

[Price 6d. each.]

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

RELIGION, ETHICS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, ART, COMMERCE.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

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

VOL. II.]

JUNE 1914.

[No. 5.]

Contents.

PAGE

The Awakening of a Mind. By ALICE WELCH	193
Baptism with Water and Fire: Explained	194
The Kikuyu Controversy	198
The Rev. de Wendte on the Kikuyu Conference	200
The Universal Religion	201
The Bishop of Winchester at Woking, and Islam	206
The Dying Forces of which—Christianity or Islam?	212
The Continuation of God's Blessings. By LORD HEADLEY	217
A Most Warlike Religion. By J. M. PEEBLES, M.D., M.A., Ph.D.	220
Adrianople. By BEATRICE	223
The Messenger. By J. PARKINSON	224
The Study of Arabic by Indians. By MAULVI MUHAMMUD AHMAD, M.A., Lt.M., Ph.D.	234
The Woking Mosque Lectures:—	
"The True Catholic Faith"	240
The Mosque Lecture on Atonement	242
The Necessity of Islam in the Presence of Christianity and other Religions	243

Price Six Shillings per annum post free in advance; and in India Rs. 7.

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

London:

J. S. PHILIPS, 99 SHOE LANE, E.C.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

JUNE 1914.

[No. 5

THE AWAKENING OF A MIND.

“O GOD of life, Eternal God of love,”
Look down upon my storm-tossed soul to-day
And send a ray of light from Heaven above
To penetrate the gloom and show the way.

The Christ-religion taught me when in tenderest of ages
Filled my mind, untroubled yet by worldly thought or care,
A baby mind and capable to only mimic prayer;
But as I read the book of life I had to turn its pages.

Islamic teaching says of gods there is but one ;
Christians say that I must worship God and Christ His Son ;
I hear of idols heathens have for gods in lands afar,
My mind is wakening and one God must be my guiding star.

Now when years have passed and all my thoughts are free,
The silent prayers of the Muslim faith have a strong appeal to me,
I reverence Christ as prophet great and messenger Divine,
But want to send my prayers to God straight to his heart from
mine.

ALICE WELCH.

Woking.

BAPTISM WITH WATER AND FIRE : EXPLAINED.

ISLAM—THE BAPTISM OF GOD.

*I, indeed, baptise you with water unto repentance ;
but he that cometh after me is mightier than I,
whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall
baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.—*

St. Matt. iii. 11.

BAPTISM with water is a legacy from Judaism to Christianity. It could outlive the fatal influence of Pauline teachings, which relieved the adherents of the Church of Christianity from the burden of the Commandments. But if the law was the curse, as we infer from the writings of St. Paul, and its observance unnecessary, is not the adoption and continuance of the Jewish rite of initiation to righteousness in the Church of Christ an anomaly? And if the sacred custom is observed to symbolise the new dispensation, the said ceremony, in fulfilment of the words quoted above, if they applied to Jesus Christ, should be performed with fire and not with water. We need not at present enter here into the question of the Holy Ghost—a Being imperceptible in Himself and often not recognisable when translated into the actions and deeds of those baptised in the Church : a question which demands a strange kind of orthodoxy of the faith to believe in Him.

BAPTISM IN THE CHURCH NOT WITH THE HOLY GHOST.

Besides, the symbol of the Holy Ghost is fire and not water, as the words of the holy Baptist show, and so It made Its appearance in "cloven tongue like as of fire." But the subsequent absolute disappearance of such experience in the Church as we read in the second chapter of the Acts, accompanied with the fact that Jesus and His Church never made use of fire when initiating people into His kingdom, leads one to believe that the Baptist did not allude to the Son of Mary but to someone else for the full application of the words in the above quotation. The words, however, were true. They had their own meanings. In order to divine their spirit we should not forget the low intellectual growth of the people they were addressed to. Their rational faculty was in its infancy. For lack of proper understanding in His disciples Jesus had also to speak in parables. Great teachers of religion in other parts of the world in those days experienced the same difficulty. Similes and metaphors were the chief means of imparting religious truths to the uninitiated. It could not be taught to them in the abstract.

SYMBOLISM SUITS CHILD HUMANITY.

Symbolism worked well. As dolls are necessary to amuse children, so idols and other symbols were placed before child man, as Lord Krishna says, to bring him to his God. But ours is an age of advancement, and symbolism should give place to realities. Disregard of this fact only has caused all the difficulties in approaching religion in its purity. Men otherwise intellectually advanced show a want of common sense in matters of religion. They forget their time in accepting symbols for reality and figures of speech for facts. So is the case with Baptism. This ceremony among the Jews was performed on reaching a certain age. Till then strict observance of the law was not demanded. Minority of age was taken as responsible for all defaults. But after Baptism fulfilment of all righteousness was expected. We use water in cleansing things from all impurities; we wash ourselves to remove all physical uncleanness from our body. So a Jew was plunged into a tank or a river at his baptism to signify that he will purge himself of his past impurities—moral and spiritual—and prepare for a new life. The rite, as well as the idea of the new life, which came to Christianity through Jewish channels, was not peculiar to Judaism. The Hindus and the Zoroastrians do the same thing till now. The hair of a Hindu child at the ceremony of *Mundean* are cut and he is bathed in a river. Then comes the ceremony of the investiture of the Sacred Thread—a symbol of the new life—as the wearing of the Cross with Christians of certain persuasions.

Symbolism, as stated above, works well with races intellectually less advanced. But it is not free from its drawbacks. Signs, when taken for realities, lead to wrong beliefs and false doctrines. Baptism could not stand above this general rule. Baptism in the name of Christ, it is alleged, causes a miraculous transformation in one's life. It infuses a new spirit, and secures righteousness. With some sects of Christians, plunging into water in the name of Christ makes one sinless; so much so, that the baptised stands no more in need of the observance of the law. Some are so sanguine of its efficacy that the subsequent delinquencies of one who has once been baptised in the name of Christ cannot mar its effects. Once baptised and you are saved. The time for such belief, however, has passed, though the missionary uses the same teaching in the East. He excites terror, and suggests baptismal water as the only agency to extinguish the fire of hell; hence his success with only the most ignorant. Symbols are, after all, symbols; they bring no light or culture. They act when our mind works under superstition and is in its infancy. With the growth of culture and knowledge, they should give way to the great verities of life.

Islam, the final development of the religion of God, appeared when the age of reason and general intellectual culture was near

its dawn. It therefore taught religion on rational bases ; it divested it of all ritual coverings, and showed its face in its true colour ; realities were manifested out of symbols and signs, and a flood of light was thrown on the mysteries of Divine teachings. *Sabagh* is the Arabic equivalent for the word *Baptism*. It literally means to dip a thing into dye. "Baptism, or the colour of God, is Islam," so says our Holy Book. When we dip a thing into a dye, it loses its original colour and assumes a new one. The object of Baptism is the same : to be at one with God, and to walk humbly with Him. We cannot attain this spiritual state unless we lose our very existence into that of God, which means to lose our own colour and adopt that of God. John the Baptist meant the same thing when he referred to baptism with fire. When a thing is put into fire it apparently loses its own entity, and assumes the colours and attributes of fire. Divine baptism is to plunge into that fire, to consume our own entity and to be like a dead person in the hand of God, with no personal will, nor exercise of our own discretion, but absolute submission to His Will and implicit obedience to His Commandment. This is the literal meaning of Islam. Hence the words of the Quran, which say : "Islam is the Baptism of God." Thus we find in Islam the true interpretation of the words of John the Baptist.

BAPTISM WITH WATER UNTO REPENTANCE.

The Baptist spoke simple truth when he said : "I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance." If you wish to get a proper dye on a cloth, you cannot do so unless your cloth is perfectly clean of all spots. If not, you have to wash it with water before dipping it into dye. So says John : You have to wash your unclean spiritual linen with the water of repentance before you plunge into the *fire* or the *dye* of God. The baptismal ceremony in the Church may be taken as a verity in its symbolical form, but it is with water and hence a preparation ; we have still to walk humbly with God, to lose our own self, and to be at one with God—*i.e.*, to be dyed in the dye of God. The questions then arise : How to do it ? Where is that fire of God which may burn ourselves and give us its own shape and attributes ?

In order to answer these questions we should first try to find the elements of our 'self.' What constitutes chiefly our entity ? It is our will, our discretion, and our judgment. This gives us our independent entity. This only differentiates us from the rest of the universe. When we subordinate our will to that of the other, morally speaking, we lose our very existence. Is it not more difficult to plunge into burning fire than to yield to the opinions of others ? To baptise yourself with fire, therefore, is to immolate your will before the will of God : and this means Islam. Hence the Quranic text : Islam is the Baptism of God. *Baptism with water is a preparation for baptism with fire.*

If the ceremony performed at the birth of a child, combined with the rite of Confirmation at the age of discretion, creates in him true subordination to the will of God, the pouring of water or plunging into the font in the church in the name of Christ is really a baptism with fire. But this is not one's experience. In spite of all baptismal functions true Christian life has become rare.

We all are, more or less, self-willed. Our will requires training and discipline. Besides, unless we have the revealed will of God before us, we have nothing to be subordinate to. In every hour of life we have to use our will. Unless there are two courses before us, one dictated by our own will, and the other prescribed by God, there is no occasion for us to subordinate our will to that of God. How short-sighted was St. Paul who dispensed with the observance of the law ; in it lay the whole discipline—the only course which could bring us to the altar of God for self-immolation, and to plunge into the Divine fire.

DECISION BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM.

The whole problem resolves itself into one question : Does baptism in the name of Christ and our belief in the cross miraculously transform us into at-one-ment with God ; does it paralyse all our bestial passions and desires and make us but as automaton in the hand of God ? If so, we are really baptised with fire. But if to reach that high state of Resignation to God we require a course of discipline, a training under which we have to learn how to win the victory for God in the daily struggle in our life between our will and that of the Most High, and between our discretion and desire and those of the Almighty, we do need the law and external guidance ; and the whole reasoning of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans seems to be absolutely fallacious, and Jesus appears to be the true Messenger of God in saying :—

" Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least Commandments and shall teach them so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven ; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Jesus in these words taught Islam—the gospel of obedience and commandment. But His religion saw its first perversion at the hand of St. Paul, which became complete at the Council of Nice. God sent Muhammad as the comforter to guide the world unto all truth (St. John xvi. 7, 8). He taught the religion of God in its true proportion.

To bring complete death on our own passions and desires is the baptism with fire. If we succeed in doing so, we are in the position to imbue ourself with Divine attributes, this being baptism with the Holy Ghost. Like an iron in the fire, we lose our own colour and attributes, and become like fire ; heat exudes

from us, and we perform all its functions. When that stage is reached God becomes as our limbs and joints, our hands are His hands, our eyes are His eyes, and our feet are His feet. We work wonders and perform miracles. If Christianity in its present form produces such results, Baptism in the Cross is baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, and if these things have become extinct in the annals of the Christian Church, and the old records are new stories and myths, the baptism referred to by John the Baptist was Islam.

THE KIKUYU CONTROVERSY.

ONE salient point stands out in marked contrast to the pitiable division of Christian opinion on this matter, and that is the unity of Islam. Lord George Hamilton says: "The same spirit of narrow and blind secretarianism which ruined African Christianity thirteen centuries ago again rears its head, again endeavours to facilitate the victory of united Mohammadanism over discordant Christianity." The Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A., says: "The advance of a united Mohammedanism makes unity imperative—God has need of every convert to resist it's assaults." And again, "The advanced guard of the Moslem invaders who appeal with such successful force to the heathen dwelling in the crude ignorance of fetichism, Christianity has to face a dead mass of Heathenism and a united Mohammedanism."

If the missionaries feel that they preach God's word to the African, why then this fear of Islam? Here is a lesson to the world. Christianity stands openly confessed as a failure by the discordant divisions into which it has fallen. Two liberal-minded Bishops try to produce the true spirit of charity, and to consolidate these varying sects so far away from the Mother Country to which they belong, and another Bishop charges them with "heresy." Again we are face to face with that eternal problem: "What is Christianity?" At the present day there are 490 odd different sects of Christians, each one calling itself the "only true faith." Can all be correct? Each condemning the other as "lost" because they differ in their tenets. Oh, where is the real teaching of Jesus? Rome stands majestically aloof, while Protestantism is a seething cauldron of doubt and discord. May I venture to quote a verse from the Holy Kuran: "As to those who split up their religion and become sects, have thou nothing to do with them: their affair is with God only. Hereafter shall He tell them what they have done." Commenting on this, the Rev. J. M. Rodwell, M.A. (author of a translation of the Holy Kuran), says: "Muhammad had a just appreciation of that narrowness of mind which is the characteristic of sectarians in every age, who seize upon some

point of truth through inability to grasp the whole in its due proportion and bearing, and glory in it as if the fragment were the whole." Does not this apply with all force to present-day Christianity, which thus stands condemned by the words of one of its most learned priests? Turn to Islam, and we find that although the widest liberty of thought is allowed, yet Muslims are one the whole world over, and can worship in any Mosque in all lands. Can a Christian, tied by the tenets of his particular sect, enter a church or chapel of another denomination and worship with unity of spirit with others of a different heading to his own. Will a Baptist enter an Anglican church, or a Methodist a Catholic cathedral? Miss A. Small, in her book "Islam" (under the heading of "The Failure of Christianity"), says: "The story of Islam, the Church which has grown up side by side with the Church of Christ, is laden with suggestions upon this subject of the failure of the latter to bring in the Kingdom of the Father. There is another Christian idea suggested by a study of Islam which emerges from the last: the idea of Brotherhood of the Father's children. This is of the very essence of Christianity as it is of Islam, but has never been carried into effect in the same magnificent way. There are various illustrations of this: the absence of all caste distinctions in Muslim society, the kindly relations which exist between master and servant, rich and poor, Mussulman of various races. Christianity has much to learn in these directions. Again, the desires to bring men within the Brotherhood is a passion with every Muslim." Again she writes: "The Muslim is never ashamed to confess his faith: his devotion to God and his loyalty to the Prophet are not matters too sacred for conversation. They are his deepest life, wherefore should he shun reference to them? When as much can be said of the members of each Christian Church much will be gained." Again, speaking of controversy between Christian and Muslim: "Discussions and arguments end as they began. But there is a soul of honour in him, and a fair approach meets, as a rule, with a fair response."

"'You have read the Quran? Bring me a Bible,' said a *bigoted* Muslim woman to the writer, 'shall we talk the matter over quietly? Tell me of your faith and of what it means to you; and will you give me also a hearing.'" One fails to see why this writer uses the word "bigoted" here: is not this toleration and fair play in the highest form? These qualities possessed by Islam, which have drawn forth the admiration of Christians and so led them to compare their own faith with Islam to the disadvantage of the former, must make the unbiassed thinker wonder why it would be such a terrible calamity if Africa should eventually become (as it is rapidly doing) Muslim. What can Christianity offer in place of these qualifications possessed by the religion which it fears as a serious rival? Let the Christian Church stop this senseless missionary propaganda, seek the

truth and put her house in order, then when she has settled her internal dogmatic differences, and is, like Islam, united, she can then think of sending her preachers to others. The Kikuyu dispute and its settlement is regarded with interest by Muslim and Christian alike, as it has shown to the world the superiority of Islam over the petty bickerings existing in Christendom after 2,000 years of Christianity, which has proved such a lamentable failure. Truly the pioneers of Islam are needed to teach the West the virtue they so lack, and that is—charity.

BERTRAND TADRONA.

THE REV. DE WENDTE ON THE KIKUYU CONFERENCE.

OUR readers will be interested to read the following from the able pen of Dr. C. W. Wendte, of the great Liberal Christian Movement, Boston, America, who, since we met him at Paris, has rightly claimed our reverence for his ability, broadmindedness and charitable spirit. In him we find a great coadjutor in the great cause of seeing one universal religion of obedience to God and love to humanity established. His indefatigable efforts have already inspired many to carry olive branches to the jarring elements in the world of religion. He will find in us a most willing, helping hand in the great cause ever present to his mind. We, however, are indebted to the right reverend doctor for the good spirit he always shows in dealing with Islam. The extract given below forms the concluding portion of an article which appeared in the last number of the *Christian Register*:—

“The historic conference at Kikuyu, on the railroad between Mombasa and Uganda in East Africa, was excellent for its attempts at Christian unity, but of what real value is a federation of Protestants which accepts as its basis the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, the ‘absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the word of God’ and ‘the atoning death of our Lord as the ground of our forgiveness’? Is any revival of foreign missionary work in Africa to be hoped for from such an exhibition of mediævalism? And, meanwhile, Islam, with its simple doctrine of one God, the Father, and all men brothers, is sweeping the Dark Continent.”

ALLAH AL-MAJID ! Thy favour grant that we may keep this Covenant.

EDWIN ARNOLD.

THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

THE REV. DR. J. T. SUNDERLAND, while presiding over the All-India Theistic Conference held at Karachi in December last, delivered a very inspiring and thoughtful address on the unification of nations on the basis of religion. In the course of his address he made the following remarks :—

“Man’s earliest idea of human brotherhood was necessarily narrow and limited, because men’s relations with one another were limited. First, there was brotherhood within the family, but no further. Later, it widened to take in the clan or the tribe, but did not extend beyond that. Still later, as tribes or clans united to form nations, the brotherhood idea enlarged and became national. But outside the nation all peoples were still regarded as aliens and barbarians, against whom it was proper to wage war and from whom it was right to take by force lands, flocks and herds and other property, slaughtering captives or making slaves of them at the pleasure of the conquerors. The thought of brotherhood extending without limit, and carrying with it duties and responsibilities to all men everywhere, was very slow in making its appearance.

“Nor was this strange. Men could not get the idea of one humanity until first they had the idea of one world; and until recent times there was no such thing known as one world.

“The countries of the earth were simply so many fragments of a world, bearing only the slightest relation to one another. Japan was a country by itself, hardly known by any beyond its neighbours. China was a country largely isolated from the rest of the world. The same was true of India. Europe was a continent off by itself, in early ages having little intercourse with other parts of the earth. The great double continent of America was not even known to exist until about four centuries ago. Australia was hidden in distant seas until very recent times. The vast interior of Africa remained an unknown land up to our own generation. Thus all these lands of the earth were mere unrelated fragments of a world.

“But now a great change has taken place. Within our generation the world for the first time has become really one. How has this been brought about? By many causes. Exploration and discovery by land and sea have made all parts known, even to the tops of high mountains, and the seemingly inaccessible North and South Poles. Trade and commerce, railways and telegraphs, cables under seas and wireless messages over seas and lands, postal systems, world-wide finance, travels, newspapers and literature circulating everywhere—these things, like shuttles, have woven all parts of the earth together and made them into one, and constituted all the peoples of the world for the first time really one humanity.

"The consequences flowing from this unification of the world must necessarily be great. Since we have now one world and one human family, the family must learn to live together in peace and goodwill. This is absolutely vital. Antagonisms between people far apart and having little relation are comparatively harmless, but antagonisms inside a family are fatal. This means that the most imperative, the most pressing question now before the whole world is how to promote human brotherhood, how to enable the great newly created world-family of nations and races to live together without destroying one another. Human brotherhood is good in whatever form it appears. It is particularly important, however, that it be promoted in *four directions*—namely, between races, between nations, between individuals and classes (social and industrial brotherhood), and between religions."

The world has become like one flock, and needs only one shepherd also. That there ought to be one universal religion to bring human brotherhood under Divine Fatherhood has been an ideal of many and is a popular desire. Every religion in these days claims to be the universal religion. This in itself proves the same general demand for one religion. Religious differences are really responsible for all the hatred and discord which dis-integrates the whole fabric of human society. Race and colour prejudices only come in the train of religious prejudice. To secure the universal Brotherhood of Man under the Universal Fatherhood of God demands one common tie, and religion can only serve this purpose. But opinion deserving weight and respect is found also on the other side. This very topic was taken up last year in the Religions Congress of the Liberals held at Paris. "Is a universal religion possible or desirable: If so, how is it to be attained?" was the question which opened a most interesting discussion in the Congress.

DR. OTTO ON A UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

The first speaker was Prof. Rudolf Otto, of Goettingen, a distinguished student of religions. His address was thought to be one of the most important utterances of the Congress, and was listened to with profound attention. After an historical review of the attempts made in ages past to establish a universal faith, Prof. Otto considered the question, "Is it advisable for religious reasons to strive to bring about a universal belief and worship?" In the course of his able address, he said:—

* "There may be an inner relationship as regards their central conceptions in all the great world faiths, but it is inconceivable in our day that a general religion can be imposed on mankind, as King Asoka imposed Buddhism in India, Constan-

* This extract has been taken from "An Appreciation of the Sixth International Congress of Religious Progress, Paris."

tine and his successors Christianity in the Roman world, or Queen Elizabeth the reformed faith in England. The formulation of a syncretic faith by eminent theologians, and its voluntary acceptance by all is equally unthinkable. The national and racial feelings of mankind alone would forbid it. No instructed person really believes that a universal language can be framed and adopted by mankind. As Greece, Japan and France show us, any endeavour to create a universal art would equally be doomed to failure: the charm and impression of art lies in its variety, individuality, spontaneity and freedom. Even so, no eclectic process, no religious mosaic will ever meet the varying needs of human souls. Religion must be variable, indigenous, personal, not uniform and final. The speaker cited the parable of the Three Rings, in Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*. The great author was wrong in his philosophising: not one, but all three of the rings were genuine. What is needed is to abandon the search for a universal religion and recognise the equal rights of all the great world-religions to express, each in its own way, the religious spirit in man. They should, however, unitedly engage in a war against irreligion. They should seek to understand and appreciate each other better. Comparative religion should be taught more thoroughly in our universities and theological schools and in our churches. We should cherish and seek to develop our own faith, freeing it from dogmatism and prejudice, and bringing it more into accord with its basic principles of universal sympathy and goodwill. A new method is necessary in the conduct of foreign missions—less of arrogance and condemnation of other faiths and more of appreciation and charity."

We admire the spirit which characterised the whole utterance of the learned doctor. We echo the wise advice he gave to the foreign missions. We endorse his opinion when he says that no eclectic process will ever meet the varying needs of the human soul, but we are unable to agree with all he says. Could not Divine dispensation unite the whole world if it could do the same in bringing various members of tribes and nations together on a religious basis? There were times in history when one race did not know of the other. Religion, like other God-given gifts, was a universal blessing, and so every nation had its own. Religion, in fact, was the only common tie between various families, clans and tribes of a nation. Was not that Divine bond again in requisition on a larger scale when various nations came in contact with each other, and the natural or artificial barriers separating one race from another were removed? Could the Universal Providence of God remain indifferent to such a palpable need? If He solely, in days past, was responsible for one national religion to bind its various units into one harmonious whole, could not the same Fountain-head be looked to again for the revelation of one universal religion to reduce the various races of man into one fraternity? To think otherwise would be

tantamount to denying a Divine origin to religion. If national religion came from God, universal religion must come from the same source, otherwise, religion will become an institution of human ingenuity.

RELIGION NOT AN ART.

Religion, of course, if an art or a product of the human mind, variety and individuality might fairly be desired for it as its chief attraction ; but if it comes from God, its universal adaptability, like all other things created by God for human benefit, will make it more beautiful and sublime. Is not religion, after all, a gift from God, to help our nature up to a higher moral and spiritual plane? Do we not possess some higher cravings? Does not religion, and only religion, satisfy them? In one word, religion provides food and nourishment for our soul.

SOUL AND BODY.

But there is a marked affinity between the body and the soul. They are inseparably interwoven with each other. Again, there is a marked semblance between things physical and things spiritual. Even there is a palpable similarity in the laws appertaining to these two things. If homogeneity is the characteristic feature of Providence in physical things, why is heterogeneousness to be presumed in spiritual matters? Man made the earth and the things in it. He could not live without the atmosphere and the solar system. Do not the same things work everywhere and in the same way to meet our physical needs, making allowance, of course, for the slight change observable on account of climatic conditions? Again, we have been equipped with various appetites and cravings. Have not the same means been adopted by God to satisfy them? Do not they work to our best advantage? Would the sameness of means to satisfy our spiritual cravings mar the effect? We see no reason to think so. Material supplied by God is the same everywhere. It is the human superstructure on it which creates differences. "A universal art," as Prof. Otto says, "would be doomed to failure." But the God-made material to help and feed the art will remain the same, and will survive the decay. As long as a thing remains in its natural purity it preserves its sameness everywhere and is liked by every person ; but when it has the tinge of human manipulation about it it loses its universal attractiveness. It assures variety and cannot appeal to all. So has been the case with religion. Only, one and the same teaching came from God to man in different places, suiting, of course, the status of his intellectual growth, when men lived separated from each other. Those were the days when means to preserve a teaching in its integrity had not been discovered. This led to corruption, and the religion of God was subjected to human interpolation and became diverse. But it contained the original germ in it, and hence a comparative

religion. But we have no comparative art. Because the latter is purely a human invention, and the former has become a mixture. Comparative religion is the only Divine religion, and the rest are but human additions. Again we find something very striking and peculiar to religion. There are three great branches of religion—Semitic, Aryan and Chinese; of the Semitic we read in the Bible. The Zoroastrian and the Vedic are the offshoots of the second branch. Buddhism, Confucionism, and Shintuism may be classed under the third. In every class we find a generation of prophets who appeared from time to time to renew the old religion, to sift it from human alloy, and add something new to it suiting the new conditions. Thus these religions have remained strong, though within their own defined areas. But when more recent developments removed these barriers and the whole world became like one country, with countries like cities and cities like streets, could not God raise one master mind to teach one cosmopolitan religion containing in it all previous teaching revealed to men under various religions? If we accept religion in former days as a Divine and a revealed institution, a universal religion is quite conceivable and most desirable.

Almost all the great religions of antiquity at present claim to be the universal religion in demand. Islam, the latest religion, does the same. But a claim is not an argument and much less a proof. Invidious comparison between the merits of rival religions is not, however, a pleasant task. It leads to no result. It is cumbersome and trying to a reader; sometimes we wish to avoid it as far as possible. We will discuss the subject from a different standpoint. We give here some of the distinctive features which a religion claiming universality should possess. They are as follows:—

(a) It should appear at the time of its need, and address the whole human race as coming from 'the Lord of the Worlds,' and not from a tribal deity or a National God.

(b) It should speak something of formerly existing religions, in order to satisfy the natural anxiety of their adherents about their own faith, accepting every Divine truth in them as its own, and rejecting human interpolation and addition, if any.

(c) It should teach the equality of man, and do away with all race and colour distinctions.

(d) It should meet all such questions as agitate the human mind within the province of religion.

(e) As meant for different nations, of different civilisation, it should meet their respective requirements, helping their growth according to their own ways.

(To be continued.)

THE
BISHOP OF WINCHESTER AT WOKING,
AND
ISLAM.

III.

IS JESUS A PERFECT EXAMPLE TO THE
WHOLE WORLD ?

"THAT they should follow the life which was a perfect example to the whole world" was the third exhortation made by the shepherd of Winchester diocese to his flock at Woking in the course of his remarks on Islam. A Muslim could not do better. All the prophets of the world, with Jesus as one of them, were raised by God to be a model to humanity. This we read in the Quran. They taught mankind through their actions and words. They were the best example to the people around them. They left many a lesson and specimen of morality for the coming race. Even now they stand at the top, and can be taken as an ideal. We Muslims believe the same as to Jesus Christ. But that He left in 'His life a perfect example to the world,' as the Bishop of Winchester urges, is only a bald statement which appeals more to credulous orthodoxy than to reason, which looks for corroboration. The Bishop of Winchester is not the first to make this bald statement. Renan, with all his rationalistic attainments, was not proof against his early predilection when he said : "Religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man (Jesus) as the ideal representative and guide for humanity."

WORDS AND ACTIONS.

In judging the ethical side of one's character people make a serious mistake, which sometimes creeps imperceptibly even into the judgment of level-headed writers known otherwise for their impartial criticism. Words are accepted for actions, virtues preached to others in sermons and homilies are often believed to be actually owned by their teachers. But it is a mistake, and a serious one. No literature in any community is devoid of books on ethics. They contain golden rules of morality worthy of a prophet or a god in man ; but, if whatever is contained in them is to be accepted as an index to the moral character of their writers, our judgment on the moral side of Lord Bacon's character should be otherwise. A teacher, however highly divine his claims may be, should not be accredited with possessing all those moral attributes which he inculcates to others through his precepts, unless he, by his own example, has converted them into action. This truth was never so practically and lucidly hinted at as by the author of 'Anwar Suheli,' a famous book on morality in Persian literature, where all moral lessons which he intended to teach to his readers have been put into the mouths of birds and other dumb creatures. In fact, an ethical aphorism written on a wall is as good as in the mouth of a man if the latter has never been able to

put it into practice. Besides, morals can be best brought home to others only through actions, and an example is, therefore, deemed always better than a precept.

CONDITIONS OF ACTUALITY.

No one can deny that every potentiality requires certain conditions to become an actuality, and a moral preached, and perhaps potentially possessed by one cannot be claimed as owned by him unless he brings it into practical shape under given conditions. It is through the splendid meekness with which He bears all the derision of the Israelities and His marvellous patience in the face of the hardest trials of life which He suffered as a martyr to the truth, that meekness, forbearance and patience become enviable possessions of the Lord Jesus, otherwise He would have been a mere tale-teller of passive morality. It is a real misfortune of the highest magnitude that the ministry of the Lord was curtailed by circumstances which He could not control, and the world lost the chance of seeing a practical manifestation of various divine moral qualities which possibly He possessed. Even the much-praised morals in Christian literature, like forgiveness, could only see their complete development at His hands. The said moral quality also, like others, requires given conditions, and unless they are present one cannot be fairly accredited with it. Three essential conditions must be fulfilled before you can claim to possess this noble attribute. In the first place, you must be persecuted ruthlessly by your enemies. Secondly, your enemies must fall, and change of circumstances render them at your mercy, and, last of all, though not the least in importance, in spite of your possessing the means to give them the punishment they justly deserve, your noble nature gets the better of you and you forgive them. Mercy, like forgiveness, can only be shown by one who finds others at his mercy, and unless one attains that high position the preachings of mercy are words which lack reality. Besides, it is our everyday experience that people in power generally regard forgiveness as an insult rather than as a kindness when it comes to them from a helpless victim of their persecution. It is deprecated and treated with contempt. Of course Jesus on the Cross prayed for forgiveness for His tormentors, and it shows that He was in that mood at the time, but sentiments and feelings expressed by Him while praying for his enemies on that occasion have also been given vent to by other great men under similar trials of life, and He is not unique in this respect. The moral quality of forgiveness, however, could not see its realisation in the lifetime of Jesus: one finds only the first of the three conditions precedent for the manifestation of forgiveness in His life, the other two are lacking. It remained in embryo for some six hundred years more, and found its right use and occasion at the hand of the Prophet in Arabia, when the 'Lord on high with His 10,000 Saints' reached the gates of the 'ancient House' in the person of Muhammad. The old writings were fulfilled, and Mecca was conquered, without a single drop of human blood being shed, an event unparalleled in the whole history of the world. The enemies of the prophet in Mecca had subjected him and his followers for thirteen years to a long course of trials and hardships, which surpassed in intensity and quantity the hardest trials in 'others' life. His enemies fell and found themselves at the absolute mercy of their persecuted victim. They deserved every imaginable punishment to be devised by human ingenuity, and to bring them to it was simply to meet the ends of Justice and Equity. Muhammad would have been quite justified if he had punished them as severely as Joshua, Ramchandra, and Krishna did when victorious over their enemies, but the great Divine moral attribute of Forgiveness which the Son of God Himself could not reveal in Himself, being hampered in His ministry by circumstances beyond His control, received its full revelation, which otherwise would have remained in abeyance, perhaps for ever. God raised various

prophets from time to time, and His various characters were revealed in them. Muhammad was the last of the race, and all those divine moral attributes which were still undeveloped in man, and had had no occasion for proper manifestation in the lifetime of previous prophets, found their proper revelation in him. Forgiveness being one of them, had its own occasion as well as its use. It found no occasion in the lifetime of Jesus, and if others had it, they did not utilise it. But Muhammad had the rare opportunity and did not fail to use it. His enemies when utterly fallen entreated him to treat them as a noble-minded person would do. The appeal was most opportune and made to the right man, and was readily accepted. Modesty, Meekness, and Patience undoubtedly are noble qualities in man which partake of the Divine nature, but do these passive tender qualities exhaust the long list of human morals? Are there not other stern, active morals, noble as well, which are essential to constitute humanity? Bravery, Justice, Generosity and Trustworthiness among them; and did Jesus get the occasions necessary for the manifestation of these morals? Because, unless one gets a fitting opportunity for the exercise of a moral quality, a possible potentiality is no proof of actuality. God forbid that we stigmatise Jesus for being otherwise, but what we mean to say is that negative virtues are no virtues, especially in teachers of morality; they cost nothing, and are no help to one who needs a specimen in practice.

TENDERNESS AND STRENGTH.

This is what can be fairly said about the tender passive moral qualities which are chiefly claimed for Jesus, but there are stern moral qualities besides which are also divine, but which, we are afraid, found no revelation in the Son of the Holy Virgin. These stern moral qualities when properly balanced secure happiness to human society. Anger, Hatred, and to them we may add Vengeance. They are all necessary to keep life and property secure. They cannot be branded as lower and bestial passions. They have their right use, and it is only through their degenerate use that they become so. Do we not observe them in the working of dumb nature, which, in my opinion, is the best index of Divine character? We read of them as attributes of God in the Biblical record. Besides, to say that they are undesirable is simply to find fault with the Supreme Wisdom who supplied man with these passions. Are not Hatred and Anger realities? Do they not affect the trend of human affairs? And if man is born after the image of God, and consequently all the moral qualities observable in him are those of God, all these stern and active moral qualities must be divine moral attributes in man, and cannot be dispensed with. They no doubt require regulation and training, and it is in the life of a perfect man in whom God is claimed to have been revealed that we look for the right use of such passions. Is not a morality preached and taught in the Sermon on the Mount sufficient, if adopted, to destroy those stern moral qualities which we call, and are Divine, and to render our life and property insecure? The morality, we are afraid, is too sublime to be practised, and will, we believe, remain so till the day of Judgment. But can the teacher of the said Sermon under these conditions claim to be a perfect model of humanity and a complete representative of Divine character, and is His claim justified? We have purposely referred to these two passions, as they cannot exist if the said Sermon is brought into practice, though its Teacher Himself could not restrain Himself from making use of them sometimes; but there are innumerable moral attributes besides, human and divine, which, to take the most favourable view of the case, remained in abeyance and did not see their revelation in the Nazarene prophet; and we see no reason therefore to say in the words of Renan that "religion cannot be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on this Man (Jesus) as the

ideal representative and guide of humanity." Renan should have known that there were various walks of life most necessary for the superstructure of human society, and Christ could not be a guide there. A King on the throne, a Judge on the bench, a Statesman in his Cabinet, and a General in the field are as necessary factors of human society as a teacher of morality, and God was also not unwise in raising patriarchs like David, Solomon, Joseph, and Joshua, who acted respectively as a King, a Judge, a Minister of State, and a General. They were human beings, and possibly committed errors, nay, sins, as Christians believe, in the performance of such duties. But if God had to come as the "ideal representative and guide to humanity," He would have been more useful to human society if He had appeared as a king or a statesman. He could have left better rules for the guidance of Christian kings and statesmen in Europe, and the world would have seen a millenium when relieved of their ambition and self-assertion. The Western nations badly wanted a God in the person of a General rather than in a "Prince of Peace" to guide them in their recent uncalled for campaigns. He could have taught them morals of war. Perhaps his precepts and actions in this respect might have proved a better check to Christian atrocities in Tripoli and the Balkan than the Ordinance of the Hague Conference.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

We are told that Jesus is to appear in the last days as King to do justice to the oppressed, and to set all iniquities right, but if the world is to end at the time of His second advent, our need of an 'ideal representative and guide to humanity' will also come to an end. It may be said perhaps that His Kingdom was not the Kingdom of this world, nor did He allow 'His servants to fight,' that He 'should not be delivered to the Jews.' (St. John xviii. 36.) But if the civic and economic policy of the world necessitates the existence of some kind of kingdom, and the enforcement of mutual rights and obligations between man and man, which is the only basis of a commonwealth, and which renders some sort of rule indispensable; and if no sooner man emerges out of the primitive state of nature than at once knowledge of individual property rushes to his mind, and its security, together with the safety of his own life, brings home to him the necessity of some sovereign political authority, though in a rudimentary form; and, last of all, if the policy of England converted the old Witenagemot into the modern Parliament, should we look to the Mount of Olives for an "Ideal representative and Guide of humanity," as Renan says, or to the Mount of Faran to find a King, a Statesman, a Lawyer, and a General in the Person of the Prophet.

A calm and unprejudiced consideration of these facts given here will convince our readers that the remark made by the Bishop of Winchester was not free from error. Christ, as He Himself confessed, is no example in the higher walks of life, but will He be of help to us in our ordinary life? Is not our domestic life an essential and important part of our programme in life? Are not many houses in these days of ours scenes of unpleasantness, misery, and discord? And does not this deplorable plight result from the want of those sweet relations between husband and wife which make the matrimonial bond a heavenly tie? Is not the very word 'home' a treasure of dearest and happiest associations, which are becoming extinct day by day; was not woman created to be a 'help meet' to man, and are they not meant to be husband and wife, on the happy or unpleasant mutual relations between whom a home becomes a heaven or a hell? If these are realities, and to a great extent responsible for our happiness or misery, are we not in urgent need of a Guide to regulate our domestic daily life? It is a great misfortune that the divine element in Christ did not allow Him to have an earthly connexion with some woman as husband and wife, and we are again constrained to turn our eyes to some other quarter for a

"guide of humanity." Jesus, of course, had a mother, but His divinity again comes in the way, and a son in a Christian house has nothing to learn from Him in home morals. The Holy Virgin could with complacency of mind hear her Divine Son call her 'woman' because she saw something in Him different from her, but an ordinary English woman would like to see her son behave differently.

IS THE MORALITY OF JESUS PRACTICAL?

The deeper we go into the question the more doubtful we become as to the correctness of the Bishop's remark concerning Jesus Christ which we have quoted above. The Morality taught by Him in His famous Sermon on the Mount never found favour even with His immediate followers. Even now it is taken as the best specimen of morality taught in words; but the world has become two thousand years older since then, and still cannot see the way to bring it into practice. Even the devout members of the Church and the most zealous workers in modern evangelical campaigns find themselves unfit for the task and unable to work out these high principles of ethics, and are looking for the second advent of the Lord when the Kingdom of Heaven shall come to restore peace, amity and love, and man, becoming circumcised of all stern but otherwise manly passions, will be in a more suitable disposition to act upon them. Some old Rishi even now in the Himalayan icebergs in the East may appreciate them, but certainly no one in the West.

The whole difficulty lies in realising His ministry and His real mission as a teacher of these rigid principles of morality. In my opinion, if Jesus be given His true position, it will be that which He Himself professes and claims, shorn of all the graceful Pauline coverings of Ecclesiastical dogma. He stands redeemed of His paradoxical situation, and the unpracticable nature of His teaching is explained. Here He seems to be in His right place. He was a prophet raised to reform the house of Israel, and to bring together its scattered sheep into one fold. He came to improve the morals of the Israelites and expose the hollowness of the knowledge of the Pharisees, who posed as the only expounders of Mosaic law. The law was the law of retribution and vengeance. It was abused, and He came to explain it. He shows its proper application, and thus to fulfil it and not to destroy it.

To make myself more explicit in establishing the true position of the Prophet Jesus, I must first refer to the circumstances which were responsible for bringing the Law of Moses into existence. The children of bondage required emancipation, physically as well as morally. Through the bondage of many generations they had lost all manly morals and had become mean, dejected, and cowardly. Crossing the Red Sea could liberate them from the yoke of the Egyptian kings, but it could not free them from the thralldom of servile habits. The law of liberation, therefore, came to their rescue; "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," was the only code of life suited to redeem their enervated spirits. The said law accordingly worked well, and succeeded in turning children of bondage into a race of rulers and conquerors. Then came abuse. They forgot the spirit and began to worship the letter. They left the kernel and went after the husk. They insisted scrupulously on the literal observance of the Law of Vengeance, and in course of time they became a personification of vengeance. They had manifested slavish meekness once, but now they became anger incarnate. Their hatred when aroused knew no bounds. Thus they fell morally, and with it came their worldly downfall. They were again humbled under a foreign yoke, and began to pray for salvation. They needed a Redeemer, for whom they approached Jehovah through their patriarchs, and a Saviour was promised. The promised Messiah came, and brought them the true key of salvation, but they failed to understand His mission. Their previous history was a good lesson. They

should have known that if their emancipation was in the law, the subsequent salvation should also follow the law. If the law of vengeance came to regenerate them when they were slaves to unmanly habits, and was a necessary preliminary to making them rulers and conquerors, the law of mercy was indispensable as well to redeem them from being victims of anger and hatred before they could be restored to their lost supremacy. The Redeemer of the house of Israel not only diagnosed the real disease which had contaminated their national fabric, but also came with a panacea when He said "Ye have heard that it hath been said 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him thy other also. And if any man will sue thee and take away thy coat let him have thy cloak, and if whosoever shall compel thee to go with him one mile, go with him twain."

A NEW GOSPEL.

It may be impracticable as the world thinks, it may not be consonant with its polity and commonweal, but it brought a new Gospel to, and could save, those who had been slaves to hatred and anger. This law of mercy which was evolved on the Mount of Olives was the New Dispensation and not what has been dogmatically preached afterwards. Strong faith in it, and its practical observance, were sure to bring salvation to the scattered house, and not the blood of the Teacher who became a martyr for it. But 'to hate thine enemy' was the watchword, and one who taught them, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," could not be accepted by them as heir to the throne of David and restorer of their lost supremacy.

Jesus has been unfortunate in having foes as well as friends. No one could understand the Covenant He renewed. Both wanted a kingdom. The former when disappointed became His enemies and could not leave Him till they brought 'Him to the Cross'; the latter, more hopeful, looked to the last times for the moment when their sons shall have an exalted position with Him on the throne, but no one appreciated His teaching. He Himself was a great believer in the law and its observance. He believed that the world and its kingdoms must go to those who possessed high morals and knew how to control their passions. He knew that it lay much more by the cultivation and possession of certain characteristics that a nation can find supremacy over others than in the possession of military training and weapons of war. He knew that faith in and observance of certain laws only could create the character and morals desired. He knew the weak points of the Israelites, whom he came to raise, and the Law revealed to Him was the one evolved in His Sermon on the Mount. This was the New Dispensation, this was the New Covenant to redeem the lost house, to establish which He came to the Cross, and His martyrdom, as believed. In the renewed law lay their salvation. But His race rejected it, and fell, to rise no more.

CHRIST'S TEACHING.

Unfortunately, as we remarked before, the position of Christ and the nature of His teaching, though clear to one not subject to any predilection, has always been a mystery even to His followers. Take Him as a Prophet, a Teacher and a Holy Messenger of God raised to bring scattered sheep together and restore the house "under the wrath of God" to its lost supremacy, and therefore to teach them morals to meet the contingency of the time and place which He was in, the whole mystery is solved, and He commands all the respect and reverence which a human mind can feel for one of the greatest teachers of and martyrs to truth. But take Him as a God and you are beset with difficulties never to be surmounted. Read His teachings in the light of the facts explained above, and an Impracticability becomes a Possibility, or rather a Necessity suited to the requirements of the time and the people addressed.

But to find in them some germs of Divinity simply because they cannot be practised by an average human being, and because the modern mind is too sordid to take them seriously, is simply to betray one's ignorance of an ordinary theory of legislation and its progress and evolution.

Jesus is in the category of the Muslim prophets. We accept Him as an ideal and an example in several respects. We follow Him in many things. But to find in Him a perfect model is simply to contradict history. Muhammad is the only person in the history of the world who passed through various hardships and trials of life, and attended various human calls, and filled different offices, and thus was able to leave behind a blameless, perfect example for human imitation.

THE DYING FORCES OF WHICH— CHRISTIANITY OR ISLAM?

II.

"CAN WE STILL BE CHRISTIAN" is a most appropriate title which Professor Rudolf Eucken, the distinguished professor of philosophy in the University of Jena, gives to a new volume by him, just published, at this critical moment for the Church religion. Dr. Eucken is a well-known theologian, and is rightly considered one of the great masters on the subject of religion. He is much above the type of scheming missionaries whose tirades against Islam in the pages of many of the missionary organs have, as our readers know, induced us to begin this series. To corroborate us as well as to bring some of these to a saner judgment, we quote from the book of Professor Eucken, who apprehends the coming downfall of the present form of Christianity, which may more aptly be called "Churchianity," and which superseded the religion taught by Jesus at the Council of Nice. We assure Professor Eucken that no amount of anxiety and labour can avert the fatal catastrophe which faces the religion of the Church—the Divinity of Christ and Atonement, with its other credulous paraphernalia. Its fate is doomed. In fact, it is no real religion but a myth, the outcome of paganism, and cannot stand light and culture. But true Christianity shall remain ever green—that old, old religion of the Divine Commandment and Obedience—the religion of "Obedience to God and Benevolence to Mankind" taught by generations of prophets in every corner of the world; so much emphasised by the Son of Mary in His Sermon on the Mount—*i.e.*, the religion of Islam, which literally means submission to the Divine Will, and which found its final completion in the last Prophet—Muhammad. We endorse almost all that has

been said by Dr. Eucken. We, however, reserve our further remarks on the following for a subsequent number :—

CHRISTIANITY REVERED AND REJECTED.

A sharp division runs to-day through Christendom, destroying its unity and endangering all the strength and truth of its life. On the one hand the traditional religion is revered, on the other rejected; outwardly its stability is unimpaired; *inwardly it is convulsed with the throes of upheaval.*

PASSIONATE MOVEMENT OF PROTEST.

But despite all its reputation and influence, Christianity is being assailed by a passionate movement of protest, which is growing in intensity and carrying all before it. It is not the tame and timid doubt which all ages know so well, not a mere failure on the part of individuals to live up to the heroic mood which religion requires of them. No! The antagonism that meets it to-day goes much deeper, and is vastly more dangerous. Unbelief was once confined to the few, and those chiefly in the upper strata of society; *to-day it lays hold on large masses of people, plunging them now into dull indifference, now into a passion of iconoclastic hate.*

Figures prove conclusively that the interest in church services and observances is constantly decreasing, and that the faithful are rapidly becoming a minority. In our great cities—in Germany, at least—every attack or even aspersion on Christianity *meets with rapturous applause.* Is such treatment of religion—the religion we ourselves profess—a natural and normal occurrence, and can we find any *parallel to it outside of Christianity?*

UNBELIEF AGGRESSIVE.

Unbelief, moreover, is no longer directed merely to particular features and aspects of Christian thought. It has extended over the whole area, so that Christianity itself is called in question, and not merely certain of its dogmas and institutions. Again, this unbelief, abandoning its old defensive attitude, has become more and more aggressive in character. It marshals its several forces in close array, and moves them forward together in battle-line. It is not content with merely being tolerated: it longs to rule. It organises its adherents and confronts Christianity with big constructive programmes. In this respect the monistic movement is an important sign of the times.

FOR A RENEWAL OF LIFE.

But how could such a union of forces take place at all unless, away behind individual opinion there were distinctive tendencies of civilisation actively at work,

putting forward new claims, indicating new paths, and entirely reversing the whole trend of life? *It is only in virtue of its at-one-ness with the spirit of the age that this movement of protest can justify its existence and indulge the hope of final victory.* It stands, and feels that it stands, for a necessary renewal of life.

MEANING OF THE SCHISM.

Thus we live in an age of transition, of struggle between opposing systems. We are forced to ask the meaning of this schism, this threatened disruption of human life, and to find out where we are to look for the means of healing it. Does this mighty countermovement—still apparently gathering force—betoken the approaching dissolution of Christianity, the end of its power? Does it mean that our spiritual life must seek a new centre? Or does all the commotion and upheaval only point to the need of an inward renewal of Christianity? Do the convulsions of to-day denote the death-struggle of an old world-power or are they only the throes of a new birth? *Can Christianity find room and value for all that is of genuine worth in the experiences and demands of our present-day development, or are they rocks on which it is destined to founder?*

This is a question which not only determines the main drift of our common work, but deeply affects the life and soul of each individual. A question of this kind, once clearly put, cannot without grave loss remain long unsettled: it demands a definite answer.

THE CHURCH OUT OF DATE.

If progressive minds to-day feel the Church to be mainly a weight and a hindrance, the fault lies not in the nature of the Church in general, but in the fact that the churches of the present day do not meet the needs of our present stage of development, that they are inwardly old and outworn. But this should urge us to a renewal of the churches, not to a rejection of them.

CLOSER TOUCH WITH HUMAN ACTIVITY.

The maintenance of Christianity requires considerable changes in its traditional form. Religion must enter into closer touch with human activity and at the same time become a more powerful leaven in the world. The spiritual life must be more independent of man's character and condition, and must overcome within itself the opposition between personal and impersonal modes of conceiving it, which it can do only by advancing to an essentially higher level. In the idea of redemption the positive and renewing aspect must play a more important

part. Christian morality must form the high level along which further progress is to be made. The central fact of religion must be shifted further back; it must now be the upbuilding of a new life for man and for mankind, and must thus become more intimately related to the soul. Finally, the Church must become a repository of the facts and tasks of life itself.

The problem to-day has outgrown not merely the limits of this or that creed, but also of Christianity and even of religion itself. It has extended to the whole of life. We have become confused as to the foundations of our life and being. While the external world has been flooded with fresh light, the meaning of our own existence has become obscured. Anyone who properly appreciates the greatness of this crisis will admit that the movement for the revival of religion is not concerned with an opposition within one special church, but with a matter of pressing and urgent importance to the whole of humanity.

THE WORLD A PREPONDERATING IDEA.

It is the preponderating tendency of modern science to take the nature around us for the whole of reality, and allow it to swallow up our soul-life entirely. This means that it abandons all the distinctive qualities and valuations which the soul-life seemed hitherto to possess, and also that it underrates the significance of history.

The social movement works in the same direction of suppressing and absorbing the inner by the outer; economic problems and the material welfare of man are given precedence over everything else. All our effort and energy are claimed for them, and the manner in which these problems are solved is allowed to determine the whole character of life and the treatment of inner problems also.

Æstheticism, again, and epicureanism, which have a much wider implication than the pleasure-seeking of mere individuals, push the inner life far into the background. The growing refinement of sensibility, the greater mobility and the increasing differentiation of life, the free and airy severance of subjective mood from all material fetters—these things combine to prevent any concentration of life into self-activity; they break up its unity and change it into a mere play upon the surface-side of things. Thus growth of the external world, growth of work which aims at modifying the outward conditions of life, and the reduction of man to a bundle of impressions and sensibilities—all work together to destroy the freedom of the soul, and make even the quest for it seem meaningless.

Life has moved ever more and more towards the circumference, and now does not see what is to become of the centre.

We must grapple with the great problem for ourselves, and seek a something more in the inwardness of our life . . . until we arrive at an inward world which can meet the world that presses in on us from without on an equal or even a superior footing.

RELIGION ABOVE THE CHURCH.

Are we, asks Professor Eucken, to view the declension from religion complacently, and allow it to assume still greater proportions? Through fear of touching the churches, are we to look on quietly while religion slips out of our life? Or are we to put religion above the churches and seek new ways, mindful of Goethe's saying: "*Necessity is the best councillor*"?

In this great movement, this serious struggle, those alone can engage with confidence and gladness who recognise a higher life than that of the merely humanistic culture with its utilitarian goods, and who at the same time cherish the conviction that religion is not a mere product of human hopes and desires, but that it opens up and brings into our life a wealth of concrete actuality which both transcends and permeates the world, and that it is, in first instance, not man's work, but God's.

DEFINITION OF CHRISTIANITY.

Professor Eucken gives this fine definition of what Christianity is—no mere extra:—

Christianity makes religion the sovereign mistress of man's life and destiny, revealing a new world other than that of his immediate environment, and claiming for it his whole-hearted devotion. Religion, on this view, is no mere extra—the embroidery of a life whose substance is already given: it is the solution of an intolerable contradiction; it effects a complete reversal of all existing values. Man becomes conscious of this new world as of all things the most supreme and certain, needing no evidence from any other tribunal, but itself constituting the tribunal before which everything else must justify itself. God is not viewed from the standpoint of the world, but the world from the standpoint of God.

Professor Eucken's answer to the question, *Can we still be Christians?* is:—

We not only can, but must be Christians—only, however, on the one condition that Christianity be recognised as a progressive historic movement still in the making, that it be shaken free from the numbing influence of ecclesiasticism and placed upon a broader foundation. Thus here lies the task of our time and the hope of the future.

THE CONTINUATION OF GOD'S BLESSINGS.

WERE it not for our physical sensations we should be unable to understand the meaning of pleasure or pain, and the very beauty of the word Paradise would be unintelligible to us. A spirit or soul never clothed in flesh conveys nothing whatever to our minds or hearts. All sensations of love for the wonderful beauties of Nature are connected with the life blood which unceasingly flows through our living frames. It is not possible to conceive any joys unconnected with bodily sensations. Take the case of kindly actions alone—I mean unselfish acts by which one human being is able to give great pleasure to another or help another without any prospect of worldly reward for himself—is it not a fact that every such act produces a thrill of physical joy or a lightheartedness which is beneficial to health and happiness? The question of *why* the spirits and souls should be clothed in flesh is not one for us to ask, we only know that it was God's will, and no human being can presume to inquire into such mysteries.

Heavenly blessings, and those good things which “pass man's understanding,” may not be identical with those pleasures we already know something about on this earth, but it is extremely unlikely that an entirely new set of conditions will be presented when the transition time of passing from the earthly to the heavenly state takes place. We see continuity in all creation, and is it not, therefore, *reasonable* to suppose that in the future state we may experience a further development, in intensified and glorified form, of those pleasures we already know something about? Why not? There is nothing wrong in enjoying the pleasures of life, or the Merciful and Compassionate God would not have given us senses which enable us to appreciate those pleasures. As the Holy Koran says: “Bear good tidings to those who believe and do good works that they shall inherit gardens beneath which rivers flow. So often as they are fed in that life with fruits they shall say: ‘These are the fruits which were given us formerly,’ because they shall find the fruits of after-life resembling the fruits which were given them here.”

The fruits of Paradise may not indeed be the *same* as those we enjoy on earth, but they will be such as we can understand and appreciate in an intensified form, and this would not be the case if we had not received the previous instruction and experience. The remembrance of God and His Mercies will be an everlasting source of joy, and will enable the true believers to identify the fruits of Paradise with those of this world, and they will be able to say “These are the fruits which were given us in the former life.”

The idea of *continuity* runs through the pages of the Koran. As Mirza Ghulam Ahmad said, in his remarkable work "The Teachings of Islam," whatever good men enjoy spiritually in this life are really blessings not of this, but of the next life, and are "granted to them as a specimen of the bliss that is in store for them in the next life in order to increase their yearning for it."

From this we may be led to infer that whether we regard the existence of mankind from the standpoint of this present world—which we know *something* about—or from the hypothetical and more extended and wonderful platform of the next world—of which at present we know so little—we cannot get away from the fact that we are *ourselves*. Each individual must have had a beginning, ordered by God Himself, and it would seem that the identity of each must be the same whatever the environment or however extended the different stages of existence.

To the entirely unimaginative and stolid individual, who regards with indifference all the pleasures of this life, there can never come any very keen desire for an increase of those pleasures—his blunted faculties will not allow him to experience delight in the beauties of Nature and wonders of the universe, so that his conception of Paradise is probably very feeble. On the other hand, the sensitive and highly appreciative nature of one who gratefully accepts the bounties and pleasures of life is probably energised and strengthened by looking forward to a Paradise where there is the enjoyment in greatly intensified form of those delights he has already experienced.

It does seem strange that the teachings of the Western Churches have exerted so much influence for so many hundreds of years, when it is considered that such a needlessly insipid and unattractive future state is set forth in the doctrines advanced, which are held to be of vital importance. As a small boy my only dread of death was connected with a fear of being compelled to sit on a cloud for ever playing a harp. Exactly how the repellent idea got into my head I do not remember, but there it was, and it induced discomfort of mind. How much more desirable would it have been had a beautiful flower and lovely view of earth and sky and sea been shown to me with the remark: "There, my boy, you see how pretty and sweet that flower is, and how splendid that view? Well, in Heaven there are flowers a hundred times more beautiful and sweet, and views a hundred times more magnificent?" This would have given me something to look forward to and desire; and even now the mere writing down of these words gives me comfort, as I feel they are so true.

Why should it be wrong for human creatures whose experience of pleasures is, so far as they know for certain, confined to this present world's lessons and attractions, to look forward to a continuation of such pleasures on a far grander scale? But

here the sacerdotal element comes in and says, "No; all is vanity, the pleasures of this world are wicked, you must not enjoy them, and above all, you must not expect anything of the kind in the next world." When sacerdotalism holds the key the difficulties as regards Heaven are greatly increased. Why should not Western churches teach the rational doctrine of a continuity of those blessings which mankind already understand and believe in? Why make fresh obstacles by conjuring up complicated statements as to rewards and punishments attendant upon the belief or disbelief in certain dogmas? Why not cultivate a simple faith in God, and trust in His power to intensify all our earthly pleasures in a spiritual existence? Would such a course be in any way hostile to the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ? I think not.

"In every blade of grass I see
Thy sacred, loving hand;
In every thought that comes to me
Behold the promised Land."

In this verse, written many years ago, I recognise the spirit of continuity—if we can see God's wonderful handiwork in this world we can surely also form some faint idea of His infinite power to magnify the favours He has already showered upon us in such lavish profusion.

Recently (May 21, 1914), "Heaven" was the subject of a sermon preached by Dean Inge in St. Paul's Cathedral. In the course of his remarks he is reported to have said that he "did not believe there was ever a time when Christians thought less about Heaven. As soon as the clergy left the subjects of this world and began to talk about eternity, men's attention obviously flagged." . . . "Many Christians tried to make Heaven a geographical expression and to put eternity within the framework of time." The very rev. gentleman concluded his outspoken address by saying that the average man now thought for himself, and knew enough astronomy to feel the absurdity of placing Heaven either inside or outside the Solar System. Many of the clergy were themselves perplexed and said as little about Heaven as they decently could. It was better, he thought, that the clergy should admit that they "do not know," than that there should be crude symbols given to the world as literal facts. It certainly seems to me that the humble spirit of agnosticism is preferable to dogmatic teachings built up on the superstitions of the Dark Ages.

HEADLEY.

God saith, verily My compassion overcometh My wrath.

—*The Holy Prophet.*

A MOST WARLIKE RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR.

GLADLY would I most heartily say, "Thank you, Sir," for forwarding me the *Islamic Review*, Vol. II., No. 3, if I personally knew you. I find this monthly journal not only exceedingly interesting, but really educational.

Because for years a rigid opposer of American slavery, believing and lecturing also upon human rights, regardless of colour, race or nation, President Grant of our country, in 1868, appointed me United States Consul to Trebizonde in Asiatic Turkey, thus giving me an excellent opportunity to study the customs, laws and ethics of Muhammedans in Trebizonde, Constantinople, Smyrna and other Oriental countries. This study, with previous readings, varied observations and experiences, greatly modified my views concerning the general type of Islam; for I there met those who worshipped one God and were socially upright and broadminded in their relations with other religionists. The Dervishes with their ceremonies and healing gifts, and my interviews with two or three Sufis, were spiritually exhilarating. And what especially interested me—a life-long temperance advocate (I am now past ninety-two years of age)—was the entire absence of drunkenness in the above-named cities.

Be sure, I knew that the Quran persistently forbid the use of intoxicating liquors; and, further, I discovered that only the unsound, unorthodox Muhammedans who did use any liquors were dressed like Europeans, having against the Quran's commands imbibed vice-tending European habits.

And, further, in the line of fraternity and goodwill, it will not be denied by those versed in history that when the great Caliph Omar took Jerusalem, in 637 A.D., he rode into the city by the side of the Christian Patriarch Sophronius, conversing with him upon the antiquity of the City of Jerusalem. At this time no blood was shed.

There should always be a distinct differentiation between the Christianity of the Christ who, it is reported, "went about doing good," and the churchianity of the creeds and orthodox confessions of faith.

When the orthodox crusaders entered Jerusalem the streets were soon crimsoned with human blood; and not only adults, but children—and all this to secure the empty tomb of that Judean reformer who said: "Return good for evil—put up thy sword—by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another."

It is asked: What has been the real orthodox creed of both Catholic and Protestant churches? Athanasius should know,

being a pronounced Christian father. Here is the creed in part :—

“ Whosoever will be saved before all things, it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith, which faith, except every one do keep pure and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly ; and this faith is, that we worship God in trinity and unity . . . the Father is eternal, the Son is eternal and the Holy Ghost is eternal. The Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty and the Holy Ghost is Almighty. The Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Ghost is God. . . . Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost.”

The Christian religion so-called, with its confessions of faith, has been a most war-like, bloody religion, since the time of the murderous Roman Constantine, with his officiating Bishops and Priests. Later, blood began to flow in crimson currents.

Councils were called, creeds were established, heretics were banished or executed by theological ecclesiastics. When Priscillianists (in 355 A.D., at the instigation of the two bishops, Ursatius and Ithicas) were being put to death, they pleaded for clemency ; but these unfeeling bishops' reply was : “ The Holy Scriptures and the interests of the Church require your deaths.”

At a later period, John Calvin, Beza, and other sectarian bigots wrote books and pamphlets defending the right and the lawfulness of religious persecutions. John Knox, of Scotland, appealing to the Word of God, declared that “ those guilty of idolatry and heresy should be put to death.”

Persecutions, murders, and holy wars have ever gone hand in hand with sectarian Christianity. During those nine crusades of “ Christians against Mohammedans, to rescue the empty tomb of Christ in Jerusalem,” two millions of human lives were sacrificed.

When that fiery Christian warrior, Godfrey, took Jerusalem at the close of the tenth century, the whole garrison, without distinction of age or sex, were put to the sword.

At the St. Bartholomew massacre, in France, 10,000 of the common people perished, and over 500 of them were denominated “ the rank.”

On February 15, 1568, a sentence of the holy office of Romanism condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to be put to death as heretics, and three million (says Motley in his “ Republic ”) men, women, and children “ were sentenced to the scaffold.” It may be safely said that Roman Catholics and Protestants, alternating in power, also murdered each other.

During the war between Germany and France, the Germans gaining a great victory in a battle, Catholics and Protestants

united, joyously joining their forces, marched through the streets of Berlin in evening-time singing :—

“ Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,
Three thousand Frenchmen sent below.”

Those sectarian creeds, those persecutions, and those bloody wars were the legitimate outcome of orthodox theology—the orthodoxy of blood.

The Church psalmist, Watts, sang :—

Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood
That calmed God's frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne
And turned His wrath to grace.

Another hymn reads :—

There is a fountain filled with blood
Drawn from Emmanuel's veins,
And sinners plunged beneath that flood
Lose all their guilty stains.

Another orthodox poet says that :—

With one tremendous draught of blood
Christ drank damnation dry.

This Constantine church-religion of creed and blood has always been a bloody religion, crimsoning hundreds of hills and valleys with the blood of freethinkers, investigators, and martyrs.

This orthodox theology of salvation through blood—the blood of an ancient Jew—is still preached in our orthodox pulpits. Only recently the Rev. W. L. Tucker, of the Calvary Church, of Los Angeles, said, as reported in the Monday morning papers, that “ God put the sins of the sinner to Christ's account in order that the merits of Christ Jesus, through the blood, may be laid to the sinner's account. This doctrine of of substitution—that is, the imputation of man's sins to the atoning Jesus Christ—is the central doctrine of the Church. And so, justification by faith is instant acquittal.” In line with this we have the hymn,

Jesus died and paid it all—
All the debt I owe.

Again, the Rev. Dr. Carter, of Los Angeles, California, published recently these words: “ Nothing but Jesus' blood leads through the heavenly quarantine. Nothing but His atoning blood can pass one through the gates into the eternal city.”

This is sound orthodox churchianity as practically preached in this twentieth century. I know of no more searching, stirring lines with which to finish this article relating to the persecuting orthodox Christianity of the centuries than these

words from Shakespeare: "In religion, what damned error but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a text, hiding the grossness with fair ornament."

J. M. PEEBLES, M.D., M.A., Ph.D.

5719 Fayette St., Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.

ADRIANOPLÉ.*

BELOVED Adrianople

And envied by the States,
Firm in the loves of all thy sons
And stalwart in their hates,
Outwitting all the nations
Who prowl around thy gates!

With Muhammad as thy leader
And Allah for thy shield,
Thy sons have fought and died for thee,
But never hearts did yield
Such mighty streams of loving faith
While dying on the field!

With love thy bulwarks strengthened,
Thy streets with faith are paved,
Thy saintly shrines doth hear this vow.
"Thou shalt not be enslaved!"
So long as Allah guides thy steps
Thou wilt indeed be saved!

The dew from heaven is falling
To quench thy thirst just now,
Soft winds do blow from north and south
To cool thy heated brow,
And Allah from His throne on high
Doth bless thy sons who bow!

Thrice blessed Adrianople!
For love so true and bold
Defends thee in thy hour of need
And doth not loose her hold,
Tho' nations clamour at thy gates
To grasp thee and thy gold!

BEATRICE.

* The above was composed by one of our English Muslim sisters in the days of the siege of Adrianople.

THE MESSENGER.

LA-ELAH-EL-LALLAH MUHAMMED-ER
RESOUL ALLAH.

“There goeth the son of Abdallah who hath his conversation in the heavens.”—*Kurayish*.

LOOKING backwards over the history of the world, we find men in different spheres of human activity standing out conspicuous among their fellows, and over them as pioneers or leaders in thought and state. Foremost of all, the most conspicuous, the most revered and beloved are the great religious teachers and reformers, the expounders of morals, the definers and formulators of the laws of conduct and of the highest aspirations of the soul. Those men appeared in different nations, to different races, and at different epochs in the history of mankind. They appeared just when it seemed as if reformers were needed, when morals required resuscitation, when higher religious ideas required clarifying and restating, and the religious conscience a fresh impetus and a nobler outlook. Those men were the founders of the principal religious systems of the world. The outstanding figures being: Lao Tze, Confucius, Buddha, Zoroaster, Issa (Jesus), and Muhammed. Speaking generally, we may say that the followers of each look upon the founder of the system to which they belong as the principal messenger of God; outside of that point their beliefs concerning the attributes of the various teachers differ greatly. The highest claim is made by the Christians, with a few exceptions—namely, that Issa or Jesus is the Son of God, born of a virgin mother—and that all the others are imposters or false prophets. The broadest and most tolerant claim is that made by the Muslims, or followers of the teachings of Muhammed—namely, that Muhammed was a man just as we are, but that he was the greatest of the prophets, being inspired by God to complete the work of the prophets who preceeded him; they, therefore, look upon the prophets of all religions as men inspired to teach great religious truths and to lay down pure doctrines, and that Muhammed revived and extended those truths. His teachings contained in the Holy Quran being God's final revelation to mankind.

In the *Islamic Review* our editor and other writers have dealt in part with the teachings of Islam, for so the religion of the Muslim is called. They will continue to do so, therefore it is not necessary I should extend the subject at present. But one thing is necessary—namely, that readers of the *Review* should know something of the life of this man who expounded the ethical laws and taught the beautiful and beneficent doctrines written about. I propose, therefore, in this article to give in

outline the more important of the facts connected with his life, the opposition he encountered from his own clansmen and others, his difficulties, his struggles, and his steadfastness in what he believed to be the path along which God was directing him. I can only do this meanwhile in outline, and with the purpose that those readers not already acquainted with the life of the Prophet may be able to grasp and visualise the whole more readily. Either I or others may afterwards deal in more detail with special incidents and epochs in the life of the first of Arabs.

I am not here specially writing for Muslims, but for those English readers who have never given any study to the subject, and now, having heard something of the teachings of Islam, would like to learn a little concerning the expounder. What Muslims themselves believe concerning their Prophet and his teachings will be dealt with in this paper continually; that is the purpose for which it was founded. I do not wish in the present article to expound views to any length, but to confine myself as much as possible to facts in the life of Muhammed, so that the readers mentioned will be able to mentally survey the whole without effort, and also that they will better understand the references to various events in his life mentioned time and again by contributors who are forced to assume that the reader is acquainted with the same. I also hope that it will create within their minds that interest that will carry them on to further study and make them look forward to future articles in the *Review* from whatever pen they may emanate, illustrating in more detail incidents in life of the dark-eyed son of the desert, who stood for God, alone among the Arabs, and whose teachings were destined to influence and mould the lives and characters of millions, and to affect the whole course of the world history and change even the thought and life of Christianity itself.

Muhammed was the son of Abdallah, the youngest son of Shayba, better known in history as Abd ul-Muttalib; his mother was named Amina; she was a daughter of Wahb, the chief of the family of Zuhri. As in the case of the birth of Jesus, the exact date of Muhammed's birth is uncertain. Syed Ameer Ali gives August 29, 570 A.D.; Caussin de Perceval, August 20, 570 A.D.; Prof. Palmer, April 20, 571 A.D.; Dr. E. Deutsch, same year; Dr. A. Miller, in *Der Islam*, says 570 is correct, and that April 20, 571, is the conventional date. He seems to have been born on the 12th Rabi I. of the year of the Elephant, according to the Era of the Pagan Arabs; the difficulty is to find the exact time corresponding to our chronology. He was a posthumous child, his father having died shortly before his birth. The child was first placed in the charge of Thueiba, a slave woman, and shortly after given over to Halima, a woman of the Bani Sa'd, to be taken to the hills and there brought up in the healthy mountain air. This

was customary amongst the high-born women of the Arabs. At the end of two years Halima weaned him and brought him to his mother, who, seeing how the mountain air had made the child strong and robust, requested the nurse to take him back again. When about five years of age, the nurse brought him to Amina, and he remained with her until her death about a year afterwards. The orphan lad now passed under the guardianship of his grandfather, Abd ul-Muttalib, who lavished upon him the utmost love, treating, as might be expected, his little grandson with more tenderness than the other members of his household. In about four years' time he was destined to lose his grandfather, who passed away in 579 A.D. at an advanced age. The doubly bereft orphan now passed under the guardianship of his uncle, Abd-u-Manaf, better known as Abu Talib, on whom also devolved the guardianship of the Kaaba and the sacred well, Zem-Zem. We may be sure that his uncle instructed him in the religion and mysteries of what was at that time the centre of Pagan religion. When still a lad he prevailed upon his uncle to allow him to accompany one of his caravans to Syria. This would be the first expedition made by him into a foreign land, his first opportunity of visiting new scenes and learning something of the habits and thoughts of other peoples than the Arabs. We are not informed by the Arab writers concerning the exact number of expeditions made, but we can easily conceive of a young man of his nature taking every opportunity of his uncle's kindness to obtain his permission to accompany a caravan travelling either to Syria or Persia. Those caravans would be many days on the journey, and in the evening, when the caravan encamped for rest, the youth would have the pleasantest hours of his life. There in cool and verdured wady he would listen to the story-tellers rehearsing the deeds of the Arabs and hear of the patriarchs, Fathers Ibrahim and Ismail, and of the prophets, Musa and Harun. There he would learn legends of love and war, the battles of the Banu Bakr and the Banu Hind, and drink deep of the romance and poetry of his nation. Romance and poetry had become embedded in the nature of the Bedawin, a part of his existence, its root deeply planted in his bosom, drank its very life-sap from the warm blood-drops of his heart. The Prophet was an Arab of the Arabs, a scion of the Banu Hashim, the noblest family of the Kurayish.

When about twenty-five years of age he became what we might term the steward of a kinswoman, a widow named Khadija; she was a lady of the Khurayish and very wealthy. Desirous of obtaining a trustworthy person to take charge of her caravans, her choice lighted on Muhammed. The choice proved successful from a business point of view; the young man, Muhammed, proved able in guiding the expedition and energetic and faithful in the discharge of his duties; it was destined to prove happy, also, for Khadija, although fifteen years the

senior of her steward, fell in love with him, and he returning the affection, they were married about 595 A.D. Their married life was an exceedingly happy one. She bore him four daughters and three sons; the latter died in infancy. This marriage made Muhammed one of the richest men in Mecca—he was already one of the most respected. The following incidents show not only the respect in which he was held, but give an insight into his character.

Mecca was not only a religious centre famous for its shrine, where three hundred and sixty images were ranged round the great god Hobal, but pilgrims from the various tribes came year after year to kiss the black stone, which they said had fallen from heaven in the days of Adam. Then Ukaz lay only three short journeys away, where the great fair was held, and the most renowned poets attempted to outshine each other in the art of the Muses, and to sing of the prowess and glory of their tribes and of themselves. Trade was carried on between times, pleasure was rampant, and we may be sure that women and wine were features of the pageant.

About the time we write of there was no leader in Mecca strong enough to maintain order, and lawlessness became rife, feuds were common, and street brawls ensued; not only strangers but even citizens were robbed and the women insulted. At the instance of Muhammed, the principal members of the family of Zuhra and Taym and the descendants of Hashim bound themselves by oath to defend every individual citizen or stranger, freeman or slave, from wrong and injustice, and to obtain redress where such occurred. This league of chivalry was called *Hilf-ul-Fuzûl* (Federation of the Fuzûl), probably from the names of the persons composing it. In 605 A.D., during the reconstruction of the Kaaba, a dispute arose which might have led to a long war and severe fighting and much bloodshed, but was happily averted by the tact, resource and ability of Muhammed. The dispute arose as to which of the persons representing the four bodies of the Kurayish should have the privilege of putting the black stone in its place in the eastern corner when the Kaaba was under repair. During the dispute it is said that the oldest citizen arose and exclaimed:—

“O Kurayish, hearken unto me! My advice is that the man who chanceth first to enter the court of the Kaaba by this gate of the Bani Shayba, he shall be chosen to decide the difference amongst you, or himself to place the stone.”

As God willed it, almost immediately after Muhammed, who had been away during the period, walked through the gate. When the matter was explained to him, Muhammed, taking off his mantle, spread it on the ground, and lifting the stone placed it on the mantle. Turning to the assembled chiefs, he said:—

“Now let one from each of your four divisions come forward and raise a corner of the mantle.”

They did so, when the stone reached the proper height, he guided it into its place with his own hand. So by the exercise of a little commonsense and sound judgment the matter was amicably settled, and what might have been a bloody war averted.

Another act of kindness set an example. The young Zaid bin-Harith was captured and brought a prisoner to Mecca, where he was bought by a nephew of Khadija, who presented the Arab lad in a gift to the wife of Muhammed ; he obtained the boy from his wife and at once gave him his freedom. The result was that Zaid became absolutely devoted to Muhammed and refused to leave him to go back to his own tribe, even at the request of his father.

The events dealt with above may not seem of importance to the readers, and they may wonder why I have dwelt on them. I have done so with a purpose. The youthful period of a man's life is the time when his character is being moulded, when the man is being made. It is the time when he is receiving impressions and imbibing them, when he is learning from the book of Nature in all its pages and from every picture in its text—learning through the medium of experience the facts of reality that are surging around him, and whose waves are infringing upon him on all sides. Youth is the time when the soul absorbs ideas the readiest, reacts the quickest to external stimuli, and is attracted by every wave, contracting or expanding according to the conditions. The period outlined then was the most important in the history of Islam. Islam was in the throes of its birth within the heart of the Prophet. It only required the touch of the Divine fire to make it quicken and break forth into flame and light with its splendour all the hills of Arabia.

We have to remember he was not an educated man. In those days in Mecca there were no schools, as we know them, where a boy might learn to read and write ; no wonderful libraries wherein a student thirsting for knowledge might delight and obtain mental stimulus and guidance and help from the writers of the world towards the solution of the problems of existence, of life and death.

But the light came, came to that uneducated Arab amid the hills of his native land, and spreading ever further and further it flashed through continent and continent, and still blazes on with undiminished glory.

The Divine call came to him when he was in the prime of manhood—on the borders of forty years of age. No doubt there was a lengthy period of preparation—years of thought, of mental unrest and spiritual anxiety and doubt, when the idols of polytheism and the superstition and idolatry of the religion learned in youth was being cast overboard. The old and oncoming new must have struggled for the mastery while the soul was being purified, and a nobler faith and nobler view emerging.

After his marriage with Khadija more leisure was his, hours for study and contemplation: how to raise the morals of his countrymen, revive their religious zeal, and how to know the truth amid a thousand theories propounded by a thousand warring sects. He had to a certain extent thrown off the sprightly step and upright carriage of the camel-driver. His walk was strong, but the stoop of the thinker became more and more prominent. His manner became that of the philosopher seeking to penetrate the mysteries of Nature and to hold converse with the Divine. He sought the silent valley and the solitude of the mountain caves to meditate. The change was visible, especially to his friends, those who were in close contact with him. His wife, probably startled a little at first, soon caught glimpses of his prophetic aspirations and religious utterances, and cheered him with kind words, encouraging him to the best of her ability. His principal retreat was in the mountains to the north of Mecca. During the month of Ramazan (probably December 610) he retired to the cave in the hills to fast, pray and meditate, and seek aid from on high. It was the

“BLESSED NIGHT, AL KADER.”

“What shall make thee understand how excellent the night
Al Kader, is?

The night, Al Kader, is better than a thousand months!

Therein do the angels descend,

And the spirit also,

By permission of their Lord.

With His decrees concerning all matters,

It bringeth peace until the rosy dawn!”

—Sura xcvi.

The coal-black tresses of the night wrapped the earth in gloom; salubrious breezes in the darkness kissed the verdure and licked with cooling tongue the parching rocks. The pale stars shining overhead looked down in dreamy silence on the mountain of Hira, with its red granite cavern and lonely occupant. Muhammed, scorched by the red-hot lava of volcanic thought, through the vista of ecstatic vision, beheld, coursing on the night-wind, the “chariots of heaven and the horsemen thereof.” A glorious figure in brilliant raiment, holding an open scroll, appeared before him. The voice that spake in thunder from the crest of Sinai shook with rolling echoes the valley of those rugged Arab hills.

“Cry in the name of Allah!

In the name of Allah who hath created,—

Who hath created man of thick blood!”

“But I cannot read, I am a man untaught,” trembled from the lips of Muhammed.

"Cry!" came the voice—

"Cry! by the most beneficent Allah,
Who taught the pen to write,
Who taught man what he knew not!"

What a cry from the soul, what a vision! The agony of the garden of Gethsemane must have been a pin-prick to the agony of Hira, when the strong vein swelled on the camel-driver's brow. Yet he doubted his mission to preach, conscious of his unworthiness and lack of education. Khadija and his friend Waraka tried to reassure him, but the doubts were not removed until Gabriel again appeared to him in vision and the call became distinct, the command certain.

"O thou that art covered!

Arise and preach,
And magnify Allah!
Purify thy garments,
And shun abominations!
Grant not favours for increase:
Wait patiently for Allah.

When the trump shall blow shall be distress for misbelievers!"

—Sura lxxiv.

He now entered definitely upon his mission, the path laid down for him. He rose exalting:—

"By the splendour of mid-day!

By the stilly night!

The Lord hath not ~~not~~ forsaken thee,
Neither doth He hate thee.

Verily the life to come shall be better than the past!"

—Sura xciii.

"What calls you here?" asked his uncle, Abu Talib, on finding him and the little Ali praying alone, "and what religion do you profess?" "I profess the religion of Allah, of His angels, of His prophets," replied Muhammed, "the religion of Abraham. Allah has commissioned me to preach this to men, and to urge them to embrace it. Naught would be more worthy of thee, O my uncle, than to adopt the true faith, and to help me to spread it."

"Son of my brother," replied the noble old man, "I can never abjure the faith of my ancestors; but if thou art attacked I will defend thee." Then turning to his son Ali, he added:—

"Muhammed will never lead thee into any wrong way; hesitate not to follow any advice he giveth."

For a time he went only unto his friends, teaching and exhorting them to follow the doctrines of Islam. But the spirit in him was too strong to allow such a nature to remain in such a narrow pathway, and he came boldly out into the open to preach the Gospel to one and all. He denounced the worship

of idols and the moral degradation of the worshippers. "Invoke no other God but Allah," was his continued cry; by Divine help alone might regeneration take place. About this time such suras as the following, which I quote in part, must have been wrung from him :—

"By the declining day!
Verily man rushes to destruction,
Save such as believe and do righteousness,
And urge one another to truth and patience."—Sura ciii.

"Verily man is to his Lord ungrateful,
And is himself a witness thereof,
Verily he is keen in loving this world's goods."—Sura c.

As Gilman emphatically says: "These are not the ravings of an unbalanced mind, but the powerful cries of one in earnest for the good of others."

At first the Meccans scorned him, saying: "There goeth the son of Abdallah who speaketh about the heavens," but when he denounced the idols as senseless wood and stone, a strong opposition arose, as might be expected in such a case. They stoned him, cast dirt in his face, and drowned his voice with yells. The Kurayish approached Abu Talib, and bade him "cause Muhammed to hold his peace, or we will take up arms against thee as well as against him; and we shall fight until our party or thine is exterminated." Abu Talib sought his nephew, and said :—

"Deliver us from the evils that hang over thee and our family."

"O my uncle," said Muhammed, "should the sun descend upon my right hand and the moon on my left to fight against me, and should the alternative be presented to me of renouncing my mission or of perishing in accomplishing it, I would not waver from my purpose!"

The persecution of the Muslims became more bitter than ever. Verses were written by his enemies reviling him and sent throughout the land. His friends also replied by verses in his favour. They were spread broadcast, and his name and influence spread all over Arabia. Time saw the persecutions increase. His few converts, especially those of low birth, suffered the most. The arm of Abu Talib was still strong enough to save his nephew from death, if not from insult. His followers received such severe treatment that, in 615 A.C., he advised some of them to seek refuge for a time in Abyssinia. This was the first exile. The same year saw two noted conversions to Islam. That of Hamza, his youngest uncle, who, on learning that Abu Jahl had insulted Muhammed, rushed into the Kaaba where that chief was sitting with various members of the Kurayish, and, striding up to him, struck him with his

bow, and declared for Muhammed. Thereafter he joined his nephew at the House of Arkam.*

The next conversion was that of Omar, destined to be the second Khalifa. Robust, of commanding stature, bold, impulsive, precipitate, firm of purpose, easily angered, in the flower of his youth—about twenty-six years of age, he was a man to stand in awe of, and the Kurayish feared him. Yet the Muslims were only a few among many. A ban was laid upon them. They were confined to the quarter of Abu Talib. The enemy, forming a league against them, swore not to enter into marriage or to buy or sell with them. The ban held till the year 619 A.C. came round, when Hisham, son of Amr, used his influence to bring it to an end, and winning over Zubair, the son of Abu Ommeya, to his side the pact was broken. About December 619 A.C., his beloved wife Khadija died, and a month or so later his uncle Abu Talib passed away. He had now lost his strongest supporter and his best protector.

Abu Sofian, his inveterate enemy, stirred up the tribe against him again. He retired to Ta'if to propagate his doctrines there, but the enmity of the Kurayish followed him, and he was driven out and returned to Mecca.

The blackest of clouds have a silver lining, and a little ray of sunshine now burst through : a ray that was later to pour forth in glory and in splendour. In 620 A.C. a few men of Yathrib heard him at Mecca and became proselytes, and returning home spread the news through their city. On the following pilgrimage (621) they came again and others with them. A small band numbering twelve, with deputies from the tribes of Aus and Khazraj, the principal in Yathrib. A conference was held, where the Prophet addressed them. They gave their adhesion to his cause, and pledged themselves as follows:—

“We will not associate anything with God ; we will not steal, nor commit adultery, nor fornication : we will not kill our children ; we will abstain from calumny and slander ; we will obey the Prophet in everything that is right ; and we will be faithful to him in weal and in sorrow.”—
 “Ameer Ali following Ibn Hisham,” p. 289, and
 “Ibn-ul-Athir,” vol. ii. pp. 73-4.

This was the first pledge of Akaba, from the name of the hill whereon the meeting was held. The converts promised to return in a year and report on the success of their efforts. A general renunciation of idols occurred shortly after the return to Yathrib. So great was the influx of converts that a message was sent to the Prophet asking him to send them a teacher, and so he sent them Musab. So successful was his missionary

* I hope in a future article or two to deal more in detail with this part of the history both in regard to the first converts and the meetings in the House of Arkam, and Professor Margoliouth's “Secret Society” myth.

campaign that before the year passed almost every tribe in Yathrib gave converts to Islam, and the two principal, the Beni Aus and Beni Khazraj, were almost wholly Muslim, including the leading men. When the time of the pilgrimage arrived, seventy-three men and two women of Yathrib journeyed to Mecca to hear the Prophet, and to invite him to their city. They met at evening after the sunset, below the hill of Akaba, where the first pledge was taken. This time the pledge was extended: they took an oath to defend him with their lives. Such was the second pledge of Akaba. The Kurayish soon learned of the meeting, and resolved at one fell swoop to exterminate the Muslims. Some of his converts informed the Prophet of the evil design, and, gathering his followers together, he sent them off to Yathrib, with the exception of his cousin Ali and his father-in-law, Abu Bakr, one of his early converts, whose daughter, Ayesha, he married some time after the death of Khadija. The Kurayish was now resolved to kill the Prophet himself. The difficulty was how to accomplish it so as to escape a blood-feud. According to the Pagan clan law, the killing of a man of one clan by a member of another brought down on the slayer the vengeance of every member of the opposing clan. For the members of any one or two tribes to have slain Muhammed would have drawn on them and their brethren the blood-vengeance of the Banu Hisham, both Muslim and Pagan. This they desired to avoid. At last Abu Jahl suggested that a number of men should be chosen, some from each family, and that they should simultaneously sheathe their swords in his bosom. Hearing of the intentions regarding himself, the Prophet resolved to depart for Yathrib, and, taking with him Abu Bakr, made his way to a small cave in the mountains of Shaur, to lie in concealment until the pursuit passed by. When the Kurayishites reached the house of Muhammed, they found only Ali, the son of Abu Talib, lying in the Prophet's bed. On demanding where the master was, they were met by the reply: "I have no knowledge of him. Am I his keeper? Ye bade him to quit the city, and he is gone."

Horsemen were sent out to look for him, especially towards Yathrib. All the time Muhammed and Abu Bakr lay in the cave on the hills to the south, while a servant of the latter brought food to them in secret, and bread cooked by Asma, his daughter. Parties scouting passed near them, but they remained undiscovered. "What," said Abu Bakr, "will we do if they find us: we are but two?" "We are three," said Muhammed, "God is with us." When the pursuit slackened, they mounted swift camels prepared for them, and travelling westward for a time, towards the Red Sea, struck the caravan track leading into Syria. The news that he was coming went before him, and on his arrival at Yathrib his welcome was a royal one. "He is come! he is come!" the people cried as they streamed out to meet him, clad in holiday attire.

"O people," he said, "show your joy by giving to your neighbours the salutation of peace; send portions to the poor; bind close the ties of kinsmen; pray while others sleep; and thus shall ye enter paradise!"

This event is known as the Hijra (Hegira) or Flight, and is the event from which the Muslims date their calendar. The day was the 4th Rabi I. of the first year of the Hijra, according to C. de Perceval 20th June, 622 A.C., and according to the same scholar his entry into Yathrib, henceforth known as Medina (the City), took place on Friday 16 Rabi I. (2nd July) 622. The year commencing on the 15th July 622. A new era had dawned for Islam.

J. PARKINSON.

THE STUDY OF ARABIC BY INDIANS.

By MAULVI MUHAMMUD AHMAD, M.A., Lt.M., Ph.D.,
Revenue Minister, Bhopal, C.I.

It has been said that a Muhammadan without the knowledge of Arabic is a contradiction in terms. This may be an exaggeration, but it is certainly more than desirable for an educated Muhammadan to have first hand knowledge of his national and religious language and literature.

No doubt the inducements for the study of Arabic which existed a hundred years ago have mostly disappeared, and the number of our "Ulemá" is decreasing day by day, because there are no lucrative appointments or positions for which those who are highly proficient in Arabic are eligible. The Government of the day maintains or gives special grants-in-aid to several Arabic schools in the Province; professors of Arabic are employed on the staff of nearly every college of importance; and for those who join the legal profession the study of Arabic still possesses considerable monetary value: for it is impossible to master the intricacies of Muhammadan Law without access to original authorities in Arabic. For those who wish to travel through Muhammadan countries which line the entire route between India and Europe, from Arabia to Morocco, as well as for those who desire acquaintance with the intellectual life of Muhammadans outside India, the study of Arabic is equally essential.

It is natural for an educated Indian Muhammadan to feel interested in the social and economical welfare of his co-religionists in Arabia, Egypt, Asia Minor, Turkey, Tripoli, Tunis, Algeria and Morocco, and he cannot learn much about them first hand unless he can read the Arabic books and newspapers that are published in those countries.

Unlike Sanskrit or Latin, which are no longer spoken anywhere, and possess only an academic interest, Arabic is still a living language, spoken in at least half-a-dozen countries, the medium of important communications and business transactions between different peoples, and still the delight and despair of eager students and accomplished scholars.

It is impossible to excel in Persian or Urdu compositions, or to acquire a thorough grasp of these languages without an adequate knowledge of Arabic. Arabic words glitter like gems in the best Urdu and Persian compositions, and it is often impossible even to read them correctly without considerable familiarity with Arabic grammar and vocabulary.

It is acknowledged on all hands that the Arabic literature is one of the richest amongst the languages. In the days of the *Abbasside* Emperors, Baghdas was flooded with camel loads of literature gathered from the four corners of the globe. The best and most valuable part of these foreign books was translated into and otherwise assimilated and absorbed with Arabic literature. A considerable portion of the Arabic works thus produced was unfortunately destroyed later on by Háláku Khan, but what remained after his pillage and vandalism is still the envy of many civilised nations. It was not long afterwards that four lacs of Arabic works were counted in the Royal Library of Cordova, in Muhammadan Spain, and in more recent times the Khadevial Library in Cairo was found to contain one lac of Arabic manuscripts.

But these treasures remain a sealed book to many of our educated men in India. The method of teaching Arabic, which has obtained for many years in this country, is to a great extent responsible for our reversion to its acquisition. In the old-fashioned "maktabas" grammar alone is taught for many years, and, as Arabic grammar is by no means easy, the process is very painful to young learners. Later on undue prominence is given to Logic, and very little or no attention is paid to Arabic History or Literature. The result is that there is a general consensus of opinion amongst students that Arabic is one of the most difficult languages taught in this country. As a matter of fact, it is no more difficult for a Muhammadan to learn than English or any other foreign language.

The method of teaching makes the whole difference. Government has done something to improve it by insisting that in all the Arabic schools leading up to the "Mullah" and "Fazil" Examinations, in the United Provinces, for instance, Arabic readers will be taught simultaneously with grammar from the lowest classes. This has also been borne in mind in prescribing the Arabic courses of study in Anglo-Vernacular schools and colleges.

But, unfortunately, the number of students who take up Arabic in Government or aided institutions is very small. The student population has inherited from its parents the dread of

Arabic study, and in nearly ninety-nine cases out of a hundred a Muhammadan student prefers to take up Persian instead of Arabic. Persian is probably easier to acquire than Arabic, but the difference in the difficulties of the two languages is not so great as is generally supposed.

From the religious point of view Arabic is all important. It is probably impossible to comprehend the full significance and to grasp the spirit of our religion without access to religious works which have not yet been translated from Arabic into Urdu. From the literary and utilitarian points of view Arabic has a far more extensive literature, and whereas it is still spoken in at least half a dozen Indian countries, each of them nearly as large, if not larger than Persia, Persian is practically confined to Persia, and parts of Afganistan and Baluchistan. Arabic is therefore relatively far more important to an Indian Muhammadan than Persian, and it behoves us to popularise it by simplifying its method of teaching as much as possible.

The best means of acquiring a language rapidly is to go and reside in a country where it is spoken. In France and Germany there are institutions which undertake to give you a fair working knowledge of French or German in six months. It may not be possible to acquire Arabic so rapidly, but a year's stay and serious study should suffice in places like Cairo in Egypt or Bērūt in Asia Minor. These places have for centuries been the centres of Arabic learning, and they now offer all the conveniences of modern civilisation that are still wanting in holier places like Mecca or Medina, the cradles of Islam. Next to a stay in a country where Arabic is spoken, it is best for those who already possess a knowledge of English or French to acquire Arabic in the way in which it is acquired by Europeans. In reading Arabic with an Indian maulvi it is not often possible to get out of the old groove, and for an English-knowing student Arabic is therefore more easily acquired through the medium of English. England has produced many scholars like Burton and Palmer, who possessed a thorough knowledge of Arabic. They lived in Arabia and Egypt disguised as Mohamedans for several years, and both spoke and wrote Arabic so faultlessly that even Arabs could not always detect their foreign nationality. Palmer has written several books for English students of the Arabic language. His "Manual of Arabic" is a small, compact handbook, which serves as an excellent introduction to both classical and modern Arabic. A more comprehensive and equally interesting grammar is that by the Rev. R. Sterling, who has resided for many years at "Mazza," in Palestine.

For text books "Alf Lela" is one of the easiest and most entertaining book for a beginner; another book is "Mojâuiul-adab," portions of which have lately been presented for the Allahabad Matriculation Examination. This is an excellent collection in six handy volumes of extracts from the best Arabic

authors, which afford a most instructive and interesting course of reading. These works are sure to create in the student such a zeal for Arabic studies as would ensure his prosecuting them further and deriving a genuine pleasure from them.

The best work in Arabic is, of course, the Holy Quran. Except where passages of some difficulty occur here and there, the Quran is written in a style at once simple and elegant; for the object was to interest and instruct the common people in Arabia and elsewhere, as well as to address the learned amongst them. The language of the Quran is, therefore, such as can be easily understood by an uneducated Arab as well as by Indian students after a brief but careful study of the language.

The best period of Arabic literature ended with the Quran and the "Hádís." The most elegant poems in the language were written before the Quran was revealed. Although Muhammadan power rose rapidly and reached its zenith after the promulgation of the Quran, Arabic literature suffered rather than improved after the Muhammadan conquests; for these conquests introduced the Arabs to Persian literature, which is as stilted and affected as the pre-Quranic Arabic literature is simple and natural. As a result of this contact with Persian literature there were very few really great works produced in Arabic after the "Quran" and the "Ahádís." Poems like "Hamasa" and the "Seven Muallaqat," which are among the jewels of Arabic literature, and whose elegance has compelled the admiration of European scholars, and induced men like Sir Charles Lyall, late Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, to translate them into English, were all composed in pre-Quranic days. It is this pre-Islamic literature therefore that deserves the special attention of all students of Arabic literature.

To give only a few specimens of Arabic poetry. *Jarir*, one of the "Umayyid" poets, praises the power and influence of his tribe "Banu tamim" by saying :—

When you have incurred the displeasure of the
"Banu tamim" tribe, beware ! for the entire world
is against you !

Fatima bint Hajam, speaking of her deceased brother and protector, says :—

Thou wert a mountain behind which I took
refuge and shelter. Thy death has left me on a
treeless plain, exposed to the scorching rain of a
tropical sun. I now fear the meanest assailant,
and crave his mercy, for thy death has dulled the
edge of the lances carried by my protectors.

The fourth Khalifa "Ali," describing the transitory nature of this world, says the world may be compared to a passing shadow, or to the lightning which flashes for a moment on the

horizon of our hopes. The poet "Mutammim," who has recently lost his brother Malik, is moved to tears while passing through a graveyard. His companion expostulates on his weakness and points out that he has left his brother's grave far behind him, and asks "Mutammim" whether it is right to shed tears on every grave that he comes across. "Mutammim" replies:—

The sight of these graves reminds me of my great
sorrow. Leave me alone and let me weep, for all
the graves in this graveyard are the graves of my
brother "Malik."

An Arab's eagerness to rescue the oppressed is brought out in "Samils" couplet:—

When they are asked to rescue anyone, they do
not ask who wants their help, what fighting is
likely, and where.

The conspicuous bravery of Arabs is admitted on all hands, for their country has really never been fully conquered by any other nation. The "Bedouins" are practically as independent to-day as in the pre-Islamic days. The poet Umar celebrates this national trait in the couplet:—

Where fully armoured heroes are anxious to avoid
sword cuts, we grasp the keenest edge with bare
hands.

The Arabs love of their horses is proverbial. An Arab refused to part with his favourite mare, though selected by his king, and said:—

It is dearer to us than our life and property, and
we are prepared to starve ourselves and our
children for the sake of feeding her.

Works on special subjects—such as law and medicine, as well as modern newspapers—are written in much simpler language as compared with literary works and it consequently requires much less labour to comprehend them.

Considering the amount of time and labour that our boys still devote to the unintelligent study of the Quran, one cannot help regretting that their precious time is not more profitably spent in acquiring the Arabic language. In the old-fashioned maktabs children begin Qáida Baghdádi at the age of five or six years, and it then takes them several years to learn the Quran by rote.

Many of them spend as many, if not more, years thereafter in learning it by heart. Yet they do not understand the significance of any portion of what they have read for so many years. If their teachers would take the trouble to teach these boys the rudiments of the Arabic language at the same time that they are learning to read the Quran, their time would be far

more profitably spent, and the boys would thereby be enabled not only to read but to understand and appreciate the meaning of the Quran. It is too much to hope for this improvement in the old maktab, for the teachers there are generally themselves ignorant of Arabic; but the pity of it is that even in modern and up-to-date institutions, managed by educated Mohamadans, no attention is apparently paid to this important subject. In these institutions the boys are made to read the Quran for at least half an hour every morning, but no attempt is made by their teachers to explain the meaning of what the boys read mechanically. It would be far better for the boys if they read, say, only one or two lines of the Quran, but grasped their sense and learnt the meaning of each word separately during that half hour rather than they read through a number of pages mechanically without understanding a single word.

"A SONG OF PRAISE."

1.

'TIS sunrise on the mountains, far beneath the valley fair
Lies before me as a mirage floating in the desert air,
And a wave of love sweeps o'er me as I view the scene before me.
Each flower and bird and bee,
And all things wild and free,
Sing the everlasting story—

There is no God but God! There is no God but God!
God is Most Great! Most Great!

2.

'Tis moonlight on the ocean, and in the velvet night
The tropic stars gaze down on me as myriad points of light;
The moonbeams flicker on the sea, and the song of my life swells up
from me.

From world to world,
From star to star,
It rings through all eternity—

There is no God but God! There is no God but God!
God is Most Great! Most Great!

RASHEEDA ROSS.

MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARDS DEATH.

AL-BÂITH ! Opener of Tombs ! we praise
Thy power, which unto life the dead can raise ;
Why should we fear to yield our breath
To Thee that art the Lord of Death.

Pearls of the Faith.

THE WOKING MOSQUE LECTURES.

"THE TRUE CATHOLIC FAITH."

(Delivered by KHALID SHELDRAKE on Sunday, April 12, 1914.)

I SHOULD like first of all to read to you several verses from the Holy Kuran, the first quotation being from Sura 2, Ayat 59:—

"Verily, they who believe (Muslims) are they who follow the Jewish religion, and the Christians, and the Sabeites—whoever of these believeth in God and the last day, and doeth that which is right, shall have their reward with their Lord: fear shall not come upon them, neither shall they be grieved."

Also Ayat 172 of the same Sura:—

"There is no piety in turning your faces towards the East or the west, but he is pious who believeth in God, and the last day, and the angels, and the Scriptures, and the prophets; who for the love of God disburseth his wealth to his kindred, and to the orphans, and the needy, and the wayfarer, and those who ask, and for ransoming; who observeth prayer, and payeth the legal alms, and who is of those who are faithful to their engagements when they have engaged in them, and patient under ills and hardships, and in time of trouble: these are they who are just, and these are they who fear the Lord."

These two verses are the sum total of the highest form of catholicity in the true sense of the term. Very early do Islam and Christianity part company. Islam believes in the *ascent* of man to the divine state, Christianity teaches the *descent* of man. Man has gradually evolved from being an unintelligent being—very little above the animal creation, as we can see from the skulls we possess of what we term "pre-historic man." The gradual development of the faculty of reason has raised man to the position he now holds. The triumph of Islam is that it makes such an appeal to our reason, our logic, argument succeeding argument in proper sequence. It does not ask us to believe blindly because certain things are mysteries, but asks us first of all to convince ourselves that these things are so. Our God is He who reveals Himself to all mankind, He is not a mysterious power whom we must fear and tremble when we see the terrible pictures of punishment prepared to frighten the imaginative and sensitive by Christian orthodoxy. We Muslims believe in One God ("Qul Huwalláhu Ahad"), and we strive for

the Unity of Mankind—that true Brotherhood which we Muslims know so well. What a grand ideal to see all men worshipping the One God, and dwelling in harmony and peace! The very conception of a ruling Trinity—Three in One—destroys all unity of belief, of thought, of worship—yes, of life itself. What does Islam possess that renders it the only religion which can gather all men to God as workers? I will try to tell you. If a person becomes Muslim, he becomes at once broad-minded; instead of refusing to believe any but his own particular revelation he believes in all God's prophets and in all Divine revelations. Christianity denies any revelation not made to the Jewish race by a Hebrew prophet; not so Islam. I as a Muslim can revere the truths taught by Buddha, Zoroaster, Moses and Jesus as I reverence and love the Word of God given to us by our Holy Prophet Muhammad (on whom be peace!). I do not say this, that I *do not* hold the present book known as the Bible to be the *unaltered teaching* of the prophets. I will quote but one all-sufficient reason why the Revision Committee of the New Testament have taken out from that book the following verse: "There are three that bear record in Heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one" (I. John v. 7), and their reason for so doing is that "it could not *honestly* be left in"; and Calmet, a leading theologian of the seventeenth century, says: "This verse is not to be found in any ancient copy of the Bible." Mark you well—this is the very text on which the doctrine of the Trinity rests, and Christians themselves admit that this is a forgery of a late date. Does not this distinctly prove that the Bible has been corrupted? Again, the date of the oldest Hebrew manuscript is assigned as A.D. 400; another higher critic places this as far too early and says that *no certainty* can be given to *any writing before* A.D. 1000. Let us be generous and take A.D. 400. This means that the Gospels were written (by whom? Christians themselves do not know) 400 years after Christ. Can we place any trust in such books written so long after the events had taken place? We cannot. Turn to the Holy Kuran, still taking Christian testimony: even Sir W. Muir, the greatest opponent of Islam, has to admit that "the Kuran I hold is that which is translated from the very revelation of God given to us over 1,300 years ago by our Holy Prophet, and has remained unchanged and uncorrupted—this is, indeed, the greatest miracle. Shall I, then, read of Jesus in the Bible where I have no certainty? No; I read of Jesus in the immortal words of the Holy Kuran, where I have proof." Islam, again, preaches a practical Brotherhood—once a Muslim and you enter into that vast Body of Believers numbering over 400,000,000. It does not matter what colour you may be—black, yellow, white, or brown; whether you are prince or peasant, rich or poor, learned or ignorant—all in Islam are equals. Those of you here who saw us at our devotions as you came into the Mosque saw how we stand side by side, all

brethren in Islam. The Holy Kuran contains the wisest system of jurisprudence in the world. The Occident has tried to imitate by enacting laws which even now are still far behind those of Islam. Take the great curses of Christian lands, drunkenness and gambling, which ruin many homes and spread gloom and unhappiness wherever their curse is felt. God in the Holy Kuran has taken away from all Muslims these two great evils. Islam forbids alcoholic liquor and gambling, and so 1,300 years ago, by the wise law-giver and Prophet of Arabia, God saved Muslim lands from these scourges, which Christianity is impotent to suppress. Is not Islam the nobler teaching? The wise provision made for women, which gives them such a distinct status immeasurably superior to that which they possess in Christendom, the Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din spoke of so ably last Sunday, and I will not venture to say more on the subject just now. Should you desire to become Muslim the way is made easy by God. In Christianity, with its different divisions, should one Christian decide to go over to another Church, he in all probability must do penance for his past beliefs, and probably be baptised again, as though his late church is not recognised as a church of Christ. How sublime is it to turn again to Islam. Here are no penances, no narrow-minded prejudices; the new convert repeats the Kalima and is accepted as a brother by all Muslims—his sincerity is a matter for God and his own conscience; we are not his judges. If you still differ from us we do not condemn you to a hell for so doing, as others do. The Holy Quran says: "Let there be no compulsion in religion." Be sincere and search the Truth for yourselves. Do not believe blindly, but study Islam and other religions with an open mind, and Allah, in His goodness and mercy, will bring you to the Light.

THE MOSQUE LECTURE ON ATONEMENT.

"On Sunday the usual prayer was cited by Mr. Khalid Sheldrake, who also briefly spoke after the address of the Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, who spoke at length on the subject given above. The theory of vicarious atonement, the speaker said, was based upon the theory of sin by inheritance. St. Paul put the whole question in a nutshell when he said, in Romans v. 18: "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness the free gift came." But we read in Exodus something contrary: "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." The same we read in Numbers xiv. 18. Which of the two was true, the speaker inquired? Only three or four generations are to be condemned, so it is given in the Ten Commandments. But St. Paul says that the whole human race has been condemned by

one's sin. We are not told by Jesus to accept our religion from St. Paul, but He Himself respected the Commandments and ordered us to teach and keep them. If we teach the Commandments we cannot survive four generations, and hence no need of that atonement after four generations. Sin is often compared with disease, which sometimes is inherited. Here again we find the same rule. No disease travels beyond three or four generations. Either the disease disappears or the family after three or four generations becomes extinct. Again, the very idea of justice on which the theory of atonement has been based goes against it. If we inherit sinful nature, the very nature being creation of God, it is unjust to punish us for a thing in which we have no hand. Will God punish us for what we did under the dictate of a nature made by Him? It would be unjust. There is another reason advanced by the advocates of atonement. It is said that God cannot show His mercy without compensation. It is untrue on the very face of it. Divine mercy shown in creating things before our existence, and so necessary for our life, was without any compensation. Jesus Himself gave the lie to this argument when He taught in the Lord's Prayer to say: "Forgive us our debt, as we forgive our debtors." Do we forgive debts by asking someone else to pay on behalf of our debtors?—*The Surrey Herald*, May 8, 1914.

THE NECESSITY OF ISLAM IN THE PRESENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS.*

*And we (God) have sent down the book to thee
(Muhammad) that thou mightest clear up to them
the subject of their wranglings.*—The Quran 16: 67.

These words in the Book of God give one of the chief reasons which necessitate this final revelation from God. Almost all pre-Islamic religions, though of Divine origin, soon lost their original purity after the departure of their first teacher. They became split into pieces, and caused various denominations and persuasions, differing from each other on basic principles. It became difficult—nay, impossible—to find out the true form of a religion. That was the state of things at the advent of Islam. So is the case even now. Take any religion and you will find it reduced into sects and subsects. Though common in a generic name, they are at variance with each other on fundamental principles, yet all looking to one origin as their sole authority. Hinduism, perhaps, is an apt illustration of this pious heterogeneity. Like an ocean, it can manage to cover all waters of different colour. The Vedas are the sacred scriptures there, and the sole root of innumerable ramifications: a Theist and an Atheist or Agnostic; a Monotheist or a Pantheist; a believer in

* The lecture was delivered on April 19, 1914.

God in man or a disbeliever in such Divine incarnates ; an Idolator or an Image-breaker ; a Deist or a believer in a Revealed Religion ; a believer in transmigration of souls or one who has no faith in this theory ; a puritanical Vishnuvite or an unprincipled libertine under Shaktak denomination—all Hindus, though poles apart from each other in their tenets and beliefs, yet almost all of them relying on the Vedas as their sole authority for such beliefs. The other pre-Islam religions present the same picture. There are Atheists as well as Theists in Buddhism ; and the latter may again be sub-divided into two classes—those who take God as Impersonal and those who hold the other view. And has not Christianity met the same fate ? Various sects sprang in its very infancy. There were the Arians, Nestorians, Ebionites, Monophysites, Sabellians, Maromites—all at daggers-drawn against each other, and differing cardinally in their doctrines. Then comes the Council of Nice to find out *what people should or should not believe* (as if the matter of belief was a human device !), and the doctrine of the Trinity received prominence. The Athanasian Creed was formulated. The Pope swayed the Christian world for some centuries ; but faith became shaken in his infallibility, and Protestantism made its appearance, which, again, was torn into as many pieces as one can imagine, and this process of division has not reached its termination. They may all be identified as one class under the common name of Christians, but they all are diametrically opposed to each other in their beliefs. Do they all contain the truth, especially in the matter of their differences ? There cannot be two contradictory and at the same time true opinions on the same subject. Which is the true form of the original religion ?—a question which must agitate every honest seeker after truth. Is it Unity or Trinity ?

There are most conflicting opinions on various important articles of faith : remission of sins, necessity of actions, eternal punishment, holy communion, ordination, predestination, baptism and its rituals, and so forth. What was the teaching of Jesus on these Christian verities ? Who is to decide these differences, and, in the above-quoted words of the Quran, “clear up to them the subject of their wranglings.” They say the Church “filled with the Holy Ghost” is the sole authority. But shall we know which Church—the Romish or Anglican, the High or the Low Church, and why not the Greek Church with all her antiquity ? There is, however, another question worth consideration : Did God ever raise a council to confer on the problems of religion and sift the truth, or has He not always inspired one, and *only one*, person at a time to meet the need ? Trace any religion to its origin : it emanates from one man. Every great religion of the world counts in it generations of prophets. They came, one after the other, to renew the old faith, and to purify it of human corruption, and add some new revelation from God to the old religion to make it agreeable to their own times

God's ways are unalterable. Change in Divine dispensation is unknown. Where there is something wanted, factors which led to its previous existence at once appear again and work in the same manner as before. This unchangeable nature of the Divine laws is at the root of all scientific discoveries, and has been our common-day observation in Nature from the beginning of the Universe. If the same physical causes came into work when necessary in the physical sustenance of the Universe, why then the novel change in the province of spirituality? If one man has always been raised up to restore Divine religion to its original purity, if the word of God came always to one man to set at rest such differences as arose from corruption in religion, why not again one man to act as the mouthpiece of God, if the conditions of the time demanded Divine intervention? That all religions of the world had become corrupt at the advent of Islam and had been split into pieces has already been shown. Is not the Quran only consistent with the aforesaid established ways of God in His providential dispensation when it says that it has been sent by God to clear up wranglings and differences of people belonging to various religions? If similar contingencies before Christ invited Divine intervention in the form of Divine revelation to Him, how can one demur to this Quranic statement? That there was necessity at the advent of Islam cannot be denied. If to meet it the Book of Islam came, it is not an inconsistent event. The only question that can be raised is why Muhammad should be accepted as the elected one. The answer is very simple. Muhammad is the only person in the field who claims to satisfy the demand. God never delayed for scores of centuries in sending a man after His mind to guide the world. Man needed guidance at that time: only Muhammad claimed to be the guide. No other claimant to control his rights has come forward ever since, leave alone what are his other claims. That it was not the Church nor a council, but one man only, who, filled with the Holy Ghost, had to teach the religion and make up the deficiency in the faith left by Jesus Christ, is a fact which one can easily find in the prophetic words of Jesus Christ when He says:—

Nevertheless I tell you the truth; 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. . . . I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.—

St. John xvi. 7 and 12-13.

It appears from these words that the coming one was one person, and not a council. But it is said that the person pro-

phesied is the Holy Ghost, who through the Church had to guide the people unto all truth ; as if the Holy Ghost had not already descended. Was Jesus Himself devoid of the Holy Spirit ? And, if the Holy Ghost was in Him, how could He utter these words : " If I go not away the Comforter will not come," or " If I depart, I will send him unto you " ? The words are too clear to allow any confusion. They show that He who was yet to come was one who had not appeared before, and could not come till Jesus left the world. To say that the Holy Ghost is meant in the Biblical text is to admit that Jesus thought His whole ministry was without that Spirit. And what about the Holy Dove we read of in the Bible which descended upon Jesus after He was baptised by John. If it was a reality, and Jesus was filled with the Holy Ghost, the person spoken of in St. John is some other than the Holy Ghost.

Again, the Church filed with the Holy Ghost does not fulfil the prophecy. Jesus admitted that He had yet to say many things to His disciples ; he left His religion incomplete. The coming one had to guide man into all truth ; he had to make new and copious additions to the teachings of Christ ; he had to improve upon them. Has the Church made any additions ? Has she improved on what we read in the words of Christ ? Can any Church luminary enlighten us on what has been added to the existing store ? " He shall not speak unto you of himself, but whatever he shall hear, that shall he speak. Has the Church or any of her dignitaries ever claimed to hear from the Holy Spirit ; have they ever understood what was the experience about the Holy Spirit of the prophets before Christ ? " " He will show you things to come " was said about him ; has the Church ever made any prophecy of things to come ? These are our demands, which arise from the words of the above-given—prophecy, and the Church in no case fulfils it. Are these words of Christ untrue ? Was this promise a mere hoax ? God forbid if I say so ; a Christian must see its fulfilment. Muhammad is the Spirit of truth. He did not speak of himself, he spoke what he heard, and he delivered prophecies of coming events. The Quran has referred to this prophecy in the following :—

" The (Spirit of) truth came and the false fled away ; the false had to fly (The Family of Quran). He (Muhammad) speaks not from impulse, but under the revelation he received from God " (53 : 2). And remember when Jesus the Son of Mary said : " Children of Israel, of a truth I am God's Apostle to you to confirm the law which was given before Me, and to announce an apostle that shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad (Paracletos). "

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 سے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یار سالہ مہینہ میں
دو بار ہو جائے قیمت سال روان اس وقت بعض سے بحال 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 بہت سی کامیاب 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 لیا ہو
میں پیچیدہ نہیں ہوں ان کی غناست والہ میں یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑتا ہوں۔ یہ رسالہ
تو یہی مافی عوفہ ہے کہ اسلام کا خوشنہ 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 خیرداران 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 بٹکا ہو جاوے گا۔
لیونکہ متفرق حساب 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.