

[Price 6d. each.]

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

Edited by { KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.
SADR-UD-DIN, B.A., B.T.

VOL. II.]

AUGUST 1914.

[No. 7.]

Contents.

	PAGE
Study for an Atheist	305
A Decisive Word Between Christianity and Islam	308
Dr. Johnson on the Quran	309
A Muslim Wedding Sermon in the Mosque, Woking	310
Resurrection (?) or Resuscitation: The Rev. A. J. Waldron and the Resurrection of Christ. By BERTRAND TADORNA	314
Islam at the White City. By EDGAR A. WELCH	317
Moslem Day: Prayers of the Faithful at the White City	317
The Messenger. By YEHYA-EN-NASR PARKINSON	32
"The Christian Life" on "Islamic Review": Notes of an Octogenarian Minister	327
Muhammadanism (?) or Islam: Lecture on Islam in Edinburgh	328
Muhammadanism. By the late Dr. LEITNER, LL.D.	329
Prayers and Ablutions	338
The Path of the Arab. By BEAUMONT HILL	339
Missionary Ignorance of Islam: Mental Evolution	343
Conservatism in Religion. By A. KHAN-KARACHI	344
The Woking Mosque Lectures: My Study of the Bible. By MAULVI SADR-UD-DIN, of the Woking Mosque	347
Evolution in the Ethics of Theology: Muhammad and Jesus	
Idealo de Demokrateco kaj Socialismo en Islam (<i>Esperanto</i>). By KHALID SHELDRAKE	
The Unity of God (<i>Arabic</i>)	

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance; and in Ir

*Single copies to be obtained from the Publisher, 99 Shoe Lane, London.
and in India from Azeezmanzal, Lahore.*

London:

J. S. PHILLIPS, 99 SHOE LA

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

AUGUST 1914.

[No. 7.]

STUDY FOR AN ATHEIST.

I.

ARE we not equipped with various cravings and needs which we do our best to satisfy? Our whole life is spent in securing means to gratify our natural requirements. All that we call civilisation solely sprang from men's efforts in this direction. To secure happiness and to avert pain is the great problem of life. But is not proper satisfaction of our natural desires the climax of pleasure? Is not an ungratified need a great misery? We cannot ignore the existence of two things in Nature: our needs and the existence of means in the universe to satisfy them. We have got ears and eyes: they demand pleasant sights and melodious sounds. Fine arts must come forward to provide them. We want good drinks and delicious eatables, and we have explored the whole world to find them. We experience higher cravings as well, and we spare no pains to meet their demands. We experience feelings of love, mercy, and generosity. We must find some occasion for their exhibition, though at any cost. Similarly do we not possess the faculty for admiration, praise and thanksgiving? Do we not give expression to them when once these sentiments are aroused in our breast? Beneficence and beauty are the only factors to give rise to these noble feelings in us, as they only consummate human happiness. Even a man callous and cruel at heart cannot be indifferent to it. Thus we are in search of beauty

and beneficence, and when we secure them our praise and gratitude arise and must find expression. But beauty and beneficence often accrue to us through inanimate things. Do we praise them and express our gratitude to them? To do so would be a foolish act. If the beauty of a fine product of art contributes to our happiness, we do not look to it for our thanksgiving and admiration: we look up to the one who produced it or supplied it to us.

Is not Nature around us the sole source of our happiness? Does it not exhibit beauty and beneficence, even in its smallest particle? Do not its variegated beauties excite our admiration and praise? Is it, then, unnatural to feel grateful after enjoying its blessings? But we never give our thanks to dumb, inanimate things. We always tender our gratitude to some intelligent being who is the maker or supplier of what adds to our happiness. Whom should we look to for showing our gratitude if we have been benefited by all around us? To be grateful is human, to find an object to whom to express our gratitude is natural. Should we praise dumb nature and give our thanks to inanimate matter? We should be untrue to our very nature if we did so. We do need some intelligent being who should claim our admiration and gratitude. It is simply a natural desire. Our very nature looks for an intelligent benefactor to whom we may tender our thanks whenever we derive some benefit. Blessed be the Prophet Muhammad, to whom these mysteries of human nature were revealed. How beautifully the Book of Islam brings home to our minds the existence of God in the following. It speaks eloquently of the beauty and beneficence evinced in Nature, and thus appeals to our sense of admiration and gratitude, which must find expression in favour of some intelligent being, the Author of all:—

“All praises and gratitude are due to Allah, the Creator, Nourisher and Sustainer of all the worlds around us so necessary for our creation, sustenance and nourishment.”

THE TRUE MUSLIM SPIRIT.

IN the following lines, which appeared in the July number of *The Unitarian*, W. E. Henley, the author, only depicts what may be called the true Moslem spirit. “I am the master of my own fate, and the worker of my destinies.” This is what we often and often read in the Quran. This is the key of every success, a great energising factor in human life. Do we stand, then, in need of a Saviour? It may be so in individual cases; but to believe in a universal redeemer is simply the condemna-

tion of humanity—as if man had nothing good and noble in himself. What a low view of humanity! Could one think of any capability of advancement in him if he needs redemption by birth.

“My life shall be a challenge, not a truce!
 This is my homage to the mightier powers,
 To ask my boldest question, undismayed.”
 It matters not how straight the gate,
 And charged with punishments the goal,
 I am the master of my fate,
 I am the captain of my soul.

W. E. HENLEY.

GEMS OF WISDOM.

From the Sayings of the Caliph Omar.

1. HE who keeps his secret to himself remains his own master.
2. Do not put off till to-morrow what you should do to-day.
3. That which recedes cannot make progress.
4. Do not forget yourself when you correct others.
5. The less you get absorbed into the world, the more you become free.
6. God may bless him who sends me my faults as a present —*i.e.*, who informs me of my faults.
7. Let not one's reputation mislead you.
8. Do not judge a man by his prayers and fasting, but by his truthfulness and wisdom.
9. He who can explain his own actions best is the most wise.
10. Wealth breeds conceit.
11. I judge the wisdom of the person from the question he puts to me.
12. How dare you make men slaves when their mothers bring them forth as free men?

MANZOOR MAHMUD (Alig.)

A DECISIVE WORD BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.

ISLAM believes in man's obedience to the Law, and proposes a code for him ; the religion of the Christian Church teaches that he does not possess such capability, and calls the law a curse. Islam believes in the purity of man's nature, and makes sin a mere subsequent acquisition as a result of environment ; Christianity declares sin to be an heritage of human nature, and makes man a "guilty sinner." Islam believes in the highest aptitude of man to work out his final evolution, and thus opens unlimited progress before him ; Christianity accepts eternal perdition as our only deserved fate, with salvation from it only through a vicarious atonement. To decide which of these two religions is true is not a difficult thing. Our own nature is the best judge in the matter. Everything in us, as already shown, needs and involuntarily follows the law. Disease means its breach ; to set Nature aright is cure. To enable it to observe physical laws is the sole object of medical science. No physician has succeeded in curing his patients from headache by breaking his own head. He should apply means efficacious enough to bring Nature in tune with the physical law. Sin is a moral disease caused by the breach of some laws of morality. Prophets, including Jesus, came to teach and enjoin laws for moral and spiritual health. If by cutting his own limb a medical expert cannot cure anyone of the complaint which the latter's limb is suffering from ; if a suicide of a doctor cannot relieve one of some mortal disease ; how can the death on the Cross of Another save us from the consequences of spiritual death ? Is not sin, after all, the result of wrong discretion ? Is it impossible to secure its right use ? To say so would be simply to give the lie to our own ways of life. We need regulation and training of discretion. In order to reach that stage we go to schools and universities, read histories and biographies, seek the words of the wise and the company of the righteous. Is this not all waste if the understanding is unfit for being bridled ? God gave us various faculties, and He gave the law to regulate them ; He also created an aptitude in them to follow His laws. Is not discretion a faculty ? Why, inaptitude to observe the law is conceived in it ! And if it is capable of fulfilling the law, we can work out our own salvation and do not stand in need of atonement.

But let us consider the Commandments, observance of which is considered by the Church to be an impossibility. They are given in Exodus xx. They may be summarised as follows : (1) To worship One God ; (2) not to associate another deity with Him ; (3) not to take the name of God in vain ; (4) to keep the

Sabbath holy; (5) to honour the parents; (6) not to kill; (7) not to commit adultery; (8) not to steal; (9) not to bear false witness; (10) not to covet neighbour's possessions.

Has not Islam enabled at least more than a quarter of mankind to worship only One God and never to associate any other deity with Him? Has not Christianity produced millions of men who lead an idle life in observing the sanctity of the Sabbath? Has not the world seen tens of thousands of Muslims who worship their parent next to none but God, as enjoined by the Quran? Thus the first five Commandments have been rightly observed. The rest of them have been promulgated in the Civil and Criminal laws of every civilised society, and are working properly. If we are criminal by nature, as the dogmatised religions give us out to be, how is it that these legislated ordinances manage to secure respect and observance? Are we really all murderers, adulterers, thieves, perjurers, and covetous? What a heinous view of ourselves! What a low estimate of humanity! Yet a perfectly natural one if we subscribe to the tenets of modern Christianity. And yet it is often trumpeted from the pulpit that Christianity has helped to bring forth all that is noble and good in humanity. How can one who is sinful by nature possess anything noble and good in him? But we do possess it really; and this gives the lie to much that is preached by way of religion.

DR. JOHNSON ON THE QURAN.

If it (the Quran) is not poetry—and it is hard to say whether it be or not—it is more than poetry. It is not history, nor biography. It is not anthology, like the Sermon on the Mount; not metaphysical dialectics like the Buddhist sūtras; nor sublime homiletics, like Plato's conference of the wise and foolish teachers. It is a prophet's cry, Semitic to the core; yet of a meaning so universal and so timely that all the voices of the age take it up, willing or unwilling, and it echoes over palaces and deserts, over cities and empires, first kindling its chosen hearts to world conquest, then gathering itself up into a reconstructive force that all the creative light of Greece and Asia might penetrate the heavy gloom of the Christian Europe, when Christianity was but the Queen of Night.

O GOD, Thou knowest me better than I know myself, and I know myself better than they know me. Make me, I pray Thee, better than they suppose; forgive me what they know not, and lay not to my account what they say.

ABU-BEKR (The First Caliph).

A MUSLIM WEDDING SERMON

IN

THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

THE 2nd of July 1914 brought us a happy scene at the Woking Mosque. The Muslim and other friends of Mr. Usman-el-Mehdi (*alias* Mr. John Barlington Fisher), of Woking, met in the Mosque to celebrate his marriage according to Muslim rites with a young Muslim lady from Tarbet, Argyllshire, Scotland—Rasheeda (*alias* Miss Margaret Ross). The ceremony began with a recital from the Quran by Maulvi Abdul Mohy Arab, our Arabic translator, who appeared in his full Arab dress. The Imam then, reciting the usual opening words of the *Khutha Nikah* (wedding sermon) in Arabic, proceeded thus:—

These which have just been cited are the opening verses of a chapter from the Quran. This chapter goes under the title of "The Women." Our Holy Prophet (hallowed be his name!) often read these verses in his sermon when he had to celebrate marriages among his followers. We Muslims do the same on such auspicious occasions. Marriage is a most sacred relation. It entails various duties and obligations which are often ignored, thereby making home-life a curse. Our Prophet therefore recited these verses, as also similar other verses from the Quran dealing with female rights, in order to remind the marrying couple of the grave responsibilities they were incurring in entering into connubial life. In fact, in this marital partnership, which unites two souls together, woman has often been the sufferer. She is treated as a dainty little thing, a beautiful embellishment in the household. She has lavished upon her epithets like "better-half," but the fact remains the same, she is hardly ever awarded the treatment she is entitled to by her very position as partner in life. The reason thereof is not difficult to find out. From times unknown in history man's estimate of women has been very, very low. Even civilisation could not ameliorate her conditions. Rome, Greece, Egypt, Persia, India, China—all had their palmy days, but woman was always treated as a chattel—a marketable thing transferable at the sweet will of the man at the head of the household. Even religion before Islam could not better her condition. Woman remained always in the shade till the final Book of God—the Quran—was revealed. In order to do her honour one complete chapter was revealed after her name and every justice was done to her rights. The very first verse of the chapter strikes the keynote:—

"O people fear your Lord, who hath created you from one soul, and of his kind created his wife and from these hath spread abroad many men and women. And fear ye God, in whose name ye

ask mutual favour, and reverence the womb that bear you. Verily is God watching you."

Man and woman coming out of one soul; they proceeded from the same origin. Equality in origin demands equality in treatment and gradation. Therefore it is ordered that man, finding woman weak and frail, should not slight her or make light of her position in any way, as she comes from the same soul as man. The verse quoted is very important in one respect : it gives the lie to what the Christian writers say about us, that we do not believe in woman possessing any soul.

In order to perpetuate the human species, man and woman have to perform various functions of marital life. That love and kindness should be the only rule of life, and no enforcement of the authority by man and no subservience on the part of woman, but that affection, tenderness, and benevolence should regulate their mutual dealings and feelings, has been brought home to us in the following verse :—

"And one of His signs is that He has created wives for your own species that ye may be comforted with them, and has put love and tenderness between you."

This is the ideal of wifehood in Islam, and one cannot find elsewhere a higher ideal of the mutual relations of man and woman based upon love, affection, and equality.

That men and women are equally indispensable to each other's happiness has been taught in another verse, which to illustrate the truth uses a simile of exquisite beauty :—

*"Hunna libásun lakum wa
Untum libasun la hunna."*

TRANSLATION.

"Your wives are a garment for you as you are a garment for them."

What a beautiful and apposite metaphor to explain the varied duties and obligations of man and woman in the married life. The garment when worn is next to our body; let man and wife be so attached to each other in their mutual love and affection. The garment hides one's nakedness and such physical defects as ought to be concealed; we have moral defects as well. They may remain hidden from the public eye, but man and woman become cognisant of each other's secret defects after the con-nubial knot is tied; and though we may be passed as the best of society in public estimation, yet we do possess some sore points in our life, which should always remain too sacred for public knowledge. This privacy is also useful for the good of human society. If our other half will not come to our help in this respect the exposure would lead to dire results, and the

peace of domestic as well as of social life will be in peril. Let man and woman therefore hide each other's defects as the garment does in the case of physical deformities. Again, our clothes bring comfort to us against the inclemency of the weather. In winter and in summer they protect us against the cold and the heat. One may stand the severities of the weather, but to cope with social inclemency, when chill and breeze find their way into our domestic circles, is a trial severe enough to exhaust all patience and perseverance. Wife or husband are the only comfort in these trials. Again, the garment brings grace, beauty, and embellishment to the body ; so, too, are wives to their husbands, as the latter to the former. Thus pithily in one laconic verse the Quran gives the best that can be imagined of all the mutual duties and obligations of man and woman in their matrimonial life.

No disrespect and disregard of female rights and claims is suffered in Islam. "Live and associate with (your) wives kindly" is another injunction in the words of God. One may cite several other verses from the Quran indicating female rights, but I quote one which gives them the best they may desire :—

"And if you men have certain rights on them
(women) they have similar rights on you in all
fairness."

This establishes equality of rights between man and woman. Every Muslim husband should therefore always keep this in view in his dealings with the fair sex.

We have met to-day, ladies and gentlemen, in this assembly of Muslim and other friends to celebrate marriage between two Muslims—Usman-el-Mahdi, *alias* Mr. John Barlington Fisher, of Woking, and Rasheeda, *alias* Miss Margaret Ross, the unmarried daughter of Mr. John Ross, of Tarbet. They accept each other for husband and wife willingly, with free consent and without any coercion. The dower of this marriage under Muslim rites has been fixed at five hundred pounds, half of which is two hundred and fifty pounds, with the mutual consent of the parties. This sum will be payable to Rasheeda, the bride, at her demand, by Mr. Fisher Mehadi, the bridegroom, and will become the private property of Rasheeda—to be used by her in any way she likes without any interference or participation by her husband. This sum is in addition to what she will be entitled to from Mr. Fisher as his wife.

After this the Imam asked the bride and the bridegroom to stand up in their places, and the following questions and replies were made :—

The Imam : Do you, Usman-el-Mahdi, *alias* Mr. John Barlington Fisher, accept with your free consent and without any coercion, Rasheeda, *alias* Miss Margaret Ross, the unmarried daughter of John Ross, of Tarbet, Argyllshire, as your wife with dower of five hundred pounds payable to Rasheeda

at her demand by you, which dower will be her private personal property ?

Usman-el-Mehdi : I do accept.

The Imam : Do you Rasheeda, *alias* Miss Margaret Ross, accept Usman-el-Mehdi as your husband, with dower five hundred pounds payable to you by the said Mr. Fisher on your demand, which will be your private personal property ?

Rasheeda : Yes, I do accept.

The Imam then said : I do declare you, Usman-el-Mehdi and Rasheeda, as married, in the presence of this assembly of Muslims and others, as witnesses to your marriage, which is valid according to our rites. May God bless you, and grant you a happy life. But, before we depart, let me give you a word of advice, and in doing so I cannot do better than to read to you, and for the benefit of the others present here, some of the blessed sayings of our holy Prophet. You are Muslims, and you have accepted Lord Muhammad as your Guide and Teacher ; then let his sacred words be the torchlight of the life you have now to begin. First I will invite the attention of Usman-el-Mahdi to the following words of his Lord and Master :—

(1) Women are the twin-halves of men.

(2) God enjoins upon us to treat women well, for they are our mothers, daughters, and aunts. Those men who beat their wives do not behave well. He is not of my ways who teacheth woman to stray.

(3) The rights of women are sacred : see that women are secured in the rights attributed to them.

(4) Woman is sovereign in the house of her husband.

(5) Do not prevent your women from coming to the mosque.

(6) The world and all things in it are valuable, but the most valuable thing in the world is a virtuous woman.

(7) A Muslim must not hate his wife, and be he displeased with one bad quality in her, then let him be pleased with another which is good.

(8) The best of you, before God and His creation, are those who are best in their own families, and I am the best to my family.

(9) Give your wife good counsel, and, if she has goodness in her, she will soon take it and leave off idle talking ; and do not beat your noble wife like a slave.

(10) That is the most perfect Muslim whose disposition is best ; and the best of you are they who behave best to their wives.

(11) The Prophet said, when asked by Moawujah about wife's right over her husband : Feed her when thou takest thy food ; give her clothes to wear when thou wearest clothes ; refrain

from either giving a slap on her face or even abusing her ; and separate not from thy wife, save within the house.

(12) Fear God in regard to the treatment of your wives, for verily they are your helpers. You have taken them on the security of God, and made them lawful by the words of God.

To you, Rasheeda, I have to say only one or two words from the holy words of your Master Muhammad (glorified be his name !):—

“ A virtuous wife is a man’s best treasure.”

“ She is the ideal wife who pleaseth thee when thou lookest at her, obeys thee when thou givest her directions, and protectest her honour and thy property when thou art away.”

The Imam resumed his seat, and the clerk of the Mosque brought two copies of the marriage deed, written on parchment, which were then duly signed by the bride and the bridegroom in the presence of the assembly, and attested by the said witnesses of the marriage, and some of those present. One copy of the deed was given to the bride and the other to the bridegroom.

This concluded the marriage ceremony, and the whole party left the Mosque and went to refreshments.

RESURRECTION (?) OR RESUSCITATION.

THE REV. A. J. WALDRON AND THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

JUST recently quite a stir was caused by a playlet called “Should a Woman Tell?” which came from the pen of the Vicar of Brixton. The Rev. A. J. Waldron is the kind of man whom we must admire. He is a broad-minded cleric, quite up-to-date in all matters scientific and theological, is full of humour, and, above all, is not afraid to say what he thinks. He quite raised a storm of criticism by announcing on Easter Sunday that he did *not* believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus. He quite frankly admits that the Bible is not infallible, either historically or scientifically, and that the writers were limited by the knowledge of their time. One can quite agree with *John Bull’s* words that “here is a surplice with a man under it.” It is refreshing to find a clergyman who asserts his individuality, and refuses to be bound by the narrow limits of the particular creed of his Church. I am not quite aware as to the particular definition of his own views on the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, but quite agree with him that it could not have been a bodily rising from

the *dead*. If we take the evidence of the "New Testament" on the subject, we must do so with an open mind. It is admitted that the Gospels are anonymous and interpolated, although probably copied from original writings which may have been produced by the four evangelists. However, let us take the position as it stands. First of all we have Jesus and the disciples in the Garden of Gethsamane. Here Jesus prays to God "Father, if it be possible put this cup from Me, nevertheless, not My will but Thine." Knowing full well that the hatred of the Jews was bringing matters to a climax, he felt his courage failing, and prayed for spiritual comfort and help. Here the humanity of Jesus attained to that position of complete submission to the will of God, which is the ideal of all men who really love the Father. At length Judas appears and kisses Jesus. This one point, the so-called betrayal of Christ, seems strange to the observer. He was so well-known to the Jews, who saw and heard him every day, that the idea of their inducing one of the disciples to point him out seems superfluous. However, he is tried and condemned to be crucified. Here again a strange fact forces itself upon the mind of the student. Why to be *crucified*? This was not the Roman or Jewish capital punishment of those times, neither are the Gospel accounts of the trial in accordance with the Roman or Jewish jurisprudence of the day. These points lend themselves to the idea that the persons who compiled the Gospels had a very rudimentary idea of the geography, customs and laws of Syria, which was in those days dominated by the Roman Empire. To return again to the subject: It is stated that on the way to the place of execution Jesus was forced to carry the cross, and, being faint, Simon the Cyrenean, or again Joseph of Arimathæa, was ordered to carry it for him. This calls for comment, as it is impossible to suppose that a free citizen should be compelled to carry a cross in this manner to relieve a condemned man. According to the Gospels, Jesus was placed upon the cross at mid-day, and several marvels were supposed to occur. First, darkness over the whole of the land; secondly, that the veil of the Temple was rent in twain; and thirdly, that corpses awoke out of their graves and walked into the city. The Romans were a very correct people, and they certainly recorded the history of their Empire very minutely, but they give us no account whatever of these happenings. Again, it is to be supposed that had corpses actually walked into the city this fact must have been chronicled far and wide, and the Romans, who were a very superstitious people, would certainly have accepted these happenings as the action of the God of Jesus. The records are ominously silent. Then Jesus on the cross had nails driven into his hands and feet, and a crown of thorns around his brow, being in agony he cried "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Here the Prophet Jesus felt that God had actually left him indeed, and, being man, voiced his lament. He was given vinegar on a

sponge to revive him, this being a kindness on the part of the Romans, as this was a staple drink of the army. It is recorded that he cried with a loud voice and "He gave up the ghost." We must notice that there is a discrepancy in these words as translated, by comparison with the Syriac version, which states "He sighed with his breath." Both of these renderings could mean that he swooned, not that he died. Notice next that he was taken down before sunset out of regard to the susceptibilities of the Jewish Sabbath, which then commenced. Jesus, by this account, had not been on the cross many hours, and especially when we remark that his legs were not broken, we can agree with the verdict given by medical men that this was not sufficient to cause death, but merely a swoon. Again, the spear being plunged into the side, we are told that blood and water flowed; here is a sign that circulation had not ceased. The whole time being three hours according to Luke xxiii. 44. Then we are told that Joseph of Arimathæa begged the body from Pilate, who consented, and that he laid Jesus in a tomb of his own. One wonders how Joseph, who was not a native of Jerusalem, came to have a tomb in the latter city. Let us pass on to the morning of the Sunday. Here the disciples and the women folk went to the sepulchre and found the stone rolled away and the tomb empty. Mary Magdalene stayed behind and was accosted by a man whom she took to be the gardener, but he discovered himself to her as Jesus. Here we have one of the followers of Jesus, who knew him most intimately, not recognising him on account of a disguise. He again appeared to two disciples on the road to Emmaus, and went along with them, and they did not know who it was spoke with them until the peculiar action and words on the partaking of food, breaking the bread, revealed to them the fact that it was Jesus. Why was it necessary for Jesus to disguise himself? If he had risen from the dead, had he appeared to the Romans and Jews they would have hailed him as a supernatural being and worshipped him, and he could have founded the Kingdom of Heaven on earth there, as he had often wished; here was the convincing miracle—all that was needed. No, regrettably we cannot accept that he had risen from the dead, but instead we must come to the conclusion that he was not dead when taken from the cross, and was afterwards revived by those who took him away. Then he appeared to the disciples in an upper room and showed them his hands, feet and side, convincing even Thomas that he was actually flesh and blood and *not* a spirit. Thus are the proofs strengthened, and when Mr. Waldron says that he does not believe in a "bodily" resurrection, are we to take it that he accepts the fact of a rising from the *dead* as a *spirit* or that he denies the death of Jesus?

BERTRAND TADORNA.

ISLAM AT THE "WHITE CITY."

A MOST successful day of propaganda work and reunion of all Muslims was held on Friday, July 17. The event was styled by the newspapers and the official programme of the Exhibition as "Moslem Day." Shortly after 11 o'clock the stream of Muslims began to flow into the magnificent hall which the authorities had provided. The event was under the auspices of "The Islamic Society," and the arrangements were in the hands of Mr. Jelal Shah, the Acting Secretary. At 12.30 the Azan broke the silence, and white sheets being placed in position, Jumma Namaz commenced. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., the well-known Imam of the Mosque, Woking, preached a most eloquent sermon* on the "Unity of God," he dealt with the character of Muhammad, and quoted the verse, "I am a man like unto you," drawing a picture of the life of the Prophet and how he was—as man—a pattern to humanity. He said that if we had aspirations to become angels, we should need an angel as a pattern, and that if we were to become gods—to use his own word, to "godize"—then there is the necessity of having a god or god-man as a model. (Here he had to face an interruption from a gentleman who was watching the service, and who wished to challenge some words of the Khwaja's, but it was explained to him that it was a Muslim service in progress and not a lecture, and that he would have an ample opportunity of asking questions between 5 and 6 o'clock.) After the service all dispersed in order to view the Exhibition, and for luncheon. At 3.30 p.m. Mr. Qari Safaras Hoosein, of Delhi, who is a missionary of Islam in England, gave an interesting discourse upon the "Philosophy of Islam." Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, being Chairman and President for the day, had to occupy his position from this time until 8.30 p.m., which must have been exceedingly fatiguing. From 4 to 4.45 o'clock the speaker was Moulvie Zafar Ali Khan, B.A., the Editor of the *Daily Zamindar*, of Lahore, India. He spoke in a very able and convincing manner upon "Islam and England," pointing out that the strength of the British Empire depended to a large extent upon her support from the Muslims, who formed by far the greater portion of the Empire. He showed that sometimes officials had greatly erred in their judgment of Muslims, and appealed that fair-play should be extended to the Press in India. Many men, whose loyalty was above doubt, had suffered heavily by wrong decisions when only doing their duty to Islam by defending it against its detractors.

At 4.45 p.m. all assembled for the "Asr" (afternoon) Prayer. This was very interesting as it was conducted by an English Muslim. In this connection the Chairman made a very apposite

* The sermon will appear in our next number.—ED.

remark, which was received with applause. He said that Islam did not believe in sacerdotalism, nor did it give countenance to priesthood. Every Muslim was his own priest; there was no intermediary between him and his God. Similarly every good Muslim, without undergoing ordaining conventionalities, could lead prayer and be followed by other Muslims. Islam was a practice and not a theory, and as a practical proof of this democratic principle in religion they had requested Mr. Khalid Sheldrake to lead them in their prayer as Imam.

Mr. Sheldrake was followed in the prayers by a large gathering, and one could notice the presence of several Englishmen among the ranks of the Faithful. This was followed by an interval in which questions were invited, the replies being given by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. The gentleman who had interrupted in the morning came armed with many questions, to which the Khwaja listened calmly and replied. Some admissions were made by the questioner. He said that he was a Christian, a Trinitarian, and he believed in the Divinity of Jesus. He said that he did not for a moment wish to infer that Christianity had produced scientific research, but he wished to ask how Islam had favoured culture and learning. He was answered by the Chairman, and also by Mr. Zafar Ali Khan, who both quoted verses from the Quran which incited their readers to make scientific discoveries, and spoke upon the glorious civilisation which was possible under Islamic rule, when Europe, which was then completely under Christian domination, was sunk in the deepest ignorance, and then pointed out that progress was first made upon contact with the Islamic culture of the Caliphates of the East. A gentleman here caused some lively diversion by standing and asking, "How dare you come to this country to upset the existing religion?" He went on to say that he was a Christian, and was defending his own faith. The proceedings were here interrupted by cries of dissent from all part of the hall, and the fiery nature of the speaker had nearly drawn heated words from many, but for the intervention of the Chairman, who calmly reminded the speaker that the religion of the country, if it was Christianity, had already been upset by his own countrymen in the ranks of Atheists, Rationalists, Spiritualists, Unitarians and others, and he need not complain against the Muslims. Then Mr. Mohammad Crabtree, an English Muslim who was present from Egypt, appealed in a very beautiful speech for reverence when the Muslim was praying. He pointed out that many people, who worshipped the same God as the Muslims, when they saw the Islamic prayer, with its prostrations, laughed and made fun of the worshippers. He said that they were in reality mocking not the Muslims, but the very God that they professed to worship in common with Islam. His words called forth an immediate rejoinder from the principal opponent. He said that the last speech was quite unnecessary, as no Christian ever laughed at a Muslim while the latter was

praying, he himself would be ashamed of anyone who did so, and therefore he resented the speech, as it was untrue. Mr. Crabtree immediately replied that during prayers that afternoon, had he looked round, he could have seen smiles and laughter upon the faces of many present, which proved his words. Mr. Zafar Ali Khan also gave his experience upon this point. During these bitter moments Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din calmed the disputants with his kindly smile and tactful manner, and having restored peace, he replied to all the attacks made by the questioners in a satisfactory and convincing way. Then Mr. F. Mohammad Sayal, of Qadian, India, read a paper on Islam and spoke for some time. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din snatching a hasty meal at this time, the chair was occupied very ably by Mr. Qari Safaras Hoosein, B.A., who had spoken earlier in the afternoon. The next speaker was Mr. Khalid Sheldrake, who "needed no introduction," said Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who again took the chair. He spoke upon "Why I adopted Islam."†

* * * * *

Others on the programme included Mr. Mushir Husein Kidwei, lately Hon. Secretary of the Pan-Islamic Society, whose subject was "The Need of Islam in Europe"; Dr. M. Saadi Bey, of Constantinople, "Islam and the Twentieth Century," and Moulvie Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., B.T., giving "A Phase of the Life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad." At 8.30 came the time for "Maghrib" (evening) Prayer, and all assembled, the Imam on this occasion being the Quari Safaras Hoosein, B.A.

The proceedings terminated with a hearty vote of thanks to the President, Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, whose kindly smile had been for all, and who had occupied the chair in such an able manner for so many hours under trying conditions.

EDGAR A. WELCH.

MOSLEM DAY.

PRAYERS OF THE FAITHFUL AT THE WHITE CITY.

FOUR times the voice of the Muezzin rang out, calling the faithful to prayer, at the White City.

"Allaha Akbar!" (God is most great), he called, his forefingers driven deep into his ears.

† We do not wish to spoil the beauty of the splendid address by Mr. Sheldrake by merely giving extracts, so we shall give it *in extenso* in our next issue.—ED.

And at the cry the Moslem colony in London gathered in the Palace of Music to recite the liturgy of Islam.

It was "Moslem Day," and as many Moslems as could get away from business attended the service at the White City, conducted by the Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, Imam of the Woking Mosque.

TOWARDS THE HOLY CITY.

Dressed in immaculate English dress, with turban or red fez on their heads, the faithful stood on a white sheet, facing towards the East and Mecca. Five times a day all the Moslems in the world turn their faces to the holy city of Islam and recite their prayers.

Following the loud cry of the Muezzin, the Imam took up the chant "Allaha Akbar!" the assembled congregation bowing at his words.

Then, raising their hands to their ears (for long ago apostates came to prayers with false idols concealed beneath their arms), they recited the liturgy after him, following his body movements, bowing, kneeling, and laying their foreheads in the dust.

ENGLISH CONVERTS.

"La ilaha ila-l-Lah," they cried in a melancholy sing-song, "There is no God but God," and again the Muezzin lifted up his voice.

Then, following the genuflections of the Imam, the congregation humbled themselves in the dust again, muttering their prayers.

Many European converts to Islam were present at the ceremony, which is known as the "Jooma Namas," or Friday prayers.

After the reading in English of a passage from the Koran, the Imam delivered a sermon on the "Unity of God," after which the congregation dispersed.

Later in the day addresses were given by prominent disciples of Islam, dealing with the philosophy of Islam, its growth in England, and its social influence.

Mr. Khalid Sheldrake, a prominent English convert, also addressed a large meeting on "Why I adopted Islam."

—*The Star*, July 18.

BE friendly to him who would be unfriendly to you, give who will not give you, and forbear with who would do you harm.

THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD.

THE MESSENGER

THE Banu Khuzaa was a tribe in alliance with the Muslims. The Banu Bakr was in alliance with the Kurayish. The latter, assisted by members of the Kurayish, committed a foray on the former, a number of persons being slain in the encounter. The Banu Khuzaa being by their alliance virtually under the protection of the Prophet, applied to him to redress the wrong put upon them during a time of peace, the clans being still bound by the treaty of Hudaibia. Muhammed at once commanded the mobilisation of the forces, and in a short time 10,000 men were arrayed beneath his standard. He was resolved on this occasion to put an end to the machinations of the Meccans. The expedition set out in January 630 C.E. They entered Mecca practically unopposed, the inhabitants were unable to put an army in the field against him. The troops under Khalid met with a slight resistance from Safwan, son of Omeyya; Ikrima, son of Abu Jahl; and Suhail, son of Amr—three of the bitterest foes of Islam. Only a few followers supported them; and the resistance soon broke down, and the Muslims entered the city in triumph.

What a triumph it was! Epoch making! One of the decisive events in the history of the world. The town which stood for years the bulwark of paganism, the enemy of Islam, went down without an effort. The chivalry of heathendom was prostrate before the valour of the Muslim. For years she withstood the Prophet and his mission, persecuted him and his followers; reviled and stoned and cast him forth an outcast and a wanderer in the land. She plotted against him, and launched forth cohorts of foot and horse, steel-tipped, mail-clad, to overcome and slay him. Now she lay at his feet and sought the mercy she refused to him. WHAT WAS HIS REVENGE?

In the hour of his conquest, of his elevation, of his triumph, how did he treat those who spurned and mocked him, and hunted him with spear and bow?

HE FORGAVE THEM.

Forgave them every trespass, every evil, persecution and injury. God was to him the merciful and compassionate, so he, as Allah's messenger, gave mercy and bestowed compassion on the enemies now pleading his forgiveness and grace. No more magnanimous deed has ever been performed and handed down by history as an example to all mankind. Where he might with justice have severely punished he was gentle, and forgave.

The people were spared, not so the idols. The Muslims swept the Kaaba as clean of every vestige of paganism as Hercules is said to have swept the Augean stalls. The great god Hubul and his 360 satellites were shivered to atoms, their

power and glory passed away for ever. The sacred House was purified and made a fitting place to which every Muslim might turn in his daily devotions or visit in his time : the crown and capital of Islam, the visible and permanent sanctuary to which pilgrimage might be made.

That work accomplished, he called the people together and addressed them as a father speaking to his children, bidding them give up larceny and infanticide, and deceit, adultery and lying ; to speak no evil, especially of women, and to invoke no other god but Allah. He did not compel them to become Muslims, for him there was no violence in religion, it was his duty to preach. But he left them teachers that they might hear and understand the faith of Islam, and having set everything in order returned to Medina. Medina gave him shelter in his hour of need, and he was resolved never to forsake it.

Thereafter disciples were sent out in all directions to proclaim to the tribes of the desert the religion of the One God and to call on them to embrace His teachings and conduct themselves according to His ordinances and His laws.

The large tribes of the Hawazin and the Shakif leagued together to overthrow him. The forces met in the Valley of Hunain, when, after a fiercely contested engagement, the members of the coalition fled before the Muslims, who for the first time appear to have outnumbered their foemen in an encounter. Ta'if, the city of the Thakifites, was too strong for the Muslims to storm, and after a short seige they retired ; with Mecca in their hands, its surrender was only a matter of time.

The ninth year of the Hijra has been called the Year of Deputations, on account of the vast number of embassies and envoys sent to Medina by tribes from all parts of Arabia, either asking for alliance with the Muslims or for admission to the ranks of the Faithful. The following year was equally rich in deputations. Principal amongst those who gave in their allegiance were the Himyarite Princes of Yemen, of Mahra and of Oman, and the tribes of Yemama, to be followed by the tribes of Hayramant and Kinda, the Banu Abd-al-Kays, the Banu Hanifa, and many others. In December 630 C.E., Ta'if also handed in its allegiance to the Prophet. The most of Arabia was now under his sway, while his missionaries were preaching his doctrines in every quarter of the land.

It is not to be assumed that the people were all Muslims, although the tribes gave a nominal assent to the Faith on their acceptance of the rule of the Prophet, who was well aware of the fact. Converts were coming in rapidly, persons who were convinced of the truth of his mission ; time would do the rest. One anomaly occurred : during the pilgrimage Muslims and pagans mingled together, each performing the ceremonies according to his own beliefs. Many obscene practices and degrading actions were to be observed alongside of the pure rites of Islam. The Prophet resolved those pagan practices should cease, and at the

pilgrimage of March 631 C.E., proclamation was made to that effect by the lips of Ali :—

“No idolator shall after this year perform the pilgrimage, and no one shall make the circuit of the Holy Kaaba naked.”

The following year he resolved to lead the pilgrimage himself. He was ageing, and knew that his mission must soon be nearing its end, and probably he wished to see for the last time that the ceremonies were performed in all simplicity, purity and beauty. He set out on February 23, 632 C.E.,* accompanied by a concourse of about one hundred thousand people. On March 7† from the top of Mount Ararat he delivered a beautiful and impressive sermon from which I quote a few of the maxims to show the trend of the address :—

“Your lives and property are sacred and inviolable amongst one another until the end of time.”

“Ye people ye have rights over your wives and your wives have rights over you.”

“Treat your women well. . . . Verily ye have taken them on the security of God, and have made their persons lawful unto you by the words of God.”

“The debtor shall return only the principal.”

“Henceforth the vengeance of blood, practised in the days of paganism, is prohibited, and all blood-feuds abolished.”

“Know that all Muslims are brothers unto one another. Ye are one brotherhood.”

“Guard yourselves from committing injustice.”

As the sermon came to a conclusion, he lifted his voice and cried :—

“O Lord! I have delivered my message and accomplished my work.”

And the whole multitude responded :—

“Yea, verily thou hast.”

And he cried again :—

“O Lord! I beseech thee, bear Thou witness unto it.”

On the completion of the services he returned to Medina. His message was indeed delivered and his work accomplished. His leave-taking was his last farewell to Mecca ; he was never to see it again. A few months only were left him to carry on the

* In my copy of Muir the date is given as March 630 A.D., probably a typographical error for 632. Professor Margoliouth gives February 17.

† According to Muir, three days later.

mission, and he worked to the last. Even when stricken by fatal sickness he visited the mosque and prayed for those present and absent, bidding them live in peace and goodwill, and be conscientious in the performance of religious duties. At noon on Monday, June 8 A.D. 632, he passed away in the arms of Ayesha.

His work was at an end, his mission was fulfilled. Beloved by all, of the noblest generosity and of becoming humility, a smile was ever on his lips, kindness shone from his dark, beaming eyes, and gentleness revealed itself in every aspect of his manner. Enthusiastic when enthusiasm was required, and heroic in the face of persecution and injustice. Adamant in the face of evil and error, merciful when mercy could be given. By steadfastness, courage and devotion he changed the whole current of Arabian thought and custom, and remoulded the history of the world.

Al-Kader night the scroll of gold beheld,
On Hira Mount the words of light outwelled ;
And chivalry arose with pennons spread,
And Araby awoke, the darkness fled ;
The star of morning cast a lustre bright,
The Western isles were flushed with Eastern light.
Mecca beheld the rising of the sun,
The continents proclaimed the victories won ;
From Indus banks to Andalous the blest
The lamp of knowledge burned in East and West ;
Alone in Muslim school and mosque and hall,
The voice of reason answered to the call.

May the mercy and blessing of Allah be with him !

J. PARKINSON.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.H.	C.E.	
	570	Birth of Muhammed.
	579	Death of Abdal-Muttalib, his grandfather.
	590	Marriage with Khadija.
	610	Al-Kader night.
	613	Ministry begins in earnest.
	615	First exile to Abyssinia.
	617-8	The period of the Ban.
	620	Death of Khadija and Abu Talib.
	621	First Pledge of Akaba.
	622	Second Pledge of Akaba.
1	622-3	The Flight ; construction of State at Medina.
2	623-4	Battle of Badr.
3	624-5	Battle of Ohod.
4	625-6	Banishment of Banu Nadhir.
5	626-7	Expulsion of Banu Kuraizha, Battle of the Ditch.
6	627-8	Peace of Hudaibia.
7	628-9	Fall of Khaibar, Battle of Mutta.
8	629-30	Capture of Mecca.
9	630-1	Year of the Deputations.
10	631-2	Farewell pilgrimage and death.

What an Imâm is I leave my younger readers to discover for themselves.

* * * * *

The number for July opens with a prayer said by one of the above-named editors at a meeting of London Muslims and others at Caxton Hall, on June 12, to celebrate the anniversary of the capture of Constantinople in 1453. With some slight exception it might have been a prayer by Theodore Parker or George Dawson or my late friend Mr. Voysey. It refers to the "gentle philosopher of Nazareth," whom "Thou wast pleased to choose from his fellow-men as Thy mouthpiece, like other prophets of the world." It goes on to refer to "that religion of Nature which demands no mutilation of reason for unbelief in its teachings; which makes faith without action a rotten reed; which found its final perfection at the hand of Thy last Prophet [Mohammed]; that religion which teaches us to believe in the universal brotherhood of man under Thy universal Fatherhood, and kills all racial prejudices and other distinctions; that religion which makes the Sermon on the Mount a practical reality." The concluding paragraph of the prayer has an historical interest; "O real Bringer of true science and culture to man, we meet to-day to celebrate that great monumental event in history which Thy high dispensation was pleased to cause, to bring forth revival of learning in the world; that is, the fall of Constantinople before Muslim, which was emblematic of the fall of ignorance before culture, the fall of vice before virtue, and the fall of mediæval darkness before light. It was through this great event that the great depositories of knowledge and philosophy were unsealed, and were added to by our ancestors," &c.

* * * * *

I think my readers will agree that this is far superior to the tone of prayers of Christian "orthodoxy," especially at the time of the fall of Byzantium. We have only to read the chapters in Gibbon's immortal history relating to that period, or Finlay's admirable "History of the Byzantine Empire," recently re-published in "Everyman's Library," to be convinced of the immense superiority of the religion of Islam over the current Christianity so-called of that time. For myself, if I lived in the East I think I should prefer the religion of the Moslem to that of any of the warring "Christian" sects, if I could obtain a dispensation from the peculiar rite which it holds in common with Judaism.

* * * * *

Another passage is worth quoting as showing the comprehensive character of enlightened Mohammedanism. It is styled "Who is Muslim?" and the answer is as follows: "He is an Israelite in following the Ten Commandments of God, and the law of retribution with its legitimate bounds. He is a follower of Christ, doing away with all the ritual of the Pharisees, and

denouncing their hypocritical observances. He observes the Law of Mercy promulgated on the Mount of Olives when it leads to reclamation. His object is reformation through mercy or retribution, as the case may be. He is an Arya-Hindu in breaking images, and a Sanatondharmi in paying respect to all the godly men of any nation and creed, which has been called Avatars—incarnation of God. He is a Buddhist in preaching Nirvan—that is self-effacement as the Key of Salvation. He is Unitarian to establish the unity of God. In short, he embraces through the Quran [Koran] every beauty in every religion, and turns his face from what has been added to the religion of God by man—and this is Islam !”

* * * * *

It seems to me that this is very similar to modern Unitarianism. I shall have more to say on this subject in future Notes.

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM.

WHILE proposing a resolution* in a large and unanimous meeting held under the auspices of the Anglo-Ottoman Society at Caxton Hall, Westminster, S.W., Mr. Adolphe Smith said he could never dissociate the cause of Turkey from the history of Islam. How much Europe owed to Islam! Love of science, the study of mathematics, the pursuit of medicine, the establishment of universities and public libraries—these we owe to the great movement of the Moors and Saracens; and, later, the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks started the wave of “Renaissance.” The Renaissance, which rescued us from the Dark Ages, was prepared by the free spirit of inquiry brought into Europe by the enlightened Muslims of an earlier age. Mr. Smith quoted passages from the Quran, such as “Science is a religion,” and said that in Constantinople in the time of Abdul Hamid II. he found a Muslim women’s Hospital, equipped and conducted in a manner superior to any he had inspected in all Europe. As he was an expert on sanitation, his word might help a little to dispel a cherished illusion of Christian Europeans.

* “That this meeting strongly protests against any policy of the European Powers calculated to weaken the Ottoman Empire, as fraught with grave international complications, unsettling the stability of the world’s markets and finance, antagonising against Christendom the Mussalman populations of all countries and fostering amongst them a rebellious spirit the dangers of which it is impossible to overlook.”—ED.

MUHAMMADANISM (?) OR ISLAM.

LECTURE ON ISLAM IN EDINBURGH.

WE quote the following from the *Scotsman*, dated July 6, 1914:—

Under the auspices of the Edinburgh Islamic Society, a lecture on "Islam and other Religions" was delivered by the Rev. Khwaja Kamul-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B., to the Oddfellows' Hall, Edinburgh, on July 4. Mr. G. M. Khan, M.A., B.Sc., president, occupied the chair, and there was an attendance of about 150. The lecturer said that Islamism, the religion which started more than 1,300 years ago by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, literally meant complete submission to the Divine Will, and implicit and unreserved subjection to the control of God in preference to all their opinions, all their prejudices, all their judgments and prepossessions. It was defined thus in the Quran, which embraced all those religions which had been revealed to mankind from time to time in various countries and to various nations. Moslems believed in God, and they believed in what had been revealed to Muhammad, as well as everything that had been revealed to any prophet in the world. Islam embraced any religion and every religion that emanated from God for the guidance of human kind, without any distinction of creed or colour. (Applause.) God made no invidious distinction in the dispensation of His bountiful gifts for our physical nurture, and he who believed that God had been favourable to certain classes of men as far as spiritual nourishment was concerned was blind to this universal dispensation in every item of Nature. It was seen from history, he said, that the prophets came at a time of need to restore morality and virtue in the world. To the Moslem mind the best name that could be given to any religion was Islam. On this point, the lecturer said *he wished to dispel an error* under which people in the West had laboured: THEIR RELIGION HAD NEVER BEEN IN NAME MUHAMMADANISM. THAT WAS SIMPLY A NAME WHICH EUROPE HAD FATHERED ON THEM. THEY WERE MOSLEMS, AND BELIEVED IN GOD. A MUHAMMADAN WAS ONE WHO WORSHIPPED MUHAMMAD; MOSLEMS NEVER WORSHIPPED MUHAMMAD. (Applause.) MUHAMMAD WAS NOT THEIR DEITY. HE WAS LIKE THEMSELVES—A MAN; * OF COURSE, SUPERIOR IN SPIRITUALITY. (Applause.)

* "Say in sooth, I am only a man like you; the only difference is that I receive revelation from God, that your God is only One God.—The Quran 18: 110.

MUHAMMADANISM.*

By G. W. LEITNER, LL.D., M.A., PH.D., D.O.L., &c.

MY special knowledge of Muhammadanism began in a mosque school at Constantinople in 1854, where I learnt considerable portions of the Koran by heart. I have associated with Muhammadans of different sects in Turkey, India, and elsewhere, and have studied Arabic, the language in which their sacred literature is written. I may at once point out that without a knowledge of Arabic it is impossible to exercise any influence on the Muhammadan mind; but I would add that there is something better than mere knowledge, and that is sympathy: sympathy is the key to the meaning of knowledge—that which breathes life into what otherwise would be dead bones.

There are instances of eminent scholars who, for want of sympathy, have greatly misjudged Muhammadanism. Sir William Muir, *e.g.*, has been led into very serious mistakes in dealing with this religion.

Let us hope that the present occasion may help, in however humble a degree, to cement that "fellow-feeling" which ought to exist between all religions.

"In proportion as we love truth more and victory less," says Herbert Spencer, "we shall become anxious to know what it is which leads our opponents to think as they do."

As regards the great religion with which we are dealing to-day, I have adopted the term "Muhammadanism" in order to limit this address to the creed as now professed by Muhammadans. If I had used the better heading "Islam," which means the creed of "resignation to the Divine will," a more extensive treatment would have been necessary than can be afforded in the course of an hour.

Muhammadanism is not the religion of the Prophet Muhammad, because he only professed to preach the religion of his predecessors, the Jews and the Christians; both these faiths being in the faith of "Islam," of which the form preached by Muhammad is the perfection and seal.

TO WALK WITH GOD IN PRACTICE IN ISLAM.

"To walk with God," to have God with us in our daily life with the object of obtaining the "peace that passeth all understanding," to submit to the Divine will"—this we, too, profess to

* Lecture delivered at South Place Institute—"Religious Systems of the World."

seek ; but in Muhammadanism this profession is translated into practice, and is the corner-stone of the edifice of that faith.

In one sense Muhammadanism is like, and in another sense unlike, both Judaism and Christianity. To walk with God, to have God ever present in all our acts, is no doubt what the prophets of both these religions taught ; and in that sense they were all Muhammadans, or rather "Muslims"—namely, professors of the faith of "Islam."

MUHAMMAD WAS INSPIRED.

But so far as I know anything either of Judaism or of Christianity, the system preached by Muhammad was not merely imitative or eclectic ; it was also "inspired"—if there be such a process as inspiration from the Source of all goodness. Indeed, I venture to state in all humility that if self-sacrifice, honesty of purpose, unswerving belief in one's mission, a marvellous insight into existing wrong or error, and the perception and use of the best means for its removal, are among the outward and visible signs of inspiration, the mission of Muhammad was "inspired."

The Judaism known to Muhammad was chiefly the traditional "Masôra" as distinguished from the "Markâba" ; indeed, pure Judaism as distinct from Buddhistic or Alexandrian importations into it.

The Christianity also which Muhammad desired to restore to its purity was the preaching of Christ, as distinguished on the one part from the mystic creed of St. Paul, and the outrageous errors of certain Christian sects known to the Arabs.

The idea of Muhammad not to limit the benefits of Abraham's religion to his own people, but to extend them to the world, has thus become the means of converting to a high form of culture and of civilisation millions of the human race, who would either otherwise have remained sunk in barbarism, or would not have been raised to that brotherhood which "Islam" not only preaches but also practises.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT TRANSLATED INTO DAILY LIFE.

The founder of Muhammadanism has been talked of by Christians in the most unworthy manner. Still, at first, he was regarded as a quasi-Christian Sectarian. Dante refers to Muhammad as a heretic in his "Inferno" ; and, indeed, in another sense, he was only a dissenter from one of the many forms which have adopted the appellation of "Christian." Some authors alleged that his religion was taken from the Talmud ; but it seems to me that the question of what Muhammadanism really is cannot be summed up better than in stating it to be pure Judaism plus proselytism, and original Christianity minus

the teaching of St. Paul. This as regards its theory ; in practice it is far more than modern Christianity in its artificial European aspect—the “Sermon on the Mount” translated into daily life.

EVERY MUHAMMADAN A CHURCH IN HIMSELF.

Every Muhammadan is a church in himself; every one is allowed to give an opinion on a religious matter, on the basis of the belief common to his co-religionists. They are not slaves to priests ; they pray to God without an intermediary, and their place of worship is wherever they happen to be at the appointed hours of prayer.

Their preachers can also follow other vocations ; some of them are shoemakers, &c. But, of course, the bulk of their ministers of religion are so by profession in regulated communities.

There is no such thing as a Pope among them.

Any ordinary Muhammadan may say, “By resigning myself to the Divine will I am myself the representative of the faith of which the Prophet Muhammad was the exponent.”

Muhammad himself did not make any claim to infallibility. On one occasion he had a revelation censuring himself severely for having turned away from a beggar in order to speak to an illustrious man of the commonwealth, and he published this revelation, the very last thing which he would have done had he been an impostor, as ignorant Christians call the great Arab prophet. Allow me now to read to you the letter of an eminent religious Muhammadan functionary, the present Sheikh-ul-Islam of Constantinople, to a convert, Mr. Schumann, which I humbly venture to endorse, except the following passage : “On the day when you were converted to Islam your sins were taken into account.” This sentence cannot be taken literally ; for, according to the Muhammadan faith, the sins of all are taken into account. There is a revered saying that the objection of one who is learned is “better than the consent of a thousand who are ignorant” ; and, without in the least professing to be learned, I can, from a Muhammadan standpoint, claim the privilege of a believer in objecting to a ruling which has probably been rendered incorrectly in translation, and which contradicts the injunction addressed to *all* to “avoid sin and apply yourselves to righteousness,” whether Jew, Christian, or Muhammadan.

THE FIVE PILLARS OF ISLAM.

With regard to the outward signs of a Muhammadan, such as prayer, alms, fasting, and pilgrimage, the religious books contain the necessary instructions. As for prayer, they practically enforce that “cleanliness is next to godliness,” for ablutions precede prayer. The regulations regarding both acts are minute, and as to their ritual it is not of every Christian that a priest could say what the Sheikh-ul-Islam says of every Muham-

madan : "These things, however, may be learnt from the first Mussulman that you meet."

Their alms, which are rightly called only a pecuniary prayer, consist in giving up a portion, not less than a fortieth part, or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., of their goods to the poor. These alms go into the public treasury, and are applied, among other things, to the redemption of slaves, another subject regarding which Christians ignorantly accuse Muhammadans of a state of things which Muhammad did his best successfully to mitigate by a practical legislation towards its eventual abolition.

But, reverting to alms, in order that these be acceptable to God, the givers must show that they are in lawful possession of the gift (which, it is needless to add, can be increased beyond the legal minimum). It would not do "to rob a till in order to build a chapel," but those who voluntarily give more than the fortieth part will be rewarded by God.

The pilgrimage to Mecca is of great importance, as Muhammadans meet there from all parts of the world ; it is a bond of union, and creates a real visible Muhammadan Church, such as the Christian world, with its innumerable subdivisions, does not yet possess for the assembly of an entire Christianity ; it is, moreover, a great stimulus for the diffusion of culture by means of a common sacred language, the Arabic, in the same way as was the case in Europe when Latin was the one language spoken by all learned persons in addition to their native tongue. Thus by knowing Arabic one has a key not only to the Muhammadan religion, but also to the heart of the whole Muhammadan world. In Asia, and even Africa, in spite of the so-called semi-barbarism, any abstract Arabic word can become the common property of all the Arabic-speaking or Arabic-revering nations, and Muhammadanism thus possesses an agency of civilisation and culture which is denied to other faiths.

Fasting is, of course, a mere discipline, but it is also of great hygienic value, and, as stated by the Sheikh-ul-Islam, "The fulfilment of the duties of purity and cleanliness, which are rational, also fulfil the hygienic requirements of the physician."

Indeed, as regards Muhammadan rules generally regarding abstention from wine, pork, improperly slaughtered flesh, the disposal of what would be injurious if not quickly made away with, &c., it may safely be asserted that they were not laid down to worry those who fulfil them, but to benefit them in body and mind.

MUSLIM CHARITY AND EQUALITY.

With regard to social gradations, the rich man is considered to be the natural protector of the poor, and the poor man takes his place at the table of the rich. Nowhere in Muhammadan society is there any invidious distinction between rich and poor ; and even a Muhammadan slave is not only a member of the household, but has also far greater chances of rising to a position in the Government or in society than an English pauper.

Food is given to anyone who needs it, and charity is administered direct, and not by the circuitous means of a Poor Law system. Indeed, from a Muhammadan, as also from the Buddhistic, point of view, the giving of charity puts the giver into a state of obligation to the receiver, since it enables the former to cultivate his sense of benevolence.

In the same way, among the Hindu Brahmins, when even a "sweeper" comes to ask for alms at a Brahmin's door, the latter worships him for having afforded him the opportunity for the exercise of charity. Such a view, in my humble opinion, includes all the "graces" of the truest and widest Christian charity, and, from that standpoint, I can only say that the best "Christians" I ever knew were a Brahmin who had never heard the name of Christ, an old Muhammadan who revered Him as a prophet, and a poor Jew who nursed through a long illness the Christian who had deprived him of his little all.

Servants, although they partake of meals after, fare exactly the same as their masters.

In a Mosque there is perfect equality among worshippers; there are no pews; the "Imam" of the place or any other worshipper may lead the prayers, and nothing can be a more devotional sight than a crowd of Muslim worshippers going through their various genuflexions with perfect regularity and silence.

Englishmen object to formalism, but they often worship routine and the letter, rather than the spirit, of rules. Indeed, it may be said that English precision is at the root of a great deal of evil; and if charity in its widest sense is the greatest of virtues, the formalities that accompany its collection and distribution in this country destroy its very grace.

We do not seem to recognise that laws are laid down for general guidance, and that the letter of such laws is not to be the lord but the servant of our interpretation of them. Above all, our abstract charity, our abstract religion, our hard-and-fast rules are in contrast to the personal, individual, concrete, dramatic, allegorical, and imaginative which characterise the Eastern faiths and forms that have been adapted by us. There would be no Nihilists and no Socialists in Europe were Western society constituted on the basis of Muhammadanism; for in it a man is not taught to be dissatisfied, as is the great effort, aim, and result of our civilisation.

MARRIAGE IN ISLAM.

I would now draw your attention to what the Sheikh-ul-Islam says regarding marriage. The marriage contract requires the attestation of two witnesses, and constitutes a religious act; but it is not sacramental, as with Christians and Hindus.

The husband is to enjoy his wife's company, but he cannot force her to accompany him to another country; he is, however, in the latter case, bound to continue to maintain her.

When a connubial quarrel takes place, arbitrators may be chosen, and divorce is allowed if the parties cannot remain together otherwise than in a state of enmity. You will admit that Muhammadan legislation on the subject of marriage does not deserve the opprobrium that has been cast on it by Christian writers.

DIVORCE IN MUSLIMS VERY RARE.

The statement that among Muhammadans there exists the power of unlimited marriage along with unlimited power of divorce is not true. Divorce is not such an easy matter. . . . It cannot be obtained without the judgment of arbitrators.

Besides, at marriage a certain dowry is named, which has to be paid to the wife in the event of divorce; and many women fix the amount in a sum far larger than the husband would ever be able to pay, in order to secure themselves against the danger of a divorce.

Among the Hindus marriage, being spiritual, cannot be dissolved, and among the Roman Catholics it can only be dissolved with the greatest difficulty; but whether the sacramental or the contract view of marriage be taken, the union is, as a matter of fact, in the vast majority of cases, of a permanent nature in all countries and among all religions, though I grieve to have to admit that, having lived among Muhammadans from 1848, for nearly forty years, in spite of their "unlimited opportunity for divorce," I have known of more cases of divorce among Christians than among them. I have also no hesitation in affirming that in kindness to their family, to the learned or aged, to strangers, and to the brute creation, the bulk of Muhammadans are a pattern to so-called Christians.

POLYGAMY.

A few words may be said regarding the much-abused subject of Muhammadan polygamy. Apart from the fact that polygamy tends to provide for the surplus female population in the few places where there is such surplus, and that polygamy is a check on prostitution and its attendant evils, as also a protection against illegitimacy of birth, it cannot be denied that the vast majority of Muhammadans have only one wife. This is largely due to the teaching of Muhammadanism.

Muhammad came into a state of society where to have a daughter was considered to be a misfortune, and where female children were sometimes buried alive. There was no limit to the number of women that a man could marry, and they were a part of the property divided among the heirs of a deceased person.

On the unlimited polygamy which produced this state of things Muhammad put a check; he directed that a man could only enter into the marriage contract with two, three, or four

wives, if he could behave with equal justice and equal love to them all.

Unless he could do that he was only permitted to marry one wife. Now as, practically, no one can be, as a rule, equally fair and loving to two or more wives, the spirit of Muhammad's legislation is clearly in favour of monogamy.

He also raised woman from the condition of being a property to that of a proprietor, and he constituted her as the first "legal" sharer whose interests the Muhammadan law has to consult.

The allegation has been made against Muhammad that by his own example he justified profligacy.

Let this statement be examined. Fortunately, we are not dealing with a legendary individual, but with an historical person, whose almost every act and saying is recorded in the Hadís or collections of traditions, which, next to the Koran, form a rule of Muhammadan conduct. These "Acts of the Apostles" are subjected to the most stringent rules of criticism as to their authenticity, and unless the story of an act or saying of the Prophet can be traced to one of his own companions, it is thrown out of the order of traditions, which form the subject of critical investigation as to their actual occurrence adopted by Muhammadan commentators. We have certainly far less authority of a secular character for the sayings and doings of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well, then, on what authorities, good, bad, or doubtful, do the allegations of Muhammad's profligacy rest? I have no hesitation in affirming that, following every such story to its source, it will be found to be entirely unsubstantiated, and that, on the contrary, to the very great credit of Muhammad, in spite of many temptations, he preserved the utmost chastity in a state of society which did not practise that virtue.

Living among heathen Arabs, he remained perfectly chaste till, at the age of twenty-five, he married a woman of forty (equivalent to one of fifty in Europe); and he married her because she was his benefactor and believed in his sacred mission. As he stated years after her death to a young and beautiful wife, who was "only jealous of the old and dead Khadija," in answer to her question, "Am I not so good as she?" "No, you are not so good; for she believed in me when no one else did, she was my first disciple, and she honoured and protected me when I was poor and forsaken."

During the whole period of his marriage with her, twenty† years, he remained absolutely faithful to her.

It is true that, at the age of fifty-five, we find him taking wife after wife; but is it not fair to assume that in the case of a man who had shown such self-control till that age there may

† Not twenty, but twenty-seven years.—ED.

be reasons other than those assigned by Christian writers for his many marriages? What are these reasons?

I believe that the real cause of his many marriages at an old age was charity, and in order to protect the widows of his persecuted followers.

Persecution was great against his followers, "the believers in one God." At one time no one was allowed to give them food, and some of them were obliged to escape to Abyssinia in order to seek a refuge with the Christian king of that land. The king did not give them up to their persecutors. Some of them died in Abyssinia; and their widows, who would otherwise have perished, Muhammad took into his household. The idea that the Prophet had any improper intention in so doing is without foundation; especially if we consider that he had given abundant proof during his youth of continence. The story of the marriage of the Prophet with Zainab, the divorced wife of his freedman and adopted son, Zeid, has also given rise to misconception. It may be premised that the heathen Arabs considered it wrong to marry the divorced wife of an adopted son, although they had no objection to marry the wives (excluding their own mother) of a deceased father, just as some people nowadays might not mind breaking the Decalogue who would on no account "whistle on a Sunday."

Muhammad excluded all this "nonsense" by saying that an adopted child was not a real child; and this being so, it could not be supposed to be within the prohibited degrees. To affirm this truth and not to justify a new marriage, the Prophet received a revelation, which has been misconstrued as a sanction to a wrongful act.

It really seems to me that if men cultivated something like true charity they would have a different view of other religions than they now hold, and that they would endeavour to learn about them from their original sources, instead of from the prejudiced second-hand reports of the opponents of these religions.

Celibacy is rare among Mussulmans, and there are very few, if any, marriageable women that are not married.

Adultery is punished equally both in man and woman. The culprit is flogged with a hundred stripes publicly.

TAVERNS, GAMING HOUSES, OR BROTHELS UNKNOWN TO MUSLIMS.

The Muhammadans have no taverns, gaming-houses, or brothels, nor have they any idea of legalising prostitution; and as regards their general conversation it is infinitely more decent, as a rule, than that of most Europeans. I have seen young Muhammadan fellows at school and college, and their conduct and talk are far better than is the case among English young

men. Indeed, the talk of the latter is often such as would incur punishment in a Muhammadan land.

POSITION OF A MARRIED WOMAN.

The married woman is in a better legal position than the married Englishwoman, and she can give evidence in attestation of a birth, marriage, or death, which is still denied to a woman in Republican France.

HOLY WAR CONDITIONAL.

As regards the assumed immutability of the Muhammadan religion, there is a liberty of interpretation of the Koran which enables "Islam" to be adapted to every sect and country: *e.g.*, the law laid down for its interpretation that a conditional sentence has to take precedence of an absolute one, is one that secures every reasonable liberty of conscience: *e.g.*, "fight the infidels" is an absolute sentence; "fight the infidels if they attack you first" is a conditional sentence, and has therefore first to be taken into account in determining the much misunderstood question of the "holy war" or rather "Jihád," against infidels. Indeed, no such war is legitimate except in self-defence against those who persecute Muhammadans *because* they believe in one God and who turn them out from their homes; in other words, as in the case of the Muslim refugees to Abyssinia. As for religious toleration, there is much more of it in practice among Muhammadans than *has* been the case, at any rate, in Christian countries; and had this not been the fact, the Armenian, Greek, and Jewish communities would not have preserved their autonomy, religion, and language under, say, Turkish rule—a rule, I may add from personal knowledge, which offers many lessons of forbearance and humanity to Christian legislation.

Muhammad included Jews and Christians among Muslims; or those who believe in God and the last day "shall have no fear upon them, neither shall they grieve."

EQUAL PROTECTION OF MOSQUES AND CHURCHES.

In the chapter on "Pilgrimage" in the Koran, the object of a religious war is declared to be the protection of "mosques, synagogues, and churches," for in them alike "the name of God is frequently commemorated."

Is not this as tolerant a position as we have only reached after centuries (if, indeed, judging from the present foolish crusade against Muhammadanism, which we are confounding with slavery, we *have* reached such a position)?

I know many Muhammadans who have subscribed to churches; how many Christians subscribe to mosques? Yet in them "the name of God" is, indeed, commemorated.

As for Muhammadan persecutions of Christians, they do not compare with the massacres of Muhammadans by Christians.

Ab uno disce omnes. When Omar, in order to avenge a former massacre of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, swore to put the defenders of the city to death he refrained from doing so after taking it; for, as he said, "I will rather incur the sin of breaking my oath than put to death a single creature of God."

I cannot conclude this address better than by insisting on the fact that the Jewish, Christian, and Muhammadan religions are sister-faiths, having a common origin; and by expressing a hope that the day will come when Christians will honour Christ more by also honouring Muhammad.

There is a common ground between Muhammadanism and Christianity, and he is a better Christian who reveres the truths enunciated by the Prophet Muhammad.

PRAYERS AND ABLUTIONS.

To be always prayerful to God is the spirit of prayer, but if we fix special times for saying our prayers that is mere ritual: a plausible sentiment which sometimes comes to the lips even of those who possess devotional hearts. Misconception of the true functions of religion and its relation to mundane affairs is the cause of such expressions. Many people appear to think that what is readily acknowledged to be true of our worldly affairs cannot also be true of religion. This is quite a wrong notion. Religion came from God to govern our life in all its phases. Are not regularity in action and punctuality in time the great secrets of success in every walk of life? Can we give full justice to anything, even if it be ever present in our mind, if we fail to fix the time for its accomplishment? Fitful and random attention ever leads to failure. Should we disregard this ABC of our daily life in our duty to God? But even the theory itself is untrue on its very face. Our deeds are the real index of the interest we take in anything. If a thing is paramount in our minds, it cannot fail to find its translation into our actions. Why, then, should not this be the rule in the case of prayer? Unfortunately, those who theorise on the beauties of being ever prayerful in spirit often forget to repeat even a few prayers!

Another inconsistency that is frequently to be met with is seen in the tendency to chaff at the idea of our regular ablutions. People are ready enough to devote attention to the toilet before they take their places at the table or assume their part at some social function. To be neat and to look smart is the fashion of our life, necessitating frequent ablutions. Should this order of our lives change in our relation to God? Will He be more edified at seeing us in shabby attire, with slipshod manners and slovenly ways? If "Cleanliness is next to Godliness," can there be any harm in our resorting to it when going to speak with God?

THE PATH OF THE ARAB.

THE ocean is made up of innumerable drops of water. In surveying the whole we are apt to forget the individual units. The ocean is fed by a myriad rivers, themselves the combination of many smaller streams, which in turn receive their body substance from the various showers of rain, drawn earlier from the ocean by the heat of the sun and afterwards deposited on the surface of the earth.

In the realm of those events called historical a similar process of combination and interrelation occurs. All Nature is one, a vast movement of things and events all related to each other in genealogical series, the present flowing from the past and bearing on its bosom the oncoming future. Innumerable small events create mighty movements which in after years are looked upon as epochs in the history of mankind, the dawn or fall, the turning point in the rise or dissolution of nations and empires. In the brilliance or awfulness of the total movement the many smaller events and currents which preceded and moulded it, giving it its majesty and magnificence, are generally overlooked and neglected. Yet those things, which even at the time of their occurrence appeared trivial, are the bricks out of which history has and is being built—they are the formative factors of things.

In the kingdom of human actions we oftentimes build very badly jerry-structures that break to pieces in our hands. What is of more value, we oftentimes build better than one knew or even thought of at the time of action. The moral is, be always as careful as we can. We never judge accurately the far-reaching effects that will follow. A stone cast into the sea makes ripples on the surface, forming waves which flow ever outwards, even although invisible, to the uttermost ends of the ocean.

When Shurahbil, the son of Amr, slew the messenger sent by the Prophet Muhammed to the Prince of Duma, probably no one of his day could have foreseen the consequences, or guessed that the deed was to prove one of the leading factors in forming the path over which the conquering Arab was to travel on the road to empire, martial-shod. That pathway was to be strewn with the fate of nations, states, dynasties and races. The ruins of old civilisations, hoary with antiquity and withered with moth and rust, were to be ground into powder on that path. New powers were to rise, decline and fall. In the womb of the future, pregnant as with celestial fire, was the glory of Omeyyad, Abbaside and Fatimid; the magnificence of Damascus and Baghdad and Cordova, and the splendours of the queen cities of India, Africa and Andalusia, of Agra, Cairo, Fez, Seville and Granada, peerless mistress of the chivalry and beauty of the West.

The path was not a new one that led to the north, to the ruling cities of the world. Arabian immigration often before had swept hitherward over the peoples to the conquest of the great fortress of the Islands and the domination and occupation of Central Asia, with the fertile alluvial valley of Mesopotamia, where the large twin rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates, clove a pathway to the southern sea.

Their first coming known to us was at the very dawn of written history. How often they came before that time we can only conjecture, and speculation is, after all, of very little use. They at least left their mark on every civilisation of the past, and were the principal factors in the formation of the thought and civilisation of the present. The influence of the Semite on every current of human activity and progress has never been fully estimated, and it has not been even grudgingly acknowledged.

As Paton points out:—

“At the earliest period disclosed to us by the Egyptian and Babylonian records, Syria and Palestine were already inhabited by Semites—that is, by a race ethnologically and linguistically allied to the Hebrews. . . . From these facts we may infer that the Semites were in possession of the lands bordering on the eastern end of the Mediterranean as early as the fourth millennium B.C. . . . The fact that all the branches of this race—Assyrio-Babylonian, Canaanitic, Aramæan, Sabœan, Ethiopic and Arabian—are closely similar to one another, both in physiological structure and in language, points to their being descendants of a single primitive stock; and the original home of this stock was probably Arabia.”*

The earliest Babylonian and Egyptian records so far discovered reach back to about 3500 B.C., and we find that even at that period the Semite was spread over the whole of Central Asia. From later evidence we conjecture that a little earlier a wave of emigration from Arabia set in. The Semite of the desert swept northward with sword and spear in his hands to conquer, and having conquered settled down, adopting the civilisation, thought and religion of the inhabitants he found there, and gradually becoming indistinguishable from them. No doubt he would react on them with his habits and ideas, but being probably in the minority of numbers became lost, like the Norman in England.

But that was not the only wave which, issuing from Arabia, went northward in a storm of conquest. From the records one would almost assume that such waves were periodic. The

* “Early History of Syria and Palestine,” p. 2, 3.

wandering Bedawin in the great sun-burned peninsula seems to have gone on multiplying his kind and increasing in numbers generation after generation until his sand-hillocks, date groves and herds proved too barren and too small for his sustenance and his slaves. Then the teeming womb of the desert, welling over, poured its contents in the direction of the Polar Star in search of food, overrunning the cities of the Islands and Syria, and even Egypt.

Speaking in round numbers, we may say those outbursts took place about every thousand years. For something like twenty generations the Arab lay almost dormant, cut off by the mighty stretch of desert from the world-ruling cities of Central Asia, from Babylonia, Lugash, Ur, Agade, Usk and Erech, and the lands of Martu and Suri. Then, springing into life, he issued forth, conquered and subdued. Having done so he gave new rulers to the lands, new names to places, and finally became absorbed into the mass of the population.

About 2700 B.C., Sharganisharali, commonly called Sargon I. (Sharukin), went forth to bring the peoples to subjection and found a dynasty at Agade. Elam and Katrala and Suri (Mesopotamia) went down before him. Four times he invaded Martu (Syria).

As the inscription says :—

“Sargon went up to . . . his terror he (spread) over (the land); the sea of the setting sun (*Mediterranean*) he crossed; three years at the setting of the sun he conquered (the lands) and made them of one accord; his statue at the setting of the sun he set up; their prisoners he transported over land and sea.”

His son, Naram-Sin, was even greater than he, and called himself on his inscriptions: “King of Agade, King of the four quarters of the earth.” The first Babylonian monarch to claim divinity, after the fashion of the Pharaohs, his empire must have been large and his army powerful. From evidence lately unearthed in the Island of Cyprus, he appears to have been deified there and his cult to have persisted for a long time. On the passing away of Naram-Sin the supremacy of the near East seems to have gone to South Babylonia to the rulers of Ur and Lugash; their power and empire, to judge from the records, was as extensive as that of the dynasty of Agade and as firmly fixed. Yet they were destined to fall, and the power that overthrew them must have been enormous.

About 2500 B.C. Arabia, once more pregnant with humanity, sent out another wave of migration, called by historians the Amoritic. This migration overflowed the whole of Western Asia from Babylonia to Egypt. The Pharaohs of Memphis were forced to move southward and compelled to establish a new capital at Herakleopolis, until at last (2224 B.C.) Khyan, a foreigner, seated himself on the throne of Egypt, under the style

of "Lord of the Desert." The invasion on the other side so weakened Babylon that for a time she lost her supremacy in Syria and Palestine. This weakening of Babylon was the opportunity of Elam, and her king, Kuder-Nankhandi, came down on her with all his troops, pillaged her cities, destroyed her temples, carried off the images of her gods, and made subject her rulers. Kudur-Laghamar, probably the Chedorlaomer mentioned in the Bible (Gen. xiv.) as being overthrown by Abraham, was a successor of the above Kudur-Nankhandi. The Amraphel, king of Shinar, also mentioned, was probably his subject Kham-murabi, sixth king of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Kham-murabi finally overthrew his superior, expelled the Elamites and re-established the supremacy of Babylon; he was also the great law-giver of the East. His code of laws, the oldest known, and lately unearthed, on examination show that the later code of laws of the Israelites given in Leviticus must have been founded on the earlier code of the Babylonian monarch.

About 1300 B.C., a fresh wave of Semites poured over Palestine and Syria; their coming was spread over generations, and the migration has been called the *Aramæan*. Readers will remember the saying of Jacob: "an Aramæan ready to perish was my father." Palestine was at that period under the sway of Egypt, and the invasion brought about the now well-known Fell-el-Amarna correspondence between the petty rulers in Palestine and the Suerain then ruling in Egypt. A fair outline of the spread and progress of the invasion can be obtained from the letters, the principal writer being Rib-Addi, Prefect of Zubla, under Amenhotep IV., and his communications are a series of appeals for help and a report of the fall of town after town and stronghold after stronghold.

The people called Khabiri (probably Hebrews in the widest sense of the term) spoken of on the tablets were forerunners of the Aramæan inundation, and were followed at later intervals by the Suti, 'A-sa-ru (Asher), the Bedawi tribes of 'Aduma (Edom), and still later those allied tribes and their clients known under the combined name of the Israelites.

This invasion changed the whole character and language of many of the parts of Western Asia. At the same time the Semite was pushing north, the Hittite was making his rule secure in what is now Asia Minor, and would probably have pushed still further south had not a series of strong rulers arose in Egypt; his power was checked, if not broken, by the famous fighting Pharaoh, Ramessu II. He was followed by other strong rulers of the Fourteenth Dynasty and the Bedawin tribes restrained. It was only when Egypt became weakened that the Israelite clans and their allies were able to follow their blood-brethren into what seemed to them the promised land—a land not perhaps flowing with milk and honey, but superior to their desert home.

About 500 B.C. the Nabatæan migration took place; but civilisation was now fairly advanced, the large cities were

stronger and the migrants were held better in hand, the migration affecting principally the places bordering on the Syrian desert.

Bounded on the west, south and east by the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, the path was ever to the northward, to the colder and richer regions beyond the ocean of sand. Out, ever outward, millennium after millennium and age after age, to subdue or settle, and, having settled, to adopt the customs, literature and religion of the races with whom they intermingled and with whom they mixed their blood ; giving ideas and taking ideas, and preparing the way for the last and greatest migration of the Arab when Central Asia failed to hold them. When they plunged their horses in the Oxus and galloped by the Indus banks ; when Northern Africa saw the scimitars flash in the sunshine and heard the battle-shout, and Andalusia awoke to the calling ; and the Pyrennes were white with their lances and their banners waved on the fields of France. The advance of the Muslim, with which I hope to deal in my next.

BEAUMONT HILL.

MISSIONARY IGNORANCE OF ISLAM. MENTAL EVOLUTION.

(*Extract from a Letter.**)

" . . . They [the back numbers of the present volume of the *Islamic Review*] have helped me to a truer estimate of the place of the great Arabian philosopher-prophet in the evolution of the purpose of *Allah*, the Great One. What strikes me particularly, after my reading of the *Review*, is the colossal ignorance—wilful or feigned—of the average Christian missionary concerning the life of Muhammadan countries. In my early life I was reared in all the environment of Christian tradition, and was taught to look upon the Muhammadan as a type of blood-thirsty brigand, without morality or learning, and decidedly decadent, a worshipper of forms and ceremonies, and having only a veneer-like form of God-idea. These pictures of fierce men, with vengeance and persecution in their heart, and unsheathed sword in their hand, make deep impressions on child minds ; and though my awakening came many years ago, early impressions still cling. To-day the revulsion of feeling is complete, and I look to a life of high morality and sweetness as the true index to a spiritual life—'for the life of religion is to do good.' The Christian missionary is always a ——— when he is not worse.

" However, I must not ruminate. Let me thank you for giving a juster conception of a true servant of God—Muhammad (*C, L, B, p*)—and of his followers, and I trust the All-wise and Merciful One may spare you on earth to carry on a propaganda, which will help to break down the barriers."

* From Mr. Ernest Oaten, of Sheffield, to Kh. Kamal-ud-Din, of the *Islamic Review*.

CONSERVATISM IN RELIGION.

IT is a noteworthy fact that while the peoples of the world coming in contact with one another easily succeed in dispelling wrong notions in temporal matters, in matters spiritual a fatal conservatism or stagnation is the rule. Whenever I happen to make a remark on the beauties of my religion, I am interrupted with a reply such as this, "*Aray bhai*, don't be a bigot, all religions are true." Is this not extreme indifference to religious problems? Is it not shutting one's eyes to the development of religious thought from the worship of stocks and stones and demons to the purer worship of one Almighty God? All religions are true! We may as well say all religions are false. But if all religions are true, it implies at least this much that some religions must be better than others. Plain facts of life, however, show that some religions, though useful at one time, are positively injurious, and effectually retard progress and civilisation among its adherents. If I say to any of my friends, "Among us Asiatics, religion is part and parcel of life; it is our sole guide, and regulator of our conduct in all affairs," he heartily subscribes to the proposition. But alas! when I ask him what his beliefs are, and what Divine commandments and prohibitions regulate his life, he is thrown out of his element. Some people take shelter in the proverb "*dharat pari-e dharam na chori-e*," meaning thereby not that one should adhere to one's sincere religious convictions, but that one should not give up the religion of one's ancestors, however injurious they may be. Such, in brief, is the attitude to religion all over the world. Future historians will probably describe this age as characterised by total indifference to spirituality. Although our lips assign great importance to religion, most of our great men devote their lives to politics only, forgetting that true progress is impossible without moral and spiritual elevation. What hinders reform in religion is weak-mindedness, cowardice and fear. In this age of religious toleration, even ordinary courage will do—not the courage of a prophet like Muhammad, whom even the prospect of a certain and imminent death could not deter from delivering God's mission to His benighted sons. Unfortunately, even ordinary courage is wanting.

Signs of a change are, however, just appearing in the horizon. One of them is the establishment of an International Congress of Religious Progress. The sixth meeting of this Congress was held at Paris in July 1913. "The best of the Western theologians met together to find that Religion of Obedience to God and Benevolence to Mankind which may restore spiritual blessed unity among all mankind and establish the universal brotherhood of man under the universal Fatherhood of God.

Various speakers in the Congress discussed the desirability of a religion which, without mutilating their intellect or causing separation between beliefs and rational convictions, may furnish them with principles leading to unlimited progress and the final evolution of man." This is certainly the crying need of the day. We want a religion in which there is nothing irrational on the very face of it. It is absurd to believe in "things apparently unreasonable under the garb and name of *mysteries*." Religion should have its basis on rationality, and yet be capable of satisfying the noblest longings and emotions of the human soul. Religion should also be simple and definite, so as to appeal even to savages, and immediately transform them into civilised beings, and at the same time capable of appealing to and elevating the most advanced thinkers of the age. Lastly, religion should provide us with "a practical code of life conducive to our utility, to our civilisation and to the development of our faculties. Religion may teach us to hold certain beliefs, but those beliefs must actuate us to adopt that code of life."

Whoever aspires to bring about religious advancement among his people must make a thorough and impartial study of Islam. The cause of Islam has greatly suffered at the hands of biassed and interested Europeans. Our complaint against them says Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, is NOT MISCONCEPTION, MISCONSTRUCTION, OR EVEN MISINTERPRETATION, BUT WILFUL MISREPRESENTATION AND MISINFORMATION. It is not intended here to point out the beauties of Islam. But *there is one peculiar feature of Islam which cannot but induce everybody to take up its study*. The Quran is as authentic as the most authentic book in the world, and the life of the Prophet is as well known as that of Napoleon Bonaparte or Frederick the Great. He travelled through all the walks of life, and rose from the deepest abyss of danger and adversity to the highest pinnacle of glory. This illiterate, simple son of the wilderness stood up, all alone, against the forces of darkness, and cemented savage warring tribes into a solid, heroic nation, to which there is no parallel in the history of the world. He became a mighty monarch, and yet neither built palaces for himself nor surrounded himself with pomp and gay nobility. He dined and worked and slept in the midst of the humblest of his followers. No tiaraed head, says Carlyle, was ever obeyed with anything like the obedience shown to this simple Arabian dressed in a cloak of his own clouting. His history, therefore, supplies rules of conduct for almost every walk of life. He has regulated, and will continue to regulate, the social, political and spiritual conduct of myriads of human beings; and yet it is a wonder that while almost everybody reads volumes on Napoleon and Frederick, very few take up the history of this remarkable Arab, simply because he happens to be the founder of an alien religion. In this connection it is necessary to suggest Ameer-ali's "Spirit of Islam" and his "History of the Saracens," to be found in every library, and

Islamic Review, a monthly, edited by Khawja Kamal-ud-Din, in London. These authors do not ferret out mysterious meanings out of obvious absurdities, or give ingenious interpretations to involved and ugly passages, as is done by patriotic professors of some religions. They make plain and straightforward statements, and relate an unvarnished tale of the development of Islam. To read them is an education in itself.

A. KHAN-KARACHI.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—Undoubtedly all religions are true, according to our belief, but in their original. Their present shape is a human make. Every nation was blessed with its Divine messenger—so says the Quran; but the lapse of time, coupled with want of efficient means to preserve the teaching in its integrity, marred the purity and created a chaos of doctrine to tenets under every big religion of the world. If truth is one-sided, there could not be conflicting doctrines under the same creed. But so is, and was at the advent of Islam, the case in every pre-Islamic faith. If religion came from God, this jumble of pole-apart teachings could not be suffered under Divine Providence. Obliteration of corruption is the universal law of nature. In fact, this was one of the chief reasons which caused the revelation of the Quran, so says the Holy Book:—

“We have sent Apostles to nations before thee,
but Satan prepared their work for them. . . .
And we have sent down the Book to thee, only
that thou mightest clear up to them the subject of
their wrangling, and as a guidance and a mercy to
those who believe.”

Wrangling is destruction, and much more, impious, once within the holy precincts of faith. It could not be allowed, and the Quran came to put a stop to it. It gave all the principles and tenets of the faith in most unequivocal language, and left no room for doctrinal conflict. To think is to differ, no doubt, and no rational institution can live long without allowing healthy difference of opinion, which is a real blessing, as the Holy Prophet Muhammad said. But everything has its limits, and so in religion diversity of thought could not be tolerated in matters fatal to the very growth of the creed. It should not affect its unifying forces. The Quran, therefore, explains all the basic doctrines of Islam in the clearest possible terms; all articles of Muslim faith receive a lucid treatment. The moral, ethical, and spiritual code of the Muslim life is also not in obscurity.

NEXT to faith in God, the chief duty of man is to treat his fellow-men with gentleness and courtesy.

THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD.

THE WOKING MOSQUE LECTURES.

MY STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

By MAULVI SADR-UD-DIN, of the Woking Mosque.

THE Quran and Lord Muhammad enjoin upon us to cherish liberality of views. As Muslims, we have to look upon the revealed books as our common heritage, and so the Apostles are to be equally revered. The Quran does not content itself with general statements to this effect, but also endorses whatever was revealed to Moses, Jesus, and other prophets of the House of Jacob, together with other books as having emanated from the All-sustainer. Furthermore, the Islamic Scripture would stand up for Divine books and their exponents that came prior to itself. Indeed, it goes still further, and endorses them by advancing proofs on their behalf. Lord Muhammad claimed to have come in fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments: he never laid claim to anything that was alien to preceding revelations, but on the other hand announced himself to be the Divine Apostle who was foretold, and who would bring out to perfection all theological thought. In the words of the Christian Gospel, he was ordained to be the cornerstone of the edifice of theology. It is a pity that the claims of the Lord Muhammad have been neglected by the Christian fathers, who are accountable for the misrepresentation with which Christendom has been deceived. To denounce a personality that confirms the doctrines of Jesus Christ among other prophets of God, and consequently cements the ties of brotherhood between people of sister persuasions, runs counter to the Will of the Father.

Let us see now what indispensable office has been performed by Lord Muhammad. The Bible prophecies the advent of a Divine Messenger: it states clearly his function, his signs, his strength, his scene of action, &c., &c. Is it not the duty of every Jew and every Christian to look for the fulfilment of such prophecies? Does not the canker-worm of doubt fret their convictions if the prophecies of their religious books remain unfulfilled? Is it not sheer prejudice to blind ourselves to the realisation of such predictions when we find them so plainly and fairly fulfilled in the case of a particular person?

The following are a few of the prophecies reproduced here for any unbiassed reader to study and see for himself how far the facts with which they deal coincide:—

Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2: "And he said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shined forth from MOUNT PARAN, and

He came with TEN THOUSANDS OF SAINTS : from His right hand went a fiery law for them."

Isaiah xxi. 7 : "And he saw a chariot with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of asses, and a CHARIOT OF CAMELS."

Habakkuk iii. 3 : "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from MOUNT PARAN. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of His praise."

Revelation xix. 11 and 16 : "And I saw heaven opened, and behold A WHITE HORSE ; and he that sat upon him was called FAITHFUL and TRUE, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war."

"And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, and LORD OF LORDS."

If the ass symbolises the territory in which Lord Jesus Christ appeared, and the Mount of Olives and the Valley of the Jordan were the scene of His earthly ministry, then these prophecies must carry weight with those who call themselves Christians, and they must recognise their fulfilment in the light of history. Have not several prophecies of the Old Testament been taken to refer to events in the life of Christ? We cannot understand the logic of present-day Christendom. Till the advent of Christ all the prophecies found their fulfilment in some tangible personage or historical event ; but after Him all prophetic pronouncements were confined to a spiritual fulfilment. What a mockery of interpretation ! If the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem on the ass, and the putting of their clothes on the ass and the colt by the Disciples, and if the cutting of the branches from the trees—ordinary chance events in one's life—have been given such importance as confirming certain events mentioned in the Old Testament, is it not hopelessly absurd to give a mythical interpretation to other prophecies which admittedly do not refer to Jesus Christ?

In Rev. xix. (quoted above) we read of a white horse, "and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war," and his name is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. The Book of Revelation was written in A.D. 96, so the rider on the white horse cannot be Jesus Christ ; besides he is the rider on the ass. Is not the white horse an Arab, and is not the epithet the Faithful that of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, given to him by his nation for his truthfulness and veracity? Are not the Faithful and Muslims synonymous in common parlance? Who else but Lord Muhammad can be the fulfilment of the above-quoted prophetic words in the Revelation? His name in the Revelation is "King of kings" : who else after the times of Jesus is the

founder of a Divine religion which can count kings and lords within its ranks? He must make war in righteousness: who other than Muhammad came after the writing of these predictions to fulfil them? We should be consistent in our reading of the Bible. If you read all the prophecies applying to Jesus in the events of his life, read also others which do not refer to him but to someone who came after him.

If the prophesied ass refers to events in Jerusalem in the days of Christ, as the ass is a popular means of conveyance in Judea; then for horses and camels we shall have to look to Arabia.

In Deuteronomy again we read of these things; "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law." If the epiphany of the Lord from Sinai and Seir refers to the appearance of Moses and Jesus, what about Mount Paran? Have not the Meccan mounts been called Paran Mountains from time immemorial? If you have specified the two, why not the third one? Again, he came to Paran with ten thousand saints. This cannot refer to Jesus or Moses: they never came near Mount Paran, and they never commanded ten thousand followers. Is not the famous event of the conquest of Mecca by Muhammad a monumental testimony to the fulfilment of the prophesy, when he came with ten thousand faithful followers to Mount Paran from Medina? Again, we read "From his right hand went a fiery law." There have been only two law-givers among the ranks of the prophets—Moses and Muhammad: the former from Sinai, the latter from Mount Paran.

That someone had to come after Jesus to fulfil these prophecies is quite clear from the words of Jesus Christ himself when he speaks of a Comforter. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." So says Jesus: the words are too clear to admit of any obscure meaning. The Comforter has to come after him; he has not yet come, he will not come till Jesus departs. To take the Holy Ghost as the One referred to here is simply a blasphemy: it would infer that the Holy Ghost had not descended till then, and Jesus was devoid of Him. This in itself is contradictory to what we read in Matt. iii. as happening at the time of the baptism of Jesus by John: "And, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." The Holy Ghost then did descend and was with Jesus, and remained with him till his departure from the earth. If, then, the Comforter in the prophecy means the Holy Ghost, are not the words of Jesus meaningless when he says, "The Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you."

EVOLUTION IN THE ETHICS OF THEOLOGY.

MUHAMMAD AND JESUS.

That ye resist no evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also.

JESUS.

Return evil with good ; overcome it with good. If they (the doers of evil) do not refrain from doing evil, why should you refrain from practising good ?

MUHAMMAD.

Two lessons of sublime morality coming from the two renowned teachers of the world, raised by God to ameliorate humanity. Both precepts Divine, as their speakers spoke under Divine inspiration. Yet one includes the other, and makes improvement to an appreciable degree. One teaches passive morality against evil, while the other wants to overcome it by doing good. Perhaps the environments of the two were responsible, as explained by our learned contributor, *Maulvi Sad Dar-ud-Din, B.A., B.T., of Qadian*, in the article given below, which we received in April last.

THE far-reaching persecution to which Muhammad was subjected was protracted for a considerable number of years, and thus put the teacher and the taught to a hard trial. The Apostle endured these hardships manfully, and exercised true resignation. He enjoined a similar forbearance upon the initiated also. Such a doctrine, though truly noble and virtuous, was incompatible with the national character of the Arabs, who could not brook any insult or injury. It enables us to realise the forbidding and onerous duty that the Apostle took upon himself. It also speaks of the degree and character of his resolution that called for the execution of such an enterprising task. Does it not reveal to us a great mind endeavouring to regenerate an incorrigible nation, and exercising his humanising influence upon the iron-souled Arabs ? To inculcate a habit that does not chime in with the deep-rooted habits of a nation is generally futile. But it was surprisingly the reverse in the case of this great Apostle of God. His followers took the doctrine of toleration and forbearance to heart, and gave a practical demonstration of it. They came pouring in to enlist his sympathy and receive instructions that would bear them up in that high tide of persecution. The tortures and atrocities that were freely inflicted by the provoked nation knew no bounds ; but I may content myself with reproducing one, for the sake of those that can make a psychic study of the prophet's heart.

One of the proselytes lived in a quarter the inhabitants of which exceeded all the other clans in persecuting the followers of Muhammad. The darts of calumnious tongues, in alliance with blows of clubs and staves, were hurled upon him. But he escaped death, and lodged a pathetic complaint with the Apostle of God. The latter advised him to put up with the trial and "*return evil with good.*" The devotee followed the instructions in implicit obedience to the divine; but the measure could not abate the high floods of aggression. After sustaining cruelties for some time more, the poor helpless man came a second time to his master to repeat the same old complaint; but he received the same lesson with a good deal of emphasis on his "*overcoming the evil with good.*" Again matters came to a crisis, and he made for the prophet to remonstrate with him and make out a strong cause for himself, with the object of obtaining permission to pay the miscreants in the same coin, and exchange blows with them and break heads. But the Apostle was equal to the situation, and thoroughly cognisant of the arduous mission entrusted to him. He brought him round by holding converse with the noble sufferer to the following effect: "Do you make sure that injuries have been inflicted upon you?" "Yes, my Lord," said he, "I have been tormented unbearably." "Are you certain that you have been reciprocating evil with good?" "Certainly, my Lord, I have been doing them good!" "Well, then," rejoined the Apostle, "*If they do not refrain from doing evil, why should you refrain from practising good?*" The gentle words of the prophet brought relief, and raised the ideal of self-devotion and virtue in his eyes.

The instruction is in itself eloquent of the noble and magnanimous heart, and speaks volumes for the ideal example of toleration held up for imitation.

Let us consider in what theological evolution consists. Some six centuries before the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad, Jesus was commissioned by God to regenerate His flock. Jesus Christ, together with His disciples, was also confronted with similar difficulties; but His persecution soon came to an end by abruptly culminating in a most tragic end. It was not granted to Him to live among His disciples for a sufficiently long term, and consequently His teachings remained limited. Prophets undertake to educate and evolve the character of a nation. Such evolution involves time, which is the chief requisite for all growth—physical and mental, as well as moral. The limited space of time in which Jesus could perform His mission is responsible for the comparatively small degree of reform that He was able to effect. During that period of persecution complaints were naturally made to Him against the infidels. But the prophets, the wisest and most prudent type as they have been, adapt their injunctions to their environment and the capacities of their disciples. Christ taught them a lesson of passive obedience, as is exemplified by His tenets.

"If thou art smitten on the right cheek, turn the left also," is an illustration in point. No one should find fault with such doctrines. For doctrines are always warranted by the level of the development of disciples. You know that Christ is believed to be the son of a mechanic, and you also know the stamp of men that gathered round Him—octroi men, fishers and such like. No wonder, therefore, if you find such doctrines, emanating as they do from the lips of that Holy Man, in perfect accord with the requirements of time, and in entire harmony with the intellectual level of His people.

Jesus's doctrine of perfectly passive endurance evolves into the Lord Muhammad's forbearance and toleration combined with "*returning evil with good*." This evolution is endorsed by Christ Himself, while giving a description of the great powers of Muhammad and the intellectual and moral capacity of the people whom he was ordained to instruct in theology. The twelfth verse of the third chapter of St. John corroborates the assertion by reading thus: "If I have told you earthly things and you believe not, how shall you believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?" We read John again to this purpose: "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things*, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Muhammad was sure to "*teach all things*," for he was granted a long term of life, and an experience of many spheres of life, and had to pass the severe ordeal of change of condition. From an orphan he rose to the position of king. Muhammad (the choicest blessings of God be upon him!) has not only left us the Word of God, but also a detailed and elaborate code of jurisprudence, rules and regulations for the guidance of varied social conditions, but also ways of accomplishing union with God.

We find Jesus Christ grieving over His failure to effect the regeneration of men that were nerveless. On the other hand, we observe a grand evolution achieved by the Lord Mohammad in fostering a surprisingly true spirit of toleration and self-devotion in the stone-hearted Arabs, whose warlike blood, inherited from a long line of ancestors, could not brook any injury. It was more than a miraculous change that came over the Arabs. Lord Christ did not set the example in question personally, for we find him addressing the priests of the disbelievers as "*a generation of vipers*." In the case of Mohammad, we observe that toleration does not only flow from his lips, but also is practised when he enjoyed consummate political power. He enters in triumph the gates of Mecca with ten thousand saints, and facing his relentless enemies that had lavished atrocities on him and his for thirteen long winters, he declares a general pardon, and guarantees the safety of their property and their lives. This is obviously a very great evolution.

IDEALO DE DEMOKRATECO KAJ SOCIALISMO EN ISLAM.

“MIAJ Fratoj! Miaj devoj al vi estas multaj, kaj vi posedas rajtojn al kiuj mi devas klinigi. Unu estas, ke vi prizorgu ke mi ne malbone uzus la popola monon, alia estas ke mi ne malhelpus justajn mezurojn pri la revenuo de la nacio. Ke mi levigus viajn salariojn, ke mi protektas la landon, ke mi ne entiras vin en danĝeroj ne necesaj. Kiam mi eraras vi rajtas haltiganta min kaj mi devas fari laŭ via decido.”

Tiamaniere parolis unu el la plej altaj kaj bonegaj estroj de la mondo, Kalifo Umar, kiam li komencis lian regnon, nur kelkaj jaroj post la morto de Nia Sankta Profeto, kiu unue predikis la principojn de popola governmento al la tuta mondo en formo perfekta. Estas vere super ĉiu kritiko ke li dum lia tuta vivo agis konforme al tiuj ĉi vortoj en ilia gusta spirito. Lia bonkonata eldiro, “Ne ekzistas Kalifregno sen la Konsultado de la aro de Musulmanoj” estis la karaktereco de lia vivo kiel estro. Li ricevis por lia laboro pago praktike ne utila por vivi, lia cemizo estas malmola, maljuna, multe kudrita kaj sirita; fakte la tuta sumo li elspezis dum tago ne egalas unu silingo. Je la Komenco li ne akceptus ion de la “Bait-ul-Mal” (Nacia Monkesto) sed, poste, trovinte ke lia devoj kiel rego estis malhelpita pro liaj tagaj laboroj, kiujn li devas fari por obteni monon por vivi, li konsentis, sed lasis la aferon de lia salarion por la decido de la “Muglis-i-Shura” (La Konsilistoj), ankau de la Musulmanoj mem en la Musjido (Angle Mosque) je la semajne prego vendrede. Ili decidis ke li devas havi sumon suface por ordinarioj necesajoj.

GRAVECO DE POSICIO KIEL KALIFO.

Konciencaj Musulmanaj Regnoj ciam rigardis la posicio de Kalifo kiel tre gravega, kiel devo kiu bezonas iliaj plej bonaj laboroj kaj pensoj. Umar Bin Abdulazeer ekploris Kiam li li estis elektita. Li profesis agi fidele al la Musulmanoj, kaj iris al lia domo, ne rajdanta sur la stata Cevalo sed sur lia propra mulo. Lia edzino demandis al li la kauson de la plorado diranta. “Estas vere tempo por gojo kaj plezuro ke Musulmanoj elektis vin Kiel Cefo, respektanta vin Kiel la plej bona el ĉiuj la popoloj.” Li respondis kun voco tre peza “Malsagulo! ĉu vi ne komprenas ke mi prenis sur maj sultroj peza kaj devplena okupo, por ke mi devas prizorgi la vasta aro de Musulmanoj? Kiel vi povas pensi ke estas tago por gajeco car mi estas viro tre malrica?”

LA IDOJ DE LA KALIFO EN ILIAJ FESTAJ ROBOJ.

La sekvanta historio saĝnas stranga al ni de tiuj ĉi tagoj, sed ĝia vereco neniam oni dubis. Estas vere objekta leksiono

por Socialisto en la Okcidento. Li povas, post la legado de tiuj ci artikolon, diri ke liaj demandoj ke la elspezoj de la regaj personoj de Europo estus limitigita, ne estas ideo de "Utopia."

Okazis unu el la "Ids" (Festa-tago) kaj lau la historio, la infanoj de la Kalifo havis vestaĵojn malbone sirtajn; lia edzino insistis ke li acetu por ili novajn vestaĵojn. Umar II plendis ke nenio restis de la pago kiun li ricevis por la taga laboro. Lia edzino proponis ke li petos la monon por la venonta tago, de la "Bait-ul-Mal." La visago de la Kalifo rugigis kun kolero, kaj li respondis furioze "Cu vi estas certa ke mi vivos gis morgau ke mi havos oportunon labori por la monon, kiun mi ricevus hodiau?" Oni devas memori ke tiu ci okazis kiam la Kalifo estis unu el la plej potencaj regoj de la epoko, kaj li estis estro de la mondo de Hindujo gis Maroko.

Ne estas sole la Kalifoj kiuj simbolis praktike la doktrinoj de Muslima Fracteco. Ec la plej malrica Musulmanoj estis korplena de tiu ci spirito. Dum la milito en Sham (Angle: Syria) la Romanoj kiuj estis Kristianoj estis ce Baisan Kaj la Muslima armeo ce Fahl. Ne estis longa tempo de la venkigo de la Kristanoj en la batalo de Damishq (Angle: Damascus) en 14 A.H. (14 jaroj post la tempo Kiam la Sankta Profeto Muhammad (Angle: Mahomet) lasis Mecca (Meka) por Medina. La Muslima kalendaro de tiam komencio. La Kristianoj faris cion por aresti la progreso de la Muslimoj. Ili akvigis la tuton landon inter Baisan kaj Fahl sed vane. La Muslimoj antaŭen iris, kaj tiam la Kristanoj petis ke Abu Ubaida, la saga generalo de la Muslima armeo, sendus reprezentivo por arangi pacon. Ma'az iris tien. La Kristana kampo estas plena do luksaĵoj kaj Ma'az ne volis sidigi sur io fabrikita de la laborego kaj sklaveco de la malfeliciaj malriculoj. Tial li sidis sur la ne kovrita planko. La Kristianoj bedaŭris ke li ne permesu ke ili honorigi lin, kaj ne volis ke la kulpon resti sur iliaj sultroj. Ma'az ne povis helpi ekkrianta "Mi tute ne zorgas por tio kion vi pensas estas honoro. Se sklavoj sidis tiamaniere mi gojas ke mi estas humila servisto de Dio." La Kristianoj estis miregita je lia elparolo, kaj demandis cu estis iu pli sankta ol li mem en la Muslima armeo, al kiu li respondis ekselente "Suficas por mi scii ke mi ne estas la plej malestiminda de miaj frataj soldatoj." Post konversacio pri la aferoj por rapidigi pacon Ma'az eldiris la sekvantajn vortojn. "Se vi akceptos Islam vi igos niaj fratoj. Vi havas regon kiu estas la sola majstro de viaj vivoj kaj estaĵoj, sed nia rego ne agas kiel se li estis super de ni. Se, Dio malpermesu, li stelos'aŭ faras io ajn pekojn, ni punos lin laŭ la kutima metodo. Li ne logas en palaco kaj ni povas ciam alproksimigi al li. Ec en mondaĵ trezuroj li ne estas pli rica ol aliaj Musulmanoj."

Tradukita de

KHALID SHELDRAKE.

الأمر يا مرنا بان نشرك بالله تعالى بل انه يريد ان نعدم ما في قلوبنا
 و اعنى بذلك توحيد الله تعالى - ثم لا ينبغي قبل نزول القرآن الكريم
 ان اكثر الناس كانوا يعبدون الشمس والقمر والكواكب
 والرياح والياه والنار والقيم والشجر والمدد والمعبود لا غير
 خادما فلذلك ان ابواب جميع العلوم قد سدت في ذلك الزمان
 ولما نزل القرآن الكريم وبشرنا واعلمنا بان جميع هذه الاشياء
 خلقت لاجلنا واجل منا فعنا وان الله تعالى قد سخرها لنا -
 وجعلها تحت طوعنا فعند ذلك ابواب جميع العلوم الجديدة
 فأنظر والى صد امة القرآن الكريم حيث بين ان الله تعالى
 سخر لنا ما في السموات وما في الارض وجعلها خادمة لنا وقد
 تبين بان قبل نزول القرآن الكريم ما توجه احد الى العلوم الجديدة
 ولما ظهر الاسلام شرعت الناس باخذ العلوم الجديدة حتى ترقوا
 شيئا بعد شيء فلهذه حسنة عظيمة من حسنات الاسلام على
 الناس ولكن تأسف على حالة المسلمين في هذا الزمان حيث
 يجنون بانفسهم بانهم موحدون ولكن تشهد علينا انما
 غير ذلك - نعم اذ لم نهي شيئا فنحن مشركون في كل شيء
 غير موحدين لله تعالى فالشيء الاول لا بد ان نعمل كما لا مل
 والثاني ان نجعل جميع تلك الاشياء تحت طوعنا ونستعملها
 لخدمتنا لا ان الله تعالى سخرها لنا وجعلها تحت تصرفنا
 فيا ايها المسلمون لا يطلق علينا اسم التوحيد الا وان فعلنا
 بما نقرأ وان الله ولي العالمين + المترجم +
 محمد عبد الحمى الحديدي (مولوي فاضل)

فاذا فكر العاقل ونظر الى هذه الآثار والنعم التي لا تحصى جبل قلبه
 على حب الله تعالى وعبدته العباداة الخاصة التي لا يشوبها شرك
 ووحده التوحيد الكامل وتوكل في قلبه بعد هذه العقيدة الكاملة
 امران احدهما بان ما سوى الله جل شانه مخدق مثلنا ^{والله}
 ان جميع ما في الكائنات خلق له جلنا وتحت تصرفنا كما قال
 تعالى (ولقد كرمنا بني آدم وعملناهم في البر والبحر ورزقناهم
 من الطيبات وفضلناهم على كثير ممن خلقنا تفضيلاً) وقال
 تعالى (سنخر لكم الفلك لتجري في البحر بأمره وسنخر لكم الانهار
 سنخر لكم الشمس والقمر والأنبياء وسنخر لكم الليل والنهار)
 وقال تعالى (الم تروا ان الله سنخر لكم ما في السموات وما في
 الارض) فلا شك ولا ريب ان الله جل شانه فضلنا على جميع ^{الكل}
 بل سنخر ما فيها لنا ^{عليها} وتحت تصرفنا لا تخفى ايضاً ان ما في الكون
 قسمان انسان وغيره فنوع بني الانسان على حد سواء
 واما غيره فهو خادوم لنا كما صرح الله تعالى في الايات القرآنية
 فاذا تدقق الانسان بان جميع بني نوعه على حد سواء كمثله
 والله يقدر على ان ياتي بالاعمال والافعال والخلق التي
 تصد من بني نوعه فتقوى همته وترفع وعنده
 ذلك يقصد الوصول باجتهاد الى الدرجة التي وصل
 اليها غيره من بني نوعه فهذا هو التوحيد البحت لان
 درجة الالهية خاصة بالاله جلّت عظمتُه لانه خالق
 ومن مخلوقه - واذا امرنا احد بان نصل الى درجة ومنزلة
 هي ليست من جنسنا بل هي فوق طاقتنا كالالهية فهذا

فدبحان الذي بيده ملكوت كل شيء) وقال تعالى (ان الله على كل شيء قدير) وقال تعالى (ان الله له ملك السموات والارض وما لكم من دونه من وحي ولا نصير) وقال تعالى (ليس كمثله شيء وهو السميع البصير) وقال تعالى (فاعلم انه لا اله الا الله) وقال تعالى (وكان الله بكل شيء محيط) وقال تعالى (ان في خلق السموات والارض واختلاف الليل والنهار والفلك التي تجري في البحر بما ينفع الناس وما انزل الله من السماء من ماء فاحيي به الارض بعد موتها وبث فيها من كل دابة وتصريف الرياح والسحاب المسخر بين السماء والارض الايات لقوم يعقلون) فان من اجمال فكره في هذه المعجزات وادار نظره على عجائب خلق الله تعالى في الارض والسموات وما فيهما من العجائب والغرائب ومن اختلاف الليل والنهار بالزيادة والتقصان والمجيئ والذهاب مع تعاقبهما على ذلك بحالة منتظمة لا يتغيران مهما تعاقبت الفصول وتوالت الاعوام ومن الفلك التي تجري على الماء لينتفع الناس بها في امور معاشهم ومن انزال الماء من السماء فتنبث الارض بعد يبسها وتنتشر فيها الدواب بما تاكله من ذلك النبات ومن تصريف الرياح وتقلبها جنوبا وشمالا وشرق وغربا حارة وباردة ومن الغيم المسخر بين السماء والارض بلا علة تمنعه من السقوط ولا ممسك يحسكه يهبط حيث شاء الله تعالى شانه لا يستدل على كمال قدرته ونهائه عظمته واحاطة علمه وسعة كرسيه وعلو شأنه سبحانه ما اعظم شأنه سبحانه اللهم وبحمدك وتبارك اسمك وجلت عظمك

فهذا دليل قاطع على ابطال الوهيّة المسيح ابن مريم عليه السلام
 لأن بعثته لنا في لباس الالهية من البش المحض لأن ارادتنا
 ووجدنا تناو وترقياً تنا الى ارج الكمال وحدته بكمال الانسانية
 فقط فلا بد ان يكون هادينا ومرشداً لنا من نوع البشر انساناً
 كاملاً مكتملاً لا غير لنا بشر محتاجون مُحدَثون محاطون
 لا علم لنا فيما يكون غداً ولا قدرة لنا بالجماد معدوم وان الله
 جل وعلى قادر على كل شيء خالق كل شيء عليم بذات الصدور
 غنى عن كل شيء لا تجرى عليه الغفلات ولا البداوات بل لا
 تتغير ذاتة ولا تتبدل صفاته ولا تختلف حالته قائم
 بنفسه غنى عن غيره كما قال تعالى (خلق السموات بغير عمد
 ترونها والقوى في الارض راسياً ان تميز بكم وبش فيها من كل
 دابة وانزلنا من السماء ماءً فانبثنا فيها من كل زوج كريم
 هذا خلق الله فاروقى ما ذا خلق الذين من دونهم) وقال
 تعالى (ولقد آتينا لقمان الحكمة ان اشكر لله ومن يشكر
 فانما يشكر لنفسه ومن كفر فان الله غنى حميد) وقال
 تعالى (وعند مفاتيح الغيب لا يعلمها الا هو) وقال تعالى
 (بدع السموات والارض) وقال تعالى وخلق كل شيء وهو بكل
 شيء عليم ذكركم الله ربكم لا اله الا هو خالق كل شيء فاعبدوه وهو
 على كل شيء وكيل لا تدركه الابصار وهو يدرك الابصار
 وهو اللطيف الخبير) وقال تعالى اوليس الذي خلق
 السموات والارض بقادر على ان يخلق مثلهم بلاء وهو
 الخلاق العليم انما امره اذا اراد شيئاً ان يقول له كن فيكون

وقال تعالى (كما ارسلنا فيكم رسولاً منكم) وقد بين الله عز وجل
 في صيغة هؤلاء الرسل وحكمة ارسالهم في قوله (رسلنا مبشرين
 ومنذرين لئلا يكون للناس على الله حجة بعد الرسل وكان الله
 عزيزاً حكيمًا) فبشرى لنا ثم نبشرى لنا معشر المسلمين ان الله تعالى
 قد بعث فينا رسوله الكريم محمد العزى الذى فداه اى واسى
 من جنسنا كما قال تعالى فيه فى الآية المذكورة الصدر اقل انما
 انا بشر مثلكم فهذه بشارة عظيمة لانها منبع الترقيات الى
 ارفع الدرجات - وان اخلاقنا وسيرتنا واعمالنا جميعاً هي
 نقل لسيرة الرسل وما هم عليه من الادب والحاسنى الانسانية
 لان من فطرة الانسان التاثر والافعال والنقل من اخلاق
 اهل جنسه وبني نوعه مثلاً نطقنا واكلنا وشرابنا بل جميع
 خرواتنا وسكناتنا كلها نقل بعض من بعض لاننا بشر فخذ
 مكارم اخلاقنا من جنسنا البشرى - نعم لو كنا من الملكة فلد
 من الهداية والمرشد بين لنا ان يكونوا من الملكة كما قال تعالى
 (ولو جعلناه ملكاً لجعلناه رجلاً) وقال تعالى ز قل لو كان فى الوجود
 ملكة لم يكون مطعونين لنزلنا عليهم ملكاً رسولاً فحق
 لنا ملكة فكيف نكون الهة فهل فى قوانا قدرة الالهية
 او هل اراد الله بنا بان نكون الهة او هل رضع الله تعالى
 استعداد الالهية فينا فاذ لم يكن هذا كله فاق حاجتنا
 بهادير سله الله لنا الهاً فالا هنا هو الله تعالى لا غير الله -
 ارسل لنا رسلاً من جنسنا يهدونا الى ما يحبّه ويرضاه
 كما قال عز وجل (ان كنتم تحبون الله فاتبعونى يحبكم الله)

توحيد المولود سبي نر وتعالى

قل انما انا بشر مثلكم يوحى الى انما الهكم الله واحد فنى كان
يرجو لقاء ربه فليعمل عملاً صالحاً ولا يشرك بعبادة ربه احداً
ان الله تعالى خلق الخلق وطبعهم على اخلاق حسنة تساعدهم
على انتظامهم في احوالهم واخلاقها انما لا جل ان يتسابقوا بها
في عمارة هذا الكون الذى قدر وجودهم فيه الى اجل معلوم لكن
لما كان تحديد الرغبة في السبق يوجب كل راغب عند حده
وياسه من مجاوزته وبذلك تتعطل حركة المسابقة لم
تعدل الا خلق في اصل الفطرة فصارت تلك الا خلق
السيئة في معرض الطغيان والوصول الى حية يصبح بدء
ضررها الكبر من نفعها لذلك اقتضت رحمة الله تعالى بعلمه
بمخاض اختياره ان يرسل لهم هداً ومرشدين من جنسهم
فطرحهم على الا خلق الفاضلة والصفات الكاسلة واطلعهم على
مكان الا خلق واسرارها وكيفية علاجها ودرجة الاعتدال
منها اليهدوهم ويرشدوهم الى ما فيه صلاحهم وتقويم
اخرهم وتهذيب نفوسهم ويتنولوا الخير ليتبعوه والشر
ليجتنبوه ويردوهم الى حد الاعتدال في مثل هذه الا خلق
قال الله عز وجل (لقد من الله على المؤمنين اذ بعث فيهم رسولاً
من انفسهم يتلو عليهم آياته ويزكيهم ويعلمهم الكتاب والحكمة
وان كانوا من قبل لفي ضلال مبين) وقال تعالى (وما ارسلنا من
قبلك الا رجالاً نوحى اليهم من اهل القرى) وقال تعالى (وما ارسلنا
من قبلك الا رجالاً نوحى اليهم فاستلوا اهل الذكر ان كنتم لاتعلمون)

اسلامک ریویو کی قیمت میں اضافہ

موجودہ ضرورتوں کے مقابل رسالہ کا حجم کافی نہ تھا اسلئے سروسٹ رسالہ
قریباً ڈیوڑا کر دیا ہے۔ آئندہ ممکن ہے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یار سالہ مہینہ میں
دو بار ہو جائے قیمت سال روان اس وقت بعض سے بحاب پانچ روپہ وصول
ہو رہی ہے۔ اور یہ قیمت رسالہ سات روپہ کر دی ہے۔ اسلئے میں ان احباب
کے خدمت میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ یہ رسالہ تاجرانہ اصول پر نہیں چلایا گیا۔
غرض یہ ہے کہ اسکی قیمت سب کا بیان مفت غیر مسلم دنیا میں تقسیم ہوں۔ اسلئے
رسالہ کی اس غرض کو مد نظر رکھ کر اگر یہ احباب خود بخود زائید قیمت لے لیاں
میں پیچیدہ بین نوادوں کی غنائت والہ میں یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑنا ہوں۔ یہ رسالہ
تو یہی مافی عوفہ ہے کہ اسلام کا خوشنہدہ چہرہ نہ صرف غیر اسلامی دنیا پر چمکے
لگتا ہے بلکہ خود انگریزی خوان مسلم طبقہ اسلام کا عاشق ہوتا جاتا ہے
خود بخود قلوب میں تبلیغ دین کا خاص جوش پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ کل اسلامی دنیا
از سر نو اصلی اسلامی زندگی کی طرف آرہی ہے۔ جن خدایاران رسالہ کا سال
کسی درمائی ماہ سے شروع ہوا ہے وہ بھی اگر گذشتہ سن کا نمبر منگو اگر حباب
شروع سال سے درست کر دین تو رسالہ سے بہت سا بوجہ ہلکا ہو جائیگا۔
لیونکہ متفرق حباب علی کی زیادتی کو چاہتے ہیں اور یہاں گالاش نہیں۔
یہی غرض تو یہ ہے کہ حقدار ممکن ہو یہ رسالہ مفت تقسیم ہو۔ سو اس میں
جو یہ امانتہ بنائے وہ عند اللہ اپنے آپ کو ماجر کرے۔

خواجہ کمال الدین Khwaja Kamaluddin

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

To meet the complaints of such of our readers and subscribers as may not happen to receive particular numbers of the *Islamic Review*, the undersigned requests them to inform him to once.

SH. NOORAF MAD, Manager.

The Mosque, Woking, England.