

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY,
CAPTAIN FRANCIS W. H. PETRIE, F.G.S., &c.

VOL. XXV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute.)

INDIA: W. THACKER & Co. UNITED STATES: G. T. PUTNAM'S SONS, N. Y.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND: G. ROBERTSON & Co., LIM.

CANADA: DAWSON BROS., *Montreal*.

S. AFRICA: JUTA & Co., *Cape Town*.

PARIS: GALIGNANI.

1892.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ORDINARY MEETING.*

D. HOWARD, ESQ., D.L., F.C.S., &C., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed.

The following Paper was then read by the Author:—

ISLĀM: ITS ORIGIN, ITS STRENGTH, AND ITS WEAKNESS. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, M.A.

Μοῦνοι θεοφιλέες, ὅσοισι ἐχθρὸν τὸ ἀδικέω—(Democritus).

. Τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει, σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γένηται—(Æschylus).

ISLĀM is to-day the religion of about 150,000,000 of our fellow-creatures. Its sway extends from the Pillars of Hercules to the Caspian Sea, from the Pamir Steppes to Zanzibar, from the Balkans to Sumatra. It is the faith of Arabia, Palestine, Syria, Turkey in Europe and Asia Minor; of Mesopotamia, Persia, Afghânistân, Baltchistân; of the vast regions of Turkistân and other parts of Central Asia. In India alone its professors number 57,000,000. It is the religion of the Malay Peninsula, and is said to be still extending in the Islands. In Yun-nan and other parts of China its devotees may be numbered by tens of thousands.

It is the religion of Egypt and of the whole of the Sûdân, and its professors may be found not only in Zanzibar, but at Lake Victoria Nyanza. We find it again in the Niger Basin, in the regions of Haûsa and Sokoto, and it is not unknown at Sierra Leone. The Tawâriks and other fierce tribes of the Sahara profess a belief in Muḥammad, and the Arabian "Prophet" is acknowledged by sovereigns and people alike throughout Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco. To what extent this faith is still being spread in Africa it is difficult to say precisely, but it is already the dominant religion of fully one half of the entire continent. Nor must we imagine that the Muslims in general care but little for their faith. On the contrary, commended to its professors not less by its many half-truths, and its apparent* simplicity, than by its warlike spirit and lax moral code, Islâm has long exercised, and even now exercises, over the hearts and lives of many millions of Muḥammadans a very powerful influence indeed.

Nor has this influence been entirely confined to those who have professed the religion of Islâm. The number of works bearing upon the subject which have appeared on the Continent and in England during the present century, show that much interest exists with reference to this religious system. To Geiger, Sprenger, Dozy, Weil, and many others on the Continent; to Lane, Carlyle, Rodwell, Draper, E. Deutsch, Sir W. Muir, Bosworth Smith, and Dr. Koelle, in our own language, we owe volumes of great interest, and in many cases of much value. An attentive student of these writers, however, is struck by the fact that the opinions expressed by them regarding Muḥammad himself and the

* Some modern writers represent Muḥammadanism as a faith which has neither mysteries nor miracles, nothing which the human mind cannot readily grasp. Nothing can be further from the truth. The miracles related in later Muslim writings as wrought by Muḥammad are very numerous and very absurd. Those attributed in the Qur'ân to the prophets mentioned in it are of the same nature. No religion which, like Islâm, recognises a Creator and a Creation, sin and righteousness, Heaven and Hell, can possibly be free from the element of mystery. In reality, Islâm is simple only with reference to its evidences, which consist in Muḥammad's own *assertion* of his prophetic claims.

† It is needless to dwell on the method of the propagation of Islâm, acknowledged by Arabic historians such as Al Wâqidî, etc. *Vide* also the injunctions regarding the Jihâd or Holy War in the Qur'ân (e.g., Sûrahs IV, VIII, XLVII, etc.), and in the *Mishkâtul Maḥâbiḥ* (*Kitâbul Jihâd*), etc.

faith which he founded, are very far indeed from being in accord with one another. Some authors are inclined to attribute Muhammad's system, taken as a whole, to something very similar to Satanic inspiration,* while others would venture to claim for him the honour of being "a very Prophet of GOD."† It is but fair to say, however, that those who take the latter view are, generally speaking, persons who have little or no personal knowledge of Muhammadan countries, and who, being ignorant of Arabic and other languages of the Muslim world, derive all their information at second hand from other authorities, or are indebted for it to a considerable extent to their own imagination. Those whose personal acquaintance with the subject alone entitles their opinions to much weight, are almost, without exception, opposed to the favourable views so very prevalent at the present time among many people in this country. The so-called liberalism of the day is too often based upon hasty and ill-weighed conclusions, and a determination to oppose Christianity‡ at any cost. Not a few of our fellow countrymen, who are loud in their praises of Buddhism and Muhammadanism, would be unable to speak as they do if they had really *studied* the religions which they so much admire.§ I purpose in the present paper, so far as my limits will permit, to inquire into the origin of Islâm in the first place, and then to endeavour to estimate the degree of credit due to its claim to be the last and most perfect Revelation of GOD.

I. What then is Muhammadanism, or, as it is more properly called, Islâm?¶ Some have called it a reformed Christianity,

* Among others, Sir W. Muir, "Life of Mahomet."

† Bosworth Smith, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism," 2nd Edition, p. 344. Cf., also Carlyle, "Heroes and Hero-Worship," lecture on Mohammed.

‡ *Vide* Prof. Grau: "Ursprünge und Ziele unserer Kulturentwicklung," concluding chapter, pp. 245, *seqq.*

§ Nothing strikes one acquainted with the East and with Eastern thought on revisiting England, so much as the astounding degree of ignorance still prevalent on these subjects in this country; especially among those (speaking generally) who endeavour to extol such religions as Buddhism and Islâm at the expense of Christianity.

¶ This is the name given to the religion in the Qur'ân: *e.g.*, Sûrah III, 17:—

أَنَّ الدِّينَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ الْإِسْلَامُ .

and even ventured to speak of the movement in Arabia which gave rise to the religion as "the Southern Reformation,"* and to regard it as parallel to "the Northern Reformation" under Luther and the Swiss and English Reformers of the sixteenth century! Such a view needs for its refutation only the very slightest acquaintance with the tenets of Muhammad. Another opinion rather widely held is that Islâm is a Christian† heresy, and that it may be compared with the Arianism of early times. A very cursory study of the subject will show how far this idea also is from the truth. In reality we can hardly describe Muhammadanism more correctly in few words than by saying that it is a corrupt form of late Judaism,‡ with which ideas and practices derived from Arabian and Persian heathenism, and in one or two instances from heretical books, have been mingled. This will be apparent if we investigate the origin of the religion—not a very difficult task, since, as has been remarked by a recent writer on the subject, Islâm is almost§ the only great religion whose origin and growth we can historically trace.

1. At the outset we must admit that the religion of Islâm owes very much to the personality of Muhammad|| himself, without whom, had it arisen, it would undoubtedly have been very different from what it is. In fact, it is not too much to say that, in the religion of the Muslim, Muhammad practically holds very nearly the same place as our Lord Jesus Christ does in that of the Christian. Divine honours are not, it is true, accorded to him, but he is entitled the Seal¶ of the Prophets, the last, greatest, and most perfect of

* *Eg.*, Dr. Draper, in his most unfair though cleverly written book, "The Conflict between Religion and Science."

† Carlyle for instance, "Heroes and Hero-Worship," says: "Islâm is definable as a confused form of Christianity."

‡ *Vide* Rabbi Geiger: "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?" I cordially agree with Hauri's remarks on the subject (*Der Islâm*, pp. 43, 44): "Abgesehen von einer Reihe christlicher und persischer Vorstellungen, finden wir im Koran wesentlich *jüdische* Gedanken."

§ Of course Christianity, too, is an exception to the rule here implied.

|| Bosworth Smith, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism," p. 12.

¶ Of Muhammad's very numerous titles perhaps the most usual are:—

رَسُولُ اللَّهِ, "the Apostle (or Messenger) of God;" نَبِيُّ اللَّهِ, "God's

the Messengers of GOD, summing up in his own person, in a far superior degree, all the peculiar virtues of every one of the Prophets who preceded him. In everything except the exercise of the peculiar* privileges accorded to him in virtue of his prophetic office—about which the less said the better—Muhammad is the Divinely appointed model for the imitation of all men. Prayers must be offered just in the very postures he adopted on such occasions. His habits in respect to personal cleanliness, and the most private matters of domestic life, have been carefully observed and written† down for the reverential observance of all true Muslims. In India, at least, it is the custom of the most devout to carry this system so far that they even dye their beards the same colour as their “Prophet’s.” It has been truly said that Christianity is not a religious system, but a life; that it is *Christ*. With almost equal truth it may be affirmed that Islām is Muhammad. Certainly his spirit is infused into the religion which he founded, and still animates to an almost incredible extent the hearts of its professors in every Muhammadan land.

With reference to the various doctrines in the Religion of Islām as taught by Muhammad, we may fairly conclude *a priori* that he did not invent them for himself, but borrowed his materials to a great extent from pre-existing‡ systems of religion, though he built these various materials into a more or less harmonious whole according to his own plan and the exigencies of his position. A candid examination of Islām, as it is taught in the Qur’ān and in the authoritative Tradi-

Prophet;” خَاتَمُ النَّبِيِّينَ, “the Seal of the Prophets;” and الْمُصْطَفَى, the Chosen.”

* *Vide* Qur’ān, Sūrah XXXIII, 49–51. (Flügel’s edition of the Arabic text.)

† In all the great collections of Traditions, a vast number are of this description; *cf.* Mishkātu’l Maṣābiḥ, *passim*. Every rule of conduct, of ritual, of daily life, is deduced from those observed by Muhammad. As examples of his claims may be quoted the words ascribed to him by Tradition:—

انا قائد المرسلين... انا خاتم النبيين - انا اول شافع ومشفع -

انا اكرم الاولين والآخرين على الله - انا سيد ولد آدم يوم القيامة الخ

Mishkāt, pp. 505, *sqq.* (Bombay edition.)

‡ *Vide* Renan, “Études d’Histoire Religieuse;” Sayyid Ahmad, “On the Religion of the Pre-Islamic Arabs;” Sayyid Ameer Ali, “The Spirit of Islām.”

tions of the "Prophet," and a comparison of it with those other religious systems with which Muḥammad was brought more especially in contact, will enable us to learn the measure of originality which may be ascribed to it. Muḥammad himself claimed for it none; for, though asserting that the Qur'ân contained GOD'S last and most perfect revelation to man, and was revealed to himself word by word by the Angel Gabriel, he yet affirmed that the religion which he promulgated was that of Abraham, and in fact of all the prophets,* declaring of the Father of the Faithful, the "Friend of God," that he himself also was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but an orthodox Muslim.†

2. When Muḥammad appeared, although he found religion in a very corrupt state among his fellow-countrymen, yet they had by no means entirely lost all belief in the One True GOD. It has been well pointed out‡ that the ancient and primeval religion of the Semites was monotheistic. Many Semitic tribes, it is true, as for instance the Assyrians, the Phœnicians, and even the Hebrews themselves at more than one period of their history, fell into polytheism and idolatry. Yet this process was a very gradual one, and in many cases the names of the deities worshipped are sufficient to prove that they had their origin in Monotheistic conceptions.¶ The Northern Arabs, especially, seem to have preserved their pristine faith without very much corruption up to a comparatively late period. We find among them no such deities as the Baal, Ashtoreth, Moloch, Ammon, worshipped in Canaan. Herodotus¶ informs us that the Arabs of his own day worshipped two principal deities, Orotál and Alilát. The former of these names is doubtless a corruption of** *Alláh Ta'ála'* (GOD

* *E.g.*, Súrah X, 20 (*vide* Muḥammadan commentators on the verse) Súrah II, 118-120; Súrah III, 89; Súrah IV, 124, etc.

† So called by Muslims also. *Cf.* Súrah IV, 124; *Mishkát*, p. 505, etc.

‡ Súrah III, 58-60; and Súrah VI, 162.

§ *E.g.*, by Ernest Renan, "Histoire Générale et système comparé des Langues Sémitiques," vol. i.

¶ Renan, *op. cit.*

¶ Herod., Lib. III, cap. viii:—*Διόνυσον δὲ θεὸν μόνον καὶ τὴν Οὐρανίην ἡγεῖνται εἶναι . . . ὀνομάζουσι δὲ τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον Ὀροτάλ, τὴν δὲ Οὐρανίην Ἀλιλάτ.*

** This (الله تعالى) is one of the commonest titles of GOD among the Arabs, the אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיִין of Gen. xiv, 18, 19, 22.

Most High), while the latter is the goddess Allât* mentioned in the Qur'ân as worshipped by the heathen Arabs. The name Allâh Ta'âla', in which the word Allâh is the exact equivalent of ὁ Θεός in Greek, is significant of the fact that the One True GOD† was still acknowledged by the Arabs in Herodotus' time. The same fact is clear from the name *Beitu'llâh*, or "House of GOD," given from very early times to the Ka'abah at Mecca,‡ a shrine to which Diodorus§ informs us that all the Arab tribes in his time paid great respect. And in the celebrated collection of Arabic poems termed *Mu'allagât*, which have come down to us from pre-Islâmîc times, we find the name of GOD with the article (Allâh) repeatedly occurring.¶ Again such

* Sûrah LIII, 19, ^{اللآت}, probably "the Goddess."

† In speaking of the pre-Islâmîc Arabs, Weil says:—"Hörten aber dabei nicht auf, an ein höchstens Wesen zu glauben, welches vor Mohammed schon Allah taala genannt ward." ("Mohammed der Prophet," p. 18.) Sir W. Muir, "Life of Mahomet," p. xvii, *note*, agrees with this.

‡ Vide Sayyid Aḥmad, "Essay on the History of Mecca," p. 6; Sûrah II, 119.

§ *Ἱερὸν ἀγιώτατον ἱδρύται τιμώμενον ὑπὸ πάντων Ἀράβων περιπτώτερον.* (Diodorus Siculus, Lib. III.)

|| *Eg.*, An Nâbighah (Diwân, poem I, verses 23, 24):—

لَهُمْ شَيْمَةٌ لَمْ يُعْطِهَا اللَّهُ غَيْرِهِمْ مِنْ الْجَبَدِ وَالْأَحْلَامِ غَيْرِ عَوَازِبِ
مَحَلَّتْهُمْ ذَاتُ الْإِلَهِ وَدِينِهِمْ قَوْمٍ فَمَا يَرْجُونَ غَيْرَ الْعَوَاقِبِ

Again, Poem III, verses 9, 10:—

أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ أَعْطَاكَ سُورَةَ تَرَى كُلَّ مَلِكٍ دُونَهَا يَتَذَبَذَبُ
إِذَا تَطَلَّعَ وَالْمَلُولُ كَوَاكِبُ إِذَا تَطَلَّعَتْ لَمْ يَبْدُ مِنْهَا كَوَكِبُ

Labid also says:—

لِعَمْرِكَ مَا تَدْرِي الصَّوَارِبِ بِالْحَصْلِ
وَلَا زَاجِرَاتِ الطَّيْرِ مَا اللَّهُ صَانِعُ

names as that of 'Abdu'llâh, Muhammad's father,* bear testimony to Arabic monotheism. Ibn Ishâq, the earliest biographer of Muhammad, whose work has come down to us, in speaking of the religion of the ancient Arabs, tells us that the tribes of Kinânah and Qureish, when performing the ceremony termed *Ihlâl*, used to address the Deity in words which asserted their belief in His Oneness.† Various local cults prevailed in different parts of the Peninsula, yet monotheism was, in most if not in all parts of Arabia, at least theoretically recognised. Ash Shahrîstânî's testimony‡ on this point is conclusive. The Arabs of pre-Islamic times, he tells us, may with reference to religion be divided into various classes. Some believed in a Creator and a creation

* *Vide* Ibn Hishâm, *Siratu'r Rasûl*, Abû'l Fidâ, "Life of Muhammad," etc., on Muhammad's parentage. 'Abdu'llâh died some months before Muhammad's birth.

† Muhammad's earliest biographer, Zuhri, died A.H. 124. His work is no longer extant. Ibn Ishâq (died A.H. 151), was his disciple, and he also wrote a work on the same subject, large fragments of which are preserved in Ibn Hishâm's *Siratu'r Rasûl* (died A.H. 213). I quote the Egyptian edition of the latter.

‡ Ibn Hishâm, *Siratu'r Rasûl*, Part I, pp. 27, 28 (Egyptian edition):—

فكانت كنانة وقريش اذا اهلوا قالوا لبيك اللهم لبيك لبيك
لا شريك لك الا شريك هولك تملكه وما ملك

§ *Ibid.*—في وحدونه بالتلبية—

|| Ash Shahrîstânî (in his work entitled *الممل والنجل والنحل*, quoted by Abû'l Fidâ, "Hist. Ante-Islamica," Fleischer's edition, pp. 178-181; *vide* also Krehl, "Über die Religion der vorislamischen Araber," pp. 4, *sqq.*), says:—

والعرب الجاهلية اصناف فصنف انكروا الخالق والبعث وقالوا
يا طبع المحيي والدهر الممضي كما اخبر عنهم التنزيل وقالوا ما هي
الا حياتنا الدنيا نموت ونحيا وصنف اعترفوا بالخالق وانكروا
البعث وصنف عبدوا الاصنام وكانت اصنامهم مختصة
بالقبائل فكان ود لكلب وهو بدومة الجندل وسواع يهذيل ويعوث
لمذحج ولقبائل من اليمن ونسر لذي الكلاع بارض حمير ويعوق
لهمدان واللات لتقيف بالطائف والعزى لقريش وبني كنانة ومناة

produced by Him out of nothing, but yet denied the Resurrection and the return to GOD. Others believed in a Creator, a creation, and some kind of a return to GOD for judgment, but denied GOD's Prophets and worshipped false gods, concerning whom they believed that in the next world they would become *mediators* between themselves and GOD. Regarding the latter class of Arabs, Sayyid Ahmad admits that their doctrines, "*plus the doctrine of revelations, were very nearly identical with the main principles of Islām.*"* Ibn Ishâq and Ibn Hishâm inform us that idolatry had been introduced into Mecca only about fifteen generations before Muḥammad.† The Arabs were doubtless conscious that it

للأوس والخزرج وهبل أعظم اصنامهم وكان هبل على ظهر الكعبة وكان
أساف ونابيل على الصفا والمروة وكان منهم من يعيل إلى اليهود
ومنهم من يعيل إلى النصرانية ومنهم من يعيل إلى الصابئية ويعتقد
في أنواع المنازل اعتقاد المنجمين في السيارات حتى لا يتحرك
الأنثى من الأنواء ويقول مطرنا بنوء كذا وكان منهم من يعبد الملائكة
ومنهم من يعبد الجن وكانت علومهم علم الأنساب والأنواء والتواريخ
وتعبير الرويا وكان لابي بكر الصديق رضى الله عنه فيها يد طويل
وكانت الجاهلية تفعل أشياء جأت شريعة الاسلام بها فكانوا لا
ينكحون الأمهات والبنات وكان اقبح شيء عندهم الجمع بين
الاختين وكانوا يعيبون المتزوج بامرأة ابيه ويسمونه الضيزن وكانوا
يحججون البيت ويعتمرون ويطوفون ويسعون ويقفون المواقف
كلها ويرمون الجمار وكانوا يكبسون في كل ثلث اعوام شهراً ويعتسلون
من الجنابة وكانوا يداومون على المضمضة والاستنشاق وفرق الرأس
والسواك والاستنجا وتقليم الاظفار ونتف الابط وحلق العانة
والختان الخ

* Sayyid Ahmad, "Essay on the Religions of the Pre-Islamic Arabs," pp. 5, 14.

† *Stratū'r Rasūl*, pp. 27, sqq. They say (on Muḥammad's authority) that 'Amr bin Lahī was the first to introduce idolatry into Mecca:—

انه كان اولاً من غير دين اسمئيل فنصب آلاتاً

was an innovation upon the faith of those ancestors of whom they were so proud. This being the case, and remembering* that the worship of the One True GOD had never entirely ceased in the country, we can readily understand how Muḥammad could come forward in the name of the Supreme GOD of the nation, the GOD of Abraham, Who had been merely cast into† the background by the overgrowth of local cults.

Most of the rites and ceremonies which play so important a part in the Religion of Islâm, were practised in the country from time immemorial. The Arabic historian Abû'l Fidâ states that "The Arabs of the Time of Ignorance used to do things which the religious law of Islâm adopted. . . . They used to make the Pilgrimage to the House (the Ka'abah), and to visit holy places, and wear the *Ihrâm* and perform the *Tawwâf*, and to run (between the hills As-Safâ and Al-Marwâ), and to stand at all the Stations, and cast stones (at the Devil in the valley of Minâ), and they were wont to intercalate a month every third year."‡ He adds that the ceremonial washings, religious cleansing of the teeth, and the practice of circumcision, were also in vogue among the Arabs long before Muḥammad's time.§ Then as now the pilgrims to the Ka'abah had to kiss the famous *Hajarul Aswad* or

* It would be quite incorrect to describe the polytheism of the pre-Islâmic Arabs as at all similar to that of the Greeks and Romans. It was rather similar to the saint-worship of the Eastern Churches at the present time. The inferior deities were worshipped as *mediators* with God. (Ash Shahristânî, quoted above; Ibn Hishâm, p. 127; Sale, *Prel. Disc.*; Sayyid Ahmad, "Essay on Manners and Customs of Pre-Islâmic Arabs," p. 13.) Weil ("Mohammed der Prophet," p. 18), well says:—"Übrigens betrachteten die Araber vor Mohammed ihre Götzen, welche theils Menschen- oder Thiergestalt hatten, theils als rohen, von dem Tempel zu Mecca herrührenden Steinen bestandet, nur als Götter *zweiten Ranges*."

† Grau, "Kulturentwicklung," pp. 137, 138.

‡ "Hist. ante-Islâmica," Fleischer's edition, p. 180. (See the passage quoted at full length note ||, pp. 8, 9.)

§ Similarly Ibn Ishâq says (*Strat'ur Rasûl*, Part I, p. 27):—

وفيه على ذلك بقايا من عهد إبراهيم يتمسكون بها من
تعظيم البيت والطواف به والحج والعمرة والوقوف على عرفة
والمزلفة وهدى البدن والاهلال بالحج والعمرة مع ادخالهم فيه
ما ليس منه - الخ .

Black Stone, in token of deep reverence if not of actual worship.

3. The Jews held in Muhammad's earlier life a position of great power and influence in Arabia.* They constituted several very numerous tribes, as the Banî Qureidhah, the Banî Qeinuqâ'a, the Banî Nadhîr and many others. Although they do not seem to have been distinguished for learning,† yet they undoubtedly preserved their ancestral veneration for the books of the Old Testament, and many Talmudic legends and tales lived in the mouths of the people. Muhammad found that their possession of inspired books gave the Jews a position of great religious importance in the eyes of his countrymen, which was augmented by the fact of their direct descent from Abraham, of their own connection with whom the Arabs were so proud. He could not doubt that the Jews still preserved the Religion of Abraham, for which his predecessors the Hanîfs‡ had resolved to search. The monotheism of the Jews and their aversion to idolatry would also exercise a very favourable influence upon Muhammad's mind, and would predispose him to endeavour to ally them with himself in his campaign against the corruptions which he discovered to have crept into the religion of his fellow countrymen. The Qur'ân shows§ in the clearest manner possible how much of his teaching Muhammad borrowed from the Jews. Again and again he professes that his religion is the same as that which the "People of the Book" had received by Divine¶ revela-

* *Vide* Siratu'r Rasûl and all Arabic historians; also *cf.* Rabbi Geiger, "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?" pp. 6-9, *et alibi*.

† *Ibid.*, p. 10.

‡ Regarding whom see an interesting account in Ibn Hishâm, Part I, pp. 76, *sqq.* The chief of these *Hanîfs* or "Orthodox Believers" were Waraqah bin Naufil, 'Ubeidu'llâh bin Jahsh, 'Uthmân bnu'l Huweirith, and Zeid bin 'Amr.

§ See this proved at length in Rabbi Geiger, "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?"

¶ أهل الكتاب ^ص ^ع; the Jews, Christians, and perhaps Sabaeans, are so called in the Qur'ân *passim*, but the epithet is most commonly used in reference to the Jews especially.

¶ This is most fully confessed in the Qur'ân in many places, *e.g.*, Sûrah II, 130:—

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ

tion. He was not, however, personally acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and his Jewish instructors Waraqah,* Habîb bin Malik, and above all 'Abdullâh ibn Sallâm,† were far better instructed in tales from the Talmud than in their Canonical Scriptures. This accounts for the fact that many of the stories told in the Qur'ân regarding Scripture characters agree far more closely with Talmudic fables than with Old Testament history. The resemblances are, in fact, so great as to preclude any possibility of accounting for them except by plagiarism on Muhammad's part, although he professed to receive his teaching from Divine inspiration. A few examples‡ will suffice. The narrative given in the Qur'ân§ concerning Abel's burial, and how a raven taught Cain how to bury him, agrees exactly with the account given in the "Pirke Rabbî Eliezar," except that in the Jewish legend the raven gave Adam and not Cain the lesson in question. Such blunders in details are not uncommon in other similar plagiarisms in the Qur'ân. Again Muhammad's account¶ of how Abraham in his youth was cast into the fire by Nimrod's order, and miraculously delivered from it, is in almost every detail borrowed from the "Midrâsh Rabbâh."*** R. Abraham Geiger has

وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْإِسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَى وَعِيسَى وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ
 مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ لَا نَفْرَقَ بَيْنَ أَحَدٍ مِنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ .

* Waraqah for a time professed Judaism, as Ibn Ishâq tells us (*op. cit.*, Part I, pp. 76, *sqq.*).

† Abû'l Fidâ, "Annales Moslemici," Part I, 283; *cf.* Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

‡ These are all borrowed from Rabbî Geiger's work, where the Chaldee texts may be read in the original.

§ Sûrah V, 30-35. The *names* of Cain and Abel, however, do not occur in the Qur'ân. Muslims call them Qâbil and Hâbil.

|| Chapter XXI; Geiger, p. 103.

¶ Told in a fragmentary way in Sûrah XXI, 52-72; Sûrah II, 260; VI, 74; XIX, 42-50; XXVI, 69-79; XXIX, 15; XXXVIII, 81-95; XLIII, 25-27; LX, 4, etc.

** Midrâsh Rabbâh on Genesis, § 17; Geiger, pp. 123, 124. Muhammad does not mention Nimrod by name, but Muhammadan commentators do, following Jewish tradition. He also calls Abraham's father *Azar* instead of Terah, by a corruption of Zârah (his name in the Talmud).

pointed* out a number of Aramaic words in the Qur'ân which have much puzzled Arabic commentators, and which form another unmistakable proof of Muhammad's indebtedness to Talmudic lore. Among other minor matters in which the Qur'ân borrows from the same source may be mentioned the existence of seven heavens† and seven hells, the fact that at the Creation GOD'S throne‡ moved in the air over the waters, the existence of a "Prince§ of Hell," of Al A'râ†† or the partition between heaven and hell, the prophecy that the Resurrection¶ will be ushered in and helped forward by a great rain, the assertion that hell is never** full, the information that evil spirits hearken behind a curtain†† to GOD'S counsels, and many other similar absurdities. What Muhammad relates of Hârût‡‡ and Mârût, two angels that sinned, is precisely what the Midrâsh Yalkût tells us of the angels Shamhazai and 'Azâêl. His assertion§§ that at the Deluge "the oven boiled up," is an echo of the Rabbinical saying that "the generation that lived at the time of the Flood were punished with *hot water*."

It was not merely such traditions as these that Muhammad borrowed from the Jews of his own time. He learnt from them to assert his belief in the Prophets of the Old Testa-

* *E.g.*—^ستوراة = תּוֹרָה = תּאֲבוֹתָ = תִּיבוֹתָא = جَهَنَّم =
 = فِرْقَانٌ = مُعَذِّبٌ = طَاعُونَ = שְׂכִינָה = סִכִּינֵה = יִירַדְנוֹכ =
 מַלְבָּדִית = מַלְכּוֹת = חַעְזוֹן = מַעוֹן = שֶׁחֲטֵא = שֶׁחֲטֵא = פִּרְקוֹן =

(Geiger, pp. 41-60). For the Syriac words I am myself responsible.

† Sûrah XVII, 46, 88; Chagigah IX, 2.

‡ Sûrah XI, 9; Rashi on Gen. i, 2.

§ Called Mâlik by the Muslims (Mishkât; *Bâb Sifat'u'n Nâri wa Ahlihâ*,

section ii), and by the the Rabbins merely גֵּיהֵנוֹם .

|| Sûrah VII, 44; *cf.* Midrâsh to Ecc. vii, 14.

¶ Tract *Taanith*, *initio*; Berêshith Rabbâh; Pocock, "Not, in Port Mosis," pp. 117, 255.

** Sûrah L, 29; *cf.* Ôthiôth de Rabbi Aqibâ, VIII, 1.

†† Sûrah LVII, 5; XXXVII, 7; XV, 17, 34, etc.; *cf.* Geiger, pp. 83, 84.

‡‡ Sûrah II, 96 and Yahya's comment. *in loc.*, quoted by Sale; Midrâsh Yalkût, cap. XLIV; Geiger, p. 107. Jonathan's Targum calls them Samhasai and 'Uzziêl.

§§ Sûrah XI, 42, and XXIII, 27; Rôsh Hashanah, XVI, 2; Sanhedrin,

وفار التنور، ددر المبول بروثחין גדינו - : 108

ment, of whom he often* makes mention in the Qur'ân, and concerning whom he tells some marvellous tales, of which Solomon's† conversation with a lapwing, his armies of genii and men and birds, and the tale of the *Ifrit* bringing him Queen Balkis' throne, are fair specimens. It is beyond dispute, moreover, that Muhammad's belief in the One True God, though not learnt directly from the Jews, was much strengthened by his intercourse with them. We may infer that his iconoclasm owed something to the same influence. But the impress which Talmudic‡ Judaism, as it then existed in Arabia, has left on the religion of Muhammad is deeper still. Arabian Judaism at that time was the direct offspring and the development of the Pharisaism into which the Jews of our Lord's day had corrupted the religion of the Prophets. It was a faith which attached an extreme value to outward observances, such as fasting, pilgrimages, ceremonial rites, washings, fixed times of prayer, etc. Muhammad§ was very naturally therefore led to deem these things of very great importance. The Pharisaism of the Jews thus became the parent of that which is now manifested in Islâm. Muhammadans themselves at the present day are often struck on reading the New Testament (when they can be persuaded to do so) by observing how completely the spirit, and much of the form also, of their own faith accords with that of the Pharisees condemned by our Lord. No attentive reader of

* *E.g.*, in Sûrah XIX, 42, *sqq.* Vide also his references to Aaron (II, 249, *sqq.*), Abraham (II, 130, *et passim*), David (XXXIV, 10, etc.), Enoch (XIX, 57, etc.), Elisha (VI, 86), Elijah (VI, 85), Ezra (IX, 30), Job, Jonah, Joseph, Joshua, Noah, Solomon, Zacharias, etc.

† Sûrah XXVII.

‡ The Talmud was completed about a century before Muhammad's time, the Babylonian Gemara having been finished about A.D. 530, the Jerusalem Gemara about A.D. 430, and the Mishna about A.D. 220 (Gfrörer's "Jahrhundert des Heils," pp. 11-44). R. Geiger (*op. cit.*, pp. 9, 10) says: "Dass die jüdische Glaubensansicht eine völlig durchgebildete und ganz in das Leben aller Gemeindeglieder eingedrungene schon damals gewesen sei, lässt sowohl ihr Alter nicht bezweifeln als auch vorzüglich die schon zu Stande gebrachte Beendigung des Talmuds."

§ Hauri ("Der Islâm," pp. 43, 44) says: "Das ganze Leben ist in religiöse Formen eingeschlossen: tägliche Gebete, Festtage, Wallfahrten, Fasten, Enthaltung von gewissen Speisen und äussere Reinigungen. Das ist die Religiosität, mit welcher Mohammed bekannt wurde, und sie hat auf seine Stiftung so grossen Einfluss geübt, dass wir sagen müssen: Der Islâm ist nicht eine neue Religion, auf ein neues Princip gebaut, sondern nur eine Vermengung des einseitig gewordenen Judenthums mit arabischem Heidenthum."

the Qur'ân can fail to notice how completely the book breathes throughout the spirit of this corrupt and slavish form of Judaism. Hence a recent writer* well terms Islâm "the Religion of Revelation translated into flesh," in order to show its servile and carnal character, its professors being—in keeping with Muḥammad's descent from Ishmael and Hagar—children of the bondwoman and not of the free.

4. From orthodox Christianity Islâm borrowed little. Although in the Qur'ân there are no less than 131 references to the Holy Scriptures by name, yet there is only one† direct quotation from the Old Testament and another less direct‡ from the New, together with the assertion that Christ predicted the coming of a prophet called Ahmad, the same name as Muḥammad. The "Prophet" could learn little he cared to know from the corrupt Eastern Church of his time. But there lingered among the many sects of Christians and Christian heretics then to be found in Arabia, Syria, and

* Grau, "Kulturentwicklung," p. 138; "Keineswegs aber ward im Islam das Heidenthum vollständig überwunden; vielmehr ist er nur die ins Fleisch übersetzte Religion der Offenbarung, das Kind der Magd und nicht der Freien, wie Ismael."

† Vide each such passage quoted in the original and commented on in Sir W. Muir's "The Coran" (S.P.C.K.).

‡ In Sûrah XXI, 105:—

وَلَقَدْ كَتَبْنَا فِي الزَّبُورِ مِنْ بَعْدِ الذِّكْرِ أَنَّ الْأَرْضَ يَرِثُهَا عِبَادِيَ
الصَّالِحُونَ

(The quotation here is from Ps. xxxvii, 11).

§ Sûrah VII, 38:—

وَلَا يَدْخُلُونَ الْجَنَّةَ حَتَّى يَلْمَ الْجَمَلُ فِي سَمِّ الْخَيْطِ

(Cf. Matt. xix, 24).

|| Sûrah LXI, 6:—

وَإِنَّ فَارَيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ يَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ
مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي
اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ

Muḥammad evidently meant to refer to John, xvi, 7, *sqq.* He no doubt misunderstood the word Παράκλητος, and imagined it meant what Περικλυτός does, of which *Ahmad* is a fair translation.

Egypt, many marvellous tales connected with our Lord and His Apostles and the saints and martyrs of the past. Many of these are still extant in the Apocryphal Gospels, several of which are of considerable antiquity.* Mixing with men who loved to recount such tales, and being ignorant of the canonical New Testament, Muḥammad adopted many silly legends and incorporated them into the Qur'ân. As an example we may quote that of "the Seven Sleepers," whom he calls "the Companions† of the Cave," and whose absurd tale he tells at full length as Divinely revealed to him. Regarding the Virgin Mary, Muḥammad assures us that her mother before her birth dedicated‡ her to GOD's service, that she was reared in the Temple under the care of Zacharias,§ where GOD sent angels|| to feed her, and that lots were cast with rods¶ to decide who should take charge of her as she grew up to womanhood. Again, on one occasion when she was hungry a date palm** lowered its head and offered its fruit to her. All these and many other such tales are taken from the "Protevangelium of James," the "Pseudo-Matthew," the "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," and similar apocryphal works.†† So also of our Lord Himself we are told in the Qur'ân as well as in the "Gospel of the‡‡ Pseudo-Thomas"

* *Vide* Giles' "Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti," 2 vols.; also Cowper's "Apocryphal Gospels," Introduction, Section IV; and Tischendorf, "On the Origin and Use of the Apocryphal Gospels."

† Sûrah XVIII, 8-26.

‡ Sûrah III, 31; *cf.* "Protevang. Jacobi," iv: *Εἶπε δὲ Ἄννα, Ζῆ Κύριος ὁ Θεός μου, ἐν γεννήσῳ εἶτε ἄρρον εἶτε θῆλυ, προσάξω αὐτὸ δῶρον Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ μου*; *cf.* also "Evang. de Nat. Mariae," cap. i; also "Pseudo-Matthew," ii.

§ Sûrah III, 32; *cf.* "Protevang. Jac.," cap. viii, *sqq.*

|| Sûrah III, 32; *cf.* "Evang. de Nat. Mariae," cap. vii; "Protev. Jac.," cap. viii; "Hist. Nat. Mariae," cap. vi.

¶ Sûrah III, 39; *cf.*, "Protev. Jac.," cap. ix, "Evang. de Nat. Mariae," cap. vii and viii; "Hist. Nat. Mariae," cap. viii.

** Sûrah XIX, 23, 25; *cf.* "Hist. Nat. Mariae," cap. XX (connected, however, with the Flight into Egypt—another of Muḥammad's blunders!).

†† Tischendorf thinks that the "Protev. Jac." belongs to the middle of the second century; Cowper is uncertain whether it existed before the fourth century. The "Pseudo-Matthew" (otherwise called "Hist. Nat. Mariae") may belong to the fifth century (Cowper). The "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary" belongs to the fifth or sixth century (Cowper).

‡‡ An early work, attributed by Cowper to the middle of the second century. Much of it is incorporated in the present form of the "Arabic Gospel of the Infancy."

and the "Arabic Gospel* of the Infancy," that Jesus spoke when an infant† in the cradle, and that as a boy he gave life to a bird‡ made of clay. Following in the footsteps of the Valentinians, Basilides,§ and the Manichæans, Muḥammad denied our Lord's crucifixion,|| asserting that someone else had died in His stead. He rejected, however, the Docetism upon which this idea was based,—another example of the strangely composite nature of his doctrines and of his blunders. He evidently believed the Virgin Mary to be, in the opinion of Christians, the Third Person¶ in the Trinity, and identified her with Miriam, the sister of** Aaron! This is almost paralleled by his statement that the Hebrews in the Wilderness were persuaded *by a Samaritan*†† to make the Golden Calf!

5. The religion of Zoroaster again has left its mark upon Islām, owing to the not inconsiderable number of ideas which Muḥammad borrowed from it. In his early manhood the Persians exercised sovereign sway over many parts‡‡ of Arabia. Their tales were very popular among the Arabs, and are referred to in the Qur'ān.§§ Along with the heroic legends of Irān it was natural that some of its religious tenets

* This work in its present form, however, is in a late style of Arabic; it is probably a translation of a Syriac work, which may itself have been of Coptic origin. *Vide* the text in Giles' "Cod. Apoc. N. T.," Vol. i, pp. 12, *sqq.*

† "Ar. Evang. Infantiae," cap. i; *cf.* Sûrah XIX, 30, 31, *sqq.*; also Sûrah V, 109; Sûrah III, 40, 41, etc.

‡ "Pseudo-Thomas," cap. ii (Giles, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 48, 49): "Ar. Evang. Inf.," cap xxxvi; Sûrah III, 43; Sûrah V, 110.

§ Irenæus, "Adv. Hæres.," Lib. I, 23; August., "Hæres.," IV, etc., etc.

|| Sûrah IV, 156.

¶ *Cf.* Sûrah IV, 169 (*vide* also Al Beidhâwî, Yahya, and Jalâlu'ddîn's commentaries *in loco*). *Vide* also Sûrah V, 76-79, 116, and Jalâlu'ddîn's commentary.

** Both *Miriam* and *Mary* are in Arabic (as in Hebrew) the same word—

in Arabic it is ^{مريم} *مريم*. Hence the confusion. The mother of Jesus is called "Sister of Aaron" in Sûrah XIX, 29.

†† Sûrah XX, 87, *sqq.*

‡‡ Especially over the kingdom of Hirah in the north-east, also over the Arabs of 'Irâqu'l 'Arabî (Abû'l Fîdâ, "Hist. Ante-Islamica," ed. Fleischer, p. 126). The Persians had also in Muḥammad's time succeeded the Abyssinians in the sovereignty of Yaman (Ibn Ishâq).

§§ Sûrah XXVII, 70; *vide* also Ibn Hishâm, Part I, p. 124.

should also gain access to their minds. Much that the Qur'ân tells us of the *genii*,* beings made of subtle fire and intermediate between angels and men, is clearly traceable to this source.† The very word جِنِّيّ (jinni) by which such a being is called is the Avestic 𐬒𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 (jainī), a wicked (female) spirit.‡ The *Hûr* (حور) or *houries* of the Muḥammadan Paradise are unmistakably identical with the 𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎 § *Pairikas* of the Avesta (in modern Persian *Peris*), “female genii|| endowed with seductive beauty, dwelling in the air and attaching them-

* Cf. Sûrah VI, 100, 128 ; XV, 27 ; XXVI, 212 ; XLI, 24, 29, etc.

† Much that is related of Solomon in the Qur'ân is almost identical with Persian legends about Yima Khshaeta (Avesta), or in Modern Persian *Jamshid*. These legends were current among the Arabs of his time, and were regarded by Muḥammad as true and (apparently) as recorded in the inspired writings of the Jews! There is a curious old Persian book not long since re-discovered, written in Pahlavi in the Persico-Arabic character, but with an amplified translation in the Dari form of Persian. It is called the “Heavenly Dastûrs” (in the original دَسْتَاوِرِ آسْمَانِي).

Every treatise in it is attributed to a different prophet, and the second sentence in each treatise runs thus:—*فَه شِيد شَمَتَايِ هَرشَدَنده هَرشَشْكَرْ*—= “In the Name of God the Merciful, the Gracious,”—the very formula used at the beginning of every Sûrah but one in the Qur'ân, in

Arabic بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ. The first clause in each treatise is

نَعْدُ بِاللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ, identical with the Qur'anic نَعْدُ بِاللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ.

Al Beidhâwī and Jalâlân (comment, on Sûrah XXV) tell us that the

اَسَاطِيرِ mentioned in Sûrahs XXV, XXVI, 70 ; XLVI, 16 ; LXVIII, 15, was a book well-known in Mecca before Muḥammad's time, and in which the doctrine of the Resurrection was taught. Is there any possibility of a connection between the دَسْتَاوِرِ and the اَسَاطِيرِ?

‡ The word occurs, e.g., in Yasna X, 4, 2, 53. A great number of evil spirits of various kinds are mentioned in the Avesta, among which are:—*Jainis, Jahis, daevas, drujes, nasus, the yâtus*, etc.

§ Yasna IX, 61 ; Yesht X, 26, 34, etc.

|| C. de Harlez, “Manuel de la Langue de l'Avesta,” *sub. voc.*

selves to the stars and to light." The Arabic name for these beautiful damsels* too, is of Persian origin, being derived from the Pahlavi *hūr*, † Avestic *hware* (𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎) "brilliant," "the sun." Though the Qur'anic Paradise (الجنة) derives its name from the Hebrew Garden of Eden (גֶּדֶן), yet it is not unlike the Persian conception of (𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎) ‡ *Vahistō Ahu*, "the perfect world." § The Muḥammadan Angel of Death (مَلَكُ الْمَوْتِ), also called عزرائيل, though known to them

* The idea of the existence of these celestial damsels is a very ancient one among the Aryans. The Hindûs of ancient times called them *Apsarasas*, and believed that they inhabited *Swarga* (Indra's heaven—the sky), and that they used to transport thither the *Kshatriyas* or warriors who died in battle (vide Sir M. Monier-Williams' edition of the "Nalopakh-yānam," s.v. चत्रियाः). Manu says ("Dharmasāstra," Bk. VII, śl. 89):—

आहवेषुमियो ऽन्यो ऽन्यजिदांसन्तोमहीक्षितः ।
युध्यमानाः परंश्नत्यास्वर्गयान्धपराङ्मुखाः ॥

that warriors who die bravely in battle inherit *Swarga* immediately after death. So also in Nalop. II, 17, 18, Indra says to Nala:—

धर्मज्ञः पृथिवीपालाम् त्यक्तजीवितयोधिनः ॥
शस्त्रेण निधनं काले ये गच्छन्धपराङ्मुखाः ।
अयं लोको ऽच्चयस् तेषां यथैव मम कामधुक् ॥

Compare this with the Muḥammadan idea of the reward of those who die in battle fighting for their faith.

† Penrice derives حور pl. from a singular حوراء, f. of أحرور, "black-eyed," from حوراء, a form of حار. ("Dict. of the Koran," s.v.) I prefer the derivation in the text.

‡ Fargand II, 35, 36, etc.

§ Are not the beautiful youths of Paradise (the *Ghilmân* الغلمان), who wait upon the blessed there (Sûrah LVI, 13), identical with the Gandharvas or celestial musicians of Indra's heaven?

directly through Jewish fables, is indirectly borrowed from Persia, where he was known in Avestic times as 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 or 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 * *Vidātus* or *Astōvidhotus*. To the same religion Muḥammad was indebted for his Road, or Bridge† (الصراط) over Hell, which the ancient Persians called *Chînavat* (in mod. Persian چینود). Many of the strange and absurd ideas found in more recent Muḥammadan works may be traced to the same source, as for example the theory that the earth is sevenfold, or built in seven‡ storeys, one above the other. These seven storeys of the earth are the seven (𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 or 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀) *Karshvares*§ of the Avesta, and to a great extent correspond, and are certainly of common origin with the seven (द्वीपः) *dvîpas* of the Hindûs. It is remarkable as showing the extent of the influence which Zoroastrianism had even before Muḥammad's time exercised upon Arabia, that the word for "the faith" or "Religion" most frequently used in the Qur'ân (دين) *dîn*, is not a pure Arabic word at all, but is the Avestic (𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀) *daëna*, which is used quite as technically in the early Zoroastrian Scriptures as its Arabicised form is in the Qur'ân.¶ In fact nearly all that Islâm teaches about the angels, the work and nature of evil spirits, and kindred subjects, is derived either directly from a Zoroastrian or Magian source, or indirectly so through the medium of later Jewish legends which were deeply coloured through the influence of Persian myths.

* Yesht X, 93; Fargand V, 25, 31.

† Penrice ("Dict. of Koran," s.v.) says that صراط comes from no verbal root in the Arabic language. It is just the form the Persian word would take when introduced into Arabic.

‡ 'Arâisu't Tijân, pp. 5-9; Qiṣaṣu'l Anbiyâ, pp. 4-6, etc.

§ Yasna LXIV; Yesht X, etc.

¶ Fargand II, 1-3; Yesht XVI, etc. The word in the Avesta means primarily *law, doctrine*. Ahura Mazda is represented as giving his *daëna* to Yima and afterwards to Zarathuštra (Zoroaster). Hence the Arabic meaning of the word = *Religion*.

Thus nearly every leading doctrine of Islâm can be traced with perfect certainty to some Pre-Islâmic creed. Even in Muḥammad's lifetime he was accused of deriving from human teachers the revelations he professed to receive from GOD through the Angel Gabriel. This he strenuously denied, asserting that his wonderful acquaintance with the history of the Old Testament Prophets was a manifest proof of his Divine mission!

II. We have spoken above of the great influence which Islâm exerts over many millions of our race. The secret of its might lies to a great extent in the amount of truth incorporated in it and derived from Judaism and primitive Semitic tradition. Muḥammad discovered not a single new truth, nor did he inculcate a single moral precept which had not been much more forcibly taught in the Old Testament. The more perfect moral system, and the completed revelation of GOD, contained in the New Testament he either ignored or denied* in set terms. Instead of being an advance on Christianity, therefore, as it must necessarily be if it were (as it claims to be) a later and perfect revelation, Islâm has retrograded far behind the limit reached by the Prophets of Israel. It has no priesthood, no sacrificial system, no atonement for sin, no blessed hope of a coming Redeemer, no clearly-defined moral code, no glorious past ennobled by holy and devoted Prophets, no sinless future promised in its Qur'ân. It has lost much that GOD had revealed previously, and gained instead only heathen myths, Jewish Pharisæism, and the Arabian fatalism and love of war. Yet in spite of all this Islâm has retained enough of truth, though somewhat distorted, to give it the influence of which we have spoken. The Creed of Islâm,† or of Unity, as it is called, well illustrates the character of the religion. It consists, as Gibbon remarks,‡ “of an eternal truth, and a necessary fiction,” “Lâ ilâha ill' Allâhu; Muḥamadur Rasûlu 'llâhi,” “There is no GOD but

* I do not mean that he rejected the *Injil* (Εὐαγγέλιον) as he calls the New Testament. On the contrary, it is again and again in the Qur'ân spoken of as Divinely inspired. But most of the truths taught in the New Testament, e.g., our Lord's Divinity, His atoning Death, etc., are denied, and Muḥammad shows no knowledge whatever of the moral system taught by Christ.

† In Arabic كَلِمَةُ الْإِخْلَاصِ.

‡ Vol. IX, Cap. L.

GOD; Muḥammad is the Apostle of GOD.* The grand and simple monotheism of the first part of this formula commends itself to all minds, while the concluding portion, if accepted on the authority of the first, suffices to quench every lingering doubt about the minor doctrines of Islām, resting as they do wholly and entirely upon the assertions of Muḥammad.

1. The chief truths† retained in Muḥammadanism are :—(1) The Unity of GOD and His distinctness in Nature and Attributes from the Creation which is the work of His hands. (2), Man's dependence upon his Creator, his need of a Divine Revelation, the fact that GOD has revealed Himself through certain great Prophets in inspired books, and that He hears and answers prayer. (3), The certainty of an after-life of rewards and punishments according to our deeds done in the body. Regarding these great doctrines Islām gives no uncertain sound, and we may thank GOD that they are so powerfully urged and so frequently insisted on both in the Qur'an itself and in the Traditions of the "Prophet," the two great sources whence the doctrines of the religion are drawn. Yet it would be an utter mistake to suppose that these points which we have mentioned are recognised by Muslims as forming in themselves the fundamentals of their faith. They may be all classed under the first clause of their creed, but the *kalimah* contains *two* clauses, and it is the second that, in the opinion of the Muslims, distinguishes it from the creeds of less perfect religions. The first clause formed, they tell us, an integral part of the creed of both Jews and Christians; but while the former‡ were Divinely authorised to add to this

* In the Qur'an both clauses virtually occur; the first in Sûrah III,

55:—^{مَا مِنْ آيَةٍ إِلَّا مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ} مَا مِنْ آيَةٍ إِلَّا مِنْ آيَةِ اللَّهِ—^{وَمَا مِنْ إِلَهٍ إِلَّا اللَّهُ}—and the latter in Sûrah XXXIII, 40:—

مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِنْ رِجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِنْ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ

† It is unnecessary to adduce quotations from the Qur'an and the traditions to prove that these truths are taught in the Muḥammadan faith. They are found in almost every page.

‡ This is the account given in such works as the '*Arâisut Tihân*, and is current among Muslims in different lands. Other traditions, however, state that the Muḥammadan *Kalimah* or Creed was written by GOD before the creation of the world on the base of the Celestial Throne

(العرش). It is also inscribed on the Seal of God. Cf. *Mishkâtul*

the words "Moses* is he that conversed with GOD," and the latter the phrase "Jesus is the Word of GOD," the concluding section of the Muḥammadan creed has now finally, by the Divine decree, taken the place, for all true Believers, of the previous temporary and imperfect conclusions. Hence no one can in any true sense be a Muḥammadan who accepts the three great truths we have above enumerated but refuses to give his adherence to all the rest of Muḥammad's† teaching. It would be manifestly incorrect, therefore, to regard these truths as the foundation upon which the faith rests. On the contrary, it is based entirely upon Muḥammad's unsupported claim to be the last and greatest of the Prophets. Muḥammad is reported to have summed up the chief doctrines and injunctions of his religion in the following‡ words:— "Islām is founded upon five points: (1), the testifying that there is no God but GOD, and that Muḥammad is His Servant and His Apostle: (2), the offering of prayer: (3), the payment of *Zakāt* (alms fixed by Divine law): (4), the Pilgrimage§ to Mecca: (5), and Fasting during *Ramadhān*.

Muḥammad's teaching, even with reference to the three great truths previously mentioned, is not free from grave defects. It is the glory of Islām that it teaches that GOD alone should be worshipped, that it recognises GOD as Personal, Omniscient and Almighty, the Creator and Preserver, the Master and Judge of all Creation. But of a GOD of infinite holiness, of infinite justice, and of infinite love, Muḥammad had no idea whatever. Among the ninety-nine Titles or Names|| of GOD repeated by Muslims, the name of *Father* does not occur. Not only so, but the use of such a

Maṣābiḥ, Bombay (Arabic) Edition, p. 487, etc.; also *Qigāṣūl, Anbiyā*, near beginning.

* *Vide* Mishkāt, pp. 505, 506.

† *Cf.* "Rusūm-i Hind," Muḥammadan portion (Pl. II), p. 261: "In the opinion of Muslims, Faith is the pivot upon which all kinds of good works turn, and the root of all acts of worship. And its great support is to believe in and trust with sincerity of heart to whatever things his Excellency Muḥammad stated."

‡ Mishkāt, Bk. I, p. 4.

§ Mr. Bosworth Smith's contention that the Hajj or Pilgrimage to Mecca is no essential of Muḥammadanism is thus incorrect. As we see, it is, on the contrary, one of the fundamental matters insisted upon by Muḥammad. This one matter will serve to show (what it is hardly necessary to demonstrate at full length) that Islām is as purely *local* a faith as Judaism originally was.

|| Given fully in Mishkāt, *Kūḍb Asmā-illāh ta'āla'*, p. 191, *sqq.*

term with reference to GOD seems to the Muslim to be most terrible blasphemy. Muḥammadan theologians tell us that the gulf between GOD and Man is so immeasurable that no inferences with regard to GOD'S dealings can possibly be drawn by considering what our intuitions with reference to justice or holiness may require.* A modern writer well says, "There† is no creed the inner life of which has been so completely crushed under an inexorable weight of ritual. For that deep, impassable gulf which divides man from God empties all religious acts of spiritual life and meaning, and reduces them to rites and ceremonies." Hauri writes, "However‡ much he" (Muhammad) "discourses about GOD'S Righteousness, His Wrath against sin, His Grace and Mercy, yet Allāh is not holy love, not the negation of all self-seeking and sensuality. Neither in Holiness nor in Love is He just. Towards the ungodly, Love does not attain to its right. Allāh is quick and ready enough to punish them, to lead them astray and to harden their hearts; His Wrath is not free from passion. Towards Believers, that Holiness which can love nothing impure is defective. Allāh can permit His Prophet to do things that would otherwise be objectionable: to the rest of the Believers also He can permit what is not of itself good. . . . The commandments which Allāh gives are not the expression of His Nature; they are arbitrary and can therefore be retracted and replaced by others. Thus the GOD of Muḥammad leaves upon us the impression of an arbitrary Oriental despot, who makes His enemies experience His wrath in a terrible manner, and loads His faithful servants with benefits, besides winking at their misdeeds." The one attribute of GOD which to the Muslim mind towers above and almost overshadows all others is His almighty *Power*. Islām may with reason be called the Deification of Power. This Power may be exercised in the most arbitrary manner, and is unrestrained by any law of Holiness or Justice existent in the very being of GOD. Hence it is that Muḥammadans entirely fail to see the moral obliquity of many of their

* Al Ghazzālī, *e.g.*, says: "Nor is His justice to be compared with the justice of men, because a man may be suspected of acting unjustly by invading the possession of another; but no injustice can be conceived of God, who can find nothing belonging to any other besides Himself." (Quoted by Ockley, "Hist. of the Saracens.")

† Osburn, "Islām under the Khalifs of Baghdād," p. 4.

‡ "Der Islām," p. 45.

“Prophet’s” actions. “If *we* were to do such a thing, it would be murder or adultery, as the case may be,” they say; “but when Muḥammad the chosen, the Apostle of GOD, acted thus, he committed no sin, for *God* commanded him to do so.*” The fact that it is a moral impossibility for GOD to sanction, much less to command, the commission of distinct breaches of the eternal Moral Law is quite beyond their comprehension, and the enunciation of such a statement seems to them to be a blasphemous denial of the Omnipotence of GOD.

One of the leading features in the Religion of Muḥammad is the belief it inculcates in an inexorable Fate† by which all things are ruled for time and for eternity. A Tradition declares that before creating the world GOD caused to be written down all that should happen on earth, even to the extent of the movement produced by the rustling of a leaf upon a tree. The happiness or misery of every man in the next world was decided by the Divine decree long before his creation. The Qur’ān represents GOD as saying, “Verily§ I will fill Hell with men and genii,” and makes Him declare that He created them for this very|| purpose. “GOD,” we are repeatedly assured, “misleadeth¶ whom He willeth, and guideth aright whom He willeth;” and He says of Himself in

* Mr. Bosworth Smith (“Mohammed and Mohammedanism,” pp. 143–4) says that the Jewish Rabbis also held that “a Prophet who was properly commissioned might supersede any law.” If so, this may be another Rabbinical idea borrowed by Islām. But certainly the Old Testament shows us that not even David or Solomon could transgress the *moral* law with impunity. How far Islām in this matter falls behind the morality of the Jews, even in the times of the Kings, is well seen by comparing what the Bible says of David’s adultery with Bathsheba, and what the Qur’ān says of that of Muḥammad with Zeinab, the wife (divorced for his sake) of his adopted son Zeid. (Cf. 2 Sam. xi, xii, with Sûrah XXXIII, 37–40. See also Al Beidhâwî’s commentary.)

† Vide Mishkât, *Bâbu’l Īmân bil Qadr*, pp. 11, *sqq.*; Sûrahs VI, 123, 125; VII, 177, 185; X, 99; XI, 120; XIII, 27, 30; XVI, 39, 95; XVII, 14; XVIII, 16; XXXII, 17; LXXIV, 34; LXXVI, 29, 30; LXXXI, 28, 29; XCV, 4, 5, etc.

‡ “Qisâsu’l Anbiyâ,” p. 4.

§ Sûrah XI, 120, and Sûrah XXXII, 13.

|| Sûrah XI, 120; VII, 178.

¶ Sûrah LXXIV, 34;—

يُضِلُّ اللَّهُ مَن يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَن يَشَاءُ

the Qur'an, "As for every* man, We have firmly fixed his fate (*lit.* his bird) upon his neck." It is unnecessary to dwell upon this point as it is so well known. The word "Islâm" denotes *self-surrender* or *resignation*, but it is resignation to such a Deity as this, the resignation of impotence, of terror, and of despair. The proper and fitting attitude of the pious Muslim towards GOD. Muḥammadan theologians tell us, is that of the corpse when in the hands of the washers of the dead.† The evil results which this blighting and soul-deadening doctrine has produced in every Muḥammadan country can be appreciated by none but those personally acquainted with Eastern lands.

Although the obligation to offer Prayer to GOD is most fully recognised‡ by every Muslim, yet Islâm fails to realise what Prayer really is. It is regarded as a duty imposed by the arbitrary§ *fiat* of GOD, rather than as a spiritual means of refreshment and of enabling the worshipper to hold communion in spirit with GOD. Indeed, of such communion Muḥammad never even dreamed.|| The worshipper is required to offer his homage to his Master at certain fixed times in the day, and in doing so he must use definitely prescribed genuflexions and prostrations, and he is obliged to follow with the utmost precision the appointed ritual. If he fails in this, his prayer is ineffectual, no amount of heart devotion can render it acceptable to GOD, nay rather it is turned into sin.¶ "Resting on the arms while at prayer is pleasing to the people of Hell," said the "Prophet." The amount of merit attached to a prayer is greatly dependent

* Sūrah XVII, 14 :-

وَكُلِّ إِنْسَانٍ أَلْزَمْنَاهُ طَائِرَهُ فِي عُنُقِهِ

† Hauri, "Der Islâm," p. 76.

‡ Vide Mishkât, Kitâbu's Ṣalât; Qur'an *passim*; also A. von Kremer, "Kulturgeschichte des Orients," Vol. II, pp. 30, *sqq.*

§ Vide the account which Qatâdah gives of how GOD commanded Muḥammad during his "Night Journey" to command his people to offer fifty times a day their prayers, but how on Muḥammad's entreaty the number was reduced to *five*, whereupon a heavenly herald proclaimed in GOD's name, "I have completed My injunction and removed a burden from My servants." (Quoted by Sayyid Aḥmad, "Essay on Shaqq-i-Sadr and Mi'râj," p. 31.)

|| Mr. Bosworth Smith acknowledges this (*op. cit.*, p. 199, etc.).

¶ Vide on the whole subject Mishkât, *Sifat'u Ṣalât* and *Bâbu'l Masâjid wa Mawâdhi' i's Ṣalât.*

upon the place where it is offered. "A prayer in this Mosque of mine,"* said the "Prophet," "is better than a thousand prayers anywhere else, except in the Holy Mosque" at Mecca. At another time he said, "A man's prayer† in the congregation exceeds in value twenty-five times his prayer in his own house." Public prayers must always be in Arabic, even though the great mass of the worshippers may be utterly unable to comprehend the words they utter. Even when offered privately, the prescribed prayers at the five stated times of worship each day must be in Arabic, though when he has offered these the worshipper may then, if he will, address GOD in any other language he pleases.

2. One of the gravest defects in Islâm is the very shallow conception of sin‡ which it inculcates. Sin is, a Muslim holds, the transgression of an arbitrary decree passed by the Deity, which He may rescind at His pleasure. Thus many actions which are sinful, because prohibited here, will be perfectly innocent in the next world. For example, there are indications in the Qur'ân that Muḥammad regarded a *very* great excess of unchastity on earth as a sin; and yet in the same volume he encouraged his followers to exertions in the cause of their "Prophet" by promising them as a reward a practically unlimited indulgence in this vileness in Paradise,§ even before the very throne of GOD! *Why* GOD should have seen fit to forbid such conduct here on earth no Muslim can tell, but *if* we deny ourselves in this matter here, we shall, as a reward, be permitted the unlimited indulgence of our lower appetites|| in the unending After-life! Again, the

* Mishkât, p. 59.

† *Ibid.*, p. 60.

‡ This is well shown in Dr. Hooper's "Christian Doctrine in contrast with Hindûism and Islâm," pp. 5-28.

§ Cf. Sûrahs XLVII, 13, 16, 17; LV, 46-*fn.*; LVI, 11-39, etc.

|| What a great influence such promises of sensual pleasure have had upon Muslims ever since the "Prophet's" time, Arabian historians bear witness. Another evidence is afforded by the care with which every (genuine or not) Tradition bearing on the subject has been collected and recorded. Many of these Traditions greatly exaggerate the pictures drawn in the Qur'ân, but are of the same kind for the most part. Attempts have been made to explain away all these things by understanding them in a spiritual sense, but this is not possible, nor is it at all to the taste of the orthodox Muslim, though it may please the Mystic. A good example of such attempts is afforded by Muḥiyu'ddin's commentary on, e.g., Sûrah LVI 11, *sqq.* So also Al Ghazzâlî. The author of the controversial work "Mizânu'l Mawâzin," however, can only urge in defence of such passages that they are "supported by the Gemara and Talmud."

Qur'ân and the Traditions prove that Muḥammad held that good deeds, and even the due observance of the prescribed ritual, would suffice to do away* with sin. "If there be at the gate of any one of you," he said† one day to his companions, "a river in which he bathes five times every day, will any pollution remain upon him?" They answered in the negative. "Then that is what the Five Prayers are like," said he; "by means of them GOD wipes out sin."

The true character of Islâm and the divorce which it, in common with all other false faiths, makes between Religion and Morality, cannot be better exemplified than in the picture which it presents to its professors of the bliss reserved for the saved in Paradise. The verses in which these sensual gratifications are again and again enumerated in the Qur'ân‡ are unfit to be read aloud to a Christian audience. How very attractive Muḥammad's followers found these things may be inferred not only from history, but also from the eager care with which some of their most learned doctors have treasured up every tradition§ which represents Muḥammad as describing these pleasures in what they doubtless regarded as still more glowing colours. A single sentence from these Traditions will here suffice:—"And verily every man among the people of Paradise shall surely wed 500 Houries, and 4,000 virgins, and 8,000 divorced women." In one place in the Qur'ân|| "a more abundant reward" is promised to the best among Muslims, but it is not stated what this reward is. Those Muḥammadan doctors who have felt how degrading¶ such descriptions of Paradise as those we have referred to are, have endeavoured to introduce a higher element in virtue of this phrase. They** quote a

* Cf. Sûrah II., 273; Mishkât, *Kitâbu's Şalât*, Sect. III.

† Mishkât, *ibid.*, Sect. I, p. 49, where see many more such Traditions.

‡ E.g., Sûrah LVI, 11-40; LV, 46 *sqq.*, etc.

§ Vide the accounts in Al Bukhârî's "Aṣ Şaḥîḥ," etc., also (summarised)

in Mishkât under such headings as صفات الجنة ("Descriptions of the Garden," *i.e.*, of Paradise).

|| Sûrah X, 27 :—

لِّلَّذِينَ أَحْسَنُوا الْحُسْنَىٰ وَزِيَادَةٌ

¶ E.g., Al Beidhâwî endeavours to prove that the friendship between the *Houries* and the pious in Paradise is merely Platonic. We leave those who can reconcile this idea with such descriptions to do so.

** Al Ghazzâlî, for instance, supports the text (quoted by Pocock in "Not. ad Port. Mosis," p. 305).

Tradition in which Muḥammad promises as the highest of all rewards the *vision of GOD Himself. This idea, if it really occurred to Muḥammad, was evidently derived from Christianity,† or from the Jews.‡ But an attentive study of the passages in which the promise is given represents it in a more genuinely Muḥammadan, if to us less attractive, light. One of them, however, will suffice for the present: "The§ Apostle of GOD said, 'Verily the least of the inhabitants of Paradise in rank is he who shall indeed behold his gardens, his wives, and his pleasures, and his servants, and his couches, extending over the space of 1,000 years' journey, and the most acceptable unto GOD among them shall look upon His face night and day.' Then he recited (Sûrah LXXV, 22, 23): 'Faces in that day shall be bright, looking upon their Lord.'" Here we perceive that the very same passage which tells of the Vision of GOD, mentions also the carnal delights already referred to, and represents GOD as approving of His servants' indulgence in them. Such an idea is not more dishonouring to GOD than it is certain to prevent the very possibility of true purity of heart, nay all desire to attain to it, among the orthodox followers of the "Prophet."

Space will not permit us to dwell on the many other weaknesses in the Religion of Islâm, on its innate intolerance,|| its unscientific¶ cosmogony, its assertion of the truth and

* Mishkât, *Kitâbu-l-Fitan*, *Bâbu Ru'yat'Ullâh*, pp. 492, 493.

† *E.g.*, Matt. V, 8; 1 Cor. xiii, 12; 1 John iii, 2, 3; Rev. xxii, 3, 4, etc.

‡ *E.g.*, Isaiah xxx, 17.

§ Mishkât, p. 493:—

قال رسول الله - أن ادنئى اهل الجنة منزلة لمن ينظر الى جفانه
وازواجه ونعيمه وخدمته وسريره مسيرة الف سنة وكرمهم على الله
من ينظر الى وجهه غدوة وعشية - ثم قرأ - وجوه يومئذ ناضرة
الى ربها ناظرة .

|| Sûrah V, 37; Sûrah IX, 5, 29, etc.

¶ *Cf.* Mishkât, 'Arâisu't Tijân, Qisasu'l Anbiyâ, etc. In the latter book, *e.g.*, we are told on the authority of Muḥammad that the earth was originally made out of the foam of a wave which GOD created from a gigantic pearl, and that He made that pearl out of primitive darkness. The colour of the sky is said to be due to the fact that over the earth towers a gigantic mountain named Qâf, which is made of emerald, and is

inspiration of both the Old and the New Testament, coupled with the statement of matters quite inconsistent with what they teach, its entire *absence of proof*.* That it is an essentially anti-Christian creed is abundantly evident from many passages, of which it suffices to quote only one (Sûrah V, 19), "Verily they blaspheme who say, 'GOD is truly the Messiah, Son of Mary.' Say thou: 'Then who would possess any claim upon GOD, if He wished to destroy the Messiah, Son of Mary, and His mother, and all that are in the earth?'"† This is perhaps the latest pronouncement of the "Prophet" on the great central truth of the Christian faith.

3. It remains for us to consider very briefly the nature of the influence which Islâm has exerted over the public and private life of its professors. However much or however little truth any religion may incorporate in its dogmas—if its practical results are bad, destructive to what is noblest in our common humanity, having a tendency to encourage the free developement of our lower nature and to prevent mental and moral progress,—then such a faith cannot be the revelation of the GOD of Love, of Holiness and of Justice.

As to the political condition of all Muḥammadan lands at the present time there is no room for much difference of opinion. Misgovernment, tyranny, extortion, an absolute Monarch and an enslaved people are everywhere found in these countries. Of the condition of agriculture, the fine

2,000 years' journey in circumference. A snake of the same length lies coiled around the earth. The seven storeys of the earth rest between the horns of a bull named Kajûta, which has 4,000 horns, each of the latter being 500 years' journey distant from every other. His feet rest on a fish that swims in water forty years' journey deep!

* The *only* proofs are (1), Muḥammad's assertion of his prophetic office, and (2), the (supposed) supernaturally beautiful style of the Qur'an in the original.

لقد كفر الذين قالوا إن الله هو المسيح ابن مريم قل فمن يملك من الله شيئاً إن أراد أن يهلك المسيح ابن مريم وأمه ومن في الأرض جميعاً .

arts, commerce, engineering,* science,† and kindred subjects there is no need for me to speak. Slavery‡ is sanctioned for all time in the Qur'ân, and servile§ concubinage with all its concomitant evils is not only tolerated but authorized for all Muslims by the example of their "Prophet" himself. The position of woman among the Muslims may not be lower than it was among the Arabs in Pre-Islâmic times, but it is certainly far more degraded than that held by Jewish and Christian women in Eastern lands. Woman is regarded as man's slave and his plaything. The idea of her having been created by GOD to be man's help-meet, the sharer of his joys, the partner of his sorrows, seems never to have entered Muḥammad's mind, though he *might* have learnt it from the Jews, had he so chosen. It is not too much to say that such a principle is hostile to the genius of Islâm. Even to the present time, wherever the precepts of the "Prophet" are

* In most Muḥammadan countries even wheeled carriages are either unknown or are imported from other lands. This is the case, *e.g.*, in Persia at the present day.

† Dr. Draper and others have lavished epithets of praise upon the Muslims of the past for their services in the cause of Science. But where is all this Muḥammadan Science now? Why (if it is due to Islâm) did it never rise upon purely Muḥammadan ground? The lands where Muslim culture reared itself most proudly in the past were precisely those, like Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Spain, that had long been the seats of learning and civilisation. Their philosophy and science came almost exclusively from the Greeks, nor could the Muslims even render the works of the *literati* of Greece into their own tongue. This was done for them by Syrian Christians. (Renan, "Langues Sémitiques.") Gibbon admits that the Arabs made no advance in Geometry beyond Euclid, and that they confess that they learnt Algebra (in spite of its Arabic name—from

الجبر) from the Greek Diophantus. They still hold to the Ptolemaic system in Astronomy, as the Qur'ân indeed compels them to do. Such attainments as they made were not the result, moreover, of Orthodox Islâm. This has always been *hostile* to progress. Science flourished at Baghdâd under the House of 'Abbâs, all of whom were infidels, and perished when an orthodox Muḥammadan revival took place. See on the subject Osburn's "Islâm under the Khalîfs of Baghdâd."

‡ The difference between the spirit of the Gospel and that of the Qur'ân in this respect is well illustrated by the fact that, although as early as Justinian's time the Gospel doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men had so leavened the Roman world and affected the stern conservatism of Roman law, that in the "Institutes" (Just. Instit., Lib. I, tit. iii, § 2), slavery is defined as something "contrary to nature," yet up to the present time no Muḥammadan legislator has done as much.

§ Cf., *e.g.*, Sûrah XXXIII, 52.

faithfully obeyed, there is no true family life. The wife never eats with her husband. She either waits upon him at his meals, if the household is a poor one, or takes her food in the seclusion of the *haram*, while her husband is attended upon by his slaves in his own part of the house. Each believer *may* have four* wives at a time, and may divorce† them at will and marry others in their stead. In Persia, temporary marriages for a month, a week, or even shorter periods, are sanctioned by the religious authorities. Although the Sunnis regard such marriages‡ as illegal, they are said to be of frequent occurrence at Mecca itself during the pilgrimage. It is impossible and undesirable to detail all the evils to which the Religion of Muḥammad thus gives rise—to tell of the divisions in families, the jealousy and hatred between half-brothers, between two legal wives of the same husband, the slanders, the crimes thus brought about. Nor does such a very “liberal” moral code prevent worse evils, for the most unnatural vices and nameless crimes are of frequent occurrence. It is painful to refer to these things. Suffice it to say that, throughout a large portion of the world, Islām has rendered the very conception of a high and pure family life impossible. A faith that thus degrades the gentler sex, and fails altogether to revere or even acknowledge the innate nobleness of feminine humanity and the dignity of wifehood and motherhood, is its own condemnation among all enlightened men of whatever class or creed they may be.

4. After what has been said above it is hardly necessary to say that it is impossible for anyone who has carefully studied the subject to affirm that Islām has any claim to be considered to have come from GOD. Islām does not and cannot satisfy the deepest longings of the human heart. It does not reveal GOD in His Divine Fatherhood, in His Love, His Justice, or His Holiness. It does not show Man his true position in GOD’s sight, nor does it teach him what sin is and how to gain release from its power. Islām is opposed to all freedom of thought, to all true progress, whether moral or intellectual, political or religious. It is only in Muslim lands at the present day that the profession of Christianity means the convert’s death at the executioner’s hands. Such being

* Sūrah IV, 3.

† *Vide* Mishkāt, “Bābu ’l khul’ wa’ttilāq,” pp. 285, *seqq.*

‡ Mishkāt, p. 264. Such a marriage is called ^{سكوة} *سكوة* in Arabic.

the case, it is evident that Muhammadanism cannot, with advantage to any section of the human race, take the place Divinely assigned to Christianity. To talk, as some do, as if the Religion of the "Prophet of Arabia" were well suited to the Semites, or to the Mongol and Turkish races, or again to the Negro—is merely to show one's self culpably ignorant at once of human nature, of Christian truth, and even of Islâm itself. Such platitudes will never satisfy anyone who has at heart the highest interests of his fellow-men.

Just as was the case at Rome at the close of one of the great *æons* in the world's history, so now among ourselves, there are men, priding themselves on their enlightenment and liberality of sentiment, who—as their prototypes worshipped Isis and Serapis, or again followed Epicurus or Plato, according as the varying fashion of the day might impel them—are ready to call themselves now Agnostics, now Buddhists, and now Muhammadans, as the fancy may strike them. Such men may perhaps bolster up Islâm for a time, and thus for a time retard its inevitable downfall. But, in spite of their utmost efforts, the true nature of this religious system will become generally known, and will then be seen to be indefensible. Muhammad is in every way unfitted to be the ideal of a single human being. In spite, therefore, of its many half truths borrowed from other systems, it is not too much to say that Islâm has preserved, in the life and character of its Founder, an enduring and ever active principle of degradation and decay,

APPENDIX.

After the proof-sheets of this paper were in my hands, there appeared a very important book entitled "The Spirit of Islâm" (Syed Ameer Ali), which constitutes in itself a sign of the way in which orthodox Islâm is losing its hold on the minds of thoughtful Muslims who have come in contact with Western thought. The author professes (*Preface*) his hope that his book "may assist the Muslims of India to achieve their intellectual and moral regeneration," and may at the same time "help in the diffusion of Islâmic ideas in the West."

It is unnecessary to say anything here with reference to the readiness with which the author accepts modern Rationalistic theories regarding the origin of some of the leading doctrines of Christianity, and how decidedly he manifests his opposition to the truth of the Deity of our Lord, and other cardinal doctrines of the Bible. No one would expect to find him an authority upon such matters as these. But he claims to be received as such when he treats of Islâm. And yet anyone at all acquainted with the Qur'ân and the Traditions (Ahâdith) may readily perceive that in reality the Sayyid represents orthodox Muhammadanism as it actually exists and has existed from the "Prophet's" time to the present, *about as fairly as Strauss, Baur, De Wette, and others of the same school, may be taken to represent the Christianity of the New Testament!* Any Western student of Muhammadanism who trusts to "The Spirit of Islâm" as an exponent of Muslim belief will find himself woefully mistaken. A careful reader may observe this for himself by reading between the lines. A few examples, however, of the gulf which separates Ameer Ali and the modern "reform" party in India from Muhammad's own teachings may be noted. The God of Muhammad is the Almighty Creator, Ameer Ali repeatedly professes Pantheism, or quotes with special approval Pantheistic passages (*Introd.*, p. 664, &c.). Muhammad professed to receive the Qur'ân directly from the Angel Gabriel by Divine inspiration, and taught that every word and letter was of Divine authority. Ameer Ali tells us that Muhammad taught an eclectic faith, and confesses that he borrowed from the Docetism of Christian heretics (pp. 56-58), from Zeid the Hanif (p. 80, *note*), from Zoroastrianism (pp. 387, 394), and that his teaching shows a gradual development (pp. 398-400). In this I quite agree with him: but no orthodox Muslim would consider this other than gross blasphemy.

The Sayyid has so far profited from Western thought that he is able to declare himself the foe of polygamy and slavery. But he demands too much from our credulity, or depends unduly on the crassness of our ignorance of the Qur'ân, when he ventures to tell us that *Muhammad* agreed with him in all this. His attempt to explain Muhammad's many marriages as being formed only from motives of the purest and most unselfish charity (p. 331, *sqq.*), is admirable as an example of able casuistry. The method in which he strives to rescue his master's memory from the stain of cruel and cowardly murder is ingenious in the extreme, if not ingenuous, but is

by no means convincing to those who have even the very slightest acquaintance with Ibn Hishâm and Muḥammad's other Arabian biographers (p. 162, *sqq.*).

The Sayyid endeavours with great ability to show that the spirit of Islâm has ever been forward in the encouragement of learning and science. But he (quite unintentionally) refutes himself by confessing that *the very dynasties (e.g., that of the Fâtimides in Egypt, and the 'Abbâsides in Mesopotamia) under which Muḥammadan (so-called) learning flourished were devoted followers of the Itizâl and similar schools of philosophy*, which he himself compares (and rightly) with the Rationalistic movement in Modern Europe (pp. 496, 520, 571, 610, *sqq.*, 646). "Distinguished scholars, prominent physicists, mathematicians, historians—all the world of intellect in fact, including the Caliphs, belonged to the Mutazalite School" (p. 610). A little further on he adds:—

"When Mutawakkil was raised to the throne 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 wealth of the Empire; Rationalism was the dominating creed among the educated, the intellectual, and influential classes of the community" (p. 646). When these heretics lost their political power and orthodox Muhammadanism (styled *Patristicism* by Ameer Ali) again asserted its authority, the short but brilliant period of intellectual growth and progress in Muslim lands swiftly passed away. It is unfair, therefore, to attribute to *Islâm* results which ensued from the cultivation of Aristotelian philosophy and Grecian science, and which disappeared for ever when the true Spirit of Islâm re-asserted itself. The result of the latter in every Muhammadan land has been what the author well states regarding one part of the Muslim world:—"A death-like gloom settled upon Central Asia, which still hangs heavy and lowering over these unhappy countries" (p. 589).

The CHAIRMAN (D. HOWARD, Esq., D.L., F.C.S.).—We have to thank Mr. Tisdall for a very valuable paper, one of a kind that is much needed now. In spite of our pride as to the advance of

science, there is a terrible tendency to neglect the very conditions of exact science ; when we get beyond physical science, in which those advances have been made, instead of the verification of facts and theories we too often substitute pure deductions from our own ideas for actual facts ; and this has been very much the case in dealing with foreign religions, and with Islam, perhaps, more than any.

We have pictures of Muhammadanism which are founded, as has been truly stated, not on an accurate knowledge either of the literary source of Islam, or even by a study of the Koran in the original, but on second or third hand means of knowledge eked out by imagination. It is a terrible result of civilisation when it turns back upon itself in the path of progress to seek something strange and new in the field of imagination. It is a feature of our boasted later civilisation, no doubt, that because a thing is unknown we turn to it rather than to that we have known.

Undoubtedly it is right to be just to our antagonists, as the author of this paper is, but in regard to Islam we have more even than mere history to go upon. We may learn of Muhammadanism what is actually found to be its working on those who adopt it, and that is a sound basis of knowledge to go upon.

The following letters from members unable to be present were then received :—

From Sir THEODORE FORD :—

I should not have ventured to make an observation on this paper had it not been for the request made that anyone who has made the subject of Islam an object of study should, if practicable, take part in our customary discussion on papers read to us. The more I consider the treatment of the subject by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, the less opportunity I feel there is for discussion. The conclusion drawn as to the sources from which Muhammad framed his religious system seems one proved almost to demonstration from the authorities cited, strengthened as those are by the consideration of the extreme *a priori* probability of the case ; and if I venture to say anything, it is rather in confirmation of the writer's opinions as to the moral products of Islam, than with a view to add to, confirm, or detract from the results of the historic examination which he has made of the sources and character of Islam itself.

A good many years' residence in countries where a very large, and sometimes major, proportion of the population are followers of

Muhammad, and a not inconsiderable insight into their social and family life which a judicial position gave, enables me to speak with some confidence on the moral effects of the two systems, Christianity and Islam. Deplorable as we must all feel to be the decadence from the moral standard of their creed of but too numerous a multitude of the disciples of Christ, whether regarded from the standpoint of the individual or from their corporate existence as constituting a Christian Church, it yet remains true that the normal practice of the Christian is on a much higher moral level than the normal practice of the Muhammadan; and even in particular cases where a more favourable judgment would be given, the standard and practice of the "good Muhammadan" falls greatly short of one who comes within a *measurable* distance of living up to the moral teachings of Christ. This truth runs through the family as the individual life. These are, at least, the opinions which some little experimental acquaintance with the question has led me to form, and as such are offered by way of a confirmative contribution to the views expressed by Mr. Tisdall on pages 170 and 174 of his paper.

From the Very Rev. E. M. GOULBURN, D.D., late Dean of Norwich:—

I have looked through Mr. Tisdall's paper, and it seems to be a most learned, exhaustive, and valuable treatise on a subject on which many well-meant but shallow views have been entertained.

I have not observed in the notes (although it may be there) any reference to Forster's "Mahometanism Unveiled," a book which had a deserved popularity in its day, but which is now forgotten, though doubtless obtainable at bookstalls. As far as I remember it exhibited very powerfully the truth set forth in the sentence opening up the second section of the paper, as to *the secret of the success* of Mahometanism (for I cannot accommodate myself to the modern method of spelling), and drew out in a masterly way how Ishmael was a sort of debased copy of Isaac. The author, Bishop Jebb's Chaplain, was a man of mark in his day.

From Mr. HORMUZD RASSAM:—

I need not say that the author has handled the subject most admirably, and exposed the so-called revelations of the Korân in a plain and tangible manner.

The CHAIRMAN.—There are many here who are well qualified to speak on the paper, and I will now ask them to give us the benefit of their views.

Rev. HENRY LANSDELL, D.D., M.R.A.S.—I feel very strongly the force of what our Chairman has said as to the exceeding value of this paper, because it has so truly worked out and given us

reference to the various authorities against which it speaks; I came here to-night to say a few words upon the subject, but from a very different standpoint. I have seen, as a traveller, a very large portion of those parts of the world where Muhammadanism obtains—as you will see from the map here exhibited, the lines on which represent my journeys. In Russian Turkistan, one sees Muhammadanism in a certain form. Again in the valley of the Tarim you see sundry variations. Then coming down into India you find remains of what appears to have been a superior Muhammadan civilisation to that in Turkistan. Going up the valley of the Euphrates I continued through Palestine, observing certain phases of Muhammadanism there, and then went on to Tripoli, and visited the famous Muhammadan town of Kairouan. Thence I continued through Algiers and across to Spain, where I visited the Muhammadan remains at the Alhambra and in other towns. Having seen then, as a traveller, a good deal of the countries where this religion obtains, I am bound to say that almost everything in the paper is in accordance with what I have witnessed. I cannot go to anything like the depth that the paper does, nor do I approach the subject as an Arabic scholar, or from any wide extent of reading, but rather from what struck me in Muhammadan countries, and what I have read in the Koran. If Muhammadanism be tested by this book, it seems to show great literary weakness. Its pages struck me as singularly wanting in coherence. I believe a considerable portion of it was written on bones, the shoulder blades of sheep, and substances of that kind, and one might almost think that Muhammad had handed them over to a copyist without reference to order. One cannot help comparing the Koran with the writings of the New Testament. Take, for example, the Epistle to the Romans. There, you evidently have the writing of a man who understood logic and rhetoric, and who knew how to frame his arguments. His first chapter is different from his sixth, and occupies a different place in his reasoning. The author has a line of thought to go upon and to work out; but nowhere in the Koran could I see this. You take a chapter which begins with a flourish of trumpets, perhaps after a battle, but as you proceed you do not get a subject argued out, or an appeal to reason, but certain statements are thrown down, and you are expected, without questioning, to believe and accept them. Again, I was struck by the absence of pathos and of connected stories,

if I may so put it. It would be quite easy to find half a dozen passages in either the Old or the New Testament which are universally recognised as beautiful in their literary composition. Take the parable of the Prodigal Son, containing I suppose about five hundred words. I should be exceedingly sorry for anyone to require of me, as a literary exercise, and using only five hundred words, to write a story with as much detail, as much pathos and beauty as in this pearl of parables. I could not do it, and I doubt whether any living writer could; but I am bold enough to think that you could find plenty of English authors who could write as good a book as the Koran, so wanting is it in literary power and in argument; whilst, as the writer of the paper has shown, its want of originality and its plagiarism are patent. I had observed this in reference to the Old and New Testaments, but I did not know the plagiarism was so wide as the writer of the paper has shown. There is another point of difference compared with the writers of the Old and New Testaments. You never catch one of them incorporating a myth or making a palpable blunder, whereas in the Koran you have a man telling you "that the Hebrews in the wilderness were persuaded by a Samaritan to make the Golden Calf." Then if you take Muhammadanism as tested by its results, one sees in it the lower instincts of man developed—a love of war and of lust. As to the degradation of women, one does not know where to begin. You have heard a little about it; but the most horrible thing I have ever known is the system of temporary marriages practised in the valley of the Tarim, especially in Kashgar. The Russian Consul told me that during the five years he had lived there, he had known many girls to have twenty husbands before they were twelve years old! Temporary marriages are sanctioned for a week. I am not sure whether they are not for a day, and it is common for men there to change their wives five or six times a year; and that, be it observed, is in a place where Muhammadanism has had full sway for a great many years, and where, if the system were good, it ought certainly by this time to have shown itself. The writer of the paper says "the Sunnis do not allow the legality of these marriages," I do not presume to contradict him, but, it is the practice in Kashgar. It may be that they do it in spite of the law rather than in the keeping it. Again, I notice in Muhammadanism a neglect of the higher faculties of man. You look in vain for mercy to the slave. Everywhere there is slavery in

Muhammadan lands, and we never hear of a Muhammadan putting forth his hand to stop that curse. Pity, again, for the sick is almost unknown. I can scarcely remember a native hospital or an institution of the kind founded by Muhammadanism. Again, I notice in Muhammadanism an absence of one of the grandest features in Christianity, viz., of self-denial for others. Therefore it seems to me to be highly unsuitable as a religious system for the human race. Its standard of morality is palpably low, and those who want such a standard may well be pleased to become Muhammadans. Again, it lacks a perfect model. Look at the man Muhammad, and the very thought of taking him as an example should be wholly and utterly disgusting to any right-minded or pure man or woman. So that if we judge the religion by its book, or by what it has produced in the countries that profess it, Muhammadanism is certainly found wanting.

Rev. Dr. KÆLLE.—I desire to join in expressing the pleasure I have felt in the reading of this paper. Perhaps the author will not object to a little criticism.

I will begin with the three words of which the author denies the Arabic origin, viz., *jannat*, a garden, *jinnī*, spirits, and *dīn*, religion. All these three words the learned lecturer said were of foreign origin; *jannat* he traces to Hebrew origin, and the two others to Avestic origin. That is a mistake, because all these three words have clear and distinct roots in the Arabic language. *Jannat* is derived from *janna*, to cover, shelter, or as we call it, *pro-tect*. It means a protected place, or as in English, a garden, *i.e.*, a guarded place. This root, it is true, exists in Hebrew, but it is equally an Arabic root, and there is no reason to suppose that Muhammad went to the Hebrew for a word which he had in his own language. So with regard to *Hūr* or *Houriēs*, the young ladies of Paradise, that has not only an Arabic (*Hara*), but a general Semitic root, in Hebrew *Khūr* and *Khawar*. Now, what does it mean? It means to be white, brilliant; and simply designates a lady with a very white skin and with black eyes of fascinating brilliancy and lustre. It was known that the tawny races considered it the height of human beauty to have an excessively white skin. Even now it is notorious how the Turks esteem the Circassian beauties for the same reason. *Dīn*, religion, is a perfectly Arabic word; and there is no reason why we should go to another language for its source. *Dīn* comes from *dāna*, to owe,

to serve. It means a debt (*dein, dina*) which a man owes to his God, and it is therefore identical with our word *religion*, if derived from the Latin *religare*. This meaning is also reflected in the whole nature of Muhammadanism, which looks on all religious acts as a debt which a servant owes to his master. These are trifles; but I should like to make a few other remarks of a different nature.

There are three omissions I observe in the paper, one in each of the three points concerning Islam, viz., "Its origin, its strength, and its weakness." As regards its origin, the author abundantly showed how Islamic doctrines were to be found in pre-existing religions; but he merely takes it for granted that therefore they must have been taken from previous religions. Now I should have been very glad to hear him explain how and why the relics of previously existing religions came to form the substance of a religion which professes to have been expressly revealed by the angel Gabriel to Muhammad. This forms a very interesting psychological and historical question, and it is one upon which we ought to have heard something. The second omission is as to the strength of Islam. The author devotes three pages to its strength, and he tells us that it consisted in the truths or half-truths borrowed from other religions. But what does it mean—to speak of the strength of Islam and not even once to mention the *sword*? It certainly is one of the sources of the strength of Islam, if not the chief source. As soon as Muhammad's power began to be established in Medina, that place became too hot for the Christians, and they had to seek safety by emigrating to Mecca. The two great Arab tribes of Medina, the Awsites and Khazrajites, submitted to the new power from anything but religious motives; and very many of them, wholly unconvinced, yielded to the force of circumstances, and embraced the militant religion, as the earliest Muhammadan historian tells us, "to save themselves from *death*." They were the large party known as "hypocrites." Not regard for truth, but dread of the sword made them Moslems. At Muhammad's death all Arabia had been subjected to Islam. But whilst he lay still unburied such dissensions broke out in Medina, that Saad, the leader of the opposing party, was nearly killed, and order was only restored with the greatest difficulty. As soon as the news of Muhammad's death reached Mecca, Islam was openly repudiated, and his representative, Attab, had to hide himself for

days, from fear of being slain, till one of the leading men who formerly had received from Muhammad the present of 100 camels, came forward and declared, "Many of you say that the death of Muhammad will be the death of Islam; but I tell you, it will only be the means of making Islam stronger: for we shall not hesitate to cut off the head of anyone whom we suspect." Throughout Arabia the Islamic yoke began to be cast off; and Abu Bekr's fanatical troops had the greatest difficulty, and suffered several defeats, in finally restoring the Muhammadan supremacy. The terrorism then started has prevailed ever since in the world of Islam; and it is notorious that even now in its decrepitude every Mussulman who relinquishes his religion thereby forfeits his life. But for the use of the sword, we should probably never have heard either of Muhammad or of Islam. It is therefore an inexcusable omission, in setting forth the strength of Islam, to ignore its sword and its terrorism.

I also think the author might have said more about the anti-Christian character of Muhammadanism. It professes to supersede and to replace Christianity. This is the gravest charge against it. These things I think it would have been well to have dwelt upon, especially as there are means enough in the present day to have assisted in so doing; but the paper itself, so far as it goes, is good, clear, and useful.

Professor ORCHARD.—This paper, to my mind, is one of the most able and satisfactory contributions to the subject of Islam. I think the author has certainly shown that there is such a difference, not to say opposition, between Islam and Christianity, that Islam can never in any sense become a true substitute for Christianity, nor can it ever prepare the way for Christianity. Some of the fundamental conceptions of the two systems are not only different, but absolutely irreconcilable. A system that has the idea of God which Islam has—and that idea of sin which Islam has—that idea of the relation between God and man which Islam has—a system which knows nothing whatever of the need of the covering blood of God's own Lamb, can never be in any real or true alliance with Christianity.

I could have wished that the author had said a little more about what seems to me to be *the* characteristic feature of Islam, that is to say, its fatalism. It is very much through its fatalism, I think, that the system has obtained the immense hold it has on so

many of the human family. Why should fatalism be welcomed? It is opposed to experience, to logic, and to our intuition; and yet it is liked, and why? Because fatalism does away with free-will, and free-will is the necessary element for obedience or disobedience to God. Hence, Islam, in doing away with free-will, does away, logically, with sin, and that being done away with, responsibility is gone, and there is no reason for living so as to please God as the God of holiness and as the God that hates sin. That is one reason why Islam had such an acceptance, not only was it propagated by the terrors of the sword, but it pandered to the lowest passions of men and did away with responsibility.

Rev. O. BEVEN, M.A.—While welcoming the earnest language that has been used as to the Islam conception of God, so utterly unlike the Christian conception, and also the Islam conception of sin, I would refer to Dr. Mosely's remarks on the point in the Bampton Lectures, for like most of what he wrote, it is very forcible. A point in the system to which no allusion has been made, and one that seems rather to contradict these features is, that Muhammadanism inculcates and fosters a very strong sense of brotherhood. This may seem utterly incompatible with their dealing in slaves, but it is a fact that I have noticed in Ceylon where Muhammadanism is strong.

Dr. T. CHAPLIN.—I beg permission to say a few words, because for some twenty-five years of my life I have been in almost daily intercourse with Muhammadans in various classes of society. One or two things seem to me to have been omitted or passed over too lightly in this very valuable paper; one is in connection with the strength of Muhammadanism.—It has been said that too little weight has been given to the consideration that Muhammadanism was propagated by the sword and upheld by the sword. That, no doubt, is true, but I think we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that although this was the case in the past it is not the case at the present time. Unless I am misinformed there are something like forty or fifty millions of Muhammadans enjoying the protection of the British Crown, and there would seem to be no reason why those forty or fifty millions of Muhammadans should not give favourable consideration to the doctrines and claims of Christianity. There must be some reason which does not lie on the surface, why the teaching of Muhammad has taken such a hold on men's minds, especially in Eastern countries; and it seems to me

that not quite sufficient stress is laid on the security that Muhammad promises for his adherents in the next world. Over and over again it has been said to me by Muhammadans, "You ask me to throw over my religion and to embrace the doctrine of Christianity. Why should I? I am in a position of absolute safety for the future. When I turn to Christian books I find that Christians are never secure of their future till the day of their death. My destiny in the future does not depend upon my course of life here or upon anything I do, but it is secured by the fact of my being a believer in the doctrine of Muhammad, while you Christians must not only believe in Christ but you have to deny yourselves year after year during the whole course of your existence, and are taught to believe that you may fail at last."

There is another point to which I would allude, and that is that the history of Muhammadanism affords most instructive proof of the fact that a system that is false can *never* be a stepping-stone to a system that is true. We do not find that Muhammadan truths or half-truths lead men to Christ—on the contrary, they form an almost insuperable barrier to Christian truth.

I think that the discussion on this valuable paper teaches us a lesson, as Christian men and women, that there is a great responsibility resting on us in reference to the Muhammadan world. I have not time to more than refer to one thing that is uppermost in my mind as to the strong hold of Muhammadanism on Western Asia, which is the condition and practice of the Christian Churches. Whatever we may think in our charity with regard to those whose views differ from our own, it is certain that Muhammadans in Western Asia think that Christians are the worshippers of Mary, that they are guilty of other idolatries besides, that in fact their whole system is a system of idolatry; and this is a terrible hindrance to the progress of Christian truth amongst Muhammadans, who regard God as an invisible and immaterial being.

A VISITOR.—I have had much intercourse with well educated natives of all kinds of religions during my long sojourn in Western Asia, and I have come to the conclusion that one of the causes of the want of the success of Christianity there is greatly due to the brusque manner of Western Christians in their intercourse with the natives, whose manners are of a very opposite

kind. Moreover, Christianity is represented there by so many opposing sects.

The CHAIRMAN.—I will now call upon the author to reply. Some of those who have criticised the paper certainly seem to be agreed upon one point, namely, the wish that we had more of the paper.

The AUTHOR.—I must in the first place avail myself of the opportunity of thanking those who have so kindly criticised my paper, and still more those who have criticised it adversely.

With regard to what Dr. Lansdell has said as to the legality or otherwise of temporary or ^{متعة} marriages among the Sunnis, I am aware that the law is broken in certain places, even at Mecca itself during the pilgrimage. But the Sunnî doctors certainly regard these marriages as illegal (*vide* traditions collected in the *Mishkâtu 'lMaşâbih*), though the Shî'ahs sanction them.

Dr. Kœlle has very justly referred to many omissions in my paper. No one can be more conscious of its numerous shortcomings than I myself am. But I may fairly plead that it was impossible for me in a single paper to deal at all fully with the whole field covered by the word Islâm. That subject is such a wide one that I thought it best to confine myself strictly to the consideration of *orthodox* or Sunnî Muhammadanism. This entailed the omission of all detailed references to particular sects and to the vast and deeply interesting field of Muslim Mysticism, which is a study apart and of itself. For this cause I have not attempted to deal with Muhammad's life and character, nor have I spoken of the reason for the spread of Islâm. My subject was "Islâm; its Origin, its Strength, and its Weakness," and to this I have endeavoured to confine myself. Those who desire to see the subject fully dealt with cannot do better than to consult Dr. Kœlle's own admirable work, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism." Among my other omissions Dr. Kœlle has pointed out the fact that I have not dwelt upon the psychological phenomena presented by the development of the faith in Muhammad's own mind. I confess to the impeachment, for I felt that matter to be beyond my depth, and have therefore acted on the principle, "*Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*" But I may add that Dr. Kœlle has admirably treated the question in the book to which I have referred.

I designedly omitted all reference to the sword and to the spread

of Muhammadanism owing to that, its most trenchant argument. Everyone is aware that it is not the sword which *now* upholds Islâm. This has been ably pointed out by Dr. Chaplin. Yet I have stated that any Muslim who openly professes Christianity still does so at the risk of his life. I fancied that all would observe the distinction between *strength* and *power*. The former word—as is clearly seen in the phrase “Their *strength*” (not *power*) “is to sit still”—denotes the defensive as opposed to the offensive aspect of the religion. This will perhaps suffice to show that my title is not a misnomer. I cannot plead guilty to the charge of having entirely omitted to point out *how* relics of previously existent religions were incorporated into Islâm. I think I did so as fully as the length of my paper would warrant.

I must now answer his criticism on my derivation of the words *jannat*, *jinnî*, *dîn*, and *hûr*. In speaking of *jannat* I did not at all intend to deny that the word is a pure Arabic vocable. I quite agree with Dr. Kœlle as to its derivation. No other idea is tenable. I differ from him, however, regarding the three other words. *Jinnî* cannot be derived from *jannat*, for by the rules of Arabic etymology it would then be *jannî*. Again the *jinn*s have no connection whatever with the Muhammadan Paradise (*jannat*), and are not allowed to enter it.

Dr. Kœlle.—I inadvertently omitted to say that the word *jinnî* (a class of imaginary spirits, the jinn) comes from the same root as *jannat* (garden), viz., *janna*, to cover, conceal, protect. It therefore describes them as invisible beings, who live in the invisible world, and become visible only at times.

The AUTHOR.—If we derive the word *jinnî* from the root *janna* to cover, protect, it is difficult to see why it should not rather be *janîn* (on the analogy of *qalîl* from *qalla*). I therefore prefer the derivation I have given in my paper. With regard to *dîn* the matter stands thus:—In Hebrew, דין means to rule, to judge, and the noun דין (*Kethîb*) or דין (*Qri*) means judgment. In Aramaic the root and the noun are the same as in Hebrew, and have the same meaning. In Syriac ܕܝܢ means to judge, and ܕܝܢܐ is judgment. In Assyrian the word *dayânu*, a judge, shows that the root and its derivatives are of similar significance. In Arabic itself دَانَ means to judge, to owe, etc., and دَيْن means a debt,

while ^سدين signifies *judgment, condemnation* (cf., Qur'ân, Sûrah I., يوم الدين 'day of Judgment'). But I confess I cannot quite see how *dîn* in the sense of *religion* can come from the same root. It is a word perfectly distinct from *dein* ^سدين "debt," with which Dr. Kœlle connects it. He of course knows that, as opposed to *imân*, *dîn* denotes rather the outward, ceremonial part of religion, the *law* rather than the *faith*. In Avestic the word *daëna* means just what *dîn* does in its second meaning, viz., *law*, then *doctrine, rite* (cf. Yasna xliii, 9, 11, etc.), *ayâ daënayâ*, "selon ce rite" (Harlez, "Gram. de l' Avesta" s. voc.) It is *den* in Armenian still, and comes from $\sqrt{dî}$, Sanskrit $\sqrt{dhî}$, "to see, to consider." [The Avestic word could not be derived from a Semitic word *dîn*, as has been suggested. Many *Pahlavî* words are from Semitic languages, but not *Avestic* ones.] The word *Hûr* may be from a common Semitic root which in Hebrew means *white*, and in Arabic *dark-eyed*. Dr. Kœlle adopts the former idea, while Penrice, in his "Dictionary of the Koran," argues in favour of the latter. That is one of the charms of a Semitic language! I think the derivation from the Avestic *hware*, "brilliant," which in *Pahlavî* becomes *hûr*, is more likely. Yet, even if so, the Arabs would naturally try to connect the word with a root in their own language so as to give it a meaning (cf. "*sparrowgrass*" for *asparagus*, and the Greek fancy that *ᾠασις* should be spelt *αῦασις* and derived from *αῦω*, whereas it is really from ^سوادي).

Another thing that has been pointed out by Dr. Kœlle is the great difference between Islâm and Christianity. This he has done more forcibly than I have. I quite agree with him that the two religions can never exist in harmony with one another. They never have done so and never will.

As Professor Orchard has said, I have spoken very briefly of Muslim Fatalism, because I thought that it was perhaps *the one* fact generally known in this country regarding Islâm. I have, however, devoted about half a page (p. 167) to it,—all that my limits permitted.

As to the feeling of brotherhood among Muslims, to which Mr. Beven referred, I must say that Muhammadans seem to me to have

a feeling of clannishness rather than aught else. Of universal brotherhood they have no idea.

Dr. Chaplin has referred to their assurance of felicity in the next world. It is doubtless true that thoughtless Muslims deem themselves all right as far as the next world is concerned simply because they *are* Muslims. This idea, however, is not exactly in accordance with their creed. There is a tradition to the effect that Muhammad said that his religion must excel all others in everything, and as there were seventy-two sects among Christians there must therefore be seventy-three—or one more—in Islâm. Only one of these numerous sects is entitled to salvation, and each Muslim believes that his own sect is the happy one. Another tradition states that on the Day of Judgment GOD will assign to every Muhammadan, who would otherwise be condemned, a Jew or a Christian to be cast into hell-fire in his stead. Again, any Muslim who has in his heart one grain of faith, although he may be cast into hell, will yet ultimately be delivered from it. But some of the most pious Muhammadans have died in the greatest agony of mind. For there is no Atonement in their religion and no proof of it upon which they can rely. As a thoughtful Muslim said on one occasion after hearing an argument between a friend of his and a Christian, "What a fine religion ours is—until you inquire into it!"

I am glad that attention has been called to our responsibility with regard to Muhammadanism. It does seem to me a most scandalous thing that the Christian Church should have neglected the Muhammadan world as it has done for so many hundreds of years. Christian England rules over a vast number of Muslims. We surely have no reason to be ashamed of our faith, as we show ourselves to be by our carelessness and lukewarmness in this matter. We have as yet hardly more than *begun* missionary work among the Muslims, but whatever slight efforts we have made have been blessed by GOD in a way we could hardly have expected. We can point to able men, like Imâdu'ddîn and Şafdar 'Alî in the Panjâb, who were once champions of Muhammadanism, but who are now preaching the Christian faith which once they opposed.

In conclusion I must thank you all for having so kindly listened to my paper. (Applause.)

The Meeting was then adjourned.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING PAPER.

From Major C. R. CONDER, R.E., D.C.L., LL.D., M.R.A.S., &c.

The paper on Islam by Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, M.A., is a scholarly and useful summary of what is known as to the real character of the Moslem religion. With exception of one point, the views as to its relationship to earlier creeds are those to which I have called attention from time to time since 1883,* in works with which Mr. Tisdall is probably not acquainted. The Christian and Jewish elements have long been recognised, but I had not come across any account of the Persian element, which appeared to me, when studying the Zendavesta, to be quite as important. In fact, Geiger, when writing his celebrated essay on the Jewish comparison, was not aware that many of the Talmudic legends and fancies are not original in the Talmud, but were clearly borrowed, by the Jews, from earlier Magian beliefs. These ideas do not appear in any Hebrew work until after the time when the Jews came into close contact with the Persians.

I have more than once expressed my belief in the strong personal influence of Muhammad. Of his wild genius and energy, and enthusiastic conviction, I think no student can fail to be convinced. But he had very little that was original to relate; and Islam, while certainly borrowing from all the older Asiatic creeds, is distinguished from them by its *negations* rather than by its *dogmas*. I much doubt if Muhammad read either Jewish works or the gospels of the Gnostic Christians. The vagueness of his information seems to point rather to his having picked up, orally, the legends of Jews, and Persians, and Gnostics, both from the traders with whom he came early in contact, and also from his wives, Rihânah, the Jewess, and Maria, the Coptic slave.

Many Arab tribes were Christian before Muhammad's time (Beni Hanifa, Beni Tai, and others). The Jews had penetrated into Arabia some 100 years before he was born (if we may credit the history of Dhu Nowâs), and the great towns were full of Jews when the new creed was preached. The Persian element was also present, and had so far affected Arab ideas, as to teach some of them to hold the dog as sacred as in Persia.

The evidence quoted is, however, literary only; and, I think,

* See "Heth and Moab," Appendix II, pp. 406-416; 1st Edition, 1883, "Syrian Stone Lore," 1st Edition, 1886, pp. 324-348. "Palestine," 1889, pp. 119-127.

that in some cases monumental contemporary evidence is more important, and gives different results to those which we obtain from Moslem writers, whose own beliefs coloured their statements, and who are, moreover, very late authorities. We have numerous inscriptions from Yemen, some from Northern Arabia, others Nabathean, and others in the Safa alphabet of Bashan (which is Yemenite in origin), which serve to carry us back some 1000 years before Muhammad, and to show us something of what the Arabs of the "times of ignorance" really believed. To this monumental evidence the author does not allude.

There is nothing surprising in the fact that the early Arabs had some knowledge of a single Deity, considering how long the Jews and Christians had dwelt among them before Muhammad came, and considering that the idea was known to the Egyptians at least as early as 1400 B.C., and perhaps quite as early in Chaldea. But I do not think this can be quite regarded as monotheism, because the early Arabs, like the Canaanites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Phœnicians, were certainly the worshippers of very many gods.

I have not been able to find any evidence, in the monumental texts which refer to these deities, which would support the theory that they were regarded as "intercessors" with God. That seems to me to be rather an attempt of later Moslem writers to explain away the true character of the ancient idolatry, which in no way differed from that of other races. The author says that we do not find Baal, Moloch, Ashtoreth, etc., among Arabs; but this does not quite agree with the monumental evidence. The Himyarite gods included עתתר 'Aththar, whose name has been compared with that of Istar (the later Ashtoreth); דשמי "the heavenly," is apparently only the old Baal Shemim; and the name of El—the older form of Allah—occurs as a compound in such titles as אלמקה. *Hobal*, worshipped at Mecca, is the old אל הבאל of Mareb—a name perhaps connected with הבעל, or "the Baal" (هبال). The Assyrian and Aramaic influence was strong in Arabia from 700 B.C. downwards, and the exclusively Assyro-Babylonian god, *Sin* (שין), of the moon, was adored even as far south as Hadramaut. These were but a few of the many deities, known monumentally, who were adored as independent powers of Heaven and Hell by early Arabs. Among the Nabatheans the same texts show us that the worship was not monotheistic, but included the two deities, אל and אלה—the Assyrian *El* and *Alat*. So Herodotus couples *Alilat* with *Orotal*; but the proposed explanation of the latter name seems to me very doubtful. The antiquity of the Mecca shrine, where the Arab Venus was adored, was no doubt very great; but Diodorus does

not, I believe, give it the later name of *Beit-Allah*. If Ibn Hishâm says that idolatry was only fifteen generations old in Mecca in Muhammad's time, this only proves that writing 200 years later than the date of the Hegira, he knew very little of the true history of that shrine, which has been very carefully studied.

It should also be remembered that the Korân and the Sunna do not represent Islam in all its aspects. The religion of the Mosque and of the College is not the religion of the peasant, in the remote villages where no Mosque exists. Nor is it the religion of the Sufi mystic, or of the sceptical Moslem philosopher. The study of Moslem historians is not sufficient by itself to show what Islam is, in all its varieties of higher thought, and lower superstition, and of conflicting sects.

With what is said as to the influence of the "religion of Zoroaster," I concur, and have long since so concurred in print; although students of the *Zendavesta* do not appear generally to admit the existence of an historical Zoroaster. The name is the old *Zarathustra Spitama*, or "pure high priest," who was a legendary teacher. In addition to the points of similarity noted, all of which I have previously treated briefly, may be noticed the Moslem idea of the *Kaf* mountain, and of the trees of Heaven and Hell, which appear to be of Persian origin, and several other such comparisons. But it should not be forgotten that the Persians came under Semitic influence in Babylonia, and borrowed many ideas from their conquered subjects. I believe the word *daena* for "religion" is one of these borrowings; and the Pehlevi dialect is full of borrowed Aramaic words for religious ideas. It should also be noticed that the similarities to Persian dogmas are found, not in the Korân itself, but in the Moslem traditions after the conquest of Persia. On the other hand many Talmudic ideas, and notably those which refer to the soul hovering near the grave, appear to be of purely Persian origin. In justice to the great Arab genius, whose wild imagination—full of thoughts of the Day of Judgment and of Hell—was expressed in rude poetry, often magnificent in the original, it should be remembered that most of the absurd legends concerning him are the fancies of later writers, and not found in the Korân. I doubt myself if the Korân, as we have it, is to be solely ascribed to Muhammad. Finally, the Aramaic forms of its dialect are, I think, more probably due to the character of the Koreish vernacular, than to any borrowing from books. Similar forms occur in the dialect of Hadramaut long before the time of Muhammad.

NOTE BY THE AUTHOR, IN REPLY.

It would take too long to answer Major Conder's remarks at all fully. He must pardon me if I hesitate to contradict Arabic historians when they hand down genuine traditions of pre-Islamic worship and religion. Our knowledge of the inscriptions of Arabia is hardly sufficient to warrant us in doing so. Nor are many inscriptions found in that part of Arabia in which Muhammadanism had its origin. Yaman and Hadramaut are of course entirely out of court in this matter. I am, however, thankful for the information contained in Major Conder's note.

The differences between the views expressed by Major Conder and my own are rather in details than in actual facts. I have in my paper stated that Polytheism existed in Arabia before Muhammad's time, and that it was introduced (according to Arabic writers) from Syria. The inscriptions quoted by Major Conder prove this as far as the *Najd*, etc., are concerned. The forms he quotes, e.g., עתהר and דשמוי, are distinctly *Aramaic*, and not Arabic. *Sin* שן is Accadian. This shows that Polytheism, as far as the inscriptions he refers to are taken as authorities in the matter, was not of native origin, but was introduced from other countries. I do not agree with Major Conder's derivation of

הבַּעַל = הבאל = הֵבַל from הֵבַל or הֵבַל. His quotation of אלה and אלה from the monuments, though the forms are not Arabic, tends to prove the accuracy of my suggestion that Ὀροτάλ and Ἀλλάτ were for ^{و ت ا}الله تَعَالَى and ^{و ت ا}اللات respectively. I do not feel certain about the Ὀρο part of the former word, but it must, I fancy, represent either ^{و ت ا}الله or ^{و ت ا}ايل.

I am glad to find my views of the indebtedness of Islām to Zoroastrianism supported by Major Conder, though he is correct in his supposition that I am not acquainted with those of his works that he mentions. Had I known them I should have quoted them in my notes. I cannot, however, agree with him in his doubts about the authenticity and genuineness of the Qur'ān. I have already in my answer to Dr. Kœlle replied to Major Conder's suggested derivation of *daëna*. Although the Pahlavi language, as he rightly says, contains very many Semitic words, yet the *Avestic* tongue contains hardly one, if even a single one, that can with any probability be derived from any Semitic stock.