a brief but exhaustive sketch of Ibn-Sîna's views, culled, as he says, from his various books. After describing Ibn-Sîna's treatment of the sciences, logic, and other cognate subjects, Shahristani states that the Philosopher discussed metaphysics under ten theses; under the first five, he deals with the origin of knowledge, experimentation, induction, and deduction; matter and force; the relation of cause and effect; the primary and accidental, universals and particulars. Under the sixth and seventh he demonstrates that the Primal Cause—the being whose existence is necessary by virtue of his Essence—is one and Absolute. Under the eighth and ninth he deals with the unity of the Cosmos, the relation of human souls to the Primal Cause and the Active Intellect, the first created. And lastly, he discusses the conception of future existence, the doctrine of "Return" (معاد). He proclaims the individual permanence of the human soul, and argues that it will retain its individuality after

its separation from the corporeal body; but that the pleasure and pain of the future existence will be purely spiritual, depending on the use or misuse by man of his mental, moral and physical powers to attain the Perfection. He argues under the last head the necessity for mankind of prophetism. The Prophet expounds to men the Divine laws, explains to them the ethical demands of God and Humanity in parables comprehensible to common folk, which appeal to and settle their hearts. The Prophet dissuades from jealousy, rancour, and misdeeds; lays the foundations of social and moral development, and is God's veritable messenger on earth.

Abû Bakr Mohammed ibn Yahya, surnamed *Ibn-ul-Säyeg*, popularly called Ibn-Baja, corrupted by the European scholiasts into Avenpace, is one of the most celebrated philosophers among the Arabs of Spain. He was not only a distinguished physician, mathematician, and astronomer, but also a musician of the first rank. He was born at Saragossa towards the end of the eleventh century of the Christian era, and in 1118 A. C. we find him mentioned as residing in Seville. He afterwards proceeded to Africa, where he occupied a high position under the Almoravides. He died at Fez in 1138 A. C. Several of his works have come down to us in their entirety and show the free range of the Moslem intellect in those days.

Ibn-Tufail (Abu Bakr Mohammed ibn Abdul Malik ibn-Tufail al-Kaisi) was born in the beginning of the twelfth century at Gaudix (Wadi-ash), a small city of Andalusia, in the province of Grenada. He was celebrated as a physician, mathematician, philosopher, and poet, and was held in great esteem at the court of the first two sovereigns of the Almohade dynasty. From 1163 to 1184 he filled the office of vizier and physician to Abu Yaakub Yusuf, the second Almohade king. Ibn-Tufail died in Morocco in 1185 A. C. He belonged to the contemplative school of Arab philosophy which was designated *Ishráki*, an offshoot of ancient Neo-Platonism, and akin in its aspirations to modern mysticism. His contemplative philosophy is not founded on mystical exaltation, but on a method in which intuition is combined with reasoning. His famous work, called *Hai ibn Yukzân*, represents the gradual and successive development of intelligence and the power of perception in a person wholly unassisted by outside instruction.[1]

[1] See Appendix II.

Ibn-Rushd or Averroes (Abu'l-Walîd Mohammed ibn Ahmed) was born in 520 A.H., (1126 A.C) at Cordova, where his family had for a long time occupied a prominent position. His grandfather was the *Kazi ul-Kuzzât* of all Andalusia under the Almoravides: Ibn-Rushd was a jurisconsult of the first rank, but he applied himself mainly to medicine, mathematics, and philosophy. Introduced to Abu Yaakub Yusuf by Ibn-Tufail, he was received with great favour by that sovereign. In 1169—1170 we find him holding the office of Kazi of Seville, and in 1182 of Cordova. For a few years after the accession of Yaakub al-Mansur to the throne of the Almohades, Ibn-Rushd enjoyed the consideration and esteem of that monarch, but when the pent-up Berber fanaticism burst forth he was the first to fall a victim to the fury of the lawyers and Mullahs whom he had offended by his philosophical writings, and who were jealous of his genius and his learning. Ibn-Rushd was without question one of the greatest scholars and philosophers the Arab world has produced, and "one of the profoundest commentators," says Munk, "of Aristotle's works." Ibn-Rushd held that the highest effort of man ought to be directed towards the attainment of perfection, that is, a complete identification with the Active Universal Intellect; that this perfection can only be attained by study and speculation, and abandoning all the desires which belong to the inferior faculties of the soul, and especially to the senses,—but not by mere sterile meditation. He also held that prophetic revelations were necessary for spreading among mankind the eternal verities proclaimed equally by religion and philosophy; that religion itself directs their search by means of science; that it teaches truths in a popular manner comprehensible to all people: that philosophy alone is capable of seizing the true religious doctrines by means of interpretation; but the ignorant apprehend only the literal meaning. On the question of predestination he held that man was neither the absolute master of his actions nor bound by fixed immutable decrees. But the truth, says Ibn-Rushd, lies in the middle, الامر بين الامرين words used by the Fatimide Imams, and explained by them somewhat similarly. Our actions depend partly on our own free will and partly on causes outside us. We are free to wish and to act in a particular manner; but our will is always restrained and determined by exterior causes. These

causes spring from the general laws of nature ; God alone knows their sequence. It is this which, in the language of theology, is called *Kazâ* and *Kadar*. Ibn-Rushd's political theories were directed against human tyranny in every shape. He regarded the Arab republic under the Rashidîn Caliphs as the model government in which was realised the dream of Plato. Muawiyah, he says, in establishing the Ommeyyade autocracy, overthrew this ideal, and opened the door to all disasters. Ibn-Rushd considered women to be equal in every respect to men, and claimed for them equal capacity—in war, in philosophy, in science. He cites the example of the female warriors of Arabia, Africa, and Greece ; and refers to their superiority in music in support of his contention, that, if women were placed in the same position as men, and received the same education, they would become the equals of their husbands and brothers in all the sciences and arts ; and he ascribes their inferiority to the narrow lives they lead.

In Ibn-Rushd Arabian philosophy reached its apogee. Six centuries divide him from the Prophet. Within these centuries the Arab intellect had broadened in every direction. Men like Ibn-Sîna and Ibn-Rushd thought with the accumulated wealth of ages on all the most important questions which occupy human attention in modern times, and formulated their ideas, little different from those held by the most advanced scientists of the present day, with logical precision. All these thinkers claimed to be Moslems, and were recognised as such by the best minds of their times. Ibn-Sına repudiated with indignation and contempt the charge of infidelity levelled against him by fanatics or enemies jealous of his fame ; and one of the greatest mystical poets of Islam, Sanaï, whose orthodoxy, though doubted by his personal foes, is no longer questioned, has embodied his veneration for "Bu Ali Sîna" in an immortal poem.[1]

Ibn-Rushd wrote on the concord of religion with philosophy ; and one of his intimate friends, Abd ul-Kabîr, a highly religious person, described him as one anxious to establish a harmony between religion and philosophy. Al-Ansari and Abd ul-Walîd speak of Ibn-Rushd as sincerely attached to Islam ; and his latest biographer says : "There is nothing to prevent our supposing that

[1] See Appendix II.

Ibn-Rushd was a sincere believer in Islâmism, especially when we consider how little irrational the supernatural element in the essential dogmas of this religion is, and how closely this religion approaches the purest Deism."[1]

The close of the tenth century was full of the darkest omens for rationalism and science. The star of the son of Sîna had not yet risen on the horizon; but masters like Kîndi and Fârâbi had appeared and departed after shedding an abiding lustre on the Saracenic race. Patristicism was triumphant in every quarter which owned the temporal or spiritual sway of the Abbassides: the college of jurists had placed under the ban of heresy the rationalists and philosophers who had made the name of Moslems glorious in the annals of the world; a heartless, illiberal, and persecuting formalism dominated the spirit of the theologians; a pharisaical epicureanism had taken possession of the rich, and an ignorant fanaticism of the poor; the gloom of night was fast thickening, and Islam was drifting into the condition into which ecclesiasticism had led Christianity. It was at this epoch of travail and sorrow for all lovers of truth that a small body of thinkers formed themselves into a Brotherhood to keep alive the lamp of knowledge among the Moslems, to introduce a more healthy tone among the people, to arrest the downward course of the Islamists towards ignorance and fanaticism, in fact, to save the social fabric from utter ruin. They called themselves the "Brothers of Purity," *Ikhwân-us-Safâ*. The society of the "Pure Brethren" was established in Bussorah, which still held rank in the fast-dwindling Caliphate as the second city of the empire, the home of rationalism and intellectual activity. To this "Brotherhood" none but men of unsullied character and the purest morals were admitted; the passport for admission into the select circle was devotion to the cause of knowledge and humanity. There was nothing exclusive or esoteric in their spirit; though, from the necessities of their situation, and working under a rigid theological and political despotism, their movements were enshrouded in some degree of mystery. They met together quietly and unobtrusively in the residence of the head of the society, who bore the name of Zaid the son of Rifaa, and discussed philosophical and ethical subjects

[1] Renan, *Averroes et Averroism*, p. 163.

with a catholicity of spirit and breadth of views difficult to rival even in modern times. They formed branches in every city of the Caliphate, wherever, in fact, they could find a body of thoughtful men, willing and qualified to work according to their scientific method. This philanthropic and scientific movement was led by five men, who, with Zaid, were the life and soul of the "Brotherhood." Their system was eclectic in the highest and truest sense of the word. They contemned no field of thought ; they "culled flowers from every meadow." In spite of the mysticism which slightly tinged their philosophical conceptions, their views on social and political problems were highly practical and intensely humane. As the result of their labours, they gave to the world a general *resumé* of the knowledge of the time in separate treatises, which were collectively known as the *Rasâil*[1]*-i-Ikhwân-us-Safâ wa-Khallân-ul-Wafâ*, "Tracts of the Brothers of Purity and Friends of Sincerity ;" or, shortly, *Rasâil-i-Ikhwân-us-Safâ*,[2] These *risâlas* range over every subject of human study—mathematics, including astronomy, physical geography, music, and mechanics ; physics, including chemistry, meteorology, and geology ; biology, physiology, zoology, botany, logic, grammar, metaphysics, ethics, the doctrine of a future life. They form in fact, a popular encyclopædia of all the sciences and philosophy then extant. The theory of these evolutionists of the tenth century as to the development of animal organism may be compared with advantage with that entertained in present times. But I am not concerned so much with the scientific and intellectual side of their writings as with the ethical and moral. The ethics of the "Pure Brethren," are founded on self-study and the purification or abstraction of human thought from all impurity. Moral endowments are prized above intellectual gifts ; and the strength of soul founded upon patient self-discipline and self-control is regarded as the highest of virtues.[3] "Faith without work, knowing without doing, were vain." Patience and forbearance, mildness and loving gentleness, justice, mercy, and truth, the sublimity of virtue, the sacrifice of self for others, are taught in every line : cant, hypocrisy, and deceit, envy and pride, tyranny and falsehood, are reprobated

1 Plural of *Risâla*, a tract, a chapter, a monograph.
2 Published in 4 vols., at Bombay in 1305 A. H. by Haji Nur ud-dîn.
3 See the 3rd *Risâla*, vol. iv.

in every page; and the whole is pervaded by a purity of sentiment, a fervent love of humanity, an earnest faith in the progress of man, a universal charity, embracing even the brute creation in its fold.[1] What can be more beautiful, more truly humane, than the disputation between the "animals and mankind?" Their ethics form the foundation of all later works.[2] Their religious idea was identical with that of Fârabi and Ibn Sina,—the universe was an emanation from God, but not directly; the Primal Absolute Cause created Reason, or the Active Intelligence: and from this proceeded the *Nafs-i-nufûs*, the Abstract Soul, from which sprung primary matter, the protoplasm of all material entities; the Active Intelligence moulded this primary matter, and made it capable of taking shapes and forms, and set it in motion, whence were formed the spheres and the planets. Their morality is founded on this very conception of the Primal Absolute Cause being connected by an unbroken chain with the lowest of His creation; for the Abstract Soul individualised in humanity is always struggling to attain by purity of life, self-discipline, intellectual study, the goal of Perfection,—to get back to the source from which it emanated. This is *Maâd*; this is the "Return" which the Prophet taught; this is the rest and peace inculcated in the Scripture. It was thus that the "Pure Brethren" taught. Whatever we may think of their psychology there is no denying that their morality was of the purest, their ethics of the highest that can be conceived, standing on a different plane from those of the theologians who induced the bigot Mustanjid to burn their encyclopædia in Bagdad, before Bagdad itself was burnt by the Mongols.

Aristotelian philosophy, which was founded on "observation and experience," was, however, more akin to the Saracenic genius and the positive bent of the Arab mind. Aristotelian logic and metaphysics naturally exercised a great influence on the conceptions of Arab scientists and scholars. Neo-Platonism, based on intuition and a certain vague and mystical contemplation, did not take root among the Arabs until it was made popular by the writings of the unfortunate Shahab ud-dın Saharwardi. The Aristotelian conception of the

1 See the 4th *Risâla*, vol. iv.

2 Such as the *Akhlâk-i-Nasiri* of Nasir ud-din Tusi, the *Akhlâk-i-Jâlâli*, and the *Akhlâk-i-Muhsinî* of Hussain Waiz Kashifi.

First Cause pervades accordingly many of the philosophical and metaphysical writings of this period. And it was in consequence of the influence exercised by the Stagyrite that a section of Arab thinkers tended towards a belief in the eternity of matter. These men received the name of *Dahrîs* (from *dahar*, or *nature*). "The fundamental idea of these philosophers", says Kremer, "was the same as has gained ground, in modern times, owing to the extension of natural science." But they were not, as their enemies called them, *atheists*. Atheism is the negation of a power or Cause beyond and outside the visible and material world. These philosophers affirmed no such thing; they only held that it was impossible to predicate of the *Causa Causans* any attribute whatsoever, or to explain the mode in which He works on the universe. They were, in fact, the exponents of the doctrine of *taalîl* or agnosticism.

It appears clear, therefore, that the Islam of Mohammed contains nothing which in itself bars progress or the intellectual development of humanity. How is it, then, that, since the twelfth century of the Christian era, philosophy has almost died out among the Islamists and an anti-rationalistic patristicism has taken possession of the bulk of the people? How is it that predestinarianism, though only one phase of the Koranic teachings, has become the predominant creed of a large number of Moslems? As regards the supposed *extinction* of philosophy among the Moslems, we shall have to call attention to the revival of *Avicennism* under the Seffavian sovereigns of Persia to show that rationalism and free-thought are not yet dead in Islam. But the questions which I have formulated apply to the general body of Moslems, and I propose to explain the causes which have led to this result.

Before the Abbasside Mutawakkil's accession to the throne, Islam presented a spectacle similar to that of Christendom in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was divided into two camps, one of Authority, the other of Reason; the one advocated the guidance of humanity in matters, natural as well as supernatural, by precedent, pure and simple; the other, by human judgment tempered so far as practicable by precedent. Between these two parties the difference was irreconcilable. The first was composed chiefly of the lawyers—a class of people who have been regarded in every age and country, and not always without reason, as narrow-

minded, self-opinionated, and extremely jealous of their interests as a body. To them were joined the ignorant populace. "The creed of the bishop is the creed of the grocer. But the philosophy of that grocer is in no sense the philosophy of a professor. Therefore it is that the bishop will be revered where the professor will be stoned. Intellect is that which man claims as specially his own; it is the one limiting distinction; and thus the multitude, so tolerant of the claims of an aristocracy of birth or of wealth, is uneasy under the claims of an aristocracy of intelligence." [1]

As I have had occasion to mention in a previous chapter, most of the legal decisions pronounced by the Prophet were called forth by the passing necessities of a primitive and archaic society. After him the Caliph Ali was the expositor of the new Faith. In the Koran these legal doctrines were extremely few, and adaptable to any circumstance or time, and, during the reigns of the Rashidîn Caliphs, were expounded chiefly by Ali and his disciple Ibn Abbâs.

Upon their death, the men who had attended their lectures or listened to their judgments opened classes of jurisprudence on their own account. *Fakîhs* or lawyers multiplied; they discussed religio-legal questions, gave opinions on points of casuistry, the rites of religion, as well as on the ordinary relations of life. Gradually they became the keepers of the conscience of the people. Naturally there was a keen desire to discover how the Prophet had acted in any particular case; traditions multiplied. The supply was in proportion to the demand. But, excepting in the school of Medina, there was no uniformity of system or method. The immediate descendants of Mohammed followed one definite rule; if they found any precedent of the time of the Prophet or of the Caliph Ali, authenticated by their own ancestors, *which was applicable to the circumstances of the case*, they based their decision upon it; if not, they relied on their own judgment. Law was with them inductive and experimental; and they decided according to the exigencies and requirements of each particular case. Under the early Ommeyyades there was no fixed rule; the governors ruled sharply by the sword, according to their own

[1] Lewes's *History of Philosophy*, vol. ii. p. 59.

judgment, leaving matters of conscience to the *Fakihs*. Under the later Ommeyyades, however, the lawyers assumed great preponderance, chiefly on account of their influence with the fickle populace. When the Abbassides rose to power the lecture-room of the Imam Jaafar as Sadik was attended by two men who afterwards became the bulwarks of the Sunni Church,—one was Abu Hanîfa, [1] and the other Malik son of Anas. [2] Abu Hanifa was a native of Irak; Malik, of Medina. Both were men of severe morals and great kindliness of nature, and anxious to broaden the foundations of the Church. They were devoted to the family of the Prophet, and suffered in consequence of their attachment. Abu Hanifa on his return to Kufa opened a class which became the nucleus of the now famous Hanafî school. He rejected most of the traditions [3] as untrue, and relied solely on the Koran; and by "analogical deductions" endeavoured to make the simple Koranic utterances applicable to every variety of circumstance. Abû Hanîfa knew nothing of human kind; nor had he ever been to any city except Medîna and Bagdad. He was a speculative legist, and his two disciples, Abu Yusuf, who became Chief Kazi of Bagdad under Harun, and Mohammed ash-Shaibani, fixed Abu Hanîfa's conceptions on a regular basis. Malik proceeded on different lines. He excluded from his system all inferences and "deductions." He applied himself to discover in Medîna, so full of the Prophet's memories, every real or supposititious incident in the Master's life, and based his doctrines thereupon. His was "the Beaten Path,"[4] and to the simple Arabs and the cognate races of Africa, Mâlik's enunciations were more acceptable, being suited to their archaic forms of society, than the rationalised views of the Fatimide Imams, or the speculative theories of Abu Hanîfa. Soon after came Shafeï, a man of strong and vigorous mind, better acquainted with the world than Abu Hanîfa and Malik, and less casuistical than Abu Yusuf and Mohammed ash-Shaibani. He formed, from the materials furnished by Jaafar as-Sadik, Malik, and Abu Hanîfa, an eclectic school, which found acceptance chiefly among the middle classes. Less adaptable than original Hanafîsm to the varying necessities of a

[1] See *ante*, p. 322. [2] See *ante*, p. 323. [3] Ibn Khallikân.
[4] The *Muwatta*, i.e. "*The Beaten Path*," is the name of his work on jurisprudence.

growing and mixed population, it contained sufficient germs of improvement, which, had they not been killed by the rigid formalism of later times, would have been productive of substantial good.[1] Four different systems of law and doctrine, more or less distinct from each other, thus established themselves in the Islamic world. The Fatimide system was chiefly in force among the Shiahs, who were dispersed all over the empire; Malikism among a large part of the Arabs in the Peninsula, among the Berbers, and most of the Spanish Moslems; Shafeïsm among the fairly well-to-do classes; and Hanafism among the more respectable sections of society in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt. The position of Hanafism in the Caliphate was similar to that of Pharisaism among the Jews. It received the countenance of the Court as the only school with sufficient expansiveness to meet the requirements of a mixed population. To have acknowledged the Fatimide system would have been to give too great a preponderance to the descendants of the Prophet; to have adopted Malikism and Shafeism for the administration of a liberal State would have jeopardised the interests of the empire. Hence, whilst rationalism ruled in the colleges and *Madrassas*,[2] Hanafïsm held possession of the pulpits and *Mahkamas*.[3] In its theological views, Hanafïsm inclined towards *Sifâtism*; but it varied its opinions according to those of the rulers. At this period Hanafïsm was remarkable for its flexibility. Ahmed ibn Hanbal, commonly known as Imam Hanbal, made his appearance at this juncture,—a red hot puritan, breathing eternal perdition to all who differed from him, he was shocked with the pharisaical liberalism of Hanafïsm, and disgusted both with the narrowness of Malikism and the common-place character of Shafeism, he applied himself to frame a new system, based on traditions, for the whole empire. Abu Hanifa had rejected the majority of the current traditions; Ibn Hanbal's system included a mass of incongruous, irrational, and bewildering stories, the bulk of which were wholly inconsistent with each other, and bearing upon their face the marks of fabrication. And now commenced a serious struggle between the parties of progress and retrogression.

1 Shâfeïsm is spreading rapidly among the educated Hanafis of India.
2 *Madrassa* is a place where lectures are given, hence a college, school, etc.
3 Courts of justice.

Ibn Hanbal adopted the extreme *Sifâtia* views; he inculcated that the Deity was visible to the human sight; that His attributes were separate from His essence; that the statements about His being seated on the throne were to be accepted in their literal sense; that man was in no sense a free agent; that every human action was the direct act of the Deity, and so forth. He denounced learning and science, and proclaimed a holy war against Rationalism. The populace, carried away by his eloquence or his vehemence, took up the cry; the Hanafî jurists, whose power materially depended on their influence over the ignorant masses, and who were jealous of the prominence of the scientists and philosophers in the Court of Harûn and Mamun, made common cause with the new reformer. The pulpits began to fulminate brimstone and fire against the upholders of reason and the advocates of philosophy and science. The streets of Bagdad became the scenes of frequent rioting and bloodshed. Mutassim and Wasik repressed the fanatical violence of the fiery puritans with some severity. The prime mover of the disturbances was put in prison, where he died in the odour of great sanctity; his bier was followed to the grave by a crowd consisting of a hundred and forty thousand men and women.[1] His system never took root among any large body of people: but, mixing with Hanafîsm, it gave a new character to the doctrines of Abu Hanîfa. Henceforth Hanafîsm represents a mixture of the teachings of Abu Hanîfa and of Ibn Hanbal.

When Mutawakkil was raised to the throne the position of the various parties stood thus:—the Rationalists were the directing power of the State; they held the chief offices of trust; they were professors in colleges, superintendents of hospitals, directors of observatories; they were merchants; in fact, they represented the wisdom and the wealth of the empire; Rationalism was the dominating creed among the educated, the intellectual, and influential classes of the community. *Sifâtism* was in force among the lower strata of society, and most of the Kazis, the preachers, the lawyers of various degree were attached to it. A cruel drunken sot, almost crazy at times, Mutawakkil had the wit to perceive the advantage of an alliance with the latter party. It would make him at once the

[1] See Appendix II.

idol of the populace, and the model Caliph of the bigots The fiat accordingly went forth for the expulsion of the party of progress from their offices under government. The colleges and universities were closed; literature, science, and philosophy were interdicted; and the Rationalists were hunted from Bagdad. Mutawakkil at the same time demolished the mausoleum of the Caliph Ali and his sons. The fanatical lawyers, who were now the priests and rabbis of Islam, became the the ruling power of the State. Mutawakkil's death and Mustansir's accession gave the victory once more to the Progressists. But their success was short-lived. Under the pitiless and sanguinary Mutazid b'illah the triumph of Patristicism was complete. He mercilessly persecuted the Rationalists. They inculcated that "justice" was the animating principle of human actions; that God Himself governed the universe by "justice," which was His Essence; that the test of right and wrong was not any individual will, but the good of humanity. These doctrines were terribly revolutionary; they were aimed at the divine right of the Caliph to do wrong. Tom Paine could scarcely preach worse. On the other hand, the clerical party taught very properly "God, is the Sovereign; as the sovereign does no wrong, so God can do no wrong." There could be no question which of these two doctrines was true. The days of Rationalism were now over under the Abbassides. Expelled from Bagdad, it took refuge in Cairo, which was worse, for if there was one place which the Abbasside Caliphs hated with the hatred of death, that was Cairo. The very name of Rationalism became one of dire import to the Pontiffs of Bagdad. A College of Jurists was established to ferret out "heresy" in the writings of the philosophers and scientists, whose misfortune still was to live within the reach of the patristic influences. The works in which the smallest taint was observed were committed to the flames; their authors were subjected to tortures and to death. Islam now presented the spectacle of orthodox Christendom. There was a time when, in spite of the fact that the temporal power was arrayed against it, Rationalism would have regained its hold on the masses. In their constant disputations the clerical party always found themselves worsted; and though, on these occasions, they not unfrequently invoked the more forcible reasoning of the sword and bricks and stones, their defeats

in argument perceptibly told on the ranks of their followers. It was at this period that the retrogressive party received the assistance of an unexpected ally. Hitherto they had fought against Reason with their usual repertory of traditions. Abu'l Hassan al-Ashaari, a descendant of the famous Abu Musa al-Ashaari, who had been tricked by Amr ibn al-Aas into abandoning the rights of the Caliph Ali, was educated among the Mutazalas. He had learnt their logic, their philosophy, their science of reason. Actuated by vanity, and partly perhaps by ambition, he one day in the *Jâmaa* mosque of Bussorah, in the presence of a large congregation, made a public disavowal of the Mutazalite doctrines, and declared his adherence to *Sifatism*. His theatrical manner and his eloquent words impressed the people, and the waverers at once went over to him. Ashaari was now the greatest man in the Caliphate; he was petted by the legists, idolised by the populace, respected by the Caliph. He gave to the clerical party what they had long been wanting—a logical system, or what may be called by that name, for the defence of patristic theology against the rationalistic conceptions of the Mutazalas, the philosophers, and the Fatimide Imams. Abu'l Hassan maintained the Sifatia doctrines, with very slight modifications.

A short summary of his views, taken from Shahristani, will explain the present mental lethargy of so many Moslems. "He maintained," says our author, "that the attributes of the Deity are eternal and subsistent in His Essence, but they are not simply His Essence, rather they are additional to His Essence; . . . that God speaks by an eternal word, and wills by an eternal will, for it is evident that God is a Sovereign, and, as a Sovereign is One to whom it belongs to command and prohibit, so God commands and prohibits; . . . that His ordering is eternal, subsistent in Him, a quality pertaining to Him; that the will of God is indivisible, eternal, embracing all things subject to volition, whether determinate actions of His own or actions of His creatures—the latter, so far as created by Him, not as they are their own actions by *appropriation*;[1] . . . that God wills all things morally, good and evil, benefical and injurious; and, as He both knows and wills, that he wills on the part of His creatures what He knows, and has caused to be registered in the me-

1 Shahristâni explains this word later.

morial-book—which fore-knowledge constitutes His decree, His decisions, and His determination, therein there is no varying or change; that an *appropriated* action means an action which is pre-destined to be done by created ability, and which takes place under the condition of created ability." In plainer language, he taught that every human action emanates from God, or is pre-destined by His decree, to be performed by a particular person, and this person, having the capacity of *appropriation* or *acquisitiveness*, does the act; the act is primarily God's act, secondarily the man's. For example, if a man applies himself to write a letter, his desire to write is the outcome of an eternal decree that he should write; then he takes up the pen, it is the will of God that he should do so; and so on. When the writing is finished, it is due to his *acquisitiveness*. Shahristâni very appropriately observes that, according to Abu'l Hassan, no influence in respect to origination (of action) pertains to created ability. This worthy divine further maintained that "God rules as a Sovereign over His creatures, doing what He wills and determining as He pleases; so that were He to cause all men to enter Paradise, there would be no injustice, and if He were to send them all to hell, there would be no wrong-doing, because injustice is the ordering in respect to things which do not come within the sphere of control of the Orderer, or the inversion of established relations of things, and God is the Absolute Sovereign, on whose part no injustice is imaginable, and to whom no wrong can be attributed; . . . and that nothing whatever is obligatory upon God by virtue of reason—neither that which is beneficial, nor that which is most advantageous, nor gracious assistance . . . and that the ground of (human) obligation is nothing which constitutes a necessity binding upon God." . . .

After mentioning the doctrines of Abu'l Hassan, Shahristâni proceeds to state the views of Abu'l Hassan's principal disciple, whose teachings were adopted by a large body of people—Abu Abdullah Mohammad bin Karram, "whom we count as one of the Sifatias." This man maintained that the Divine attributes were distinct from His Essence, that God can be perceived by eyesight, and that He creates human actions from time to time as He wills.

In order to meet the Mutazalas on their own ground, Abu'l Hassan invented a rival *science of reason*—the real scholastic theology

of the Moslems, which, though supposed to be an offshoot of the *Ilm-ul-kalâm* founded by the Mutazalas, is in many essential features different from it. For example, most of the Mutazalas were *conceptualists*, whilst the Ashaarî *Mutakallimîn* were either *realists* or modified *nominalists*. The Ashaarîs maintained that a negative quality like ignorance is an actual entity, whilst the Mutazalas declared that it was the mere negation of a quality, for example, ignorance was the absence of knowledge. The Ashaarı *Mutakallim* maintained that the Koran was uncreated and eternal; the Mutazalite declared that it represented the words of God revealed to the Prophet from time to time as occasion arose, otherwise there would be no meaning in *nasikh* and *mansukh*, for admittedly some of the later verses repealed others which had been uttered before.

Ashaarîsm thus became the dominant school in the East. When the enlightened Buyides became the mayors of the palace Rationalism again raised its head in Bagdad; but Ashaarïsm never lost its hold over the conscience of the masses, nor did Mutazalaism ever regain its old position of preponderance. The Buyides were Rationalists; but the Seljukides, in spite of their patronage of learning and science, belonged to the Ashaarı school. Renan[1] has observed that Islamism, having become, by the accident of history, the property of races given over to fanaticism, such as the Spaniards, the Berbers, the Persians, the Turks, acquired in their hands the garb of a rigid and exclusive dogmatism. "What has happened to Catholicism in Spain has happened to Islam, what would have happened in all Europe if the religious revival which took place (in Christendom) at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century had stopped all national development." This observation is absolutely true. The Persian always associated an idea of divinity with the person of his sovereign; the Turk, the Mongol, the Berber look upon their chiefs as the direct descendants of God; conversion to Islam did not detract from their veneration of their kings or princes. For centuries the Arabs had tried to exorcise the demon of fanaticism which had been introduced into the hearts of the Spaniards by the Christian clergy; they failed, and the moment the Chancellor al-Mansur, in order to enlist popular

[1] *Averroes et Averroism*, p. 30.

support in furtherance of his ambitious designs, raised a cry against Rationalism in Spain, the same crowd which afterwards assisted with willing hands and gleeful faces at the *auto-da-fe* of heretics, helped in the burning of philosophical works in the market-place of Cordova. The victorious arms of Saladin carried Ashaarïsm into Egypt. Whilst Rationalism was thus fighting a losing battle with its old enemy, the writings of Imam al-Ghazzali, which were directed chiefly against the study of philosophy, strengthened the hands of Patristicism. Abu Hamid Mohammed ibn Mohammed al-Ghazzali[1] was a man of undoubted talents and purity of character. He had studied philosophy and dived into the mysteries of the sciences; he had even indulged in free-thought. Suddenly the spirit of earnest longing for a solid rock on which to rest the weary soul, the spirit that has worked similarly upon other minds in later ages, spoke to his heart, and from a philosopher he turned into a mystic. In the *Munkiz*, which appears to have been a discourse delivered either verbally or written to his religious brethren, he describes with some *naïveté* how he hankered for knowledge, and in its search went everywhere, dipped into everything, acquainted himself with every subject; and how he abandoned the doctrines which had been instilled into him in early life. He says he knew the saying of the Prophet, which declared that every child was born with a knowledge of the truth in nature, and therefore wanted to know what that truth was. Then he describes how he was seized with scepticism, and how he escaped from its consequences by betaking himself into the higher regions of faith, viz. a mystical exaltation. The discourse contains a violent attack on the philosophers, whom he groups under three heads. (1) The *Dahrîs*, who believe in the eternity of matter, and deny the existence of a Creator. (2) The Physicists or naturalists, who believe in the existence of a Creator, but think that the human soul once separated from the body ceases to exist, and that therefore there is no accountability of human actions; both of them were infidels. (3) The Theists (Plato and Aristotle), "these have complete-

1 Was born at Tûs in Khorâsân (the birthplace of Firdousi) in the year 1058 A. C. (540 A.H.); died in 1111 A.C. (505 of the Hegira). His most celebrated works are the *Ihya ul-ulum* (the Revival of the Sciences of Religion); the *Munkiz min-uz-zullâl* (Deliverance from Errors); *Makâsid-ul-falâsifa* (the Tendencies of Philosophers); and *Tahâfut-ul:falâsifa* (Destruction of Philosophers), to which Ibn-Rushd wrote a refutation called the *Tahâfat-ut-Tahâfat ul-falâsifa* (the Destruction of Destruction, etc.).

ly refuted the doctrines of the first two, and God has saved thereby the true believer from the battle." "But they must be pronounced infidels; and so also the Moslem philosophers who have followed them, especially Farabi and Ibn-Sîna, for their philosophy is so confused that you can not separate the truth from the false, so as to refute the latter! From what we can discover of the writings of these two men, knowledge may be divided under three heads; one group we are bound to pronounce as *infidel*, another as heresy, and about the third we need say nothing!" And yet with all this simplicity there is considerable practical sense displayed in Ghazzali's writings. He praises wisdom as far higher than mere belief, and opposes the fanatical dogmatism which rejects all rational inquiry and all knowledge because it is cultivated by his *bêtes noires* the philosophers. He calls this dogmatism the unwise friend of Islam. At the same time his precepts on personal independence, on moral discipline, on self-purification, on practical kindness, and on the education of the young, and his denunciation of the immoral and useless lives of the Mullahs of his time, reflect great credit on the goodness of his nature.

From this period there was an unceasing struggle between Rationalism and Patristicism. In the year 1150, under the orders of the Caliph Mustanjid, all the philosophical works of Ibn-Sîna and the copies of the *Rasail-i-Ikhwân us-Safa* found in the public and private libraries were consigned to the flames. In 1192 the physician Al-Rukn Abdus-Salam was accused of atheism, and the populace and priests proceeded to make a bonfire of his books. The Mullah who presided at this ceremony stood on a chair and delivered a sermon against philosophy. As the books were brought out they were delivered to him, and with a few words of remark on their impiety, he threw them into the fire. A disciple of Maimonides was a witness to this strange scene, and has left an account of it. "I saw," says he, "in the hands of this doctor the work of Ibn-ul-Haithem (Al-Hazen) on astronomy. Showing to the people the circle by which the author represented the celestial sphere, the doctor burst forth, 'Misery of miseries, inexpressible disaster!' and with these words he threw the book into the flames." But even the influence of Imam al-Ghazzali and the temporal power of the sovereigns, some of whom were at heart rationalists, would not have

prevented the eventual victory of reason over the dead-weight of authority, had not the Mongol's sword turned the scale. "One Khan, one God : as the Khan's ordinance is immutable, so is God's decree." Could any doctrine be more logical or more irresistible, backed as it was by a million swords ? Rationalism, philosophy, the sciences and arts went down before that avalanche of savagery—never to rise again. The gleams of light which we have seen shining on Western Asia under the successors of Halâku were the fitful rays of the setting sun. Policy worked with an inborn fanaticism in crushing any endeavour to introduce rationalism and philosophy in the Moslem world. The lawyers were not only strong, but also the main support of despotism. The result was as we have already seen, Patristicism took possession of the hearts of the largest portion of Moslems, and has in course of time become a second nature with them. They can perceive nothing except through the medium of the patristic glasses. Mohammed inculcated the use of reason ; his followers have made its exercise a sin. He preached against anthropolatry and extravagant veneration for human beings ; the Sunnis have canonised the *salaf* and the four jurists; the Akhbari Shiahs, their Mujtahids,—and have called any deviation from the course laid down by them—however much that deviation might accord with the Prophet's own teachings and with reason—a crime. He had said that "ghosts, apparitions, and the like have nothing to do with Islam." They now believe firmly in them. He impressed on them to go in quest of knowledge to the land of the heathens. They do not take it even when it is offered to them in their own homes.

Under the Seffavians, rationalism and philosophy came to life once more—though not in that vigorous shape in which they had flourished under the earlier Abbassides. From the twelfth to the fifteenth century Irân had suffered terribly; and in the darkness which enshrouded the land during this long period of disaster and trouble, the Shiah Mullahs had assumed the position of the clergy to a larger degree than even the Sunni lawyers. They claimed the sole and absolute power of expounding the laws on the ground that they were the representatives of the Fatimide Imams. Mulla Sadra, whom we have already mentioned as the reviver of the Usuli doctrines,—the religion of Mohammed as it was understood and accepted by his

immediate descendants,—applied himself to revive the study of philosophy and science among his countrymen. It was by no means an easy task, but he worked with tact and judgment. Avicennism came to life again, and, in spite of the political vicissitudes of Iran, the destruction of lives during the Afghan domination, and the establishment of the Kajars on the throne of Persia, has persistently maintained its hold over many of the cultivated class. One of the best epitomes of Avicennistic philosophy was published in the reign of Shah Abbas II.,[1] by Abdur Razzak bin Ali bin al-Hassan al-Lahiji, under the name of *Gouhar-i-Murad*, "The Pearl of Desire." It contains a summary of Ibn-Sîna's views, explained and illustrated by references to the opinions of the Caliph Ali and his descendants, and philosophers and physicists like Imam Fakhr Razi, Nasir ud-din Tusi, Imâm Taftazâni, and others.[2]

1 Of this sovereign it is said that he was as tolerant to all religions as his great ancestor Abbas I. He often declared the principle by which his conduct on this point was regulated : "It is for God, not for me, to judge of men's consciences : and I will never interfere with what belongs to the tribunal of the great Creator and Lord of the Universe."

2 Some of Abdur Razzak's views are extremely interesting. For example, dealing with Mutazalaism and Ashaarîsm, he states that "the Mutazalas invented the science of *Kalâm* with the object of establishing a harmony between the precepts of religion and the requirements of society, and of explaining by principles of Reason the [Koranic] verses and the traditions which at first sight seem unreasonable (الحسب ظهور) ; whilst their opponents (طایفهٔ مخالف) upheld the literal acceptance [of the verses of the Koran and of the traditions], partly from motives of bigotry and partly from policy ; prohibited all interpretations, and pronounced the interpretations of the Mutazalas and all their opinions as heresy (بدعت), and designated the Mutazalas heretics (مبتدع), and considered themselves in opposition to them [the Mutazalas] as *ahl-i-Sunnat wa-Jamâat*. . . . So much so, that many of them have fallen into the sin of thinking God to be a material being, all of them are immersed in that of anthropomorphism.—And this has happened of their shutting the door upon all interpretations ; they have construed in their literal acceptation, the verse that 'He is seated on the Throne,' and such like, and the traditions as to رویت (the sight of God) until they derived *tajsîm* (corporeality) from one, and *tashbîh* (similarity, or anthropomorphism) from the other. These people had at first no method of reasoning or putting forward of logical arguments ; they relied only on the literal words of the Koran and traditions until the appearance of Abu'l Hassan Ashaarî, who was a prominent disciple of Abu Ali Jubbai, one of the learned Imâms of the Mutazalas. Abu'l Hassan had acquired great knowledge of logic and argumentation. He abandoned the *Mazhab-i-itizâl*, and adopted that of the *Ahl-i-Sunnat wa-Jamâat*, and made great endeavours to advance the cause of this sect, which up to his time had no influence whatsoever. Henceforth it began to be called after him. He invented principles and rules according to the Mutazalite models. . . . And as the tyrannical sovereigns found that the doctrines of this *Mazhab* suited their policy, خلفا و ایمهٔ جور نیز در اغلب بنا بران که قواعد مذهب ایشان موافق مصالح آنان بود

We cannot help contrasting the present condition of the Church which claims to be orthodox in Christendom with that of the one which advances a similar claim in Islâm. From the fourth century, ever since its foundation, until the revolt of Luther, Catholicism proved itself the mortal enemy of science, philosophy, and learning. It consigned to the flames myriads of beings for heresy; it trampled out the lispings of free-thought in Southern France: and closed with violence the schools of rational theology. But Catholicism, after the great break of Luther and Calvin, discovered that neither the cultivation of science nor the pursuit of philosophy renders the faithful an unbeliever. It broadened its base and now includes men of the largest minds, scientists, *littèrateurs*, etc. To an out-sider it presents a more liberal aspect than even the Reformed Christian Churches. For five centuries Islam assisted in the free intellectual development of humanity, but a reactionary movement then set in, and all at once the whole stream of human thought was altered. The cultivators of science and philosophy were pronounced to be beyond the pale of Islam. Is it impossible

they supported this sect; and so Ashaarsïm spread widely among the *Ahl-i-Islâm*. But, as the doctrines of the Mutazalas (قواعد اعتزال) were founded on the principles of reason (اصول عقلیه), they found acceptance among a large number of the true-hearted people (در دوایب حق رایحنه). And as the Mutazalas had studied deeply the philosophical works (of the Greeks), they introduced arguments borrowed from them in the discussion of metaphysical and theological subjects. And when the Ashaarîs became aware of this, as they considered everything which was not contained in the bosom of Islam a heresy—هر حة در صدر اسلام معمول نبوده بدعت دانسته بودند, they at once pronounced the study of philosophy (مطالعه کتب حکمت) to be unlawful and dangerous. It was owing to the endeavours of this sect that philosophy became so unpopular among the *Ahl-i-Islam* as to affect even the learned of the Mutazalas. But the *Ashaaria* were the originators of this antagonism to philosophy, for, otherwise, it is in truth in no way inconsistent with religion or the mysteries (اسرار) of the Koran and traditions. . . . The prophets and their representatives (اوصیا) have explained the truths of philosophy which are Divine by *tamsil*, similitudes." . . . "With regard to the freedom of human actions, there are three *Mazhabs*: the first is the doctrine of *Jabr*, and that is the *Mazhab* of the Ashaarias; they hold that the actions of man are immediately created by God without any exercise of will on the part of human beings—so much so, that if a person lights a fire, the lighting is said to be an act of God." Then after exposing the immorality of this doctrine, the author proceeds to say, "the second *Mazhab* that of *tafwîz*, was adopted by a few Mutazalas, who held that man has absolute power to choose what is right and what is wrong, and do accordingly. The third is the *Mazhab* of the Fatimide Imams, and the majority of the philosophers and rationalists who maintain that human actions are the immediate creations of man, but evil and good are pointed out by God." . . .

for the Sunni Church to take a lesson frcm the Church of Rome? Is it impossible for her to expand similarly—to became many-sided? There is nothing in Mohammed's teachings which prevents this. Islamic Protestantism, in one of its phases,—Mutazalaism,—has already paved the way. Why should not the great Sunni Church shake off the old trammels and rise to a new life?

The wonderful mysticism which forms the life and soul of modern Persian literature owes its distinct origin to the esoteric significance attached by an important section of the Moslems to the words of the Koran. The elevated feeling of Divine pervasion with which Mohammed often spoke, the depth of fervent and ecstatic rapture which characterised his devotion, constituted the chief basis on which Moslem mysticism was founded. During the lifetime of the Prophet, when the performance of duties was placed before speculation, there was little scope for the full development of the contemplative and mystical element in Islam. This mystical and contemplative element has existed in all religions and among every people. As our battles, moral and physical, grow fewer, we look upon this—the character of quiet contemplation—as the true type of humanity. But yet it will vary with the peculiarities of the individual and the race, and according to their tendency to confound the abstract with the concrete. The Hindu looks to the absorption of the special in the Infinite as the culmination of happiness; and to attain this end he remains immovable in one spot, and resigns himself to complete apathy. The sense of infinity makes it difficult for him to distinguish between the priest and the God, or himself and the God, objectively; and eventually between the Deity and the different forms of nature in which He is supposed to be manifested. Gradually this train of centemplation leads to the formal conclusion, as appears from the Bhagavad Gita, that Creator and creation are identical. We see thus how curiously pantheism in its extreme manifestation approaches to fetishism, which preceded every other idea of the Divinity. In its infancy the human mind knows no spiritual sentiment but one of unmixed terror. The primeval forests which the hand of man has not yet touched, the stupendous mountains looming in the distance, the darkness of the night, with the grim, weird shapes which hover about it, the howling of the wind through the forest tops, all inspire fear and awe in the

infant mind of man. He worships every material object he finds more powerful or more awe-striking than himself or his immediate surroundings. Gradually he comes to attach an ideality to all these objects of nature, and thinks these idealities worthy of adoration. In process of time all these separate idealities merge in one universal all-embracing Ideality. Materialistic pantheism is the first step in the rise from fetishism.

Neo-Platonism, itself the child of Eastern thought, had impressed its character on Christainity, and probably given rise to the Eucharistic idea. With the exception of Johannes Scotus, the mystics of Europe during the Middle Ages fought only on this ground. Mysticism, properly so called, with its higher yearning after the Infinite, was ushered in by the Moslems.

The idea among the nobler minds in the world of Islâm, that there was a deeper and more inward sense in the words of the Koran, arose not from the wish to escape from the rigour of texts and dogmas, but from a profound conviction that those words meant more, not less, than the popular expounders supposed them to convey. This conviction, combined with a deep feeling of Divine pervasion,—a feeling originating from and in perfect accordance with the teachings of the Koran and the instructions of the Prophet,—led to the development among the Moslems of that Contemplative or Idealistic philosophy which has received the name of Sufism, and the spread of which, among the western Mahommedans, was probably assisted by the prevalence of Platonic ideas. Imam al-Ghazzalı in the East, and Ibn-Tufail in the West, were the two great representatives of mysticism among the Moslems. The former. as we have already seen, dissatisfied with every philosophical system which based knowledge on experience or reason, had taken refuge in Sufism. Al-Ghazzalî's influence served greatly to promote the diffusion of Sufism among the Eastern Moslems, and idealistic philosophy was embraced by the greatest intellects of the Mahommedan East. The Moulana Jalal ud-dın of Rum (Turkey), whose *Masnavî* [1] is venerated by the Sufı,—Sanaï, whom Jalal ud-din himself has called his superior,[2] Farıd ud-dîn

[1] One of the apologues of the *Masnavî* on true devotion being the *service of man*, has been beautifully rendered into English by Leigh Hunt in the lines beginning—

"Abou ben Adhem (may his tribe increase)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace," etc.

[2] Appendix II.

Attâr, Shams ud-dîn Hâfiz, Khâkâni, the moralist Saadi, the romancer Nizâmi,—all belonged to this school.

The pure, we may say the exalted, side of this beautiful Idealism, entirely founded on the teachings of Mohammed, has furnished glorious themes to the poets of Islam. The idylls of that universal Divine love, which pervades nature from the lowest type of creation to the highest, sung in sweet strains and rapturous words by Jalal ud-din, Sanaï and Attar, are regarded by the Sufis with a respect only less than that entertained for the Koran.

Sûfism in the Mahommedan world, like its counterpart in Christendom, has in its practical effect, however, been productive of many mischievous results. In perfectly well-attuned minds mysticism takes the form of a noble type of idealistic philosophy ; but the generality of mankind are more likely to unhinge their brains by busying themselves with the mysteries of the Divine Essence and our relations thereto. Every ignorant and idle specimen of humanity, who despising real knowledge abandoned the fields of true philosophy and betook himself to the domains of mysticism, would thus set himself up as one of the *Ahl-i-Maarfat*, " people of knowledge." And that this actually occurred in the time of Ghazzali we see by his bitter complaint that things had come to such a pass that husbandmen were leaving their tillage and claiming the privileges of "the advanced." In fact the greatest objection to vulgar mysticism, whether in Islam or in Christendom, is that, being in itself no religion, wherever it prevails it unsettles the mind and weakens the foundations of morality ; indeed, it brings about a state of things which is every day visible in the naturalistic pantheism of India.

Yet the benefits conferred by the nobler type of idealistic philosophy are too great to be ignored ; and the Idealism of Averroes has done more to develop in Europe the conception of Universal Divinity than all the dreamy lucubrations of succeeding thinkers. Christian Europe owes its outburst of subjective pantheism—and its consequent emancipation from the intense materialism of a mythological creed—to the engrafting of Moslem idealism on the European mind. Christianity, apart from the Platonism with which it was pregnant during the first five centuries, is of the most material character. It does not recognise a God apart from human conceptions ; its deity is intensely anthropomorphic and personal. It was the influence of

Averroistic writings that attracted the attention of reflecting people to the great problem of the connection between the worlds of matter and of mind, and revived the conception of an all-prevading spirit, "which sleeps in the stone, dreams in the animal, and wakes in the man,' "the belief that the hidden vital principle which produces the varied forms of organisation is but the thrill of 'the Divine Essence that is present in them all.' "

جان عالم گویمش گر ربط جان دانم بتن
در دل هر ذره هم پنهان و هم پیداستي

"I would have said He was the Soul of the Universe if I had known the relation of the human soul to the body, for He is present and hidden in the heart of every atom."

THE END.

APPENDIX I.

TRANSLATION OF THE PERSIAN AND ARABIC MOTTOES AT THE HEAD OF THE CHAPTERS.

O Thou! who hast no place in any place,
Wonder-struck I am that Thou art at every place.
Faith and no-Faith are both engaged in Thy search.
Both crying aloud, "He is the one, He is the all-Alone." ... P. i. Introd.

He attained the height of eminence by his perfection ;
He dispelled the darkness (of the world) by his grace ;
Excellent were all his qualities ;
Pray for blessings on him and his posterity. ... ... P. 1

Mohammed is the lord of the two worlds and of mankind and the Spirits.
And of the two nations, the Arabs and the Ajam (non-Arabs) P. 38

Thou hast come before all the Teachers of the world,
Though thou hast appeared last of all ;
Last of the Prophets thy nearness has become known to me ;
Thou comest last, as thou comest from a distance. ... ... P. 47

May God ever convey my benedictions and greeting.
To the Prophet of Arabia, of Medîna,—of Mecca ;
The sun of excellence and of splendour, and of sublimest eminence ;
The light of full moon, of elegance, and of the sky of generosity ;
The noblest of creation in person and in adoration and in watchfulness ;
The most excellent of mankind in munificence and generosity. ... ...P. 52

He is like the flower in delicacy and like the full moon in spendour.
Like the ocean in liberality, and like Time in resolution. ... ...P. 62

He called towards God, and those who took hold of him
Took hold of a rope that never breaks. ... ...P. 78

But how can the desire of the eulogist come up to
What is in him of nobility of disposition and nature? ... ... P. 86

He surpassed all the Prophets in constitution and in disposition,
Nor any did approach him either in knowledge or nobleness.
Avoid what the Christians assert about their Prophet;
(But) declare whatever else thou wishest in his praise, and contend for it.

Indeed the Prophet is a light from which guidance is sought,
And a drawn sword out of God's swords. ... ...P. 94

Is it from the remembrance of the neighbours at Zi-Salam
That thou hast mixed tears flowing from the eyes with blood? ...P. 100

When the help of God and victory come and thou seest the people entering into the religion of God in troops,
Celebrate the praise of thy Lord, and ask pardon of Him; for He is the Forgiver. ... ...P. 102

Come to Me, do not seek except Me;
I am the Beneficent; seek me thou wilt find Me.
Dost thou remember any night in which thou hast called to Me Secretly,
And I did not hear thee? Then seek Me thou wilt find Me.
When the afflicted one says "dost not Thou see me?"
I look towards him; seek Me, thou wilt find Me.
When My servant disobeys Me, thou wilt find Me
Quick in chastising; seek Me, thou wilt find Me. ... ...P. 117

Say, unto whom belongeth whatsoever is in beaven and earth?
Say unto God; He hath prescribed unto himself mercy ... ...P. 138
(For translation of the other passage see p. 151.)
The disputes of the seventy-two sects put them all aside,
As they did not see the Truth they took to the path of fiction...P. 263

(*N. B.* The Mahommedan world is supposed to be split up into seventy-two sects.)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

APPENDIX II.

The tradition which I have paraphrased into English is as follows :—

جاء الله من سيناء و اشرق من ساعير او استعلن من فا ران

"Sâyîr," says Yâkût in his Geographical Encyclopædia, "is a hill in Palestine and Fârân is the hill of Mecca ;" *Mujam ul-Buldân*, Vol. III, p. 834. ... ...Introd. p. lix

p. 145 ... ... لا صلوا ة ا لا بحضو رِ القلب

Ibid. ... ... اقرار باللسان و تصديق بالقلب

p. 248. ... من كا ن له ذمتنا فد مه كدمنا ود يته كد يتنا

ولنجران و حاشيتها جوار الله و ذمّة محمدالنبى رسول الله على انفسهم و ملتهم و ارضهم و اموالهم و غائبهم و شاهدهم و عيرهم و بعثهم و امثلتهم ولا يُغيَّر ما كانوا عليه ولا يغيرّ حق من حقوقهم و امثلتهم لاتفتن اسقف م اسقفته ولا راهب من رهبانته ولا واقّه من وقاهيته على مانحت ايدهم من قليل او كثير وليس عليهم رهق ولادم جاهلية ولا يحشرون ولايعشرون ولايطأ ارضهم جيش ... p. 246

لا يهدم لهم بعية ولا كنية ولا يمنعون من ضرب النوا قبين ولا من اخرا ن الصلبان فى يوم عددهم ... ... p. 247

Whatever the sins of the Bâbîs may have been, their punishment, in its barbarous inhumanity, far exceeded their deserts—a punishment borne with sublime fortitude which cannot help evoking the admiration of every heart not steeped in racial or religious fanaticism and which is bearing its natural fruit. The sect, instead of dying out, is increasing in number, and judging from the few *professed* Babîs I have met, actuated with bitter hatred against the Mullahs whom they believe to be the primary cause of their persecution.

The cruelties to which the Bâbîs were subjected were the acts of an ignorant populace and a frightened governor hounded on by fanatical priests. In China, in our own times under the eyes of the civilised world, disciplined troops of certain civilised Powers perpetrated the most diabolical and nameless horrors upon unoffending citizens and helpless women and children. Crimes like these destroy one's faith in humanity and progress ... ... p. 346.

The astronomer Ali Ibn Yunus was a man of versatile talent. "He made astronomy his particular study," says Ibn Khallikân, "but he was well-versed in other sciences and desplayed an eminent talent for poetry." ... ... p. 347.

The *Indian Social Reformer* of Bombay (of the 28th of July 1901), in an appreciative article on "the Liberal Movement in Islam", drew my attention to certain statements of M. Renan in one of his lectures delivered in March, 1883 at the Sorbonne. [1] In this lecture, M. Renan has tried to show that Islam is opposed to science, and that scientific pursuits came into vogue among the Moslems only when the religion became weakened. "Omar", he says, " did not burn, as we are often told, the library of Alexandria ; that library had, by his time, nearly disappeared. But the principle which he caused to triumph in the world was in a very real sense destructive of learned research and of the varied work of the mind."

The correctness of this somewhat wild and reckless assertion, which, coming from the author of "Averroes and Averroism," is startling, was at once challenged by the learned Shaikh Jamal ud-dîn who was residing at Paris at the time. M. Renan's reply to the Shaikh's criticism is instructive. The learned Frenchman had to qualify his generalisations and to acknowledge that by Islam he meant the religion of Mohammed as accepted and practised by the ignorant and fanatical sections of the Moslem communities. I will quote here the passage in which he limits his strictures, as it may perpaps be of some help in awakening the Mussalmans themselves to a sense of their responsibilities :—"One aspect in which I have appeared unjust to the Shaikh is that I have not sufficiently developed the idea that all revealed religion is forced to show hostility to positive science ; and that, in this respect, Christianity has no reason to boast over Islam. About that there can be no doubt. Galileo was not treated more kindly by Catholicism than was Averroes by Islam. Galileo found truth in a Catholic country despite Catholicism, as Averroes nobly philosophised in a Moslem country despite Islam. If I did not insist more strongly upon this point, it was to tell the truth, because my

[1] The lecture is headed "Islâmism and Science," and is printed in a book called "the Poetry of the Celtic Races and other Studies."

opinions on this matter are so well known that there was no need for me to recur to them again before a public conversant with my writings. I have said, sufficiently often to preclude any necessity for repeating it, that the human mind must be detached from all supernatural belief if it desires to labour at its own essential task, which is the construction of positive science. This does not imply any violent destruction or hasty rupture. It does not mean that the Christian should forsake Christianity, or that the Mussulman should abandon Islâm. It means that the enlightened parts of Christendom and Islam should arrive at that state of benevolent indifference in which religious beliefs become inoffensive. This is half accomplished in nearly all Christian countries. Let us hope that the like will be the case for Islam. Naturally on that day the Shaikh and I will be at one, and ready to applaud heartily..... I did not assert that all Mussulmans, without distinction of race, are and always will be sunk in ignorance. I said that Islâmism puts great difficulties in the way of science, and unfortunately has succeeded for five or six hundred years in almost suppressing it in the countries under its sway ; and that this is for these countries a cause of extreme weakness. I believe, in point of fact, that the regeneration of the Mohammedan countries will not be the work of Islam ; it will come to pass through the enfeeblement of Islam, as indeed the great advance of the countries called Christian commenced with the destruction of the tyrannical church of the Middle Ages. Some persons have seen in my lecture a thought hostile to the individuals who profess the Mohammedan religion. That is by no means true; Mussulmans are themselves the first victims of Islâm. More than once in my Eastern travels I have been in a position to notice how fanaticism proceeds from a small number of dangerous men who keep the others in the practice of religion by terror. To emancipate the Mussulman from his religion would be the greatest service that one could render him. In wishing these populations, in which so many good elements exist, a deliverance from the yoke that weighs them down, I do not believe that I have any unkindly thought for them. And, let me say also, since the Shaikh Jamal ud-dın desires me to hold the balance equally between different faiths, I should not any the more believe that I was wishing evil of certain European countries if I expressed a hope that Christianity should have a less dominant influence upon them."

It is a matter for regret that European scholars, generally speaking, should persist in comparing the lowest form of Islam with the highest form of Christianity. All religions have different phases ; they vary according to the climatic and economic conditions of the country, the environments and education of the people, their national characteris-

tics and a multitude of oher causes. To compare modern idealistic Christianity with a debased form of Islam is an insult to common sense and intelligence. In this work I have endeavoured to show how Islam furthered the intellectual movement of the world, how it brought to life a dying world, how it promoted culture and civilisation. It was not the Islam which is professed to-day by the ignorant bigot, the intriguing self-seeker, but it was nevertheless Islam—Islam in its truest, highest and noblest sense. I have tried to show the cause of the blight that has fallen on Moslem nations. It is more than probable that my views will not satisfy the critic of Islam who has started with a pre-conceived bias, or who judges of the Faith by its latter-day professors. All the same I venture to assert that my statements are founded on historical facts.

* * * * * * * *

One assertion of M. Renan requires a categorical refutation. He has alleged in his lecture "as a very remarkable thing that among the philosophers and learned men called Arabic, there was but one alone, Alkindi, who was of Arabic origin : all the others were Persians, Trans-oxians, Spaniards, natives of Bokhara, of Samarcand, of Cordova, of Seville. Not only were those men not Arabs by blood, but they were in nowise Arabs in mind." The memory of this great French scholar, whose acquaintance I had the privilege of making, deserves every respect. But surely this sweeping observation is very wide of the truth. A glance at the *Wafiât ul-Ayân* (Ibn Khallikan's great Biographical Dictionary), the *Târikh ul-Hukama* and other works of the like nature, will show how utterly unfounded the assertion is. From the genealogy of the eminent men whose lives are contained in these books, it will be seen that a vast number of the great scholars, doctors and savants, although born in places outside Arabia, were Arabs by descent.

Probably M. Renan would not have admitted that Ali (the Caliph) was a philosopher, but his descendants Jaafar as-Sadik and Ali ar-Raza were unquestionably entitled to be included in that designation. And Jaafar as-Sadik was a scientist besides. Jaabir ibn Haiyan (Geber), the father of modern chemistry, worked in fact with the materials gathered by Jaafar. It is admitted that Al Kindi, "the Philosopher of the Arabs", was descended from the royal family of Kinda and was an Arab of the Arabs. But it is not known that Yahya ibn Ali Mansur (see *ante* p. 344) was a pure Arab. Nor is it known that Ali ibn Yunus (*ante* p. 347) belonged to the tribe of as-Sadaf—"a great branch," says Ibn Khallikân "of the tribe of Himyar which settled in Egypt." Al-Jahiz, Abu Osman Amr, *al-Kinâni al-Laisi*, the celebrated Mutazalite

philosopher, who died at Bussorah in A. H. 255 (868.—9 A. C.) was a pure Arab, a member of the tribe of Kinana. Avenpace (*ante* p. 386) was a Tujîbite by descent. "Tujîbi pronounced also Tajîbi," says Ibn Khallikan, "means descended from Tujîb the mother of Aadi and Saad, the sons of Ashras ibn us-Sakûn. She herself was the daughter of Saubân bin Sulaim ibn Mazis, and her sons were surnamed after her."

The Avenzoars (*ante* p. 355) belonged to the Arabian tribe of Iyaz ibn Nizâr and hence bore the title of al-Iyâzi.

The great grammarian al-Khalîl ibn Ahmed was a member of the tribe of Azd. The Spanish historian and philosopher Ibn Bash-kuwal was a descendant of one of the Medinite Ansar who had settled in Spain. Masudi (*ante* p. 359) was a direct descendant of one of the Prophet's immediate companions and disciples, Ibn Masud, hence the title; whilst Ibn ul-Athir was a member of the celebrated tribe of Shaiban.

The political economist and jurisconsult, al-Mawardi, a native of Bussorah, was a pure Arab.[1]

The soldier, statesman, philosopher and poet, Osâma was a member of the tribe of Kinâna.

Sharîf al-Murtaza, the author of the *Ghurrar wa'd Durrar*, one of the greatest scholars of his time, was descended from Imam Ali ar-Razâ.

Ibn Tufail (*ante* p. 396) was a member of the tribe of Kais and hence the title of al-Kaisi.

Ibn Khaldûn was descended from an Yemenite family which had settled in Spain. They came from Hazramut and were therefore called *al-Hazramî*.

I have given only a few names picked out at random but the curious reader will find numberless instances in the books I have mentioned.[2]

To say that these men were not Arabs and had no Arab blood in them is surely a bold assertion. I might with equal effrontery assert that, because Longfellow, Channing, Emerson, Draper were born in America, they were not Anglo-Saxons. ... ...P. 366.

* * * * * * * *

Ibn Khallikân calls al-Fârâbi "the greatest philosopher of the Moslems" and speaks of him in the following terms :—

ابو نصر محمد بن محمد طرخان بن اوزلغ الفارابي التركى
الحكيم المشهور صاحب التصانيف فى المنطق و الموسيقى و غيرهما

(1) Two of his most inportant works are *the Ahkâm us-Saltanat* and *as-Siâsat ul-Mulk*, both spoken of highly by Von Hammer.

2 See also Wüstenfeld's *Geschichte der Arabischer Aerzte*, *Târîkh ul-Islâm* of Zahabl, and Casiri's *Bibliotheca Arabica*.

من العلوم و هو اكبر فلاسفة المسلمين لم يكن فيهم من بلغ رتبته
فى فنونه و الرئيس ابو علي ابن سيناء المقدم ذكره بكتبه تخرج
بكلامه و انتفع فى تصانيفه

"Abû Nasr Mohammed bin Mohammed bin Turkhân bin Auslagh al-Farabi at-Turki (the Turk), a celebrated philosopher, author of many works in logic, music, and other sciences. He was the greatest of philosophers among the Moslems, and no one among them attained a rank equal to his in the sciences. And the *chief* (of philosophers) Abu Ali Ibn Sîna, whom I have mentioned before, derived benefit from his writings." ... ... p. 394.

Abu'l Kâsim Kinderski was a famous poet and *Avicennistic* philosopher of Persia in the 18th century. ... ... *Ibíd*

* * * * * * * * * *

Hai ibn Yukzân was translated into English and published in London so long ago as 1686. ... ... p. 396.

Sanâï has given expression to his admiration for Ibn Sîna and his devotion to philosophy in the following lines.

نخواهم لا جرم نعمت نه در دنيا نه در جنت
همي گويم بهر ساعت چه در سرا چه در ضرا
ده يارب مر سنائی را صناعی ده تو در حكمت
توان كز وی برشک آيد روان بو علی سينا

"I do not seek for any reward in this world or the next.
"Every moment I pray, whether in prosperity or in adversity.
"O my Lord, bestow on Sanaï the proficiency in philosophy and sciences
"Such as would make even the soul of Bû Ali Sîna jealous." ...P. 398.

The position of Sanaï in the world of Islam can be gathered from the following lines of Jalal ud-dîn Ruml revered nowadays by educated Mussalmâns throughout Asia and Egypt.

عطار روح بود و سنائی دو چشم او
ما از پي سنائی و عطار آمديم

" Attâr was its soul [of the philosophy of mysticism], Sanâï was its eyes ; I only walked in the footsteps of Attâr and Sanâï."

* * * * * * * *

The reactionary character of the influence exercised by Abu'l Hasan Ali al-Ashaari and Ahmed al-Ghazzali can hardly be over-

estimated. It has been happily summed up in a few words by the learned editor of al-Beirûni's *al-Âsâr ul-Bâkieh*—"but for al-Ashaari and al-Ghazzali the Arabs might have been a nation of Galileos, Keplers and Newtons." By their denunciations of science and philosophy, by their exhortations that besides theology and law no other knowledge was worth acquiring, they did more to stop the progress of the Moslem world than most other Moslem scholiasts. And up to this day their example is held forth as a reason for ignorance and stagnation.

Al-Ashaari was born at Bussorah in 883-4 A. C. (270 A. H.) and died at Bagdad ; but the year of his death is not certain ; it occurred probably some time between 941 and 952 A. C. (300 and 340 A. H.). He was originally a Mutazala and publicly taught the rationalistic doctrines. A clever, ambitious man he saw no opportunity of power or influence among the Rationalists ; an alliance with the party of retrogression meant fame and tangible reward. He, accordingly, made a public renunciation of his former creed in man's free will and "of his opinion that the Koran was created." This happened on a Friday at the Cathedral mosque of Bussorah Whilst seated on his chair lecturing to his pupils, he suddenly sprang up, and cried aloud to the assembled multitude :—"They who know me, know who I am, as for those who do not know me, I shall tell them : I am Ali ibn Ismâil al-Ashaari, and I used to hold that the Koran was created, that the eyes (*of men*) shall not see God, and that we ourselves are the authors of our evil deeds ; now I have returned to the truth, I renounce these opinions and I take the engagement to refute the Mutazalites and expose their infamy and turpitude." And with the recantation of each doctrine that he formerly professed, he tore off from his person some garment saying "I repudiate this belief as I repudiate this dress." First went the turban, then the mantle and so on. The effect of this theatrical display was immense among the impressionable inhabitants of Bussorah and the fame of al-Ashaari spread so rapidly among the people that he soon became their recognised leader. Ibn Khallikân calls him "a great upholder of the orthodox doctrines."

* * * * * * * *

Upon the death of the last Fâtimide Caliph al-Aazid li-dîn Illâh, Saladin, who was Commander-in-chief and Prime Minister, proclaimed the Abbasside Mustazii and thus restored Egypt to the spiritual sovereignty of Bagdad. Ashaarism henceforth became dominant in that country.

The theological students, who were chiefly the followers of Ibn Hanbal, under the weaker Abbasside Caliphs became a source of great trouble in Bagdad. They constituted themselves into a body of irresponsible censors ; they used forcibly to enter houses, break musical instruments and commit similar acts of Vandalism.

APPENDIX III.

For the Genealogical Tables of the Saracenic Caliphs and Sovereigns see my *Short History of the Saracens.* I give here the names of the Ommeyyade Caliphs of Damascus and Spain, of the Abbasside Caliphs of Bagdad and the Fatimide Caliphs of Cairo with the dates of their accession to make the text intelligible.

THE RÂSHIDÎN CALIPHS.

	A.H.	A.C.
1. Abû Bakr, ...	11 =	632
2. Omar, ...	13 =	634
3. Osman, ...	24 =	644
4. Ali, ...	34 =	655

THE OMMEYYADE SOVEREIGNS OF DAMASCUS.

1. Muâwiyah, I., ...	41 =	661
2. Yezîd, ...	61 =	679
3. Muâwiyah II., ...	64 =	683
4. Merwân I., ...	65 =	684
5. Abdul Malik, ...	65 =	685
6. Walîd I., ...	86 =	705
7. Sulaimân, ...	96 =	715
8. Omar bin Abdul Azîz	99 =	717
9. Yezîd II., ...	101 =	721
10. Hishâm, ...	105 =	724
11. Walîd II., ...	125 =	743
12. Yezîd III., ...	126 =	744
13. Ibrâhim	126 =	744
14. Merwân II., ...	127 =	745

THE ABBASSIDE CALIPHS OF BAGDAD.

1. As-Saffâh, *Abu'l Abbâs* (Abdullah), ...	132 =	749
2. Al-Mansûr, *Abû Jaafar*, ...	136 =	754
3. Al-Mahdi, (Mohammed)	158 =	775
4. Al-Hadi, (Mûsa)	158 =	775
5. Ar-Rashîd, (Hârun)	170 =	786

6. Al-Amîn, (Mohammed)	193 =	809
7. Al-Mamun, (Abdullah)	198 =	813
8. Al-Mutassim b'Illâh, (Abû Ishâk Mohammed) ...	218 =	833
9. Al-Wâsik b'Illâh, (Abû Jaafar Hârûn)	227 =	842
10. Al-Mutawakkil aala-Illah, (Jaafar)	232 =	847
11. Al-Muntassir b'Illah, (Mohammed)	247 =	861
12. Al-Mustaîn b'Illah, (Ahmed)	248 =	862
13. Al-Mutazz b'Illah, (Mohammed)	252 =	866
14. Al-Muhtadi b'Illah, (Mohammed Abu Ishak) ...	255 =	869
15. Al-Mutamid al'-Allah, (Ahmed, Abu'l Abbas) ...	256 =	870
16. Al-Mutazid b'Illah, (Ahmed, Abu'l Abbas) ...	279 =	892
17. Al-Muktafi b'Illah, (Ali, Abu Mohammed) ...	292 =	902
18. Al-Muktadir b'Illah, (Jaafar, Abu'l Fazl)	295 =	908
19. Al-Kahir b'Illah, (Mohammed, Abu Mansur) ...	320 =	932
20. Ar-Razi b'Illah, (Mohammed Abu'l Abbas) ...	322 =	934
21. Al-Muttaki b'Illâh, (Ibrahim, Abu'l Ishak)... ...	329 =	940
22. Al-Mustakfi b'Illah, (Abdullah, Abu'l Kâsim) ...	333 =	944
23. Al-Muti UIlâh, (Fazl, Abûl Kâsim)	334 =	946
24. At-Tai I'Illah, (Abdul Karim, Abu Bakr) ...	363 =	974
25. Al-Kadir b'Illah, (Ahmed, Abu'l Abbas)	381 =	991
26. Al-Kaîm b'amr-Illah, (Abdullah, Abu Jaafar) ...	422 =	1031
27. Al-Muktadi bi'amr-Illah (Abdullah, Abu'l Kasim) ...	467 =	1075
28. Al-Mustazhar b'Illâh, (Ahmed, Abu'l Abbas) ...	487 =	1094
29. Al-Mustarshid b'Illah, (Fazl, Abu'l Mansur) ...	512 =	1118
30. Ar-Rashid b'Illah (Mansur, Abu Jaafar)	529 =	1135
31. Al-Muktafi bi'amr-Illah, (Mohammed, Abu Abdullah)	530 =	1136
32. Al-Mustanjid b'Illâh, (Yusuf, Abu'l Muzaffar ...	555 =	1160
33. Al-Mustazi, bi'amr-Illâh, (Hassan, Abû Mohammed)...	566 =	1170
34. An-Nâsir li-dîn-Illâh, (Ahmed, Abu'l Abbâs) ...	575 =	1180
35. Az-Zahir bi'amr-Illah, (Mohammed, Abu Nasr) ...	622 =	1225
36. Al-Mustansir b'Illah, (Mansur, Abu Jaafar) ...	623 =	1226
37. Al-Mustaasim b'Illah, (Abdullah, Abu Ahmed) ...	640 =	1243

THE FÂTIMIDE CALIPHS OF EGYPT.

	A.H.	A.C.
1. Al-Mahdi, Obaidullah	296 =	908
2. Al-Kaim bi-amr-Illah, ...	322 =	934
3. Al-Mansur bi-amr-Illah, ...	333 =	945
4. Al-Muiz li dın-Illâh, ...	341 =	953
5. Al-Azız b'Illâh, ...	365 =	975
6. Al-Hâkim bi-amr-Illâh, ...	386 =	996

7. Az-Zâhir l'-azaz-dîn-Illâh,	...	...	411 = 1021
8. Al-Mustansir b'Illah,	...	...	427 = 1036
9. Al-Mustaali b'Illah,	...	...	487 = 1094
10. Al-Aamir bi-Ahkam-Illah	...	...	494 = 1104
11. Al-Hâfiz li-dîn-Illâh,	...	...	523 = 1130
12. Az-Zafir bi-amr-Illah	...	...	542 = 1149
13. Al-Fâiz ba-amr Illâh	...	...	543 = 1150
14. Al-Aazid-li-dîn-Illah	...	...	564 = 1171

THE OMMEYYADE CALIPHS OF CORDOVA.

138—422, 756—1031 A C.	A. H.	A. C.
Abdur Rahmân I., (*ad Dâkhil*)	138 =	756
Hishâm I, (Abu'l Walîd)	172 =	788
Hakam I., *al-Muntassir*	180 =	796
Abdur Rahmân II, (*al-Ausat*)	206 =	822
Mohammed I.	238 =	852
Munzir	273 =	886
Abdullâh	275 =	888
An-Nâsir li-dîn-Illâh, Abdur Rahmân III. ...	300 =	912
Al-Mustansir b'Illâh, Hakam II. ...	350 =	961
Al-Muwayyid b'Illah, Hisham II. ...	366 =	976
Al-Mahdi, Mohammed II.	399 =	1009
Al-Mustain b'Illah, Sulaiman	400 =	1009
Mohammed II. (again)	400 =	4010
Hisham II. (again)	400 =	1010
Sulaiman (again)	403 =	1013
Ali bin Hamûd, (*An-Nâsir the Idriside*) ...	407 =	1016
Abdur Rahmân IV., (*al-Murtaza*) ...	408 =	1018
Kasim bin Hamud, (*al-Mamûn*)... ...	408 =	1018
Yahya bin Ali bin Hamûd, (*al-Mustaali*) ...	412 =	1021
Kâsim bin Hamûd, (again) ...	413 =	1022
Abdur Rahmân V., (*al-Mustazhir b'Illâh*) ...	414 =	1023
Mohammed III, (*al-Mustakfi b"Illâh*) ...	414 =	1024
Yahya bin Ali bin Hamud, (again) ...	416 =	1025
Hisham III., (*al-Mutazz b'Illah*) ...	418 =	1027

INDEX.

A.

Aadi, son of Hatim, 98, 99.
Aâdites, 35.
Abdullah ibn Maimun al-Kaddah, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308.
Abdullah ibn-Zubair, 7.
Abdur Rahman son of Auf, 20.
Abd ush-Shams, 4, 5.
Abu Mohammed al-Hassan ibn Ali al-Aaskarî, 317.
Abu'l Hassan Ali ibn Amajur, 345.
Abu'l Hikam, 43.
Abbas, 5, 6, 14, 41, 106, 109, 269, 273, 278, 285, 287, 288, 291, 342, 414.
Abbas II., Shah, 414.
Abbassides, 100, 195, 226, 257, 258, 277, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 291, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 307, 310, 326, 337, 338, 338, 340, 341, 342, 345, 351, 353, 357, 379, 399, 402, 404, 404, 407, 413, 414.
Abdul Kâdir Jilani, 314, 340.
Abdul Malik ibn Marwan, 212, 275, 293, 295, 322, 326, 355, 383, 396.
Abdul Muttalib, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 23, 92, 106.
Abdul Wahhab, 328.
Abdullah, 7, 8, 71, 107, 110, 194, 255, 267, 269, 278, 303.
Abdullah ibn Abbas, 278.
Abdullah ibn Ibâdh, 327.
Abdullah ibn Saad ibn Surrah, 267.
Abdullah ibn Ubbay, 53, 55, 64, 71, 96, 107.
Abdur Rahmân al-Hâzini, 351.
Abdur Rahman Sufi, 346.
Abelard, 366.
Aben-Bethar, 356.
Abraha, 7, 8.
Abraham, 19, 119, 132, 289, 307, 309.
Abu Abdullah ibn al-Mubarak, 322.
Abu Abdullah Malik ibn Ans, 323.
Abu Ali Mohammed al-Jubbai, 383, 388, 414.
Abû Bakr, 5, 20, 25, 35, 43, 44, 65, 81, 96, 109, 194, 195, 210, 223, 247, 251, 253, 266, 267, 268, 269, 278, 295, 335, 337, 393, 396.
Abû Hanifa, 279, 164, 322, 323, 340, 404, 405, 406.
Abu Hashim Khalid ibn Yezîd, 334.
Abu Jaafar Mohammed al-Jawwad, 316.
Abu Jahl, 43, 57, 58, 80, 89.
Abu Lahab, 7, 23, 35, 36.
Abu Maashar, 344.
Abu Mohammed Abdullah, 100, 295.
Abu Musa, 271, 326.
Abû Mûsa al-Ashaary, 270, 408.
Abu Musa Jaafar, 354.
Abu Muslim, 280, 281, 283.
Abu Obaidah, 252, 253, 254.
Abu Rafe Sallam, 69.
Abu Raihan Mohammed ibn Ahmed al-Beirunî, 350.
Abu Rashîd Nafe ibn Azrak, 327.
Abu Said al-Khazri, 50, 377.
Abu Sufian, 6, 53, 63, 64, 66, 73, 74, 84, 85, 98, 267, 269, 270, 271, 334.
Abu Talib, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, 34, 36, 37, 38, 63, 254, 297.
Abu Ula, 365.
Abû Usaiba, 355.
Abû Yusuf, 164, 247, 369, 393, 404.
Abu'l Feda, 15, 19, 27, 34, 41, 44, 45, 58, 66, 72, 93, 97, 101, 113, 264, 296, 354, 359, 360.
Abu'l Hassan, 345, 365, 408, 409.
Abu'l Hassan al-Ashaari, 408.
Abu'l Hassan Ali al-Askari, 317.
Abu'l Hassan Musa al-Kasim, 316.
Abu'l Huzail Hamadani, 383, 387.
Abul Kasim, 17, 355, 362, 394.
Abu'l Maali aj-Juwaini, 388, 389.
Abu'l Wafa, 346, 347, 383.
Ahmed ibn Hayet, 383.
Ahl ul-Bait, 276, 279, 280, 281, 282 285 288.
Ahl-i-Sunnat-wa'l Jamaet, 286, 387.
Ahl-ul-batin, 330.
Ahl-ul-Itizal, 383, 386.
Ahl-uz zahir, 330.
Ahmed ibn Mohammed (Abû Omar) 365.
Ahmed ibn Mohammed al-Nehâvendi, 344.
Akbar, 291, 314.

Akd ul-Liwa, 3.
Akhbâr, 320.
Akhbâri, 162, 164, 318, 319, 320, 321, 413.
Akhbarism, 320.
Al-Ahsâ, 307.
Al-Amîn, 1, 13, 22, 47, 110.
Al-Aswad, 108,
Al-Azhar, 296.
Al-Bahrain, 307, 326.
Al-Beiruni, 159, 350, 354, 359.
Al-Demri, 357.
Al-Edrisi, 354.
Al-Farabi, 393, 394, 399, 401, 412.
Al-Ghazzali, 145, 146, 411, 412, 417, 418.
Al-Hadi, 395.
Al-Hallaj, 121.
Al-Istakhri, 354.
Al-Kâim bi-amr Illâh, 287.
Al-Kâmil, 360.
Al-Kindi, 344, 393, 399.
Al-Kohi, 346.
Al-Kumi, 354.
Al-Mahdi, 298, 338, 393.
Al-Makîn, 360.
Al-Mansur, 280, 281, 316, 337, 338, 410.
Al-Muiz, 295, 296, 310, 342.
Al-Nafs-uz-Zakiya, 294.
Al-Nairizi, 345.
Ali, 13, 14, 19, 22, 27, 35, 43, 44, 45, 57, 63, 65, 66, 91, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 108, 109, 142, 145, 159, 176, 194, 210, 212, 213, 214, 242, 247, 248, 253, 254, 256, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 276, 278, 279, 280, 284, 285, 286, 290, 292, 293, 295, 297, 300, 302, 309, 314, 319, 323, 326, 333, 334, 337, 346, 377, 383, 384, 390, 403, 407, 414.
Ali ibn-Amajur, 345.
Ali ibn-Abbâs, 355.
Ali ibn-Mûsa ar-Raza, 284, 335.
Ali ibn-Taba Taba, 261.
Ali II., 292, 293, 295, 309, 316.
Ali III., Abu'l Hassan Ali ar-Raza, 284, 316, 380.
Ali IV, Naki, 317.
Ali Mohammed, Mirza, 328, 329.
Ali Shah al-Bokhari, 352.
Ali Sher Amir, 353.
Alamut, 311, 313, 314.
Alamûtias, 311, 312, 313.
Albigenses, 181, 285, 367.
Al-Mâmûn, 190, 284, 343.
Almohade, 369, 396, 397.
Alp Arslam, 287, 311, 351.
Amalekites, 48, 49 59.
Amavis, 286.
Amr ibn-al-Aas, 88, 170, 171.
Anabaptists, 180.
Ansâr, 49, 52, 72, 92, 93, 266, 276, 288, 337.
Anushirvan, 299.
Anwari, 339, 365.
Arabian tribes, 5, 7.
Arians, 32, 180, 181, 299.
Aryans, 229,
Asadullah al-Ghalib, 315.
Ashaarias, 350, 408, 410, 411, 414, 415.
Ashab-ul-adl-wa't-Tauhîd, 385, 389.
Asna-Aasharias, 286, 292, 295, 315, 317, 318, 321.
Asnâ-Aashariaism, 286, 321.
Athenians, 184, 202, 207, 208, 335, 341, 344.
Aurangzeb, 286, 363.
Aus, 49, 54, 69, 167.
Avenpace, 366, 368, 369.
Aven-Zoar, 355.
Averroes, 261, 349, 355, 356, 366, 368, 397, 410, 418.
Avicenna, 320, 352, 355, 356, 395, 402, 414.
Ayesha, 109, 194, 195, 210, 269, 368.
Ayyam ul-Mina, 3.
Azar, Lutf Ali, 365.
Azarika, 327, 328.
Azd ud-Dowla
Azîz b'Illah, 347.

B.

Babek, surnamed Khurram. 299.
Babism, 121, 328, 329.
Babylon, 119, 183, 208, 338.
Bactria, xx.
Badr, 62, 68, 89, 194.
Bagdad, 214, 286, 287, 291, 296, 297, 307, 316, 317, 326, 332, 338, 340, 342, 343, 345, 346, 352, 357, 359, 360, 366, 371, 379, 401, 404, 406, 407, 410
Bahmani, 286.
Balazuri, 359.
Banû-Abbas, 276, 278, 279, 282, 284, 285, 287, 297.
Banu-Bakr, 89.
Banu-Fatima, 285, 286, 346.

Banû-Fizara, 78, 86.
Banû-Hashim, 35, 285.
Banû-Idrîs, 286, 345, 390.
Banû-Kaynukâa, 49, 55, 70, 74, 75.
Banû-Khuzaa, 289.
Banû-Kuraizha, 49, 55, 68, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77.
Banu-Nadhir, 49, 55, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73.
Banu-Ommeyya, 276, 279, 280, 295.
Barmekides, 284.
Bâtinia, 306, 315, 330.
Bayezid, 314, 315.
Bâzân, 108.
Bukhâri, 57, 153, 377.
Buwaih, 284.

C.

Cairo, 286, 291, 296, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 332, 342, 345, 346, 347, 357, 360, 362.
Catherine St., Monastery of, 79.
Chaldæo-Magism, 120, 231, 287.
Chengîz, 285, 338, 352.
Christ, 117, 122, 131, 147, 174, 180, 181, 210, 234, 244, 265, 301, 314, 317, 367.
Christian Sects, xxxvi.
Chyroseir, 302, 307.
Co-cheou-King, 347, 352.
Collyridians, 122.
Constantine, 62, 104, 174, 181, 182, 185, 301, 343, 397.
Cordova, 213, 332, 342, 348, 349, 357, 362, 366, 368, 411.
Ctesiphon, 178.

D.

Dahri, 402, 411.
Dai, 306, 309, 312, 313.
Dai-ud-Daâwat, 308.
Dakîki, 350.
Damascus, 11, 97, 273, 275, 336, 338, 352, 363, 366, 379, 394.
Dâr ul-Amân, 176.
Dâr-ul-Hikmat, 308.
—— ul-Harb, 176.
—— ul-Islam 176.
—— un-Nadwa, 3, 43.
——us-Salâm, 340.
David, 44, 77, 142, 200, 231, 232.
Diwân aan Nazr fi'l Mazalim, 257.
——— ud-Dia, 257.
——— ul-Aata, 258.
——— ul-Ahdas w'ash-Shurta, 258.
——— ul-Barid 257.
——— ul Jund, 257.
——— ul-Kharâj, 257.
Diwân ul-Mawâli wa'l Ghilmân, 257.
——— ut-Toukia, 257.
——— ur Rasail 257.
——— uz-Zimam, 257.
——— uz-Zimâm an-Nafakât, 257.
Descartes, 355, 357.
Dhiraria, 7.
Diat, 54, 68, 91.
Dioscorides, 341, 357.
Dumat-ul-Jandal, 72, 80, 271, 286, 326.

E.

Ebionites, xxxiv.
Eleusis, 310.
Essenians, 147, 199.
Eunas-al-Aswari, 381.
Ezra, 120, 130.

F.

Fakhr ud-dîn al Marâghi, 352.
Fakhr ud din Râzi, 261, 311, 352, 414.
Farid ud-dîn Attâr, 159, 365, 417, 418.
Fath ibn-Nabeghah Khâkâni, 352.
Fâtima, 7, 14, 63, 159, 176, 269, 276, 277, 279, 283, 287, 288, 289, 291, 295, 296, 314, 342, 303.
Fatimides, 211, 214, 219, 283, 284, 286, 287, 291, 295, 296, 297, 298, 303, 307, 310, 320, 323, 337, 347, 369, 382, 383, 384, 385, 389, 405, 408, 413, 415.
Fazl, 13, 108, 278.
Fazl ibn-al-Hadasi, 383.
Fidâi, 311.
Firdousi, 350, 365, 411.

G.

Galeazzo Maria Sforza, 310.
Ghair-Mukallidin, 291.
Ghair-Mukallidism, 324, 325.
Ghâllia, 292, 314.
Gibbon, 445.
Gilân Dimishki, 381.
Giralda, 371.
Gnosticism, 199, 314.
Gowhar-i-Murad, 383, 392, 414.
Grenada, 213, 291, 348, 349, 362, 363, 366, 368, 296.
Gregory the Great, Pope, 351.

H.

Hadîs Kudsi, 318.
Hadîs Musik, 319.
Hâfiz (Shams-ud-din), 365, 418.
Hafsa, 194, 195.

Hâjib, 258.
Hajjâj ibn Yusuf, 282, 327.
Hakim ba-amr-Illah, 310, 347.
Hakim bin Hashim, 298.
Hamadan, 305, 307, 356, 394.
Hamadani, 359.
Hamid ibn Sulaimân, 323.
Hanafi, 85, 204, 279, 289, 322, 323, 324, 325, 404, 406.
Hanbal, 405.
Hanbali, 289, 322, 323, 324.
Harun, 214, 284, 286, 316, 393, 404, 406.
Hârun ur-Rashîd, 247, 323, 363.
Hashim, 4, 5, 10, 12, 22, 36, 255, 265, 279.
Hâshimias, 176, 314.
Hashimite, 10, 36, 38, 266, 337.
Hassan, 156, 271, 273, 292, 295, 309, 311, 312, 314, 315, 319, 383.
Hassan al-Basri, Imam, 382.
Hassan bin Haithem, 347.
Hassan ibn Kahtaba, 281.
Hassan ibn Mohammed Shah Humeiri, 310.
Hassan Sabah, 287, 310.
Hawazin, 9, 91, 92.
Hegira, 45, 87, 94, 102. 189, 214, 249, 316, 322, 338, 340, 359, 360.
Hellas, 363.
Heraclius, 85, 95, 175
Hetairai, 208.
Hijâz, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 49, 95, 102, 258, 271, 272, 279, 287, 288, 294, 316, 326.
Hilf-ul-Fuzul, 212.
Hind, 66, 271, 334.
Hisham, 36, 267, 293, 383.
Hisham ibn Abdul Malik, 293.
Hitopodesa, 340.
Hooran-i-Behisht or Houris, 230.
Huguenot, 181, 285, 298, 367.
Hulaku, 285, 312, 313, 352, 413.
Humaida, 214.
Hunain, 91, 98.
Hussain, 155, 210, 272, 273, 274, 275, 279, 282, 284, 285, 288, 292, 295, 306, 309, 314, 316, 346.

I.

Ibâdhia, 327, 328.
Ibn Abbas, 197, 278, 279, 334, 403.
Ibn-ul-Athir, 14, 15, 18, 20, 25, 27, 28, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 58, 65, 66, 67, 68, 72, 73, 74, 83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 101, 106, 110, 264, 359, 360.
Ibn-Baja, 356, 393, 395.
Ibn i-Batuta, 362.
Ibn-Duraid, 365.
Ibn-Faridh, 365.
Ibn-i-Hanbal, 323, 405, 406.
Ibn-i-Haukal, 354.
Ibn Khaldûn, 150, 151, 159, 285, 290, 291, 296, 299, 302, 359, 360, 361, 377, 384.
Ibn Khallikan, 266, 354, 365, 404.
Ibn Rushd, 261, 349, 356, 389, 393, 397, 398, 399.
Ibn-Shathir, 353.
Ibn Sîna, 159, 352, 393, 394, 395, 398, 399, 401, 412, 414.
Ibn Tufail, 356, 393, 396, 397, 417.
Ibn Ula, 365.
Ibn Taqtaqa, 261.
Ibn un-Nabdi, 341.
Ibn-ul-Wardi, 354.
Ibn Yunus, 347, 352.
Ibrahim, 280, 281, 294.
Ibrahim ibn Saiyar an-Nazzam, 383, 388.
Ibrahim-Adham, 159.
Idris, 294, 354.
Idrisîde, 294, 342.
Ihrâm, 37.
Ihtijâj-ut-Tibrisi, 378, 379, 380.
Ijmaa-ul-Ummat, 321, 322,.
Ikhtiar, 380.
Ikhwan-us-Safa, 399.
Ilm-i-Tashrîh ul-Arz, 357.
Ilm-ul-Kalam, 384, 410.
Imâmia, 292.
Imam-i-Aâzam, 323.
Irakians, 281, 282, 324, 331.
Isa ibn Bahan, 294.
Ishakia, 314.
Ishrakia, 335, 396.
Islâm, 7, 12, 16, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 49, 53, 56, 62, 66, 71, 79, 80, 84, 87, 88, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 103, 104, 107, 117, 122, 129, 137, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 152, 153, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 164, 166, 173, 175, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 189, 193, 194, 197, 206, 209, 213, 214, 216, 220, 223, 225, 235, 245, 246, 249, 250, 252, 253, 255, 256, 259, 261, 263, 268,, 269, 272, 275, 277, 278, 283, 286, 285, 288, 292, 293, 298, 299, 300, 302,

305, 310, 311, 312, 314, 315, 317 318, 320, 321, 325, 326, 327, 329 331, 334, 335, 336, 342, 350, 353 359, 360, 364, 366, 368, 369, 370 372, 376, 381, 384, 391, 392, 398 399, 402, 407, 410, 412, 413, 414, 417, 418.
Ismail, 140, 286, 295, 309.
Ismailia, 292, 295, 303, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 321.
Ismailism, 307, 308.
Ismailite, 306.
Israil, 40, 62, 101, 234, 289.

J

Jaafar, 14, 27, 89, 159, 316, 346.
Jaafar as-Sadik, 226, 281, 293, 295, 302, 309, 316, 322, 330, 335, 336, 354, 379, 385 404.
Jabala, 252, 253.
Jabal ul-Arafat, 10, 106, 198.
Jabarias, 381, 382.
Jabr, 380.
Jahm bin Safwân, 381.
Jahmia, 381.
Jallal ud-din Malik Shah, 351.
Jallal ud-din Rumi, 159, 365, 392, 395, 417, 418.
Jamal ud-din al-Kifti, 296, 297, 335, 352.
Jami, 353.
Jarudias, 294.
Jean Mariana, 260.
Jesus, 21, 26, 29, 41, 43, 59, 60, 104, 113, 120, 121, 122, 130, 131, 132, 136, 141, 147, 149, 151, 152, 169, 170, 172, 185, 199, 200, 202, 211, 212, 218, 232, 233, 234, 238, 239, 245, 299, 309, 313, 314, 317, 369.
Jews, 18, 29, 49, 54, 55, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 86, 96, 102, 119, 120, 130, 140, 141, 145, 146, 147, 153, 167, 169, 174, 180, 188, 205, 207, 210, 218, 221, 231, 232, 245, 246, 247, 250, 259, 260, 297, 299, 306, 317, 327, 349, 357, 376, 379, 405.
Johannes Damascenus, 336.
Johannes Scotus, 417.
Jouhar, 296.
Judaism, 147, 224, 229, 318.
Justinian, 181, 187, 335.
Juwairia, 82, 196, 197.

K.

Kaab, son of Ashraf, 6, 35, 68, 99.
Kaaba, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 23, 26, 32, 34, 36, 82, 83, 100, 119, 146, 149, 150, 252.
Kaab ibn-Zuhair, 99.
Kadessia, 178, 250, 280.
Kadir-b'Illah, 297.
Kahtanites, 2, 49.
Kais, 6.
Kaisanias, 314.
Kaisaria, 292.
Kaithan, 278.
Kais Aylan, 14.
Kaithan, 278.
Karmathites, 305, 307.
Kasîdat-ul-Burda, 100.
Kaza and Kadr, 308, 398.
Kazwini, 311, 354.
Kerbela, 156, 210, 273, 279, 282, 285 306, 346, 377.
Kesrâ Anûshirwân, 8, 179, 298, 338.
Khadîja, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 37, 193, 210, 269, 295.
Khaibar, 46, 69, 73, 80, 86, 87, 108, 197.
Khakani, 365, 418.
Khâlid ibn Abdul Malik, 344.
Khalid ibn Walid, 6, 64, 65, 88, 90, 178, 197, 247, 254.
Khanam Bibi, 363.
Khariji, 53.
Khawarij, 285, 286, 326, 327.
Khawârijism, 325.
Khitabias, 314.
Khulafa-i-Rashidin, 322.
Khusru Parwîz, 365.
Khazrai, 39, 49, 53, 69, 169.
Kinda, 102.
Koba, 45.
Koraish, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 43, 44, 45, 53, 54 56, 57, 65, 66, 68, 69, 71, 73, 74, 80, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 102, 167, 168, 176.
Kossay, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
Kublai Khan, 352.
Kufa, 267, 269, 271, 273, 274, 281, 282, 283, 293, 323, 326, 333, 338, 379, 393, 404.

M.

Maabad-al-Juhni, 381.
Maad Abu Temim, 295, 391.
Maasum, 290, 291, 305, 319.
Mahdi, 294, 295, 317, 318.
Mahdia, 295, 309.
Mahmûd, 223, 350, 351, 352, 356, 365.

Majâlis-ul-hikmat, 308.
Makkari, 359.
Makrîsi, 295, 296, 297, 308, 310, 354, 359, 360.
Mâlik, 362, 404.
Malik al-Ashtar, 270, 271.
Malik ibn-Anss, 277.
Malik Shah, 311, 340, 351.
Maliki, 204, 289, 296, 322,405.
Mamûn, 214, 247, 257, 259, 284, 288, 316, 323, 341, 342, 343, 344, 354, 390, 393, 406.
Manah, 32, 33.
Mâni, 288, 301, 302, 303, 306.
Manichæism, 179, 287, 299, 300, 301, 303, 306, 308, 309, 314.
Mansur, 121, 257, 286, 294, 338, 340, 344, 390.
Mansurièh, 338, 359.
Marr uz-Zuhran, 10.
Marzbana, 109.
Mâsha-Allah, Abu'l Farâj, 344.
Masudi, 289, 350, 354, 359.
Mazdak, 179, 288. 299.
Mazdakism, 299.
Mecca, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 22, 28, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 63, 69, 72, 80, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 94, 97. 105, 106, 110 146, 149, 174, 194, 239, 252, 255, 258, 271, 275, 278, 286, 307, 331, 336.
Medina, 42, 48, 49, 54, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 80, 82, 84, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 106, 111, 151, 166, 167, 168, 173, 178, 194, 200, 245, 252, 255, 258, 266, 268, 269, 273, 275, 276, 294, 316, 317, 331, 335, 336, 337, 379, 383, 403, 404.
Merv, 281.
Merwân, 267, 280, 281, 334.
Merwan II., 326, 327.
Messiah, 53, 167, 231, 232, 233, 234, 306, 317.
Mirkhond, 303, 359, 383.
Mohammed Abu Bakr ibn Zakaria ar-Râzi, 355.
Mohammed al-Bakir, 293, 295, 309, 316, 336.
Mohammed al-Habib, 295.
Mohammed al-Mahdi, 377.
Mohammed al-Maktum, 295.
Mohammed ash-Shaibani, 404.
Mohammed ibn Isa ibn Abdullah, 345.
Mohammed ibn Mûsa al-Khawarismi, 344, 345.
Mohammed ibn al-Hanîfa, 279.
Mohammed ibn Ali ibn Abdullah, 261, 278, 280, 281, 294.
Mohammed ibn Talaun, 353.
Mohammed Shah, 328.
Mohi ud-din-al-Maghrabi, 352.
Mohsin Fani, 303, 306, 310, 311.
Mokanna, 298.
Morjias, 290.
Mosailima, 109.
Moses, 17, 29, 104, 117, 120, 183, 197, 200, 212, 265, 289, 309.
Mozarites, 280.
Mualafat-ul-Kulub, 98.
Muawiyah, 98, 100, 225, 253, 256, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 279, 285, 326, 383, 298.
Muâz ibn Jabal, 108, 145, 161, 331.
Mubashar ibn Ahmed, 352.
Mughaira, 98.
Muhájirin, 49, 52, 63, 72, 83, 276, 337.
Muiz ud-Dowla, 284.
Mujtahid, 162, 189, 294, 317, 319, 413.
Mukawwim, 7.
Mulahida, 311.
Mulla Sadra, 320, 321.
Murcia, 348.
Muruj uz-Zahab, 360.
Mushrikin, 28.
Mustansir b'Illah, 340, 349, 407.
Munafikin, 53, 64, 68, 71, 73, 90, 107.
Muntassir, 284, 291.
Musa, 159, 316.
Musa al-Kazim, 295, 316. 340.
Musa bin Shakir, 344, 345.
Mushhabahas, 238, 382, 389.
Mushrik, 327.
Mustanjid b'Illâh, 401, 412.
Mustansarieh, 312, 340.
Muta, 88, 108, 175.
Mutanabbi, 365.
Mutassim b'Illah, 284, 285, 299, 317, 323, 390, 393, 406.
Mutawakkil, 190, 284, 291, 317, 341, 383, 402, 406, 407.
Mutazala, 190, 192, 204, 290, 318, 323, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 392, 408, 409, 410, 414, 415.
Mutazalaism, 321, 384, 385, 390, 391, 392, 410, 414, 416.
Mutazid b'Illah, 283, 295, 307, 341, 407.
Muti-Ullah, 284.

Muttalib, 5, 12, 22, 36.
Muwaid ud-din al-Orezi, 352.

N.

Nâdir Shah, 370.
Nafe ibn-al-Azrak, 328.
Nahj ul-Balaghat, 335, 377, 385.
Najjaria, 54, 381.
Najran, 245, 246.
Namus ul-Akbar, 17, 18.
Nasir ud-din Tusi, 347, 352, 414.
Nawasib, 285.
Nawasibism, 300.
Nedwa, 3, 4, 6.
Nejdat, 327.
Nestorians, 335.
Nizamieh, 340, 365.
Nizam-ul-Mulk, 311. 351.
Numânias, 314.
Nusairis, 314.
Nuwairi, 303, 359.

O

Obaidullah al-Mahdi, 295, 296, 297, 303, 307.
Obaidullah bin Ziâd, 210, 273, 274, 278.
Oelsner, 353.
Ohod, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 73,
Okaz, 10, 11, 212, 363.
Omar, 6, 35, 46, 65, 107, 181, 194, 195, 247, 248, 252, 254, 267, 278, 280, 293, 295, 326, 337.
Omar ibn-Abdul Azîz, 276.
Omar ibn-Khaldûn ibn Târik, 349.
Omar Khayyam, 347, 351.
Ommeyya, 6, 10, 20, 25, 38, 89, 107, 225, 254, 271, 274, 286.
Ommeyyade, 3, 100, 176, 195, 254, 255, 256, 264, 268, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277, 279, 282, 283, 286. 288, 291, 293, 298, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 341, 353, 381, 382, 398, 403, 404.
Ormuzd, 140, 230.
Orwa, 97, 98.
Osama, 108, 223.
Osmân, 14, 62, 63, 83, 96, 195, 247, 248, 254, 255, 256, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 278. 295, 334, 337.
Osman, son of Affân, 20.
Otba, 26, 27, 42, 66.

P.

Paul, 310.
Paulicianism, 181, 299, 301, 302, 303, 306, 307.
Pelagius, 32, 250.

R.

Râbia, 26, 42, 106, 107, 159, 189.
Raihana, 77.
Rawafiz, 293.
Rifada, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9.
Roderick, 260.
Roushenias, 314.

S.

Saad ibn Muâz, 73, 75.
Saad ibn Ubada, 73.
Saadi, 99, 365, 418.
Saffah, 275, 280, 281, 282, 283, 287, 337.
Sakîna, 214.
Saladin, 182, 286, 351, 411.
Salaf, 335, 381, 382, 385.
Salehias, 294.
Salerno, 332, 366, 368.
Samiya, 25.
Sanâï, 37, 43, 159, 237, 285, 398, 417, 418.
Sassanides, 214, 242, 275.
Sauda, 194.
Seffavian, 286, 370, 402, 413.
Selim I., 283, 285, 291, 370.
Send ibn Ali, 344.
Shâfei, 204, 289, 296, 322, 323, 404.
Shâfeïsm, 324, 405.
Shammaites, 119, 201.
Sheikha Shuhda, 214.
Shiahism, 289, 292. 300, 320.
Shiahs, 162, 189, 204, 225, 284, 285, 287, 290, 293, 297, 306, 307, 311, 314, 319, 321, 322, 323, 327, 405, 413.
Sifâtias, 382, 387, 405, 406, 408, 409.
Siffin, 270, 278, 326.
Sofana, daughter of Hatim, 99.
Solyman, 291, 370.
Sûfîs, 295, 303, 315, 340, 417, 418.
Sufîsm, 417, 418.
Sukaina, 214.
Sulaiman, 277, 281, 294.
Sulaimania, 294.
Sultan Khodâ Bendah, 352.
Sunni Church, 286, 288, 291, 300, 324, 404, 416.
Sunnïsm, 288, 300, 314, 325.
Sunnis, 162, 225, 287, 290, 291, 307, 317, 318, 321, 322, 324, 326, 327, 413.

Surra man-Raa, 317.

T

Taalîl, 402.
Tabarias, 294, 360.
Tabuk, 97, 99, 175.
Tafwîz, 380, 382, 385, 415.
Takeyye, 306, 307.
Taklîd, 322.
Talha, 5, 269, 393.
Tashbîh, 380.
Tay, 99.
Tâyef, 10, 38, 91, 92, 97, 98, 193, 279.
Teraphim, 120.
Thakîf, 38, 91, 98.
Thamudites, 129.
Thumama, 80.
Tibri, 14, 15, 18, 39, 46, 61, 65, 66, 70, 71, 72, 75, 82, 84, 87, 90, 91, 92, 98, 99, 264, 359, 360.
Timur, 353, 365, 369.
Tulaiha, 109.
Turanian, 353.

U.

Ulugh Beg, 353.
Umm-i-Habîb, 214, 316.
Umm-i-Habiba, 195.
Umm-i-Jamîl, 23.
Umm-i-Salma, 195.
Umm-i-Fazl, 214, 316.
Usuli, 319, 320, 413.
Usulïsm, 318, 321.
Uzza, 33, 94, 97.

W.

Wahâbis, 307, 324, 328, 369.
Wahabïsm, 327.
Waladeh, 368.
Walîd, 26, 267, 291, 349, 383.
Waraka, 14, 17, 18.
Wasil bin Aata, 383, 384.
Wassâf, 311, 312.
Wâsik, 284, 390, 406.
Watwat, 365.

Y.

Yahya-ibn-Zaid, 280, 393.
Yaakub al-Mansur, 369, 397.
Yaakub ibn-Tarik, 349.
Yasar, 25.
Yathreb, 5, 8, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 54, 55.
Yazdjard, 178, 179, 214, 275, 280.
Yermuk, 250.
Yeum-i-Aashura, 285.
Yeum-un Nahr, 100.
Yezîd ibn Abû Sufiân, 81.
Yezîd ibn Muâwiyah, 210, 271, 272, 273, 282.
Yezîd bin Muhallib, 277.

Z.

Zaid, 14, 15, 38, 89, 108, 195, 196, 223, 293, 294, 399, 400.
Zaidias, 290, 293, 294.
Zainab, 195, 196, 210, 274.
Zainab, grand-daughter of the Prophet, 195.
Zainab, Umm-ul-Masakîn, 195.
Zain ul-Aabidin, 274, 279, 280, 292, 309, 316.
Zamakhshari, 17, 56, 66, 90, 156, 195, 238, 240, 241, 330, 332, 383.
Zealots, 119.
Zeb un-nissa, 363.
Zend Avesta, 140, 188, 230.
Zindîk, 284, 301.
Zimmi, 242, 246, 248, 249.
Zoroaster, 104, 230.
Zoroastrians, 102, 104, 120, 131, 139, 181, 229, 230, 231, 232, 235, 236, 247, 250, 299, 300, 317, 379.
Zubair, 7, 36, 269.
Zubaida, 214, 363.
Zuhair Faryabi, 365.
Zubair son of Awwam, 20.
Zu'l Majâz, 10.
Zu'l-Yezen, 9.

REESE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Printed at the "Cotton Press" 45, Baniatola Lane—Calcutta.