

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
شَمْسُ مُحَمَّدٌ وَصَلَّى عَلَیْ رُسُلِهِ الْكَرِیْمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA

VOL. VII.]

JANUARY 1919

[No. 1

THE HOLY QUR-ÂN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, *is now ready.* Price 22s.* Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Cloth-bound Edition, price 16s., postage extra. Prices in India: India paper, Rs. 20; cloth bound, Rs. 17. Apply in India to Ishaat-Islam Office, Nowlakha, Lahore.

Qur-ân Class.—We are sorry to note that, owing to the illness of the Imam, there will be no Qur-ân classes for the present. The students will be informed when the classes are taken up again.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House, every Friday, at 1.30 p.m.

Service, Sermon and Lectures every Sunday at the Muslim Prayer House (111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, W. 8), at 3.15 p.m., and at the Mosque, Woking, at 3.15 p.m.

* The rise in the price of book-binding has compelled us to increase the price. We advise our customers abroad to send us 2s. 6d. extra, to cover insurance fee, and thus to secure the book against loss through enemy action.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

NOTES

WE are able to announce now that Khwaja Kamaluddin, who had been keeping indifferent health since the beginning of October, will be able to return to work soon. He has had a long change, which seems to have done him good, and it is expected that before long he will be in a much better state of health. It is greatly satisfying that he received the news of the great bereavement that has befallen him quietly and with Muslim resignation. Full reference to the same will be found on the next page. We trust in this dire calamity he would seek refuge in Allah, the only Healer of wounded hearts.

The Society of London Muslims was fairly active during October and November, a brief report of its work having been given in our last issue. We are glad to add the following as the programme of its work during the month of December:—December 1st, Mr. Syed Ehsan El Bekry, on "Islam and the Muslim Home"; December 8th, Mr. S. H. Riza, on "Islam, a Great Moral Idea"; December 15th, Mr. Syed Ehsan El Bekry, on "The Place of Islam in Worldly Dealings"; December 22nd, Mr. Dudley Wright. We have made arrangements to publish the sermons given at the London Muslim House in the REVIEW, as well as in pamphlet form.

Friday prayers at the London Muslim Prayer House are being held as usual, speakers being Mr. Khwaja Ismail, Syed Ehsan El Bekry, and Mr. Abdul Qayum Malik.

ADHESION TO ISLAM.—We are glad to note that Mr. D. V. Anderson, Marble Arch, London, has joined us with his declaration in our Faith and has embraced Islam.

INCREASE of One Shilling in the annual price of the REVIEW. We are compelled to do it owing to further rise in the printers' and other charges.

A SAD LOSS

"BELOVED Bashir has been called back. Sorrowfully we submit."

The above were the terms of an Indian cable received suddenly by Khwaja Kamaluddin from Maulvi Muhammad Ali.

Kh. Bashir Ahmad was the name of Mr. Kamaluddin's eldest son. He was in the full prime of youth—only

A SAD LOSS

two and twenty years of age. He graduated when only twenty, and was a popular athlete in his college. Physically a strong-built young man and of such sweet and obliging disposition that everybody who came in contact with him liked him.

The Musalmans have been taught by the Holy Qur-án and the Holy Prophet to repeat the words *Inna lillahi wa inna ilaihe rajioon* ("For Allah we are and to Him we return") whenever they hear of any sad catastrophe of the kind that the cable brought from India.

Repeatedly in the Qur-án they have been advised: "Stand firm in calamities." The wording of the cable which announced the sad news repeated the above words, which cannot but have a calming effect upon the minds of every Muslim. He must submit to the command of recall from the High Above with resignation. It is no doubt difficult to do so on such occasions as the present one; but the bereaved father in this case resignedly submitted to Divine Will.

The loss of a young man of promise in the prime of life would have been sad in any case. What adds more to the melancholy is that the young man had promised to devote himself to the religious work and to come over to England to help his father and eventually to relieve him from his present work and thus to enable him to write some exhaustive work on Islam.

In fact, he had already devoted himself to the sacred work. After graduating he had given up all worldly ambitions and secular undertakings. He had given up the idea of devoting himself to any paying profession for which he had received his education. The two years after his B.A. he had spent in learning Arabic and in studying the traditions and life of the Holy Prophet. He had taken upon himself to translate the ISLAMIC REVIEW in the Urdu language for the general benefit of his countrymen. He was warned by his father that the religious work required great sacrifices. He was young. He had good prospects. He was married and lately he had a son born to him. It is naturally difficult for young men to be sacrificing—to give

ISLAMIC REVIEW

up good prospects. But Bashir Ahmad never wavered for a second to decide upon that sacrifice. He was determined to devote himself whole-heartedly to religious work and to pass all his future life in humility and even penury. It was a noble determination. He was ready to leave his home, his wife, his child,¹ and to come to England to take up his work. But the inscrutable Destiny had ordained otherwise. It is regrettable to note that just at the time when he was arranging to start for the sacred work at Woking he was called back. How sad! How disappointing! There is no doubt that every Musalman, young or old, man or woman, is a missionary of his beloved religion, but there are not many young men who cheerfully sacrifice their future prospects and devote themselves whole-heartedly to the religious missionary work. This still further intensifies the loss suffered by Musalmans by the death of Bashir Ahmad. It is not easy to find a substitute. These are unpropitious days for Muslims. The sudden loss of Bashir Ahmad adds to the sadness. The death of Bashir Ahmad is not merely a personal loss to Mr. Kamaluddin, it is a loss to the Woking Mission—a loss to Muslims generally—a loss to all those who are interested in this Mission, which by combating atheism and irreligiousness in England is furthering the cause not only of Islam but of religion generally.

AL-QIDWAI.

14th November, 1918.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—And do not speak of those who are slain in Allah's way as dead; nay, (they are) alive, but you do not perceive.

And We will most certainly try you with somewhat of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits; and give good news to the patient,

Who, when a misfortune befalls them, say: Surely we are Allah's, and to Him we shall surely return.

Those are they on whom are blessings and mercy from their Lord, and those are the followers of the right course.
—AL-QUR-ĀN, ii. 154-7.

¹ Later cable makes the loss sadder. The tragedy was complete. Khwaja Bashir Ahmad and his wife died together. The little son followed his parents to the celestial abode a few days later.

HISTORY OF NOAH

THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM

WHEN war and pestilence were rife, and dear ones passed
away,
Sublimest Faith supported us, enabling us to pray
For hearts most thoroughly purified, for minds like saints
of old,
And souls attuned to those whom Thou hast garnered in
Thy fold.

O grant that in our simple Faith—Surrender to Thy Will—
We may show love to Thee and Thine, nor doubt Thy power
to fill

With joy our lives as on we pass, and sorrows leave behind,
Looking to Thee, our only Guide, The Light of all mankind.

EL FARROQ.

HISTORY OF NOAH

AS GIVEN IN THE QUR-ÁN.

Certainly We sent Noah to his people, so he said : O my people ! serve Allah, you have no god other than Him ; surely I fear for you the chastisement of a grievous day.

The chiefs of his people said : Most surely we see you in clear error.

He said : O my people ! there is no error in me, but I am an apostle from the Lord of the worlds :

I deliver to you the messages of my Lord, and I offer you good advice, and I know from Allah what you do not know :

What ! do you wonder that a reminder has come to you from your Lord through a man from among you, that he might warn you and that you might guard (against evil), and so that mercy may be shown to you ?

But they called him a liar, so We delivered him and those with him in the ark, and We drowned those who rejected Our communications ; surely they were a blind people.—AL-QUR-ÁN, vii. 59-64.

References to Noah and his history are contained in the following places in the Holy Qur-án :—3 : 32, 6 : 85, 7 : 59-64, 10 : 71-73, 11 : 25-48, 14 : 9, 17 : 3, 21 : 76, 77 ; 23 : 23-29, 25 : 37, 26 : 105-122, 29 : 14, 15 ; 37 : 75-82, 51 : 46, 53 : 52, 54 : 9-16, 58 : 26, 66 : 10, 69 : 11-12, 71 : 1-28.

Fuller references to the deluge and the making of the ark are contained in 11 : 37-48 and 23 : 27-29. It may be noted here, however, that the Holy Qur-án does not support the theory of a world deluge, for it plainly states here that Noah was sent only to his people, i.e. not to all

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the nations. The Holy Qur-án says that only the people to whom Noah delivered his message called him a liar, and that only those were drowned who rejected *Our communications*, i.e. the message of Allah delivered through Noah. Hence the deluge only affected the territory of Noah's people, not the whole world, as the Bible would have us believe. This is one of the many important points in which the Holy Qur-án differs from the Bible, and the truth is once more on the side of the Holy Qur-án.

It should be borne in mind in reading the histories of the prophets as given in the Holy Qur-án that the object of the Qur-án is not to narrate history as such, but to bring out certain characteristics of the histories of different nations, to mention incidents which contained prophetic allusion to the Holy Prophet's life, illustrating the general warnings made regarding the ultimate consequences attendant upon the rejection of truth. The Qur-án does not concern itself with the details of what messages a prophet delivered to his people and of how he was received; it simply contents itself with the broad facts that every prophet preached Divine Unity, every prophet laid stress on piety, every prophet was received with severe opposition, and that each of these messengers ultimately succeeded in establishing the truth. This, with slight variations, is the sum and substance of the histories of the prophets that are recorded in the Holy Qur-án. It is not, as stated by a Christian critic, "the experience of Muhammad" that is recorded in the histories of prophets, but it is the experience of the prophets containing a prophetic allusion to the experience of the Holy Prophet. This is clear from the fact that the histories of the prophets relating the destruction of their opponents are contained chiefly in Meccan revelations, whereas at Mecca the opponents of the Holy Prophet were at the zenith of their power and the cause of the Prophet was to all appearance hopeless, while during the Medinite revelations the enemy was vanquished, so there was not much need to mention the history of earlier prophets and their opposers.

MUHAMMAD ALI.

THE RELIGION OF PHILOSOPHY

By GULAM MUSTAFIA KHAN, B.A. (Alig.).

PHILOSOPHY has invariably played an important rôle in the civilization and culture of the human society. It has given a deeper insight into the mystery of life and has made the life more or less worth living. The Hindu Philosophy of the ancient times made the Hindu nation what it was in the

THE RELIGION OF PHILOSOPHY

times of old ; and when the six famous schools of Hindu Philosophy faded away, the glory of the nation was over. Similarly the superstructure of the Roman Empire was erected on the foundation of the Stoic Philosophy. The central doctrine of the Stoics was the utter indifference to the pleasures and pains of life. This was somewhat like the Hindu Philosophy of *Maya*, which preached that the things we see in the world were mere creatures of our own imagination, having no reality in themselves. The Stoics believed that the pains and pleasures of life are nothing but the images conjured up by our own brain. This was, however, not true to life, and therefore it had very little bearing on the practical sphere. Seneca, the great exponent of Stoicism, wrote a treatise eulogizing the poverty and denouncing the wealth ; but he himself was the richest man that ever lived in the world. He praised the humble cottages of the poor while his beautiful villas stood high in the air " talking with the sky." He admired obscurity, but he himself was practically a candidate to the throne of the Roman Empire. Thus his whole Philosophy was a mere sham. It was only on his lips or in books, and was never translated into his deeds. It had no influence on his practical life, and therefore it could not have any influence upon anybody else. The *realities* of life cannot be obliterated by sheer force of imagination. No amount of Stoic sophistry can make a widow believe that she has lost nothing in the sad death of her loving husband, who was a source of comfort and solace to her. Thus the old pagan Philosophy was meant only to please the fancy, and was not fit to be carried out in the practical life.

The New Philosophy of Bacon has turned the old schools of Philosophy topsy-turvy. It has brought a new light and a new force of reasoning. It says that we ought to believe in observation only—things which we see with our own eyes. Thus it is diametrically opposite to the Old Philosophy, which was based upon the imagination and supposition. But this new force also is quite impotent in making up the human character. For instance, a man is, perchance, deprived of his two legs. The modern Philosophy will analyse the

ISLAMIC REVIEW

sequences of this calamity : the poor fellow will have no chance of walking freely ; he will be a cumbersome burden on society ; he will be looked down upon by his kith and kin, and so on. In short, his life will be a drudgery of troubles and pains. Do you think that such ideas will not make the man's life more painful ? And if there is nothing beyond our ordinary vision, if we are born simply to live, eat, chatter, and die, the life is certainly not worth living. That is why, I think, the cases of suicide are frequent in European countries. In short, the Philosophy of Bacon is too materialistic and does not satisfy the spiritual side of humanity. Unfortunately, Bacon himself cut a very poor figure so far as human character was concerned.

The Philosophy of Islam strikes the golden mean. It does not ignore the hard realities of life, nor it asserts that this world is the be-all and the end-all of human life. It is neither altogether devoid of imagination and sentiments like Bacon's Philosophy, nor is it entirely idealistic and imaginative like the Philosophy of Seneca. Islamic Philosophy takes the life as it is, full of chances and opportunities, of pleasures and pains. But it does not say that there is no hereafter. It takes the life as a trial, a furnace in which human metal is tested. Our present life is a stage of the next one, and we are required to work here honestly and faithfully in order to reap a good harvest in the next. So this world of ours is not our ultimate goal, but certainly it affords means to attain the GOAL. This is the Philosophy of Islam, and it has exerted a marvellous effect on the moral character of mankind. It was through the influence of this practical Philosophy, that has a bright and hopeful future before it, that the Arabs were raised from the nadir of degradation and poverty to the zenith of civilization and prosperity.

THE LONDON MUSLIM HOUSE SERMONS

I

THE ESSENCE AND MISSION OF RELIGION

By DUDLEY WRIGHT.

THERE is probably no expression or term in any language which has been more abused than that of "religion." There are few, even among those who seldom cross the threshold of church or chapel, who would care to be called irreligious or to be described as having no religion, although none could be more scant in their observance of religious forms and ceremonies. They like to be thought as being in possession of a form of godliness, although the power which should characterize its possession is lacking. To the majority of so-called religious people religion is merely a philosophy, something to be talked about, discussed, and argued, but not to be put into practice. Indeed, in excuse for this absence of dynamic power, it may be admitted that some forms of the Christian faith cannot be practised, except in part, for the simple reason that they are impracticable. They have become so overclouded with dogmas and opinions that whatever practical application they may once have possessed in their earlier history has become difficult of demonstration at the latter stage because of the development of doctrine. For example, what practical influence upon life and character can be exercised by a belief, however strongly held and expressed, in the Trinity, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, or the Infallibility of the Pope? What is there to cheer the heart or to lead to a practical demonstration of a religious life in subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Vatican Decrees, or the Westminster Confession? How will an argument concerning the particular colour or shape of a vestment help us to overcome temptation? Shall we find any practical guide to a perfect life on earth in the acceptance or reiteration

MUSLIM HOUSE SERMONS

of a creed propagated more than a thousand years ago, which, we are told in that creed, "except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved"?

What, then, are we to understand by the expression 'Religion'? In what does it consist and what is its mission? Who is its Author and who are its subjects? "Religion," said the Prophet Muhammad, "is admonition, and it means being pure." In other words, it is a revelation from God, leading man to Himself and teaching him the path along which he must travel. It must be practical as well as theoretical, and characterized by intense reverence. Religion must come from God and it must reveal God. It must set forth the way of salvation clearly and definitely and be devoid of absurdities. True religion has no mysteries. There should be nothing in religion which cannot be understood or grasped by the human intelligence. Much in connection with ceremonial religion has been revived from the ancient Mysteries, but what were these Mysteries? They were national rites into which it was looked upon as a disgrace not to be initiated. Initiation demanded acceptance of certain elementary truths, and, after initiation, the progression of the candidate to higher degrees depended upon the assimilation of and putting into practice certain spiritual truths which were taught him. Character, not creed, was the dominant factor. The term "Mystery" in this instance is not synonymous with "inexplicable," and true religion is the plain way to God, demanding no subscription to an impossible creed which cannot intellectually be grasped. The champions of many creeds are concerned not so much for the propagation of truth as for the maintenance of their own peculiar opinions, and thus it happens that religion which should have a unifying influence has, more often than not, been the cause of the utmost discord not only in home and private life but also among nations, leading to the commission of crime and bloodshed. This, also, is the reason why religion, instead of becoming the strongest incentive to a dutiful and virtuous life, has become the plaything of nations.

Anthropologists have been compelled to admit the

spiritual instinct within man in all ages, of all races, impelling him to seek communion with a Supreme, Unseen Power. The instinct is the primary stepping-stone of Religion, and to that Power Islam gives the expressive name of Allah, a name never applied to any other object of worship. To that Power, and to no subordinate or inferior being, does the Moslem offer the whole of his worship and religious adoration, every fibre of his body tingling with animation in his love and devotion to Allah, his Creator and Sustainer. Allah is not a tribal deity; not a national deity; not merely the Lord of the world, but the Lord of All the Worlds, the Creator of all that has been, that is, or that ever will be.

Al Ghazzâli thus writes of Allah :

“ He is One, who hath no partner ; singular, having no like. . . . He is ancient, having no first ; eternal, having no beginning ; remaining for ever, having no end. . . . He, praised be His name, is Living, Powerful, Mighty, Omnipotent, . . . who neither slumbers nor sleeps, nor is subject to decay or death. To Him belongs the kingdom and the power and the might. His is the dominion and the excellency, and the creation and the command thereof. And the heavens are folded up in His right hand, and all creatures are couched within His grasp. . . . He knows all things that can be understood and comprehends whatsoever passes, from the extremities of the earth to the highest heavens ; so that an ant’s weight should not escape Him either in earth or heaven, but He would know the creeping of the black ant in the dark night upon the hard stone.”

The whole of the Qur-ân is a revelation of Allah, but particularly, perhaps, the 42nd Sura reveals Him to the human race. The common earthly term of “ father ” cannot be applied to Him. He is Lord of All. Undivided sovereignty is His. Fatherhood implies obligations and duties which must be performed. Allah can have no obligations to His subjects. He is Lord of All. He acts in mercy and love to His subjects, not from obligation. He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. His Love—who can fathom it? It is so great that He demands no compensation, no human blood-offering for its exercise, but He holds an undivided sway.

His Unity must be the basis of all true religion. "He begetteth not and is not begotten, and there is none like unto Him." The restoration of this true knowledge of Allah was the mission of the prophets—Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad, as well as all others. What was the condition of the world at the time Muhammad was called to the prophetic office? Listen to the description given by a Christian missionary (Rev. W. St. Clair-Tisdall in *The Religion of the Crescent*, p. 17):

"Muhammad from the beginning of his claim to the prophetic office showed himself to be irreconcilably opposed to polytheism in whatever form, and to be the bitter enemy of all idol-worship. And if ever iconoclasm was needed in the world, it was needed then. Not to speak of the shameful spectacle which the Christian Church in almost every part of the world then presented in this respect, the ancestral Temple at Mecca contained 360 idols, one for every day of the lunar year. Besides these the planets and other heavenly bodies were worshipped, and almost every Arab tribe had contributed its own local deity to help to fill the building which, though still retaining its ancient appellation of 'The House of God,' had become a pantheon in which even 'Christian' idols were adored. When he captured Mecca in 630 A.D. after his victory over the Quraish, Muhammad is said to have entered the Ka'abah and entirely demolished every one of these idols and even obliterated every picture which it contained. From that time to the present every true Moslem is animated by the same hatred of idolatry."

A similar condition prevailed when Jesus was called to his prophetic mission, when even the Temple itself had to be cleared of its money-changers who had invaded its sacred precincts. What is the state of the Christian world to-day? Every issue of the religious press acknowledges, with evidences of weeping and lamentation, the failure of the Church in its mission to humanity. The leading article in the current issue of *The Church Times* opens with these significant words:

"The Church of England is said, with some reason, to have failed conspicuously in face of opportunities presented

by the great cataclysm of war. It certainly has not risen to the height of the occasion."

In the same issue there is the report of an address delivered by Sir Robert Newman, the recently elected M.P. for Exeter, who is described as "an earnest Churchman" on the question: "Is England a Christian Nation?" and to that question Sir Robert Newman replied emphatically in the negative.

England had, like the rest of Europe, been indulging in a nominal, but not active, Christianity, the conventional respectability of Mrs. Grundy taking the place of the religion of Christ. There were alarming aspects at the present moment. The new educational proposals ignored all religious aspects of the national life, and the proposal that places of worship should be closed on Sunday evenings in order to save coal and gas, whilst places of amusement were not interfered with, showed little appreciation of true Christianity. He doubted if any real increase in the attendance at public worship could be shown since the outbreak of war. Reconstruction after the war must not be a selfish struggle between Capital and Labour, but must be built upon Christian foundations.

There would have been a different tale to tell if the Christian Church had concerned itself more with the fundamentals of religion than with the millineries or, as Emerson describes it, "the peacock ritual." Men are now besought to "get back to God," and in that very entreaty is found an acknowledgment of the cause of the failure. Men have got away from God because religion, instead of being a practical exercise of the spiritual faculties of the human race, has become a dissertation, a series of dogmatic utterances. The followers of Jesus in no way resemble their leader. Indeed, as one writer has put it: "The reason why Jesus is so fascinating a memory to his Church disciples is that he is so wholly unlike them." Christianity, alike with Buddhism, has suffered from the intrusion of a priestly caste. A similar attempt was made to invade Islam, but this, happily, was frustrated. Revelation—the highest gift of Allah to humanity—is not confined to any one person or nation, or

to any particular age. It is continuous, but Allah does not bestow it in any haphazard manner. Jesus received his prophetic call after he had spent forty days of fasting and prayer in the wilderness. It was while the Prophet Muhammad was fasting and praying in the cave at Mount Hira that the angel Gabriel appeared to him and he received his prophetic call. And fasting and prayer have ever been two essentials of true religion. More misconception, perhaps, has centred around prayer than around any other spiritual act. Prayer is enjoined by Islam as a means of the moral elevation of man. Much obloquy would have been spared had prayer always been regarded in its rightful aspect. It is the true means of that purification of the heart which is the only way to communion with God. It cannot effect a change in the Unchangeable or alter the Immutable. The effect produced is not upon Allah but upon the pray-er, the one who prays, bringing him into harmony with the Supreme Will. It is said of Walden, Abbot of Montrose, that when in darkness and agony, he would in anguish of soul cast himself upon the ground and pray with the utmost earnestness. He no sooner rose from his prayer than he found the thick mist of darkness which had overwhelmed his mind scattered and his soul suddenly filled with light, fervour, and an inexpressible holy joy, in which he sang the praises of Divine mercy with an interior jubilation which seemed to give him in some degree a foretaste of the joys of the blessed. In the Talmud there is a prophetic intimation of the religion which asks no favours, but prays by living a holy life, when life is prayer and conduct is sacrifice. It foretells the day when prayer shall cease in the Jewish Church and thanksgiving only shall be heard. Prayer is not a substitute or excuse for inaction. "Trust in God and tie your camel" said the Prophet, which afterwards was varied by Oliver Cromwell into "Trust in God and keep your powder dry." "Pray," says one writer, "as though everything depended upon God, act as though everything depended upon yourself." Victory in the time of war rests with those who have made the best preparations, conducted the warfare in the most skilful manner, and fought with

the greatest determination. It is no mere formality that the Moslem five times daily, at the least, turns towards Mecca to endeavour to bring himself in tune with the Supreme, with Allah; and that in acknowledging his entire submission to the will of Allah he bends his head in the dust, thus to tender his praise and to offer up his petition for Divine guidance.

Fasting is one of the means employed for the suppression of the tendency to evil. It means, as it also does in Judaism, not merely abstinence from food and drink, but also from all evil. It is a form of discipline which a large section of the Christian Church prefers to ignore, notwithstanding the example of their founder and his companions and the definite statement that certain evils can only be overcome by prayer and fasting.

Almsgiving has always been one of the practical applications of true religion. England boasts a very elaborate system of poor-law relief, which is a substitute for the religious principle of almsgiving. It is the outcome of a so-called religious reformation, which probably introduced more abuses than it swept away. Until the reign of Queen Elizabeth the poor of this country were regarded as the heritage of the Church, and their wants were supplied by those who endeavoured to remember the injunction: "ye have the poor always with you." The Act of Parliament passed in 1601, however, established the principle of a compulsory assessment for the relief of the poor on the occupier of land or house property. In Islam almsgiving is as obligatory as prayer and fasting, and it is regulated by the Holy Qur-án.

Thus briefly may be described the essence and mission of Religion. The first essential is the acknowledgment of a Power greater than humanity, guiding and directing man towards a spiritual goal; that Power being both transcendent and immanent. Not only are we, but all that is—everything, whether animate or inanimate—is dependent at every moment of time on the sustained and prolonged creative act of Allah. To Him access may be gained at any time, in every circumstance, by prayer. No sacramental

ordinances are necessary for man to approach Allah nor has He to be bribed by sacrifice of flesh and blood.

Most honour to the men of prayer,
 Whose mosque is in them everywhere!
 Who, amid revel's wildest din,
 In war's severest discipline,
 On rolling deck, in thronged bazaar,
 In stranger land, however far,
 However different in their reach
 Of thought, in manners, dress, or speech—
 Will quietly their carpet spread,
 To Mecca turn the humble head,
 And, as if blind to all around,
 And deaf to each distracting sound,
 In simple language God adore,
 In spirit to His presence soar,
 And in the pauses of the prayer,
 Rest as if wrapt in glory there.

The late Professor Huxley once wrote :

“ I can conceive the existence of a Church in which, week by week, services should be devoted, not to the iteration of abstract propositions in theology, but to the setting before men's minds of an ideal of true, just, and pure living ; a place in which those who are weary of the burden of daily cares should find a moment's rest in the contemplation of the higher life which is possible for all, though attained by so few ; a place in which the man of strife and of business should have time to think how small after all are the rewards he covets compared with peace and charity. Depend upon it, if such a Church existed, no one would seek to disestablish it.”

Such a religion was that which the Prophet Muhammad preached and taught. Islam is the religion of humanity for humanity. It was equally the religion of the prophets who went before him : it is the religion of every prophet of God who appeared in any part of the world at any period of the world's history. “ Every nation had an apostle ” (Sura x. 47). Every apostle preached against idolatry, and he who attempts to take away one iota, one jot or tittle from the honour and glory which is Allah's alone, is just as surely guilty of idolatry as were the children of Israel when they made the golden calf and bowed down and worshipped

THE QUR-ÁN

it. "The Lord our God is One" was the cry that rang through the Jewish Temple of old and may be heard in the synagogue to-day. "Why callest thou me good?" said Jesus; "there is none good but one, that is God." But the followers of that prophet are to-day taking away the honour and glory which are due to God alone and bestowing them upon the prophet instead.

"There is no God but Allah" is the cry that resounds five times daily in every Mosque throughout the world and many more times daily in every Moslem household. The Unity of God: that is the essence of religion.

Come sound His praise abroad,
And hymns of glory sing;
Our Allah is the sov'reign God,
The Universal King.

Come worship at His throne,
Come bow before the Lord;
We are His work and not our own,
He formed us by His word.

To-day attend His voice,
Nor dare provoke His rod!
Come like the people of His choice,
And own your gracious God.

II

THE QUR-ÁN

By MARMADUKE PICKTHALL.

Zálíkal Kitábo Lá Raiba Fíhi Hudan Lilmuttaqín.

THE other day I had a letter from a man in the West Indies referring to a sermon which I preached to you some time ago about Religious Truth. The letter is extremely violent, the writer thinking it his duty to denounce me as an impostor and false guide. As he likens me, however, incidentally, to the Prophet (may God bless and keep him!), I am well content. But he is evidently labouring under the impression that the Qur-án is a mere parody of the Bible, a deliberate parody. He writes of it as of a fraud which

has been long exposed, belief in which is now unworthy of a thinking man.

Well, I am afraid that there are still plenty of people who, like my correspondent, look on the Qur-án as an imposture whose only beauties are derived from plagiarism, and who, far from feeling that respect for our dear Prophet's memory which is due to all great benefactors of mankind—a title which few thinkers would deny to him—regard him as one who deceived people consciously, seeking nothing better than his own aggrandizement. That is the view the Christian Church espoused for centuries, and still may be said, I think, to hold officially. But modern scientific criticism has demolished it.

As for the Qur-án being a parody of older Scriptures, or a compilation from them, the answer to that is, that it resembles no other book in the world. A passage here and there repeats the message of the older Scriptures, and there are many references to Jewish history and the life of Christ. But these references cannot be called plagiarism by any canon of criticism that I know of, since the stories and events referred to were regarded as the common property of men in Mecca at that period, and they are only used in the Qur-án for illustration of the main theme of the book, which is amazingly original. There is nothing anywhere, in any language, at all like it. No such enlightened, passionate, persuasive vindication of the Majesty, Benevolence, and Boundless Power of God; no such lucid exposition of the laws which govern human happiness and misery, here and hereafter—the natural (that is, the divine) laws of the moral and the spiritual, no less than the outward world—exists in any language. It bears the accent of sincerity in every word. And it must be remembered that the man who is accused of having borrowed wholesale from the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians had never read those Scriptures in his life. It has been suggested by opponents of Islam that the Prophet was assisted in his fancied lucubrations by a Christian monk. The Christian monk referred to saw Muhammad only as a lad in Syria, whither the future Prophet had travelled with his uncle. He had been in

his grave for years when the Qur-án was first revealed. In the same way it has been suggested that he had at hand a man well versed in all the Jewish Scriptures—Waraka, the son of Naufal. Waraka lived to hail Muhammad as the prophet of his people, but died a few days later, while the Prophet was still a private individual, while the Qur-án consisted of a few words only—words certainly not borrowed from an earthly source.

No. The first thing which must strike an open-minded critic when perusing the Qur-án is the sense of unquestionable authority which every word conveys—a sense which never comes from utterances not sincere. And the last impression such a critic will receive, after the book is read, is one of wonder at the vigour and the scope of its instruction, including every detail of the life of man, and above all at the Majesty of the Conception of Almighty God which flames from it. I think that this will be felt even by one who reads the book in bad translations; and no translation that I know of can be praised. It is impossible to translate literally from a synthetic language to an analytic language and still preserve the force of the original.

Most of the translators of the Qur-án have been Arabic scholars, preoccupied by individual words which present difficulties, rather than by the meaning as a whole. Many Arabic words can only be translated into English accurately by a long periphrasis; and many allusions which require no comment for an Oriental must be explained to English readers by long notes. Consequently, translations of the Sacred Book are prosy, and seem discursive and garrulous, whereas the Qur-án in Arabic is terse, majestic, and poetical. So bad are some of the translations, and so foolish many of the notes which choke the text, that people like my correspondent, who have glanced at them but never read them, may almost be excused for thinking the Qur-án only a clumsy imitation of religious books. If they would read even the worst translation carefully, they could not fail to change their mind, and feel the power of inspiration in it, just as Goethe did. But every one has not the intellect of Goethe, and many shrink from any effort of intelligence.

I want to deal to-day with the objections—I should call them calumnies if they were not maintained in all good faith—which are made to the Qur-án by those who view it with a prejudice. There is a book in existence, the work of a Christian minister, called (if I remember right) “The Sources of the Qur-án,” which seeks to demonstrate that there is hardly anything original in the Qur-án; that it is a mere compilation of legends and ideas collected out of other Scriptures current at the period—the Gospels of St. Barnabas and of the Innocence, for instance, the Talmud and some other Jewish books—mixed with the folklore of the Meccan Arabs. The aim, of course, is to impugn the good faith of our lord Muhammad (may God bless and keep him!), to make him out a person who committed something like a forgery in order to send off a new religion invented for his own ambitious purposes.

Well, in the first place, every story which the Qur-án is alleged to have borrowed from this or that source was common property in Mecca at the period, when very few indeed of the inhabitants could read or write. And in the second place our lord Muhammad could not read, and he had nobody at hand to furnish him with the materials for such a compilation as some people imagine the Qur-án to be. The Prophet lived a public life, kept open house, and had around him always a whole crowd of witnesses, who all have testified to his complete sincerity, who all believed in the Qur-án as the pure word of God. If there had been any work of preparation or elaboration of the Súrah's, there would be some mention of it surely in the testimony of those first believers who, studying the Prophet as mankind's Example, thought no detail of his conduct too minute to bear in mind. There is no such mention. There was no such work. The Qur-án, whatever may be thought of it upon its merits, was spontaneous; a genuine outpouring from the Prophet's spirit while he lay entranced. What has misled folk into thinking it prepared beforehand is the sanity and justice which pervade its pages, so different from the vague and monstrous imagery which we associate with the work of visionaries—which we find in Revelation,

for example, or the Hebrew prophets. This book is, in fact, a miracle, whether we regard it from the literary, psychological, or religious standpoint. Considering the place and time of its appearance, considering the Prophet's life and education, it seems to me impossible to account for its existence by what we mortals are accustomed to call natural means. The vagueness which is found in other revelations, which seems to please and soothe some people, is not here. In other books the vision is obscure and troubled; here it is clear. Those have the beauty of smoke-clouds irradiated by the glow from fire unseen; this is the fire itself. People who call that other vagueness mysticism and admire it complain of the Qur-án that it is much too matter-of-fact and practical. Can they not see that it is the most mystical of works? That very practicality and matter-of-factness in things spiritual is proof of the clear vision. In the Qur-án the spiritual world is neither vague nor obscure. It is the one reality. God is everything. We are nothing save in our relation to His boundless Majesty and by His grace. In the light of this reality, so clearly seen, the folly of men's wicked deeds and insolent beliefs becomes apparent. The idolator is scorched and shrivelled as by fire. The drunkard and the libertine become as suicides. The liar and the traitor and the wanton shedder of man's blood shudder and collapse as if struck down by lightning. Those who despise God's blessings and transgress the natural law—God's law, for He it is who made the world—whatever their intentions, seem presumptuous and absurd.

Day and Night, Sun, Moon and Stars, the life of plants and trees and animals and birds and insects, birth and death—all the phenomena of nature, ordered as they are, bear witness in these pages to the Unity of God who made them. All the legendary stories which adorn these pages are chosen so as best to illustrate God's power and mercy, and the nature of the laws which He imposes upon men and nations.

They say Muhammad pillaged from the former Scriptures. I say that the Qur-án, where it retells a story to be found in them, always elucidates that story, giving to

it a new religious worth. Read in the Bible how David slew Goliath. Then turn to the Qur-án.

“And after he (i.e. Saul) had crossed the river, he and those who believed with him, they said : There is no strength in us to-day against Goliath and his hosts. But those who supposed that they would meet Allah, said : How many a small company has conquered mighty hosts by God’s permission, for God is with the patient who have faith.

“And when they came out in the field against Goliath and his hosts, they said : Our Lord, pour out upon us faithful patience, make our footsteps sure, and help us against those who would oppose Thy will.”

That is a prayer which all of you should learn in Arabic.

It goes on : “And they overcame by permission of Allah, and David slew Goliath, and Allah gave to him the Prophethood and wisdom, and taught him what He willed of knowledge. And if it had not been for God’s opposing some men to others, the world would have gone all to badness ; but Allah is Lord of Kindness to His creatures.”

Could there be anything more likely to give hope to little companies of people, like the early Muslims, who stood opposed to all the forces of the earth, than this story as revealed in the Qur-án ? And has it anything like this value as related in the Hebrew Scripture ? Here it is a word of hope for little companies of honest, faithful people for all time, a message of encouragement to all reformers. And yet we Muslims of the present day, in all our millions, are daunted by the hosts arrayed against us.

“Say :

“Our Lord, pour out upon us faithful patience, make our footsteps sure, and help us against people who oppose Thy kingdom.”

“And they overcame them by God’s leave, and David slew Goliath. . . .”

Have no fear.

That is but a single instance out of many I could quote. Take the story of the Yellow Heifer in the same chapter, or the story of the Christian martyr in Sûrat Yâ Sîn—which

some have thought a parody of the martyrdom of St. Stephen. These stories, in the Qur-án, are never borrowed, hackneyed things, but new and bright additions to religious thought. The story of the heifer explains the incident of the Golden Calf, and gives to it a new, world-wide significance. The story of the martyrdom is wonderfully sweet and fitting in its context.

“It was said to him: Enter Paradise. He said: O would that my people knew how God has pardoned me and raised me to great honour.”

It is the cry of the true believer in his agony, the cry of one beyond the reach of grief and fear.

There is another charge which has been brought against this book by Christian missionaries, the charge of downright error. They declare that Muhammad had so little skill in history that he confused the time of Moses with the time of Jesus, and made Mary the mother of Jesus identical with Mary or Miriam the sister of Moses. But even Christian writers have protested that this is probably unjust, since the Arabs of the Prophet's day, like the Arabs of our own, were deeply versed in genealogies. The charge of error rests entirely on a similarity of names, and seems to me, to say the least of it, a little hasty.

Again, the frequent reference to persons and events traditional among the Arabs, but unknown to us, has none of the fantastic character ascribed to it by Christian writers, who take perverse delight in collecting tales which were invented afterwards to explain those references by an imaginative race and laying all that nonsense to the charge of the Qur-án itself. This book is not in any sense a compilation, much less plagiarized. It is unique in literature, the most original book in the world. Nor can we, as Muslims, for a moment accept the man Muhammad (may God bless and keep him!) as its author in the ordinary sense. The book comports the colour of the Prophet's mind to some extent, as also of the place and time in which he lived; but it far transcends his earthly knowledge and experience. He himself spoke of it always as a message given to him by Another, which he must deliver. He himself revered it

and obeyed its edicts as coming from the Lord whom we must all obey.

I myself think of it rather as a new creation than a book thought out and written in the usual way. Even when I try to view it from the critic's standpoint, it seems to me as if some Power outside Muhammad had taken the Prophet's life and mission, his surroundings and the learning of the time—had taken, too, the Prophet's personality, his very soul—to give an earthly form and colour to a message in itself unearthly, and make it understood by mortal men.

Beware how you pay veneration to the book itself, the letters and the binding and the form of words, for that way lies idolatry and death. But keep the message always in your hearts, and live by it.

The Qur-án itself declares in ch. x. vers. 37-40 : " And this Qur-án is not such as could be forged by those besides Allah, but it is a verification of that which is before it and a clear explanation of the book, there is no doubt in it, from the Lord of the worlds.

" Or do they say : He has forged it ? Say : Then bring a chapter like this and invite whom you can besides Allah, if you are truthful.

" Nay : they reject that of which they have no comprehensive knowledge, and the final sequel of it has not yet come to them ; even thus did those before them reject (the truth) ; see then what was the end of the unjust.

" And of them is he who believes in it, and of them is he who does not believe in it, and your Lord best knows the mischief-makers."

And again in ch. xcvi. vers. 5, 6 : " And they were not enjoined anything except that they should serve Allah, being sincere to Him in obedience, upright, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate, and that is the right religion.

" Surely those who disbelieve from among the followers of the Book and the polytheists shall be in the fire of hell, abiding therein ; they are the worst of men."

SOUL—ITS CREATION AND FUNCTION

THE rise of life and the appearance of soul in material frame is as yet an unsolved mystery. Our physico-chemical science seems yet far beyond giving an intelligible explanation of this sudden and novel process, and, because apparently there seems to exist a sort of conflict between the soul and the matter, the exponents of Dualism assert that they are two different entities. Besides, the soul when fully evolved, rules the body—the animated organism in human form—and it is argued, therefore, that it must be different from the body. But the vivifying principle called life does the same thing in every organism. If soul controls the body, life also brings lifeless matter under its complete submission. Life, on its appearance, becomes general controller and arranger of everything in the system; but life itself in its turn becomes subordinate to the soul. If the dualist therefore thinks that the soul comes from without, others theorize in the same way about life; and the reason which makes such an opinion possible in some circles is the sudden departure in the “habit” of the matter, when from a stage of seeming lifelessness it becomes “quick.” But we know that this rise of vivifying principle is the outgrowth of the very matter in which it is found and of which it assumes control, it is therefore difficult to accept the above view without hesitation. The appearance of electricity is a good illustration in point. It rises absolutely instantaneously whenever there is a combination of two given metals and a certain liquid matter. Its appearance is as much sudden as its subsequent dominance which it assumes over objects out of which it had grown. This natural phenomenon proves conclusively that there are things which, although different in appearance and characteristics from their components, are yet one with those out of which they had arisen.

Besides this we witness one other phenomenon in all stages of evolution. Every material organism not only sustains its existence at the expense of the one lower than it, but is also dominant over it. Whichever organism intervenes two evolutionary stages, while it lives upon and regulates the one immediately below it, it in its turn becomes fond of and subject

to the control of that form of matter which in the course of growth stands immediately above it. For example, every member of the organic order lives upon another in an inorganic form, and regulates it too. But when this organism assumes animal shape it becomes vested with diverse impulses and emotions. These emotions now practically rule the vivifying principle, which under the dictates of that rule destroys all other lower animal organisms to prolong its existence and to promote its growth. These impulses, limited in function in their primary stage, become passions and predilections in the human frame, and after passing through another process of evolution they become full-fledged into what is termed the soul. The soul, thus born, assumes control over emotions and passions, which in their turn dominate other organisms in the universe. By viewing a few evolved forms, which seemingly diverge in their characteristics and features one from the other, and observing the new departure that becomes manifest in the life of the matter, or such other superficial signs, it would be nothing but jumping to conclusion to say that something foreign has introduced itself into the organisms, and that the new form of the organisms did not grow out of its older one. This is due to our want of knowledge, and it is expected that coming generations of scientists would remove the veil of mystery which seemingly envelops this process of nature.

At every appreciable stage of departure in the course of its growth matter becomes invested with absolutely new clothes and characteristics. Vivifying principle, impulses, and passions, discretion—called life, consciousness and soul in popular parlance—are different distinctive features of the said new departure. They may be sudden in their appearance and their emanation inexplicable in physico-chemical terms, but they evolve from the same material. If we regard life or soul as coming from without and not rising from the body, what about those impulses which for the first time make their appearance in animal organism? They as well differ in their characteristics from life and matter. They rule both, and help the functions and combination of life. Should they be also taken as coming from without? For they possess features similar to those for which life and soul

have been taken to be not from the body. No one till now has advanced this theory. Impulses and passions have always and by all been accepted as outgrowth of the body. Difference in animal impulses and human passion is only of a degree. They partake of the same nature. In human form natural impulses become clothed with individual consciousness. Does not this individual consciousness constitute the real material which builds human discretion, the chief characteristic of the soul? If discretion, therefore, for its origin can rightly be traced to individual consciousness—the sum-total of human passions—and our passions in their original form of animal impulses emanate from various inorganisms and organisms specialized under the control of life, is not body, then, the mother of the soul?

SOUL—A CONSCIOUS CONSTRUCTIVE ABILITY.

The function of the soul in the build of humanity leads us to the same conclusion. Human soul, when not hampered by carnal desires, is only a conscious constructive ability in our frame to create high morals and spiritualities out of low passions. They are to be sublimated into morality, which, when highly cultivated, gives birth to spirituality. Morality does not mean extinction of passions and killing of impulses. It consists of controlling and balancing them, and to find out proper occasion and place for their use. This is done by the soul. The soul, therefore, is only a creative agency, which evolves perfect man out of a brute. Her chief function is to make unerring discretion between the beneficial and harmful aspect of our passions and to accept the former and reject the latter for our further growth. Does not soul do the same thing that life does in animated organism? As life is the controller of material in the build of the physical part of our nature, so soul is the arranger of another kind of material in the make of our moral and spiritual side. Their function is the same, the difference being in the nature of the material they respectively use. They both are creative agencies in animal and human form; one works unconsciously and the other consciously, as the material life works upon is devoid of consciousness, while the groundwork of soul is individual consciousness. In short,

life and soul are the two different names of that constructive ability in the build of humanity which makes unerring discrimination between the useful and the deleterious. We know that coal and diamond come from the same material. They both belong to the inorganic world. Their growth results from incorporation and not from assimilation. But difference in proportion in the material used creates these two different things. Similarly a chicken, a pig, and a man, as remarked before, take the same material for their frame, but here again the difference arises from the difference in the proportion of the material used respectively in these three combinations of matter. All this material is existing in chaotic condition in the universe, but the unconscious constructive ability peculiar to every mould of matter makes scrupulous discrimination in accepting the useful proportion and rejecting the baneful. Similarly all men are clothed with equal impulses. Thieves and prophets are physiologically the same, and possess and experience similar passions. But the creative agency in man called soul becomes strong in the latter class and creates perfect men. If other men are not so, the said agency has been hampered in its course. The same we do find in lower forms of matter. Life sometimes counteracted by other forces produces diseased growth.

Thus soul, life, and constructive ability are different names of the same functionary working under different circumstances and in different stages of material growth. Muslim philosophers and divines have been very clear in this respect. They acknowledged possession of soul by every form of matter; as, for instance, mineral soul, vegetable soul, animal soul and human soul were the names given by them to the same constructive ability which works in these different worlds.

No doubt we know very little of soul. But do we know more of life or of the said unconscious constructive ability than what we know of soul? There are very many other things in the universe which are as well a mystery to us for their appearance and the part they play—electricity, for example. Soul is as much mystery to us as life. The utmost we know of them is their function, and it is to make discrimination between the good and the evil. What is done unconsciously by life in

build of body the same is done consciously by soul in framing spirituality.

The cause of difference is obvious. The material which life works upon does not possess consciousness, while the material for the soul to build spiritual man is human consciousness—the sum-total of various passions and impulses which the soul has to sublimate into ethics, philosophy, and religion. The soul when risen enters the body in her creative capacity. Man was not made to live the life of an animal. God made him to rise higher and higher. The objective is accomplished under the unerring discrimination of the soul between right and wrong. Thus the soul, though a mystery to us, can on account of the function she performs rightly be styled as an index of the Divine Command under which man, vested with various capacities, has to bring them to perfection. The word Rabb in the Qur-án, which as explained before is a name of God, means Creator, Sustainer, and Evolver. Man has to evolve himself under the command of his Rabb, who has created in him various capacities, and this command is put into force through the soul. This secret was revealed to us in the following verse of the Qur-án: "And they ask you about the soul; say: 'The soul is by the commandment of my Rabb (God), and you are not given aught of knowledge but a little'" (xvii. 85).

Thus life and soul are creative agencies in human frame; one works out the physical and the other the spiritual side of our nature. But they do not come from without. They arise at particular stages of the development of matter.

As a matter of fact every atom has in it the essentials that go to the making of human soul. It is a truth which has been fully demonstrated by the following verses of Al Qur-án:—

"And certainly we created Man of an extract of clay.

"Then we made him a small life-germ in a firm resting-place.

"Then we made the life-germ a clot, then we made the clot a lump of flesh, then we made in the lump of flesh bones, then we clothed the bones with flesh, then we caused it to grow into another creation, so blessed be Allah, the best of Creators.

"Then after that you will most surely die."

(Holy Al Qur-án, chap. xxiii. 12-15.)

The above-quoted verses declare that the human frame was originally made of an extract of clay from the earth, which, as the Qur-án says elsewhere, is the result of a process of the burning of the gas. Similarly in another part of Al Qur-án we are told that this our planet was originally in a liquid state. Any detailed reference to this point would be unwarranted digression from our main theme, so we are content to say that, according to the Holy Qur-án, the Earth is an evolved stage of the matter arising out of burning gas, and the man the outcome of some more successive evolutionary processes. Speaking of the various stages of evolution, the above verse uses the two conjunctives "Summa" and "Fá." The former is used in Arabic when there is a period between two stages or degrees of a certain action, and the latter when the different stages follow one another unremittingly. Accordingly in the above quotation "Summa" intervenes the "extract of clay" and the "germ of life," which stand widely apart from each other. But "Fá" is used to connect one stage with another after the "germ of life" has taken root up to the stage of flesh. We have then the conjunctive "Summa" repeated when the germ of life assumes shapes of bone and flesh, and is at a distance from the stage when it becomes permeated with soul. The words of Al Qur-án, i.e. "Then we caused it to grow into another creation," point to a new "mode of being" which man would assume, but it certainly would not come into us from without. It is latent in us.

This one single theory, that soul and body are not one, but two distinct entities, has been the source of endless views in all systems of religions and schools of thought to the detriment of the welfare of man. Another similar theory is that of the transmigration of soul. These have led people for ages to seek the solace of their mind in what is known as "Yog," "Atonement," hermit's life, and other practices of false austerities. They opined that soul and body have nothing in common; the former is "held" by the latter, and real salvation lies in rescuing it from that bondage. To suppress all kinds of human passions was held in great esteem. Hence it is that we have the institutions of hermits in endless forms in different societies the world over. This again is the chief drawback of the teaching that

people ascribe to Buddha. It is supposed to ordain that total isolation from all worldly connections is the best means of suppressing earthly passions and desires, and hence the only passport to the haven of everlasting bliss. Attainment of spiritual purity deemed possible only through the cutting asunder of all worldly ties—a distinctly unnatural creed! Thus the belief that soul and body are two different entities introduced different kinds of asceticism, and Monasticism was also adopted for the welfare of the soul, with celibacy as its necessary condition. Such institutions have never been a nursery of healthy morals, but have germinated moral leprosy and retarded progress of civilization.

SOME FLESHES AS FORBIDDEN FOOD.

To resume the subject: matter in every stage of its evolution lives for its further growth chiefly on that form of its development which stands immediately previous to it. If the vegetable kingdom provides chief food to animals, they in their turn appear in some form on the human table to provide the best nutrition. Every kingdom thus supplies groundwork for the production of the coming one, especially in matter which conspicuously differentiates the former from the one standing previous to it. In other words, what differentiates between two forms of growth immediately lower or superior to each other, works as a bedrock to carry out further growth. The new element in the coming order is to be evolved from what differentiates its immediate lower order from the one previous to the latter. Vegetation in its most evolved shape exhibits locomotion, which evokes to its utmost in the animal kingdom, but consciousness is the distinctive feature in animal life. Consciousness consists of several emotions and impulses which are commonly possessed by man and lower animals. These impulses are the offspring of animal organism, and stand as differentia between the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and act as constructing material for further progress in human frame. These passions present their full exhibition in some animals, but they are to be refined and balanced within moderate bounds to make man of the brute. A goat is "poor in spirit," but it is not morality, it is a natural impulse, which needs balancing to make it a true morality. The carnivorous show ferocity

and courage, while the herbivorous generally exhibit humility and timidity. If camel exhibits anger at its height, cow fully possesses that impulse, which when exercised within moderate bounds becomes true meekness and modesty. Pig is only an incarnation of lust and a full exhibition of dirt-loving nature. These animals are different complexes of the same material. But the difference in shape and passions follows the difference of the measure and proportion in which their original ingredients have been specialized. Thus every different combination of elements in animal life creates different passions, and will carry them along with it wherever it goes. Therefore flesh of such animals which exhibit passions in their worst form should not make an article of human diet. Morals of the animals we eat must affect our morality. This explains the rationale of placing flesh of certain animals in the category of prohibited food under certain religious systems.

In short, these various impulses and passions which became evolved in animal organism are to be sublimated into high ethics and morality, not only to create social order, but to produce true humanity, which in its full-fledgement will act as groundwork for further progress—life beyond the grave. But this process of sublimation solely depends upon our knowledge of that "measure of moderation" which in different respects acted as guide to atoms in their every stage of evolution from ethereal speck to human frame. If constructive ability unconsciously kept that measure before it in discriminating between the useful and the deleterious, it did not matter much, as the growth up to human organism was unconscious. But humanity brings a new starting-point—something is to be evolved out of consciousness and the constructive ability must work consciously with guidance in some conscious form, i.e., Revelation from Creator. If a rain in material form comes from above to give rise to life for the build of material organism, which reaches its perfection in human form, the further growth, which is intellectual and spiritual, needs a spiritual rain; hence the Qur-án compares itself and other sacred books to rain—a subject to be dealt with later on.

THE THREE GREAT MARTYRS OF THE WORLD

SOCRATES—JESUS—HOSAIN

By SHEIKH M. H. KIDWAI.

Wa la taqúli limanyaqtalo fi sablillahe amvatun balahyáun wa lakín la tash'úrún.

“And do not speak of those who are slain in Allah's way as dead; nay, (they are) alive, but you do not perceive” (Al-Qur-án, ch. ii. v. 154).

CHAPTER I

THREE GREAT MARTYRS OF THE WORLD

HUMAN history has produced a great many martyrs in this world. The history of the son of Adam and Eve is an old, old history. It has produced many a great man. A good number of those great men have suffered because of their greatness. One of the proofs of greatness is in braving misfortunes. Mother Nature is used to putting her children who are of good calibre to test by confronting them with afflictions and sufferings. Many a bar of gold has been put into fire to prove its purity. Man has very often been put to a hard test. A good many men in the long history of their race have been put to the final test. They have faced death while espousing the truth. They have suffered death in their right cause. In almost every walk of human life heroic martyrdom has been achieved by several men. Every religion, every country, every race, has had its own martyrs. Islamic history is full of martyrs—such martyrs of whom any nation, any religion, can well be proud.

Among Muslim religious leaders there have been a number of martyrs. In the lifetime of Muhammad there were hosts of martyrs. Of the first four Khalifas and successors of Muhammad only one—the first Khalifa, Abu Bakr—died a natural death. The martyrdom of the third Khalifa, Osman Zin Nurain, was one of the noblest martyrdoms. He was killed after a siege of ten days, in which food and water also were refused to him. His own people and slaves were ready to fight against the besiegers, but he did not allow them to do so because he could not take upon himself the responsibility of bloodshed among the Musalmans. He

allowed himself to be mercilessly killed, but would not allow any other Muslim's blood to be shed.

Christianity also, in its earlier days, though not during the lifetime of Jesus, produced martyrs.

It is an astounding fact that the personality of Jesus could only assert itself after his crucifixion.

In his own life he failed to infuse even so much love for himself that his own disciples betrayed him and even cursed him. They did not move a finger to save him from death. But a long time after his crucifixion many Christians suffered torture for him. They suffered even death.

In other religions also martyrs have not been unknown.

But there are certain features in the martyrdom of three persons—Socrates, Jesus Christ, and Imam Hosain—which makes them Princes of the realm of martyrdom.

Personally they were very great. The cause for which they died was very noble. The impression their martyrdom made upon the world has been permanent.

The respect which the human mind has cherished for them has been abiding.

I will give in brief the account of the life and death of each of them.

CHAPTER II

SOCRATES

SOCRATES lived in the fifth century before Christ. He was the son of Sophronicus, who was a statuary, and of Phænarete, who is said to have been a midwife. After his education in music, geometry, astronomy, and gymnastic, and also Greek literature, he began his life as a sculptor, but gave it up after some time. His domestic life was not very happy. His wife was Xanthippe, and Socrates could not feel quite comfortable with her.

His sons were also dull and fatuous. After leaving art, Socrates took up education. He invented his own system and became very famous.

It is enough to say that geniuses like Plato were his pupils, and took pride in him. Socrates conceived and declared that he had a divine commission.

He regarded the task of improving not himself alone, but others also to have been divinely allotted to him. He knew the importance of what was said centuries after him, "Physician, cure thyself."

He never missed any opportunity to educate himself. He was fully convinced of his own limitations, and in his preachings was never arrogant. He had great sympathy

with all who erred. He loved to help the people on the right path.

Socrates was a man of great piety. Xenophon says, "No one ever knew of his doing or saying anything profane or unholy."

The doctrine of the unity of God was then almost unknown in the West. Greece was the home of culture, yet the people were groping in the darkness. They had their own mythology. They believed in multitudes of gods and goddesses. That mythology, that polytheism jarred upon the pure mind of Socrates. He himself had come firmly to believe in one Supreme Being—one Creator of the Universe.

He could not reconcile his conception of that benevolent, merciful, and intelligent Supreme Being with all those tales which were related to him by his fellow-citizens as regards the doings of gods and goddesses. Some of those doings were such as would be avoided even by the worst of men, yet they were supposed to have been committed by gods. And those gods still expected that any man would worship them. Socrates could not. However, he did not absolutely and wholly run down the religious faith of his countrymen. He charged his people only to have corrupted their religion by additions of unworthy stories and myths.

In support of the Divine Being whom he worshipped he referred to the natural phenomena underlying benevolence, and bounty in the world, and also to the universality of belief. His own soul being pure, he believed in the revelation and warnings which are given to men through signs. He thought he had a sort of "guardian spirit" with him. All this was queer to his people, and therefore one of the charges against him was of introducing "new divinities."

The life Socrates lived was very simple indeed. Summer and winter, his coat was the same. His food was very poor. He went barefooted and without a shirt. He neglected his own self to be able to be more independent to give education to others. He sacrificed his own luxuries to fulfil better the commission which he believed he had received from God. He spent most of his time in the market-place, streets, and gymnasia. He conversed with all—priests, politicians, workmen, labourers, artisans, and artists.

Intellectually, Socrates was a very great man, morally he was not less great. He was a worthy citizen of his country, which he loved. But his love for his country and people was not like that which English people have for theirs. It was not narrow and exclusive. He recognized the whole world as his country. Socrates did not lack in physical courage. He served as a hoplite at Patidæa, and saved the life of Alcibiades.

The Divine voice within him had forbidden him from taking any part in politics. But he seems to have ignored it, and ultimately it was because of political animosity of some of his contemporaries that he suffered his martyrdom.

In 406 B.C. he was a member of the senate. On the first day of the trial of the victories of Arginusæ, being president of the Prytanis, he resented the illegal and unconstitutional proposal of Callixenus that the fate of eight generals should be decided by a single vote of the assembly. He first got the support of a few others in the opposition, but when they left him he opposed alone. Two years later, during the reign of terror, the Thirty ordered five citizens, including Socrates, to go to Salamis and bring thence their destined victim Leon. Socrates alone bravely disobeyed.

Naturally he was disliked by the Thirty, and they even threatened to punish him under a special ordinance forbidding "the teaching of the art of argument." But the fates had reserved for the reconstituted democracy to bring him to trial, to condemn him by a majority of votes and to put him to death.

Woe to such a democracy! Woe to such a majority!

If democracies are so blind as not to appreciate the genius of even a Socrates, and they condemn him to death, they are worthy of no power.

The accusers of Socrates were Lycon the orator, Anytus the tanner, and Meletus the poet. All these were members of the democratic party, and had been returned from Phyle. The charges were: Socrates is guilty first of denying the gods recognized by the State and introducing new divinities, and, secondly, of corrupting the young.

How did Socrates meet the charges? He did not care even to prepare a defence with any deliberation. He did not seek to conciliate the judges. He defied them. He boldly argued that he was not guilty of any charges brought against him. Meletus he called and proved to be self-contradicting.

During his argument he secured from Meletus the assertion, "You are a complete atheist." And then Socrates showed how could Meletus say that he was a complete atheist, believing in no god, either old or new, when in his indictment he had charged him with having introduced new divinities. "You are a liar, Meletus, not even believed by yourself," was his remark to his chief enemy. Later on, Socrates refuted very logically the other charges against him.

He made Meletus admit that he, the senate, and everybody else tried to improve the youths, and then asked

Meletus whether his influence was greater than the influence of all the people combined. After thus silencing Meletus, he solemnly said, "Some one will say: And are you not ashamed, Socrates, of a course of life which is likely to bring you to an untimely end? To this I may fairly answer: There you are mistaken; a man who is good for anything ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong—acting the part of a good man or of a bad man; for wherever a man's place is, whether the place which he has chosen or that in which he has been placed by a commander, there he ought to remain in the hour of danger. He should not think of anything, but of disgrace. Strange, indeed, would be my conduct, O men of Athens, if I, who, when I was ordered by the generals whom you chose to command me at Potidæa and Amphipolis and Debiem, remained where they placed me, like any other man, facing death—if, I say, now, when, as I conceive and imagine, God orders me to fulfil the philosopher's mission of searching into myself and other men, I were to desert my post through fear of death, or any other fear. . . . The fear of death is indeed the pretence of wisdom, and not real wisdom, being a pretended knowledge of the unknown; and no one knows whether death, which men in their fear apprehend to be the greatest evil, may not be the greatest good. . . . And this is the point in which, as I think, I differ from others, and in which I might perhaps fancy myself wiser than men in general—that whereas I know but little of the world below, I do not suppose that I know: but I do know that injustice and disobedience to a better, whether God or man, is evil and dishonourable, and I will never fear or avoid a possible good rather than a certain evil.

"If you say to me: Socrates, this time we will not mind Anytus and will let you off, but upon one condition, that you are not to inquire and speculate in this way any more, and that if you are caught doing this again you shall die; if this was the condition on which you let me go, I should reply: Men of Athens, I honour and love you, but I shall obey God rather than you, and while I have life and strength I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of Philosophy, exhorting any one whom I met after my manner, and convincing him, saying, 'O my friend, why do you, who are a citizen of the great and mighty and wise city of Athens, care so much about laying up the greatest amount of money and honour and reputation, and so little about wisdom and truth and the greatest improvement of the soul, which you never regard or heed at all?' . . . And I say the same to every one whom I meet, young and

old, citizen and client, but specially to the citizens, inasmuch as they are my brethren. For know that this is the command of God, and I believe that to this day no greater good has ever happened in the State than my service to God. For I do nothing but go about persuading you all, old and young alike, not to take thought for your persons or your properties, but first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvement of the soul. I tell you that virtue is not given by money, but that from virtue comes money and every other good of man, public as well as private.

“ This is my teaching, and if this is the doctrine which corrupts youth, my influence is ruinous indeed. But if any one says this is not my teaching, he is speaking an untruth. Wherefore, O men of Athens, I say to you: Do as Anytus bids, or not as Anytus bids, and either acquit me or not, but whatever you do I shall never alter my ways, not even if I have to die many times ” (*Apology*).

Socrates warned them that if they would kill him it would be they who would be the losers, not he. He said that a worse man could not harm a better. There is no doubt that there was no other person like him. He sacrificed all his comforts for the sake of others. He kept the State in a fit condition by arousing the people.

He ended his speech thus: “ And to you and to God I commit my cause, to be determined by you as is best for you and me.”

Votes were taken, and he was found guilty by 280 votes against 220. How far greater a man was he than his contemporaries, how far ahead was he of his time, is revealed by the votes. For Socrates to have been condemned to death by a majority of votes of such people who were supposed to represent all that was best in the whole kingdom revealed how low was the condition of the intellectuality of the people as compared to that of Socrates.

It was Meletus who called for capital punishment. But according to the then law the accused was allowed to make a counter-proposition, and it is most likely that if Socrates had even then in a reconciliatory tone suggested some smaller yet substantial penalty, his proposal would have been accepted.

But Socrates made another strong speech. He expressed his satisfaction of the sentence, but reproved Meletus for it, and said that he deserved to be retained by the State for his service to it instead of being sentenced to death.

Socrates said that he was poor, and because in spite of his poverty he was a public benefactor, he should be maintained in the prytaneum as a public benefactor. He refused to ask that death, which may be good, should be commuted for imprisonment or exile, which were undoubtedly

evils. He was ready to pay a fine, but being poor, he could not afford more than one mina. When his disciples and friends like Plato and Crito asked him to pay more, he offered thirty minæ, to which his friends would be security. Socrates, addressing those who had voted for his death, added :—

“ The deficiency which led to my conviction was not of words—certainly not. But I had not the boldness or impudence or inclination to address you as you would have liked me to address you, weeping and wailing and lamenting, and saying and doing things which you have been accustomed to hear from others, and which is, I maintain, all unworthy of me. . . . I would rather die, having spoken in my manner, than speak in yours and live. . . .

“ The difficulty, my friends, is not in avoiding death, but in avoiding unrighteousness, for that runs faster than death. . . . And now, O men who have condemned me, I would fain prophesy to you, for I am about to die, and that is the hour in which men are gifted with prophetic powers. And I may prophesy to you who are my murderers, that immediately after my death punishment far heavier than you have inflicted on me will surely await you. Me you have killed because you wanted to escape the accuser, and not to give an account of your lives. But that will not be as you suppose, far otherwise. For I say that there will be more accusers, whom hitherto I have restrained. . . . If you think that by killing me you can prevent some one from censuring your evil lives, you are mistaken ; that is not the way of escape which is either possible or honourable : the easiest and the noblest way is not to be disabling others, but to be improving yourselves ” (*Apology*).

Socrates also spoke to those who had voted for his acquittal. He said it will comfort them to know that the divine voice—Socrates’s oracle within him in which he believed—had not checked him either when he was leaving the house or when he was entering the court or when he was speaking. This he took to indicate that death was not an evil. Then he reasoned out that death could not be an evil. He said that death was either a state of nothingness or utter unconsciousness, i.e. an undisturbed sleep, or it was a removal of the soul to a better world, where life was eternal and where there were no unjust judges.

If it was the first, it was covetable. Even a king would like to have such a sleep, which was not disturbed even by dreams. If it was the second, it was happier still, because immortality was achieved and the company of great men and good men. Socrates expected to meet

Minos, Radamanthus, and Æacus and Triptolemus, and other "sons of God, who were righteous in their own lives." Wherefore he said: "O judges, be of good cheer about death, and know of a certainty that no evil can happen to a good man, either in life or after death." He forgave his condemners and accusers, adding, "They have done me no harm, although they did not mean to do me any good." In the end he asked his people to punish his sons "if they seem to care about riches or anything more than virtues."

Socrates closed his speech on this pregnant sentence: "The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways—I to die, and you to live. Which is better, God only knows."

Under ordinary circumstances the person who was condemned to death had to drink the cup of hemlock on the day after the trial. If Socrates had died the second day after his great speech, even then his martyrdom would have been grand. But fates were bent upon a further trial of him. A further proof was demanded of him to show that he was not only a great philosopher and morally a very good and heroic man, but that he was also a good citizen, and that his love of truth was consistent with his civic duties. It so happened that in the case of Socrates the rule that during the absence of the sacred ship sent annually to Delos no one should be put to death caused an exceptional delay of thirty days. One day at dawn, when the returning ship had just been reported as descried from Sunium, Crito, his oldest friend, went to Socrates to his prison cell. He was fast asleep, but awoke when Crito entered. Crito told him that the reason of his early visit was the approach of the fatal vessel. Then the following dialogue, according to Plato's "Crito," followed:—

Socrates.—"But I do not think that the ship will be here until to-morrow; this I infer from a vision."

Crito.—"And what was the nature of the vision?"

Socrates.—"There came to me the likeness of a woman, fair and comely, clothed in white raiment, who called to me and said, 'O Socrates, the third day hence to Phthia shalt thou go'" (*Homer*).

But Crito revealed to Socrates a plan to escape, saying that by Socrates' death he will not only lose a valued friend, but his own reputation also, because people will generally think that if Crito had not valued his money more than the life of Socrates he could have rescued Socrates.

To this Socrates replied: "But why, my dear Crito, should we care about the opinion of the many? Good men; and they are the only persons who are worth considering, will think of these things truly, as they occurred."