The

Islamic Review

Edited by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

Vol. XVI.]

JUMĀDA 'L-ŪLĀ, 1347 A.H.
NOVEMBER, 1928 A.C.

Annual Subscription, 10s. Single Co

CONTENTS.

PUBLISHED AT
THE MOSQUE WOKING ENGLAND

"I have studied many different religious faiths, but Islamic teaching impresses me more than any, for it teaches that no man is so great as God, our Creator; while other faiths have saints, people born of flesh, whom they worship or pray to . . . and the Bible has been changed and rechanged so often to suit the Christian Roman Church that it is hard to believe in its truthfulness."

H. P. HANBACK.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

JUMĀDA 'L-ŪLĀ 1347 A.H.
VOL. XVI. NOVEMBER, 1928 A.C. No. 11

NOTES

The Bible Spate.

A study of last year's Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society inspires the reflection that it contains everything that is good for the average Briton to digest and says nothing of what is happening behind the scenes; which is, of course, an admirable idea, since illusions are the essence of life. The statistics record that the Bible has been translated wholly or in part into fifteen new languages, and that of Bibles and Testaments and portions of the Bible in the English Authorised Version more than two million volumes were issued. When to these are added copies of the Revised Version and versions in Welsh, Gaelic, and Irish, the total is 2,213,467 volumes. Nearly a million of these are sold in England, the greater part of the remainder finding purchasers within the Empire. As for the rest of the world, there was a significant decline in the sales effected. For example, only 9,936,714 Bibles or portions of Bibles were exported instead of more than ten millions. The Society somewhat naïvely ascribes this decline to the chaos in China.

Now, if the figures were to form the criterion of our appreciation or otherwise of the work the Society has in hand, we must needs conclude that there is a great demand for the

Bible. But whether we ought to take the statistics as indicating a widely diffused eagerness for Biblical study is quite another story. The stupendous figures given by the Society do not, in any sense, vouch for anything further than the fact that they are figures. We think it is quite safe to assume that the Bible is most generally bought merely for the sake of buying and treasuring, because it is undoubtedly a book around which there clings a time-hallowed tradition, rather than for the purpose of being read and acted upon. And as everyone knows, buying a book just for the sake of having it, and purchasing it with the object of making it the norm of one's life are two quite distinct matters. If the sales in England have not decreased, it does not necessarily follow that England is studying its Bible. Nevertheless, the figures taken at their face value afford a most gratifying proof of the zeal of the missionary spirit of the Society's colporteurs.

Another thing which strikes us, and must strike all who are at all conversant with the history of the compilation of the Bible, is the performance of, as it were, the miracle that, in spite of the fact that much extraneous matter has made its way into the text of the Bible, it can still be broadcast in millions as the word of God. What is still more interesting is that even the Christian missionary knows that the Bible must be expurgated and subjected to drastic pruning, yet through sheer money-power, year in and year out, the number of copies distributed continues to rise, for indeed it is amazing when we reflect what money can do!

Let us read the figures of the Society in the light of the following remarks, and we think their glamour will be visibly dimmed. The Reverend Geoffrey Allen, Chaplain to Ripon Hall, Oxford, speaking at the Modern Churchmen's Conference held at Cambridge, remarked [1]:—

> There is no eternal damnation—such a belief is incompatible with the revelation in Christ of a God of Love. There is no future Grand Assize.
>
> There is no reason to expect a return to earth of Jesus in the clouds of heaven. The spirit of Christ comes again wherever and whenever men turn to Him and let His Spirit of love reign in their hearts. The probable duration of the world exceeds imagination.
>
> The Church should have the courage to create anew the Bible.

[1] *Daily Telegraph* for September 21, 1928.

Large sections of the Old Testament might well be rejected; some sections preserved to show the growth [1] of the knowledge of God, and others have a place because they show the special sources of the inspiration of Jesus. To such a Bible might well be added extracts from the historical documents of other world religions.

Echoes of the purely Jewish creed are heard in the gloomy modern slogan, "Millions now living will never die." Popular religion is still disturbed by vague hopes and theories of the coming of the end of the world. Belief in eternal damnation has debased the Christian conception of God and proved an occasion of stumbling to sincere Christians.

Again, the views of Miss Marguerite Harrison, in her book *Asia Reborn*,[2] as recorded on pages 348–354, will still go a long way to steady our view of the staggering figures. The author, while examining the progress of Christianity, observes that "the Christian dogma is making no more headway than before in Western Asia, because two factors are militating against it—the Islamic revival and the spread of agnosticism, even atheism." As to the Near East, she says:—

It is a lamentable fact that missionary work has usually been the precursor or companion of commercial penetration or colonization. As the Near East did not offer a promising field for either, Christian missions in Turkey and Arabia grew very slowly and their labour was chiefly among the Christian Minorities in Syria and Asia Minor. Because they were exempt from military service, these Minorities possessed almost a monopoly of the trade, commerce and industry among the Turks, their only serious competitors being the Jews. Sometimes persecuted, often treated with indifference, they developed a strong sense of social and religious solidarity which soon became identical with political discontent and agitation.

From the beginning of the nineteenth century the discontent among the Armenians was used to foster the political aims of Russian Imperialism. At various times the other Christian communities were utilized by European Powers to create dissensions and to weaken the Ottoman Empire. . . .

In many instances the missionary had openly encouraged what was virtually treason in Turkey, meanwhile enjoying immunity from arrest through the Capitulations signed by the Sultan in times past, which placed them under the jurisdiction of their own Consuls. Even when they refrained from taking sides in political and religious questions, they rarely made any sincere effort to gain the confidence of the Muslims.

The situation, therefore, can be summed up as follows: The Near East was dropped as a hopeless problem because of the absence of the material advantages which accrue through commercial penetration or colonization; Western Asia is not

[1] Italics are ours.—ED. *I.R.*

[2] London, 1928.

ready to accept the message of the Bible. And yet huge sums of money are raised for its circulation.

One word more, while we are on the subject. It is sometimes remarked that "Turkey bans Christianity, although it has officially disestablished Islam." The reason is not far to seek, after reading the views of Miss Harrison, which do but state the plain facts. Time alone can tell whether the Christian missionary in the East, who did make some slight headway during the nineteenth century "borne on the tide of Western imperialism and often backed by Western bayonets," can at all be trusted in the future.

"Once bitten, twice shy," will perhaps best explain Turkey's mind.

Thirst for Muslim Literature.

The pulpit has always been a great force in conveying the message of Islam to the world, but experience has driven home to us the fact that literature, if broadcast, surpasses the pulpit in the wide range of its influence. This being the case, a Trust for the Encouragement of Muslim Literature was formed under the chairmanship of Lord Headley, with the Khwāja Kamālu 'd-Dīn, Sir 'Abbās 'Alī Baig, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., and K. N. Ahmed, Barrister-at-Law, as its trustees. In order to place the Trust on a sound basis, Lord Headley, accompanied by Khwāja Kamālu 'd-Dīn, went, in the beginning of 1926, on an important tour to South Africa to enlist the sympathies of Muslims there resident in the cause. The Khwāja, unfortunately, had to pay a heavy toll in consequence of the overexertion inevitably involved by his journey. Although he is recuperating steadily, he will not be able to resume his duties for a considerable time.

We print below excerpts from letters from different parts of the world, in the hope that they will be read with advantage to the Trust, and that our Muslim brothers in all parts of the world will contribute generously to its funds.[1]

A gentleman from Berlin, who is a member of the British

[1] Donations can be sent to Secretary, The Trust for Muslim Religious Literature, (*a*) The Mosque, Woking, England. (*b*) Azeez Manzil, Brandreth Road, Lahore, India.

Society for the Study of Sex-Psychology, 4, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C. 1, which Society, Moulvie Abdul Majid, the Acting-Imam of the Mosque, Woking, had the privilege of addressing on Thursday, July 12th, on the subject of "Woman under Islam," expresses great pleasure in having received literature on the subject from our Woking centre.

The gentleman wrote to us on September 28th as follows:—

MAHLOW, BEI BERLIN,
September 28, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—Some time ago you gave an address before the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology on "Woman under Islam." As I am now living in Germany, I was unfortunately unable to hear your paper. Mr. Deighton tells me that the paper was not written, but, as I am greatly interested in this subject, he has suggested that you might perhaps be willing to give me a synopsis of your argument. I wonder whether this would be giving you too much trouble. Any brief notes as to the main lines of your paper would be most welcome.

I should perhaps mention that I am a member of the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology and wrote a paper for them which they published as No. 12.

Yours truly,
H. P.

The Imam,
The Mosque, Woking, Surrey, England.

Accordingly, pamphlets on "Divorce," "Veil," "Woman under Islam" were sent. He expressed his appreciation in the letter which reads:—

MAHLOW, BEI BERLIN,
October 11, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—I am greatly obliged for your letter and the printed matter accompanying it. I have been very interested in the pamphlet on Seclusion and also in the one on Divorce. How strangely the West misunderstands the East! It is no use our trying to *imitate* each other, but we can certainly learn from each other. The attitude of us Europeans is, as a rule, curiously narrow, blind, and conceited. Surely the war should have taught us that not much is to be said for European civilization. Alas, we still go on believing in our own superiority.

I hope to make use of the pamphlets among my English-reading friends.

Again many thanks.

Yours sincerely,
H. P.

Another is from a gentleman in Canada who, endowed with a zeal to spread his faith, writes on the pamphlets and literature sent to him from time to time:—

MAYBUTT, ALBERTA, CANADA,
September 23, 1928.

DEAR SIR,—Peace be on you!

Your letter of the 6th inst. received; also the papers by Lord Headley and the current issue of the *Islamic Review*. The leaflets I shall use to the best possible advantage for the enlightenment of the people with whom I come in contact.

A. C. R.

These letters show how wide and effective is the range of literature.

Celibacy and its Origin in Christianity.

"Should Clergymen be Celibate?" was the question discussed by Dr. H. D. A. Major, Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, at the Modern Churchmen's Conference at Cambridge. His views on the question are embodied in the following words[1]:—

But it is quite intolerable that Church authorities should insist upon the celibacy of the clergy. Our own English attitude is a much sounder one—that the clergy should feel for themselves whether celibacy will serve the purpose of godliness and pastoral efficiency.

Dealing with the question of asceticism, Dr. Major urged that there were dangers in the reparatory kind of renunciation which led men to submit themselves to hardships and self-denials as an expiation for the sins of others. That kind of renunciation seemed to suggest something like priggishness, and it might lead one into all sorts of ascetic excesses and to a self-righteous and censorious attitude towards our fellow-men. Renunciation, to be of value, should be the subject of individual choice, and not be ordered by authority.

The difficulty to-day is in regard to Church authorities insisting on this discipline in our case. Some of us have practised fasting Communion for years, but I think as English Churchmen, we feel the strongest objection to the parish priest or any combination of Church authorities insisting upon that particular form of asceticism. There is the strongest possible objection to making it compulsory.

The question, as it is, does not very much concern us, nor does it affect us. For celibacy is not alone to be met with in the Christian system of life. Much can be said for and against it. Nevertheless, it is true to say that the question involves one of those institutions whose study affords us yet another method of forming an idea of the value which the Christian system of theology puts on life, and throws into relief those important aspects which serve as a background for the appraisement of differences in outlook on life of both the religions of Christianity and Islam. As to Islam, its outlook on life is

[1] *Daily Telegraph* for September 22, 1928.

summed up in a saying of the Holy Prophet Muhammad: " There is no asceticism in Islam."

The very presence of the institution of celibacy in the Christian system of life is an eloquent proof of the fact that it takes a very low and dark view of human nature. For the roots of celibacy are to be found in the doctrine of Original Sin, which, happily, of late, has been materially modified owing to the progress of knowledge. This doctrine it is that holds woman responsible for the temptation into which Eve led Adam to eat the symbolical apple which God had forbidden him to eat. In other words, it propounds that it was woman who was the first to disobey God, that it was woman who was the cause of the fall of Adam, and that it was woman who prompted Adam to follow her in disobedience. In short, it was through the agency of woman that sin—moral death—came to the world!

What trend the conception of the saints and priests of the early Christian era could possibly take one can very well imagine. They began to regard women as unclean and never liked to come in contact with them. They discouraged marriage. This notion of impurity of marriage led to the feeling that the clergy, a pre-eminently holy class, should have less licence than laymen. In the course of the fourth century it was that we find that it was a recognized principle that clerical marriages were criminal. Monasticism—a logical conclusion of this attitude—became the fashion of the day. St. Paul himself regarded marriage as a concession to the weakness of the flesh (1 Cor. vii.). Jerome (420 B.C.), Ambrose (397 B.C.) and other well-known theologians all encouraged an unmarried life. Gregory the Great was very much in favour of stopping all priests and religious Christians from getting married. It was so until 1625, when Luther set a practical example against the monastic and single life. It may in passing be remarked that it is one of the greatest benefits of Protestantism that it did much to banish the perverted modes of thought which condemned marriage from the world and restored marriage to its simplicity and dignity.

Another injurious consequence, resulting in a great measure from the Christian institutions of celibacy and asceticism, was

the tendency to depreciate extremely the character and position of woman. She was regarded as the origin of human ills. Islam realized this; for celibacy, wherein lay its roots, was in its full swing in the days of Muhammad. The Qur-án, therefore, declared: "And as for monkery, they innovated it" (Qur-án, lvii. 27).

Persecution.

They say the days of religious persecution are gone, never more to return, from the soil of enlightened Europe. And if there was any persecution to be met with anywhere at all, it was only in the Muslim lands. Such is, in few words, the brief outline of the stories on which the average European is nursed by the Christian missionary to the East. If one wanted to have a proof of this state of affairs, then it was to be found in the meagreness of success which up till now had attended the efforts at evangelizing the Muslims by the Christian missions. For what else—so one would argue—should be the reason for their failure? This seems to them to be the easiest of methods to pacify all those who sometimes evince symptoms of uneasiness and scepticism as to the measure of success attained by the Christian missions.

A few days back we received a letter—excerpts from which we reproduce below—to show that persecution, although changed in form, is still the same in spirit and substance—from our Muslim sister Miss Halíma Marguerite-Lee, whose photo formed the frontispiece of our issue for August 1928. She writes to say:—

LONDON, W.C. 1,
October 13, 1928.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER IN ISLAM,—Peace be on you!

I just write to thank you for your kindness to me on Friday evening last and also for introducing me to some other Muslims on Saturday at the Birthday Celebrations of the Holy Prophet (may peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him!). I did so much enjoy being amongst such a happy and friendly gathering of Muslims. . . .

I did not like to tell you on Friday that I have had to leave my home because of my having adopted Islam as my religion. My people would not even allow me to keep the Qur-án in the house.

However, "he whom Allah befriends is not disgraced," says the Qur-án. . . .

Yours in Islam,
HALÍMA MARGUERITE-LEE.

The italics are ours. The letter needs no comment except that we should like our Muslim friends to appreciate the nature of obstacles which one has to surmount before one feels oneself free to openly cherish that which one holds to be true.

A Bishop on the Causes of the Church Decline.

Below we print extracts from a Pastoral Letter[1] by Dr. Cyril Garbett, Bishop of Southwark, in which he attempts to fathom the causes of the decline of the Church and its hold on the people:—

There is a genuine and widespread interest in religion to-day. But our generation is not content with bare negations; it wants to know.

The secular Press opens its columns to long discussions on matters of faith, though sometimes, to judge by its contributors, it seems to be under the delusion that the successful novelist and playwright must be authorities on the spiritual life. The space given to problems of this nature is only one sign that many who never attend church are seeking the truth. For themselves and their children, they want to know if they can believe in God as revealed in and through Christ.

CAUSES OF THE DECLINE.

There is real danger lest belief in the supernatural should be lost sight of by the great majority of our fellow-countrymen. There are some who draw melancholy comfort from the theory that the decline in church attendance is the result of changes in church worship. The reasons lie deeper. They are to be found in:

Unsettlement in matters of faith;
The difficulty of reconciling new knowledge with the old beliefs;
The slowness of adapting the organizations of the Church to the needs of the modern world.

The exodus from town on Sundays by car and train, the counter-attractions of the cinema and concerts, have an adverse influence on church-going. We are in the midst of one of those periods which history has often recorded, when the claims of the unseen and the spiritual seem pale compared to the colour and splendour of the world.

The letter, considered as a Pastoral Letter, leaves much to be desired. It does not even attempt to formulate the causes which have paved the way for "the unsettlement in matters of faith." The weakest feature of Christianity is to be found in the wealth of seeds from which it has grown. Unlike Islam, it is not sure of itself. There are many confusing aspects of Christianity which can simply be traced to

[1] *Daily Telegraph* for September 24, 1928.

the various versions of the Bible. This is to be contrasted with the one "authorised version," if such a phrase be at all permitted, of the Qur-án. The simple creed of a Muslim is contained in the first chapter of the Qur-án and it is as short as the Christian "Lord's Prayer." The Muslim Prayer praises God as the Lord of the World—meaning the Universe, whatever that may imply—not only of this little world of ours. It attributes to Him mercy and beneficence with a supreme power over the Day of Judgment and is an avowal of worship and service. Its only petition is that the Muslim may be led into the path of the righteous and not of those upon whom the wrath of God is to fall.

MUHAMMAD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR 'ABDUL I'-AHAD DÁWÚD, B.D.

V

MUHAMMAD AND CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

[The learned Professor is open to correspondence on the points discussed or raised in his article. Letters may be addressed to him care of the Editor, *Islamic Review*, Woking, England.—ED. *I.R.*]

THE most wonderful and, perhaps, the most manifest prophecy about the divine mission of the greatest man and the Apostle of God, contained in the seventh chapter of the Book of the Prophet Daniel, deserves to be seriously studied and impartially considered. In it great events in the history of mankind, which succeed each other within a period of more than a thousand years, are represented by the figures of four formidable monsters in a prophetical vision to Daniel. "Four winds of heaven were roaring against the great sea." The first beast that comes out from the deep sea is a winged lion; then comes forth the second beast in the shape of a bear holding three ribs between its teeth. This is succeeded by the third terrible beast in the form of a tiger having four wings and four heads. The fourth beast, which is more formidable and ferocious than the former ones, is a monster

with ten horns upon its head, and has iron teeth in its mouth. Then a little horn shoots up amidst the others, before which three horns break down. Behold, human eyes and mouth appear upon this horn, and it begins to speak great things against the Most High. Suddenly, in the midst of the firmament the vision of the Eternal is seen amidst a resplendent light, seated upon His tribune (Arabic: *Korsí*) of the flames of light whose wheels were of shining light.[1] A river of light is flowing and going forth before Him; and millions of celestial beings are serving Him and tens and tens of thousand of them are standing before Him. The Judgment Court is, as it were, holding its extraordinary session; the books are opened. The body of the beast is burnt with fire, but the blaspheming Horn is left alive until a " Bar Nasha "—that is, a " Son of Man " —is taken up on the clouds and presented to the Eternal, from whom he receives power, honour and kingdom for ever. The stupefied Prophet approaches one of those standing by and beseeches him to explain the meaning of this wonderful vision. The good Angel gives the interpretation of it in such a manner that the whole mystery enveloped in the figurative or allegorical language and image is brought to light.

Being a prince of the royal family, Daniel was taken, together with three other Jewish youths, to the palace of the King of Babylon, where he was educated in all the knowledge of the Chaldeans. He lived there until the Persian Conquest and the fall of the Babylonian Empire. He prophesied under Nebuchadnezzar as well as under Darius. The Biblical critics do not ascribe the authorship of the entire Book to Daniel, who lived and died at least a couple of centuries before the Greek Conquest, which he mentions under the name of " Yavan " = " Ionia." The first eight chapters—if I am not mistaken—are written in the Chaldean and the latter portion in the Hebrew. For our immediate purpose it is not so much the date and the authorship of the book that forms the important question as the actual fulfilment of the prophecy, contained in the Septuagint version, which was made some three centuries before the Christian era.

[1] The original word is *núr*, and, like the Arabic word, it means " light " rather than " fire," which is represented in the text by " ish."

According to the interpretation by the Angel, each one of the four beasts represents an empire. The eagle-winged lion signifies the Chaldean Empire, which was mighty and rapid like an eagle to pounce upon the enemy. The bear represents the "Mádaí-Páris," or the Medo-Persian Empire, which extended its conquests as far as the Adriatic Sea and Ethiopia, thus holding with its teeth a rib from the body of each one of the three continents of the Eastern Hemisphere. The third beast, from its tigrish nature of swift bounds and fierceness, typifies the triumphant marches of Alexander the Great, whose vast empire was, after his death, divided into four kingdoms.

But the Angel who interprets the vision does not stop to explain with details the first three kingdoms as he does when he comes to the fourth beast. Here he enters with emphasis into details. Here the scene in the vision is magnified. The beast is practically a monster and a huge demon. This is the formidable Roman Empire. The ten horns are the ten Emperors of Rome who persecuted the early Christians. Turn the pages of any Church history for the first three centuries down to the time of the so-called conversion of Constantine the Great, and you will read nothing but the horrors of the famous "Ten Persecutions."

So far, all these four beasts represent the "Power of Darkness," namely, the Kingdom of Satan, idolatry.

In this connection let me divert your attention to a luminous truth embodied in that particularly important article of the Faith of Islam: "The Good and Evil are from Allah." It will be remembered that the old Persians believed in a "Duality of Gods," or, in other words, the Principle of Good and Light, and the other the Principle of Evil and Darkness; and that these eternal beings were eternal enemies. It will be observed that among the four beasts the Persian Power is represented by the figure of a bear, less ferocious than, and not so carnivorous as, the other three; and what is more: inasmuch as it can roam upon its hind legs it resembles man—at least from some distance.

In all the Christian theological and religious literature I have read, I have never met with a single statement or phrase

similar to this article of the Muslim Faith: God is the real author of good and evil. This article of the Muslim Faith, as the contrary, is extremely repugnant to the Christian religion, and a source of hatred against the religion of Islam. Yet this very doctrine is explicitly announced by God to Cyrus, whom He calls His "Christ." He wants Cyrus to know that there is no god besides Him, and declares:—

> "I am the fashioner of the light, and the creator of the darkness; the maker of peace, and *the creator of* evil; I am the Lord who does all these" (Isa. xlv. 1–7.)

That God is the author of evil as well as of good is not in the least repulsive to the idea of God's goodness. The very denial of it is opposed to the absolute unity of the Almighty. Besides, what we term or understand as "evil" only affects the created beings, and it is for the development and the improvement of the creatures; it has not in the least any effect on God.

Leaving this digression, I hasten to say that all these wild beasts were the enemies of the "holy people of God," as the old Israel and the early followers of the Gospels were called. For they alone had the true knowledge, the scriptures and the revelation of God. These wild beasts persecuted and massacred the people of God. But the nature and the character of the Little Horn which sprang up on the head of the fourth monster was so different from that of the other animals, that God Himself had, as it were, to come down and establish His throne in the firmament, to judge and condemn to destruction the fourth animal; to summon to His presence the Bar Nasha —"Son of Man"—and to make him the Sultan of men; for the words *Sholṭana, yaqar, malkutha,* which signify respectively the "empire, honour, kingdom" of all the peoples and nations, were granted to him (verse 14) and to the "people of the Saints of the Most High" (verse 27).

It will be noticed that as the Son of Man is nobler than, and superior to, the beasts, so the religion which he professed and established is infinitely holier than that of the Little Horn.

Now let us examine and find out who the Little Horn is. Having once definitely ascertained the identity of this eleventh

king, the identity of the Bar Nasha will be settled *per se*. The Little Horn springs up after the Ten Persecutions under the reigns of the emperors of the Roman Power. The empire was writhing under four rivals, Constantine being one of them. They were all struggling for the purple; the other three died or fell in battle; and Constantine was left alone as the supreme sovereign of the vast empire.

The earlier Christian commentators have in vain laboured to identify this ugly Little Horn with the Anti-Christ, with the Pope of Rome by Protestants, and with the Founder of Islam. (God forbid!) But the later Biblical critics are at a loss to solve the problem of the fourth beast which they wish to identify with the Greek Empire and the Little Horn with Antiochus. Some of the critics, e.g. Carpenter, consider the Medo-Persian Power as two separate kingdoms. But this empire was no more two than the late Austro-Hungarian Empire was. The explorations carried on by the Scientific Mission of the French savant, M. Morgan, in Shúshan (Susa) and elsewhere leave no doubt on this point. The fourth beast can, therefore, be no other than the old Roman world.

To show that the Little Horn is no other than Constantine the Great, the following arguments can safely be advanced :—

(*a*) He overcame Maximian and the other two rivals and assumed the purple, and put an end to the persecution of Christianity. Gibbon's *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is, I think, the best history that can instruct us about those times. You can never invent four rivals after the Ten Persecutions of the Church, other than Constantine and his enemies who fell before him like the three horns that fell before the little one.

(*b*) All the four beasts are represented in the vision as irrational brutes; but the Little Horn possessed a human mouth and eyes which is, in other words, the description of a hideous monster endowed with reason and speech. He proclaimed Christianity as the true religion, left Rome to the Pope and made Byzantium, which was named Constantinople, the seat of the empire. He pretended to profess Christianity but was never baptized till a little before his death, and even this is a disputed question. The legend that his conversion was due

to the vision of the Cross in the sky has long since—like the account about Jesus Christ inserted in the *Antiquities* of Josephus—been exploded as another piece of forgery.

The enmity of the beasts to the believers in God was brutal and savage, but that of the rational Horn was diabolical and malignant. This enmity was most noxious and harmful to the religion, because it was directed to pervert the truth and the faith. All the previous attacks of the four empires were pagan; they persecuted and oppressed the believers but could not pervert the truth and the faith. It was this Constantine who entered in the fold of Jesus in the shape of a believer and in the clothes of a sheep, but inwardly he was not a true believer at all. How poisonous and pernicious this enmity was will be seen from the following :—

(*c*) The Horn-Emperor speaks "big things" or "great words" (*rōrbhān* in the Chaldean tongue) against the Most High. To speak blasphemous words about God, to associate with Him other creatures, and to ascribe to Him foolish names and attributes, such as the "begetter" and "begotten," "birth" and "procession" (of the second and the third person), "unity in the trinity" and "incarnation," is to deny His unity.

Ever since the day when God revealed Himself to Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees until the Creed and the Acts of the Council of Nicea were proclaimed and enforced by an imperial edict of Constantine amidst the horror and protests of three-fourths of the true believing members in A.D. 325, never has the unity of God so officially and openly been profaned by those who pretended to be His people as Constantine and his gang of the unbelieving ecclesiastics! In the first article of this series I have shown the error of the Churches concerning God and His attributes. I need not enter into this unpleasant subject again; for it gives me great pain and grief when I see a holy prophet and a holy spirit, both God's noble creatures, associated with Him by those who ought to know better.

If Brahma and Osiris, or if Jupiter and Vesta were associated with God, we would simply consider this to be a pagan belief; but when we see Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth

and one of the millions of the holy spirits in the service of the Eternal raised equal to the dignity of God, we cannot find a name for those who so believe other than what the Muslims have always been obliged to use—the epithet " Gāwun."

Now, since this hideous Horn speaking great words, uttering blasphemies against God, is a king—as the Angel reveals it to Daniel, and since this king was the eleventh of the Cæsars who reigned in Rome and persecuted the people of God, he cannot be other than Constantine, because it was his edict that proclaimed the belief in the Trinity of persons in the Deity, a creed which the Old Testament is a living document to condemn as blasphemy, and which both the Jews and Muslims abhor. If it be other than Constantine, then the question arises, who is he? He has already come and gone, and not an impostor or the Anti-Christ hereafter to appear, that we may be unable to know and identify. If we do not admit that the Horn in question has come already, then how are we to interpret the four beasts, the first of which is certainly the Chaldean Empire, the second the Medo-Persian, and so forth? If the fourth beast does not represent the Roman Empire, how can we interpret the third, with its four heads, as the Empire of Alexander, split into four kingdoms after his death? Is there any other Power succeeding the Greek Empire before the Roman Empire with its ten potentates persecuting the believers in God? Sophistry and illusion are of no use. The " Little Horn " is decidedly Constantine, even if we may deny the prophecy of Daniel. It is immaterial whether a prophet, priest or a sorcerer wrote the seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel. One thing is certain, that its predictions and descriptions of the events, some twenty-four centuries ago, are found to be exact, true, and have been fulfilled in the person of Constantine the Great, whom the Church of Rome has always very wisely abstained from beatifying as a Saint, as the Greek Church has done.

(*d*) Not only does the " Little Horn," which grew into something of a more " formidable vision " than the rest, speak impious words against the Most High, but also it wages war against the " Saints of the Most High, and vanquishes them " (verse 25). In the eyes of a Hebrew Prophet the

people who believed in one God was a *separate* and *holy people.* Now it is indisputably true that Constantine persecuted those Christians who, like the Jews, believed in the absolute Unity of God and courageously declared the Trinity to be a false and erroneous conception of the Deity. More than a thousand ecclesiastics were summoned to the General Council at Nicea (the modern Izmid), of whom only three hundred and eighteen persons subscribed to the decisions of the Council, and these too formed three opposite factions with their respective ambiguous and unholy expressions of "homousion" or "homoousion," "consubstantial," and other terms utterly and wholly strangers to the Prophets of Israel, but only worthy of the "Speaking Horn."

The Christians who suffered persecutions and martyrdoms under the pagan emperors of Rome because they believed in One God and in His servant Jesus were now doomed by the imperial edict of the "Christian" Constantine to even severer tortures because they refused to adore the servant Jesus as consubstantial and coeval with his Lord and Creator! The Elders and Ministers of the Arian Creed, i.e. *Qăshīshi* and *Mshămshāni*—as they were called by the early Jewish Christians—were deposed or banished, their religious books suppressed, and their churches seized and handed over to the Trinitarian bishops and priests. Any historical work on the early Christian Church will give us ample information about the service rendered by Constantine to the cause of the Trinitarian Creed, and tyranny to those who opposed it. The merciless legions in every province were placed at the disposal of the ecclesiastical authorities. Constantine personifies a régime of terror and fierce war against the Unitarians, which lasted in the East for three centuries and a half, when the Muslims established the religion of Allah and assumed the power and dominion over the lands trodden and devastated by the four beasts.

(*e*) The "Talking Horn" is accused of having contemplated to change "the Law and the times." This is a very serious charge against the Horn. Its blasphemies or "great words against the Most High" may or may not affect other people, but to change the Law of God and the established holy days

or festivals would naturally subvert the religion altogether. The first two commandments of the Law of Moses, concerning the absolute Oneness of God—" Thou shalt have no other gods besides Me "—and the strict prohibition of making images and statues for worship were directly violated and abrogated by the edict of Constantine. To proclaim three personal beings in the Deity and to confess that the Eternal Almighty was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary is the greatest insult to the Law of God and the grossest idolatry. To make a golden or wooden image for worship is abominable enough, but to make a mortal an object of worship, declare him God(!), and even adore the bread and the wine of the Eucharist as " the body and blood of God," is an impious blasphemy.

Then to every righteous Jew and to a Prophet like Daniel, who from his youth was a most devoted observer of the Mosaic Law, what could be more repugnant than the substitution of the Easter for the Paschal Lamb of the great feast of the Passover and the sacrifice of the " Lamb of God " upon the cross, and upon thousands of altars every day? The abrogation of the Sabbath day was a direct violation of the fourth command of the Decalogue, and the institution of Sunday instead was as arbitrary as it is inimical. True, the Qur-án abrogated the Sabbath day, not because the Friday was a holier day, but simply because the Jews made an abuse of it by declaring that God, after the labour of six days, reposed on the seventh day, as if He were man and was fatigued. Muhammad would have destroyed any day or object, however holy or sacred, if it were made an object of worship intending to deal a blow or injury to God's greatness and glory. But the abrogation of the Sabbath by the decree of Constantine was for the institution of the Sunday on which Jesus is alleged to have risen from the sepulchre. Jesus himself was a strict observer of the Sabbath day, and reprimanded the Jewish leaders for their objection to his doing the deeds of charity on it.

(*f*) The " Horn " was allowed to make war against the Saints of the Most High for a period of some three centuries and a half; it only " weakened " them, made " them languid "

—as the original word in the text *ybhalli*, from *bala*, singifies—but could not extinguish and entirely root them out. The Arians, who believed in one God alone, sometimes, e.g. under the reign of Constantius (the son of Constantine), of Julian and others who were more tolerant, strongly defended themselves and fought for the cause of their faith.

The next important point in this wonderful vision is to identify the " Bar Nasha," or the Son of Man, who destroyed the Horn; and we shall undertake to do this in the next article.

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN AND ORPHANS

By C. A. SOORMA

(*Continued from the October number, p.* 384.)

CHAPTER VIII

WOMAN UNDER CHRISTIANITY: HER LEGAL STATUS

So much for the moral and spiritual position of woman under Christianity. What about her *legal status*, her capacity to hold separate property, independently of her husband? I shall quote two authors to show that wherever the Canon Law was followed the identity of the wife was merged in that of the husband and the woman ceased to be a *feme sole* in the eye of the law.

Taking Maine first, we observe:—

" But the Chapter of law relating to *married women* was for the most part read by the light, not of Roman but of Canon Law, which in no one particular departs so widely from the spirit of the secular as in the view it takes of the relations created by marriage. This was in part inevitable, since no society which preserves any tincture of Christian institution is likely to restore to married women the personal liberty conferred on them by the Middle Roman Law, but the *proprietary disabilities of married females* stand on quite a different basis from their personal incapacities, and it is by the tendency of their doctrines to keep alive and consolidate the former that the expositors of the Canon Law have deeply injured civilization. There are many vestiges

of a struggle between the secular and ecclesiastical principles, but the Canon Law nearly everywhere prevailed . . . the systems, however, which are least indulgent to married women are invariably those which have followed the Canon Law exclusively, or those which, from the lateness of their contact with European civilization, have never had their archaisms weeded out. The Danish and Swedish laws, harsh for many centuries to all females, are still much less favourable to wives than the generality of Continental Codes (e.g. under the Code Napoléon). And yet more stringent in the proprietary incapacities it imposes is the English Common Law, which borrows for itself the greatest number of its fundamental principles from the jurisprudence of the Canonists. Indeed, the part of the Common Law which prescribes the legal situation of married women may serve to give an Englishman clear notions of the great institution which has been the principal subject of this chapter. I do not know how the operation and nature of the *Patria Potestas* can be brought so vividly before the mind as by reflecting on the prerogatives attached to the husband by the pure English Common Law and by recalling the vigorous consistency with which the view of a *complete legal subjection on the part of the wife* is carried by it, where it is untouched by equity or statutes, through every department of rights, duties, and remedies", (Maine, *Ancient Law* (10th ed.), pp. 162–164).

Lecky, in another equally lucid passage, says:—

" In addition to the personal restrictions which grew necessarily out of the Catholic doctrines concerning divorce and the subordination of the weaker sex, we find numerous and stringent enactments, which rendered it impossible for women to succeed to any considerable amount of property, and which almost reduced them to the alternative of marriage or a nunnery. *The complete inferiority of the sex was continually maintained by the law,* and that generous public opinion which in Rome had frequently revolted against the injustice done to girls, in depriving them of the greater part of the inheritance of their father, totally disappeared. Wherever the Canon Law has been the basis of legislation, we find laws of succession, sacrificing the interests of daughters and wives, and a state of public opinion which has been formed and regulated by these laws; nor was any serious attempt

made to abolish them till the close of the last century", (Lecky, *History of European Morals*, vol. ii. p. 339).

In England, "up till the 1st of January, 1883, it was true to state that, as a *general rule*, the contract of a married woman was *void*. Yet there were exceptions to this rule: in some cases a married woman could make a valid contract, but could not sue or be sued upon it apart from her husband; in others she could sue but could not be sued alone; in others she could both sue and be sued alone. . . . *The Married Women's Property Acts of* 1870 *and* 1874 specified various forms of property as the separate estate of the married women, enabled them to sue for such property and gave them all remedies, civil and criminal, for its protection that an unmarried woman would have had under the circumstances. Under these Acts a married woman might make a contract for the exercise of her personal skill or labour, and maintain an action upon it ", (Anson, *Law of Contract*, pp. 153, 155).

The Married Women's Property Act, 1882, repealed the Acts of 1870 and 1874, and by Subsection 1 of Section 1, it enacted that:—

" All property, real and personal, in possession, reversion or remainder, vested or contingent, held by a woman before, or acquired after marriage, is now her separate property. She can acquire, hold, and dispose of it by will or otherwise, 'as her separate property in the same manner as if she were a *feme sole* without the intervention of any trustee' ", (Anson, *op. cit.*, p. 156).

By Subsection 2 of Section 1 of the Act it was laid down that:—

" A married woman shall be capable of suing and being sued either in contract or in tort, or otherwise, in all respects as if she were a *feme sole*, and *her husband need not be joined* with her as plaintiff or defendant, or be made a party to any action or legal proceeding brought by or taken against her . . . and any damage or costs recovered against her in any such action or proceeding shall be payable out of her separate property and not otherwise."

But it has been held that the above section does not affect the Common Law liability of a husband for his wife's *torts* during the subsistence of the marriage. It " appears to give the option of suing the wife when she has separate property and there is a

chance of the plaintiff being able to enforce judgment against her; while in cases where there would be no chance of enforcing judgment against the wife, the husband is left subject to his old Common Law liabilities. The words of the section are, *need not be joined,* but *they do not discharge the husband from his old liability*; they are intended to give a plaintiff the option of suing the husband and wife together or suing the wife alone; judgment may be entered against the wife and execution issued against her separate property, if she has any; but where she has none, the plaintiff is entitled to add the husband as co-defendant" (*Seroka* v. *Kattenburg* (1886), 17 Q.B.D., p. 177).

The Court of Appeal followed and approved of the decision in the above case in *Earl* v. *Kingscote* (1900), 2 Ch., p. 585, and *Beaumont* v. *Kay* (1904), 1 K.B., p. 292.

Thus it is clear that even to this day the identity of the wife is, to a certain extent, still merged in that of her husband in England. But the Islamic conception of treating the wife as a *feme sole* in all respects was far in advance of any Western juristic conception, as will be clear from the ensuing chapters.

CHAPTER IX

DOES CHRISTIANITY FORBID POLYGAMY?

It has often been asserted that Christianity interdicted polygamy, and made monogamy obligatory on all. Nothing can be farther from the truth.

Ameer Ali, speaking of the general prevalence of polygamy among all nations, remarks :—

"And so it was understood by the leaders of Christendom at various times that there is no intrinsic immorality or sinfulness in plurality of wives. One of the greatest Fathers of the Christian Church (St. Augustine) has declared that polygamy is not a crime where it is a legal institution of a country, and the German reformers, even as late as the sixteenth century, allowed and declared valid the taking of a second or even a third wife, contemporaneously with the first, in default of issue, or any other cause", (Ameer Ali, *Life and Teachings of Mohammed,* p. 220, and also Ameer Ali, *Mahomedan Law,* vol. ii. p. 23).

When Christianity made its appearance in Rome, history shows that polygamy was recognized and the early Christian Emperors seem to have admitted its validity. Says Ameer Ali :—

" The Emperor Valentinian II, by an Edict, allowed all the subjects of the Empire, if they pleased, to marry several wives, nor does it appear from the ecclesiastical history of those times that the Bishops and the heads of the Christian Churches made any objection to this law. Far from it ; all the succeeding Emperors practised polygamy, and the people generally were not remiss in following their example. Even the clergy often had several wives. This state of the laws continued until the time of Justinian, when the concentrated wisdom and experience of thirteen centuries of progress and development in the arts of life (combined with the Semitic influences not only of the two religions, but also of those great jurists who pre-eminently belonged to that race) resulted in their embodiment in the celebrated laws of Justinian. *But these laws owed little to Christianity, at least directly.* The greatest adviser of Justinian was an atheist and a pagan. Even the prohibition of polygamy by Justinian failed to check the tendency of the age. The law represented the advancement of thought; its influence was confined to a few thinkers, but to the mass it was practically a dead letter", (Ameer Ali, *Life and Teachings of Mohammed,* pp. 222–3).

John Milton, the great English poet, discussing the merits and demerits of polygamy, observes :—

" In the definition which I have given (i.e. of marriage) I have not said, in compliance with the common opinion, *of one man with one woman,* lest I should by implication charge the holy patriarchs and pillars of our faith, Abraham, and the others who had more than one wife at the same time, with habitual fornication and adultery, lest I should be forced to exclude from the sanctuary of God as spurious the holy offspring which sprang from them; yea, the whole of the sons of Israel, for whom the sanctuary itself was made. For it is said (Deut. xxxiii. 2): ' A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah, even to his tenth generation.' Either, therefore, polygamy is a true marriage or all children born

in that state are spurious; which would include the whole race of Jacob, the twelve holy tribes chosen by God. But as such an assertion would be absurd in the extreme, not to say impious, and as it is the height of injustice, as well as an example of most dangerous tendency in religion, *to account as sin what is not such in reality*, it appears true that, so far from the question respecting the lawfulness of polygamy being trivial, it is of the highest importance that it should be decided ", (Milton, *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, pp. 231–2).

A study of certain texts in the Bible clearly admits the *lawfulness* of polygamy. For instance :—

(*a*) " If he take him *another wife*, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish ", (Exod. xxi. 10).

(*b*) " And I gave thee (David) thy master's house, and thy master's *wives* into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things ", (2 Sam. xii. 8).

Milton argues that the wives of Saul, given to David by the above text, were the *virgins* in the house of Saul, and therefore David did not commit incest, since Saul was his father-in-law, (Milton, *op. cit.*, pp. 238–9).

(*c*) " King's daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir ", (Psa. xlv. 9).

(*d*) " And Joash did that *which was right* in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest ", (2 Chron. xxiv. 2).

(*e*) " And Jehoiada *took for him two wives*, and he begat sons and daughters ", (2 Chron. xxiv. 3).

From a consideration of the above texts and others from the Bible, Milton argues :—

" On what grounds, however, can a practice be considered dishonourable or shameful which is prohibited to no one even under the Gospel? for that dispensation annuls none of the merely civil regulations which existed previous to its introduction. It is only enjoined that elders and deacons should

be chosen from such as were husbands of one wife (1 Tim. iii. 2, and Titus i. 6). This implies, not that to be the husband of more than one wife would be a sin, for in that case the restriction would have been equally imposed on all, but that in proportion as they were less entangled in domestic affairs they would be more at leisure for the business of the Church. Since, therefore, polygamy is interdicted in this passage to ministers of the Church alone, and that not on account of any sinfulness in the practice, and since none of the other members are precluded from it either here or elsewhere, it *follows that it was permitted,* as above said, to all the remaining members of the Church, and that it was adopted by many without offence ", (Milton, *op. cit.*, pp. 240–41).

CHAPTER X

DIVORCE IN CHRISTIANITY

Did Christ allow the right of divorce ? The Protestants say " Yes," but the Roman Catholics emphatically assert " No."

" According to the fundamental teaching of Jesus, as reported by Matthew (xix. 9) the husband is forbidden to put away the wife, *except for unfaithfulness.* Divinely created as male and female, ' they twain shall be one flesh,' and ' what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.' Whether for the same reason the woman may put away the man, or whether either the innocent or guilty party may contract a second marriage, we are here not expressly informed. Inferences may, of course, be drawn by assuming that Jesus had the principles of the Jewish law in mind, but this mode of procedure is scarcely satisfying. Nor do the other sacred writers throw any clear light on these important questions. Rather do they deepen the obscurity, for both Mark (x. 2–12) and Luke appear absolutely to prohibit divorce, not expressly admitting even the one ground of separation granted on the authority of Matthew. . . . The utterances of Paul on this subject (1 Cor. vii. 8–16), as on all questions connected with marriage and the family, are of the highest importance in view of their historical consequences. Referring directly to the teaching of Jesus, he first seemingly denies the right of

divorce to either party. With Mark and Luke he omits the exception mentioned by Matthew; and with Mark he expressly forbids the wife to 'depart from her husband,' adding, however, the inconsequent and bewildering command, 'if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband' ", (Howard, *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, vol. ii. pp. 19–21).

Thus we see that among Christ's own disciples there is no unanimity as to whether the Master sanctioned divorce and remarriage or not. The confusion which these contradictory passages gave rise to was settled only after many centuries of struggle which divided the whole of Christendom into two camps, one for divorce and the other against it altogether.

Milton called divorce " A law of moral equity, a pure moral economical law so clear in nature and reason that it was left to a man's own arbitrament to be determined between God and his own conscience, and the *restraint* whereof, who is not too thick-sighted, may see how hurtful and destructive it is to the house, the Church and the Commonwealth ", (Milton, *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, Prose Works, III*, pp. 241–2).

We are entirely in agreement with Milton's views. Can anyone deny that a refusal to grant divorce must necessarily inflict great hardship on both husband and wife ? It is productive of much social harm, as it puts a premium on bastardy. The Protestant Churches allow the right of divorce, but here again we find that the reforms were the result, not of the Church, but of the State—of a few social reformers. The Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, absolutely forbids divorce, asserting that it is against the teachings of Christ ! All that it allows, in cases of disagreement between husband and wife, is *judicial separation*, and not divorce. But mere judicial separation, naturally, does not enable either party to remarry and set up a new home. They are condemned to live a life of perpetual misery, and if young, to have recourse to immorality, which, as Milton observes, is hurtful to the home, the Church and the State. We are, therefore, thankful to the Arabian Prophet that he enables us to have recourse to divorce when the husband and wife cannot live peacefully together. There is no controversy in Islam as to the lawful-

ness or otherwise of divorce. In a few short verses, the Qur-án lays down the law, and admittedly, as we shall see, they are fair and just.

CHAPTER XI

WOMAN IN PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIA

"Among Mohammed's own people, the Arabs, unlimited polygamy prevailed, prior to the promulgation of Islam. A man might marry as many wives as he could maintain, and repudiate them at will. A widow was considered as a sort of integral part of the heritage of her husband. Hence the frequent unions between step-sons and mothers-in-law which, when subsequently forbidden by Islam, were branded by the name of *Nikha-ul-Makht* (shameful or odious marriages). Even polyandry was practised by the half-Jewish, half-Sabean tribes of Yemen", (Ameer Ali, *Life and Teachings of Mohammed*, p. 225; and also Ameer Ali, *Mahomedan Law*, vol. ii. p. 20).

"Before Islam, a woman was not a free agent in contracting marriage. It was the right of the father, brother, cousin, or any other male guardian, to give her in marriage, whether she was old or young, widow or virgin, to whomsoever he chose. Her consent was of no moment. There was even a practice prevalent of marrying women by force. This often happened on the death of a man leaving widows. His son or other heir would immediately cast a sheet of cloth on each of the widows (excepting his natural mother), and this was a symbol that he had annexed them to himself. If a widow escaped to her relations before the sheet was thrown over her, the heirs of the deceased would refuse to pay the dower. This custom is described as the inheriting of a deceased man's widows by his heirs, who in such cases would divide them among themselves like goods. . . . There was no restriction as to the number of wives an Arab could take. The only limit was that imposed by his means, opportunity and inclinations. Unrestricted polygamy which was sanctioned by usage was universally prevalent. This was exclusive of the number of slave-girls which a man might possess. . . . The limits of relationship within which marriage was prohibited were narrow and defined only by close degrees of consanguinity. . . . There can be

no doubt that an Arab could not marry his mother, grandmother, sister, daughter or granddaughter, and perhaps he was not allowed to marry his aunt or niece. But *those among them that followed the Magian religion could marry their own daughters and sisters.* An Arab was permitted to take as his wife his step-mother, cousin, wife's sisters, and could combine in marriage two sisters or a woman and her niece. It is doubtful whether he could marry his mother-in-law or step-daughter. . . . Unrestrained as an Arab was in the number of his wives, he was likewise absolutely free to release himself from the marital tie. His power in this connection was absolute and he was not required or expected to assign any reason for its exercise, nor was he under the necessity of observing any particular procedure. The word commonly used for this purpose was *talaq.* It depended upon his discretion whether he would dissolve the marriage absolutely and thus set the woman free to marry again or not. He might, if he so chose, revoke the divorce and resume marital connection. Sometimes an Arab would pronounce *talaq* ten times and take his wife back, and again divorce her and then take her back, and so on. The wife in such a predicament was entirely at the mercy of the husband, and would not know when she was free. Sometimes the husband would renounce his wife by means of what was called a suspensory divorce. This procedure did not dissolve the marriage, but it only enabled the husband to refuse to live with his wife, while the latter was not at liberty to marry again. . . . The wife among the Arabs had no corresponding right to release herself from the marriage bond. But her parents by a friendly arrangement with the husband could obtain a separation by returning the dower if it had been paid, or by agreeing to forgo it if not paid. Such an arrangement was called *Khula,* and by it the marriage tie would be absolutely dissolved", (Abdur Rahim, *Muhammadan Jurisprudence,* pp. 9–11).

So much for marriage and divorce among the Arabs before Islam. But they even practised *female infanticide,* as is clear from the following:—

" In proportion to his eagerness to have a son, an Arab father regarded the birth of a daughter as a calamity, partly

because of the degraded status of women. Even in the time of the Prophet female infanticide was prevalent, and many fathers used *to bury their daughters alive* as soon as born", (Abdur Rahim, *op. cit.*, p. 12; and Ameer Ali, *Mahomedan Law*, vol ii. pp 19–21).

As regards the right of the Arab woman to hold property, we find " that though a woman was debarred from inheriting, she was under no disability in the matter of owning property. Anything that she might receive from her husband as dower or by gift from him or her parents and relatives was absolutely hers. Sometimes women acquired riches by trade and commerce, and some of them were owners of lands and houses. *But neither the person nor possessions of a woman were safe unless she was under the protection of her parents or some male relatives or her husband.* If her protector proved rapacious or dishonest, she hardly had any remedy", (Abdur Rahim, *op. cit.*, p. 12).

Regarding Succession and Inheritance, the customary laws of the heathen Arabs were as follows:—

" On the death of an Arab his possessions, such as had not been disposed of, devolved on his *male heirs* capable of bearing arms, *all females and minors being excluded.* The heirship was determined by consanguinity, adoption or compact. . . . The shares of the different heirs in the heritable estate were not fixed. . . . *If there were grown-up sons they probably excluded daughters; wives, sisters and mother did not inherit at all,* but the estate was considered liable for the payment of the widow's dower, and among some tribes at least for her maintenance", (Abdur Rahim, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–16).

The above brief account, as we have seen, bears a strong resemblance to pagan and Hindu laws. Woman was not treated as a useful and respectable member of society, but rather as mere chattel and goods. This was so in all primitive societies.

CHAPTER XII

FALL OF ADAM IN THE QUR-ÁN

So much for the position of woman in Arabia before Islam. Now let me give you the position of woman under Islam as given in the Qur-án.

We shall begin with the Qur-ánic version "of the fall of man":—

(*a*) "And We said: O Adam! dwell you and your wife in the garden, and eat from it a plenteous (food) wherever you wish, and do not approach this tree, for then you will be of the unjust", (ii. 35).

(*b*) "But the devil *made them both fall from it*, and caused *them* to depart from that (state) in which they were; and We said: Get forth, some of you being the enemies of others, and there is for you in the earth an abode and a provision for a time", (ii. 36).

And again:—

(*c*) "But the devil made an evil suggestion to *them* that he might make manifest to *them* what had been hidden from *them* of their evil inclinations, and he said: Your Lord has not forbidden you this tree except that you may *both* become two angels or that you may (*not*) become of the immortals", (vii. 20).

(*d*) "Then he caused *them* to fall by deceit; so when they tasted of the tree, their evil inclinations became manifest to them, and they both began to cover themselves with the leaves of the garden, and their Lord called out to them: Did I not forbid you *both* from that tree and say to you that the devil is your open enemy!", (vii. 22).

The above texts destroy once for all the story that it was Eve, and Eve alone, who was responsible for the banishment of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. In this allegorical picture both man and woman are *equally* culpable. Both had committed sin. Both crave the forgiveness of the Almighty, as is shown from the following verse:—

(*e*) "*They* said: Our Lord! *We* have been unjust to *ourselves*, and if Thou forgive *us* not, and have (not) mercy on us, we shall certainly be of the losers", (vii. 23).

In one stroke Islam has banished the stigma from woman that she is man's eternal seducer and tempter and that but for her man would be pure and sinless. In this respect alone, I submit, Islam stands far and above the conception of woman according to Paganism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity. Woman is not solely responsible for the sins of mankind, as we have seen above, but that both man and woman are liable to err and make mistakes.

(To be continued.)

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM[1]

By Dr. Gustav Diercks

(Continued from the October number, p. 378.)

III

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT ARABS

It was religion that principally determined the cultural life of the Oriental peoples of old, and even if we be disinclined to admit any such profound influence on the ancient Arabs as we find among the cultured peoples of the Hamitic and Semitic races, it is none the less of importance that it shows up with greater clarity the ancient ideas of the Semitic tribes and in a greater degree because it formed the foundations of Islam.

Here again we meet with the same obstacles; not so much from any lack of detail as to the religion of the ancient Arabs as because they are so blurred—the religion of Islam, it must be remembered, was very hard at work trying to destroy the remnants of the old Arab faith—that it is with great difficulty, and only in an indirect way, that we can form an idea of its general features.

Just as the Arabs preserved, longest of all, the Semitic characteristics in their purest pristine forms, so did they with religion. Both Hamites and Semites throughout exhibit a strong inclination for star-worship; which the nomadic tribes especially, aided by conditions of climate and soil, developed

[1] Being a translation of *Die Araber im Mittelalter und ihr Einfluss auf die Kultur Europa's*, pp. 52–57. Leipzig, 1882.

to a high degree; and, in the case of the settled tribes also, it paved the way for a high and esoteric teaching and the beginnings of astronomy on the one hand and for crude fetishism on the other.

The worship of stars, as is natural, must everywhere be preceded by something else, namely, the consciousness of a higher, superhuman power, which in the first place could only be dimly imagined as One, unique. With most of the peoples, especially with the Hamites and the Semites, we find, in fact, traces of such an undeveloped, uncouth and instinctive monotheism, or at the least we can assign to it an important part of their religious life. But the rough primitive people were not in a position, with their undeveloped mental faculties, to grasp the conception of an invisible power. They could comprehend the Divine only in concrete forms palpable to the senses, and hence they worshipped, as the revealed forms of the godhead, all that appeared to them most miraculous or which influenced most their existence in an untoward or toward manner; all that was most incomprehensible to them or exhibited, in the clearest possible manner, the stamp of immortality. Hence it is that the cult of the masculine Sun and his feminine complement—the Moon—was one to commend itself readily to the peoples of the South. But it did not satisfy them for long, and soon they turned to the worship of the stars, whose rising and setting corresponded with certain natural phenomena, climatic changes, rain, drought and the like. And thus we find among the various Arabian tribes, side by side with the Sun, which—according to Krehl—is the equivalent of Orotal, a name of a god mentioned by Herodotus and probably alluded to under many other names as well and with the Moon, they worshipped Jupiter, Mercury, Sirius, the Pleiades, as being the revelations of the Godhead which one characterized as *Ilāh*, *Allāh*. Saturn, be it noted, seems to have been the object of peculiar veneration among the Arabs.

Nevertheless all these stars were regarded by them as nothing more than manifestation forms of the one divine First Principal which, as done by the other Semitic peoples in the case of *el*, *Ilu*, etc., was identified now with this star, now with that or other objects of the cult. Now they con-

ceived it as one enthroned on an inaccessible superiority, now they reduced it to the simple God-concept. This one-God, already invoked as Allāh in earlier times, had neither a temple nor a cult; for amongst the Arabs there was no talk of a priestcraft, i.e. a caste which enslaves the religious and in general the mental life, nor were there any religious books. Even if later the petty gods had their temples, cults, votaries, and *Kāhins*, the latter did not exercise any moral power on the masses of the people. What they had to do was, in fact, to look after the divine service in the temples. It was in very exceptional cases that they played the rôle of mediators between the devotees and their gods or that they acquired the respect, fame, and importance enjoyed by teachers and prophets.

The holy places, in the earliest times, were the tops of mountains, and probably, for preference, such as possessed some special kind of configuration. For on them, it was believed, man was nearest to the goddesses and the stars; and from this conception was developed that cult of height which is constantly encountered amongst peoples akin to the Arabs, especially the Israelites. Religion having once reached the surface of the earth, it was but a step for the Arabs to the cult of unusually formed or rare stones, generally meteorites, not only because their origin remains a mystery, but also because the fact of their falling from vast heights must needs suggest their connection with the stars.

To add to this, there was yet another aspect of religion which must be noted.

Love for kindred, for the tribe and for the motherland was extraordinarily intense amongst the Semites, and especially the Arabs. So it came about that to such individuals as had in life accomplished some great thing their kindred were wont to dedicate a fitting memorial which, enhanced by the glamorous background afforded it of time and space, developed gradually into an object of divine worship. Of the soul of one who was murdered they believed it found no rest unless the murder was avenged; of another they imagined that it changed itself into a bird—all being initial stages in the belief of the trans-migration of souls. These simple fundamental views now linked themselves, on the one hand, with historical events so

as to become a hero-cult with which again is connected the constantly recurring cult of the supposed first men (in this case Adam and Eve); on the other hand, they afforded a foundation for a belief in the spirit-world. The beliefs in heroes, spirits, stones and stars combined together and gave rise to a fetishism which manifested itself in amulets, stones, and especially in pictures of human figures and in graven images, all of which came to be regarded as mediators between man and the gods he feared. As far as the lower strata of people were concerned, it was but natural that this fetishism had to sink still lower. The worship of stones, like that of the famous black stone of the Ka'ba is by the later Muslim scholars traced primarily to the fact that such a worship was first instituted as a sign of remembrance, of which the spiritual value was gradually but constantly being raised. Others explained that the stones, which were set up for the purposes of the cult, were but the representatives, as it were, of the Ka'ba or black stone itself, which was traditionally held to have been given to Ishmael by the archangel Gabriel. Legend further went on to state that it was then a white hyacinth but, in consequence of continual contact with sinful men, had become black and hard. The number of these fictitious stories which have crystallized themselves around the Ka'ba in all its aspects, in its building and its history, is, as may be readily understood, very great; very numerous, too, are the efforts which have been made to explain the various cults of Arabia. To go into details would naturally be impossible in the space at our disposal, but it may be mentioned in passing that Dozy also, in his exceptionally thorough researches in respect of the stone cult, alludes to a conception which often appears amongst the Semites, according to which man is believed to have risen from the stones, i.e. from earthly matter.

The original worship of idols is traced back to a Yoktanid, 'Amru bin Lohayy by name, the Emir of Khuza'a in Yaman, who had migrated from the south of the peninsula to Mecca; but this is, of course, an obvious fiction, for even in the earlier times the Israelite and Syrian idolatry was rampant in Arabia, where the people were hard at work endeavouring to symbolize in stone the figures of the deities they worshipped.

(To be continued.)

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ISLAM

By ANNA D. STRASSBURGER

THERE is a firmly established conviction among the adherents of the "Christian" Church that into their sole and unique custody has been entrusted the "gospel," the message of the Grace of God. All other religions, so bigoted Christians believe, are merely declarations of "the law," and express only the Justice of God. Islam, in particular, with its firm insistence on the unfailingness of the law of retribution and on the responsibility of each individual for himself and his own actions—Islam with its insistent emphasis on the primary need of obedience and resignation to God's Will—seems to them an especially hard and cruel creed.

Of course, as every Muslim knows, they are utterly mistaken. To the average Western mind, which is accustomed to the inevitably somewhat coloured "Christian" Church views, there is at first something incongruous in the frequent close juxtaposition of threats of punishment for evildoers and the constant reiteration that "Allah is merciful and benevolent" which occur so frequently in the Qur-ân. A little thought, however, reveals the logic of this. No living being can ever really be outside the pale of the beneficence of God ; but until he voluntarily yields obedience to the Divine Will, until his heart honestly prays "to be shown the right path," the grace of God cannot permanently manifest itself as Love to him, but must be often veiled in punishments and retributions. Such a man walks in paths which, while not outside the pale of God's grace, yet are so full of unnecessary obstructions and so circuitous in their windings that to those who walk in the "straight path" and know of its freedom and its joys, they seem indeed to be the paths "of those who go astray."

Islam knows no God at war with His own creation, and therefore has no need of elaborate sophisticated schemes of salvation. Instead of these, it proclaims a God Who understands and loves His creation and is ever ready to "run toward those who walk toward Him." The declaration of the gospel of Islam is so simple that the humblest man can grasp some

of its exquisite beauty, and yet so complete that the greatest and wisest cannot exhaust its glorious possibilities:—

"There is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is His Prophet."

Thus simply, tersely, strongly, with gracious dignity does Islam proclaim the greatest Truth in all the world—that God exists and may be known. To those who inquire "how" and "where," it replies equally simply: "By living in accordance with His laws." Far from claiming to have exhausted the knowledge of these laws, it bids each man study and seek anywhere, everywhere in any philosophy, in any religion, in all fields of human knowledge, and endeavour for a deeper understanding, a more perfect comprehension of God. All of human life is man's legitimate playground and school—if only, so Islam cautions him, he will remember that "There is no God but Allah," and not mistake the toys for their Creator or the text-book for the Teacher.

Life offers no more compelling purpose, no completer satisfaction than the effort and desire to discover in all its problems and experiences the working out of the plan of Him Who is the Creator, Sustainer, Lord and Lover of the worlds. Once a man has lived life in accordance with this purpose—no matter how briefly and imperfectly—he finds all other modes of life colourless and unsatisfactory.

To help man achieve a constant "remembering of God in all his works and ways," Islam prescribes a simple code of action—the remembrance of God at certain stated times of the day. Now, ceremonial can be a most beautiful and helpful observance when it really is "the outward expression of an inward and invisible grace." But it is capable of becoming a deadening and hampering practice when the outward action becomes the substitute for the "inner grace." Anyone who reads the Qur-án with an understanding heart must perceive the constant endeavour to emphasize this fact, to caution against such a mistake.

But anyone who sincerely longs to know God can scarcely do better than to adopt the simple practices of Islam. There is no greater help to achieving a constant sense of the presence

of God than to set aside certain periods of the day for His remembering.

Early in the morning, before the clamour of the day drowns the gentle voices of the heart, we remember God, and dedicate the day's activities to Him, thus gaining courage and right direction.

At noon we pause to offer to God the results of our labour and to thank Him, and as we meditate in the stillness of that sacred hour when heaven seems to touch the earth, we become at one with the worship which all Nature yields to her Lord in utter joyousness, and sometimes it seems as if we hear echoes and catch glimpses of the glorious ceremonial in which the angelic hosts pour out their love and adoration to the Lord of the universe. And our hearts, uplifted and aglow with the sense of at-oneness of all creation, acknowledge joyously, "There is no God but Allah."

In mid-afternoon we pause again to survey life from a larger point of view. It may well be that some problem of human relationships demands attention. Perhaps we turn for help and enlightenment to the study of the life and sayings of the Prophet who has understandingly and intimately dealt with the problems of human relationships. As our heart goes out in grateful love to him, the words rise to our lips, "And Muhammad is His Prophet," and it may be that we become conscious of a presence beside us and we realize that we are being drawn to the heart of one of the Great Ones of the world. It is not the "historic" Prophet who calls to us, but one who, like the founder of Christianity, may say of himself that he is "alive for evermore." As we rejoice in that marvellous combination of "a love that is power" and "a power that is love" which is the salient characteristic of him whom the world knows best as Muhammad, we realize that he is not alone, but that through him we have gained access to the Great Brotherhood of those who are the spiritual teachers, guides and rulers of humanity.

If we have once stood in the presence of that Great Company, our lives are changed for evermore. All lesser desires fall away and we know only one longing to become like them, to be like them "imbued with Divine attributes." We are

likely to be more meticulous than before in fulfilling the demands of ordinary relationships, but they will have lost their binding power. Henceforth we know that "those who do the Will of God are our brothers and sisters."

When in the quiet after sunset we pause again to give thanks to God for the wonderful gift of life, we are conscious not only of the fact that all Nature and the mighty hosts of devas are worshipping with us, but we are aware also of the glorious brotherhood of which we are a part. It matters not whether a man is older or younger, wiser or less informed, richer or poorer—if once we have seen in his eyes the hunger for God, if once his heart has spoken to ours of its aspiration to grow into God-likeness, he is our brother for evermore bound to us with ties of everlasting strength because they are woven of eternal things.

At night as we pause to gaze into the velvety spaces of the night and muse upon the wonders of the millions of starry worlds which we see, and about which most of us know so little in detail, there is awe and wonder in our hearts as we utter the words "There is no God but Allah." And God answers. The realization is born within us that just as we are learning to know God through the experiences of every day, through living by seeking for Him in them, so may we comprehend Him in ever larger and greater aspects if we will but study their manifestations. And as we think of Him in His greatness we sense something of the splendour of His innermost nature and we begin to grasp the meaning of the words, "With a fragment of myself created I the universe, and I remain."

Does the heart shrink from the contemplation of the fiery splendour of that magnificence, are we conscious of our weakness, our triviality and ineffectualness?

Again God answers. From beyond the uttermost limit of perceptible space floats down to us the assurance:—

"Thou art near to Me." [1]

Such is the gospel of Islam—a doctrine not of the mind or intellect only, but also of the heart.

[1] Qur-án, ii. 186.

WHAT IS ISLAM?

[The following is a very brief account of Islam, and some of its teaching. For further details please write to the IMÁM of the Mosque, Woking.]

ISLAM, THE RELIGION OF PEACE.—The word Islam literally means: (1) Peace; (2) the way to achieve peace; (3) submission; as submission to another's will is the safest course to establish peace. The word in its religious sense signifies complete submission to the Will of God.

OBJECT OF THE RELIGION.—Islam provides its followers with the perfect code whereby they may work out what is noble and good in man, and thus maintain peace between man and man.

THE PROPHETS OF ISLAM.—Muhammad, popularly known as the Prophet of Islam, was, however, the last Prophet of the Faith. Muslims, i.e. the followers of Islam, accept all such of the world's prophets, including Abraham, Moses and Jesus, as revealed the Will of God for the guidance of humanity.

THE QUR-ÁN.—The Gospel of the Muslim is the Qur-án. Muslims believe in the Divine origin of every other sacred book, but, inasmuch as all such previous revelations have become corrupted through human interpolation, the Qur-án, the last Book of God, came as a recapitulation of the former Gospels.

ARTICLES OF FAITH IN ISLAM.—These are seven in number: belief in (1) Allah; (2) angels; (3) books from God; (4) messengers from God; (5) the hereafter; (6) the measurement of good and evil; (7) resurrection after death.

The life after death, according to Islamic teaching, is not a new life, but only a continuance of this life, bringing its hidden realities into light. It is a life of unlimited progress; those who qualify themselves in this life for the progress will enter into Paradise, which is another name for the said progressive life after death, and those who get their faculties stunted by their misdeeds in this life will be the denizens of the hell—a life incapable of appreciating heavenly bliss, and of torment—in order to get themselves purged of all impurities and thus to become fit for the life in heaven. State after death is an image of the spiritual state, in this life.

The sixth article of faith has been confused by some with what is popularly known as Fatalism. A Muslim neither believes in Fatalism nor Predestination; he believes in Premeasurement. Everything created by God is for good in the given use and under the given circumstances. Its abuse is evil and suffering.

PILLARS OF ISLAM.—These are five in number: (1) declaration of faith in the Oneness of God, and in the Divine Messengership of Muhammad; (2) prayer; (3) fasting; (4) almsgiving; (5) pilgrimage to the Holy Shrine of Mecca.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.—The Muslims worship one God—the Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of all the

Worlds, the Friend, the Guide, the Helper. There is none like Him. He has no partner. He is neither begotten nor has He begotten any son or daughter. He is Indivisible in Person. He is the Light of the heaven and the earth, the Merciful, the Compassionate, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

FAITH AND ACTION.—Faith without action is a dead letter. Faith is of itself insufficient, unless translated into action. A Muslim believes in his own personal accountability for his actions in this life and in the hereafter. Each must bear his own burden, and none can expiate for another's sin.

ETHICS IN ISLAM.—" Imbue yourself with Divine attributes," says the noble Prophet. God is the prototype of man, and His attributes form the basis of Muslim ethics. Righteousness in Islam consists in leading a life in complete harmony with the Divine attributes. To act otherwise is sin.

CAPABILITIES OF MAN IN ISLAM.—The Muslim believes in the inherent sinlessness of man's nature which, made of the goodliest fibre, is capable of unlimited progress, setting him above the angels and leading him to the border of Divinity.

THE POSITION OF WOMAN IN ISLAM.—Men and women come from the same essence, possess the same soul, and they have been equipped with equal capability for intellectual, spiritual and moral attainment. Islam places man and woman under like obligations, the one to the other.

EQUALITY OF MANKIND AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF ISLAM.—Islam is the religion of the Unity of God and the equality of mankind. Lineage, riches and family honours are accidental things; virtue and the service of humanity are the matters of real merit. Distinctions of colour, race and creed are unknown in the ranks of Islam. All mankind is of one family, and Islam has succeeded in welding the black and the white into one fraternal whole.

PERSONAL JUDGMENT.—Islam encourages the exercise of personal judgment and respects difference of opinion, which, according to the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad, is a blessing of God.

KNOWLEDGE.—The pursuit of knowledge is a duty in Islam, and it is the acquisition of knowledge that makes men superior to angels.

SANCTITY OF LABOUR.—Every labour which enables man to live honestly is respected. Idleness is deemed a sin.

CHARITY.—All the faculties of man have been given to him as a trust from God, for the benefit of his fellow-creatures. It is man's duty to live for others, and his charities must be applied without any distinction of persons. Charity in Islam brings man nearer to God. Charity and the giving of alms have been made obligatory, and every person who possesses property above a certain limit has to pay a tax, levied on the rich for the benefit of the poor.

UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING