

Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

Islam B 145
Whinfield
50 B 24



E. H. Whinfield.

35
20/12 Cookbook

ESSAYS

ON THE

LIFE OF MOHAMMED.

A

SERIES OF ESSAYS

ON THE

LIFE OF MOHAMMED,

AND

SUBJECTS SUBSIDIARY THERETO.

خطبات الا حمديه

علي العرب و السيرة المحمديه

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفي الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THESE ESSAYS HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

بلغ العلي بكمـــالـــه　　كشف الدجي بجماله

حسنت جميع خصاله　　صلوا عليـــه و آلـــه

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

VOL I.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

HERTFORD:
PRINTED BY STEPHEN AUSTIN.

CONTENTS.

Preface and Introduction.

Essay on the Historical Geography of Arabia.

Essay on the Manners and Customs of the Pre-Islamic Arabians.

Essay on the Various Religions of the Pre-Islamic Arabs, wherein it is inquired to which of them Islam bears the closest Resemblance and whether by such affinity Islam is proved to be of Divine Origin or "A Cunningly Devised Fable."

Essay on the Question Whether Islam has been Beneficial or Injurious to Human Society in General, and to the Mosaic and Christian Dispensations.

Essay on the Mohammedan Theological Literature.

Essay on the Mohammedan Traditions.

Essay on the Holy Koran.

Essay on the History of the Holy Mecca, including an account of the distinguished part enacted in connection therewith by the Ancestors of Mohammed.

Essay on the Pedigree of Mohammed.

Essay on the Prophecies respecting Mohammed, as contained in both the Old and the New Testament.

Essay on *Shakki-sadar* and *Meraj*, that is, the Splitting (open) of the Chest of Mohammed; and his Night Journey.

Essay on the Birth and Childhood of Mohammed.

PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION.

"In Nomine Dei Misericordis Miseratoris."

Of all the innumerable wonders of the universe, the most marvellous is *religion*, the foundation of which lies in the distinction between the acts of men, distinguishing them into good, evil, indifferent; for, if there be no such difference, there can be no religion, *et contra*.

Now the religious idea differs from every other in this respect, that man's belief in everything, religion excepted, depends or is based upon a previous conviction of its truth; the religious idea, on the contrary, appears to be innate, and is accepted, entertained, and acquiesced in, independently of any evidence of its truth derived through the instrumentality of the external senses.

Another wonder connected with the religious idea, is that, notwithstanding the absence of anything like proof of religion being a reality, the very idea of it alone acts upon men's thoughts, and determines men's actions with a force far exceeding in intensity and enthusiasm that resulting from any other belief, however satisfactory and conclusive may be the proofs of the truth on which that belief is based.

Had the religious idea, or, more properly, sentiment, been the same in all the human race, there could have been but little difficulty in acknowledging it to be a correct one; but strange is it to say, that, in every age, each clan, tribe, and nation, nay, almost each separate individual, formed an idea of religion, or rather of the object of it, more or less different from that of others, each, moreover, being convinced that his own idea was the only true one. Thus we see that the 'το εἷς of the Greeks was not more the object of their confident belief, than is that of the Hindus in their 330 millions of minor deities, a pantheism which is distinctly expressed in the following lines from Pope's "Essay on Man"—

"All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, and God the soul;
That chang'd through all, and yet in all the same,
Great in the earth, as in th' ethereal frame;
Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,
As full and perfect in a hair as heart;
As full and perfect in vile man that mourns,
As the rapt Seraph that adores and burns:
To Him no high, no low, no great, no small,
He fills, He bounds, connects, and equals all."

Such being the case, we are not a little perplexed to find Islam representing God to have said, "I am with each individual in the appearance which he forms of me in his own mind."

We are not less surprised, likewise, upon discovering the cause of this infinite diversity of belief in this idea of religion to be one and the same—a real and lively faith in anything.

What grounds then, are there for one belief being considered as true and another as false? Why was it sin on the part of Abraham's father to bow down before idols, and why was it virtue on the part of Abraham to have destroyed those very idols and to have worshipped the true God? Why, again, was that idea wicked and sinful which prompted Saul, afterwards St. Paul, to become the accomplice of those who stoned St. Stephen, and why was that a meritorious and virtuous idea which prompted St. Paul to become the disciple of Christ? Why is it considered wicked on the part of Omar to have volunteered to murder Mohammed, and why was it virtuous in the same person to have exclaimed, "Oh Mohammed, thou art the true apostle of God!" Now, of the above-mentioned circumstances, we cannot give preference to one over another without having reasons which would justify us in so doing.

To relieve this our state of astonishment and surprise, I had recourse to the definition of religion itself, and found it to be that true principle to which all the ideas and actions of man should be conformable, so long as he retains the use of his physical and intellectual powers.

Now the truth of this principle is altogether independent of man's belief, inasmuch as its own truth must be established before any one can be required to believe in it; in other words, its truth is *primary*, while the belief of man is *secondary*.

The test, therefore, of the truth, or of the falsity of the various religions which prevail on the earth, is the ascertaining whether they are or are not in accordance with this true principle.

Arrived at this point, we must now stop to inquire what that true principle is. That true principle, as far as man's intellectual powers enable him to discover, is no other than Nature, in reference to which the founder of Islam said, "Behold the works of Nature; examine them again and again. Are they imperfect? No! Thy sight shall turn back to thine eye, without discovering therein the least imperfection. And thou shalt own, of thine own free will, the perfection of Nature."

Again, what is Nature? It is that law, in conformity to which all objects around us, whether material or immaterial, receive their existence, and which determines the relation which they bear to each other. This law exists in the objects themselves. Nature not only imprints upon our minds her own truth, perfection, and the relation which her multifarious products bear to one another, but it also points out another principle, according to which we may direct our actions and thoughts; and as Nature is true and perfect, this principle also must necessarily be true and perfect, and this true and perfect principle is what we call true religion.

But we have said that Nature is a law, and as a law necessarily implies a lawgiver, so, when we say *Nature*, we must not be understood to mean the *Natura naturans* of the atheistical school, but only that *tout ensemble* of organic and inorganic existences, the production of the *Causa causarum*, that is, God, that supreme and perfect Being upon whom the existence of all other beings originally depends, and whom Horace has described—

"Unde nil majus generatur ipso
Nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum."

Man, then, must "look through Nature up to Nature's God." As far as my own search after true religion is concerned, I sincerely and conscientiously assert that I have found Islam to be most undoubtedly the true religion, that is, its genuine and chief principles are in perfect harmony with that true one which I have defined to be true religion; and, therefore, I hope that every lover of truth, while giving me credit for my conviction, will candidly and impartially investigate the truth of Islam, and make a just and accurate distinction between its real principles and those which have been laid down for the perpetual and firm maintenance and observance of the same, as well as between those that are solely the productions of those persons whom we designate as learned men, divines, doctors, and lawyers. It is the want of such an accurate discrimination as this, between all these different descriptions of principles, which has caused men to rush headlong into all sorts of mistakes, a want or a deficiency, on the part of a Mohammedan, which is called Takleed (a blind belief in the opinions of others), and which, when exhibited in that of foreigners, is known by the name of partiality, bias, prejudice, or bigotry.

This true religion itself, and the person through whose instrumentality it has been taught are worthy of our utmost respect and commendations, and a fit theme for panegyric and eulogy. Accordingly we find that so much has already been written on this, not only by Mohammedan divines, but also by those professing a different faith, that the subject is almost exhausted: it is, however, with much regret I have to say that not one of these writers has adopted the right path; the former

class being dazzled and bewildered by the refulgent light which suddenly shone in upon them, and the latter being equally unable to see their way, on account of their ignorance of the subject matter of their lucubrations.

No biography of Mohammed, except one which will be particularized hereafter, is now extant which can claim for its author any one of the many eminent compilers of the *hadeeses;* but they have rendered us this service, at least, that of naming in their works those hadeeses also which relate to the life of Mohammed. These are consequently the works whence all the materials, more or less correct and trustworthy for the life of the Prophet, may be obtained and systematically embodied in any other form.

Abu Eesa Tirmizee (born in 824 A.D., died in 892 A.D.), besides his much valued collection of hadeeses, wrote also a work entitled "Shemaili Tirmizee," which, although not a general and complete biography, gives many particulars of the Prophet's private life. But we should be committing a very serious mistake, were we blindly to believe as true any of the hadeeses recorded in these works (be they in "Moslim" or "Bokharee"), without first subjecting them to the process of a severe and critical examination, according to the rules and regulations established for this very purpose, and which I have enumerated in my Essay upon Mohammedan Traditions.

Besides the works I have already mentioned, there are several others, of which some are exclusively appropriated to the biography of Mohammed, while others contain notices of other subjects also. Such works

have received the common or general title of "Kotab-i-Seeyar," of which the following only are now extant: Ibni Ishak ابن اسحٰق; Ibni Hisham ابن هشام; Tabkat-i-Kabeer, generally called Katibul Wackedee, كاتب الواقدي; Tibree طبري; Seerati Shamee شامي; Abulfeda ابوالفدا; Masudee مسعودي; Mawahib Ladonneyah مواهب لدنيه, etc. Of these, the first four are of very ancient date, while the rest are considerably later.

All these works are, as it were, a confused collection of indiscriminate and uninvestigated traditions. Those that bear an earlier date are still more so. The real motive of the ancient authors being that of collecting into one *corpus* all traditions whatsoever, that existed in their day, floating about in society, they left to a future generation the task of subjecting these traditions to a critical examination. The works of later writers, who obtained all the subject matter from the ancient ones, have a character similar to the latter; and, therefore, all such works, whether ancient or comparatively modern, have become one mass of undigested and confused materials, in which are mixed up together, genuine and authentic traditions with spurious, puerile, and very weak ones.

Sir William Muir writes that "to the three biographies by Ibn Hisham, by Wakidi and his secretary, and by Tabari, the judicious historian of Mahomet will, as his original authorities, confine himself." But he does not mention how many traditions are contained in these books that have not been traced up to Mohammed,—how many there are the chain of whose narrators is broken,—how many there are whose narrators are of suspected

character or impeached veracity,—how many there are whose narrators are entirely unknown,—and, lastly, though not the least, how many traditions there are which have not been subjected to any examination whatever.

Dr. Sprenger, in his zeal, overrates the real value of Wackedee, respecting which Sir Wm. Muir says, "But Dr. Sprenger's admiration of the work carries him beyond the reality." But Sir Wm. Muir himself seems to have preferred Wackedee to all others, as almost all his materials for the life of Mohammed rest upon the authority of, and are derived from, that book. Wackedee, however, is the worst author of all, and of the least credit, and all Mohammedan doctors and divines have declared him not to be, in the least degree, of any authority, and as being the least entitled to credit.[1]

In my judgment, the work of Abulfeda is undoubtedly the best of all, and therefore the most entitled to credit. He has taken the greatest care in writing his book, and has studiously endeavoured to avoid inserting any spurious and puerile traditions whatever. It would, however,

[1] الواقدي محمد بن عمر بن الواقد الا سلمي المدني الذي استقر الا جماع علي وهنه كما في الميزان (شرح محمد بن عبدالباقي الزرقاني المالكي علي المواهب اللدنيه)

Zarquany, the commentator of Alladonniyah, quotes from "Meezan' the following remark respecting Wackedee :—"Mohammedan doctors and divines have unanimously impeached Wackedee for the unauthenticity of the facts, and the weakness and spuriousness of the traditions mentioned by him."

be going too far to assert that he has wholly succeeded in so doing.

In addition to the Oriental writers I have enumerated above, there are many European authors who have written works upon Islam and its founder. Unfortunately, I could not avail myself of many of the early works upon these subjects, such as those of Daniel, Luther, Melancthon, Spanheim, De Herbelot; but from what I learn of them from other sources, I find that they contain little else than mere abuse, and harsh and uncharitable expressions. To these names may be added that of Maracci, who appears never to have been able to satiate himself with malignant and disgusting vituperation. My surprise, therefore, at reading the following remark in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 254, wherein it is stated that "the former of whom (Maracci) has, not without some show of reason, been accused of being a secret believer," may easily be conceived.

Dean Prideaux is another of those uncompromising and intolerant writers. When any Mohammedan happens to dip into his book, he cannot repress a smile at the extreme ignorance of his subject which this *Christian* author displays in almost every page of his work.

Besides these writers, Höttinger, Gagnier, Reland, and Ockley have also written upon subjects relative to Islam and Mohammed, but I am sorry to have to state that I could not avail myself of the labours of those authors.

Göethe, Amari, Noldike, and Dozy have also written much upon the above subjects, and the writer of an

article upon Islam in the *Quarterly Review* represents the above-named authors to "*have taught the world at large that Islamism is a thing of vitality, fraught with a thousand fruitful germs; and that Mohammed, whatever view of his character (to use that vague word for once) be held, has earned a place in the golden book of humanity.*"

One of the most eminent European writers of the life of Mohammed, is Dr. Sprenger, who has written a biography of the Prophet in English, printed at Allahabad in 1851. This work, however, is far from being entitled to credit. The author falls into a great number of mistakes as to the subject matter, but besides this, what is still worse is, he has adopted so exaggerated a style, and his mind is so much preoccupied and warped by prejudice and bigotry as ill becomes any writer, but more especially a historian. To justify this our remark we shall quote the following passage, which will moreover show the vast (?) amount of his knowledge of the subject upon which he presumed to write. "The Islam," he writes, "is not the work of Mohammed; it is not the doctrine of the impostor. . . . . There is, however, no doubt that the impostor has defiled it by his immorality and perverseness of mind, and that most of the objectionable doctrines are his."

With regard to the life written by Dr. Sprenger, Sir Wm. Muir writes that "the work of Dr. Sprenger, which came out as I was purusing my studies, appeared to me (as I have shown in some passages of this treatise) to proceed upon erroneous assumptions, both as to the state of Arabia prior to Mahomet, and the character of the Prophet himself."

The same author (Dr. Sprenger) has written another work upon Islam, in the German language, in six volumes. In writing this work he has availed himself of Tabakati Ibni Saad, Ibni Is*h*ak, and Wackedee. To my great regret, however, I have been unable, owing to my ignorance of the German language, to avail myself of the little advantage I might have derived from this work; but, on account of my acquaintance with the works of those Oriental authors from whom he has drawn his materials, it appears to me almost certain that this work also is, like those of other Western writers, wanting in dispassionate research and candid investigation, inasmuch as its author has likewise taken his subject matter from an ill-adjusted and confused mass of puerile traditions. Speaking of this same work, the above-named writer of the article upon Islam in the *Quarterly Review* has the following remark: "The work of the first of these (Dr. Sprenger's) we have placed at the head of our paper, because it is the most comprehensive and exhaustive, the most learned of all, because, more than any of the others, it does, by bringing all the materials bodily before the reader, enable him to form his own judgment."

The best of all the biographies of Mohammed from the pen of foreign authors, and the one which is executed in the most learned and masterly manner, is the "Life of Mahomet," by Sir William Muir. This work is in four thick octavo volumes, handsomely printed. The extensive and intimate acquaintance of this talented author with Oriental literature is highly esteemed and justly appreciated by all educated Europeans. As

regards the merit of the work itself, besides the defect of its subject matter being almost entirely based upon the authority of Wackedee—an author who, as I have before remarked, bears the least reputation in the Mohammedan literary world, and who is the least entitled to claim our belief as to his assertions—the intention and animus with which the work was written are to be deprecated as having been the fruitful source of error and deficiency. The author himself informs us that "the work was first undertaken, and the study of Oriental authorities entered upon, at the instance of the Rev. C. G. Pfander, D.D., so well known as a Christian apologist in the controversy with the Mahometans, who urged that a biography of the prophet of Islam, suitable for the perusal of his followers, should be compiled in the Hindoostani language from the early sources acknowledged by themselves to be authentic and authoritative." But it is with much regret I have to state that this motive, notwithstanding the high ability and talents of Sir William Muir, exercised upon his mind the same influence which it would naturally have exerted over any other person under the same circumstances; so much so indeed, that the interesting and beautiful features of Islam appeared to him as deformed and repulsive, an impression the effect of which upon the reader was to make him consider it as exaggeration. But, as is often the case, so in the present instance, exaggeration defeated its own object, namely, that which induced the Rev. Pfander to desire that the work should be undertaken by Sir William Muir, the result of which was that he, whom the former would

fain have held up as an angel of darkness, proved a seraph of light.

When this work appeared, the curiosity it excited among the reading public was only equalled by their impatience to peruse it, but no sooner was it found that the simplest and plainest facts connected with Islam and Mohammed had been strained and twisted and distorted, in short, subjected to the Procrustes' process in order to make them the indices or exponents of the author's prepossessions and prejudices, than the interest created by the announcement of the work fell, *instanter*, to zero. As to the young Mohammedans who were pursuing their study of the English literature, and were perfectly ignorant of their own theology, the perusal of the work under consideration raised in their youthful mind the question, if what Sir Wm. Muir has written is a misrepresentation of plain and simple facts, what are those facts in reality?

The effect which the perusal of the work in question produced upon my own mind was, to determine me to collect, after a critical examination of them, into one systematical and methodical form, all those traditions concerning the life of Mohammed that are considered by Mohammedan divines to be trustworthy, genuine, and authoritative; and, at the same time, to bring together, in a separate volume, all those traditions also that are in any way connected with the life of the Prophet, but which are spurious, puerile, apocryphal, and utterly unworthy of credit, specifying at the same time the reasons for so considering them. From this purpose I was however deterred by various causes, among which

may be more particularly mentioned the time-engrossing avocations of official life, and the want of many MSS. which were indispensable for the successful accomplishment of my undertaking. But, nevertheless, I continued, at various times, writing essays on different subjects relating to Islam, and of which the following twelve are now presented to the public in their digested form, and which constitute the first volume of the work I am now engaged upon, namely, the Life of Mohammed, the illustrious Prophet of Arabia. The remaining Essays, making the second volume, will (D.V.) be also laid before the public in a like digested form.

It being indispensable that the reader should know something respecting the works connected with the present production, all of which are in the English language, and will materially assist him in forming a correct opinion of my humble efforts; and as, moreover, the work was specially intended for the use of those Mohammedan youths who are pursuing their English studies, it has been written in that language; but being myself wholly ignorant of that splendid tongue, so as to be unable even to construct a single sentence in it, I here publicly and sincerely express my deep obligations to those friends by whose literary assistance I am now enabled to submit to the attention of an indulgent and intelligent public this first volume in its complete and digested form.

Having given, in the preceding pages, a short and cursory notice of those European authors who have written anything upon Islam or Mohammed, I cannot in justice pass over unnoticed the names of those able and learned English writers who have taken a correct

view of the above-named subjects, and who have well defended them from prejudiced and illiberal antagonists. The gentlemen now alluded to, and for whose talents I shall ever cherish high esteem and respect, are Edward Gibbon, the celebrated historian, Godfrey Higgins, Thomas Carlyle, and John Davenport.

I shall conclude this Preface and Introduction by quoting a few of the remarks of the above named authors.

John Davenport writes: "Is it possible to conceive, we may ask, that the man who effected such great and lasting reforms in his own country, by substituting the worship of the one only true God for the gross and debasing idolatry in which his countrymen had been plunged for ages; who abolished infanticide, prohibited the use of spirituous liquors and games of chance (those sources of moral depravity); who restricted within comparatively narrow limits the unrestrained polygamy which he found in existence and practice;—can we, we repeat, conceive so great and zealous a reformer to have been a mere impostor, or that his whole career was one of sheer hypocrisy? No, surely nothing but a consciousness of real righteous intentions could have carried Mohammed so steadily and constantly without ever flinching or wavering, without every betraying himself to his most intimate connections and companions, from his first revelation to Khadijah to his last agony in the arms of Ayesha.

"Surely a good and sincere man, full of confidence in his Creator, who makes an immense reform both in faith and practice, is truly a direct instrument in the

hands of God, and may be said to have a commission from Him. Why may not Mohammed be recognized, no less than other faithful, though imperfect, servants of God, as truly a servant of God, serving him faithfully though imperfectly? Why may it not be believed that he was, in his own age and country, a preacher of truth and righteousnesss, sent to teach his own people the unity and righteousness of God, to give them civil and moral precepts suited to their condition?"

Edward Gibbon expresses himself as follows:—"The creed of Mahomet is free from suspicion or ambiguity; and the Koran is a glorious testimony to the unity of God. The prophet of Mecca rejected the worship of idols and men, of stars and planets, on the rational principle that whatever rises must set, that whatever is born must die, that whatever is corruptible must decay and perish. In the author of the universe his rational enthusiasm confessed and adored an infinite and eternal being, without form or place, without issue or similitude, present to our most secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of his own nature, and deriving from himself all moral and intellectual perfection. These sublime truths, thus announced in the language of the Prophet, are firmly held by his disciples, and defined with metaphysical precision by the interpreters of the Koran. A philosophic theist might subscribe the popular creed of the Mahometans: *a creed too sublime perhaps for our present faculties.* What object remains for the fancy, or even the understanding, when we have abstracted from the unknown substance all ideas of time and space, of motion and matter, of sensation and reflec-

tion? The first principle of reason and revelation was confirmed by the voice of Mahomet: his proselytes, from India to Morocco, are distinguished by the name of *Unitarians*; and the danger of idolatry has been prevented by the interdiction of images."

Thomas Carlyle remarks thus: "Our current hypothesis about Mahomet, that he was a scheming impostor, a falsehood incarnate, that his religion is a mere mass of quackery and fatuity, begins really to be now untenable to any one. The lies which well-meaning zeal had heaped round this man are disgraceful to ourselves only. When Pococke inquired of Grotius, where the proof was of that story of the pigeon, trained to pick peas from Mahomet's ear, and pass for an angel dictating to him, Grotius answered, that there was no proof! It is really time to dismiss all that. The word this man spoke has been the life-guidance now of one hundred and eighty millions of men these twelve hundred years. These hundred and eighty millions were made by God as well as we. A greater number of God's creatures believe in Mahomet's word, at this hour, than in any other word whatever. Are we to suppose that it was a miserable piece of spiritual legerdemain, this which so many creatures of the Almighty have lived by and died by? I, for my part, cannot form any such supposition. I will believe most things sooner than that. One would be entirely at a loss what to think of this world at all, if quackery so grew and were sanctioned here. Alas, such theories are very lamentable. If we would attain to knowledge of anything in God's true creation, let us disbelieve them wholly! They are the

product of an age of scepticism; they indicate the saddest spiritual paralysis, and mere death-life of the souls of men: more godless theory, I think, was never promulgated in this earth. A false man found a religion! Why, a false man cannot build a brick house! If he do not know and follow *truly* the properties of mortar, burnt clay, and whatever else he works in, it is no house that he makes, but a rubbish heap. It will not stand for twelve centuries, to lodge a hundred and eighty millions; it will fall straightway. A man must conform himself to Nature's laws, *be* verily in communion with Nature and the truth of things, or Nature will answer him, No, not at all! Speciosities are specious. Ah me! a Cagliostro, many Cagliostros, prominent world leaders, do prosper by their quackery for a day. It is like a forged bank-note; they get it passed out of *their* worthless hands; others, not they, have to smart for it. Nature bursts up in fire-flames, French revolutions, and such like, proclaiming with terrible veracity that forged notes are forged."

SYED AHMED.

21, Mecklenburgh Square,
London, W.C.
March, 1870.

ESSAY

ON THE

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF ARABIA.

خطبةٌ

علي جغرافية الجزيرة العربه وامم العرب العاربة و المستعربه

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

رَبِّ اجْعَل هٰذ البَلَد اٰمِنًا وَّا جنُبنِي وَبَنِيَّ اَنْ نعبدَ الاَ صْنامَ

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," FELLOW OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1869.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

Arabia—the origin of the name 1
Boundaries of Arabia 2
Zoar and Beersheba are the northern boundaries of Arabia . . 3
There are two Beershebas: one of Abraham, which is near Kadesh, and the other, of Isaac. The former is in Arabia, and the latter is the southern boundary of the Promised Land . . *ib.*
Two divisions of Arabia –Arabul Hijar, and Arabul Wadi . . 6
Division of Arabia by the Arabs 7
Attachment of the Arabs to ancestral traditions . . . . *ib.*
Regard of the Arabs for their tribes 9
The Ishmaelites settled in Mecca, and their traditions trace their origin to Abraham 10
Before the advent of Mohammed, the Ishmaelites and Israelites did not interchange traditions 11
Three designations of the colonies that settled in Arabia . . *ib.*
First—Colonists that immigrated into Arabia, the Arab-ul-Baidah; their location 12
Their first offshoot—the Cushites 14
Their second offshoot—the Elam, or Jorham-ul-ola . . . 17
Their third offshoot—the Lud, and Tasm, and Imlek . . . *ib.*
Their fourth offshoot—Uz; and fifth—Howl and Ad-ul-ola . *ib.*
The prophet Hud sent to the Adites 19
False traditions assigned to the Adites . . . . . *ib.*
The word Iram in the Koran, the name of the ancestor of the Adites, and not that of a building 20
The Jodais the sixth offshoot of Arab-ul-Baidah, and Thamud the seventh 21
The prophet Saleb sent to the Thamud 22
False traditions attributed to the Thamud tribe 23
Genealogical Table of the Arab-ul-Baidah 25

Second—Colonists that immigrated into Arabia —the Arabul-Aribah 26
Descendants of Joktan 28
Almodad, where he settled . . . . . *ib.*
Sheleph, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Hazramaneth, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Hadoram, „ 29
Uzal, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Diklah, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Obal, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Abimael, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Sheba, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Ophir, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Havilah, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Jobab, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Jerah, Yarab, and Jorham, are names of one and the same person . 30
Historical difficulties connected with the descendants of Jerah, and how solved 31, 32
Joktan, the first king of Arabia 32
Joktan's birth fixed about 1757 A.M., or 2200 A.C. . . . *ib.*
Saba the Great founded the kingdom of the Yemenite Sabeans . 33
Hymiar, king of Yemen . . . . . *ib.*
Hymiar, born about 1878 A.M. or 2126 A.C. . . . . *ib.*
Pharan, son of Auf, son of Hymiar, born about 1948 A.M., or 2056 A.C. 34
Pharan settled in the plain of Mecca . . . . . *ib.*
Shaddad, king of Yemen 36
Ad, father of Shaddad, misunderstood to be the first Ad . . 37
The effects of the war among the five kings of Syria were felt in Paran, which is Hedjaz 38
Shaddad's accession, about 2092 A.M., or 1912 A.C. . . . *ib.*
Other kings of Yemen 39-44
Abraha Ashram, invaded Mecca, A.M. 4570, or A.D. 570 . . 44
Bazan appointed by Kysra Nowsherwan, as Governor of Yemen, embraced Islam 46
The kingdom of Hyarah and its kings 46-48
Conquest of Hyarah by Khalid 49
Birth of the Prophet, in the reign of Amar, king of Hyarah . *ib.*
Malik, first king of Hyarah, ascended the throne at the commencement of the first century A.M., or about the time of the birth of Christ . . . . . *ib.*

Kingdom of Ghassan and its kings 50
This kingdom founded about the third Christian century . . *ib.*
This kingdom ended about A.M. 4640, or A.D. 640 52
Kingdom of Kandah and its kings . . . . . *ib.*
These kings reigned between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth centuries, A.M. or fifth and sixth centuries, A.D. . . . 53
Kingdom of Hedjaz and its kings . . . . . *ib.*
It flourished between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth centuries A.M. or fifth and sixth centuries A.D. 54
Genealogical Table of the Arabul-Aribah 55
Tribes of the Arabul-Aribah . . . . . *ib.*
Table of the Tribes of Arabul-Aribah 60
Third—Colonists that immigrated into Arabia—the Arab-ul-Mustaaribah. 60
Their five tribes . . . . . *ib.*
I. The Ishmaelites, and their location 61
Hagar and Ishmael expelled by Abraham, as related in the Scriptures . . . . . *ib.*
Mohammedan traditions concerning the same, and difference between them 62-69
The above traditions are merely local 70
Controversy about the age of Ishmael when he was expelled, and the difficulty arising from the mention of the Scriptures about the same 71
Ishmael settled near Kaaba, in Paran 72
Three important questions about Ishmael's settlement . . 73
Three different Parans—1. Plain of Mecca; 2. Mountains and a village in Arabia Petræa; 3. A district of Samarcand 74
Paran translated as Hedjaz in the Arabic version of the Samaritan Pentateuch 75
Opinions of Christian writers about Paran 76
The opinion of Christian writers that Pharan extends from Beersheba as far as Mount Sinai, is wrong . . . 77
That Kadesh and Paran are identical, is wrong . . . 78
The Paran which is near Mount Sinai is not the one mentioned in Genesis 79
The placing of Havilah near the mouth of the Euphrates (as the Christian writers have done), is incorrect . . . 80
Placing Shur in the west of Arabia Petræa (as the Christian writers do), is incorrect 81

I. The Ishmaelites, and their location *(continued)*—
The Shur and Ashur of Genesis are Syria and Assyria, respectively 81
Hedjaz and Paran, where the Ishmaelites settled, are identical *ib.*
Mount Sinai and Agar are not identical . . . . . *ib.*
No mention is made in the Pentateuch of the Paran which is near Mount Sinai 83
The Paran which is near Mount Sinai did not exist in the time of Moses 84
A Map, indicating the different opinions with respect to the travels of Moses 85
If Paran be considered to be the plain which lies between Syria and Yemen, then Moses' march becomes reconciled with the whole narration . . . . . *ib.*
Shur and Syria proved to be identical 86
Hagar and Ishmael were expelled from the Beersheba of Abraham, which was near Kadesh . . . . . *ib.*
The water which Hagar had was consumed when she had reached Paran, and the spring which was shown to her by God was where the well of Zemzem is now situated . 87
The above report was extant among the pre-Islamic Arabs . 88
Ishmael's first and second marriages 89
The temple of Kaaba was built by Ishmael and Abraham . 90
Ishmael was a prophet; and the promises made to him by God were not merely of a temporal nature . . . *ib.*
The tradition that Abraham was commanded by God to sacrifice Ishmael, is apocryphal 91
Ishmael's twelve sons 93
Nebajoth and the place of his settlement . . . . . *ib.*
Kedar, „ „ 94
From whom Mohammed was descended . . . . . *ib.*
Adbeel and his location 95
Mibsam „ . . . . . *ib.*
Mishma, „ 96
Dumah, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Massa, „ 97
Hadar, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Tema, „ . . . . . *ib.*
Jetur, „ 98
Nephish, „ . . . . . *ib.*

I. The Ishmaelites, and their location *(continued)*—
Kedemah, and his location 98
Ishmael was born in 4094 A.M., or 1910 A.C. 99
Ak, son of Adnan, was king of Yemen . . . . . *ib.*
Mohammed was a descendant of Adnan, and was born in 4570 A.M., or 570 A.D. 100
II. The Abrahamites, or the Beni Keturah . . . . . *ib.*
The Prophet Shoaib 101
III. The Edomites, or progeny of Esau . . . . . *ib.*
IV. The Nahorites . . . . . *ib.*
V. The Haramites 102
List of the Abrahamite tribes 103
A Table of the tribes of the Arabul-Mustaaribah . . . 112
Explanations regarding the appellation of—Saracen . . . 113
A map of Arabia 115

ESSAY

ON THE

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF ARABIA.

ARABIA, or the peninsula جزيرة العرب يا عرب bearing that name, is a country situated on the East of the Red Sea, and extending therefrom as far as the Persian Gulf.

It is very difficult to ascertain precisely when the name of عرب *Arabia* was given to this country. The word עֲרַב *Arabia* عِرب however, is also given to this country by the sacred writers when describing the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon,[1] which event took place 3000 years A.M., or 1005 A.C. We would, however, venture the opinion that the name in question was known before the time of Solomon, since it has been spoken of as the name of a very well known place; we also find the word ערבה Arabah عربه in Deut. i. 7 and ii. 8. But among all the various attempts[2] to explain the origin of

[1] 1 Kings x. 15.

[2] "The name Arabia has been derived by some from Araba (which means a level waste), a district in the province of Tehama; by others, from Eber, a word signifying a nomad ('wanderer') the primitive Arabs having been such: this would connect it with the word—Hebrew, which has a similar origin. Others again are inclined to derive it from the Hebrew verb—Arab, to go down, that is, the region in which the sun appeared to set to the Semitic dwellers on the Euphrates. According to the learned Bochart, the word Arabia is derived from a Phœnician one—signifying—ears of corn. There is also a Hebrew word,—Arabah, which means 'a barren place,' and which is occasionally employed in Scripture to denote the border land between Syria and Arabia."—Chambers' Encyclopædia, p. 344.

this word, the only successful one appears to be that which derives it from the word descriptive of the physical character of the country itself, and consequently the word עֲרָבָה[1] *Arabah* عربه, signifying *desert, waste,* is the one sought. This appears the more probable from the fact that the word *Arabah* was prefixed to the name of every town as a mere appellative; its plural עֲרָבֹת *Arabath* عربات[2] being likewise used to signify a division of the peninsula. Some writers hazard the opinion that a village called *Arabah,*[3] which is situated near Tehama, may have given its name to the whole peninsula, an opinion scarcely deserving the least notice.

As to the word *Arabah,* it may, although only a distinguishing prefix to the name of a town, have been made to supersede the real name of it.

Arabia is bounded on the West by the Red Sea; East by the Persian gulf and that of Oman; on the South by the Indian ocean; on the North it reaches nearly to Babylonia and Syria, and is only separated from Egypt by the narrow isthmus of Suez. The north-western side of this peninsula adjoins the country of the Israelites, or Canaan, known to the ancient Greeks as Phœnicia, to the middle ages as Palestine or the Holy Land, and now called Syria. This was the land which Jehovah promised to give to Abraham and his posterity; but as this side of these two countries is bounded by deserts, it is therefore necessary, before attempting to fix the north-western boundary of Arabia, to ascertain, first, the south-eastern boundary of the "promised land." Now when God promised Abraham that He would give his descendants a country, the latter was abiding at a place between Bethel[4] and Hai, and

[1] Deut. i. 7, ii. 8.

[2] Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1 and 8 (Israelites). عربات بالتحريك جمع عربة و هى بلاد العرب

[3] عربه قريه فى اول وادى نخله من جهة مكة

[4] Gen. xiii. 3.

although God shewed the country miraculously to the patriarch, yet the knowledge of its exact boundaries was withheld from him;[1] but afterwards, upon God confirming his promise, He made known to Abraham two of its boundaries, saying, "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates."[2]

It appears, however, that subsequently to this, none of the sacred writers have (why, we know not) assigned the river of Egypt as the boundary of the "promised land;" on the contrary, Beer-sheba[3] is everywhere mentioned as its southern boundary; and when God showed the "promised land" to Moses, in the desert of Moab, he saw that צֹעַר Zoar صُوعر[4] was its southern boundary, now Zoar and "Beer-sheba" are nearly in a line with each other, and consequently either of them may be taken indifferently as the boundary of the "promised land" on the South.

It should, however, be particularly noted that there were two Beer-shebas,[5] the one named simply בְּאֵרשֶׁבַע Beer-sheba بير شبع[6] the other עִירבְּאֵרשֶׁבַע Kuryai Beer-sheba قريه بير شبع, or שְׁבָעָה Sheba شبعه[7] the place where, in the desert of Gerar, Isaac's servants digged a well, at the time when he and Abi Malik made a covenant and oath together. "And it came to pass, the same day that Isaac's servants came and told him concerning the well which they had digged, and said unto him, 'We have found water.' And he called it *Sheba*, therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba unto this day."[8] And this is the same place whence Jacob departed when he went towards Haran,[9]

[1] Gen. xiii. 14, 15. [2] Gen. xv. 18.

[3] Judges xx. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 20; 2 Sam. iii. 10, xvii. 11, xxiv. 2 and 15; 1 Kings iv. 25; 2 Kings xxiii. 8; 1 Chron. xxi. 2; 2 Chron. xxx 5.

[4] Deut. xxxiv. 3.

[5] "Beersheba, we are expressly informed, was situate on the south of Judah (2 Sam. xxiv. 7, 15), towards Idumea, and therefore must not be confounded with another Beersheba in upper Galilee, mentioned by Josephus, and recently by Dr. Richardson."—Bible Cyclopædia, by Rev. J. P. Lawson, M.A., vol. i. p. 307.

[6] Gen. xxi. 31–32. [7] Jos. xix. 2. [8] Gen. xxvi. 28, 32, 33. [9] Gen. xxviii. 10.

it was also there that the sons of Jacob rested themselves on their journey to Egypt to obtain corn.[1] At one time this city was the capital of the surrounding country, and Samuel's sons were judges there.[2] The prophet Amos instanced this place as greatly addicted to idolatry;[3] here also was born Zibiah,[4] the mother of Jehu Jehoash; lastly, Elijah escaped thither when threatened by Jezebel.[5] This city was not ruined until after the Babylonian captivity.[6] "It is now," according to another authority, "a poor village, adjoining a large sandy barren desert, quite uninhabited, except towards the coast." Beersheba was distant from Hebron between twenty and twenty-five miles, and had a Roman garrison in it in the time of Eusebius, who lived in the fourth century after Christ. This Beersheba was situated at lat. 31° 17′ N., long. 34° 54′ E., and the former one was situated between the two deserts קָדֵשׁ Kadesh قاديش and שׁוּר Shur شور, and was built by Abraham. Abraham and Lot left Ur[7] of the Chaldees and went to Haran, where, having remained a few days, they journeyed into Egypt, and on their return thence, stopped at the same place[8] where they had so done before; and here, while Lot separated from his fellow traveller and went to Jordan,[9] Abraham took up his abode between the deserts of Kadesh and Shur,[10] making at the same time a well.[11] Abraham dwelt here for a long time,[12] and planted many plants;[13] at the same place[14] Hagar ran away from her mistress, and meeting with this well on her way, gave it the name בְּאֵרלַחַירֹאִי Beer-lahai-roi بير للحي الناظر. After this, a famine breaking out, Isaac left this place and went to גְּרָר Gerar جرار, nor is there the least doubt that Kadesh is quite a different place, and at a great distance from Gerar.[15] Now as the inhabitants of this last place

[1] Gen. xxvi. 1, 5.
[2] 1 Sam. viii. 2.
[3] Amos v. 5, viii. 14, vii. 9.
[4] 2 Kings xii. 1; 2 Chr. xxiv. 1.
[5] 1 Kings xix. 3.
[6] Neh. xi. 27, 30.
[7] Gen. xi. 31.
[8] Gen. xiii. 3.
[9] Gen. xiii. 10, 11.
[10] Gen. xx. 1.
[11] Gen. xxi. 14, 15, 30.
[12] Gen. xxii. 19.
[13] Gen. xxi. 33.
[14] Gen. xvi. 8.
[15] Gen. xxvi. 6.

had no knowledge whatever of Isaac, he availed himself of this ignorance, and passed his wife upon them for his sister.[1] Isaac, however, being driven from Gerar by Abi Malek, went and settled in the desert of Gerar, where he digged a well, giving it the name of Sheba, and calling the place where he so settled Careya Beer-sheba,[2] so that this cannot possibly be the spot where the well was digged by Abraham.

My object for going into these particulars is that of proving two things: first—that the northern boundary of Arabia abuts upon Syria, or the Promised land, and that the boundary of the latter is the Beer-Sheba of Isaac, or Zoar, or Bela;[3] secondly—that Abraham's Beer-Sheba is at Kadesh, which is in Arabia.[4]

Arabia is, in general, a large, flat, and desert country, interspersed here and there with a few exuberantly fertile spots or

[1] Gen. xxvi. 7. [2] Gen. xxvi. 33. [3] Gen. xiv. 2.

[4] The assertions of such persons as hold that the Beer-sheba of Abraham is identical with that of Isaac, appears to me to be founded upon the following circumstances, which, as I shall presently show, cannot be admitted to be valid and authentic. The first of these circumstances which appears to favour their views is, that when Isaac left Kadesh the Philistines filled up the wells dug by Abraham, and when Abimelech expelled Isaac from Gerar, the latter is said to have "digged again the wells of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham, his father, and which the Philistines had stopped, and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them." So far, indeed, the commentators above alluded to appear justified, inasmuch as at a first or superficial glance the Beer-sheba of Abraham and that of Isaac undoubtedly seem to be identical. Such, however, is by no means the fact, as we shall presently show. Up to the 18th verse of Gen. chap. xxvi. the Scriptures speak exclusively of Abraham's wells that were re-opened by Isaac, but from the 19th verse of the same to the end of the chapter no mention is made of any wells except of wholly different ones. To these new wells Isaac gave new names, calling the first בְּאֵרעֵשֶׂק *Erek* بير عسق; the second, שִׂטְנָה *Sitnah* سطنه; the third, רְחֹבוֹת *Rehobeth* رحوبوث; and the fourth, שִׁבְעָה *Sheba* سبعه. This clearly proves that these wells were not identical with those of Abraham. Again, the 17th verse of the same chapter plainly says that Isaac pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar and dwelt there, and the 19th and 20th verses say that his (Isaac's) servants digged in the valley and found there a well of springing water, and that "the herdsmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdsmen," claiming the water to be theirs, hence upon comparing all these verses one with the other, it becomes evident that these wells were dug in the valley of Gerar, and not in that of Kadesh. Another circumstance which appears to support the opinion of the above mentioned critics, is the mention made in the 23rd verse of Isaac's quitting Abimelech and going to Beer-

oases, and some mountains of considerable size, the valleys among which are also characterized by a delightful luxuriance. Its great deficiencies are forests and water. There are fruit trees of various descriptions, the date-tree being the most valuable. The Arabian horses are the finest in the world; but the most useful animal in Arabia is the camel, justly called "the ship of the desert."

Arabia can only be properly divided into two parts—the one, Arabia Hejar, عرب الحجر or mountainous Arabia, which extends from the isthmus of Suez as far as the Red and Arabian Seas—the other or eastern portion, Arabia *Deserta*, or Arabia Vadee عرب الواوى The ancient geographer, Ptolemy, divided Arabia into three parts,[1] viz., Arabia Petræa, Arabia Felix, and Arabia Deserta. In modern maps, Arabia Petræa is made to consist of only that portion of land lying between the gulf of Suez and the Elematic gulf, or gulf of Acaba, but there is no reliable authority for such a division. Now, according to Ptolemy, Arabia Petræa should extend from the gulf of Suez as far as the boundaries of Yemen or Arabia Felix. Those writers who suppose Ptolemy to have translated the word Yemen by Arabia Felix are undoubtedly mistaken; for in the time of that ancient geographer the southern portion of Arabia Petræa

sheba, a circumstance from which it might be naturally enough inferred that the Beer-sheba mentioned above is the Beer-sheba of Abraham, because up to this time the Beer-sheba of Isaac was not in existence. But this, again, is not the case, for the Beer-sheba mentioned in that verse is not Abraham's Beer-sheba, but that of Isaac, It is the marked characteristic of the sacred penmen that they mention beforehand the name of the subject they are about to describe. Thus, in many places they have mentioned, by name, many cities and towns which did not exist till long afterwards. In chapter xxi. verse 14, the Beer-sheba of Abraham is mentioned by name, although the well had not received that appellation at that time.

[1] "Ptolemy is supposed to have been the author of the famous threefold divisions of the peninsula into Arabia Petræa, Arabia Felix, and Arabia Deserta, the first of which included the whole of the north-west portion; the second, the west and south-west coasts; and the third, the whole of the dimly-known interior. This division, however, is not recognized by the natives themselves, neither is it very accurate as at present understood."—Cham. Ency., p. 344. It must be borne in mind that Ptolemy divided the country physically and not territorially.

was thickly inhabited, and celebrated for its commerce, for which reason he gave the name of Arabia Felix (happy or fertile) to that portion of the entire peninsula. Arabian geographers have divided the peninsula of Arabia into five parts, namely, Tehama, تهامه, Hijaz, حجاز, Nedjed, نجد, Orooz, عروض, and Yemen, يمن. Such foreign historians and geographers are greatly mistaken, who maintain *that the name Hijaz is derived from the fact that the country is a general resort of pilgrims*; because the literal meaning of the word Hijaz is—any object lying between two others. The name so given to the whole country was from the circumstance of the mountain lying between Syria and Yemen. Arabia itself is divided into many parts, according to the different tribes inhabiting it, the names of their settlements, and the political condition of these, its inhabitants. But as it would be difficult, if not impossible, to say what those divisions actually were, without previously knowing who these tribes were, whence they came, and where they located themselves, we shall, therefore, proceed to ascertain these particulars to the best of our ability.

Very little upon this subject is to be gleaned either from the sacred writers, or from those of the foreign nations adjoining Arabia; the reason for this silence being that the former were exclusively occupied in their researches concerning the Promised Land, and in describing it, as well as in recording whatever related to the children of Israel, while the latter felt not the least interest in so barren and uncultivated a country.

In our present work we shall avail ourselves as much as possible of the little we can obtain from the above two sources of information, supplementing the same by such local traditions as are considered entitled to credit.

As to the traditions respecting the division of the different nations inhabiting the peninsula, they are perfectly trustworthy, for the Arabs, greatly, if not superstitiously, attached to the ancient manners and customs of their fatherland, were ever

averse to relinquish or change them.[1] Hence it was almost a sacred duty never to forget their line of hereditary succession, and for this purpose, not only each tribe, but each branch of it, had its distinctive name assigned it; thus every individual knew to what tribe, or to which offset from it, he belonged, and prided himself upon his hereditary descent, so much so that, like the ancient Scandinavian and Celtic nations, the Arabs had also their bards, the recitation or singing of whose heroic poems supplied the place of martial music.

Of their customs the following will give some idea:—When

[1] For the support of this our opinion we cannot do better than quote some passages from high authorities. The Rev. Mr. Forster states that "the proverbial attachment of the Arabians, in all ages, to the manners, customs, and remembrances of primeval antiquity, may well be placed first among these considerations; since by universal consent of authorities, this predilection stands foremost among their national characteristics." Another curious illustration of the permanence and fidelity of Arab tradition is thus described by Colonel Chesney: "An encampment of the Ageyl Arabs having arrived in the neighbourhood of Bagdad, I went to visit their camp; in the centre of which I saw floating, to my surprise, the royal standard of Spain. I endeavoured to obtain an explanation of the appearances of *the three stripes* in an Arab camp . . . . . and was told by a very old man that, when their fathers went to Barbary, and thence passed to the conquest of Spain, the Sultan (Caliph) in reward of their great services, bestowed on the Ageyl tribe, for their banner, *the royal standard of Spain.*" Dean Prideaux thus expresses himself on the subject: "The Arabs," says he, "being the most ancient nation in the world, ... who have always remained in their country in a continued descent, from the first planters of it, even to this day; and being also as little given to make changes in their manners and usages as they are as to their country, have retained those same names of places which were at first given them. Thus, the ancient metropolis of Egypt, which was called Mesri, and which afterwards, for many ages, had the name of Memphis, was, on the Arabs making themselves master of Egypt, again called Mesri, and hath retained that name ever since." This is one of the many examples that the learned Dean cites.—Professor Rawlinson says, "There is in Palestine another kind of tradition, with which the monasteries have had nothing to do—I mean *the preservation of the ancient names of places among the common people.* This is truly national and native tradition, not derived in any degree from the influence of foreign convents or masters, but drawn in by the peasant with his mother's milk, *and deeply seated in the genius of the Semitic languages.* The Hebrew names of places continued current, in their Aramæan form, long after the times of the New Testament; and maintained themselves in the mouths of the common people, in spite of the efforts made by Greeks and Romans to supplant them by others derived from their own tongues."—Historical Geography of Arabia by Rev. C. Forster, B.D.

in the battle-field, no warrior would engage in single combat without previously declaring aloud to his enemy the tribe to which he belonged and the name of his parents.

Upon any public emergency each individual enrolled himself under the banner of the leader or head of his own tribe. In some instances, if an individual of any tribe committed a crime, the punishment for which was a fine, the whole tribe to which the criminal belonged had to pay it.

The effect of these and similar customs was to make it impossible for an Arab to leave his own tribe and join another one, and hence the fullest confidence in the truth of the traditions respecting the divisions of the different countries composing the peninsula was fully established and maintained.

Having thus amply shewn the almost fabulous adherence of the Arabs to their national manners and customs, and to the ancient usages of their forefathers, we would ask—how can it possibly be believed that there are sufficient grounds for applying the following remarks to a nation so little given to change, and so particular withal as to the strict contradistinction of tribes? —remarks supported by no authorities, being but the offspring of the imagination of somewhat too partial an author. "In the Amalekites and Nabatheans we recognize very plainly the descendants of Esau and Ishmael. It is not necessary to suppose that the knowledge or tradition of their descent was uninterruptedly maintained in the nations themselves. The vicissitudes of conquest, and combination with other tribes, render it in the last degree improbable that the consciousness of their origin should have been preserved for so many centuries by a barbarous people possessed of no recorded memorials."

Now, seeing that the traditions respecting the settlement of Ishmael and Hagar have been handed down, through a highly trustworthy medium, to the present generation, both by the descendants of Ishmael and by the national local traditions—traditions which have been accepted as truthful ones by the

whole nation, without the least hesitation, how can we be expected to indorse as true and authentic the purely gratuitous remarks of the before-quoted author, who declares that "the legend is a myth, or rather a travestied plagiarism from Scripture," while he must have known, at the very time he made this assertion, that the Scriptures themselves support the tradition of Abraham's origin, and who then proceeds to "conjecture the facts" respecting the settlement of "the youthful Ishmael and his forlorn mother to have been in this wise: 'Amalekite or Ishmaelen tribes were scattered over the North and centre of the peninsula. They formed probably the aboriginal population of Mecca, or settled there in conjunction with immigrants from Yemen at a very remote period. Subsequently, an Ishmaelitish tribe, either Nabathean or of some collateral stock, was attracted thither also by its wells and its favourable position for the caravan trade, and acquired great influence. This tribe would carry in its train the patriarchal legend of Abrahamic origin, and engraft it upon the local superstitions which were either native or imported from Yemen.'"

Ishmael, when expelled from home by his father, was sixteen years of age[1]—old enough, it may be supposed, to learn to recognise, to distinguish, and to remember the various traditions delivered to him by his father. He, moreover, paid constant and frequent visits to his parent, who repaid them in turn on various occasions. Lastly, and above all, Ishmael, then in his eighty-ninth year, was present at the death of his father. All these circumstances, it is presumed, will suffice to convince every judicious and unprejudiced mind that these traditions, so rife among the various tribes of Arabia, were received by the people

[1] Abraham was 86 years of age when Ishmael was born, Gen. xvi. 16; and he was 100 years of age when Isaac was born, Gen. xxi. 5; and he expelled Ishmael when Isaac was weaned; therefore, Ishmael, when expelled from home, was 16 years of age. Abraham died in his 175th year, and was buried in the cave of Machpelah, by Ishmael and Isaac (Gen. xxv. 9), therefore the age of Ishmael on that occasion was 89 years.

direct through Abraham and Ishmael—facts so obvious and convincing as to render it a matter of no small surprise that any one could venture so far as to hazard the opinion that these traditions were transmitted through the Jews; this, however, a writer on the subject pretends to show in the passage following: "Yet the name and location would alone suffice to suggest the probability of this descent to the Israelites who read the Mosaic record; and we find in the Jewish authors, inspired and uninspired, sufficient indication that such conclusion was actually drawn. The natural inference would, from time to time, spread from the neighbouring Jews to the tribes themselves whom it concerned, and reinforce the imperfect remnants of loose traditions still lingering in their associations, their habits, or their language."

The aboriginal inhabitants of Arabia, conformably to their natural characteristic, never added any novel tradition to the stock they actually possessed, ever keeping themselves aloof from all other tribes; so much so, that when Ishmael and his followers came down and settled, the original Arabs regarded them with contempt, branding them with the degrading appellation of *aliens*. Previously to the advent of Mohammed, the Israelites and the Arabians, especially the Ishmaelites, always looked upon each other as two distinct tribes, and never interchanged their respective traditions, and the Israelites had no tradition, either oral or recorded, concerning Arabian tribes and prophets.

Upon the Prophet's declaring that all the Israelitish prophets were true ones and ought to be believed, the traditions and legends of the Israelites and of their prophets became mixed up with those of the Arabs; but as the Israelites possessed no Arabic traditions, the latter remained *in statu quo*.

All the colonies that from time to time had been settled in Arabia had, collectively, three designations given to them by the natives; first—Arab-ul-Baidah عرب البايدة, or the Arabs of the Desert; second—Arab-ul-Aaribah عرب العاربة, Aboriginal Arabs; third—Arab-ul-Mostaaribah عرب المستعربة, or Aliens:

which three grand divisions include nearly all the inhabitants of Arabia, whether the nomadic Badouins, who wander from place to place with their cattle, or the comparatively civilized ones who are peacefully settled along the coast, making, at the same time, a distinction between the Aborigines and the Aliens. Such being the case, we shall treat of the inhabitants under the three general heads above-mentioned.

FIRST.

Arab-ul-Baidah عرب البايدة, *or the nomadic tribes of the desert.*

These consisted of seven distinct collections of descendants from seven personages:[1] 1. Those of Cush, the son of Ham, the son of Noah. 2. Those of Elam, son of Shem, the son of Noah. 3. The offspring of Lud, the son of Shem, son of Noah. 4. Those of Uz, the son of Aram, son of Shem, son of Noah. 5. Hul, the son of Aram, son of Shem, the son of Noah. 6. Jodais, son of Gether, son of Aram, son of Shem, son of Noah. 7. Thamud, son of Gether, son of Aram, son of Shem, son of Noah.

The descendants of Cush settled along the coast of the Persian gulf, and its adjacent plains.

Jorham, son of Elam, taking the same direction, settled also along the southern banks of the Euphrates.[2]

Lud, the third of these heads of tribes, had three sons, Tasm, Imleck, and Ommeem, who dispersed themselves throughout the eastern portion of Arabia, from Yamuma as far as to Behrien and its vicinity.[3]

[1] قال القاضي صا عد ابن احمد الاند لسي صاحب قضاء مدينه طليطله ..... ان العراب البايدة فكانت امماضخمة كعاد و ثمود و طسم و جديس و لتقادم انقراضهم ذهبت عنا حقايق اخبارهم و انقطعت عنا اسباب العلم باثارهم *

[2] اما جرهم فهم صنفان جرهم الاولي و كانوا علي عهد عاد فبادوا ودرست اخبارهم و هم من عرب البايدة * ابو الفدا *

[3] سكنت بنو طسم اليمامة الي البحرين * ابو الفدا *

Uz, the father of *Ad*, and *Hul*, took a like direction, and penetrating far south, settled in Hazramout and the neighbouring desert.[1] Jodais, son of Gether, son of Aram, son of Shem, settled in Arabia Deserta. Thamud, son of Gether, son of Aram, son of Shem, occupied the country of Alhajar and the plain known by the name of Wadee-ol-Kora (Arabia Deserta), and forming the southern boundary of Syria and the northern of Arabia.[2]

[1] سكنت بنو عاد الرمل الي حضرموت * ابو الفدا *

و بلاد عاديقال لها الا حقاف و هي بلادمتصلة باليمن و بلاد عمان * ابو الفدا *

و الي عادٍ اخا هم هودا و هو عاد بن عوص بن ارام بن سام و هم عاد الا و لى كانت منازل قوم عاد بالا حقاف و هي رمال بين عمان و حضرموت * معالم التنزيل *

[2] سكنت ثمود الحجر بين الحجاز و الشام * ابو الفدا *

كانت مساكنهم بالحجر بين الحجاز و الشام الي و ادي القرى * معالم التنزيل *

الحجر بالكسر ثم السكون و راء اسم ديار ثمود بو ادي القري بين المدينة و الشام كانت مساكن ثمود و هي بيوت منحوتة في الجبال مثل الغاير تسمي تلك الجبال الا ثاليب كل جبل منقطع عن الاخر يطاف حوله و قدنقر فيه بيوت و نقر علي قدر الجبال التى تنقرفيها و هي بيوت في غايه الحسن فيها نقوش و طيقان محكمه الصنعة و في و سطها البير التي كانت ترد ها النافة * مراصد الا طلاع علي اسماع الا مكنة و البقاع *

الحجر بكسر الحاء و سكون الجيم و الراء ديار ثمود بوادي القري بين المدينة و الشام * مشترك ياقوت الحموي *

Having now presented our readers with a complete list of the ancestors of the seven distinct tribes of the Arab-ul-Baidah, and having also given an idea of the different places where they respectively settled, we shall proceed to describe, as far as we are able, the various off-shoots and branches that sprang from them.

First—the Bani Cush, or Cushites. Owing to the total silence of all the historians of Arabia upon the Cushites, no particulars are to be found concerning them, and hence George Sale and other writers of the same class maintain that "the Cushites did not inhabit Arabia. Navairi نويرى, in his passage وملك شرحبيل علي قيس و تميم, mentions the *Cushites* in conjunction with the Temimites, as the portion of his kingdom bequeathed by Al-Hareth to his second son, Sherhabil," and the Rev. Mr. Forster, basing his assertion upon the passage, says that "Orientals are not silent about the descendants of Cush as a people of Arabia." Navairi's passage, however, does not in any way prove that the "Kais," قيس, were the same as the Cushites, the descendants of Ham.

The reason for the silence of the Asiatic historians respecting

قال ابن حوقل و الحجر بين جبال علي يوم من و ادى القري اقول لم يحصل ذلك فان بينهما اكثر من خمسة ايام قال و كانت ديار ثمود الذين قال الله عنهم و ثمود الذين جا بوا الصخر با لواد قال رايت تلك الجبال و مانحت منها كما اخبر الله تعالي و تنحتون من الجبال بيو تا فرهين و تسمي تلك الجبال الا ثاليب اقول و هي التي ينزلها حجاج الشام و هي عن العلي علي نحو نصف مرحلة من جهة الشام * تقويم البلدان *

و وادي القري فهو با دية الجزيرة و ما كان من بالس الي أيله مو اجهًا للحجاز معارضًا لا رض نتبوك فهو با دية الشام * تقويم البلدن *

the Cushites appears to have been the identity of the names of the descendents of Cush, who settled in the East, with those of Joktan, who proceeded southward and settled in Yemen and its vicinity; and hence all the events and occurrences that were connected with or befell the Cushites have been by those historians thought as belonging to Joktan's descendants.

The Rev. Mr. Forster, however, with great and accurate research, very ably endeavoured to prove upon highly reliable authorities that the Cushites did settle in Arabia, along the coast of the Persian gulf, and by comparing the names of the various cities of the eastern coast with those given by Ptolemy, achieved a decided success.[1] But when he attempts to disperse the Cushites over the whole peninsula of Arabia, more especially in Yemen and along the coast of the Arabian gulf, his line of argument becomes weaker and weaker, so much so, indeed, that upon arriving at Yemen, his reasoning is exceedingly obscure, and can be only considered as a string of erroneous and fanciful deductions. We now, therefore, maintain that, excepting Nimrod, whom the sacred writer mentions alone, thereby leading us to infer that he did not settle along with his brothers, the

[1] "It is the commonly-received opinion that Seba, the eldest of the sons of Cush, first colonized that part of Arabia Deserta which lies adjacent to the Euphrates; a belief apparently, and not unreasonably, founded on the following circumstances:—the near neighbourhood of the district in question to Chuzestan or the proper country of Cush .... the existence, in after times, of the city of Sabe, and the people of the Sabeans on the borders of Chaldea; .... the occurrence in continuous series, along the shores of the Persian gulf, of the Cushite names and families of Havilah, Sabtah, Ramaah, Dedan, ... and, lastly, the mention in two places of the Prophet Isaiah, of Cush and Seba together, as though Seba lay adjacent to Chuzestan." "Near Cape Mussendom, styled by Ptolemy 'the promontory of the Asabi,' we observe in Mr. Sale's map the town of Cushcan, a name equivalent to the Cusham of the Old Testament. On the iron-bound coast of Oman, between the rivers Amnon, Ammon, or Oman, and Thamar (or the towns of Sib and Sobar), we find a tract of strand, called by Pliny 'the shores of Ham' (now Maham). On opposite sides of the neck of land terminating in Cape Mussendom occur, within the mouth of the Persian gulf, the city and district of Ramaah (the Regma of the Septuagint and the Regama of Ptolemy); without the gulf, the city and district of Daden or Dadena .... the Dedan of Scripture, Ramaah's younger son."—Forster's Hist. Geog. of Arabia, p. 38.

sons of Cush, whose names were Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabtechah; and the sons of Raamah, viz., Sheba and Dedan, all settled along the coast of the Persian gulf. We do not attempt to deny that some of their descendants might have proceeded to other parts of the peninsula and settled there, but we dispute the above assertion of the Rev. Mr. Forster, on the ground that when, in the course of his tracing the Cushites and arriving at any place, he finds there the slightest resemblance to Cushite names, whether in the spelling of them, their pronunciation, or even in the coincidence of a single letter, he hesitates not to class them along with the descendants of Cush, and this, notwithstanding the perfect identity of the names of many of the latter with those of the descendants of Joktan, who lived in Yemen.

The sacred writers having, on account of the Cushites, given the name of "the land of Cush," or Ethiopia, to the whole of Arabia, the Rev. Mr. Forster has, with the view of establishing this fact, brought forward very sound and able arguments.[1]

Hence no doubt remains of there being two distinct "lands of Cush," that is, two Ethiopias, the one in Africa, and the other in Asia, or in Arabia, or the whole peninsula itself. This is a highly important fact, and should always be borne in mind, because in the

[1] "In the Historical Geography of the Old and New Testament, the names 'Ethiopia' and 'Ethiopians,' are frequently substituted in our English version of the Old Testament, where the Hebrew original preserves the proper name 'Cush.' And that the name of Cush, when so applied in Scripture, belongs uniformly not to the African, *but to the Asiatic Ethiopia or Arabia*, has been inferred incontrovertibly from comparison of a few decisive texts. Thus in the book of Numbers, we read, that 'Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses, because of the Ethiopian (Heb. Cushite) whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian (Heb. Cushite) woman' (Numb. xii. 1). From the second chapter of Exodus 15-21, it is, however, certain that the wife of Moses (and we have no authority whatever to assume his second marriage) was a Midianitish woman, or a descendant of Abraham by Keturah. And it is equally certain that Midian, or Madian, was a city or country in Arabia, on the shore of the Red Sea. So that, from hence, it appears that the wife of Moses was an Arabian; and consequently that the Hebrew word Cushite is not rightly rendered Ethiopian, unless it be understood of Ethiopia in Asia or Arabia, not of Ethiopia in Africa."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 12.

course of our description it will greatly serve to explain and elucidate certain passages in the Scriptures.

Secondly, עֵילָם Elam عيلام, or Jorham-ul-ola جرهم الاولي (the first Jorham). This tribe having been comparatively stationary, the little known respecting it was its having been related to that of the Cushites, and that it settled along with them.

Thirdly, לוּד Lud لرد had three sons, *Tasm* طسم, *Imleck* عمليق and *Ommeem* اميم. Like the descendants of Elam, this tribe also was deficient in activity, on which account but very little is known respecting it. Its traces are to be found in the names of some places on the coast of the Persian gulf, as for example, that of the river Amnon (the Ammon of Pliny) and Hammaeum, identical with the name of Ommeem, the third son of Lud; it being a rule for *a* or *o* to be changed into *h*, just as Oood has become Hood, and Agar, Hagar, the mother of Ishmael. The Rev. Mr. Forster has made a mistake in attempting to prove that Amnon or Hammon is identical with the present Oman, for the latter is the Oman of Genesis xix. 38, "And the younger, she also bare a son, and called his name Bani-Ammi; the same is the father of the children of Ammon unto this day."

Fourthly, עוּץ Uz عوص, and fifthly, הוּל Howl حول, or the Hul of Scripture, being the sons of Aram; we shall deal with them jointly. Their traces are also found up to this very day in the names of places scattered along the coast of the Persian gulf, and the neighbouring plains; as for instance, Aval is the same as Howl (the Hul of Scripture). In his derivation of Aval the Rev. Mr. Forster is again mistaken, since he represents this word as being "only a varying form of the name of Havilah."

Ad-ul-Ola عاد الاولي, the son of Uz, acquired much celebrity, and his descendants became a renowned tribe, and made themselves masters of all eastern and southern Arabia; they built dwelling-houses, obtaining, besides, an ascendancy over all the other tribes. The men of this tribe were conspicuous among

those of others, for their stalwart figure,[1] as is likewise mentioned in the Holy Koran.

[1] Respecting the gigantic stature of the inhabitants of South-eastern Arabia, the Rev. Mr. Forster quotes the following remarks from Willsted's Travels in Arabia: "I observed a considerable difference between the personal appearance of the Arabs of Hajaz and those bordering on the Arabian side of the Persian gulf. The characteristics of the latter are an almost oval face, black hair, generally close shaven, eyebrows of the same colour, and a glossy skin, one shade lighter than that of the natives of India. Those near the shores of the Red Sea are lean, but of a vigorous make, and more diminutive in stature; the form of the face more lengthened, their cheeks hollow, and their hair, with the exception of two long curls on either side (on which they bestow considerable care), is permitted to flow as long as their waist. The colour of their skin is lighter.

"South-east of Beispe, four or five days, live the Dawasir Arabs during the winter; but in summer they remove to the more fertile pasture-lands of Nedjed, the nearest frontiers of which are only eight days distant. They have no horses, but furnish to the Wahabys, in their wars, about three thousand camel-riders. The Dawasirs are said to be *very tall men*, and *almost black*."—(Travels in Arabia, Appendix to vol. ii. p. 385.) "But this striking difference in height and colour from the surrounding tribes is not confined to the Dawasir Arabs. The phenomenon reappears among the Arabs of the Persian gulf, and in the very neighbourhood assigned by the learned for the settlements of Seba." "The Arabs of the Persian gulf," observes Colonel Chesney, to the author, "are a fine race of men, remarkable for *lofty stature* and *dark complexion*, in both respects differing markedly from the tribes of the Arabian gulf."—(Forster's Hist. Geog. of Arabia, p. 31.) The Rev. Mr. Forster, however, is mistaken in thinking that the descendants of Cush were exclusively men of lofty stature, because all the nations inhabiting the coast of the Persian gulf, and whom we have mentioned under the head of Arab-ul-Baidah, were men of enormous height. Even up to the present time we find two kinds of men living along the Persian gulf, who are equally tall, but differ in colour, the one being dark and the other one shade lighter.

The Rev. Mr. Forster quotes the passage, Isaiah xlv. 14, which says "Sabeans, men of stature," and founds upon this the assertion that the descendants of Cush only were tall persons. The Rev. gentlemen, is, however wrong, for two reasons—first, because the words "men of stature" do not necessarily imply that they were men of tall size, but merely that they were *respectable* persons, as the passage is rendered in the Arabic translation;* secondly, that the Sabeans mentioned in the passage were not necessarily the descendants of Cush, inasmuch as the name *Sabeans* is given, in Scripture, to other tribes also; thus the Sabeans noticed in the Book of Job (i. 15), for example, "who have every appearance of being the same race with the Sabeans of the Euphrates, are there designated, unequivocally, by the mode of spelling their patronymic, as descendants, not of Seba, the first-born of Cush, but of one or other of the three Sebas whom Moses mentions among the Patriarchs who successively colonized Arabia."

* هذه يقولها الرب تعب مصر و تجارة الحبش و سبايم رجال اشراف يعبرون اليك

To this tribe God sent a prophet, whose name was Hood هود or Hud (the עֵבֶר Eber, عيبر, of Scripture, Gen. xi. 14), whose mission it was to teach the worship of the true God, and to forbid that of idols; but as these people paid no attention to his injunctions and remonstrances, God's anger was roused against them, and He visited them with a three-years' famine, the effect of which was that the people recognised it as a divine punishment for their rejection of God's prophet. While in this miserable condition, Hud reappeared among them, exhorting them anew to eschew idolatry and to adore none other than the one holy God; assuring them, at the same time, that if they so did, He would be merciful to them, by sending showers of rain. They, however, continued obdurate and impenitent, whereupon a violent tempest, the instrument of divine wrath, and which lasted seven nights and eight days, raged through the country, with such fury, that thousands of them were destroyed, and the whole tribe, with the exception of a few, or those who had listened to the prophet, was nearly exterminated. But there is no doubt that, afterwards, these, so saved, joyfully accepted the prophet. This event occurred in the 18th century A.M., or 22 centuries A.C.

False traditions assigned to the Adites.

It is said in some books that the height of each of the Adites measured twelve arshes, ارش *i.e.* twelve times the length of a man's arms, when extended at right angles to his body; in others, this height is still more exaggerated; and that the strength of these people was so enormous, that, in walking, their feet and legs would penetrate the earth up to their knees.

In another place it is said that a palace named Irem, erected by the Adites, was made of rubies, its walls of gold and silver, and that the trees planted therein consisted of rubies, pearls, diamonds, emeralds, and every other kind of precious stones; and that the grass was of saffron and the dust of amber.

In some books it is stated that, in the reign of Moaviah, a person when in search of his camel accidentally entered this palace and brought away from it, in his lap, a large quantity of jewels, and that on Moaviah's ordering him to find out the house again, he failed to do so, and that therefore the king concluded that God had concealed it from mortal eyes.

Other books state that it was related by Ali and other trustworthy authorities that the house erected by the Adites was removed by God, from the earth and transported to heaven, and that, on the day of judgment, it will form one of the celestial Paradises.

Whatever has been said respecting the edifices erected by the Adites is altogether incorrect, for this tribe did not build any noteworthy edifices at all, their houses being only strong ones, like other buildings.

The reason of the mistakes that many writers have committed, in giving to the Adites (Ad-ul-ola) the credit of having built magnificent edifices, appears to be the wrong interpretation of the following passage of the Holy Koran: الم تر كيف فعل ربك بعادٍ إرَمَ ذات العماد التي لم يخلق مثلها في البلاد, the correct translation of which is this, "Hast thou not considered how thy Lord dealt with Ad, the people of Irem (grandfather of Ad), *whose statures were like pillars*, the like whereof had not been *created* in the land." That this is the faithful rendering of the original is also corroborated by the following passage of the Holy Koran, in which the size of this people (the Adites) is compared with trunks of hollow palm trees:—

و اما عادٌ فاهلكوا بريح صرصرٍ عاتيةٍ سنحرها عليهم سبعَ ليالٍ و ثمانية
إيام حسو ما فتري القوم فيها صرعي كانهم اعجاز نخل خاويه

the English version of which is, "And Ad were destroyed by a roaring and furious wind which God caused to assail them for seven nights and eight days successively: thou mightest have

seen people, during the same, lying prostrate, as though they had been the trunks of hollow palm trees."

The commentators Al Beidawi and Jallalain also are of the same opinion, since they say that "these words are used to express the great size and strength of the old Adites."

"الم تر" تعلم يا محمد "كيف فعل ربك بعاد ارم" هي عاد الا ولي فارم عطف بيان اوبدل و منع الصرف للعلمية و التانيث "ذات العماد" اي الطوال . . . . "التي لم يخلق مثلها فى البلاد" في بطشهم و قو تهم "جلا لين"

" الم تر كيف فعل ربك بعاد" يعني اولاد عاد بن عوص بن ارم بن سام بن نوح قوم هود سموا باسم ابيهم كما سمي بنو اها شم باسمه "ارم" عطف بيان لعاد علي تقدير مضاف اي سبط ارم . . . . "ذات العماد" اي ذات البناء الرفيع او القدودالطوال او الرفعة و الثبات * "بيضادي"

Other commentators have translated the passage under consideration, thus: "Hast thou not considered how thy Lord dealt with Ad, the people of Irem, *adorned with lofty buildings*, the like whereof hath not been *erected* in the land."

Not unlike Milton, the author of Paradise Lost, the Arabian poets of the barbarous age invented a religious story, relating how, in the time of famine, the Adites sent three persons to Mecca for the purpose of imploring God to send down rain, one of the three being Lokman (not the sage), who was a believer, and the other two, unbelievers. In this work Lokman is made to live as long as the united lives of seven successive falcons. Hence the length of Lokman's life became proverbial. Many other fabulous stories of the same kind are related of them.

Sixth, Jodais جديس; and seventh, Thamud ثمود, or Ad the second عادثاني, being the sons of גֶּתֶר Jasir گثر (the Gether of

Scripture), the son of חרם Aram ارم, the son of Shem, the son of נח Noah نوح. We shall treat of these personages jointly.

Nothing is known of Jodais beyond the fact of his having settled in the desert, and of his descendants having, after a considerable lapse of time, been known as composing one of the desert tribes.

The descendants of Thamud made for themselves a great name, and soon formed a powerful tribe, occupying the country of Alhajar الحجر and the plain known by the name of Wadee-al-Kora وادي القري or Arabia Deserta, and which forms the southern boundary of Syria and the northern one of Arabia. The Holy Koran also speaks of this tribe on several occasions. They excavated various rocks, and after having hewn and carved them, took up their abode therein. These rocks are up to this very day known by the name of Asaleb اثاليب. Almost every Arab, as well as several foreigners who have travelled in Arabia, can bear witness to the present existence of these rock-habitations, which there stand at once to satisfy curiosity and afford information respecting the nations who made them. These habitations likewise corroborate and bear testimony to the truth of that portion of the history of the Thamud tribe, which is mentioned in the Holy Koran. After the expiration of some time, this tribe also fell into idolatry, so that, in order to warn and bring them into the right path, God commissioned from among them the prophet Saleh صالح, the son of Obaid عبيد, the son of Asif, آسف, the son of Mashej ماشج, the son of Abeed عبيد, the son of Jader جادر, the son of Thamud ثمود. Some of the tribe believed in him, but others refused to give him credence; these latter addressing Saleh, said, "Produce now some sign, if thou speakest truth." Upon which he replied, "O, my people, this she-camel of God is a sign unto you; therefore, dismiss her freely, that she may feed in God's earth, and do her no harm lest swift punishment seize you." In consequence of this admonition,

the people refrained for a long time from doing the she-camel any harm.

There now ensued a great drought, and even the little quantity of water that could be found was muddied and made turbid by the she-camel when drinking it, nor could the people prevent her; therefore Saleh decided that the she-camel should be allowed to drink from the said water for one day, and have it all to herself; and that on the next one, the people should have the advantage of it, and not suffer the she-camel to approach thereto. But we learn from the Holy Koran that, after a short time, the heads of the nine different sects, into which the unbelievers were at that time divided, conspired against Saleh, and plotted his assassination; but that evil design having been frustrated, they, in revenge, killed the she-camel. Then Saleh, addressing these people, said, "Enjoy yourselves in your dwellings for three days, *after which ye shall be destroyed.*" God himself also said, "And when our decree came to be executed, we delivered Saleh, and those who believed in him, through our mercy, from the disgrace of that day; for thy Lord is the Strong, the Mighty God. But a terrible noise[1] *from heaven* assailed those who had acted unjustly, and in the morning they were found in their houses lying dead and prostrate, as though they never dwelt therein." This event occurred at the same time that Sodom, Gomorrah, Admab, and Zehoim were burnt by fire from heaven, that is, in 2107 A.M. and 1897 A.C.

False traditions attributed to the Samood tribe.

Commentators and historians assert that the infidels demanded from Saleh the following signs to prove the truth of his mission: "From this rock," said they, "if there should come forth a she-camel, which should give birth to a young one covered with

[1] This noise was that of thunder and earthquakes.

red hair at that very instant, and should the young camel become immediately a full-grown one, that should graze before us; and that we should drink of the milk of the she-camel,—then would we believe."

By placing this tradition under the head of spurious ones, we by no means intend to deny the possibility of any miracle, but merely doubt this one on the ground that it has no authority for its support: had this tradition been true, mention of so wonderful an occurrence must have been made in the Holy Koran; neither do any of the authentic sayings of the prophet authorize it. This she-camel is said to have been feared both by men and animals, and to have emptied springs and fountains of water at one draught.

The Thamuds, who knew that their destruction would be the consequence of the slaughter of the she-camel, were informed by Saleh that a boy of such and such a description, belonging to their tribe, would kill this animal, and thus bring destruction on the whole community. To escape this ruin, as foretold by Saleh, they used to kill every child who they thought possessed the sign mentioned by Saleh. This boy, however, who was destined to be the author of the extermination of his own tribe, escaped, in some way or another, that horrid fate, and, when arrived at man's estate, killed the she-camel.

Another tradition is, that when the conspirators intended to assassinate Saleh, they went to lay an ambuscade in one of those mountains through which Saleh was wont to pass, and that God lifted up a mountain from off the ground, and thus a hollow place was made there where the mountain had stood at first, and that these wicked men chose this very pit for their ambush, placing themselves in it, when behold! God let fall that very mountain upon their heads, crushing all of them in one moment.

The following is the genealogical table of the Arab-ul-Baidah, or the Arabs of the Desert:—

شجرہ انساب عرب البایدہ

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE ARAB-UL-BAIDAH, OR THE ARABS OF THE DESERT.



SECOND.

The Arabul Aribah عرب العاربه, *or the Aboriginal Arabs.*

These are the descendants of יָקְטָן Joktan يقطان, the son of עֵבֶר Eber عيبر, the son of שֶׁלַח Salah شالخ, the son of אַרְפַּכְשַׁד Arphaxad ارفخشد, the son of שֵׁם Shem شام, the son of נֹחַ Noah نوح. Some historians, however, include the Arab-ul-Baida under this head, and thus divide the Arabs into two tribes only—the Arabul Aribah and the Arab-ul-Mustaribah.

Almost all historians are of opinion that the name Uktan يقطان in the Hebrew Pentateuch is identical with the Kahtan قحطان of the Arabs, and with the Joktan of the English Bible, and that it was the progeny of this man that settled in Arabia.

The Rev. Mr. Forster has adduced some peculiarly sound arguments, to prove first, the identity of all these names above mentioned,[1] and secondly, the settlement of the same Joktan in Arabia,[2] a fact denied neither by the celebrated traveller Burck-

[1] "We recover, in Ptolemy, the name, and apparently the tribe, of the Bani Kahtan, . . . a people . . . identical . . . with the Kahtan of the Arabs, and the Joktan of Scripture."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 80.

"The antiquity and universality of the national tradition which identifies the Kahtan of the Arabs . . . . with the Joktan . . . . of Scripture, is familiar to every reader."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 88.

"That Kahtan and Joktan are only different forms of the one patriarchal name has been always stated by the Arabs themselves; and might safely be inferred from the known tendency of their idiom to the use of anagrammatic inversions."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 88.

"The capital of the ancient Sabeans, the celebrated Mareb . . . . by the Kahtan Arabs; whose identity of name with the Joktan of Moses is, in this quarter, corroborated afresh by the occurrence of the Joktanite name of Havilah."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 90.

[2] "In the latter of these primeval tribes, the Bani-Kahtan, we are here introduced, in the words of Burckhardt, to the first Arab colonists of the race of the blessed Shem."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 77.

"The passage from Masoudi, at the opening of this section, speaks the voice of Arabian history, as to the primitive antiquity of the great Kahtan tribe: a voice corroborated, on the one hand, by old and universal national tradition, on the other hand, by the perhaps still stronger evidence of the existing names, localities, and population of central and southern Arabia."—Forster, Hist. Geog., p. 79.

hardt[1] مستر برق هردط رضى الله تعالي عنه (God rest his soul), who maintains that it was the descendants of this Joktan who settled in Arabia, nor by Sir Wm. Muir, the author of "The Life of Mohammed."

Respecting the place of their settlement, the sacred penman says that "their dwelling was from מֵשָׁא Mesha ميشا as thou

[1] No doubt some of my respected readers will be startled to notice the words "God rest his soul," made use of after the name of Mr. Burckhardt, and to allay this excitement I cannot do better than quote here a passage from the most talented and learned Mr. Godfrey Higgins. "The celebrated traveller Burckhardt, who was educated at the University of Cambridge, after the most careful inquiry and mature deliberation, turned Mohamedan, and, amidst the circle of his Christian friends, died one. It appears that he was instructed in the Mohamedan faith, and converted to it, by a learned Effendi at Aleppo, and that he there publicly professed it, and underwent a close examination into his faith and his knowledge of the Mohamedan tenets, near Mecca, when he performed his pilgrimage to that place, in consequence of which he ever after claimed the title of Hadji. His conversion seems to have been sincere, though generally, I think, concealed from his Christian friends.

"I have the pleasure to be acquainted with a gentleman who now (May, 1829), holds a responsible situation under the British Government, but whose name I have no authority to give, who told me he was present with Burckhardt a very little time before he died, when he was gravely assured by him that he really was a Mohamedan, and would die one. His anonymous biographer, in his posthumous work, gives an account of his death, but carefully avoids saying a word on the subject of his religion. He probably knew that if the truth came out, the sale of his books would be ruined by the calumnies of the priests. But one sentence escapes which is sufficient to confirm what I have said—'He died at a quarter before twelve the same night, without a groan. *The funeral, as he desired, was Mohamedan*, conducted with all proper regard to the respectable rank which he held in the eyes of the natives.' If he were really a Mohamedan, it was natural for him to desire to be buried according to the Mohamedan law, and certainly if the Christians had not complied with the request, the Government would have compelled them to do it. It was not likely that it should permit the Christians to defraud the Musselmans of the honor of such a proselyte. But it is evident that they left him without reserve under the care of the British consul and in the hands of his countrymen, who had the fullest opportunity of exercising their abilities for his re-conversion. He seems to have had no interest to prejudice him in favor of Mohamedanism, but on the contrary, he thought it necessary to conceal it from his Christian employers, from whom he received his support.

"If his biographer may be credited, he appears to have been a man of the highest principle and most excellent character. Among other amiable traits recorded of this apostate infidel, as he will be called, he reduced himself to absolute and complete poverty, by giving up his patrimonial inheritance, £1,000, for the maintenance of his mother."—Higgins' Apology, p. 106, edited in 1829 at London.

goest unto סְפָרָה Saphar سفار, a mount of the East." "The theory of Burckhardt makes Mesha the same with Muza, a port of the Joktanite Sabeans, near the mouth of the Arabian gulf, and understands by Saphar, the Djebal, or hill country of Yemen, where Ptolemy locates the city of Saphar, and a people named the Sapharitæ." But the Rev. Mr. Forster considers the locality thus defined by Burckhardt, and which is about one hundred and fifty miles in extent, to be "altogether inadequate to the most moderate rational estimate of the boundaries of one of the most numerous of the patriarchal families," and endeavours, but upon very weak grounds, to disperse them up to the mountains of Nedjed. The truth, however, of the whole, is that the sacred writer has not assigned the limit of the Joktanite settlement, but has merely pointed out the direction in which it lay.

Joktan was blessed with thirteen sons,—אַלְמוֹדָד Almodad المودا, שֶׁלֶף Sheleph شلف, חֲצַרְמָוֶת Hazramaveth حضرماوث, יֶרַח Jerah يرح, הֲדוֹרָם Hadoram هدورام, אוּזָל Uzal اوزال, דִּקְלָה Diklah دقلاء, עוֹבָל Obal عوبال, אֲבִימָאֵל Abimael ابيمائيل, שְׁבָא Sheba شبا, אוֹפִר Ophir اوفر, חֲוִילָה Havilah حويلاء, יוֹבָב Jobab يوباب. The whole tribe of the Arabul Ariba, together with its various branches and offshoots are, as we shall hereafter show, the descendants of the above named personages.

Almodad المودا. The family of this patriarch settled in Yemen, or Arabia Felix, and in the district extending to the South of Behrein, and is identical with the Almodaei noticed by Ptolemy as a central people of Arabia Felix.

Sheleph شلف. He settled in the western portion of mount Zames, or in the extensive plain lying between Kasym and Madina. This nation is the same as the Salepheni tribes of Ptolemy. It is known to the Arabians by the designation of Beni Saleph, this being the Greek form of the Hebrew name Sheleph.

Hazramaveth حضرماوث. This tribe selected for its abode the

fertile province stretching along the Arabian gulf, and which bears the name of this tribe up to the present day. The people of this tribe were known to the Greeks and Romans for their extensive commerce, their skill in navigation, and courage in war.

Hadoram هدورام. Omitting Jerah, as we shall have to describe him at some length at the conclusion of this part of our subject, we proceed to say that the descendants of Hadoram, taking an eastern direction, settled in that locality. The town of Hadrama is one of the many vestiges of this tribe. Abulfeda says that the province of Darkaramatab owes its origin to this tribe.

Uzal اوزال. This family settled in Ozal, the present Sanaa, in the rich and fertile province of Yemen (Ezek. xxvii. 19).

Diklah دقلاه. This tribe likewise settled in Yemen and gave origin to the Dhul Khalaah, a people of Yemen, noticed by Pocock.

Obal عوبال. His traces are not to be found in Arabia, and the Rev. Mr. Forster asserts that this tribe migrated to Africa.

Abimael ابيمائيل. Many traces noticed by various persons testify to the settlement of this tribe in the vicinity of Beni Saleph and Hedjaz.

Sheba شبا. Although he also, proceeding towards the South, settled in Yemen, yet he is not the founder of the kingdom of the Yemenite Sabeans nor of the cities of Mareb and Saba, as was long supposed to be the case by many writers, for it was another Sheba, known by another name—that of Abdol Shams عبدالشمس who founded the above kingdom and towns, and whom we shall mention hereafter.

Ophir اوفر. This tribe settled to the East of Saba, in the province of Oman, where their traces are still to be found in the city of Ophir (1 Kings ix. 28).

Havilah حويلاه. This patriarch settled due North of Mareb.

Jobab يوباب. He also proceeded in the direction of Mareb,

and settled thereabouts. The Jobaritæ tribe mentioned by Ptolemy, and the Beni Jabbar of the Arabs, claim him for ancestor.

The various offshoots and branches of tribes that issued from one source in Arabia were called by separate names only, either on account of the great power and numbers of the tribe *en masse*, or in consequence of the celebrity of, and the wonderful deeds performed by, some person of the tribe, whence it is obvious that the descendants of the above named personages did not perform any great action entitling them to assume names proper to themselves, and therefore did not separate into branches. But this is by no means the case with Jerah, whom we shall now proceed to treat of at some length.

Jerah يرح. Arabian geographers mention two persons from among the numerous sons of Joktan, namely, Yarab يعرب and Jorham جرهم. Several historians are of opinion that Yarab and Jerah were identical, it being a rule that *j* is changed into *y* and *vice versâ*, but respecting Jorham opinions are divided, some saying one thing and some another. The majority, however, of them maintained that Yarab and Jorham were two distinct sons of Jerah, an opinion held by Strabo and by George Sale. In one passage of his work, however, Abulfeda represents Yarab and Jorham as two distinct individuals, while in another one, where he describes the various offshoots of the different tribes of Arabia, he names Jorham as the sole progenitor of all the sects, thereby implying that the different branches of Yareb's descendants were also included in the Bano Jorham one, and hence that Yarab and Jorham were one and the same individual.

Oriental historians have left the question open and unsettled, but the Rev. Mr. Forster has very ably proved Jorham and Yarab to be identical, when enumerating the "several undoubted forms, ancient and modern, of this patriarchal name," he says that "in the LXX. it is written *Jarach*, by St. Jerome *Jare*, by the modern Arabs *Jerha* or *Serha* (pronounced *Jerchä* and

Seecha), and also, as shall presently be shown, *Sherah*, or *Sheradje*, or *Zohran*." Having shown the identity of these supposed different appellations, according to orthographical rules, he proceeds to state "that the testimony universally and immemorially borne by the Arabs themselves to the identity of their Jorham with Jorah, the son of Joktan, is . . . signally illustrated and historically confirmed by the occurrence, in Ptolemy, of the unaltered Scriptural name, in an example to which we have had frequent reason to refer, his Insula Jerachaeori, or island of Beni Jerah; an island lying off the coast, in this very quarter of Hedjaz."

We have also not the least hesitation in accepting the identity of Jorham and Jorah, and in our genealogical table of the Arabul Ariba we shall mention them as one and the same individual—*Yarah* يرح, or *Yarab* يعرب, or *Jerah* جرح, or *Jorham* جرهم. In the chronicles of the Arabul Ariba, much is said respecting the descendants of this patriarch. It was his posterity that, splitting up into various sects, performed wonderful deeds and founded powerful kingdoms. To fix, however, the date of these achievements and of the foundation of these kingdoms, is the most difficult part in writing the annals of Arabia; first, because the time fixed by the oral traditions, being in every way subject to mistakes and blunders, must not be accepted as wholly credible; secondly, because the Arabian historians have borrowed the chronology of these events from the Septuagint Pentateuch, which is altogether at variance with the Hebrew Pentateuch, this latter being acknowledged as authentic by almost every Christian power; thirdly, because the Arabian historians have occasioned great confusion by blending together promiscuously the two chronologies, derived respectively from the oral traditions and the Septuagint Pentateuch, fixing the time of some events according to one, and of others according to the other. Hence it is no easy task to surmount the difficulties so rife in the history of Arabia.

To decide this intricate and therefore difficult question, we have availed ourselves of the three following sources: First, the Hebrew Pentateuch, now generally accepted by almost every enlightened nation, which has based history upon the chronology given in the above work. Taking the Hebrew Pentateuch for a basis, and relying upon this chronology, they have produced various works, and have engaged in many disputes, whether on the subject of religion, history, geology, zoology, or any other of the sciences; for which reason we have also thought it advisable to follow the same chronology in this our own work. Secondly, we have adopted the plan of comparing the several events that occurred in Arabia with those contemporaneous ones which befell the Israelites, whose history is given in the Scriptures, and by this means we have succeeded in fixing the tolerably correct chronology of the events that occurred in Arabia. Thirdly, some historical occurrences that took place in Arabia were connected with those of other countries—Persia, Italy, and Egypt, for instance: countries whose history and whose chronology of events that occurred there are tolerably well known to the world, besides which the dates of various events that happened in Arabia itself are known to a certainty; for which reason we have adopted two chronologies as landmarks to direct us in the course of our enquiry.

Joktan قحطان was the first who became king in Arabia,[1] and who made his metropolis in the rich and fertile province of Yemen. Being the brother of Peleg, the date of his birth is, therefore, not very remote from that of the latter, viz., about 1757 A.M. or 2200 A.C. After the confusion of tongues, in consequence of the building of the tower of Babel, Nimrod, the son of Cush, became king of Babylon or Assyria, and Ham the father of Misraim, that of Egypt, and it was at this very period that

[1] اول من نزل اليمن قحطان بن عابر بن شالح و قحطان المذ كور اول من ملك ارض اليمن و لبس التاج * ابو الفدا *

Joktan became monarch of Yemen, the date being 1771 A.M. or 1234 A.C.

Jerah or Jorham يعرب ياجرهم succeeded his father, nor is there the least doubt of his having possessed the provinces of Yemen and Hedjaz, then known by the name of Beni Jorham. The Rev. Mr. Forster and many other historians agree in this, an admission, the correctness of which is also proved by the identity of the names of many places found in those provinces. With the view of establishing this patriarch's settlement in Yemen, the above named author adduces a very sound proof in the fact that the former was designated "Abu Yemen," or "Father of Yemen."

Upon the death of Jorham, his throne was filled by his son Yashhab يشحب, who was in his turn succeeded by his son Abdol-shams عبدالشمس, surnamed Saba the Great سبا اكبر. This prince founded the kingdom of the Yemenite Sabeans, as well as the cities of Saba or Mareb, and was succeeded by his son Hymiar حمير.[1]

Now Hymiar being the fourth in descent from Joktan, and Terah, the fourth also, in descent from Peleg, we are justified in concluding that the former's birth could not have been very remote from that of the latter, *i.e.* 1878 A.M. or 2126 A.C.

Terah had three sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haram, and as Hymiar also had three sons, Wasil, Auf, and Malik, the

[1] ثم مات قحطان و ملك بعده ابنه يعرب بن قحطان . . . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه يشحب بن يعرب ثم ملك بعده ابنه عبد شمس بن يشحب . . . . و سمي سبا و هو الذي بنا السُدَّ بارض مارب . . . . و بنى مدينه مارب و عرفت مدينه سبا . . . . و خلف سبا المذ كور عدة اولاد منهم حمير و عمرو و كهلان و اشعر و غيرهم . . . . و لما مات سبا ملك اليمن بعده ابنه حمير ابن سبا * ابو الفدا *

descendants of Terah and of Hymiar may consequently be considered as having belonged to one and the same period, viz., that of 1948 A.M. or 2056 A.C.

Wasil begat Suksak, and Auf begat Pharan; now, taking into consideration, first, the length of time usually assigned for one generation or succession of natural descent; and secondly, the date of the birth of Lot, the son of Haran, that of Suksak and Pharan may be fixed as having occurred in 1778 A.M. or 2126 A.C., that is, thirty years before the birth of Abraham.

Wasil واثل succeeded his father,[1] and Auf settled somewhere between the countries of Hedjaz and Nedjed, a circumstance proved by the mountains lying westward of Nedjed being called to this very day the *Auf mountains*.[2] Pharan, the son of Auf, settled in his father's neighbourhood, that is, in the extensive plain wherein holy Mecca now stands, and it was upon this account that the name of *Pharan* was given not only to the vast northern desert, extending as far as Kadesh, but also to the mountains therein situated. All Oriental historians, as well as every traditionist, confirm this fact, as do also the Scriptures, which distinctly state that the name of Paran was given to the locality in question. Intending to pursue this subject more at length under the head of Arabul Mostaariba, we shall now proceed to say somewhat respecting Pharan, the son of Auf.

[1] ثم ملك بعده (اي بعد حمير) ابنه و اثل ابن حمير ثم ملك بعده ابنه السكسك بن و اثل ثم ملك بعده يعفر بن السكسك ثم وثب علي ملك اليمن ذورياش و هو عامر بن باران (فاران) (پاران) (باران) بن عوف بن حمير * ابو الفدا *

[2] عوف بفتح اوله و سكون ثانيه و اخره فاء جبل بنجد . . . . وعوق بالفتح ارض في ديار غطفان بين نجد و خيبر * مراصد الا طلاع علي اسماء الا مكنة و البقاع *

In his "History of Arabia," Abulfeda states that Pharan was the son of Auf. This history, together with its Latin translation, was reprinted in 1831, having for title "Abulfedæ Historia Anteislamica Arabice," its editor being Henricus Orthobius Fleischer. Now, as in the text at page 114, the word Pharan is printed thus باران, in the Arabic, the initial letter being without any *point*, we are left entirely in doubt whether the letter be an *f*, a *b*, or a *p*, the only three forms it can admit of; notwithstanding, however, this omission of the point, it is certain that the word can be no other than Pharan فاران.

When Arabic writers pronounce the initial *f* of a word as *f*, they write the word with that letter, but when the initial letter has the sound of *p* they pronounce it as *b*, because they have no *p* in their alphabet. For the same reason, Abulfeda has written the word *baran* باران with *b*, which is shown by the Latin translation having, in his version, BARANI: no doubt, therefore, can possibly remain that the son of Auf was Pharan.

Nothing occurred in the locality where Auf settled, to lessen or sully, in any way, whatever celebrity he had acquired, on which account the place still bears the name of that patriarch. This was, however, by no means the case with the locality where Pharan settled, for it was decreed that an event should there occur destined to overshadow and eclipse whatever had before claimed the respect and reverence of the Arabians, an event which was to make the celebrity of Pharan pale before the holy name of God, and to be ultimately wholly superseded by it.

Wasil was succeeded by his son Suksak سکسک, who was, in his turn, succeeded by his son Yafur یعفر. His cousin, Aamir-i-zooriash عامر ذوریاش, the son of Pharan, the son of Auf, and who had settled in Hedjaz, invaded Yafur's dominions and conquered them. But Noman نعمان, Yafur's son, having succeeded in expelling the usurper, and driving him back to Hedjaz, recovered his kingdom, an achievement which gained for him the surname

of Almoafer المعافر.[1] Employing the same method by which we have ascertained the date of the birth of so many personages, we find that the births of Yafur, the son of Suksak, of Aamir, the son of Pharan, and of Abraham, took place nearly at the same time, that is, in 2008 A.M. or 1996 A.C. Now, taking into consideration the natural course of succession or descent, we can easily discover the date of the birth of Noman, which was in 2038 A.M. or 1966 A.C.

Forty-five years after this last period, Abraham was called from Ur of the Chaldees, to Haran in Mesopotamia, a period all the circumstances connected with which lead us to the conclusion that the battle between Aamir and Noman must have been fought in it. Hence, also, it may be inferred that this was the time when Noman expelled Aamir from Yemen and ascended his paternal throne, viz., 2083 A.M. or 1921 A.C. Noman was succeeded by his son[2] Ashmah اشمح whose kingdom was invaded by Shaddad شداد, by whom he was also defeated and driven into exile. Shaddad acquired great power and renown, and succeeded in firmly establishing his authority. He built many splendid edifices, whose ruins are still to be seen.[3]

[1] ثم نهض من بني و اثل النعمٰن بن يعفربن السكسك بن و اثل بن حمير و اجتمع عليه الناس و طرد عامر بن ياران عن الملك و استقل النعمٰن المذكور بملك اليمن و لقب نعمان المذكور بالمعافر * ابو الفدا *

[2] ثم ملك بعده ابنه ا شمح بن المعافر المذكور ثم ملك بعده شداد بن عاد بن الماطاط بن سبا و اجتمع له الملك و غزا البلاد الي ان بلغ اقصي المغرب و بني المداين و المصانع و ابقي الاثار الغطيمه * ابو الفدا *

[3] The Rev. Mr. Forster, when dealing with the subject of Adite inscriptions discovered in various parts of Arabia, mentions the ancient ruins of Nakabul-Hajar in Hazramout. The ruins of Hassan Ghorab are also not less conspicuous than those above mentioned. The ruins of some edifices in Aden claim great antiquity, and have excited much curiosity, and are assigned to the Adites. The few remains of reservoirs, generally called tanks, that are still to be seen in Aden,

The name of Shaddad is so famous as to be familiar to almost every Oriental, and there are many wonderful stories and traditions concerning him, his magnificence and power. He was one of the descendants of Matat, the son of Abdol-shams, surnamed Saba the Great, the name of his (Shaddad's) father being Ad عاد. Many historians have confounded this Ad with the former personage of that name, and have thus referred to him various traditions which really belonged to the former Ad, and *vice versâ*.

For the purpose of distinguishing these two Ads, one from the other, we shall henceforth designate the Ad now in question, as the third of that name عاد ثالث.

In Oriental histories we find only two names in the interval occurring between Shaddad and Saba the Great, the one being that of Ad عاد, and the other of Matat ماطاط, whereas there should have been five, at least. The reason of this omission of the links connecting the above two names is that the said historians were indebted for the names of persons to the bardic songs of the early Arabians, and that these latter were accustomed to celebrate the names of those persons only who had rendered themselves famous by some great achievements.

In our genealogical table of the Arabul-Aribah, we have marked with an asterisk those places where we suspect names have been omitted, or where the historians themselves have acknowledged such omission.

It is impossible to fix, with any degree of accuracy, the time of Shaddad's obtaining the supremacy over the Yemenites, as well as that of his taking the reins of government into his own hands, but, nevertheless, we can safely say that a few years after Noman's ascending the throne, or a short, very short, time after his death, there broke out a war among the five kings of Syria. The holy Scriptures inform us that the effects of this

and whose antiquity attracts the attention and curiosity of every traveller, are reported to have been constructed by Shaddad. In addition to the ruins already mentioned there have been discovered many others which testify to the antiquity of the edifices themselves and that of their founder.

war were felt even in Arabia itself, inasmuch as they state that "Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him, smote . . . . the Horites in their mount Seir سيعر, unto El-paran ايل پاران, which is by the wilderness, and they returned and came to En-mishpat, which is Kadesh" (Gen. xiv. 5, 6, 7). That the invaders must have come down from the North of Kadesh appears evident, because the Seir mountains themselves lie northward of that place; and that they penetrated far southward of Kadesh into Paran, which is designated as Hedjaz, even up to the present time, is equally so; for if this had not been the case, the assertion that the invaders returned from Paran to Kadesh would have no meaning whatever. Neither is it correct to represent them as having proceeded westward, because in that direction lived the Amalekites, with whom these invaders fought after their return to Kadesh from their first expedition.

At that time the sovereign authority of Ishmah extended over the province of Yemen and Hedjaz, and as it was only the very commencement of his reign, it is natural to suppose that his power was somewhat weakened by the above mentioned invasion, whence it may be concluded that, tempted by this enfeebled and distracted state of the Yemenite kingdom, Shaddad, who was ever on the watch for such an opportunity, might have come down upon Ishmah, and, stripping him of his sovereignty, usurped the throne. For these reasons we are induced to believe that Ishmah came to the throne in A.M. 2091 or A.C. 1913, and also that Shaddad usurped the crown A.M. 2092 or A.C. 1912, a time fully coinciding with the period usually assigned to one generation.

After Shaddad,[1] his throne was successively occupied by his

[1] ثم ملك بعده اخوه لقمان بن عاد ثم ملك بعده اخوه ذو سدد بن عاد ثم ملك بعده ابنه الحرث بن ذي سدد و يقال له الحارث الرايش * ابو الفدا *

two brothers, Lokman لقمان and Zoo Shudud ذو شدد, the latter being succeeded by his son Alharith الحارث. Up to this time, and long after it, there were two independent kingdoms, that of Yemen and the other of Hazramout. One Alharith الحارث الرايش, surnamed the Conqueror, having united these two kingdoms under one sovereignty, several historians have, therefore, mistaken this Alharith of Yemen, for the former one, and have mentioned him as having effected the union of the two kingdoms; the consequence of this mistake being that the names of those kings who reigned between the two Alhariths have been omitted by almost every historian, and have thus been lost; so that, taking into consideration the time elapsed, the kings whose names are known will be found too few. Hamza Isphehanee[1] حمزه اصفهانی says in his history, that Alharith the Conqueror was not the son and successor of Zoo Shudud, but one of the dynasty of Hazramout. It is a matter of regret that this author does not also enummerate the kings whose names have been lost; but his mentioning the fact that fifteen generations elapsed between Hymiar and Alharith the Conqueror, enables us to fix the time accurately.

If we rely upon the above author's statement, we are led to conclude that after Alharith, the son of Shudud, there must have lived seven or eight kings before the time of Alharith the Conqueror.

Alharith the Conqueror was the son of Kais, the son of Saifee, the son of Saba the younger, one of the descendants

[1] الحارث الرايش هو الحارث بن قيس بن صيفي بن سبا الاصغر الحميري و كان الريش اول غزا منهم فاصاب الغنائم و ادخلها ارض اليمن فارتاشت حمير في ايامه و كان هو الذي راشهم فبذلك سمي الرايش و بين الرايش و بين حمير خمسة عشرابًا * تاريخ سني ملوك الارض و الا بنياء لحمزه اصفهاني *

of Hymiar, and he succeeded, as before said, in uniting the two kingdoms of Yemen and Hazramout, on which account he received the title of Raish رايش or Tubba I. تبع الاول.[1]

After him the throne was successively occupied by Saab صعب, surnamed Zool Karnain ذوالقرنين; Abraha, surnamed Zool-manar ابرهه ذاولمنار and Ifreequs افريقس; Amar, surnamed Zool-azaar عمرذوالاذعار.

During the reign of the last mentioned sovereign, the kingdom was invaded by Shurhabeel شرحبيل, who, after fighting many bloody battles, defeated the reigning monarch, and seized upon the government. Shurhabeel was succeeded by his son Alhadhad الهدهاد, who was himself succeeded by Belkees ملكه بالقيس, a queen who, after reigning twenty years, married Solomon, king of the Jews. The end of this queen's reign is correctly known through the Scriptures, and occurred A.M. 3000 or A.C. 1005, so that according to the natural course of generations, Alharith the Conqueror and Saab Zool Karnain must have flourished either at the close of the 28th or the commencement of the 29th century A.M., or A.C. 1200.

Ibn-i-Saeed-i Maghrabee[2] ابن سعيد مغربى relates that Ibn-i-Abbas having been asked concerning the Zool Karnain mentioned in the Holy Koran, answered that he was Saab of the

[1] ثم ملك بعده ابنه ذوالقرنين الصعب بن الرايش ثم ملك بعده ابنه ذوالمنار ابرهه بن ذي القرنين ثم ملك بعده ابنه افريقس بن ابرهه ثم ملك بعده اخوه ذوالاذعار عمرو بن ذوالمنار ثم ملك بعده شرحبيل بن عمرو بن غالب بن المنتات بن زيد بن يعفر بن السكسك بن وائل بن حمير. . . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه الهدهاد بن شرحبيل ثم ملكت بعده بنته بلقيس بنت الهد هاد و بقيت في ملك اليمن عشرين سنة وتزوجها سليمان بن داود * ابو الفدا *

[2] و قدنقل ابن سعيد المغربي ان ابن عباس سئل عن ذي القرنين

Hymiarite dynasty. On this authority, Abulfeda states that it was this Zool Karnain who is mentioned in the Holy Koran, and not Alexander the Great..

An important undertaking, that is, the building of Sud[1] سد, or an immense wall, was completed in the reign of this Zool Karnain. The history of the Yemenite kings informs us that this wall was begun by Saba the Great, continued by his son and successor Hymiar, and finished by Zool Karnain, and that it stood between two mountains, the one called Mareb, and the other Ablack.[2]

After Belkees, her cousin Malik, surnamed Nashir-on-naam مالك ناشرالنعم, came to the throne, and was succeeded by his son Shimar-i-Burash شمر برعش, who was in his turn succeeded by his son Abu Malik ابو مالك. The domains of this prince

الذي ذكره الله تعالي في كتابه العزيز فقال هو من حمير وهو الصعب المذكور فيكون ذوالقرنين المذكور في الكتاب العزير هو الصعب (بن) الرايش المذكور لا الا سكندر الرو مي * ابو الفدا *

[1] و كان اول من اسس السد سبا الا كبرو اسمه عامروقيل عبد شمش بن يشحب بن يعرب بن قحطان ثم بناه حمير ابن سبا بعد موت ابيه ثم اتمه بعد ذلك ذوالقرنين الحميري و هو الصعب بن ابي مرايد و كان السد من جبل مارب الي جبل الا بلق و هما جبلان منيفان علي الجبال الشا مخه الممتد من يمين السد و شمال * العقود اللو لويه في اخبار دولة الرسو ليه يمني *

[2] ثم ملك بعد ها عمها ناشر النعم بن شرحبيل . . . . ثم ملك بعده شمر برعش بن نا شر النعم . . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه ابو مالك بن شمر ثم ملك بعده عمران بن عامر الازدي . . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه مزيقيا * ابو الفدا *

were invaded by Imran عمران ازدي, one of the dynasty of Uzd, who defeated the reigning king and seized the throne, thus transferring the regal power from the house of Bani Hymiar to that of Bani Kahlan. Imran was succeeded by his brother Amar, surnamed Mazeekiah عمر مزيقيا.[1]

Alakran الاقرن, the son of Abu Malik, having recovered the dominions of his father, the crown came, for the second time, into the power of the Hymiar dynasty.

After him, his son Zoohabshan ذو حبشان came to the throne, and after him, his brother Tubba the Great تبع اكبر ascended the it and was succeeded by his son Kaleekurb كليكرب, after whom came his son Abu Kurub Asad ابو كرب اسعد, or Tubba II. Hassan حسان the son of Tubba II. next came to the throne; he was succeeded by his brother Amar-zool Aavad عمر ذوالا عواد who was succeeded by his son Abd-i-Kalal عبد كلال. Tubba III. تبع اصغر, son of Hassan, snatched the reins of government from the hands of the reigning monarch, and was succeeded by his nephew Harith حارث, the son of Amar.

All historians agree that Harith embraced the Jewish religion. He was succeeded by Mursad مرثد, son of Kalal, and after him, Vakiyah وكيعة, Mursad's son, came to the throne.

[1] ملك الاقرن بن ابي مالك ثم ملك بعده ذو حبشان بن الاقرن . . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه تبع بن الاقرن ثم ملك بعده ابنه كليكرب بن تبع ثم ملك بعده ابوكرب اسعد و هو تبع اوسط و قتل ثم ملك بعده ابنه حسان بن تبع . . . . ثم قتله اخوه عمرو بن تبع و ملك . . . . فسمي ذالا عواد ثم ملك بعده عبد كلال ابن ذوي الا عواد ثم ملك بعده تبع بن حسان ابن كليلرب و هو تبع الا صغر ثم ملك بعده ابن اخته الحارث بن عمرو و تهود الحارث المذكور ثم ملك بعده مرثد ابن كلال . . . . . ثم ملك بعده و كيعه ابن مرثد * ابو الفدا *

The period in which these kings reigned can be somewhat accurately ascertained from the circumstance of Harith, the son of Amar, embracing Judaism. It appears that when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Palestine, destroyed Jerusalem, and carried Daniel and his friends captives to Babylon, some Jews fled to Yemen. At this time Jeremiah and Daniel were prophets, and it seems highly probable, therefore, of its having been through the instrumentality of these fugitive Jews that Alharith acknowledged the unity of the Godhead. It may, therefore, we think, be accepted as a fact that Alharith and Vakiyah reigned about this time, namely, A.M. 3400 or A.C. 604. This computation will be found the more worthy of credit, if the natural course of generations be taken into consideration, because we have stated above that Malik-Nashiron-naam ascended the throne A.M. 3001. Between Malik and Vakiyah eleven other kings held sway, the aggregate of whose reigns may reasonably be supposed to be that of 400 years.

After Vakiyah, six more kings of the Hymiar dynasty came to the throne, namely, Abraha,[1] son of Sabbah ابرهه بن الصباح; Sahban, son of Mohrith صهبان بن محرث; Amar, son of Tubba عمر ابن تبع; Zoo-Shanatir ذو شناتر; Zoo-Navas, surnamed Zoo-Akhdood ذو نواس ذو اخدود; and Zoo-Jadan ذو جدن. As the family line of these kings is not clearly ascertained, we have not ventured to insert their names in our genealogical table of the Arabul Aribah, but have been contented with making some mention of them in a note. The precise period when they reigned can be ascertained. Zoo-nawas was a fanatical Jew who used to burn alive the followers of every other creed. There

[1] ثم ملك ابرهه بن الصباح ثم ملك صهبان بن محرث ثم ملك عمر بن تبع ثم ملك بعده ذو شناتر ثم ملك بعده ذو نواس و كان من لايتهود القاه في اخدود مضطرم نارا فقيل له صاحب الا خدود ثم ملك بعده ذو جدن و هو اخر ملوك الحمير * ابو الفدا *

is good reason for concluding that this was the same period as that when Artaxerxes Ochus sent into Hyrcania several Jews whom he had taken prisoners in Egypt, for their country adjoined Egypt, and as the aforesaid king was himself a Jew, his power also received a severe blow, by being deprived of his kingdom by the Africans, who thenceforth became the dominant people; therefore this period appears to be, in every respect, the last belonging to this dynasty. This period is that of A.M. 3650 or A.C. 354.[1]

From this date, up to the birth of our Prophet, there are altogether 920 years, during which period reigned the African people, called Arbaat-i-Habshah ارباط حبشه, as well as some of the Arabul Mustaaribah عرب المستعربه and the Abrahas ابرهه.

Oriental historians have fallen into error by supposing that the Arbaat-i-Habshah and the Abrahas were only two individuals, and having stated in consequence of this mistake that there were only two kings. The Arbaat-i-Habshah and Abrahas were family names, and were respectively used as prenomens for all the kings of these dynasties.

Of the Abraha house, one was called Ashram, the Abraha ابرهه اشرم صاحب الفيل who invaded Mecca A.M. 4570, or A.D. 570. He took with him a great number of elephants for the purpose of razing the temple of Mecca to the ground. After him his son Musrook the Abraha ابرهه مسروق ascended the throne, but was deprived of his kingdom by Saif the Hymiarite سيف بن ذى يزن حميرى, who, as will be seen, was much aided

[1] من كتاب ابن سعيد المغربي ان الحبشه استولوا علي اليمن بعد ذي جدن الحميري المذكور و كان اول من ملك اليمن من الحبشه ارباط ثم ملك بعده ابرهة الا شرم صاحب الفيل الذي قصد مَكَّة ثم ملك بعده يكسوم ثم ملك بعده مسروق بن ابرهه و هو اخر من ملك اليمن من الحبشة ثم عاد ملك اليمن الي حميرو ملكها سيف بن ذي يزن الحمبري * ابو الفدا *

by the Kysra Nowsherwan of Persia. After this, the supremacy of the Abraha dynasty became extinct.

Saif being the son of Zee Yazan, of the royal family of Hymiar, naturally considered himself as the rightful heir of the kingdom of Yemen. At first, he applied for assistance to the then reigning Emperor of Rome, and remained in that city for ten years urging his suit, but his hopes being disappointed, he left it and repaired to Kysra Nowsherwan, whom he entreated to assist him.

This monarch, acceding to his wish, furnished him with a large army, which defeated his rival, put an end to the Abraha dynasty, and reseated Saif on the throne.

He fixed his abode in the royal palace of Ghamdam غمدان, and gave himself up to licentious and dissolute living. The poets of his time highly eulogised this monarch, and as some historical facts are to be found in their verses, we shall here make a few quotations from them.

لا تقصد الناس الا كابن ذي يزن اذ خيم البحر للاعدآء احوالا

Ad homines cave accedas, nisi quo modo accessit Dhu-Jazani filius, quando mare ingressus est, hostibus suis perniciem ut strueret.

وافي هرقل وقد شالت نعامته فلم يجد عنده النصر الذي سالا

Heraclius quidem adiit, sedibus patriis : relictis sed ab eo auxilium non tulit quod flagitavit.

ثم انتحى نحو كسرى بعد عاشرة من السنين يهين النفس و المالا

Annis decem elapsis ad Cosroem se contulit, nihil animam suam vel divitias curans.

حتي اتي ببنى الا حرار يقد مهم تخا لهم فوق متن الارض اجبالا

Sicque tandem filios ingenuorum adduxit, quibus ipse præerat, qui montes videbantur esse terræ dorso insidentes.

لله درهم من فتية صُمر ما ان رايت لهم في الناس امثالا

Fortes, mehercle, strenuique juvenes erant, quorum, similes frustra inter homines quaesieris.

بيض مرازبةٌ غلـــبٌ اســـاورةٌ أُسْدٌ تُربَّت في الغيضات اشبالا

Splendidi, principes, prævalentes, equites, leones qui, dum catuli adhuc erant, in sylvis et saltibus sunt educati.

فاشرب هنياً عليك التاج مرتفقاً براس غمدانَ داراً منك محلالا

Itaque caput diademate cinctus, cubito innixus, in celsa Ghamdani arce, quam sedem tibi elegisti, favente fortuna, genio indulgeas.

تلك المكارم لا قعبان من لبـن شيبا بماءٍ فعادا بعـــد أبـــو الا

Haec sunt fortium gaudia, non vero duo lactis pocula, quæ aqua commixta, mox in urinam resoluta diffluunt.

Saif[1] was assassinated by some of his African courtiers, after which Kysra Nowsherwan annexed this province to his own dominions, governing it by a satrap; the last of these governors was named Bazan باذان, and embraced the Mohammedan faith.

Among the Arabul Aribah, the house of Kahtan also acquired great power and renown, and founded a mighty kingdom in the province of Hyarah حيرة.[2]

The first king of this house was *Malik* مالك, son of Fahm, after whom the throne was occupied by his brother *Amar* عمرو.

Next came to the crown, *Josaimah* جذيمة, the son of Malik, who was an energetic but ambitious prince, and who, after successfully consolidating his power, extended his dominions as far as the banks of the Euphrates on one side, and on the other

[1] و كان سيف بن ذي يزن المذكور تداصطفي جماعة من الحبشان و جعلهم من خاصته فاغتالوه و قتلوه فارسل كسري عاملاً علي اليمن و استمرت عمال كسري علي اليمن الي ان كان اخرهم باذان الذي كان علي عهد النبي صلي الله عليه و سلم و اسلم * ابو الفدا *

[2] اول من ملك علي العرب بارض الحيرة مالك بن فهم . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه عمرو بن فهم ثم ملك بعده ابن اخيه جذيمه بن مالك بن فهم . . . و كانت له اخت تسمي رقاش * ابو الفدا *

up to the frontiers of Syria. In the latter course of his progress he was opposed by the Amalekites, whom he defeated in a hot and bloody engagement. The sister of this prince, Rakkash رقاش, is reported to have married a certain Adi, a member of the house of Lakhm. Josaimah[1] was succeeded by his nephew *Amar* عمر ابن عدى, the son of Adi, who was, in his turn, succeeded by his son *Imra-ul-Kais I.* امرو القيس اول. After him his son *Amar* عمر ascended the throne, who was, however, soon deprived of his kingdom by *Aus* اوس, the son of Kelam, one of the house of the Amalekites. After Aus one or two other kings of the same family ruled over the country, but their names are unknown. This much, however, is certain, that *Imra-ul-Kais II.* امروالقيس ثانى, son of Amar, very soon recovered the dominions lost by his brother, restoring once more the reins of power to his own family. He was the first who introduced the barbarous custom of burning men alive, on which account he received the opprobrious surname of *Mohrik* المحرق (one who burns men alive), and was succeeded by *Noman* نعمان, who being disgusted with the cares and turmoil

[1] لماقتل جذيمه ملك بعده ابن اخته عمرو بن عدي بن نصر بن ربيعه . . . ثم مات و ملك بعده ابنه امروالقيس. . . و كان يقال لامروالقيس البَدَا اي الاول ثم ملك بعد امرو القيس ابنه عمرو بن امراوالقيس . . . ثم ملك بعده اوس بن قلام العمليقي ثم ملك اخر من العماليق ثم رجع الملك الي بني عمرو بن عدي بن نصر بن ربيعه اللخميين المذكورين و ملك منهم امراوالقيس من ولد عمرو بن امروالقيس المذكور و يعرف هذا امروالقيس الثاني بالمحرق لانه اول من عاقب بالنار ثم ملك بعده ابنه النعمان الاعور بن امروالقيس . . . . . ثم تزهد و خرج من الملك . . . . ملك بعده ابنه المنذر بن نعمان . . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه الاسود بن المنذر * ابو الفدا *

of the world, relinquished the government, after having reigned thirty years, and devoted himself to religion. His son, *Almonzar I.* المنذر اول, wielded the royal sceptre after him, and was in his turn, succeeded by his son *Aswad* اسود. He fought several great battles with the kings of the Ghassan dynasty. After him his brother[1] *Almonzar II.* المنذر ثانی wore the crown, being succeeded by *Alkama Zoomailee* علقمه ذمیلی. After him *Imra-ul-Kais III.* امروالقیس ثالث, son of Noman, took the reins of government, and was succeeded by his son *Almonzar III.* المنذر ثالث surnamed Maa-os-samaa ماء السماء, who was, however, deprived of his kingdom by Kysra-Kobad, who conferred it upon *Alharth* الحرث, who was of the Kondee family, and who embraced the religion of his benefactor. But when Kysra Nowsherwan came to the throne, he deprived Alharth of the government and restored it to *Almonzar III.* المنذر ثالث, who was succeeded by his son Amar عمرو, who was succeeded by his brother *Kaboos* قابوس. After him his brother, *Almonzar IV.* المنذر رابع ascended the throne, and was succeeded by his son, *Noman-Abu-Kaboos* نعمان ابو قابوس, who became a Christian, and was slain in a celebrated battle with the Persians in the reign of Kysra Purwais. *Ayas* ایاس son of Kabeesa, of the Tay dynasty, next ascended the throne. Ayas was succeeded by *Zadooyah* زادویه, after whom *Almonzar V.* المنذر خامس, son

[1] ثم ملك بعده اخوه المندر بن المنذر بن نعمان الاعور ثم ملك بعده علقمه الذميلي ذوميل بطن من لخم ثم ملك بعده امروالقيس بن النعمان بن امروالقيس المحرق . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه المنذر بن امروالقيس . . . لقب بماء السماء . . . وطرد كسري قباذ المندر المذكور عن ملك الحيرة و ملك موضعه الحرث بن عمر بن حجر الكندي . . . ثم لما تمكن كسري انوشيروان بن قباد المذكور فى الملك طرد الحارث و اعاد المندر بن ماء السماء الي ملك الحيرة * ابو الفدا *

of Noman, became king. He was defeated and had his dominions wrested from him by the Mohamedans, commanded by Khalid-bin-i-Walid خالد ابن وليد.[1]

It is, indeed, very difficult, if not impossible, to determine accurately the period during which all these kings held supreme sway; but from among the latter of them, the exact period of the reign of two, at least, is known to a certainty, which, if the natural course of generations be taken into consideration, affords a sufficient clue for ascertaining the reigns of some of the other sovereigns.

It was in the eighth year of the reign of Amar, son of Almonzar, son of Maa-os-samaa, that Mohammed was born, and therefore this king must have ascended the throne in A.M. 4562, or A.D. 562.

Our holy prophet received the first Revelation in the sixth month of the reign of Ayas, and therefore the latter must have commenced to reign in A.M. 4610, or A.D. 610. Before Amar ascended the throne, nineteen kings held sway, the aggregate of whose reigns may reasonably be presumed to amount to about 550 years, which leads to the conclusion that Malik, the son of Fahm, the first king, ascended the throne at the commence-

[1] ثم ملك بعد المنذر عمرو مضرط الحجاره . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه قابوس . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوهما المنذر بن المنذر ثم ملك بعده ابنه النعمان بن المنذر بن المنذر بن ماء السماء و كنيته ابو قابوس و هو الذي تنصر . . . ثم انتقل . . . الي اياس ابن قبيصة الطائي . . . ثم ملك بعد اياس زادويه بن ماهسان الهمداني ثم عاد الملك الي اللخميين فملك بعد زادويه المنذر بن النعمان بن المنذر بن المنذر بن ماء السماء و سمته العرب المغرور و استمر مالكًا للحيرة الي ان قدم لها خالد بن الوليد و استولي علي الحيرة * ابو الفدا *

ment of the 41st century A.M., or about the time of the birth of Christ.

Another kingdom was founded by the Arabul Arabahs, in the province of Ghassan غسان, the rulers of it being known by the name of Arab-ush-Sham عرب الشام, or the Arabs of Syria. Strictly speaking, however, they were a sort of proconsuls appointed by the Roman emperors, but from their assuming the title of king, they are treated of under that head in the history of Arabia. As some facts which are connected with these personages greatly facilitate our investigation, we shall give a brief account of them, as well as of the kingdom entrusted to their government.

This kingdom was founded four hundred years before the Islam, a date corresponding with the commencement of the forty-third century A.M. or the third A.D.

Jofnah جفنه,[1] son of Amar, was the first of this house who assumed the title of king. He is one of the descendants of Uzd, who is also connected with the house of Kahlan. The Arabs who dwelt in Ghassan before him were called Zajaimah ضجاعمه. This people resolutely opposed him for a long time, but he ultimately succeeded in subduing and bringing them under his sway.

After him, his son Amar عمرو ascended the throne, who was succeeded by his son Saalibah ثعلبه. For a long time afterwards the regal power passed successively into the hands of *Alharith* الحارث, *Jobolah* جبله, *Alharth* الحرث, and *Almonzar the Great*

[1] اول من ملك غسان جفنة بن عمرو بن ثعلبة بن عمر بن مزيقيا . . . ثم هلك و ملك بعده ابنه عمر بن جفنه . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه ثعلبة بن عمرو . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه الحارث بن ثعلبه ثم ملك ابنه جبلة بن الحارث ثم ملك ابنه الحرث . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه المنذر الاكبر * ابو الفدا *

المنذر الاكبر, this last sovereign being succeeded by his brother *Noman* نعمان,[1] who in his turn was succeeded by his brother *Jobolah* جبله. After him his brother Al-Eeham الايهم ascended the throne, he being succeeded also by his brother Amar عمرو. After him reigned Jofnah II. جفنة الاصغر, son of Almonzar the Great. Next came his brother Noman II. نعمان الاصغر, who was succeeded by his nephew Noman III. نعمان ثالث, son of Amar. The throne was next occupied by Jobolah جبله, the son of Noman III. This king was contemporaneous with Almonzar-maa-os-Samaa, of the Hyra dynasty, and fought several battles

[1] ثم هلك المنذر الاكبر المذكور و ملك بعده اخوه النعمان ابن المحرث ثم ملك بعده اخوه جبلة بن الحارث ثم ملك بعده اخوهم الايهم بن الحارث . . . ثم ملك اخوهم عمر بن الحارث ثم ملك جفنة الاصغر . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه النعمان الاضغر ثم ملك نعمان بن عمرو بن المنذر . . . ثم ملك بعد النعمان المذكور ابنه جبلة بن النعمان . . . ثم ملك بعده النعمان ابن الايهم . . . ثم ملك اخوه المحرث ابن الايهم ثم ملك ابنه النعمان ابن المحرث . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه المنذر بن النعمان ثم ملك اخوه عمر بن النعمان ثم ملك اخوهما حجر ابن النعمان ثم ملك ابنه الحارث بن حجر ثم ملك ابنه جبلة بن المحرث ثم ملك ابنه الحارث ابن جبله ثم ملك ابنه النعمان بن المحرث و كنية ابو كرب و لقبه قطام ثم ملك بعده الايهم بن جبله . . . . ثم ملك بعده اخوه المنذر بن جبله ثم ملك اخوهما سراحيل بن جبله ثم ملك اخوهم عمرو بن جبله ثم ملك بعده ابن اخيه جبلة بن المحرث بن جبله ثم ملك بعده جبلة بن الايهم بن جبله و هواخر ملوك الغسان و هوالذي اسلم فى خلافة عمر ثم عادالي الروم و تنصر* ابو الفدا *

against him. After him Noman IV. نعمان رابع, the son of Al Eeham, came to the throne, who was succeeded by his brother Alharth II. الحرث ثانی. He was succeeded by his son Noman V. نعمان خامس, who was succeeded by his son Almonzar المنذر. The throne was next successively occupied by Amar عمرو the brother of Almonzar, and Hajar حجر the brother of Amar. After this the throne was occupied in turn by Alharith الحارث the son of Hajar, Jobolah جبله the son of Alharith, Alharith الحارث the son of Jobolah. Noman, surnamed نعمان ابوكرب Abu-Karb, the son of Alharith, Al Eeham الايهم, the uncle of Noman, next ascended the throne. Al Eeham was succeeded successively by his three brothers, viz., Almonzar المنذر, Saraheel سراحيل, and Amar عمرو. Jobolah جبله, son of Eeham, son of Jobolah, next ascended the throne. After Amar his nephew Jobolah جبله held sway. This king lived in the Khaliphate of Omar, and at first embraced Mohamedanism, but afterwards fled to Rome and became a Christian. This family ceased to reign about A.M. 4640, or A.D. 640.

Another comparatively small and ephemeral kingdom of the Arabul Aribah was founded by the descendants of Kandah كنده, of the Kahlan dynasty. The first king of this house was Hajar حجر,[1] son of Amar, who usurped a portion of the dominions of Hyra and founded a new kingdom. He was succeeded by his son Amar عمرو, who was in his turn succeeded by his son Alharth الحرث. He is the same person who embraced the religion of Kysra Kobad, and by the assistance of the latter conquered the kingdom of Hyra. But upon Kysra Nowsher-

[1] فلما ملك حجر سدد امورهم و ساسهم احسن سياسة و انتزع من اللخميين ما كان بايديهم من ارض بكر ابن و ايل . . . و ملك بعد الحجر المذكور ابنه عمرو بن حجر . . . ثم ملك بعده ابنه الحرث بن عمرو * ابو القدا *

waan's restoring it to the same Almanzor, Alharith fled to Dayar-i-Kalb ديار كلب. His sons, however, for a short time continued ruling as kings in several places: thus Hajar حجر reigned over Bani Asad بني اسد; Shraheel شراحيل over Bakr-ibn-Wail بكر ابن وايل; Madee-Kurab معدى كرب over Kais Ailan قيس عيلان; Sulmah سلمه over Tughlub and Nomar تغلب و نمر.

After Hajar, who was killed, his son Imra-ool-Kais, again brought the Bani Asad under his sway. This Imra-ool-Kais was a celebrated Arabian poet, who, when Monzar-maa-os-Samaa was replaced upon the throne of his kingdom, concealed himself through fear. All these kings reigned between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth centuries A.M., or between the fifth and sixth centuries A.D.

Another kingdom was established in Hedjaz. When the kingdoms of Yemen and Hyra became weakened by internal disturbances, the descendants of Yarab or Jorham founded a new and independent one in Hedjaz. According to Abulfeda, the first monarch of this kingdom was Jorham جرهم, whose brother Yarab ruled in Yemen. But this is a mistake, arising from that author's thinking that Yarab and Jorham were two distinct individuals. This, however, is not so, because these belonged only to one and the same person, who reigned both over Yemen and Hedjaz. The same historian mentions the names of the following persons, and states that they occupied the throne in regular succession: Yaleel يالیل,[1] Jorsham جرشم son of Yaleel;

[1] وملك اخوه (اي اخايعرب) جرهم الحجاز ثم ملك بعد جرهم ابنه عبديالیل بن جرهم ثم ابنه جرشم بن عبديالیل ثم ابنه عبدالمدان بن جرشم ثم ابنه ثعلبة بن عبدالمدان ثم ابنه عبدالمسيح بن ثعلبه ثم ابنه مضاض بن عبدالمسيح ثم ابنه عمرو بن مضاض ثم اخوه الحرث بن مضاض ثم ابنه عمرو بن الحارث ثم اخوه بشر بن الحارث ثم مضاض بن عمرو بن مضاض * ابو الفدا *

Abd-ul-Madan عبدالمدان, son of Jorsham; Thalibah ثعلبه, son of Abd-ul-Madan; Abd-ul-Maseeh عبدالمسيح, son of Thalibah; Mozaz مضاض, son of Abd-ul-Maseeh; Amar عمرو, son of Mozaz; Alharth الحرث, brother of Mozaz; Amar عمرو, son of Alharth; Bushr بشر, son of Alharth; Mozaz مضاض, son of Amar, son of Mozaz.

If it were Abulfeda's opinion that these kings flourished before Ishmael, the son of Abraham, he was entirely mistaken, because the name Abd-ul-Maseeh undoubtedly proves him to have been a Christian, and therefore he could not possibly have lived before, or have been contemporary with, Ishmael. We do not, in the least hesitate to assert that this kingdom was founded while the weak and tottering kingdoms of Yemen, Hyra, and Kandah were on the decline, and therefore we are certain that its kings must have flourished between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth centuries A.M., or the fifth and sixth centuries A.D.

It would also appear that Amar عمرو, son of Lahee, reigned over this same kingdom A.M. 4210, or at the commencement of the third century A.D. Abulfeda says that this was the person who introduced the worship of idols among the Arabs, placing three images in the Kaaba, viz., Haval هول on the top of the temple, Asaf اساف, and Naila نايله.

Like the other Arabul Aribah who settled in Hedjaz, and afterwards became kings thereof, Zohair زهير, son of Johab also assumed the royal title. This was at the time when Abraha Ashram invaded Mecca, because the former is reported to have accompanied the latter in his enterprise, and therefore the period of his reign can be easily ascertained to have been the latter part of the forty-sixth century A.M., or the sixth century A.D. The most important event of his reign was that he entirely destroyed

[1] من ملوك العرب زهير ابن جباب بن هبل ... و كان زهير المذكور قد اجتمع با برهة الاشرم صاحب الفيل * ابو الفدا *

the Bani Ghaftan and the sacred temple erected by the latter, in the fond hope that it might rival the Kaaba in sanctity.

It being almost impossible to give a genealogical table of the whole tribe of Arabul Aribah, we have therefore described those only whom we have mentioned in our work.

Almost all the Arabul Aribah whom we have fully described above belong to the Bani-Jorham stock. Their descendants, however, in the course of time, separated into various tribes, the most important of whom we now proceed to enumerate. For these particulars we have availed ourselves of Abulfeda ابو الفدا and Moarif Ibn-i-Kotaiba معارف ابن قُتيبه :

1. Yarab or Jorham = Bano Jorham بنوا جرهم.
2. Abdol-shams, son of Yashhab = Bano Saba بنوا سبا.
3. Hymiar, son of Saba = Bano Hymiar بنوا حمير.
4. Kahlan, son of Saba = Bano Kahlan بنوا كهلان.
5. Ashar, son of Saba = Asharee اشعري.
6. Anmar, son of Saba = Bano Anmar بنوا انمار.
7. Aamilah, son of Saba = Aamilee عاملي.
8. Adi, son of Anmar, son of Saba = Bano Adi بنوا عدي.
9. Lakhm, son of Adi = Lakhmee لخمي.
10. Jozam, son of Adi = Bano Jozam بنوا جذام.
11. Hadas, son of Lakhm = Bano Hadas بنوا حدس.
12. Ghanam, son of Lakhm = Bano Ghanam بنوا غنم.
13. Bano-al-dar, son of Hani of Lakham = Daree داري.
14. Ghatfan, son of Heram, son of Jozam = Bano Ghatfan بنوا غطفان.

The following are the descendants of Bano Ghatfan :

15. Bano Nadlah بنوا نضلة ; 16. Bano Ahnaf بنوا احنف ; 17. Bano Dabeeb بنوا الضبيب ; 18. Bano Hadalah بنوا هداله ; 19. Bano Nafasah بنوا نفاثه ; 20. Bano Zalee بنوا ضليع ; 21. Bano Aizah بنوا عايزه ; 22. Bano Shabrah بنوا شبره ; 23. Bano Abdullah بنوا عبدالله ; 24. Bano Khazrah بنوا الخضرا ; 25. Bano Solaim

بنوا سُليم ; 26. Bano Bejalah بنوا بجالة ; 27. Bano Ghanam بنوا غنم ; 28. Bano Falah بنوا الفالة.

29. Saad, son of Malik, son of Heram = Bano Saad بنوا سعد.

30. Wail, son of Malik = Bano Wail بنوا وايل.

The following are the descendants of Bano Saad :

31. Bano Auf بنوا عوف ; 32. Bano Aizah بنوا عايذة ; 33. Bano Fuhairah بنوا فهيرة ; 34. Bano Sabhah بنوا صبحة ; 35. Bano Akhnus بنوا الاخنس ; 36. Bano Haie بنوا حيّ.

37. Hishum, son of Jozam = Hishmee حشمي.

38. Hatamah, son of Jozam = Bano Hatamah بنوا حطمة.

The following are the descendants of Bano Anmar :

39. Khosamee خثعمي ; 40. Bojailee بجيلي ; 41. Kasree قسري ; 42. Bano Ahmas بنوا احمس.

43. Dahman, son of Amir, son of Hymiar = Dahmanee دهماني.

44. Yahsab, son of Dahman = Yahsabee يحصبي.

45. Assalf, son of Saad, son of Hymiar = Salfee سلفي.

46. Aslam, son of Saad = Aslamee اسلمي.

47. Roain, son of Harth, son of Amar, son of Hymiar = Alzeeroain آلِ ذي رُعين.

48. Kozaah, son of Malik, son of Hymiar = Bano Kozaah بنوا قضاعة.

The following are the descendants of Kozaah :

49. Kulb of Wabra = Bano Kalb بنوا كلب ; 50. Adi of Jobab = Bano Adi بنوا عدي ; 51. Olaim of Jobab = Bano Olaim بنوا عُليم ; 52. Bano Abeed بنوا العبيد ; 53. Bano Rufaidah بنوا رُفيدة ; 54. Bano Masar بنوا مصار ; 55. Bano Kain بنوا القين ; 56. Bano Saleeh بنوا سليح ; 57. Bano Tanookh بنوا تنوخ ; 58. Jarm of Rabban = Bano Jarm بنوا جرم ; 59. Rasib, son of Jarm = Rasbee راسبي ; 60. Bano Bahra بنوا بهراء ; 61. Bano Balai بنوا بلي ; 62. Bano Mahrah بنوا مهرة ; 63. Bano Azrah بنوا عذرة ; 64. Bano Saad بنوا سعد ; 65. Bano Hozaim, Abyssinian slave بنوا هذيم

عبد حبشى ; 66. Zinnah of Saad = Zinnee ضني ; 67. Salaman of Saad = Salamanee سلاماني ; 68. Bano Johainah بنوا جهينه ; 69. Bano Nahad بنوا نهد ; 70. Attababiah التبابعه.

The following are the descendants of Attababiah :

71. Zoo Kalaa ذو كلاع ; 72. Zoo Nawas ذو نواس ; 73. Zoo Asbah ذو اصبح ; 74. Zoo Jadan ذو جدن ; 75. Zoo Faish ذو فايش ; 76. Zoo Yazan ذو يزن ; 77. Zoo Jowash ذو جوش ; 78. Bano Shahool بنوا شحول.

79. Wailah, son of Hymiar = Bano Wail بنوا وايل.

80. Sakasak, son of Wailah = Bano Sakasak بنوا سكاسك.

81. Auf, son of Hymiar = Bano Auf بنوا عوف.

82. Pharan, son of Auf = Bano Pharan بنوا فاران.

83. Tay, son of Addad of Kahlan = Taee طائي.

84. Ghous, son of Addad = Ghousee غوثي.

The following are the descendants of Taee :

85. Bano Nabhan بنوا نبهان ; 86. Bano Saal بنوا ثعل ; 87. Hatimee حاتمي ; 88. Bano Sambas بنوا السنبس ; 89. Bano Tameem بنوا تميم.

90. Saur, son of Malik, son of Marratta of Kahlan = Sauree ثوري.

91. Kondah, son of Saur = Kondee كُندي.

92. Sakkoon, son of Kondah = Sakkoonee سكّونى

93. Ausalah, son of Rabeeah, son of Kheyar, son of Malik of Kahlan = Ausalee اوسلي.

94. Hamdanee همداني.

95. Sabeeyee سبيعي.

96. Wadaah وداعه.

97. Mozhaj, son of Yahabir, son of Malik of Kahlan = Bano Mozhaj بنوا مُذج.

98. Morad, son of Mozhaj = Moradee مُرادي.

99. Saad, son of Mozhaj = Saadee, or Saad-ul-Asheerah سعدي يا سعد العشيره.

100. Khalid, son of Mozhaj = Bano Khalid بنوا خالد.
101. Ans, son of Mozhaj = Ansee عنسي.
102. Jofee, son of Saad = Jofee جعفي.
103. Jannab, son of Saad = Jannabee جنّبي.
104. Hakam, son Saad = Hakamee حكمي.
105. Aizoollah, son of Saad = Aizee عايذي.
106. Jamal, son of Saad = Jamalee جملي.
107. Morran, son of Jofee = Morranee مراني.
108. Horaim, son of Jofee = Horaimee حريمي.
109. Zobaid, son of Saad, son of Saad = Zobaidee زبيدي.
110. Jodailah, son of Kharijah, son of Saad = Jodailee جديلي.
111. Abo Khowlan, son of Amar, son of Saad = Khowlanee خولاني.
112. Anam, son of Morad, son of Mozhaj = Anamee انعمى.
113. Nakhaa, son of Jasr, son of Olah, son of Khalid, of Mozhaj = Nakhaee نخعي.
114. Kaab, son of Amar = Bano Nar بنوا النار.
115. Kaab, son of Amar = Bano Himas بنوا الحماس.
116. Bano Kanan بنوا قنان.
117. Al Azd, son of Ghous of Kahlan = Azadee ازدي.
118. Mazan, son of Azad = Maznee or Ghassanee مازني يا غساني.
119. Dous, son of Azad = Dousee دوسى.
120. Hano, son of Azad = Hanvee هنوي.
121. Jofnah, of Azad, of Mazin = Jofnee جُفنى.
122. Al-i-Anka آل العنقا.
123. Al-i-Mohrik آلِ محرق.
124. Jobalee جبلى.
125. Salaman, son of Maidaan, son of Azad = Salamanee سلاماني.
126. Dous, son of Odfan, of Zahran, of Azad = Dousee odsee دوسى عدثي
127. Jozaimah, son of Malik, son of Fahm, son of Ghanam, son of Dous = Jozaimee جُذيمي.

128. Jahzam, son of Malik = Jahazamee جهاضمي.

129. Solaimah, son of Malik = Solaimee سليمي.

130. Honaah, son of Malik = Bano Honaah بنوا هنائه.

131. Moin, son of Malik = Moinee مُعَيني.

132. Yahmad, of Moin = Bano Yahmad بنوا يحمد.

The following are the descendants of Azad:

133. Alghatareef الغطريف; 134. Bano Yashkur بنوا يشكر; 135. Bano Jadrah بنوا الجدره; 136. Laheb of Amir = Bano Laheb بنوا لهب; 137. Ghamid of Amir = Ghamidee غامدي.

The following are descendants of Abdullah, son of Azad:

138. Kasamilee قساملي; 139. Bano Ateek بنوا عتيك; 140. Bano Barik بنوا بارق; 141. Bano Auf بنوا عوف; 142. Shahran, son of Auf = Bano Shahran بنوا شهران; 143. Taheyah, son of Sood = Bano Taheyah بنوا طاحيه; 144. Bano Haddad بنوا هداد; 145. Khozaee خزاعي; 146. Komairee قميري; 147. Bano Holail بنوا حُليل; 148. Bano Mostalik بنوا المصطلق; 149. Bano Kaab ينوا الكعب; 150. Bano Moleeh بنوا المليح; 151. Bano Adi بنوا عدي; 152. Bano Saad بنوا سعد; 153. Aslamee اسلمي; 154. Joshamee جُشمي; 155. Khazraj, son of Saliba-tul-Anka = Khazrajee خزرجي; 156. Aus, son of Saliba-tul-Anka = Ausee اوسي.

The following are the descendants of Khazraj:

157. Jashamee جشمي; 158. Bano Tazeed بنوا تزيد; 159. Sallamee سلمي; 160. Bano Bayazah بنوا بياضه; 161. Bano Salim بنوا سالم; 162. Bano Hoblah بنوا الحُبلى; 163. Al Kawakil القواقل; 164. Bano Najjar بنوا النجار; 165. Bano Saadah بنوا ساعده.

The following are the descendants of Aus:

166. Ashhalee اشهلي; 167. Bano Zafar بنوا ظفر; 168. Bano Haritha بنوا الحارثه; 169. Ahlikoba اهل قبا; 170. Jahjabee جحجبي;

171. Jaadirah جعادره; 172. Bano Wakif بنوا واقف; 173. Sollamee سُلَّمي; 174. Bano Khatmah بنوا خطمه.

To the above we shall subjoin another table of all these tribes, the better to elucidate the preceding list.

THIRD.

The Arabul Mustaaribah عرب المستعربه

Almost all the tribes comprising the Arabul Mustaaribah (Aliens) are descended from one common stock; and their origin may be traced to Terah ترح, son of Nahor ناحور, son of Sarug ساروغ, son of Reu راعو, son of Peleg فالغ, son of Eber عيبر, son of Salah شالح, son of Arphaxad ارفخشد, son of Shem سام. In consequence of Tehra's descendants, who settled in Arabia, having been divided into five principal branches, the Arabul Mustaaribah are also separated into the same number of tribes.

First, The Ishmaelites, or descendants of Ishmael, יִשְׁמָעֵאל اسماعيلى يا بني اسمٰعيل, son of Abraham, son of Terah (Gen. xi. 28; xvi. 15).

Second, The Abrahamites, or the Beni Keturah קְטוּרָה ابراهيمى بني قطوره, that is, the descendants of Abraham, son of Terah, by Keturah (Gen. xi. 28; xxv. 1).

Third, The Edomites עֵשָׂו ادومى يا بني عيسو, or the progeny of Esau, otherwise Edom, son of Isaac, son of Abraham, son of Terah (Gen. xi. 28; xxi. 3; xxv. 25).

Fourth, The Nahorites נָחוֹר ناحورى يا بني ناحور, or the descendants of Nahor, brother of Abraham, son of Terah (Gen. xi. 28, 29).

Fifth, The Haranites הָרָן هارانى يا بني هاران or the descendants of Moab מוֹאָב مواب, and Ammon עַמּוֹן عمان, son of Lud, son of Haran, son of Terah. This last tribe is sometimes designated as the tribe of the Moabites موابى, and at others, as that of the Ammonites عمانى, but we have called it the Haran-

ites, which name, being that of their forefathers, included both of them. We now proceed to treat of each of the above-named tribes, separately (Gen. xi. 28, 29; xix. 30-38).

1. The Ishmaelites اسمٰعلى or the Beni-Ishmael بني اسمٰعيل. All historians, be they Mohammedans, or otherwise, are unanimously of opinion, that the descendants of Ishmael settled in Arabia, and that a considerable portion of the Arabian peninsula had been peopled by the progeny of the twelve sons of the above-named patriarch. As it is upon the locality where they settled, and not as to the settlers themselves, that historians chiefly differ, we shall, therefore, pay particular attention to this point.

In the Scriptures, the subject is mentioned in the following words: "And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, 'Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, *even with Isaac.*' And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight, because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, 'Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman: in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed.' And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him, a good way off, as it were a bowshot: for she said, 'Let me not see the death of the child.' And she sat over against him, and lift up her voice, and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad: and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said

unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water; and she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad to drink. And God was with the lad; and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt." (Gen. xxi. 9-21.)

The Hebrew word חֵמַת has been incorrectly translated by the English one—*bottle;* for the thing meant by the sacred penman is a skin used in the East for carrying water, and which holds sufficient for several days' consumption. Respecting the above circumstances there are likewise several traditions in the sacred literature of the Mohammedans; and I shall here quote the only two traditions recorded by Bokharee. In order that the difference existing between these two traditions may be clearly indicated and understood, they have been placed in two separate columns, each in juxta-position with the other. It should, however, be particularly remembered that these two traditions, handed down to us by Bokharee, are not such as can be received as having been actually uttered by the Prophet, since they resemble, in every respect, other local ones. The fact of their having been mentioned by Bokharee proves nothing more than that they were indeed related by the persons to whom they have been attributed by the above author.

TRADITION I.	TRADITION II.
1. عن ابن عباس قال لما كان	1. قال ابن عباس اول ما اتخذ
بين ابراهيم و بين اهله ما كان	النساء المنطق من قبل ام اسمعيل
خرج باسمعيل و ام اسمعيل	اتخذت منطقا لتعفي اثرها علي
For some reasons known only to	سارة ثم جاء بها ابراهيم و بابنها

Abraham and his wife Sarah, the former took Ishmael, his son, and the boy's mother (Hagar), and left his country.

اسمعيل Abraham brought with him his wife (Hagar) and his son (Ishmael).

2. و معهم شَنَّةٌ فيها ماء And they had with them a skin full of water.

3. فجعلت ام اسمعيل تشرب من الشنة فيدر لبنها علي صبيها Ishmael's mother drank from out the said skin, suckling her child.

3. و هي ترضعه Whom she (Hagar) suckled.

4. حتي قدم مكة فوضعها تحت دوحة Upon her arriving at the place where Mecca now stands, she placed the child under a bush.

4. حتي و ضعهما عند البيت عند دوحة And they both placed the child close by the spot where the Kaaba now stands, under a bush.

5. فوق زمزم في اعلي المسجد وليس بمكة يومئذ احد وليس بها ماء فو ضعهما هناك Near the well of Zamzem, near the lofty side of the temple—and in those days Mecca was uninhabited and without water—and they deposited the child in the above place.

6. و وضع عند هما جرابا فيه تمر And Abraham placed beside them a bag full of dates.

7. و سقاء فيه ماء And a skin full of water.

8. ثم قفى ابراهيم منطلقا فتبعته ام اسمعيل Then returned Abraham, and Ishmael's mother ran after him.

8. ثم رجع ابراهيم الي اهله فا تبعته ام اسمعيل Then Abraham returned to come back to his wife, and the mother of Ishmael followed him.

9. حتي لما بلغواكدآء Until she reached Keda.

10. فقالت يا ابراهيم اين تذ هب و تتركنا And said, "Abraham, whither goest thou, and wherefore leavest thou me here?

10. نا دته من و رائه يا ابراهيم الي من تتركنا And she called out, "O Abraham, with whom leavest thou me?"

11. فى هذا الوادي الذي ليس فيه انيس و لاشي فقالت له ذلك مرارا و جعل لايلتفت اليها فقالت له الله امرك بهذا "In this wilderness, where there is no one to pity me, neither is there anything to eat?" This she repeated several times, but Abraham hearkened not unto her. Then she asked him, "Has God commanded thee to do this?"

12. قال نعم He answered, "Yes."

12. قال الي الله He answered "With God."

13. قالت اذن لايضيعنا "Then," said she, "God will cause no harm to come unto me."

13. قالت رضيت بالله She replied, "I am satisfied with my God."

14. ثم رجعت Thereupon she returned back.

15. فا نطلق ابراهيم حتى اذا كان عند الثنية حيث لايرونه استقبل بو جهه البيت ثم دعا بهو لاء الد عوات و رفع يديه فقال رب اني اسكنت من ذريتي بو ادٍ غير ذي زرع عند بيتك المحرم حتي بلغ يشكرون And Abraham went away, and when he reached Saneoa, he could not see those he had left behind him. Then he turned towards Mecca, and prayed thus: "O Lord, I have caused some of my offspring to settle in an unfruitful valley, near thy holy house; O Lord, that they may be constant in prayer. Grant, therefore, that the hearts of some men may be affected with kindness towards them; and do thou bestow on them all sorts of fruits, that they may give thanks."

16. وجعلت ام اسمعيل ترضع اسمعيل و تشرب من ذلك الماء حتي اذ نفد ما في السقاء And the mother of Ishmael began to suckle her child, and to drink

14. قال فرجعت Then she returned

16. فجعلت تشرب من الشنة و يدر لبنها علي صبيها حتي لما فَنِي الماء and commenced drinking out of the skin, and suckled her infant until the water was consumed.

water out of the skin until it was emptied.

17. عطشت و عطش ابنها و جعلت تنظر اليه يتلوي او قال يتلبط فا نطلقت كراهية ان تنظر اليه And she and her son felt thirsty, and when she saw that her child was suffering from thirst, she could not bear to see it in such a plight, and retired,

18. قالت لوذهبت فنظرت لَعَلّي احس احدا قال فذهبت And she thought that if she went and looked around, she might, perhaps, see some one; and she went.

19. فو جدت الصفا اقرب جبل في الارض يليها فقامت عليه ثم استقبلت الوادي تنظر هل تري احدا فلم تر احدا فهبطت من الصفا and reached the mountain of Safa, that was near, and ascending it, looked at the plain, in the hope of seeing some one; but, not perceiving any one, she came down from the mountain.

19. فصعدت الصفا فنظرت و نظرت هل تحس احدا She ascended Mount Safa, and looked around to see whether or not there was any one in sight;

20. حتي اذا بلغت الوادي

20. فلما بلغت الوادي سعت

رفعت طرف در عها ثم سعت سعي الانسان المجهود حتي جا وزت الوادي ثم اتت المروة فقامت عليها When she reached the desert, she girded up her loins, and ran as one mad, until she crossed the desert, and ascended Mount Marva,

21. فنظرت هل تري احدا فلم تر احدًا but she could not see any one.

22. ثم قالت لوذهبت فنظرت ما فعل تعني الصبي فذهبت فنظرت فاذا هو علي حاله كانه يشنغ للموت فلم تقر ها نفسها فقالت لوذهبت فنظرت لَعَلّي احس احدا فذهبت فصعدت الصفا فنظرت و نظرت فلم تحس احدا Then she said, "I must now go and see how my child is;" and she went and saw that he was at the point of death, but not being able to compose her mind, she said, "If I go and look around, peradventure I may see some one." And accordingly she ascended the mountain of Safa, but could descry no one.

اتت المروة و فعلت ذلك اشواطًا then hastily returning through the wilderness, she ascended the mountain of Marva.

23. ففعلت ذلك سبع مرات
She repeated the same seven times.

23. حتي اتمت سبعا And this she repeated seven times.

24. قال ابن عباس قال البني صلي الله عليه وسلم فدلك سَعَي الناسُ بينهما It is related by Ibn Abbas that the prophet said that this was the origin of the custom of true believers running between these mountains during the Haj.

25. فلما اشرفت علي المروة سمعت صوتا And when she ascended the Marva mountain, she heard a voice.

25. ثم قالت لوذهبت فنظرت ما فعل فاذا هي بصوت She then said, "It will be better for me to go and see my child." But she suddenly heard a voice.

26. فقالت صه تريد نفسها ثم تَسمَّعت ايضا فقالت قد اسمعت
She was startled thereat, and upon hearing it again, she said, "Wherefore callest thou on me?"

27. ان كان عندك غواث
"assist me if thou canst."

27. فقالت اغث ان كان عندك خير And she replied, "Kindly assist me, if you have any compassion."

28. فاذا هي بالملك عند مو ضع زمزم She then saw an angel near the Zemzem.

28. فاذا هو جبريل The angel was Gabriel.

29. فبث بعقبه او قال بجناحه

29. قال فقال بعقبه هكذا و غمر

حتي ظهر الماء فجعلت تحوضه و تقول بيد ها هكذا He (the angel) made a hollow place, either by his foot or with his wing, and the water issued forth; and the mother of Ishmael commenced widening it.

عقبه علي الارض قال فانبثق الماء فد هشت ام اسمعيل فجعلت تحفر The narrator of the tradition, stamping the earth with his foot, said, this was exactly what the angel did, and that water issued from the spot; and she began to widen the hole.

30. و جعلت تغرف من الماء في سقائها و هو يفور بعد ما تغرف She filled the skin with water, which came out of it as from a fountain.

31. قال ابن عباس قال النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم يرحم الله ام اسمعيل لو تركت زمزما و قال لولم تغرف من الماء لكانت زمزمُ عينًا معينا It is related by Ibn Abbas that the prophet said, "May God bless the mother of Ishmael, had she left the Zemzem as it was, or had she not filled her skin with water, then the Zemzem would always have remained an overflowing fountain."

31. قال فقال ابو القاسم صلي الله عليه وسلم لو تركته كان الماء ظاهرا It is related by Ibn Abbas, that the prophet said that had she (Hagar) allowed the water to remain in its former state, the water would then have continued issuing forth for ever.

32. قال فشربت و ارضعت * الي اخر الحديث * بخاري كتاب الا نبياء * Then she drank the water, and suckled her child.

32. قال فجعلت تشرب من الماء و يدر لبنها علي صبيها * الي اخر الحديث * بخارى كتاب الا بنياء She used to drink that water and suckle her child.

Our reason for asserting that these traditions ought not to be received as having been related by the Prophet, but merely as local ones, is, that both of them are narrated by Ibn Abbas, who told them to Saeed, son of Jobair, who, in his turn, related them to other persons. Ibn Abbas, however, does not tell us whence he obtained these traditions. Now, as it is probable that he might have heard them from some one else, and not from the Prophet—therefore, it cannot be positively asserted that they were uttered by the Prophet himself.

There are in these traditions two passages (24 and 31), which *primâ facie* might appear to have been actually related by the Prophet himself; but this is far from being the case, inasmuch as these two passages are only parts of another tradition, which (by way of quotation) have been introduced by traditionists among those given above.

Another circumstance which throws suspicion upon the authenticity of these traditions is that the narrator quotes from the Holy Koran a passage containing the following prayer of Abraham: "O Lord! I have caused some of my offspring to settle in an unfruitful valley, near thy holy house." Now, by the words "I have caused," it has been erroneously understood by the traditionist that Abraham himself caused his wife and son to settle there, and that it was on this occasion that he visited the holy Mecca—a conclusion not deduced from any tradition, but which appears to have been the guesswork of the traditionist's own imagination. The real fact, however, is that it was not on this occasion that Abraham offered up this prayer, but when he revisited his son, and erected the temple of the Kaaba; which will be, moreover, clear from the following words of the prayer itself, "near thy holy house." In the above traditions facts that really happened on different occasions are represented to have occurred at one and the same time. The time, therefore, of the conversation, which in both these traditions is related as having taken place between Abraham and Hagar, appears to have been

when the former left the latter in the wilderness of Beer-Sheba, whence it is evident that the prayer must have been offered on the occasion of the erection of the Kaaba.

No mention is made in the Holy Koran of the age of Ishmael when he was cast out by his father; so that, even were the traditions in Bokharee proved to be doubtful, it would not in the least degree disparage our religion, because we do not believe in those traditions as if they were revelations, but regard them merely as local ones. The difficulty arises from the great difference in the various traditions given by the Scriptures of Ishmael's age. From Gen. xxi. 14-21, it would appear that Ishmael was but a child when expelled by his father, but other passages show him to have been sixteen years of age (see p. 10, note). We are, therefore, at a loss how to reconcile these passages. The opinions of the Rev. Mr. Forster and others upon this subject we shall show in a note.[1]

"And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder,[2] and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba" (Gen. xxi. 14).

[1] "The interest of the scene is painfully heightened if we reflect on the age of Ishmael. The boy, no longer a child, was now, at least, in his fifteenth year, but reduced by suffering to the helplessness of childhood. In this state his poor mother appears to have borne him in her arms, until her strength also failed; 'and she cast the child under one of the shrubs.' The precise age of Ishmael is easily ascertained. He was thirteen when circumcised. Isaac was not born until the following year, and had been weaned before Hagar and her son were sent into the wilderness."—Forster's Hist. Geog. p. 176.

[2] Many biblical critics, and among them Jerome, Le Clerc, and Rosenmüller, consider that as Ishmael was now seventeen years old, he could not have been placed on Hagar's shoulder, as the Hebrew text seems to express. Bishop Horsley, however, has come to the rescue of the inspired penman with the following original and ingenious remarks:—

"The Hebrew seems to express that the boy was set upon his mother's shoulders, as well as the bread and water. So the LXX. understand it; and the expresion of 'casting the child under the shrubs,' in ver. 15, confirms this interpretation. Ishmael was not less than fourteen when Isaac was born. At this time, therefore, he must have been, at least, in his fifteenth year. It is to be remembered that

The passage from the Holy Koran, "I have caused some of my offspring to settle in an unfruitful valley, near thy holy house" ربنا انی اسکنت من ذریتی بوادٍ غیرذی زرع عند بیتک المحرم clearly shows that Ishmael settled near the spot where the temple of Kaaba now stands. The Hebrew word מִדְבָּר *Madbar* مدبر and that of Arabic (واد غیر ذي زرع, Wady-i-Ghair-i-zee zaraa) used in the Holy Koran, have both the same signification, that of "unfruitful."

By the names פָּארָן Paran پاران and אֵיל פָּארָן El Paran ایل پاران—both of which are used in Genesis xxi. 21 and xiv. 6—the selfsame place is to be considered as indicated; while the words El-Paran, and the mountains of the enclosed valley of Kaaba, signify one and the same place.[1]

human life, although by this time much contracted, still extended beyond the duration of its present length; and as the length of infancy and of every other stage of life must always have borne some certain proportion to the extent of the whole, when men lived to 150 and even beyond it, it may reasonably be supposed that they were weak and tender at fourteen or sixteen years of age. This, we may conclude, I think, from the story, to have been the case in the times of Abraham and his sons. And so Josephus thought, for he says expressly that Ishmael, at this time, could not go alone. But things altered much in the next three generations, for Joseph, Abraham's great grandson, at the age of seventeen, took part with his brethren in the feeding of their father's flocks, and at the age of thirty, interpreted Pharaoh's dream, and became his prince's minister."

On the same subject another writer observes as follows: "Ishmael, though called 'a child,' must have been sixteen or seventeen years of age, and was consequently a youth capable of being a support and assistance to his mother, as he soon after proved."

An ambiguity in the text might have been avoided by placing the clause "putting on her shoulder" within a parenthesis, as it is placed by Bishop Kedeer, Stackhouse, and Pyle.

[1] In Hebrew the word El signifies God, and therefore it is a matter of great importance to enquire why this word is used with that of Paran. The mountains surrounding the temple of Kaaba, and where the Mohammedans perform the ceremony of Haj, are universally known by the appellation of El-al إلال. Some grammarians assert that the word El-al is singular, while others are of opinion that it is plural. The right derivation of this word has given rise to much discussion: some writers say one thing and others another. None, however, have succeeded in explaining it satisfactorily. Our own opinion is that it is derived from the Hebrew word El, an appellation given to those mountains which are more than one in number. The Arabs have formed its plural El-al according to Arabic rules.

Notwithstanding the perfect coincidence of the facts taken from the Scriptures with those from the Holy Koran, as above shown, there are, nevertheless, three very important questions which suggest themselves respecting Ishmael's settlement.

First. Where did Abraham leave Ishmael and his mother after expelling them from his home?

Secondly. Where did Ishmael and Hagar settle after their wanderings in the desert?

Thirdly. Was it in the very spot where they had rested for the first time, or in some other place?

The Holy Koran mentions nothing on the subject, but there are some local traditions, and also a few Hadeeses, which treat of it; the latter, however, by reason of their not possessing sufficient authority, and from their not being traced up to the Prophet, are as little to be relied on as the former. The local traditions being deemed unworthy of credit, from their mixing up together occurrences that had happened on various and different occasions, we do not think it necessary to dwell on the first question more than has been done by the Scriptures themselves, which say that "He (Abraham) sent her (Hagar) away; and she departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba" (Gen. xxi. 14).

As for the two remaining questions, although the language of Scripture is not very clear—since, in one place it says, "And he (Ishmael) grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer" (Gen. xxi. 20), and in another, "He (Ishmael) dwelt in the wilderness of Paran" (Gen. xxi. 21), passages which would certainly lead us to infer that Ishmael had changed the place of his abode; yet, as no Christian commentator represents him as having removed from one place to another, and as, moreover, neither the religious nor the local traditions of the Mohammedans in any way confirm the above, it may be safely asserted that Ishmael and his mother did not change the place where they dwelt, and that by the word *wilderness*, alone, the sacred writer

meant the wilderness of Paran. The solving of the whole question depends, therefore, upon ascertaining and fixing the position of the said wilderness of Paran, where Ishmael is said to have settled.

Oriental geographers mention three places as known by the the appellation of Paran. First, that wilderness wherein the city of Mecca now stands, and the mountains in its vicinity; secondly, those mountains and a village which are situated in Eastern Egypt, or Arabia Petræa; and thirdly, a district in the province of Samarcand.[1]

I am not quite sure whether any foreign historian has stated

[1] فاران مذكور في التوراة في قوله جاء الله من سينا و اشرف من ساعير و استعلن من فاران فسا عير جبال فلسطين و هو انزاله الانجيل علي عيسي و فاران مكة او جبالها علي ما تشهدبه التوراة و استعلانه منها انزاله القران علي رسوله محمد صلعم و فاران قرية من نواحي سغد من اعمال سمرقند و قيل فاران و الطور كور تان من كور مصر قبليه * مراصد الاطلاع علي اسماء الامكنه و البقاع * و معجم البلدان يا قوت حموي * و الطور جبل بارض مصر عند كورة تشمل علي عدة قري قبليها و بالقرب منها جبل فاران * مراصد الاطلاع و معجم البلدان *

The name of Paran is mentioned in the Old Testament, wherein it is stated the High God came from Sinai, appeared in Seir, and manifested himself in Pharan.

"By the "mountains of Seir" is meant those of Palestine, and the words, "And God appeared in Seir," refer to the conferring the Gospel upon Christ. Pharan signifies either holy Mecca itself, or the mountains in its vicinity, as is, moreover, proved by the Old Testament; and the words "was manifested in Pharan," refer to the revelation of the Holy Koran to Mohammed. Pharan is also the name of a small village in Samarcand.

Some writers represent Pharan and Toor as being two of the numerous provinces of Eastern Egypt. Others state that Toor is a mountain in Eastern Egypt, having several villages round it, and the Pharan mountains in its neighbourhood.—*Merasidol Ittilaa* and *Mojamol Boldan*.

فاران ثلثة مواضع فاران اسم جبال مكة و قيل لها اسم جبال الحجاز

that Pharan and Hedjaz, wherein holy Mecca is situated, are identical; but an Arabic version of the Samaritan Pentateuch,

و لها ذكر في التوراة يجي في اعلام بنوة البني صلعم قال الا مير ابو نصر ابن ماكولا ابو بكر نصر بن القاسم بن قضاعة القضاعي الفاراني الا سكندري سمعت ان ذلك نسبته الي جبال فاران و هي الحجاز و فاران قال ابو عبدالله القضاعي في كتاب خطط مصر فاران و الطور كور تان من كور مصر القبلية و فاران من قري سمرقند * مشترك ياقوت الحموي *

الطور سبعة مواضع و الطور ايضا علم لجبل بعينه عند كورة تشتمل علي عدة قري بارض مصر من جهته القبلية بنيها و بين جبل فاران * مشترك *

Pharan is an appellation given to three localities.

1. To the mountains of Mecca. Some authors are of opinion that all the Hedjaz mountains bear this name, and that they are the mountains mentioned in that passage of the Old Testament wherein the advent of our Prophet is foretold. Ameer Abu Nasir, son of Makoolah, states that Abubekr Nasir, son of Kasim, son of Kusaa, was called a Pharanee, that is, a native of Pharan, in reference to the mountains of Pharan, which are identical with those of Hedjaz.

2. Abu Abdoollah, in his work on the Physical Characters of Egypt, mentions that Pharan and Toor are two villages of Eastern Egypt.

Toor is an appellation given severally to seven different places, one of them being a mountain between which and the mountains of Pharan there are situated several villages.—*Mushtarak Yakoot-i-Hamvee.*

و طريق اخر علي سا حل البحر القلزمي . . . . من مصر الي عين شمس . . . ثم الي بطن مغيرة . . . ثم الي جون فاران . . . و بالقرب من فاران موضع صعب اذا سلك و الريح ايضا مغربا و الد بور مشرقا و يسمي جبلان من جبلان الي جبل الطور الي ايله الخ * نزهة المشتاق لشريف الا دريسي *

Shareef Edreesi, when enumerating in his Nizha the stages from Egypt to Medina along the coast of the Red Sea, states that Joon Pharan is the name of one of them, adding that from Pharan the passage or road lies through Toor.

edited by R. Kuenen, and published at Lugduni Batavorum, 1851, says, in a note here subjoined, that Pharan and Hedjaz are one and the same place : و سكن في برية فَرّان (الحجاز) و اخذت له امه امراة من ارض مصر * عربي ترجمه تو راة سامري *.

It is certain, however, that no Christian writer has ever acknowledged the identity of Pharan with Hedjaz. On the contrary, they all state that—

1. The vast and wide-spread tract of land extending from the northern boundary of Beer-sheba as far as Mount Sinai, is known by the name of Pharan. The boundaries generally assigned it are Canaan on the north, and Mount Sinai on the south ; Egypt on the west, and Mount Seir on the east. It contains many small wildernesses, which form the whole one, and which are distinguished by distinct and separate names, such as Shur, Beer-Sheba, Etham, Sinai, Sin, Zin, Edam, etc.

2. Some have conjectured that Kadesh, where Abraham digged a well, which he called Beer-Sheba, is the same as Pharan.

3. Others are of opinion that Pharan is the name of that wilderness which lies on the western slope of Mount Sinai.[1] The

[1] "A name which seems to be applied in Scripture to the whole of the desert extending from the frontiers of Judah to the borders of Sinai. At least, as we find it in the south of this region bordering Sinai (Num. x. 12), and in the north bordering on Kadesh (Num. xiii. 26), and elsewhere, it seems easier to suppose that Paran was the name of the whole region marked by these limits, than that there were two opposite districts, bearing the same name. Under this view the difficulty of rightly appropriating this name is obviated, seeing that all the separate allocations which different writers have brought for it, meet in the somewhat extensive district which we suppose it to have embraced. The name is well-preserved in that of Wady Faran, a valley of the Lower Sinai, through which lay the road supposed to have been taken by the Israelites in their march to the upper region."—Kitto's Cyclopædia of the Bible.

"A wilderness to the south of Palestine, where Ishmael is said to have dwelt (Gen. xxi. 21), bounded on the west by Halal and Yelek, on the north by the southern hills of Judea, and on the east by the wilderness and mountains of Kadesh. This is El-paran, or the wilderness of Paran (Gen. xiv. 6). Also the country excellent in some parts for pasture in the rainy season, where Abraham dwelt, between Kadesh and Shur, and through which the Hebrews came from Sinai on their way to Kadesh (Num. xii. 16, and xiii. 28). The wilderness of Paran might mean the

ruins of many edifices, time-destroyed sepulchres, minarets, etc., are still to be seen there. Mr. Ruper states that he discovered the ruins of a church which must have been built in the fifth century after Christ; and he also informs us that in the fourth century this place was inhabited by Christians, and that a bishop also resided there.

We have not the least hesitation in admitting the authenticity of the above statement, and in thinking that this town is identical with the one mentioned by Oriental historians as having flourished on the eastern coast of Egypt.

But although the first two observations do not seem to be corroborated by any evidence whatsoever, nevertheless we shall, in order that not the least doubt may remain, proceed to refute them.

By way of disposing of the first of them, namely, that which represents Pharan as being one vast wilderness, including many others, such as those of Shur, Sinai, etc., we cannot do better than quote here a few passages from the Scriptures, since they plainly show that Pharan is a separate wilderness of itself, having nothing whatever to do with the other wildernesses around it.

a. "And the children of Israel took their journey out of the wilderness of Sinai, and the cloud rested on the wilderness of Paran" (Numb. x. 12). This passage, which means that the Israelites departed from the wilderness of Sinai, and halted in that of Paran, proves to demonstration that the two deserts in question are quite distinct and separate from each other.

b. "And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the Rephaims in Ashteroth Karmain, and the Zemzems in Ham, and the Emims in Shaveh Kiriathaim, and the Horites in their Mount Seir, unto El-Paran,

hills bounding the plain to the east of it, and to the south of the wilderness of Kadesh; or the wilderness of Kadesh was also called the wilderness of Paran from the adjacent plain, as it was also called that of Kadesh from the fountain of Kadesh." —The People's Bible Dictionary.

which is by the wilderness" (Gen. xiv. 5, 6). Now it may be presumed that unless the wilderness of Paran be taken to be a place *per se*, the above passage has no meaning.

c. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, 'Send thou men that they may search the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel; of every tribe of their fathers shall ye send a man, every one a ruler among them.' And Moses, by the commandment of the Lord, sent them from the wilderness of Paran; all those men were heads of the children of Israel" (Numb. xiii. 1-3).

d. "And they went and came to Moses, and to Aaron, and to all the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh; and brought back word unto them, and unto all the congregation, and shewed them the fruit of the land" (Numb. xiii. 26).

e. "And he said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them" (Deut. xxxiii. 2).

f. "God came from Timan, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise" (Hab. iii. 3).

g. "And they rose out of Midian, and came to Paran, and they took men with them out of Paran, and they came to Egypt, unto Pharaoh, king of Egypt," etc. (1 Kings xi. 18).

The second remark also, which asserts that Kadesh and Paran are identical, is proved to be erroneous by the following passages from the Scriptures:—

(*a.*) "And the Horites in their Mount Seir, unto El-Paran, which is by the wilderness. And they returned, and came to En-mishpat, which is Kadesh, and smote all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites, that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar" (Gen. xiv. 6, 7).

It is clear that unless Kadesh and Paran be taken as two separate and distinct wildernesses, the passage quoted would mean nothing.

(*b.*) "And they went and came to Moses, and to Aaron, and to all the congregation of the children of Israel, *unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh;* and brought back word unto them, and unto all the congregation, and shewed them the fruit of the land" (Num. xiii. 26).

As we suspect the faithfulness of the English rendering of the italicised portion of the passage marked (*b.*), we herewith subjoin the original passage in Hebrew, with the Arabic version of it.

וַיֵּלְכוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל-מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל-אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל כָּל-עֲדַת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל
אֶל-מִדְבַּר פָּארָן קָדֵשָׁה

و قد موا الي موسي و هارون و جماعة بني اسرائيل الي بريه فاران الي
قادس ـ سفر العدد الاصحاح ١٣ ٠ ٢٦

While this very clearly shows the defect of the English translation, it also corroborates the correctness of our own remark. The true translation of it is, "unto the wilderness of Paran *through* Kadesh," a translation that perfectly coincides with the Arabic version. In this case it is quite evident that Paran and Kadesh are the names of two distinct wildernesses.

We have now to consider the third Paran, which is reported to have been situated along the western slope of Mount Sinai, a situation the correctness of which we neither doubt nor deny; but it remains for us to enquire whether this place is or is not the same wilderness mentioned in Genesis, as the place of Ishmael's settlement after his wanderings in the desert of Beer-Sheba, and also, whether the latter really did settle there or not; for if by our enquiries we can prove that he did not, then it will also be proved that this Paran is not the one mentioned in Genesis.

No local traditions exist by which it can be shown that

Ishmael settled in the locality under consideration, and whatever reasons the Rev. Mr. Forster has adduced to support his view of the subject, are wholly unsupported by any evidence whatever. In order, however, to remove all possible doubt upon the subject, we shall now proceed to refute those reasons of the reverend gentleman.

The author above alluded to, basing his remarks upon the passage, "And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria" (Gen. xxv. 18), states that "God's promises were .... already accomplished .... in the diffusion of an Ismaelitish population 'from Shur to Havilah,' or across the Arabian peninsula, from the border of Egypt to the mouths of the Euphrates."

The first mistake he makes is that of placing Havilah on the mouths of the Euphrates;[1] while, in reality, the locality in question—the name of whose founder is mentioned in Gen. x. 29—is situated in the vicinity of Yemen, Lat. 17° 30′ N., Long. 42° 36′ E.; and that this is the true position will be more evident by the reader's consulting the map of Arabia, reduced, as regards its geographical features, from J. Walker's large map, and by referring, at the same time, to the portions of Syria and Egypt, drawn by the Rev. Carteret P. Carey, M.A.

[1] The Rev. Mr. Forster, when treating the subject of the settlement of Havilah, says, "that by the land of Havilah, described in the First Book of Moses, is intended the tract of Arabia adjoining the mouths of the Euphrates, and stretching southward along the coast of the Persian Gulf." This he states on the ground—which we do not think worth credit—"that the principal of the Behrein islands retains to this day the original name (of Hauilah) in that of Aval." He further endeavours to strengthen his arguments by saying that "the following specimens will exemplify the various inflections of this name, in the modern Arabic: Aval or Aûal, Huale or Hauilah, Khau, Khatt, Haulan, Chaul, Chaulan; some of these words being varying names of the same place or district." To deduce conclusions and to dispose of such important questions in the manner above noticed, is not in the least consistent with the established rules of thorough and impartial investigation, and, therefore, not at all entitled to credit. Hence our remark that the reverend writer above quoted is wrong in his statement, and especially so, when we find in full the appellation in question in another portion of the peninsula.

The second mistake is that, following in the wake of other Christian historians and geographers, our author places Shur in the west of Arabia Petræa, wherein is situated the desert of Etham, which is decidedly wrong; for, by the desert of Shur the sacred penman means the whole of that widely-spread plain, extending southward from Syria as far as Egypt.

The original Hebrew of the above passage has the two names of שׁוּר Shur شُور and אַשּׁוּרָה Ashur اشورء only, without the word *desert* being attached to either of them; these two names, Shur and Ashur, meaning, respectively, Syria and Assyria.

It consequently becomes quite evident that the Ishmaelites settled in the wide tract of land extending from the northern frontiers of Yemen to the southern borders of Syria. This place now bears the name of Hedjaz, and is identical with Paran. We are the more justified in this our conclusion from finding that the tract of land we have described above lies exactly *before Egypt*, to a traveller proceeding thence towards Assyria, an explanation which clearly proves the truth of the passage, "that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria," meaning *before Egypt, if you were to draw a right line thence to Assyria.*

The boundaries assigned to Pharan by the Rev. Mr. Forster, on the authority of Dr. Wills—"wilderness of Shur westward, and Mount Seir eastward; the land of Canaan northward, and the Red Sea southward"—are equally erroneous.

From St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, iv. 22-26,[1] the Rev. Mr. Forster concludes that Mount Sinai and Agar are one and the same, an assertion which must rest solely upon that author's *ipse dixit*, unsupported as it is, so far as we know, by the

[1] "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

authority of any Christian writer whomsoever. No Oriental historian or geographer can be named who states that Mount Sinai was also called Agar, nor does the passage from the New Testament imply that Mount Sinai is the same as Agar. St. Paul's real meaning is, that on this same Mount Sinai two covenants were made—one with Isaac and the other with Ishmael, Hagar's son. St. Paul, allegorically speaking, says: "This Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia," that is, *this Agar* (descendants of Hagar) *in Arabia is the covenant made on Mount Sinai also, and answereth to Jerusalem "which now is, and is in bondage with her children."* It will be found impossible to twist the above passage so as to mean that Sinai and Agar were identical.

Upon the authority of 1 Chron. v. 9,[1] the Rev. Mr. Forster states that the locality eastward of Gilead, in the direction of the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf, corresponds with the primitive seat of Ishmael. The descendants of Ishmael, in the course of time, overspread almost the whole Arabian peninsula, and some of his offspring, seizing the locality in question from the aborigines, settled there. The passage simply shows that the Hagarites (descendants of Hagar) met with their defeat on the shores of the Persian Gulf, a defeat which took place 800 years after Ishmael. This passage can hardly be strained to mean that this place was the same where Ishmael himself settled.

In order to prove that Ishmael's descendants occupied the whole of the space from the northern side of the Persian Gulf, as far as Yemen, the reverend gentleman so often named does his utmost to identify the names of various places with that of the *Hagarites*. Some of these identifications are not entitled to the smallest credit; with others he adopts his stereotyped course of availing himself of the coincidence of even a single letter; while with others again, he does, indeed, succeed, but upon the weakest and most trivial grounds. But what the Rev. Mr. Forster so

[1] "And eastward he inhabited unto the entering in of the wilderness from the river Euphrates: because their cattle were multiplied in the land of Gilead."

laboriously, and we regret to say so unsuccessfully, endeavours to establish, we consider as wholly undeserving our attention *now*, and this for two reasons: first, because we are also of opinion that the descendants of Ishmael, the twelve illustrious patriarchs, were not confined to the narrow tract of land around Holy Mecca, but that, in the course of time, they spread over nearly the whole of the Arabian peninsula;[1] and, secondly, inasmuch as it has no connection with our subject—the primitive settlement of Ishmael himself and of his descendants, and not of the subsequent spreading of the latter.

We now proceed to consider the circumstance of no mention whatever having been made in the Pentateuch of that Pharan which is situated in eastern Egypt, on the western slope of Mount Sinai—a fact the more evident by taking into consideration the wanderings of the Israelites under Moses. The sacred historian states that upon the above people crossing the Red Sea, "they went out into the wilderness of Shur" (Syria) (Ex. xv. 32), and that when they crossed the wilderness of Sin, "then came Amalek and fought with Israel in Rephidim" (Ex. xvii. 8).

That the Amalekites were not the aborigines of Rephidim, but those of the valley mentioned in Num. xiv. 25, is also evident from the use of the word *came* in the above passage.

This much, however, should be remembered, that Rephidim is to the west of Sinai, that is, in eastern Egypt, and that this is the identical place where Moses caused water to issue from a rock, to which he gave the name of "Massah and Meribah"

[1] و لماكثر ولد اسمعيل صلي الله عليه وسلم ضاقت عليهم مكة فانتشروا في البلاد فكانوا لايد خلون بلدًا الا اظهر هم الله علي اهله و هم نفوا العماليق * معارف ابن قتيبه *

When the Ishmaelites multiplied, the tract of land around Mecca proved narrow and contracted for them, and, consequently, they commenced to spread over other parts of the peninsula; and wherever they went God assisted them, and they vanquished the Amalekites, and drove them out of their couutry.—*Maarif ibni Kotaiba.*

(Ex. xvii. 6, 7), and that, moreover, it was here that Moses built an altar and "called the name of it, JEHOVAH-nissi" (Ex. xvii. 15).

Moses now proceeded further to the East, until he reached a place named the Mount of God, in the desert of Sinai, where he encamped, and where Jethro, his father-in-law, came to meet him (Ex. xviii. 5; xix. 2).

There is no doubt that Jethro came from the east of Mount Sinai, for Midian, of which place he was the priest, is situated eastward of it.

Up to this time Moses, during his march from Egypt to Sinai, makes no mention of the name of Pharan.

From Sinai, the march of the Israelites was in a north-easterly direction. Referring to this journey, the sacred writer says, "The children of Israel took their journeys out of the wilderness, and the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran" (Num. x. 12). The first halt made by Moses was at a place called Taberah (Num. xi. 3); thence he proceeded to Kibroth-hattaavah (Num. xi. 34); thence to Hazeroth (Num. xi. 35), from which last place he entered the wilderness of Paran (Num. xii. 16). This Paran being the same one as where "the cloud" is said to have "rested," there cannot, consequently, be the least doubt that the march of Moses was in a north-easterly direction, that is, towards Kadesh (Num. xiii. 26); and, therefore, the Pharan mentioned by Moses cannot have been situated to the west of Sinai.

It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that the city of Pharan, whose ruins have been discovered and described by Mr. Ruper, and which had not escaped the notice of Oriental writers also, did not exist in the time of Moses, for how was it possible that any city could have flourished in a wilderness described by the sacred writer to have been "great and terrible . . . . . wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, where there was no water" (Deut. viii. 15).

The above will be still further demonstrated by the observation that the position assigned by Christian writers to the wilderness of Paran entirely depends upon the correctness of the account of the wanderings of the Israelites under Moses, respecting which circumstance opinions of the learned are as much divided as upon any other question whatever; a fact which will be still more evident on consulting the map, subjoined to this essay, wherein are marked not less than five different directions of the wanderings of the chosen people, as determined by five learned persons independently of each other.

One of the many Arabul-aribah tribes was that called the Bani-Pharan, and it appears to us as probable that some of this tribe, in consquence of continual disputes and quarrels with the Yemenites and other neighbouring tribes, might have proceeded in a north-easterly direction, and, settling to the west of Mount Sinai, in Eastern Egypt, founded there a city to which they gave the name of Pharan, and that such city is the one mentioned by Mr. Ruper and the Oriental writers. Thus much, at least, is certain, that it is entirely distinct from the city of the same name spoken of in the Scriptures.

If the wilderness of Paran be taken as that wide-spread plain, extending from Syria as far as Yemen, as is mentioned in Holy Writ itself, and maintained to be such not only by all the local traditions but also by Oriental writers—then every portion of Moses' march becomes reconciled with the whole narration, and its correctness established, as will be hereafter proved.

The whole of that extensive plain lying to the south of Syria is generally spoken of by the sacred writers as the land of Shur. In some places, however, it is called the "wilderness" alone (Ex. xiii. 18), and in others, "the great wilderness" (Deut. viii. 15); and in this wilderness the comparatively small deserts of Etham, Sin, Sinai, Zin, Kadesh, Edom, and a portion of Paran are included.

Now, the only plausible objection that can be made to our

above remarks is, that of our maintaining the identity of Shur with Syria. In Gen. xxv. 18 there are two names mentioned, the one being Shur and the other Ashur. But as all Christian writers interpret Ashur as Assyria, there can be but one reason only for denying Shur to be Syria, and this is that the acceptance of the above identification would prove favourable to Islam, by establishing the truth of the prophecy concerning Mohammed, in Deut. xxxiii. 2, and Hab. iii. 3.

According to what we have above stated Paran has Kadesh on its northern, and the desert of Zin and the Arabian Gulf on its western, frontier.

When Moses proceeded from Sinai, the cloud rested in Paran, near Kadesh (Num. x. 12), and the Jewish legislator, passing through Taberah, Kibroth-hattaavah, and Hazerath, came to Paran, in the vicinity of Kadesh. From this place he despatched messengers, who, on their way back, arrived first at Kadesh, and then at Paran ; and thus the entire march of Moses in Paran is elucidated and proved.

We shall now consider those passages of the Scriptures which treat of the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, on which subject the sacred historian thus expresses himself: " And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away ; and she departed, *and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba. And the water was spent in the bottle,* and she cast the child under one of the shrubs" (Gen. xxi. 14, 15). The italicised passage does not necessarily imply that Hagar wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba only, and that the water consumed was the same as had been given her by Abraham. On the contrary, we think such an interpretation to be incorrect: First, because the well of Beer-sheba, which Abraham had digged near Kadesh, and in the vicinity of which he had himself dwelt since a long time, was a place not quite unknown to Hagar; and, secondly, because no such scarcity of water

could have been there, seeing that several wells, which had been made, not by Abraham only but also by the Philistines, were to be found there (Gen. xvi. 18). The following interpretation of the above passage will, we venture to think, be nearer the real sense of the original, and, therefore, more correct than the one generally advanced and adopted by Christian writers. Hagar, when driven from home, might naturally have bethought herself of repairing to a locality where she could find a refuge, and might, consequently, have selected for her abode that part of the country where the Arabul-Aribah lived, because all around that place, namely Beer-sheba, dwelt nations who were quarrelsome and utterly devoid of pity.

Before reaching her destination the water that she had with her might have been consumed, and she might have filled the skin again and again from wheresoever she could obtain water; but upon her reaching the wilderness of Paran the water was altogether spent, nor could she, after the most diligent and anxious search, meet with any. Her son Ishmael might, in consequence of extreme thirst, have become faint, exhausted, and near the point of death, and Hagar, in great anxiety and mental agitation, have wandered hither and thither seeking for water. Now in all this there is nothing but what is probable and natural.

The Nomadic Arabs used to conceal, by means of reeds, every spring of water they could find in the desert, in order to keep them exclusively for their own use and benefit. This custom, which still obtains among them, was owing to the great drought so common in Arabia.

It is very probable that in those days there might have been some spring thus hidden by the Arabs on the very spot where the well of Zemzem now is, because the Hebrew word בְּאֵר *Beer* بير does not exclusively mean a well, but a fountain or spring also.

Hagar, therefore, in her running about from one place to

another like a mad woman, might very possibly have discovered this spring, and have availed herself of it,—a circumstance, be it observed, referred to in the Scriptures in the following words: "And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water" (Gen. xxi. 19). The Arab tradition says that an angel made a hollow in that place by striking it either with his wing or his foot.

All the aforesaid observations agree with the local tradition in Bokharee, already quoted above; a tradition that has always been received as genuine among the pre-Islamic Arabs, notwithstanding their being split into numberless tribes and sects, all hostile to one another, and each following a religion exclusively their own.

Under these circumstances, therefore, we cannot regard the tradition in question as a false or spurious one, more especially when several passages from the Scriptures themselves are brought to bear upon and confirm it.

Hagar began to dwell there, while, tempted by the spring of water, many persons of the Bani-Jorham tribe came and settled in its vicinity.

The local tradition in Bokharee[1] informs us that Ishmael took

[1] قال (اي ابن عباس) فمرناس من جرهم ببطن الوادي فاذا هم بطير كانهم انكروا ذلك و قالوا ما يكون الطير الا علي ماء فبعثوا رسولهم فنظر فاذا هو بالماء فا خبرهم فا توا اليها فقالوا يا ام اسمعيل اتا ذنين لنا ان نكون معكِ اونسكن معكِ فبلغ ابنها فنكح فيهم امراة قال ثم انه بدا لابراهيم فقال لا هله اني مطلع تر كتي قال فجاء فسلم فقال اين اسمعيل فقالت امرأته ذهب يصيد قال قولي له اذا جاء غير عتبة بيتك فلما جاء اخبرته فقال انتِ ذلك فا ذهبي الي اهلك قال ثم انه بدا لابراهيم فقال لا هله اني مطلعٌ تر كتي فجاء فقال اين اسمعيل

a woman to wife; that when Abraham came to visit his son he disapproved of the marriage, and hinted the propriety of a

فقالت امرته ذهب يصيد فقالت الا تنزل فتطعم و تشرب فقال و ما طعامكم و ما شرابكم قالت طعامنا اللحم و شرا بنا الماء قال اللهم بارك لهم في طعامهم و شرا بهم قال فقال ابو القاسم بركة يد عوه ابراهيم صلي الله عليهما وسلم قال ثم انه بدا لابراهيم فقال لا هله اني مطلع تركتي فجاء فوافق اسمعيل من وراء زمزم يصلح نبلا له فقال يا اسمعيل ان ربّك امرني ان ابني له بيتًا قال أَطِعْ ربّك قال امرني ان تعينني عليه قال اذا فعل اوكما قال فقاما فجعل ابراهيم يبني و اسمعيل ينا و له الحجارة و يقولان رَبَّنا تَقَبَّل منا انك انت السميع العليم قال حتي ارتفع البناء و ضعف الشيخ عن نقل الحجارة فقام علي حجر المقام فجعل ينا و له الحجارة و يقولان رَبَّنا تقبل منا انك انت السميع العليم * بخاري كتاب الا بنياء *

A large congregation of the Bani-Jorham tribe, wandering in the wilderness around the holy Mecca, descried birds flying in it, and hence they concluded that there must be a spring of water in the wilderness. On their searching after it they really found one, and, obtaining the permission of Ishmael's mother, settled in its vicinity. It was from amongst this colony that Ishmael selected a wife. After some time Abraham paid a visit to his son, but not finding Ishmael at home, he asked his wife where her husband was, whereupon she replied, very coldly, that he was gone out in quest of prey. Abraham thereat desired her to tell Ishmael in his name that he should change his threshold. When Ishmael returned she delivered the message to him, and he immediately divorced her, exclaiming that the hint was to this effect. Abraham revisited his son after a short time, and not finding him on this occasion, also, he again inquired of him from his second wife. She very politely replied that her husband was gone in the wilderness in search of prey, but she at the same time very hospitably asked him to alight from his horse and partake of the meat she had prepared. Abraham blessed her. After a lapse of time Abraham again visited his son, and meeting him this time near the well of Zemzem, informed him that he (Abraham) was commanded by God to erect an altar for His worship, and that Ishmael was ordered to assist him. The latter replied that we had better at once begin the task. Thereupon Abraham commenced the building of the temple, while Ishmael assisted him with necessary materials, both of them saying, "Lord accept it from us, for thou art he who heareth and knoweth."

divorce; that Ishmael thereupon divorced her, taking another wife from his fellow colonists, and that this second union was approved of by Abraham on his second visit to his son.

According to the local tradition Ishmael is represented to have taken both his wives from the Bani-Jorham tribe, while the Scriptures say that he married an Egyptian woman.

We have not the least doubt that this tradition is erroneous, in this case, since it would have been but natural for the Bani-Jorhamites to have, at first, hesitated to give one of their daughters in marriage to Ishmael, whom they regarded as an alien. As to his second wife, however, it is certain she belonged to the above tribe.

The holy Koran says, "And when Abraham and Ishmael raised the foundations of the house, saying, 'Lord, accept it from us, for thou art he who heareth and knoweth'" (ch. ii. v. 121). The temple of the Kaaba was erected by Abraham and Ishmael, a fact which has been corroborated by every local tradition.

According to the doctrines inculcated by the holy Koran, we Mohammedans implicitly believe that Ishmael, like his father, was selected by God, as the instrument of the Revelation of the Divine Will, for preaching righteousness and the unity of God among the people. The promise of God made with Abraham concerning Ishmael, in the following words of Moses—"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation," (Gen. xvii. 20)—has ever since been in progress of accomplishment.

Christian writers, not venturing to question this promise, pertinaciously assert that it was of a merely temporal character, and not a spiritual one. Although this statement is manifestly erroneous, yet we shall not discuss the question here, but reserve our reasons till our future essay—On the prophecies respecting Mohammed in the Old and New Testaments.

A tradition, which is still popular, that Abraham was commanded by God to sacrifice Ishmael and not Isaac, having no foundation whatever, must be deemed apocryphal.

What the holy Koran states upon the subject is, "And when they had submitted themselves to the divine will, and Abraham had laid his son prostrate on his face, We cried unto him, 'Abraham; now hast thou verified the vision, thus do We reward the righteous.' Verily this was a manifest trial, and We ransomed him with a noble victim" (ch. xxxvii. 101-7).

The holy Koran does not mention whether it was Isaac or Ishmael who was to have been offered up as a sacrifice, neither is there any trustworthy hadees which makes clear mention of it.

Some Mohammedan writers maintain that it was Isaac who was to have been offered up as a sacrifice, while others assert that it was Ishmael; a difference of opinion which is owing to the ambiguity of the passage of the Scriptures which mentions the locality where the said sacrifice was proposed to have been made, and which passage runs thus, "And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah;"[1] (instead of the word Moriah, the

[1] "MORIAH, *bitterness of the Lord, or doctrine, or fear of the Lord*, the name of the mountain at Jerusalem on which the Temple was built, and on which the Mosque of Omar now stands. It is generally thought to be the place where Abraham was ordered to sacrifice his only son Isaac, though this supposition is attended with some difficulties. The Samaritan version reads the *Land of Moreh*, in Gen. xxii. 2, instead of the *Land of Moriah*, as in our version, and the people to whom Moreh belonged were satisfied that this was the Moreh, near Shechem, just noticed, where Abraham had formerly resided, Gen. xii. 6, and that the mountain was Gerizim on which *their* temple was built. This latter supposition is entitled to some consideration if it could be ascertained that the Samaritans had not altered the text to bring the spot within their own territory. The distance from Beersheba is rather in favor of the Samaritan version, it being a good three day's journey between that place and Moreh, while the distance between Beersheba and Jerusalem is too short, unless some detaining circumstance occurred on the road. The Mahometans maintain that the site of the transaction is that on which their famous temple at Mecca was afterwards built, and in this, as well as in other circumstances, they substitute Ishmael for Isaac. It is not a little remarkable that the Jews, the Samaritans, and the Mahometans, all claim the sites of their respective temples as the scene of Abraham's trial of faith."—Bible Cyc. vol. ii. p. 240.

Arabic version has "*the land pointed out*" ارض الرويا, while the Arabic rendering of the Samaritan version has two translations, viz., "*the land accepted*" الارض المختارة, and "*the land We have pointed out to you*" المر شدة; "and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." Some Mohammedan authors have taken this mysterious place, together with the mountains, to be Jerusalem, while others think that Holy Mecca is meant. To support their opinion the latter maintain that the Hebrew word הָרִים *hareem* (mountains) is used in the dual as well as the plural number, and hence they state that of the two celebrated mountains of Mecca, Marva and Safa, one was the site of the intended sacrifice.

In the fourteenth verse of the same chapter, the sacred historian says that "Abraham called the name of that place *Jehovah Jireh*. Mohammedan writers are of opinion that Arafat, a place near Holy Mecca, is meant. Those persons, therefore, who believe this place to be Holy Mecca, affirm that it was Ishmael who was to have been offered up as a sacrifice; while others, who believe that Jerusalem is meant, assert that Isaac was the intended victim.[1] Learned Mohammedan theologians, however, distinctly say that Isaac, and not Ishmael, was to have been

[1] و قد تنازع الناس في الذبح فمنهم من ذهب الي انه اسحق و منهم من راي انه اسمعيل فان كان الامر بالذبح و قع بمني فالذبح اسمعيل لان اسحق لم يدخل الحجاز وان كان الامر بالذبح و قع بالشام فا الذبح اسحق لان اسمعيل لم يدخل الشام بعد ان حمل منه * مروج الذهب مسعودي *

The site of the intended sacrifice is much disputed, some saying that it was Isaac who was commanded to have been offered, while others assert that it was Ishmael. If the appointed victim was offered at Mecca, then it must have undoubtedly been Ishmael, for Isaac never entered Hedjaz; but if the victim was sacrificed in Syria, then, indeed, it must have been Isaac, for Ishmael never set foot on that territory.—*Moroojozahab Masoudi.*

offered up, as is also proved by the following hadees: Mohammed-bin-Muntashir said, "Verily a man vowed to sacrifice himself, if God would free him from his enemies; and he asked Ibni Abbas about the orders for it, who referred the matter to Masruc. Then the man asked Masruc, who expounded it in this wise: 'buy a ram, kill him, and give him in alms to the poor; for verily Ishak (Isaac) the prophet was better than you, and he was ransomed with a ram.'" عن محمد ابن المنتشر قال ان رجلا نذر ان ينحر نفسه . . . (فقال له مسروق) لا تنحر . . . و اشتر كبشا فاذ بحه للمسا كين فان اسحٰق خير منك و فدي بكبش . . . . (رواه ابن رزين مشكواة).

Ishmael had twelve sons:—נְבָיוֹת Nebajoth نبايوث, קֵדָר Kedar قيدار, אַדְבְּאֵל Adbeel ادبئيل, מִבְשָׂם Mibsam مبسام, מִשְׁמָע משمع, דּוּמָה Dumah دوماه, מַשָּׂא Massa مسّا, חֲדַד Hadar حدر, תֵּימָא Tema تيما, יְטוּר Jetur يطور, נָפִישׁ Naphish نافيش, and קֵדְמָה Kedemah قيدماه.

Nebajoth نبايوث. This patriarch settled in the north-western portion of Arabia. The exact position given to this tribe in the map of the Rev. Cartery P. Cary, M.A., is between 28° and 30° north latitude, and between 36° and 38° east longitude. The Rev. Mr. Forster describes them as extending "from the heart of Arabia Petræa eastward, far into Arabia Deserta, and southward, as far, at least, as to the termination of the Elamitic Gulf and the confines of the Hedjaz." Strabo assigns them a still more extensive location, for he notices "two positions on the Arabian Gulf which plainly indicate the extension of their dominions in a south-western direction, as far as the latitude of Medina, these two positions being the town and port of Hour, or the white port north of Yembo, and the port of Yembo itself."

"From this brief outline," says the Rev. Mr. Forster, "it would appear that they prevailed not only in the stony desert

and Arabia, but also within the great provinces of Hedjaz and Nedjed."

It is possible that, in the course of time, this tribe spread itself over the above defined extensive country, and we learn from the Scriptures (Isaiah lx. 7)[1] that they were a dominant tribe.

Kedar قيدار. This patriarch proceeded towards the south of the Nabathean tribe, and settled in Hedjaz. The Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc., "supply a cloud of witnesses to the national greatness and glory" of this nation. It was from out this nation that the grace and benignity of God were manifested by the advent of Mohammed, and gradually spread, and are still spreading their beneficial effects over the greater portion of the globe. There still exist among the Arabs and other Orientals innumerable traditions respecting this nation; it will, however, suffice to mention here those only that are recognised and accepted as genuine ones by the Rev. Mr. Forster.

The above-named author states that the "presumption thus afforded by Isaiah, that the tents of Kedar should be sought in this last quarter, receives material confirmation from another place of the same prophet, his description, namely, of the land of Kedar, which every reader, conversant with Arabian geography, will recognise as a most accurate delineation of the district of Hedjaz, including its famous cities of Mecca and Medina." "The reader who may require further marks of their identity is referred to the modern geography of the Hedjaz, where, in the neighbourhood of Yembo, the line of demarkation is significantly preserved to the present day in the towns of El-Khadhayre and Nabt, the regular Arabic forms of the proper names Kedar and Nabajoth."

"Thus far we have traced the vestiges of Kedar by the lights

[1] "All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebajoth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory."

of ancient geography. It remains to be seen what accession of proof may arise from a comparison of the classical indications with the traditions of the Arabs. For, however questionable, in the opinion of European criticism, the unsupported testimony of Arabian tradition may be, it is plainly impossible, on the received laws of just reasoning, to deny the conclusiveness of its independent concurrence with history, sacred and profane. Now it was the immemorial tradition of the Arabs themselves that Kedar and his posterity originally settled in Hedjaz. From this patriarch the tribe of Koreish in particular, the sovereigns of Mecca, and guardians of the Kaaba always boasted their descent, and Mahomet himself, in the Koran, upheld his claim to the princely and priestly honours of his race, on this very ground, as an Ishmaelite of the stock of Kedar. A national tradition like this rises into historical authority, when sustained, on the one hand, by those scriptural notices which place Kedar in this very quarter of the peninsula, and, on the other hand, by the unquestioned and unquestionable fact of the existence of the Cedrei, Darrae, Kedrunitae or Kadraitæ, as a people of the Hedjaz, in the ages of Uranius, Ptolemy, and the elder Pliny" (Hist. Geog. vol. i. p. 248).

Adbeel ادبئيل. No mention is made of this patriarch by the Oriental writers, and the Rev. Mr. Forster informs us that he is but only once mentioned in the Scriptures. The same reverend writer states, on the authority of Josephus, that the primitive seat of Adbeel lay in the neighbourhood of his elder brethren; but the statement of the above-named reverend historian is only correct thus far, being no longer entitled to credit when his only means for discovering traces of this patriarch are the identity of a few letters.

Mibsam مبسام. No traces can be found of this patriarch in the present geography and history of Arabia. The historian so often quoted, the Rev. Mr. Forster, says, "The vestiges of the name and race of this Ishmaelitish patriarch are fewer and more

faint than those of any of his brethren. The name in full is legible neither in the classical nor in the modern geography of Arabia."

Mishma مشماع. No traces of this patriarch can be gleaned from Oriental histories. If it be accepted as true, as the Rev. Mr. Forster would persuade us to think, that the Mishma of Genesis and 1 Chronicles, the Masma of the Septuagint, the Masmaos of Josephus, Masaemanes of Ptolemy, and the Bani Masma of the Arabs, are all identical—then can it be pretty safely asserted that the primitive seat of this patriarch was in the vicinity of Nedjed.

Dumah دوماء. The descendants of this patriarch first settled in the south of Tehama, in the neighbourhood of Medina, but when his posterity multiplied, he was obliged to remove from that narrow locality, and fixed his abode on the spot which Daumat-al-Gendal دومة الجندل now occupies.[1] There are many other spots between Syria and Medina bearing the names of this

[1] دومة الجندل . . . . وقد جاء في حديث الواقدي دوماء الجندل و عدها ابن السفقيه من اعمال المدينة سميت بدوم ابن اسمعيل بن ابراهيم و قال الزجاجي دومان ابن اسمعيل و قيل كان لاسمعيل ولد اسمه دما لعله مغيّر منه و قال ابن الكلبي دوماء بن اسمعيل قال و لماكثر و لد اسمعيل عم بالتها مة خرج دوماء بن اسمعيل حتي نزل موضع دومة و بني له حصنا فقيل دوماء و نسب الحصن اليه . . . قال ابو عبيد السكوني دومة جندل حصن و قري بين الشام و المدينة قرب جبلي طي . . . . . و دومة من القريات من وادي القري * معجم البلدان *

Daumatul Gendal. Wakedee has it Doumatul Gendal, while Ibni Sakafee informs us that it formerly formed one of the districts of Medina, and was named after one of the sons of Ishmael—Doum, Douman, Damah, or Doumah. Ibni Kalbee states

patriarch. The Rev. Mr. Forster also affirms what we have just observed.

Massa مسّا. The Rev. Mr. Forster erroneously represents the offspring of this patriarch to have settled in Mesopotamia. There is no doubt that this tribe settled in Yemen, which circumstance is corroborated by the preservation of the name of Mousa in (P. Carey's map, in which it is described as situated between Lat. 13° 30′ N., and Long. 43° 30′ E.), in Yemen, to the present day.

This tribe seems to have primarily settled in the vicinity of Hedjaz, but, on account of the contractedness of that locality subsequently removed to Yemen, a place claiming a great superiority over the first in consequence of its extreme fertility and exuberance.

Hadar حدر or the *Hadad of* 1 *Chronicles.* This patriarch took a southerly direction and settled in Hedjaz, a fact corroborated by many external as well as internal evidences. Alzohairee, a Mohammedan historian, expressly mentions Hadad as having been one of the many tribes of which the inhabitants of Arabia were composed. The existence of the town of Hadeda in Yemen and of the Bani Hadad of Yemen strikingly verifies the correctness of our statement.

Tema تيما. Next to the first two sons of Ishmael, Tema ranks the most conspicuous. The primitive seat of this patriarch was the province of Hedjaz, but, in the course of time, his descendants extended over the Central Nedjed, and some of them along the coast of the Persian Gulf. When we have in view the corroboration of the words of Moses respecting the primitive settlement of the Ishmaelitish patriarchs, we should always bestow much consideration and research as to the locality where

that when the descendants of Ishmael excessively multiplied in Tehama, Doumah left that locality and proceeded to the spot where Doumah is now situated. Abu Obaid mentions that the name Doumah is given to the districts situated in Wady Kora, and between Medina and Syria.—*Mojamol boldan.*

each of these patriarchs settled for the first time, and not upon the place where his descendants afterwards located themselves.

Jetur يطور. The Rev. Mr. Forster states that there is every reason to believe that the primitive seat of this tribe was the district of Djedour, or "South of Djebel Kassione, east of Djebel el Shiekh, and west of the Hadj road."

Nephish نافيش. Oriental historians are entirely silent as regards the settlement of this patriarch, but the above-named writer says that "the existence in Arabia Deserta of an Arab tribe, descended from this patriarch, is undeniably ascertained by the threefold testimonies of Moses, of the author of 1 Chronicles, and of Josephus."

Kedemah[1] قيدماه. It appears that this patriarch settled in the vicinity of Yemen, for we recognise in Masoudee, whose remarks we shall give in a note, a tribe designated the Kadman inhabiting the province of Yemen. The Rev. Mr. Forster is singularly mistaken in thinking that Kazemah كاظمه on the Persian Gulf, and mentioned by Abulfeda, is identical with this Kedemah.

After all the search we have been able to make for discovering the primitive seat of the descendants of Ishmael, we have come to the conclusion that traces of them are to be found from Yemen (Havilah) as far as Syria (Shur), corroborating, in this manner, the statement of Moses, "And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria" (Gen. xxv. 18).

[1] اصحاب الرس و كانوا من ولد اسمعيل و هم قبيلتان يقال لاحدا هما قدمان و لاخري يامين و قيل رعويل و ذلك باليمن * مروج الذهب مسعودي *

Two tribes are represented to have dwelt in Yemen, one being designated Kedman and the other Raoyal, and both of them were jointly known by the appellation of Ashabi Ras.—*Morrawajoz zahab Masoudi.*

Ishmael was born in 4094 A.M. or 1910 A.C., and, when driven from home, was sixteen years of age. Now if twenty years be added to the latter, it would, we think, be quite sufficient time for Ishmael to have been the father of twelve sons. We are, therefore, safe in concluding that no son was born to Ishmael after 2130 A.M. or 1874 A.C.

These twelve patriarchs acquired no great celebrity, except that of their having been the fathers of twelve distinct tribes of Arabia, and it is owing to this very fact that these tribes did not split up into offsets and branches, but remained in a stagnant and quiescent state. But we find that, after the lapse of a considerable period of time, the progeny of Adnan, a descendant of Kedar, the son of Ishmael, branched off in various offshoots, and acquired renown by their exploits.

Oriental historians unanimously state that Adnan had two sons, Moid معد and Ak عك. Respecting the latter personage the above writers simply state that he went to Yemen. The Adite inscriptions, however, discovered at Hassan Ghorab in Hazramout, clearly evince that he remained king of that country for a short time. These inscriptions were discovered at the place above-named in 1834 by the officers of the late Hon. East India Company's surveying vessel, the "Palinurus." A full account of these inscriptions, together with fac-similes of the inscriptions themselves, is given in the third volume of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The interpretation given by the Rev. Mr. Forster clearly shows that at that time Ak was king of the place.

With the view of accurately fixing the chronology of this poetic inscription, the Rev. Mr. Forster says that "Ak was the son of Adnan; and Adnan, according to the tradition of Mahomet, transmitted, through his wife, Omm—Salma, was the fourth generation from Ishmael . . . . . the date of the poem it follows must be a little, and but a little, prior to the Egyptian famine." But in this the reverend gentleman was again par-

ticularly mistaken, as no trustworthy authority exists proving that Mohammed ever stated that Adnan was the fourth generation from Ishmael. According to authentic genealogical traditions among the Arabs, Adnan lived twenty-two generations prior to Mohammed. Now taking into consideration the natural duration of one generation, then Ak must have lived in the 39th century A.M. or the 2nd century A.C.

Wailah, surnamed Kolaib, son of Rabea, one of the descendants of Adnan, also became king, and fought several battles with the Yemenites.

Zohair, the son of Josaimah, as well as Kais, the son of the former, became also, in turn, kings of Hedjaz. As we have no indisputable authority for fixing the dates of these personages, we cannot do so with any amount of certainty, but we think that it might have been the same period when the kingdom of Yemen and other ones were in decadence.

From the descendants of Adnan sprang Mohammed, in 4570 A.M. or 570 A.D., and acquired both temporal and spiritual supremacy over the whole peninsula of Arabia.

Christian writers have written much and freely upon our Prophet's genealogy, and this would be a proper place for our likewise taking part in the discussion with confidence, and refuting every objection that might be raised; but as we intend to dedicate a separate essay to this subject, it would be advisable not to touch upon it at present.

II. *The Abrahamites, or the Beni Keturah.*

"Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah. And she bare him Zimran and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah. And Joksham begat Sheba and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were Asshurim, and Letushim, and Leummim; and the sons of Midian; Ephah and Epher, and Hanoch, and Abidah, and Eldaah" (Gen. xxv. 1-5).

All these persons migrated to Arabia, and settled in the

country extending from the borders of Hedjaz as far as the Persian Gulf, and their traces are still to be found in the names of many places scattered all over the above defined locality.

It was from among these Abrahamites that the prophet Shoaib شعيب was selected by God to instruct the tribes of Aika and Midian in his true worship.

We cannot, however, state, with certainty, when this prophet flourished. But if we take Jethro (mentioned in Exodus xviii. 1, 2, etc.) and Shoaib to be one and the same individual, as has long been supposed to be the case, then, indeed, it can be very accurately asserted that this prophet lived at the time when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt.

III. *The Edomites, or progeny of Esau.*

Esau, called also Edom, took to himself three wives—Adah, Aholibamah, and Bashemoth, daughter of Ishmael. By his first wife Esau had Eliphaz; Alholibamah bare him Jeush, Jaalam, and Korah; and Bashemoth gave birth to Reuel. The sons of Eliphaz were Teman, Omar, Zepho, and Gatam, and Kenaz, and Amalek; the sons of Reuel were Nahath, Zerah, Shammah, and Mizzah (Gen. xxxvi.).

Nearly all the descendants of Esau settled in the vicinity of Mount Seir. Some of them fixed their abode in Arabia Petræa and along the northern frontier of Hedjaz, but these latter were so few in number that some writers have, on this very account, asserted that Arabia was never colonized by Esau's descendants.

IV. *Nahorites.*

Sir Wm. Muir says that "Uz and Buz, the sons of Nahor, Abraham's brother, were the ancestors of extensive tribes to the north of Arabia" (Job i. 1; Lament. iv. 21; and Jeremiah xxv. 20).

V. *Haramites.*

Sir Wm. Muir states that "they lived more to the north than any other nations before specified. Their most southerly stations lay east of the Dead Sea, and comprised the fine pasture lands of Balcaa and Kerek."

What the Holy Scriptures state upon the subject is, "Thus were both the daughters (slaves)[1] of Lot, with child by their father (master). And the firstborn bare a son, and called his name Moab: the same is the father of the Moabites unto this day. And the younger, she also bare a son, and called his name Ben-ammi; the same is the father of the children of Ammon unto this day (Gen. xix. 36-38).

We hesitate to accept the statement of Sir Wm. Muir that the Ammonites did not inhabit any portion of Arabia, but remained in the north, for we, on our part, believe that the Ammonites settled along the coast of the Persian Gulf, and that their name still exists in that part of Omman which is to be found throughout the whole tract.

If the Ammonites did not colonize Arabia, as the above author would lead us to think, then it is wrong to reckon them as one of the Arabian tribes.

Of all the Arabul Mustaaribah, who are descended from Terah, the Ishmaelites only multiplied, and, after some time, became

[1] All Christians implicitly believe that Lot was guilty of incest, a ridiculous belief indeed! Would not such an assertion be wholly inconsistent with the character of propriety and decency befitting a sacred writer, and equally unjust to so pious a personage as was Lot? Mohammedan divines, however, interpret the passage otherwise. The word *bint* used in the original Hebrew radically signifies *daughter*, but it is also applied by the Jews to a *female slave*. It was and still is the custom throughout Asia for master and the slave to address each other respectively as daughter and father.

It is more reasonable, therefore, to believe that they were two female slaves of Lot than that they were his daughters.

We have discussed this subject elsewhere* at great length, and have thoroughly proved this interpretation of ours to be undoubtedly correct.

* "Mohammedan Commentary on the Holy Bible," part iii., which is to be published.

divided into numerous tribes and offsets, while the rest remained inactive and continued stationary.

We shall now proceed to enumerate and describe these various tribes and offshoots, and it will then be seen how very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, it must have been for any man to leave his own tribe and join that of another; and this the more, as in those days society was but in its crude state, when people set an immense value upon, and took a great pride in, the noble deeds and achievements of their ancestors; when an illustrious descent was a subject of self-laudation, and when, the Arabs in particular, were so tenacious of preserving the distinction which existed and was sedulously maintained between the different tribes, and of keeping their own free from any admixture and alloy.

The following is the list of those nations who, as above said, remained inactive, without acquiring any name exclusively their own :—

1. Nahor, son of Terah = Bano Nahor بنوا ناحور.
2. Haran, son of Terah = Bano Haran بنوا هاران.
3. Moab, son of Lot, son of Haran, son of Terah = Bano Moab بنوا مواب.
4. Oman, son of Lot = Bano Oman بنوا عمان.
5. The descendants of Abraham, except Ishmael = Bano Ibraheem بنوا ابراهيم.
6. The descendants of Abraham by Keturah = Bano Keturah بنوا قطورہ.
7. Esau, otherwise Edom, son of Isaac, son of Abraham = Bano Edom بنوا ادوم.

The following are the progeny of Ishmael, who, as above noticed, multiplied, comparatively, rapidly :—

8. Ishmael, son of Abraham = Bano Ishmael بنوا اسمعيل together with the descendants of his twelve sons, who are as follows:

9. Nebajoth = Bano Nebajoth بنوا نبايوت ; 10. Kedar = Bano Kedar بنوا قيدار ; 11. Adbeel = Bano Adbeel بنوا ادبئيل ; 12. Mibsam = Bano Mibsam بنوا مبسام ; 13. Mishma = Bano Mishma بنوا مشماع ; 14. Dumah = Bano Dumah بنوا دوماه ; 15. Massa = Bano Massa بنوا مسّا ; 16. Hadar = Bano Hadar بنوا حدر ; 17. Tema = Bano Tema بنوا تيما ; 18. Jetur = Bano Jetur بنوا يطور ; 19. Naphish = Bano Naphish بنوا نافيش ; 20. Kedemah = Bano Kedemah بنوا قيدماه.

Out of the above-named twelve patriarchs, the descendants of Kedar, in the course of time, became famous and branched off into tribes. For many centuries, however, they also remained in their primitive state, and did not produce any worthy and illustrious personages, men who by their talents and surprising abilities might justly have claimed the appellation of patriarchs, or might have founded kingdoms or established nations; and it is for this reason alone that in the history of the descendants of this patriarch occurs a gap of many centuries. This very fact, however, justifies the correctness and corroborates the conclusiveness of Arabian tradition, for surely the progeny of an exiled mother and her child, cast forth into the world in so destitute and wretched a condition, must necessarily and indispensably require time for their multiplication and progress, a progress which was eventually to give them a most prominent and conspicuous place in the history of the world, and whose descendants had performed such mighty deeds and illustrious achievements as are scarcely to be paralleled in the history of nations.

Yet, notwithstanding all that we have above observed, we find in Arabian history the following eight names among the offspring of Kedar, from the commencement of this nation up to the time of their acquiring any renown: Hamal, Nabet, Salaman, Al Hameisa, Al Yasa, Adad, Odd, and Adnan.

The latter is the same Adnan whose son Ak became king of Yemen, as before observed. In interpreting the Adite inscription

mentioned above, the Rev. Mr. Forster, meeting with the name of Odd, erroneously represented it to mean the prophet Hud, a mistake which very probably arose from his assigning a wrong chronology to the inscription. Now, it is our opinion that this Odd is the same as the father of Adnan. It appears that this personage was a very righteous and pious man, and believed in and taught the "miracle-mystery," the "resurrection-mystery," and the worship of the one invisible God.

The following are the descendants of Adnan:

21. Ayad, son of Moid, son of Adnan = Ayadee ايادي.
22. Konnos, son of Moid = Konnosee قُنُصي.
23. Modir, son of Nazar, son of Moid = Bano Modir بنوا مضر.
24. Rabeeyah, son of Nazar, son of Moid = Bano Rabeeyah بنوا ربيعه.
25. Asad, son of Rabeeyah = Bano Asad بنوا اسد.
26. Dobaiah, son of Rabeeyah = Bano Dobaiah بنوا ضبيعه.

The following are the descendants of Dobaiah:

27 Bano Abul Kalb بنوا ابوالكلب ; 28. Bano Shahnah بنوا شحنه.
29. Jodailah, son of Asad, son of Rabeeyah = Bano Jodailah بنوا جديله.
30. Anzah, son of Asad = Bano Anzah بنوا عنزه.
31. Omair, son of Asad = Bano Omair بنوا عُمير.
32. Abdul Kais, son of Aksee, son of Domee, son of Jodailah = Bano Abdul Kais بنوا عبدالقيس.
33. Addoil, son of Shun, son of Aksee, son of Abdul Kais = Bano Addoil of Shun بنوا الديل شني.

The following is the branch of Addoil:

34. Bano Bohsah بنوا بُهثه.
35. Dohon, son of Wadeeyah, son of Nokair, son of Aksee, son of Abdul Kais by Wailah = Bano Wailah بنوا وايله.
36. Anmar, son of Amar, son of Wadeeyah = Bano Anmar بنوا انمار.
37. Ajal, son of Amar = Bano Ajal of Kais بنوا عجل قيسي.

38. Moharib, son of Amar = Bano Moharib بنوا المحارب.

39. Addoil, son of Amar = Bano Addoil بنوا الديل.

The following is the branch of Addoil:

40. Bano Sohan بنوا صوحان.

41. Alowk, son of Amar, son of Wadeeyah = Bano Aowk or Aowkee بنوا العوق يا عوقي.

42. Children of Bakr, son of Hobaib, son of Amar, son of Ghanam, son of Taghlab, son of Wail, son of Kasit, son of Hanab, son of Aksee, son of Domee, son of Jodailah = Alarakim الاراقم.

43. Bakr, son of Wail, son of Kasit = Bano Bakr بنوا بكر.

44. Taghlab, son of Wail, son of Kasit = Bano Taghlab بنوا تغلب.

The following are the descendants of Taghlab:

45. Bano Akab بنوا عكب; 46. Bano Adi بنوا عدي; 47. Bano Kananah or Koraish-i-Taghlab بنوا كنانه يا قريش تغلب; 48. Bano Zohair بنوا زُهير; 49. Bano Attab بنوا عتاب.

50. Ghanam, son of Hobaib, son of Kaab, son of Yashkar, son of Bakr, son of Wail = Bano Ghanam بنوا غنم.

51. Lojaim, son of Saab, son of Ali, son of Bakr = Bano Lojaim بنوا لجيم.

The following are the descendants of Lojaim:

52. Bano Haffan بنوا هفّان; 53. Bano Ijil بنوا عجل.

54. Children of Malik, son of Saab = Bano Zamman بنوا زمّان.

55. Zohol, son of Saalibah, son of Akaabah, son of Saab = Bano Zohol بنوا ذهل.

56. Shaiban, son of Saalibah = Bano Shaiban بنوا شيبان.

The following are the descendants of Shaiban:

57. Bano Alwarsah بنوا الورثه; 58. Bano Jadrah بنوا لجدره; 59. Bano Shakeekah بنوا الشقيقه.

60. Children of Taimollah, son of Saalibah = Allahazim اللهازم.

61. Sadoos, son of Shaiban, son of Zohol = Sadoosee سدوسي.

62. Kamaah, or otherwise Kais Ailan, son of Alyas, son of Modir = Kais Ailanee or Bano Kais قيس عيلاني يا بنوا قيس.

63. Amar, son of Kais Ailan = Bano Amar بنوا عمرو.

The following are the descendants of Amar:

64. Bano Kharijah بنوا خارجه; 65. Bano Wabish بنوا وابش; 66. Bano Yashkar بنوا يشكر; 67. Bano Auf بنوا عوف; 68. Bano Roham بنوا رهم; 69. Bano Ribah بنوا رباح.

70. Saad, son of Kais Ailan = Bano Saad بنوا سعد.

71. Ghatfan, son of Saad = Bano Ghatfan بنوا غطفان.

72. Moin, son of Aasar, son of Saad = Bano Moin بنوا معن.

73. Ghanee, son of Aasar = Bano Ghanee بنوا غني.

The following are the descendants of Ghanee:

74. Bano Dobainah بنوا ضبينه; 75. Bano Bohsah بنوا بهثه; 76. Bano Obaid بنوا عُبيد.

77. Monabbahah, son of Aasar = Bano Monabbahah بنوا مُنبَّه.

The following are the descendants of Monabbahah:

78. Bano Hasar بنوا حَسَر; 79. Bano Sinan بنوا سنان.

80. Ashjah, son of Ghatfan, son of Saab = Bano Ashjah بنوا اشجع.

The following is the branch of Ashjah:

81. Bano Dahman بنوا دهمان.

82. Zaiban, son of Boghaiz, son of Rais, son of Ghatfan = Bano Zaiban بنوا ذيبان.

The following are the descendants of Zaiban:

83. Bano Fazarah بنوا فزاره; 84. Bano Ashrah بنوا العشراء.

85. Ubus, son of Boghaiz = Bano Ubus بنوا عبس.

86. Saad, son of Zaiban, son of Boghaiz = Bano Saad بنوا سعد.

The following are the descendants of Saad:

87. Bano Jehash بنوا جحاش; 88. Bano Sobai بنوا سُبيع; 89. Bano Hashwar بنوا حَشور.

90. Khasfah, son of Kais Ailan = Bano Khasfah بنوا حصفه.

The following is the branch of Khasfah:

91. Bano Jasar بنوا جسر.

92. Abo Malik, son of Akrimah, son of Khasfah = Bano Abo Malik بنوا ابو مالك.

93. Mansoor, son of Akrimah = Bano Solaim بنوا سُلَيم.

The following are the descendants of Mansoor:

94. Bano Hiram بنوا حرام; 95. Bano Khifaf بنوا خفاف; 96. Bano Samman بنوا سمّان; 97. Bano Roil بنوا رعل; 98. Bano Zakwan بنوا ذكوان; 99. Bano Matrood بنوا مطرود; 100. Bano Bahz بنوا بهز; 101. Bano Konfoz بنوا قُنفذ; 102. Bano Rifaah بنوا رفاعه; 103. Bano Shareed بنوا شريد; 104. Bano Kotaibah بنوا قتيبه.

105. Salaman, son of Akrimah = Salamanee سلاماني.

106. Hawazin, son of Mansoor = Bano Hawazin بنوا هوازن.

107. Mazin, son of Mansoor = Bano Mazin بنوا مازن.

108. Saad, son of Bakr, son of Hawazin = Bano Saad بنوا سعد.

109. Nasar, son of Moaviyah, son of Bakr = Bano Nasar بنوا نصر.

110. Morra, son of Saasaa, son of Moaviyah = Bano Morrah or Bano Salool بنوا مره يا بنوا سلول.

111. Nomair, son of Aamir, son Saasaa = Nomairee نُميري.

112. Hilal, son of Aamir = Bano Hilal بنوا هلال.

113. Rabeeyah, son of Aamir = Bano Majd بنوا مجد.

114. Children of Amar, son of Aamir = Bano Boka بنوا البكا.

115. Moaviyah, son of Kilab, son of Rabeeyah = Bano Moaviyah بنوا معاويه.

116. Jafir, son of Kilab = Bano Jafir بنوا جعفر.

117. Children of Amar, son of Kilab = Bano Didan بنوا دِدان.

118. Children of Abdullah, son of Kaab, son of Rabeeyah = Bano Ijlan بنوا العجلان.

119. Children of Koshair, son of Kaab = Bano Zomrah بنوا ضمرہ.

120. Children of Monabbihah, son of Hawazin = Abo Sakeef ابو ثقیف.

The following are the descendants of Abo Sakeef:

121. Bano Malik بنوا مالک ; 122. Bano Ahlaf بنوا احلاف.

123. Tabikhah, son of Alyas, son of Modir = Bano Tabikhah or Bano Khindif بنوا طابخہ یا بنوا خندف.

124. Taim, son of Abdi Manat, son of Ad, son of Tabikhah = Bano Taim بنوا تیم.

125. Adi, son of Abdi Manat = Bano Adi بنوا عدي.

126. Sour, son of Abdi Manat = Souree ثوري.

The following are the descendants of Abdi Manat:

127. Arrobab الرباب ; 128. Bano Nasar بنوا نصر ; 129. Bano Mazin بنوا مازن ; 130. Bano Sial بنوا السیل ; 131. Bano Aizah بنوا عایذہ ; 132. Bano Taimollat بنوا تیم اللات ; 133. Bano Zabban بنوا زبّان ; 134. Bano Auf بنوا عوف ; 135. Bano Sheem بنوا شیم ; 136. Bano Zohol بنوا الزحل ; 137. Bano Bijalah بنوا بجالہ.

138. Mozainah, son of Ad, son of Tabikhah = Mozanee مزني.

139. Mor, son of Ad = Bano Zainah بنوا ظاعنہ.

The following is the branch of Zainah:

140. Bano Soofah بنوا صوفہ.

141. Tameem, son of Mor = Bano Tameem بنوا تمیم.

The following are the descendants of Tameem:

142. Habatat حبطات ; 143. Bano Aseeyah بنوا عصیہ ; 144. Albrajim البراجم ; 145. Bano Kolaib بنوا کُلیب ; 146. Bano Riyah بنوا ریاح ; 147. Bano Morrah بنوا مُرہ ; 148. Bano Makrah بنوا مقرہ ; 149. Bano Hamman بنوا حمّان ; 150. Bano Hinzilah بنوا حنظلہ ; 151. Bano Darum بنوا دارم ; 152. Bano Adveeyah بنوا العدویہ ; 153. Bano Taheeyah بنوا الطھیہ ; 154. Ali Safwan آل صفوان ; 155. Ali Otarud آلِ عطارد ; 156. Bano Auf بنوا عوف.

157. Modrikah, son of Alyas, son of Modir = Bano Modrikah or Bano Khindif بنوا مدركه يا بنوا خندف.

158. Hozail, son of Modrikah = Bano Hozail or Hozailee بنوا هذيل يا هذيلي.

159. Tameem, son of Saad, son of Hozail = Bano Tameem بنوا تميم.

160. Horaib, son of Saad = Bano Horaib بنوا حُريب.

161. Monaah, son of Saad = Bano Monaah بنوا مُنعه.

162. Khonaah, son of Saad = Bano Khonaah بنوا خناعه.

163. Joham, son of Saad = Johamee جهمي.

164. Ghanam, son of Saad = Ghanamee غنمي.

165. Harth, son of Saad = Harthee حرثي.

166. Khozaimah, son of Modrikah = Bano Khozaimah بنوا خُزيمه.

167. Alhown, son of Khozaimah = Bano Hown بنوا الهون.

The following are the descendants of Alhown:

168. Bano Karah بنوا القاره; 169. Odlee عُضلي; 170. Addeeshee الديشي.

171. Asad, son of Khozaimah = Bano Asad بنوا اسد.

172. Dodan, son of Asad = Dodanee دوُداني.

173. Kahil, son of Asad = Kahilee كاهلي.

174. Hamlah, son of Asad = Hamlee حملي.

175. Amar, son of Asad = Amree عمري.

The following are the descendants of Amar:

176. Bano Fakas بنوا فقعس; 177. Bano Saidah بنوا الصيدا; 178. Bano Nasar بنوا نصر; 179. Bano Zinyah بنوا الزنيه; 180. Bano Aadirah بنوا عاضره; 181. Bano Noamah بنوا نعامه.

182. Kananah, son of Khozaimah = Bano Kananah بنوا كنانه.

183. Malik, son of Kananah = Bano Malik بنوا مالك.

The following are the descendants of Malik:

184. Bano Fukain بنوا فُقيم; 185. Bano Feras بنوا فراس; 186. Bano Bajar بنوا بجر.

187. Malkan, son of Kananah = Bano Malkan بنوا ملكان.

188. Abdi Manat, son of Kananah = Bano Abdi Manat, بنوا عبد مناة.

The following are the descendants of Abdi Manat:

189. Bano Modlaj بنوا مدلج; 190. Bano Jozaimah بنوا جذيمه; 191. Bano Lais بنوا ليث; 192. Bano Dowil بنوا الديل; 193. Bano Zomrah بنوا ضمرة; 194. Bano Ghifar بنوا غفار; 195. Bano Oraij بنوا عريج.

196. Amar, son of Kananah = Amreeyoon عمريون.

197. Aamir son of Kananah = Aamireeyoon عامريون.

The following is the branch of Kananah:

198. Alahabeesh الاحابيش.

199. Nadar, son of Kananah = Bano Nadar بنوا النضر.

200. Malik, son of Nadar = Bano Malik بنوا مالك.

201. Alharth, son of Malik = Mottayibeen مطيبين.

The following is the branch of Alharth:

202. Bano Kholj بنوا الخلج.

203. Fahr, son of Malik = Bano Fahr or Koreish بنوا فهر يا قريش.

204. Moharib, son of Fahr = Bano Moharib بنوا مُحارب.

205. Ghalib, son of Fahr = Bano Ghalib بنوا غالب.

206. Taim, son of Ghalib = Bano Taim or Bano Adram بنوا تيم يا بنوا الادرم.

207. Lavee, son of Ghalib = Bano Lavee بنوا لوي.

208. Aamir, son of Lavee = Bano Aamir بنوا عامر.

The following are the descendants of Aamir:

209. Hasl حسل; 210. Moees مُعيص.

211. Samah, son of Lavee = Bano Samah بنوا سامه.

212. Saad, son of Lavee = Bano Saad بنوا سعد.

The following is the branch of Saad:

213. Bannanah بنّانه.

214. Khozaimah, son of Lavee = Bano Khozaimah بنوا خزيمه.

The following is the branch of Khozaimah :

215. Bano Aizah بنوا عايذه.
216. Harth, son of Lavee = Bano Harth بنوا الحرث.
217. Auf, son of Lavee = Bano Auf بنوا عوف.
218. Kaab, son of Lavee = Bano Kaab بنوا كعب.
219. Adi, son of Kaab = Bano Adi بنوا عدي.
220. Hosais, son of Kaab = Bano Hosais بنوا هصيص.

The following are the descendants of Hosais :

221. Bano Sahm بنوا سهم ; 222. Bano Jamah بنوا جمح.
223. Morrah, son of Kaab = Bano Morrah. بنوا مره.
224. Taim, son of Morrah = Bano Taim بنوا تيم.
225. Makhzoom, son of Morrah = Bano Makhzoom بنوا مخزوم.
226. Kilab, son of Morrah = Bano Kilab بنوا كلاب
227. Zohrah, son of Kilab = Bano Zohrah بنوا زهره.
228. Kosaiee, son of Kilab = Bano Kosaiee or Mojammaa بنوا قصي يا مجمّع.

The following is the branch of Kilab :

229. Nooflaeeyoon نوفليون.
230. Abdud Dar, son of Kosaiee = Daree داري.

The following is the branch of Abdud Dur :

231. Shaibee شيبي.
232. Omayah, son of Abdush-shams, son of Abdi Manaf, son of Kosaiee = Bano Omayah بنوا أميه.
233. Hashim, son of Abdi Manaf = Bano Hashim بنوا هاشم.
234. Abdul Muttalib, son of Hashim = Bano Muttalib بنوا مطلب.
235. Abbas, son of Abdul Muttalib = Abbasee عباسي.
236. Ali, son of Abu Talib, son of Abdul Muttalib = Alwee علوي.
237. Fatimah, daughter of Mohammed = Sadat Bani Fatimah سادات بني فاطمه عليها السلام.

The better to elucidate the above list of these tribes, we subjoin

a table of the various ones belonging to the Arabul Mustaaribah.

Before concluding our account of these tribes, we think the present a fit opportunity for mentioning that, in Arabia, a comparatively weak tribe, or one which was fast declining, not unfrequently amalgamated itself with a powerful one; a fact which has led foreign historians into a palpable mistake, inasmuch as some of them have thought, and still do think, that the two tribes were genealogically united together, and that thenceforth they were known by one name only—that of the stronger of the two. Hence the observation of the above authors, that the Arab tribes were always subject to "the vicissitudes of combination." This, however, is wrong, for it was not that the two tribes were so continued as to be considered as descended from one and the same stock, but that the laws which regulated the public and social lives of the two were blended together, the one assisting the other in any public emergency. Individuals of both tribes would follow the banner of one distinguished leader; and, in the event of any member of either tribe committing a crime, both tribes had to pay a fine by way of punishment, etc.

Before concluding this our Essay it will be necessary to say something regarding the appellation of—Saracens, given by the Greeks to some of the pre-Islamic Arabs, and which was subsequently extended to the whole peninsula, both before and after the introduction of Islam. Several historians have exhausted their ingenuity in endeavouring to explain this word, each of them in a way peculiar to himself, such explanations not unfrequently smacking strongly of ancient prejudices.

It will suffice for our purpose simply to quote here, without either any comment or addition of our own, what the Rev. Mr. Pocock has observed in his "history of Arabia." We shall give the Latin original and the English translation in juxta-position to each other.

At cur qui olim *Arabes*, postea Saraceni dicti sint, nondum in iis quæ a nostris edita sunt reperio quod inquirenti satisfaciat. Explosa est meritò eorum sententia, qui à *Sarah* nomen traxisse autumant ; & passim jam obtinuit ut a سرق *Sarak*, quod *furari* denotat, existimentur, voce quæ genus hominum ferox & λπϛρικὸν indigitet. At a quibus hoc nomen illis inditum ? Non ab ipsis qui famæ suæ pepercissent : sin ab aliis, sua potiùs lingua, quam *Arabum*, quibus hoc ad opprobrium sonat, locuturos fuisse credibile est. Deinde viderint eruditi an a *Sarak* سرق, quod *clam furari* significat, nomen, quo publicis latrociniis infames designentur, commodè petatur. Me si quis in indagandis *Saracenis* ducem sequetur, *ad orientem faciem convertat*. Quid enim aliud sonat *Saracenus* & *Saraceni* quam شرقی *Sharki*, & in plurali شرقیون & شرقیین *Sharkiun* & *Sharkiin*, i.e. اهل الشرق *Ahlol shark*, *Orientes incolas*, *Orientales*; quales habiti olim *Arabes Iudæis* præsertim, Quorum Terra sinesque (inquit *Tacitus*) *qua ad Orientem vergunt Arabia terminantur*. Ita *Joctanis posteros* qui *Arabes*, ad Orientem collocat S. Scriptura *Gen.* 10. 30, in ea

But I can nowhere find, in what has hitherto been published on the subject by our writers, any satisfactory reason given as to why those who were formerly called Arabs should subsequently go by the name of Saracens. The opinion of such as derive the name from Sarah has been very properly rejected, it now being generally thought that they are so-called from سرق Sarak (to thieve), a word by which a ferocious and robber race is evidently designated. But to whom were they indebted for this name ? Certainly not to themselves, who would have been more tender of their own reputation, but to the language of some other tribes rather than that of the Arabs, to whom such a word would be most offensive, as conveying with it an idea of reproach and degradation. It remains then for the learned to inquire whether a name by which are indicated men infamous for public and open robbery can properly be derived from سرق Sarak, a word meaning to *steal privily*. Now, should any one be inclined to take me as his guide in investigating who the Saracens were, *let him direct his eyes towards the East*. For, in-

scil. plaga quæ *Mesham* et *Sapharum* montem orientis interjacet, *i.e.* si audiendus *R. Saadias* من مكة الى ان تجى الى مدينة الجبل الشرقى *i.e. A mecca usque dum pervenias ad urbem montis Orientalis*, vel ut in Codice MS. legitur الى المدينه الشرقى *ad urbem Orientalem (Medinam* puto, vult)ad Orientem sitam. Perhibetur Sapientia Salomonis major quam sapientia כָּל בְּנֵיקֶדֶם *Omnium Orientalium, i.e.* (ut *Judeus* ille quisquis fuit, qui Libros Regum in linguam *Arabicam* vertit) اهل الشرق *Sharacenorum* seu Arabum. Ita scil. vocantur *Arabes Kedareni* Jer. 49. 28 בני קדם *Filii Orientis*, sive, *Orientales*. Sapientes illos qui *απώ ἀναταλῶν* venisse dicuntur, Mat. 2, ab *Arabia* venisse, veterum Christianorum sententiam fuisse observat Nobilissimus & Doctissimus *Hugo Grotius*, quam et ipse sequitur. Nonnosus (apud *Photium*) legatione se functum scribit ad *Æthiopes, Homeritas* atque *Saracenos καὶ προσἄλλα ανανταλι καὶà ἔθη Saraceni* ergo inter Orientis gentes, imo non aliam ob rationem *Saraceni* quam quod ad Orientem. Vicos quosdam, Orientalis ad alia deed, what difference of sound can there be between *Saracenus* and *Saraceni*, than between شرقى Sharki, and in the plural شرقيون and شرقيين Sharkiun and Sharkiin, that is, اهل الشرق Ahl-ol'-Shark, eastern inhabitants, Orientals, such as were formerly considered Arabs, especially by the Jews, the eastern part of whose land and territories (says Tacitus) is bounded by Arabia. In like manner the Holy Scripture (Gen. x. 30) places the descendants of Joctan, who were Arabs in the East, namely, in that part of the shore lying between Mesham and Sephar, a mountain of the East, that is, if R. Saadias is to be considered as an authority, من مكة الى ان تجى الى مدينة الجبل الشرقى *i.e.* from Mecca, until you come to the city of this eastern mountain, or, as we read in the MS. Codex, الى المدينة الشرقى to the eastern city (by which I think is meant Medina), situate towards the East. The wisdom of Solomon is considered greater than the wisdom כָּל בְּנֵיקֶדֶם of all the children of the East, that is (according to the Jew, whoever he might have been, that translated

loca situs ratione شرقة *Sharakah* and شرقيه *Sharakiah* nomen sortitos memorant *Mohammed Alfiranzabadius*, *Safioddinus*, &c. adeoque Incolas eorum شرقيون *Saracenos* audiisse. Quid ni pari ratione & illi qui totam regionem quæ aliarum respectu الشرق *Alshark*, sive *Oriens* dici meruit occupant? Nec alias se, ipsi melius distinxerint ab illis quos ipsi vulgo *Magrebinos*, i.e. *Occidentales* nuncupant. Mauritaniæ scil. incolas: ut illi Almogrebini se املغاربه *Almogarabæ*, ita qui *Arabiam* incolunt مشارقه *Masaracæ* & *Saraceni* meritò audiunt, nomine non a vitæ instituto, sed a situ, imposito; ut et librum inter celebris istius Philosophi Avicennæ præcipuos, cui titulus الفلسفة المشرقيه *Alphalsafato'l-mashrekiah*, *Philosophiam Saracenicam* recte inscripseris, non quod Barbara, sed quod Orientalis. Quod *Arabum* litera ش per *Græcorum* Σ efferatur, nullum hic scrupulum injicere debet, cum non aliter Hebræorum שׁ exprimere soleant. Sonabit vox *Saracenis* ab alio Themate, sc شرك *Sharac*, Idolatras *κοινωνήτὰσ Communicatores*, qui Deo consortes adjungunt, sed hoc nomen ut meritò *Arabibus* Antiquis, ita *Christianis* the Books of Kings into Arabic) اهل الشرقى of the Saracens or of the Arabs. In like manner they are called by the prophet Jeremiah, the Arabs of Kedar (ch. xlix. v. 28), בני קדם the sons of the East, or Orientals. The most noble and learned Hugo Grotius observes it as being the opinion of the ancient Christians, that those wise men who, according to St. Matthew (ch. ii.), came to worship, arrived from Arabia; an opinion which he himself follows. Nonnosus (in Pholius) writes that he had accomplished his mission to the Æthiopians, Homerites, and Saracens, and other tribes of worshippers. That the Saracens were therefore included among the eastern nations was for no other reason than because they were located in the East. Mohammed-Al-firanzabadi Safioddin and others inform us that certain other towns of the East, by reason of their being situated in other parts of the East, had the name of شرقة Sharakah and شرقيه Sharakiah assigned, and that they had heard the inhabitants of such places called Saracens. By a parity of reasoning, wherefore should not those who occupy the whole of the region

impiè & blasphemè impingunt *Mohammedani*, ipsi horrent, nec hujus est loci. (Specimen Historiæ Arabum, Edwardi Pocockïi. Oxoniæ, 1650.)

which, with respect to other ones, is called الشرق Alshark, or the East, be entitled to the same appellation? or how can they more effectually distinguish themselves from those who in their own tongue call themselves *Magribinos*, *i. e.* inhabitants of the West, *i. e.* of the island of Mauritania: in the same way as the Almogrebini, the المغاربه *Almogarabæ*, as well as those who inhabit Arabia مشارقه, Masaraca, are correctly called Masaracæ and Saracens, a name given them not with reference to their mode of life, but the locality of their country; in the same manner as you would very properly give the title of الفلسفه المشرقيه Alphalsiphato'l mashrikiah, the "Saracenic Philosophy," to the book so prominent among the other excellent works of the celebrated philosopher Avecinna, not on account of its being Barbarian, but because it is Eastern. As to the circumstance of the Arabic letter ش being pronounced like the Σ of the Greeks, it should occasion no difficulty, inasmuch as they were accustomed to pronounce the Hebrew שׂ in the same manner. The word *Saracenis* may also be derived from an-

other source, namely شرك Sharak, *Idolators Associants*, so called from their assigning *Associates* to God; but this name, so justly given to the ancient Arabs, is impiously and blasphemously fixed upon the Christians by the Mohammedans, whereas the former repudiate it with horror: but this is irrelevant to our subject.

This our Essay will be accompanied by a Map of Arabia, which, it is hoped, may throw some light upon the real position of many still disputed localities, the precise spot of the settlement of various tribes, the exact situation of many wildernesses, mountains, cities, etc.

The reader may, perhaps, expect to find in this Essay also a detailed account of so celebrated a city as Holy Mecca, the particulars of its foundation, together with the origin of the black stone, the introduction and signification of the ceremonies performed in the temple of the Kaaba; but, as a full description of such important and interesting subjects would require much more space than the limits of the present Essay will allow, we shall make them the subject of another one, in which they will be treated more in detail than would now be possible.

In the above-mentioned map we have also given the places referred to in the Holy Scriptures, along with references to the particular chapters and verses of that Sacred Writ.

In ascertaining the precise position of such places we have availed ourselves of the excellent Map of Arabia drawn up by the Rev. Carteret P. Carey, M.A.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS

OF THE

PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIANS.

خطبةٌ

علي مراسم العرب و عاداتهم قبل الا سلام

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

افحكم الجاهلية يبغون و من احسن من الله حكما لقوم يو قنون

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Patriarchal simplicity of the Pre-Islamic Arabians	1
Their early commerce	2
Their national character	*ib.*
Frugality and contentment were considered as inestimable qualifications	*ib.*
Moderate sleep was much commended	*ib.*
Early rising a sign of energy and activity	3
Hospitality was deemed a sacred duty	*ib.*
Affording protection to his neighbours and treating them with kindness and attention, was another qualification of a gentleman	*ib.*
Rescuing prisoners and relieving the helpless and the indigent considered as the greatest of all virtues	4
Respect for his honour and a regard for his promise were indispensable qualifications for an accomplished Arab	*ib.*
Clean clothes and scents were objects of praise	5
The putting musk into the hair, and the wearing shoes of perfumed leather, were regarded as the signs of nobility	*ib.*
Forbearance was looked upon as a virtue	*ib.*
Eloquence and wit were necessary to complete the circle of accomplishments	*ib.*
Riding on horseback was highly praised	*ib.*
Combatting with the wolf was the best proof of valour	6
The actual length of a desert ascertained by smelling a handful of its sand	*ib.*
Poetry was brought to its perfection	*ib.*
Adultery, fornication, and incest were unblushingly practised	*ib.*
All of them were addicted to wine and other strong liquors	*ib.*
Games of chance were the favorite amusement of all	7
Female slaves, called *Kainad*, were instructed in singing and dancing, and were allowed to sell their favours	*ib.*
Robbery, pillage, and murder were of common occurrence	*ib.*
Female war-captives were made slaves by the victors	*ib.*
They had a firm belief in charms and omens	*ib.*
On the occasion of a vowed sacrifice they used to substitute a deer, called Ateerah, for a sheep	8
In the event of any murder or homicide, blood for blood was the only form of atonement deemed honourable	*ib.*

PAGE

Hamah and *Sadee*, or small winged insects, which they believed issued from the skull of the murdered party if the blood were not avenged 8
Baliyah, or the deceased person's camel, which was tied to his tomb and suffered to starve . . . . . *ib.*
They used to weep over the dead for one year 9
In wars, women used to accompany the men . . . . . *ib.*
In times of famine they used to bleed their camels and drink their blood . . . . . *ib.*
In cases of drought they used to take a cow into the mountains, tie some dry hay to her tail, and setting fire to it, leave her there *ib.*
Horse-racing was common among them . . . . . *ib.*
After having granted free emancipation to his slaves, the right of ownership over them was still retained . . . . . *ib.*
Women were not allowed to milk any animal 10
Criminals were compelled to sit on the scorching sand . . . *ib.*
Customs for the treatment of cattle, etc. . . . . *ib.*
Their custom for solemn adjuration . . . . . *ib.*
The manner in which oaths were rendered binding 11
Their customs regarding inheritance . . . . . *ib.*
They were addicted to revenge . . . . . *ib.*
Customs regarding an assassin . . . . . *ib.*
A stranger could enter the house of another person without obtaining the permission of the master of that house . . . *ib.*
To dine at the house of a relative was considered as a reproach . *ib.*
Their custom for determining one's due share . . . . . *ib.*
Azlams, or the divining arrows 12
Idolatry was a general practice among them . . . . . *ib.*
Their idols . . . . . *ib.*
The reasons for which they worshipped idols 13
Mode of worshipping the idols . . . . . *ib.*
Their opinion and conviction regarding the Temple of the Kaaba and the Black Stone 14
Other places of worship 15
The Hadj and other ceremonies . . . . . *ib.*
Sabeanism and other religions 16
Their treatment of the fair sex . . . . . *ib.*
Various customs of marriage and divorce 17
They used to kill their daughters or to bury them alive . . *ib.*
Customs regarding adopted sons and step-sons 18
Customs regarding women . . . . . *ib.*
They buried the dead in graves . . . . . *ib.*
Their belief regarding the blood of the human body, and the soul . *ib.*
They believed in demons and other evil spirits . . . . . *ib.*
They put faith in good and evil genii and other powers and beings concealed from mortal view 19

ESSAY

ON THE

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS

OF THE

PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIANS.

THE Pre-Islamic Arabians, and, indeed, the Arabs in general, without any particular distinction (for even the present nation differs but very little from their remote forefathers), were a people of patriarchal simplicity; their plain and artless mode of life was almost entirely in accordance with the dictates of nature. Gradually raising themselves from the first and lowest grade in the scale of human existence, they, at length, reached the comparatively superior one of pastoral life, securing, by that transition, safety, peace, and a plentiful supply to relieve their still few and simple wants. With the wool of their sheep they manufactured a kind of coarse canvas, which, extended by means of pegs driven into the earth, formed the tents under which they dwelt, and which were struck and again pitched according as their pasture lands required. Their clothing consisted of a long sheet wrapped round their loins, and their food of half-raw flesh, milk, and dates. Their whole wealth consisted in cattle, horses, that invaluable animal—the camel, and male and female slaves, which last were, of all portions of their property, the most precious.

The daily life of a Bedouin, who may be considered as a representative of the nomadic tribes of Arabia, was nothing more than that of a shepherd, dwelling under a tent, and wandering in quest of water and pasture. Some, however, being more disposed to a settled life, congregating together, formed villages, by a systematic arrangement and disposition of their tents, and the number of these still further increasing grew into towns and cities, the inhabitants of which soon began to enjoy the advantages of a comparatively civilized life. Their time was occupied in tillage, in the cultivation of the palm tree, and of other trees and plants whose fruits sustained their life, the various kinds of handicraft, as well as trade and commerce in general. The articles in which they traded were "spicery and balm and myrrh," frankincense, cinnamon, cassia, ledanon, gold, precious stones, pearls, ivory, ebony, and male and female slaves.

From the very earliest times we find these people carrying on trade, by means of caravans, with Egypt, Syria, and other adjacent countries; and Scripture informs us that they were thus engaged at so remote a time, even as that of Jacob and Joseph. The national character, however, of both these tribes—the Nomadic and the settled or mercantile—was much the same. To be sparing and frugal in eating and drinking, and to remain satisfied and contented therewith, was considered as a great and estimable qualification. Bahilee, a celebrated poet, thus eulogizes his brother in an elegy which he composed on the subject of the death of that relative:

تكفيه فِلذَةُ لحم إن أَلَمَّ بها من الشواء ويكفي شِربه الغمر

"Oft would, of roasted meat, a mouthful serve
His hunger to appease and life preserve;
While water poured on his hand's curv'd palm
His burning thirst was wont to quench and calm."

Moderate sleep was also much commended. Hazalee, another much esteemed poet, thus praises this practice:

قليل غرارالنوم اكبر همه دم الثارا ويلقي كَميًّا مُسَفَّعا

"His sleep was ever short but sound, nor more he'd crave
Than murder to avenge or combat with the brave."

Early rising was also an esteemed qualification, it being a sign of a person's energy and activity.

Imra-ol-Kais, thus writes in commendation of himself:

وقد اغتدي والطير في دكنا تها

"I rise i' the morn, while birds repose within their nests."

Hospitality, too, in all its various modifications, was their national characteristic, being regarded by them as of all virtues the chief and fairest. Thus, to receive travellers and guests with unbounded generosity, and to treat them with all kindness, courtesy, and respect, was deemed by them a sacred duty, which, to neglect, was sure to entail displeasure and contempt.

Hazalee thus invokes a curse upon himself, should he ever be found to fail in the practice of hospitality :

ولادَرَّدَرِّي ان اطعمتُ نازلكم قشر الحتِيِّ و عندي البرُّ مكنوزُ

"With bark-flour bread, when wheat is in my store,
If I, to entertain a guest, desire,
Oh! may I then with bitter tears deplore
To see my virtues every one expire."

To treat his neighbour with kindness and attention, and to watch over and protect his house, family, and property, was another of a good man's qualifications, and if any one showed himself to be in the least degree careless or lukewarm in this respect, he was looked upon with contempt, and earned some opprobious sobriquet. The poet Bakree thus satirises Ulkama:

تبيتون في المشتا ملاءً بطونكم و جاراتكم غرثي يَبِتنَّ خماصا

"In winter night, with belly full, you lie
In sleep profound beneath the smiling sky,
While wretched poor with biting hunger weep,
Your starving neighbours catch no wink of sleep."

Zobaidee, another poet, thus writes in commendation of a person:

وجارهم احمي اذا ضيم غيرهم

"When all are strangers to repose and joy,
When cares and hardships constantly annoy,
Protected by his kind and watchful eye,
His neighbours every ill of life defy."

To rescue prisoners and to aid the needy and the helpless was considered the greatest of all virtues and the most praiseworthy of all qualifications.

A poet, speaking in commendation of himself, says thus:

وفكّكنا غُلّي امرء القيس منه بعد ماطال حبسهُ و العِناء

"Protract'd was the confinement, wretch'd the state,
Grievous and sad was Imra-ol Kais' fate,
But ne'er the less we rescued him from doom
By breaking thro' the dungeon's darkest gloom."

Turfah, another poet, writes thus:

ولكن متي يسترفِدِ القوم ارفِدُ

"On th' needy I confer the wish'd-for aid,
Ere to request, his cheek has caus'd to blush."

Hazalee writes:

واحمي المصاب اذاماوعي

"The helpless I assist, before my help he craves."

Respect for his honour and a regard for his promise were qualifications as indispensable for an accomplished Arab as any of the above-mentioned ones. Amar, a poet of some celebrity, writes:

ونوجد نحن امنعهم ذيارا واوفاهم اذا عقدوا يمينا

"There is no surer way our honour to preserve
Than never from our plighted word and faith to swerve."

Clean clothes and scents were objects of praise. The daughter of Advanee praises her husband in the following lines :

حديث الشباب طيب الثوب والعطر

"My husband young and charming is ; he takes delight
In nice perfumes ; and raiment pleasing to the sight."

The putting musk into the hair and the wearing shoes of perfumed leather were regarded as the signs of nobility. A poet thus celebrates his beloved :

اذا التا جرالداري جاء بفارة من المسك اراحت في مفارقه تجمّرا

"The musk from foreign climes that's sent
My fair one's beauteous hair shall scent."

Forbearance was looked upon as a virtue. Hatim Taee writes in this wise :

واغفر عوراء الكريم ادخاره واعرض عن شتم اللئيم تكرمًا

"Whatever faults the virtuous may commit,
To save their fame I willingly remit :
While tow'rds the proud, forbearance I observe
That I my self-respect with safety may preserve."

Eloquence, wit, and humour were indispensable to complete the circle of accomplishment. The poet Amar thus speaks of his son Garar :

وان غرارا ان يكن غيرواضح فاني احب الحون ذا المنطق الدَمِمَ

"Tho' Garar be not fair, yet do I his sire
The swarthy but eloquent youth admire."

Nabegha, another poet, writes thus :

اعذني رب من حصرٍ و عيّ

"O God, preserve me from being silenced in conversation."

Riding (on horseback), if practised from childhood itself, was highly praised, while the adult apprentice was a sure mark of ridicule and sarcasm. In the following verses a poet satirises a tribe :

لم يركبوا الا بعد ماكبروا فيهم ثقال علي اكنا فهم ميلُ

"Since in their manhood 'twas they learned to ride,
No wonder men their awkwardness deride,
Or that their posture should be void of grace,
And raise a smile on every face."

To combat with the wolf was the best proof of valour. The poet Shamakh writes thus:

وماءٍ قد دفعت الذئب عنه

"Many a pond and pool there are which from the prowlings of the wolf I have set free."

They used to ascertain the actual length of a desert by smelling a handful of its sand. Imra-ol-Kais thus writes upon it:

اذا الناقة العوذالديافي غرغرا

"Were the camel of Deyaf, so famed for speed,
To smell the sand of the desert on which we proceed,
Observ'd would he be to quail and tremble indeed."

Poetry was brought to its perfection among them.

In the commencement of the Kaseedah, a kind of descriptive poem, they used to mention, by name, the daughters, wives, and sisters of noble and wealthy personages, and openly impute to them immoralities of every description. Every poet was believed to have, under his command or authority, a genius; and the greater the poet the more powerful was the genius under his control.

Hassan, a famous poet, thus writes in his own praise:

وما نَفَرَت جِنّيْ ومافَلَّ مِبرَدي

"Neither has the spirit under my control escaped, nor, indeed, has the power of speech abandoned me."

Adultery, fornication, and incest were practised unblushingly, and were shamelessly published and boasted of in all sorts of immoral poetry.

All of them were extremely addicted to wine and other strong liquors, and, during a state of drunkenness, acts of the most shameless vice and profligacy were indulged in by the whole assembly.

Games of chance were the favourite amusement of all, without exception, and if any particular locality was famous for them people would resort thither from distant countries, as modern gamblers now do to Baden Baden. Usury also was practised generally and to a great extent.

Female slaves called *Kainad* were instructed in singing and dancing, and were allowed to sell their favours, the price of their prostitution being appropriated by their owners.

Robbery, pillage, and murder were of common occurrence; human blood being almost daily shed without remorse or horror. Females taken captives during a war were made slaves of by the victors. The poet Harris writes:

ثم مِلنا علي تميم فاحرمنا وفينا بنات مُرٍّ إماءُ

"Until our hallow'd months' desir'd return,
Did we fair Tameem's city loot and burn;
While all the daughters of Mur's glorious line
Did we to helpless slavery consign."

They had a firm belief in charms and omens. When any misfortune or calamity befel them they hoped to remove it by the use of certain small charmed stones. In the movements of animals they also found either propitious or sinister omens or prognostications: thus, if an animal crossed the path of any person from left to right it was considered favourable, and was called Saneh سانح; but on the contrary, if the crossing were from right to left, it was called Jareh جارح. The general name of this kind of divination was *Tayarah* طيرة.

Labeed, son of Rabeeyah, prior to his embracing Islam, wrote the following lines on the occasion of his brother being stricken by a thunderbolt:

لعمرك ماتدري الضوارب بالحصي ولا زاجرات الطير ما الله صانع

"How ignorant of God's eternal will
All those who deal in omens good or ill;
And female charmers of small stones must be,
Is prov'd full well by the bolt that struck thee."

They used to vow the sacrifice of a *sheep*, provided such or such a thing should come to pass, and when it did, they then substituted a deer for the sheep, calling the former Ateerah عتيرة. But this practice of sacrificing an animal of inferior price, was considered as ignominious and disgraceful. The poet Kaab thus writes in praise of his family:

وما عُتِرَ الظباء بحي كعب

"O! ne'er did Kaab's race the gods defraud,
By slaught'ring antler'd deer for bleating sheep."

In the event of any murder or homicide being committed, blood for blood was the only form of atonement deemed honorable; all such persons as condoned the offence, upon payment of a fine or otherwise, being regarded with contempt by their fellow countrymen.

The sister of Amar, son of Madee Karab, thus interdicts her family from compounding for her brother's death, on any terms:

ولا تا خذوا منهم اِقالاً وَابكُرا

"Neither by camels nor their young ones, my brother's murder e'er compound for."

They believed that if a man's blood was not avenged by blood, a small winged insect, issuing from the skull of the killed or murdered party, would fly screeching through the heavens. This strange insect they called *Hamah* هامة and *Sadee* صدي. The poet Labeed thus writes, in an elegy:

فليس الناس بعدك في نفير وماهم غير اصداء و هامِ

"Like Hamah and Sadee roam all mankind,
Fit vengeance for thy noble death to find."

On the death of any person the custom was to tie his camel to his tomb and suffer it to be starved to death, and this camel they called *Baliyah* بليه.

Labeed, the celebrated poet, thus writes in commendation of the generosity of his beloved:

تاوي الي الا طناب كل رَذِيَّة مثل البَلِيَّةِ قالصٍ اهدامُها

"Men famish'd, and, like Baliyah, spent,
Flock hopeful round thy generous tent."

They used to weep over the dead for one entire year. Labeed lays this command upon his heirs:

الي الحول ثُمَّ اسْمُ السَّلام عليكما ومن يُبكَ حولا كاملا فقدِ اعتَذِرَ

"Weep over me one year, and then adieu,
That term fulfill'd, none shall 'gain reproach you."

In war and battles women used to accompany the men and assist them in every possible way, and when their husbands were fighting in the *mélee*, they used to exclaim, "On, on ye brave and gallant husbands of ours; if ye flinch and save us not from the foe then are we no more your wives."

In times of famine or scarcity of food, they were accustomed to bleed their camels and drink their blood. In cases of drought they would, in the hope of causing rain to fall, take a cow into the mountains, tie some dry hay, thorns, and thistles to her tail, and setting fire to it leave her there.

Horse-racing was common among them, as was also betting, which was called *Rehan* رهان. War between tribes and parties frequently arose out of a mere misunderstanding. Sometimes such wars would last a considerable time, like that between the Ais and Zaiban tribes, which raged for one whole century.

Notwithstanding a person's having granted free emancipation to his slaves, he still retained the right of ownership over them, and could sell that right at his pleasure, the purchaser also being empowered to claim them as his slaves; and thus these wretched human beings passed from hand to hand, in utter despair of ever obtaining their freedom.

Women were not allowed to milk any animal, and if those belonging to any family were seen so to do, that family was looked upon with contempt, and at once forfeited all respect in the eyes of men.

Criminals were condemned by the penal laws to sit on the burning, scorching sand, by way of punishment. Dead animals were served for food, their flesh being considered as forming a delicious repast. Any she-camel, sheep, or goat, after having had young ten times, was let loose and allowed to roam about at her pleasure, and when she died her flesh was eaten by men, but not by women, who were forbidden to taste it.

If any one of the three above-named animals, on the fifth occasion of her bringing forth young ones, gave birth to a female, her ears were cut close and she was set at liberty, but her flesh and milk were considered as unlawful food, and she had the name of Bahairah بحيرة given her.

By way of a vow for the obtaining of such or such a thing, camels were let loose and allowed to roam about wherever they liked.

If any she-camel or she-goat brought forth young ones, the former ten and the latter seven times consecutively, her flesh was forbidden to be eaten by women, men only being allowed that privilege.

If any she-goat gave birth to a female young one, the owner of it reserved it for himself, but if she brought forth a male one, it was offered as a sacrifice to the idols; and if she brought forth two young ones, the one a male and the other a female, both were appropriated to himself, by the owner, and were named Waseelah وصيلة.

Every camel which had been father to ten young ones was set at liberty, allowed to roam about wherever he chose, and received the name of Hamee حامي.

A very solemn mode of adjuration was that of kindling a fire and throwing into it powdered salt and sulphur. The fire was

called *Holah* هولة, and the person who set it alight was called Mohawil مهول. The poet Aws thus writes:

اذا استقلبة الشمس صدَّ بوجهه كماصد عن نار المهول حالف

"To escape from Phœbus' bright and burning rays
My friend is forc'd to avert his painful gaze,
As does the swearer from the raging fire
Of those who so severe an oath require."

Oaths were rendered binding by placing a whip, a bow, or a shoe, under the gutter of the gates of the Kaaba.

They were accustomed to swear by their ancestors and their idols on the occasion of solemnizing a promise.

Adult male heirs alone received the inheritance bequeathed by their parents; women and boys under the age of puberty were excluded from any share. They took interest for debts. Another custom was to double the amount of the debt if not paid at the proper time and to extend the period for its payment.

They were addicted to revenge, but equality of rights among the different tribes was not observed.

If the murderer or assassin of any person remained undiscovered, fifty suspected representatives of the tribe to whom the assassin belonged were each, individually, compelled to swear that he was innocent.

Any person, although a stranger, could enter the house of another one, without previously obtaining the latter's permission so to do.

To dine at the house of a relative was considered as a reproach.

Ten persons would purchase an animal, and in order to ascertain the due share of each, ten dice (one of which was left blank, while the remaining nine were marked with the measure of the shares) were cast, and the share of each was decided by what was thrown.

In the temple of the Kaaba seven arrows were placed, each marked by a certain sign, either commanding or forbidding, according to the meaning given to each of these signs; and all

persons, before commencing any work, previously consulted these arrows, and acted in conformity to the advice they received. These arrows were called Azlam ازلام.

Idolatry was a general practice among the Arabs, and the idols, which were the objects of their worship, were as follows:

(1). Habal هبل. One of the greatest idols placed on the summit of the Kaaba.

(2). Wod وُد. The idol worshipped by the Bani Kalb tribe.

(3). Sowaa سواع. The image adored by the Bani Mozhaj tribe.

(4). Yaghoos يغوث. The idol which received divine honours at the hands of the Bani Morad tribe.

(5). Yahook يعوق. Deified by the Bano Hamdan tribe.

(6). Nasar نسر. Worshipped by the Bano Hymiar tribe of Yemen.

(7). Ozza عزيل. Adored by the Bano Ghaftan tribe.

(8). Lat لات and (9). Manat مناة were the deities of the people in general.

(10). Doär دوار. An idol worshipped by young women, who used to go round it several times in procession.

(11). Isaf اساف, an idol placed at the Safah mount, and (12). Naila نائلة, placed on the Marva hills, received all sacrifices. People used to kiss them on the occasion of their proceeding on a journey, and on their return therefrom.

(13). Abab عبعب. A large stone upon which they sacrificed camels, and the pouring of the blood of the animal sacrificed over it was considered highly meritorious. Within the Kaaba were placed the images of Abraham, having the above-mentioned divining arrows called Azlam in his hand, and a lamb standing beside him; as well as of Ishmael; or the likenesses of the above-named patriarchs in the said position were painted on the walls of the temple. Either a statue of Mary, having Jesus Christ in her lap, was placed within the temple, or her likeness in that position was painted on the walls.

By the native traditions of Arabia we learn that the idols Wod وُد, Yaghoos يغوث, Yaook يعوق, and Nasar نسر, were the images of celebrated personages bearing those names respectively. Their representations were carved upon stones and preserved in the temple as so many commemorative monuments of them, but, after a considerable time, they were also deified and adored. It is undeniably proved that the half savage inhabitants of the Peninsula did not believe in these images, nor in the men whom they represented as gods. The reasons for which they were sanctified are as follows :

As above said they regarded these images as monuments commemorating these celebrated personages and intelligences whom they represented, revered, and sanctified, not because they were idols possessing any divine power, but merely because they were the representatives of those famous and renowned individuals, to whom they showed every respect believing them to be possessed of all divine powers.

The adoration of these images, they thought, pleased and gratified the spirits of those whom they represented.

They believed that all the powers of God—the healing of the sick, the giving of children, the removing of famine, pestilence, and other calamities were equally at the disposal of those celebrated persons whom they deified, and imagined that if respect and reverence were paid to their images they would vouchsafe to grant their supplications.

They likewise firmly believed that these deified personages were the beloved of God, and that by being pleased with the adoration which their images received, they would become the medium for securing a nearer approach of the devotee to God, and that they would have conferred upon him all spiritual happiness and would intercede for the remission of his sins.

The mode of worshipping their idols was to prostrate themselves in their presence, to kiss them with great reverence, to make a circuit round them, and to sacrifice camels. The first-

born of their cattle was offered to the idols, and from the yearly produce of their fields and the profits derived from their cattle a certain portion was set apart for God and another for the idols. Should the share of the latter anyhow be lost, that of God was appropriated to them, but for God there was no such indemnification should his share be missing.

Reverence and sanctity were claimed by and paid to the black stone, as well as to the Temple of the Kaaba, from a very early period of Arabian history; its foundation being traced up to Abraham and Ishmael themselves.

Unlike the other sacred objects we have mentioned, the Temple of the Kaaba was not regarded as a monument commemorating any personage, but the entire edifice itself was distinguished from others by the dignified appellation of "The House of God," and was particularly and exclusively appropriated to His worship: in fact, it was looked upon as a mosque, synagogue, or church is in our days.

Nor was the black stone ever regarded as an idol or a representation of any renowned individual. The most generally accepted and the strongest opinion in its favour represented it to have been a stone of Paradise; this much, however, is known to a certainty, that before the temple itself was erected, the black stone stood solitary and naked in a plain, but no Arabian tradition exists which might guide us in determining, correctly, the rites and ceremonies directly concerned with it when in that condition; but the circumstances of that period throw a sufficient light to enable us to assert with tolerable safety that they must have been very similar to those which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were wont to observe with similar stones. See Genesis xii. 7, 8; xiii. 18; xxvi. 25; xxviii. 18; Exod. xx. 25.

After the erection of the temple, and after the black stone was inserted, together with other stones, in one corner of the building, no particular rites or ceremonies seem to have been observed with respect to the black stone exclusively, except that of

kissing ; a practice, however, not confined to it in particular, inasmuch as other parts of the building were likewise kissed. As regards the Kaaba itself, the people used to sit within it and perform the worship of God, as well as to run a circuit round it : but the strangest of all these customs was that of performing their worship in a state of perfect nudity, for they thought it degrading to God to adore him while wearing their clothes polluted with all kinds of sins.

In imitation of the temple of Kaaba, two others were successively erected, one by the Bani Ghaftan tribe, and the other in Yemen, by the Khosam and Bojaila tribes conjointly. Both of these imitations contained many idols that received divine honours from all belonging to the tribe that had erected them. The first of these two *pseudo* Kaabas was utterly destroyed in the sixth century A.D. by Zohair, the king of Hedjaz, and the second was razed to the ground by Gereer, in the Prophet's lifetime. The ceremony of Hadj was observed by the people of the Peninsula, from the very remotest period, and there is not the least doubt as to the circumstance of its having been traced back as far as the time of Abraham and Ishmael.

The custom of wrapping the Ihram (a large sheet of unsewn cloth) round the body at the time of performing the Hadj, was also practised by them, and if a person in that same state of partial nudity wished to enter his own house, he could not do so by the door, but was obliged to jump over the wall.

The custom of running between Mounts Marva and Safa, was practised by them just as it is at present.

Pilgrims used to assemble at the consecrated plain, but the Koreish being the most influential of all the tribes of the Peninsula were accustomed to occupy, in company with their friends, Mozdalifah, a locality more elevated and commanding than the surrounding country, while the rest of the assembly stood in the Arafat, the place where the ceremony is performed. After the ceremony of the Hadj was concluded, the congregation

retired to another place called Minah, where they used to recount, with pride, the chivalric and heroic deeds of their ancestors, immortalized by the ready means of poetry and song. Four months of the year were held sacred, and the pilgrimage of Hadj was performed, as it is done up to this day, in one of these, called Zil Hij; but this consecration of months was sometimes commuted and intermitted; for if war happened to be carried on during any one of those months, the people eluded the otherwise impropriety by changing their natural order; in other words, they supposed the current month not to be the sacred one, but the next in order was such. They used to pledge their word to keep silence for a certain fixed period, and regarded this practice as of equal merit to the Hadj.

Idolatry was practised by the majority of the inhabitants, but there was a class of the people called Sabeans, who worshipped the fixed stars and planets. They erected a great number of pagodas all over the country, dedicating them to their deified planets. In consequence of this, the Arabs in general believed that the influence of these exerted a power (for good or for evil) over human affairs, both collectively and individually, as well as over the rest of the creation, and more especially, that the falling or the absence of rain entirely depended upon the propitious or upon the evil influence of these luminaries. Besides these, other religions were also flourishing in Arabia, but we shall not touch upon them here, as this subject belongs, more properly, to our next Essay.

The fair sex was in a very wretched and degraded condition indeed. Persons had entire liberty to marry as many women as they pleased.

Although there was no established law to determine which woman of a man's relations it was lawful for him to marry, and which were unlawful, nevertheless a custom not to marry a woman of close and near relationship prevailed, and it was believed that the issue of such a woman generally proved to be of weak constitution and deficient in physical strength.

The law of marriage was observed and that of dower also recognized. Divorce was also practised. A person could take his wife back again to himself after having divorced her once, and could repeat the same practice over and over again a thousand times, as no limit to the number of divorces was fixed.

A regular term of time was fixed after the divorce within which period the woman was interdicted from marrying another person, and within which period the parties, becoming reconciled, might marry again. Persons very cruelly and inhumanly took advantage of this custom. They married a woman, divorced her on some pretext; the poor woman had to wait for the fixed period without marrying any one; when, however, the time was about to expire, her former husband again reconciled her to himself and renewed the marriage; but after a very short time he would once more divorce her, and again marry her at the close of the appointed term, and this he would repeat for any number of times. The Arab practised this merciless custom, because every person considered it as a reproach that the woman who had been once his wife should marry another man.

There was another kind of divorce, which received the name of Zihar ظِهار. It consisted of a person's abstaining from touching a member of his wife's body, and this practice was solemnized by the party's declaring that such member of his wife's body was as unlawful for him to touch as the corresponding member of his mother's, or of any other near female relative with whom it was held unlawful to marry.

The worst and most cruel of all their customs was to kill their daughters, or to bury them alive. The custom of adopting sons also prevailed among them, and the child so adopted was considered as the lawful heir of the property of his parents. Sons were allowed to marry their step-mothers, but fathers were forbidden to marry the wives either of their real or adopted sons; and the violation of this latter custom was looked upon as a crime.

On the occasion of any one's decease, the party's step-sons or, in their absence, any close and near relation, used to cast a sheet over the head of the widow, and he who so threw the cloth was obliged to marry her. Widows used to mourn over their late husbands for one complete year, and after the expiration of the fixed period, the widow used to throw some dry dung of a camel either upon a dog, or behind her own back, from over her shoulder —a practice indicating that the widow had not the least regard for her late husband.

Women were accustomed to quit their homes and mix in the public unveiled, and considered it as neither indecent nor immoral to expose any part whatsoever of their person to the public gaze.

The fair sex wore false hair, and used to have their bodies tattooed with indigo.

All the male representatives of a family used to avoid the company of all their female relatives when their terms were on them, and the latter were forbidden to mix with the rest of the family.

The custom of burying the dead in graves was common among the Ante-Mohammedan Arabs. Men would stand up, as a token of respect and grief for the deceased, should they see any bier carried to the grave to be consigned to its last resting place.

They believed that the blood of the human body was nothing else than the breath, and that the soul was the air that was within the body. Some, however, a little more enlightened than the former, believed that the soul was an animalcule, which entered into the body of men at the time of their birth, and continually kept expanding itself. After the person's death it left the body and kept screeching and flying round the grave until it attained the size of an owl.

They believed in demons and other evil spirits. All the imaginary, fanciful, and fantastic appearances which met their eyes in deserts, or among the ruins of ancient deserted buildings, and

which the solitary man frequently conjures up in his mind, they thought to be various kinds of evil spirits.

Some, and these appear to have formed the best opinion of all, attributed such spectral illusions to the influence of different constellations.

They put faith in good and evil genii, endowing them with various aspects and shapes, and had given them different appellations. According to them some genii were made up of half the body of men and half that of spirits. They believed in other powers and beings concealed from mortal view, who uttered their prognostications with loud voice, but always remained hidden: they put faith also in angels and in other intelligences, attributing to them various shapes.

Such, then, were the various manners and customs of the Pre-Islamic Arabians. The cursory sketch given in the few preceding pages will, it is hoped, throw a sufficient light upon the domestic, social, and public life of the semi-savage but high-minded and open-hearted inhabitants of the great Arabian Peninsula, and will enable the impartial reader, if such a phenomenon is to be found in the world, to compare the condition in general, and the state of morals in particular, of the Ante-Mohammedan and Mohammedan Arabias; and to deduce therefrom such conclusions as his experience and sense of justice may suggest.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

VARIOUS RELIGIONS

OF THE

PRE-ISLAMIC ARABS,

WHEREIN IT IS INQUIRED TO WHICH OF THEM ISLAM BEARS THE CLOSEST RESEMBLANCE, AND WHETHER BY SUCH AFFINITY ISLAM IS PROVED TO BE OF DIVINE ORIGIN OR "A CUNNINGLY DEVISED FABLE."

خطبةٌ

علي الا ديان المختلفة التي كانت في العرب قبل الا سلام

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

و من يبتغ غير الا سلام دينا فلن يقبل منه و هو في الا خرة من الخا سرين

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
General Remarks	1
Idolatry	2-4
Atheism	4, 5
Deism	5
Revealed Religion	6
(*a*) Sabeanism	6, 7
(*b*) The Religion of Abraham and other Prophets who flourished in Arabia	7-10
(*c*) Judaism	10-12
(*d*) Christianity	12-15
Islam is a combination of all Revealed Religions	15
Examples demonstrating this assertion	15-19
The resemblance of the principles of Islam to those of other Revealed Religions is the best proof of that Religion being divine	19

ESSAY

ON THE

VARIOUS RELIGIONS

OF THE

PRE-ISLAMIC ARABS,

WHEREIN IT IS INQUIRED TO WHICH OF THEM ISLAM BEARS THE CLOSEST RESEMBLANCE, AND WHETHER BY SUCH AFFINITY ISLAM IS PROVED TO BE OF DIVINE ORIGIN OR " A CUNNINGLY DEVISED FABLE."

TAKING as the starting point of our observations and reflections, the Mosaic account of the origin and dispersion of mankind, it appears to us that, although simplicity and unity of worship naturally, if not necessarily, prevailed while yet the human race were few in numbers and confined as to locality; yet, no sooner did they become dispersed throughout wider regions, lying under a variety of climates, than new and striking ideas crowded in upon their minds on almost every subject, but more particularly on the nature of that Being, the manifestations of whose power, whether for good or for evil, they could not but tremblingly recognize and acknowledge.

Ignorant of the physical causes of those natural phenomena which strike even the civilized man with awe and terror—the upheaving earthquake, the oak-riving thunderbolt, and the wide devastating hurricane, it was natural that they should consider them as the acts of some Being infinitely superior to themselves, and the more terrible because unseen. Hence supplication, sacrifice, adoration. As to these three principal modes of ap-

peasing the supposed wrath of their deities, they varied considerably, according to the nature and climate of the country, and the general disposition and character of its inhabitants.

Sufficient, we trust, has been said to enable the reader to know in what manner religions arose among the Arabs in general.

With regard to the Pre-Islamic tribes in particular, there is every reason to believe that, during the time they flourished, they were divided, as to their religious opinions, into four distinct classes, viz., Idolators, Deists, Atheists, and Believers in Revelation.

Idolatry.

It was the instinct of man which, in the very earliest stage of his existence, led, or rather compelled, him first to imagine and then to establish this form of worship.

"Man is naturally religious," says a writer, "and if he is ignorant of the true God he must make to himself false ones. He is surrounded by dangers and difficulties; he sees the mighty powers of nature at work all round, pregnant to him with hope and fear, and yet inscrutable in their working, and beyond his control. Hence arises the feeling of *dependence* upon something more powerful than himself . . . . . These operations of nature, again, he has only one way of conceiving and accounting for. The idea of physical causes is one of late growth; to the primitive man there is only one kind of agency he can understand—that of a will or mind like his own. Hence all things that he sees moving and acting become to him animated, conscious beings, with thoughts and passions similar to those of men; and what more natural than that he should seek, by offerings and entreaties, to secure their favour or propitiate their malignity or anger."

While yet in his savage state he looked upon the grand objects of nature as the causes either of his happiness or misery, and consequently as superior to him in power; and in order that he

might address his prayers and supplications to them under a tangible form, he had recourse to sculpture or to painting, however rude, to embody the creatures of his imagination, and which now became the objects of his adoration. Another source of idolatry was the desire of gratefully acknowledging the services rendered to the tribe or community by some individual belonging to it, pre-eminent for his warlike deeds—deeds celebrated in the rude songs and poetry of their bards, and after death rewarded by the paying him divine honours. The same remark is equally applicable to Arabia. The sun, the moon, the planets, and the constellations; angels, intelligences who, they thought, controlled and determined the events of their life, were all deified and worshipped, as were likewise men who had made themselves conspicuous by services rendered to their grateful country.

The real object and original intention of men in adopting this mode of worship were merely temporal. The worship of those idols, or, more properly, of the objects and personages they represented, was due to the confident belief that it was in their power to confer upon the worshipper every kind of worldly happiness, and also to avert from him the evils and misfortunes incidental to man; while, on the other hand, the withholding of such worship was certain to be punished by poverty, disease, default of issue, and a miserable death.

As time advanced, as civilization increased, as the means of intercommunication became more general and secure, as men came more frequently in contact with each other so as to be able to interchange their ideas, views, and impressions, their minds expanded and their pleasures became less sensuous and more refined.

The same imperceptible transition of thoughts and ideas occurred in Arabia, and the inhabitants of that peninsula invested their deities with the supreme power of vouchsafing, to whomsoever they pleased, every worldly pleasure and spiritual happiness.

Respecting the primitive inhabitants of Arabia—the tribes of Ad, Thamud, Jodais, Jorham I., and Imlek I., etc., this much is certain, that they were idolators; but we possess no local tradition of Arabia which might render us safe in particularizing the methods adopted by them for adoring their idols, the powers with which they invested their deities, and the motives and intentions with which those nations worshipped images. Almost all we know of the idols of the Arabians is respecting those of the descendants of Joktan and Ishmael, respectively designated the Arabul Aribah and the Arabul Mustaaribah.

Their idols were of two descriptions: one of them was supposed to represent those angels, intelligences, and other unknown powers in whom they believed, and whom they thought to be of the female sex; the other was dedicated to illustrious personages in commemoration of their famous actions.

That natural simplicity and originality which are the characteristics of men in the primitive stage of society were no longer distinguishable in the modes of their worship. They had moreover borrowed many ideas from the inspired religions of foreign countries as well as from those of their fatherland, and, blending together all these with their own superstitions, they had invested their deities with temporal as well as with spiritual power, but with this difference, that the first was believed to be entirely at their disposal and to proceed from them, while, with regard to the second, they believed that their idols would intercede with God to pardon their sins. Their style of living, as well as their domestic, social, and religious manners and customs, had likewise yielded to the pressure and influence of the neighbouring countries, whose inhabitants were believers in revealed religions. Such was the state of idol worship in Arabia previously to Islam.

Atheism.

In ancient Arabia there was a class of men who believed in

nothing whatever, neither in idolatry nor in any revealed religion. They denied the existence of a God and had no belief in a world to come. As they denied the existence of sin, so they equally repudiated the idea of a future state for the reward or punishment of the soul. They considered themselves under no restraint, either of law or custom, but acted according to their own free will. Their belief was that "the existence of man in this world is precisely the same as that of a plant or animal:—he is born, and, after arriving at maturity, gradually declines and dies, like any of the inferior animals and, like them, perishes utterly."

Deism.

Deism in Arabia was of two kinds. One of them consisted in the belief of an unknown invisible power to whom they were indebted for their existence; but, in all other respects, their opinions were the same as those of the atheists. The other class of deists believed in God, the resurrection, salvation, immortality of the soul, and its reward or punishment according to the actions of men; but they did not believe in prophets and revelations.

As these latter believed that the reward and punishment of the immortal soul in the next world entirely depended upon the virtuous or wicked actions of men in this world, it became incumbent upon them to pursue such a conduct as might insure them eternal happiness and save them from everlasting woe and damnation; but as they themselves were not provided with any principle on which to act, they, accordingly, directed their attention to the rules observed by the nations around them, and, according to the dictates of their reason, selected and adopted the various advantages presented by each: and hence also it arose that some persons adopted idolatry as their religion, while others professed no established religion, but acted according to their own reason and discretion.

Revealed Religion.

Four distinct revealed religions have, from time to time, prevailed in Arabia—Sabeanism, the religion of Abraham and other Arabian prophets, Judaism, and Christianity.

Sabeanism.

This religion was introduced into Arabia by the Samaritans, who believed themselves to have been the followers of the oldest ceremonial religion. They considered Seth and Enoch as their prophets, being men to whom their religion was revealed. They had a Scripture of their own, which they called the Book of Seth. In our opinion, no Jew, Christian, or Mohammedan can entertain any objection to the belief which the Sabeans reposed in the prophet Enoch, and the following passage from the Scriptures proves him to have been a holy and godly personage: "And Enoch walked with God; and was not, for God took him" (Gen. v. 24). The personage whom the Mohammedans called Esdrees and Elijah, is identical with this prophet. They had seven times for prayer, which they performed in the same way as the Mohammedans do. They also used to pray over the dead. Like Mohammedans they kept fast for one lunar month. The corruption, however, which had insensibly crept into their religion was the adoration of the stars. They had seven temples dedicated to the seven planets, and wherein their worship was conducted. The temple in Harran was the place where they all congregated for performing the Hadj. They paid great reverence to the temple of the Kaaba. The most imposing of all their religious festivals was accustomed to be held when the sun entered *Aries*, the first of the spring signs of the Zodiac. Other minor festivals were observed when the five planets, viz., Saturn زحل, Jupiter مشتري, Mars مريخ, Venus زهرة, and Mercury عطارد entered, respectively, certain

signs of the same great circle of the heavens. They believed in the propitious and the malignant influence of the stars upon the life and fortunes of men, as well as upon other objects, and held that the absence or the presence of rain entirely depended upon the said starry influences. These and similar ideas, notions, and belief were also held and believed in by other Arabs besides the Sabeans. They used to practise Etikaf, or restraint of the passions, from religious motives, and were accustomed to pass a few days in silence and meditation, either in caves or in the mountains.

The Religion of Abraham and other Prophets who flourished in Arabia.

Previously to Islam, five prophets had been successively sent to the Arabians, viz., Hud, Saleh, Abraham, Ishmael, and Shoaib, all of whom flourished before Moses, and his delivery of the decalogue to the chosen people.

The fundamental principle of the religion professed by all those prophets was the worship of the unity of God. As to the other doctrines and dogmas expounded and promulgated by the above-named prophets, they had, with the exception of those taught by Abraham and Ishmael, fallen into oblivion, and no local tradition exists which might be expected to throw any light upon the subject and enable us to enumerate them.

The doctrines and precepts of the religion of Abraham and Ishmael likewise possess no such sufficient authority by which we might particularize them, and there are but very few doctrines, supported both by religious and local traditions, that have earned such historical importance as to justify us in quoting them.

Abraham's first acts of piety and virtue were his abandonment of idolatry, destroying the idols of his father, and his sincere endeavours to discover the worship of the true God.

Circumcision and the wearing of beards are religious practices which need hardly be mentioned, as almost every one knows them to have been introduced and established by Abraham. The erection of altars for conducting divine worship was likewise a practice enforced by Abraham; and, out of the various altars erected by that patriarch, there was one on the spot where the black stone stood before its being removed and inserted, with other stones, in the walls of the temple of the Kaaba.

The offering up of sacrifice to God was established by Abraham, and its practice has continued, without ceasing, up to this day among his descendants.

As to the erection of the temple of the Kaaba for the worship of God, all local traditions and historians of Arabia agree in the fact that the above-named building was erected by Abraham and Ishmael.

From St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (chap. iv. v. 22-26) it is, in our opinion, clearly proved that the temple of the Kaaba, which "answereth to Jerusalem," was built by Abraham and Ishmael.

The ceremonies that were observed in connection with the temple of the Kaaba were—prayer to God, which was performed both within the temple and outside of it: after that a circuit was made round it, all the congregation pronouncing the name of God and kissing the temple while so circumambulating it.

One question naturally suggests itself here, and it is this: What difference is there between making a circuit round the temple of the Kaaba, the kissing the edifice itself, and the black stone, the building of altars and reverencing them, the erection of a stone by Jacob and his pouring oil over it, the turning the head while in the act of prayer towards Jerusalem,—in short, the showing of respect and reverence to material objects, and between the practices which idolators observe towards their idols, and on account of which they were and are looked upon by everybody with contempt and displeasure?

What generally deters men from clearly perceiving the difference between the two above-mentioned circumstances is the word *idolatry*, by which is understood that men revere and worship some material and artificial object, and that they are sinners.

But this is a mistake. The cause of their being infidels and sinners is not that they revere and worship material and artificial objects, but it is this, that they believe certain spiritual or material beings or powers, or grand natural objects, to be possessed of all those powers which really belong to God *alone;* and they pay that worship to the former which is due to the Almighty only, their idols being representations of the former, not of God. This belief renders them infidels and sinners; nor is it a matter of any consequence whether they worship those spiritual or those material beings or powers, or grand natural objects, by erecting in their name and dedicating to them any images or idols, or by merely believing the same in their heart, and not reproducing their belief by external actions. They receive the name of idolators because they worshipped, by means of or through these idols and images, those spiritual or material beings or powers or grand natural objects, whom they believe to be possessed of all the powers of God. Had they not adopted these external means of performing their worship, but believed the same in their heart, they would still have been, properly speaking, idolators.

The altars erected by Abraham, in which the black stone is also included, the stone of Jacob, the temple of the Kaaba, and that of Jerusalem, were not built in commemoration of any renowned personages, nor were they dedicated to any angel or grand natural object; they were erected wholly and solely for the worship of one invisible supreme God, the creator af all things. All the rites, ceremonies, and practices observed in those buildings were so many methods of worshipping God, and the worship of God, be it performed in whatsoever manner that has been sanctioned by God, is never a sin, infidelity, or idolatry.

The gathering together of all men in the plain of Arafat, where there is no black stone of Abraham, no altar of Jacob, and no temple of Ishmael, but which is merely a vast wilderness; their vociferating, all simultaneously together, the name of God, and supplicating pardon for their sins, are practices to which the Mohammedans now give the name of Hadj, and which were established by Abraham and Ishmael. In course of time, idolatry had become a general practice in Arabia, but, nevertheless we find that there were many persons who believed in one or other of these inspired religions and adored one God; and also that, very frequently, men used to stand up and proclaim themselves to be religious reformers, and to preach publicly the worship of God, and to exhort men to renounce idolatry. Those who publicly assumed the office of religious reformers, were such as the following: Hinzilah حنظلة, son of Safwam; Khalid خالد, son of Sanan; Asad Abu Karb اسد; Kis قيس, son of Saidah, etc. Abdul Muttalib is also represented by some to have been a reformer.

But, however strange the circumstance may appear that the descendants of one who destroyed the idols of his father, and, relinquishing their worship, promulgated the adoration of the true God, should have again insensibly relapsed into the same state of idolatry; how much more strange and extraordinary must be the circumstance that from the progeny of the same personage there arose one who, for the second time, destroyed the idols of his forefathers and of Arabia; who restored the worship of the all powerful, omniscient, omnipresent God, the Alpha and Omega of all things, and lastly, who dispersed the thick darkness of ignorance and superstition, into which his countrymen were plunged, by the pure and bright effulgence of eternal truth.

Judaism.

This ceremonial religion was introduced into Arabia by the

Syrian Jews who had migrated to that country and settled there. Some writers hazard the opinion that a tribe of the Israelites detached itself from the main body of the nation, settled in Arabia, and there made proselytes of several tribes. This opinion, however, is far from being correct, since the real fact is that Judaism came into Arabia along with those Jews who fled in great numbers thereto from the terrible persecution of their country and nation by Nebuchadnezzar in the thirty-fifth century A.M., or fifth century A.C., and settled in Khaibar in northern Arabia. Shortly afterwards, when their disturbed and excited state had somewhat subsided into order and tranquility, they commenced propagating their religion, and succeeded in making proselytes of some of the tribes of Kenanah, Harith, Ibn Kaab, and Kendah. When Zoo-Navas, a king of the Hymiar dynasty, and who, we think, flourished in 3650 A.M., or 354 A.C., embraced Judaism, he vastly increased their number by compelling others to accept that faith. At that time, the Jews had great security and power in Arabia, possessing there many towns and fortresses.

It is natural to suppose that the chosen people looked down upon idolatry with contempt and indignation, but no local tradition exists to the effect that they regarded the temple of the Kaaba in any other light than that in which the Arabs themselves did; and there is good reason to believe that either a picture or a statue representing Abraham, with the ram beside him ready for sacrifice, might have been painted upon the interior of the Kaaba, or placed as a statue within its walls, through the instrumentality of the Jews, according to the description of that circumstance as given in the Pentateuch.

There is no doubt that, through the medium of the Jews, the idea of God became much more elevated, noble, and sublime than it previously was among the Arabians in general, whether those who had embraced their religion, or such as kept up intercommunications with them, and had the advantage of associating

with them; and, as the Jews possessed an excellent code of laws, both social and political; and as, moreover, the Arabians of those days were entirely destitute of anything of the kind, it is a legitimate inference that many domestic and social regulations and practices mentioned in that law, should have been borrowed and observed by the Arabs, but, more especially, by the inhabitants of Yemen, where the law was enforced by the authority of their king, Zoo-Navas, who, as above-stated, had embraced Judaism.

We need hardly dwell, on this occasion, upon the tenets and doctrines which Judaism inculcates, as well as the ceremonies and usages observed by the professors of that faith, as they are all given in the Pentateuch, and as almost every one is more or less familiar with them; those which we wish particularly to point out will be mentioned on the occasion of our dwelling upon the connection that exists between Judaism and Islam.

Christianity.

It is certain that Christianity found its way into Arabia in the third century after Christ, when the disorders and abuses which had insensibly crept into the Eastern Church, and the persecutions to which those early Christians were subjected, compelled them to quit their native land, to find, if possible, an asylum elsewhere. Many Oriental as well as European historians, who are all indebted for their subject matter to Eastern writers, unanimously represent this period as contemporaneous with the reign of Zoo-Navas, an opinion, however, with which we can by no means agree, since, according to our calculations (see Essay I., p. 44), Zoo-Navas flourished nearly six hundred years before the event now under consideration, and hence, also, we differ from those writers who represent Zoo-Navas to have persecuted the Christians.

The first locality in which these refugee Christians settled was

Najran, whence it may be concluded that it was there where they had the most proselytes. These Christians were of the Jacobite communion, a designation commonly given to the Oriental sect of Monophysites, although it is more strictly applicable to the Monophysites of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Chaldæa. The special name of Jacobite is derived from a Syrian monk, called Jacobus Baradæus, who, in the reign of the Greek Emperor Justinian, formed the Monophysite recusants of his country into a single sect or party. They believed that Christ has only one nature—a human nature become divine.

Christian writers represent their religion as having made a very great progress among the Arabians, but we cannot concur with them in so thinking, since we find that, with the exception of Majran, the inhabitants of which province had, for the most part, embraced Christianity, there were but very few persons belonging to the tribes of Hymiar, Ghassan, Rabia, Taghlab, Bahru, Tonuch, Tay, Kodea, and Hira who followed their example, and that, unlike the Jews, they converted to their faith no numerous or complete congregations. It is highly probable that it was through the instrumentality of these detached Christian proselytes, that either the picture or the statue of Mary, holding the infant Jesus in her lap, was painted on the inside walls of the temple of the Kaaba, or placed therein.

Such was the religious aspect of Arabia, and such were the divers religions that flourished there at one and the same time, and whose doctrines, tenets, rites, ceremonies, and customs must have been mixed up and blended together and practised by the Arabians in general, for it is hardly credible that those half savage and ignorant people could have been acute enough to have weighed the comparative merit of so many religions, and to have appreciated the nice distinction separating them from one another.

Under this heavy incubus of religions was Arabia groaning when Islam suddenly and unexpectedly appeared, and, to her

great astonishment and inexpressible delight, relieved her of her insufferable load, diffusing, at the same time, the light of truth throughout the whole length and breadth of Arabia; so that Islam must have been to Arabia, if possible, more than a providential boon. From its very nature Islam was opposed to idolatry, for the former taught, inculcated, and enforced natural and eternal truths, while the latter, by keeping man in a state of ignorance, prepared him to become a slave, both morally and politically. Nor was that faith on better terms with atheism, for its very first and main principle is an implicit belief in the unity of that God, the very existence of whom Atheism denied. It was no very desperate struggle between Islam and the second of the two sects of Arabian deism, for the doctrines of this sect, plus the doctrine of revelations, were very nearly identical with the main principles of Islam. With the revealed doctrines of Sabeanism Islam was entirely identical, but what it condemned in the former was the worship of the stars and heavenly intelligences, and the erection of statues and pagodas in commemoration of, and dedicated to, such luminaries as are mentioned above—a kind of idolatry into which the Sabeans had in the course of time insensibly relapsed.

All the principles, doctrines, and dogmas of the religion preached by Abraham and the other Arabian prophets, and of Judaism, were not in the least opposed to those of Islam; but, on the contrary, the principles and the doctrines of Islam were the counterpart of those of the religion of Abraham and other Arabian prophets, and of Judaism; the only difference between Islam and Judaism being, that the former acknowledged the prophetic mission of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ, and that it did not accept some of their wrong interpretations of the Scriptures. The principles of Islam were quite in harmony with those wholesome ones which Jesus Christ originally inculcated; but to the principles, doctrines, dogmas, religious practices, rites, ceremonies, and customs of the *pseudo* Christians contempo-

raneous with Islam, they were entirely opposed and antagonistic; and in nothing did the two religions resemble each other except in a few detached and isolated precepts of morality.

What then is Islam? It is nothing more nor less than a perfect combination of the revealed principles, doctrines, and dogmas of the Sabean religion, completed and brought to their entire perfection; of the religion of Abraham and other Arabian prophets, completed and perfected; of Judaism in their complete and perfect form, and of the principle of the unity of God, and those of morality originally inculcated and promulgated by Jesus Christ. We shall elucidate this answer of ours by some examples.

The adoration of no other gods than God, and the destruction of idolatry are identical with the principle and practice inculcated in Judaism. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. xx. 3). "And make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth" (Exod. xxiii. 13). "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them" (Exod. xx. 4, 5). "Turn ye not unto idols, nor make to yourselves molten gods, I am the Lord your God" (Lev. xix. 4). "Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone to bow down unto it" (Lev. xxvi. 1). "Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them and quite break down their images" (Exod. xxiii. 24).

The best and the principal precepts of Judaism are the following, which are also maintained and taught by Islam. "Honour thy father and thy mother. . . . Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. Thou shalt not

covet thy neighbour's house" (Exod. xx. 12-17). The times for prayers fixed by Islam, and which are seven, five, or three,[1] are, to a great extent similar to those of Sabeanism and Judaism.

The method of performing prayers much resembles that laid down in the Sabean and Jewish faiths. Besides the purification of the soul at the time of prayer (this being the sole purpose for which prayer was instituted), and the outward purification of body, clothes, etc., inculcated by Islam, very much resemble the like observances of Jews and Sabeans. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes" (Exod. xix. 10). "And Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water" (Levit. viii. 6). The only innovation introduced by Islam, in connection with matters of religion, and which is not found in any other creed, is the substitution of *Adau*, or human voice for the Jewish trumpet and the Christian church bells. Regarding this novelty a Christian author writes as follows: "These several times of prayer," says he, "are announced by the Mueddins from the minarets or Madnehs of the mosque. Their chant, sung to a very simple but solemn melody, sounds harmoniously but sonorously, down the height of the mosque, through the mid-day din and roar of the cities, but its impression is one of the most strikingly poetical, in the stillness of night, so much so, that even many Europeans cannot help congratulating the Prophet on his preferring the

[1] The names of the seven prayers and the different times for their performance are: (1.) Fajar فجر, dawn, or the last hour of the night before sunrise; (2.) Dohah ضحى, Day-break, or between sunrise and noon; (3.) Zohr ظهر, after mid-day; (4.) Asr عصر, between the Zohar time and the sunset; (5.) Maghrib مغرب, after the sunset; (6.) Isha عشى, after the departure of twilight; and (7.) Tahajjud تهجد, after midnight. The seventh and second are not Fardz (absolutely imperative), while the rest of them are such. It is allowed to perform the second and the third together as well as the fourth and the fifth together. In this case there are five prayers and three times.

human voice to either the Jewish trumpet-call of the time of the Temple, or the Christian church bells."

All the sacrifices that are allowed by Islam resemble those of Judaism, or, in other words, these sacrifices are, as it were, selections made by the former from a great number of those which are allowed in Judaism.

Fasts, again, are likewise similar to those in Judaism and Sabeanism, and resemble much more the latter than the former.

The prohibiting men from doing any secular work on the Sabbath Day during the time set apart for prayer and other religious observances, is identical with the same custom of the chosen people; but from the time of Abraham, Friday was the day observed by the Arabians as their Sabbath.

Circumcision is the same as was practised by the Jews and the followers of Abraham. Marriage and divorce are nearly the same as are practised in other revealed religions. "When a man hath taken a wife and married her and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house" (Deut. xxiv. 1).

The laws respecting the lawfulness or unlawfulness of certain women for marriage are similar, in many respects, to those of Judaism.

The prohibition of unclean and polluted men and women from entering a mosque or from touching the Koran, etc., are very similar to the provisions of Judaism to meet the like cases, with this difference, that in Islam the prohibition is less strict than in Judaism.

The prohibition from eating swine's flesh is the same as that in force among the Israelites. "And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be cloven-footed, yet he cheweth not the cud; he is unclean to you" (Lev. xi. 7).

The laws regulating the lawfulness or unlawfulness of animals

for food, and the prohibition to eat animals who have died a natural death, resemble the like injunctions of the Mosaic Code.

The abstinence from taking wine and other spirituous liquors also resembles the Jewish practice—"Do not drink wine nor strong drink" (Lev. x. 9).

Penalties assigned by Islam, for various crimes and offences, are also, to a great extent, like those of Judaism. Bastinado and stoning (according to those lawyers who believe that the practice is allowed in Islam) of men for adultery, fornication, or incest, are provisions having great affinity to similar ones among the Jews. The punishment of death assigned to a Moslem for becoming a renegade (but according to those lawyers only who believe this practice to be a crime), also resembles a like practice enforced by Judaism—"And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him" (Lev. xxiv. 16).

Islam is represented to have borrowed the idea and conviction of angels from the Talmud, of good and evil genii from the Midrash and the Talmud, of the state of body and soul after death from the Jews, of paradise and hell from Judaism and Christianity, of the signs of the approach of the last day and the day of resurrection from the Midrash and the Talmud. We are, however, of opinion that, in the first place, many of the above-named circumstances do not belong to Islam, and, secondly, that those which do have any connection with that religion are not at all borrowed, excepting only their names, from any of the above-named sources, inasmuch as the description of these circumstances, as given by Islam, entirely differs from that furnished in the above-mentioned books and faiths.

The limits of this Essay will not allow us to dwell upon these matters at length, and to discriminate those which belong to Islam from those which do not, as well as to give a full explanation of the latter; we shall, therefore, conclude the subject by asserting that, taking it for granted that all the above-named circumstances

belong to Islam, which is, indeed, the prevailing belief of Mohammedans in general, in that case they bear the same resemblance to the similar circumstances contained in Judaism as do those other principles of Islam which we have above compared with the corresponding ones of Judaism.

Islam borrowed nothing from Christianity, except the following two doctrines:—(1.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," Matt. xxii. 37; (2.) "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise," Luke vi. 31.

At this point of our description, a reflection might naturally suggest itself to the inquisitive and inquiring mind, which is, that, in this case, Islam is nothing more than a collection of principles and precepts culled here and there, and that it has nothing it can call its own; but it will be evident to every reflecting reader that this resemblance of the principles and doctrines of Islam to those of other revealed religions is the greatest proof of its being divine and inspired. All things that proceed from one infinite perfection must be of one nature, and perfect of their kind. As it is impossible for God to create his own rival and equal, as it is impossible for Him to exclude any created object from his all-pervading will and domination, so is it impossible that two different principles should proceed from Him, for the purpose of effecting one object. Mussulmans should ever remain grateful to Mohammed, who confirmed the true mission of all the prophets from the creation of the world up to his time, who brought all the revealed religions of the earth to perfection, and who threw open to his faithful followers the everlasting gates of eternal and ineffable light.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE QUESTION

WHETHER ISLAM HAS BEEN BENEFICIAL OR INJURIOUS TO HUMAN SOCIETY IN GENERAL,

AND TO THE

MOSAIC AND CHRISTIAN DISPENSATIONS.

خطبةٌ

علي ان الا سلام رحمة للانسان وجُنّة لا ديان الا نبياء باوضح البرهان

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم و اتممت عليكم نعمتي و رَضِيْتُ لكم الا سلام دينا

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—On the advantages derived from Islam by Human Society in general	1-7
SECTION II.—Refutation of the opinion that Islam has been Injurious to Human Society	7
Polygamy	8-13
Divorce	13-20
Slavery	20-25
Freedom of judgment in Religion	25-29
Refutation of the remark that the sword is the inevitable penalty for the denial of Islam . .	29-30
Toleration.	30-35
SECTION III.—Benefits and advantages which Judaism and Christianity derived from Islam. . . .	35-37
SECTION IV.—Advantages derived from Islam by Christianity particularly	37
The origin of Christian Unitarianism traceable to Islam	38
The origin of Protestantism traceable to Islam .	38-40

ESSAY

ON THE QUESTION

WHETHER ISLAM HAS BEEN BENEFICIAL OR INJURIOUS TO HUMAN SOCIETY IN GENERAL,

AND TO THE

MOSAIC AND CHRISTIAN DISPENSATIONS.

THE subject upon which we are now about to treat, is one which, from its very nature, requires, in order to command attention and awaken interest, to be approached in a spirit equally free from illiberality, prejudice, and acrimony; and as the tone of our observations will therefore be conciliatory, we trust that, at least, if we fail to convince, we shall not offend. Our subject matter will be divided into four sections.

SECTION I.—*On the Advantages derived by Human Society in general from Islam.*

Conscientiously disposed as we ourselves may be to treat the subject impartially, it is with the more regret we say that Christian writers invariably regard everything relative to Islam with so much suspicion, as to afford us very little hope that our present remarks will not be viewed through the same offensive medium. On this account, therefore, we shall content ourselves here with mentioning those advantages and benefits for which Christians themselves acknowledge human society is indebted to Islam. The following remark, coming as it does from Sir Wm. Muir, is the more valuable, as being the deposi-

tion of by no means a willing witness: "And what have been the effects," asks that author, "of the system which, established by such instrumentality, Mahomet has left behind him? We may freely concede that it banished, for ever, many of the darker elements of superstition which had, for ages, shrouded the Peninsula. Idolatry vanished before the battle-cry of Islam:[1] the doctrine of the unity and infinite perfections of God, and of a special, all pervading Providence, became a living principle in the hearts and lives of the followers of Mahomet, even as it had in his own. An absolute surrender and submission to the divine will (the very name of Islam), was demanded as the first requirement of the religion. *Nor are social virtues wanting.* Brotherly love is inculcated within the circle of the faith.[2] Orphans are to be protected, and slaves treated with consideration.[3] Intoxicating drinks are prohibited, and Mahometanism may boast of a degree of temperance unknown in any other creed."[4]

When dwelling upon the subject of Mohammed's "merit towards his country," the celebrated historian Gibbon remarks as follows: "His beneficial or pernicious influence on the public happiness is the last consideration in the character of Mahomet. The most bitter or most bigoted of his Christian or Jewish foes will surely allow that he assumed a false commission to in-

[1] Islam entirely rooted out idolatry from Arabia, and brought home to all other creeds that were at that time prevalent in the world, the notion that idolatry was a grave sin.

[2] Not only "within the circle of the faith;" but to all beings, whose hearts, to use the phrase of the Hadees, "are fresh with life."

[3] Virtually speaking, Islam almost abolished slavery, for in no case is it allowed, except in that of war captives, and that also with the benevolent intention of saving their lives. Persons who give them their liberty are entitled to the highest degree of reward; those who ransom their lives stand next in the order of meritoriousness; and those who keep them as slaves must maintain them in the same style of living as they do themselves.

[4] To these excellent injunctions Sir William might have added, the prohibition of all games of chance; the abstaining from the use of indecent words and expressions; love and reverence for parents; compulsory alms; and kind treatment of animals, etc.

culcate a salutary doctrine, less perfect only than their own. He piously supposed, as the basis of his religion, the truth and sanctity of *their* prior revelations, the virtues and miracles of their founders. The idols of Arabia were broken before the throne of God; the blood of human victims was expiated by prayer, and fasting, and alms, the laudable or innocent arts of devotion; and his rewards and punishments of a future life were painted by the images most congenial to an ignorant and carnal generation. Mahomet was, perhaps, incapable of dictating a moral and political system for the use of his countrymen: but he breathed among the faithful a spirit of charity and friendship; recommended the practice of social virtues; and checked by his laws and precepts the thirst of revenge, and the oppression of widows and orphans. The hostile tribes were united in faith and obedience, and the valour which had been idly spent in domestic quarrels was vigorously directed against a foreign enemy."

Mr. Davenport, in his admirable "Apology for Mohammed and the Koran," observes as follows: "It is a monstrous error to suppose, as some have done, and others still do, that the faith taught by the Koran was propagated by the sword alone, for it will be readily admitted, by all unprejudiced minds, that Mohammed's religion—by which prayers and alms were substituted for the blood of human victims, and which, instead of hostility and perpetual feuds, breathed a spirit of benevolence and of the social virtues, and must, therefore, have had an important influence upon civilization—was a real blessing to the Eastern world, and, consequently, could not have needed exclusively the sanguinary means so unsparingly and so unscrupulously used by Moses for the extirpation of idolatry.

"How idle and ridiculous was it, therefore, to bestow nothing but insolent opprobrium and ignorant declamation upon one of the most powerful instruments which the hand of Providence has raised up to influence the opinions and doctrines of mankind

through a long succession of ages. The whole subject, whether viewed with relation to the extraordinary rise and progress, either of the founder personally, or of the system itself, cannot be otherwise than one of the deepest interest, nor can there be any doubt but that, of those who have investigated and considered the comparative merits of Mohammedanism and Christianity, there are few who have not at times felt confounded at the survey, and been compelled not only to admit that even the former must have been ordained for many wise and beneficent purposes, but even to confide in its instrumentality in the production, at least, of much eventual good." The same author goes on to remark that "the first revivers of philosophy and the sciences, the link, as they have been termed, between ancient and modern literature, were, most undoubtedly, according to every species of testimony, the Saracens of Asia and the Moors of Spain, under the Abasside and Ommiade Caliphs. Letters which originally came to Europe from the East were brought thither, a second time, by the genius of Mohammedanism. It is well known that arts and sciences flourished among the Arabians for almost six hundred years; whilst among us rude barbarism reigned, and literature became almost extinct." . . . "And again, 'It must be owned, that all the knowledge, whether of physic, astronomy, philosophy, or mathematics, which flourished in Europe from the tenth century, was originally derived from the Arabian schools; and that the Spanish Saracens, in a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the fathers of European philosophy.'" "But to resume," says the same author, "Europe is still further indebted to Mohammedanism; for, not to mention that to the struggles during the Crusades we mainly owe the abolition of the onerous parts of the feudal system, and the destruction of those aristocratic despotisms on the ruins of which arose the proudest bulwark of our liberties, Europe is to be reminded that she is indebted to the followers of Mohammed, as the link which connects

ancient and modern literature, for the preservation, during a long reign of Western darkness, of the works of many of the Greek philosophers, and for the cultivation of some of the most important branches of science, mathematics, medicine, etc., which are highly indebted to their labours."

The writer of an excellent article upon Mohammedanism in Chambers's Cyclopædia, observes as follows :

"That part of Islam, however, which has undergone the least changes . . . in the course of time, and which most distinctly reveals the mind of its author, is also its most complete and its most shining part—we mean the ethics of the Koran. Injustice, falsehood, pride, revengefulness, calumny, mockery, avarice, prodigality, debauchery, mistrust, and suspicion are inveighed against as ungodly and wicked; while benevolence, liberality, modesty, forbearance, patience and endurance, frugality, sincerity, straightforwardness, decency, love of peace and truth, and, above all, trusting in God and submitting to His will, are considered as the pillars of true piety and the principal signs of a true believer."

The same writer goes on to remark as follows :—

"We cannot consider in this place what Islam has done for the cause of all humanity, or, more exactly, what was its precise share in the development of science and art in Europe. Broadly speaking, the Mohammedans may be said to have been the enlightened teachers of barbarous Europe, from the ninth to the thirteenth century. It is from the glorious days of Abbaside rulers that the real renaissance of Greek spirit and Greek culture is to be dated. Classical literature would have been irredeemably lost had it not been for the home it found in the schools of the 'unbelievers' of the 'dark ages.' Arabic philosophy, medicine, natural history, geography, history, grammar, rhetoric, and the 'golden art of poetry,' schooled by the old Hellenic masters, brought forth an abundant harvest of works, many of which will live and teach as long as there will be generations to be taught."

The writer of an Essay, entitled "Islam as a Political System," inserted in the "East and the West," enumerates in the following passage the advantages that human society derived from Islam: —"Islam put an end to infanticide, then prevalent in the surrounding countries. Christianity might have equally opposed, but was not equally successful. It put an end to slavery, the adscription to the soil. It gave equality of political rights, and administered even-handed justice, not only to those who professed its religion, but to those who were conquered by its arms. It reduced taxation, the sole tribute to the State, consisting of the tenth. It freed commerce from all charges and impediments; it freed the professors of other faiths from all forced contributions to their church or their clergy, and from all religious contributions whatever to the dominant creed. It communicated all the privileges of the conquering class to those of the conquered who conformed to its religion, and all the protection of citizenship to those who did not. It secured property, abolished usury, and the private revenge of blood. It inculcated cleanliness and sobriety; it did not inculcate them only, but it produced and established them. It put an end to licentiousness, and associated with charity to the poor the forms of respect for all."

"The results produced by Islam," continues the same writer, "seem too vast, too profound, too permanent, to allow us to believe that the human mind could anticipate them, far less adjust the scheme; thence the disposition to take refuge in chance, or providential design, instead of applying to it the process of reasoning by which we estimate the effects of the laws of Solon or the triumphs of Timoleon. Nevertheless, this scheme was framed by a single man, who filled with his own spirit those who were in immediate contact with him, and impressed a whole people with the profoundest veneration of which man ever was the object. The system of laws and morals which he formed agreed equally with the highest development as with the lowest level of society, which, during ten centuries,

passing from race to race, made every people by whom it was received superior to, and triumphant over, the nations and empires with which they came in contact."

Thomas Carlyle, in his "Lectures on Heroes," remarks on the subject under consideration, as follows: "To the Arab nation it (Islam) was as a birth from darkness into light; Arabia first became alive by means of it. A poor shepherd people, roaming unnoticed in its deserts since the creation of the world: a Hero-Prophet was sent down to them with a word they could believe: see, the unnoticed becomes world-notable, the small has grown world-great; within one century afterwards Arabia is at Granada on this hand and at Delhi on that;—glancing in valour and splendour and the light of genius, Arabia shines through long ages over a great section of the world. Belief is great, life-giving. The history of a nation becomes fruitful, soul-elevating, great, so soon as it believes. These Arabs, the man Mahomet, and that one century,—is it not as if a spark had fallen, one spark, on a world of what seemed black unnoticeable sand; but lo! the sand proves explosive powder, blazes heaven-high, from Delhi to Granada!"

Section II.—*Refutation of the Opinion that Islam has been Injurious to Human Society.*

Sir Wm. Muir states that, "setting aside considerations of minor import, three radical evils flow from the faith. . . . First: Polygamy, Divorce, and Slavery are maintained and perpetuated;—striking, as they do, at the root of public morals, poisoning public life and disorganizing society. Second: Freedom of judgment in religion is crushed and annihilated. Toleration is unknown. Third: A barrier has been interposed against the reception of Christianity." We shall consider every one of these evils singly and separately.

It is a great mistake to suppose that by Islam polygamy is

made compulsory upon its followers, on the contrary, the general practice of it is not even recommended, the privileged use of it being reserved for such as for physical reasons may stand in need of it, but in the absence of such an excuse the indulgence in it is wholly contrary to the virtues and morality taught by Islam.

Unfortunately, however, no small impediment is thrown in the way of a calm and candid investigation of the subject by the antagonism which exists between the manners, customs, and modes of thought of one nation and those of another. Thus, the very word polygamy suggests to Christians ideas so offensive that they enter upon any discussion respecting the practice with minds almost predetermined to find in it nothing but an unmitigated evil, and without inquiring how far it may be justified by the requirements of climate, the comparative number of the sexes, and by various physiological and social reasons.

We propose to consider this subject from three points of view, namely, Nature, Society, and Religion.

For the due consideration of the first point, it will be necessary to ascertain, if possible, what has been the will or intention of the Creator of all living creatures as regards this subject, or, in other words, whether He intended man to be universally polygamistic or not. Now this His intention, can, we apprehend, be read clearly and indisputably in all the works of nature, for it is evidently impossible that His will should be at variance with the productions of it; and, accordingly, from the unerring manifestations of nature we learn that such beings as are intended by their Creator to be monogamistic invariably bring forth their young, in pairs, one of the two being a male and the other a female. Those, on the other hand, that are intended to be polygamistic are delivered of one or more, no relative proportion of sex being observed. According to this law of nature man falls under the second head; but as, by his position, and by the rare and precious endowment of reason, he

is raised far above all other sentient beings, so is he required to use all those powers, rights, and privileges bestowed upon him by nature in common with the other beings around him, with caution, and in harmony with his physical, social, and political liabilities, as well as with the laws of hygiene and the influences of the climate in which he lives.

Secondly: Man is, by his very nature, a social being; and therefore, as God saw "it was not good for man to be alone," he made "a help for him," which is woman—one who was destined to share with him the cares and the amenities, the sorrows and pleasures, of life; to increase his happiness and diminish his affliction by her tender sympathy—one, lastly, who was to contribute, with himself, to carry out that great, that all-important command, "Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth." When, however, from whatever cause, this helpmate fails to perform her natural duty, some remedy must surely have been appointed by the All-wise Creator to meet the exigency, and that remedy is polygamy—that is, the act of a man's marrying either more than one wife at one and the same time, or after divorcing the former one. The latter privilege is allowed to the wife in the event of the husband's incompetency, with this reasonable difference only, that man can have recourse to his remedy when he so wills, while the wife must first obtain a legal authorization for the act.

If this remedy, whose necessity we have proved both by natural and social laws—the tendency of both which descriptions of laws is pretty nearly the same—had been denied to man, society would have greatly suffered thereby, since man would have been led, in consequence, to commit vices and crimes of the deepest dye.

Again, in order to prevent persons from running into excess—which is at all times bad, and sometimes dangerous—and to render it certain that the person so having recourse to polygamy was impelled by a real necessity, many stringent restrictions and

binding regulations have been established, such as the observance of perfect equality of rights and privileges, love and affection, among all wives, etc., etc. These restrictions and regulations materially serve to prevent truly pious and religious persons from indulging in polygamy, for they almost immediately discover that the availing themselves of this privilege, without fulfilling its conditions and observing its regulations, which are so strict as to be extemely difficult to be complied with, is incompatible with the due and faithful discharge of their religious duties. No doubt the institution of polygamy affords many facilities to the libertine, as well as to all whose sole object in life is the unrestrained gratification of their animal appetites; but for this abuse of a beneficial institution they will be amenable to the Great Searcher of the human heart, who will, most assuredly, mete out to them the punishment due to their offence.

We cannot allow to pass unnoticed the remarks of Mr. Higgins, and, after him, those of Mr. Davenport, in favour of polygamy. It is to be regretted that both these gentlemen should have viewed polygamy from one point of view only—namely, a physiological one—whereas our religion has granted this liberty, not only from physiological considerations, but, as we have above stated, to afford a remedy for the embitterments of conjugal life. Mr. Davenport says:—"With respect to the physiological reasons for polygamy, it has been observed by the celebrated Montesquieu that women, in hot countries, are marriageable at eight, nine, or ten years of age;—thus, in those countries, infancy and marriage almost always go together. They are old at twenty. . . . It is, therefore, extremely natural that in these places a man, when no law opposes it, should leave one wife to take another, and that polygamy should be introduced."

Mr. Higgins writes that "Biologists and natural philosophers have found other reasons which might serve as some apology

for this allowance (polygamy), which will not apply to us cold-blooded, frog-like animals of Northern climates, though they may be applicable to the descendants of Ishmael, natives of the scorching sands of the desert." Again, he says, "I find it asserted in the Oriental collections of Sir W. Ouseley, page 108, that 'the warm regions of Asia make a difference between the sexes not known to the climates of Europe, where the decay of each is mutual and gradual; whereas in Asia it is given to man alone to arrive at a green old age.' If this be true, it goes far to excuse Mohammed in allowing a plurality of wives, and it sufficiently accounts for the fact that Jesus never expressly declared himself upon this subject, but left it to the regulation of the governments of countries, as it was evident that what would be proper for Asia would be improper for Europe." Nor should we be justified in leaving out from our impartial consideration the deplorable morals that were in general practice shortly previous to the advent of Mohammed. Persia stood foremost in the corruptness of her morals. The laws of marriage were set aside. Respect and regard to relationship, however close or distant, were not at all observed. A mother was as lawful to her son as a daughter to her father, or a sister to her brother; in fact, they may justly be compared to a flock of animals, which are guided by no law whatever. When we turn our attention to a little north-west of Persia, a locality mostly inhabited by Jews, we find that polygamy was a general practice, without any restrictions. Arabia, again, affords us a perfect combination of the customs of the Persians and the Jews, where there was no end to the number of wives, and where no law guided the people in their choice. All women, without any distinction of rank, age, or relation, served alike to the brutal appetites of the male sex. When we look upon the Christianity of that age—if it can be called Christianity at all—we see many of her professors pursuing a course diametrically opposite to the above-mentioned one; we mean

the somewhat general practice of celibacy. In short, it was amidst this mental and intellectual darkness, and the corruptions and depravity of the manners and morals which enveloped the world on all sides, that Mohammed's genius codified a law, so perfect in its nature, so consistent with reason and propriety, so conducive to the health and prosperity of society, and so beneficial to the matrimonial existence of both the parties interested.

Thirdly: When the subject is considered from a religious point of view, we find that polygamy is nowhere prohibited in Judaism and Christianity, which at present are, besides Islam, the only two inspired religions in the world. For the support of our assertion we shall quote the remarks of a few eminent *Christian* authors in favour of polygamy. Higgins states that "because Mohammed, following the example of the legislator of the oldest ceremonial religion west of the Euphrates, and, as all Christians maintain, of the world—Moses—allowed his people, the descendants of Ishmael, the son of the father of the faithful, a plurality of wives, he has been constantly abused by Christians, to use their own words, for *pandering to the base passions of his followers.* But why the allowance of a plurality of wives should be visited with such very harsh censure, I do not know. Surely the example of Solomon, and David—*the man after God's own heart, which He had found to fulfil His law*—might plead for a little mercy, more especially as Jesus nowhere expressly forbids, in any one of the twenty Gospels which were written by some or other of the multitude of the sects of his followers, to record his commands." Davenport states:—"As to the lawfulness of polygamy, it will be seen, by referring to the following passages in Scripture, that it was not only approved, but even blessed, by Jehovah himself—Gen. xxx. 22; Exodus xxi. 11; Deut. xvii. 17; 1 Sam. iv. 1, 2, 11, 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 42, 43; 2 Sam. xii. 8; 2 Sam. v. 12; Judges viii. 30; Judges x. 4; Judges xii. 9, 14."

But the most distinguished and talented defender of polygamy was the celebrated John Milton, who, after quoting numberless passages from the Bible in defence of the practice, says:—"Moreover God, in an allegorical fiction (Ezekiel), represents himself as having espoused two wives, Aholah and Aholiah—a mode of speaking which Jehovah would by no means have employed, especially at such length, even in a parable, nor, indeed, have taken upon himself such a character at all, if the practice which it implied had been, intrinsically, dishonourable or shameful. On what ground, then, can a practice be considered so 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 previously to its introduction." . . . "Lastly," continues Milton, "I argue as follows, from Hebrews xiii. 4: Polygamy is either marriage, fornication, or adultery. The Apostle recognizes no fourth state. Reverence for so many patriarchs who were polygamists will, I trust, deter every one from considering it as fornication or adultery; for 'whoremongers and adulterers God will judge'; whereas the patriarchs were the objects of His special favour, as He himself witnesses. If, then, polygamy be marriage, properly so called, it is also lawful and honourable. According to the same Apostle, 'Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled.'"

The subject of Polygamy has been considered from three different points of view—Nature, Society, and Religion; but as it is not necessary to consider *Divorce* with regard to the first of the above subjects, it will be discussed only in connection with the other two.

Considering the universality of the institution of marriage among all nations, both ancient and modern, and its general recognition as the basis of man's individual and social happiness, whatever tends to lessen its influence must ever be regarded as a serious evil.

Hence the Church of Rome has thrown around marriage the halo of sanctity by making it one of her Seven Sacraments, as the best means of its defence; while Protestant England, with the like view, made a decree for divorce—only attainable by a very expensive appeal to the House of Lords—an arrangement which lasted till the year 1856, when a new Court of Justice was created to take cognizance of all cases of divorce, and determine their merits by the verdict of a Jury.

Generally speaking, divorce is the greatest of enemies to society, by diminishing the respect due to marriage, and destroying man's confidence in woman's fidelity. It cannot, however, be denied that divorce has also its advantages: it releases either the husband or the wife, whose incompatibility of disposition, violence of temper, or frailty, embittered the life of both. But, while being thus a benefit to the individual, divorce is not the less injurious to society by the scenes of immorality too often blazoned before the public, and also by the injurious effect which the separation of their parents must have upon the children of the parties. Such being the evils which follow in the train of divorce, the having recourse to it as a remedy can only be justified when its non-adoption would cause miseries still more unbearable, cares and anxieties still more annoying, and daily increasing animosities and mutual recriminations.

Our Prophet neither underrated nor overvalued divorce. He constantly pointed out to his followers how opposed it was to the best interests of society; he always expatiated upon the evils which flowed from it, and ever exhorted his disciples to treat women with respect and kindness, and to bear patiently their violence and ill-temper; and he always spoke of those who availed themselves of divorce in a severe and disparaging manner; so that many a person was led into the mistake that they who had recourse to divorce, and they who shed human blood, were guilty of crimes of equal atrocity. Notwith-

standing, however, Mohammed's rooted antipathy to divorce, he gave it the importance and consideration it justly claimed and merited. He allowed it under circumstances when it could not fail to prove a valuable boon; when it either entirely removed, or at least greatly alleviated, the cares, troubles, and embitterments of wedded life; and when, if not taken advantage of, society would suffer still more than it already did. In such cases divorce is far from being a disadvantage to society; it is, on the contrary, a blessing and an efficient means of bettering the social condition. Mohammed did not restrict himself to merely allowing divorce to be adopted under certain circumstances; he permitted to divorced parties three several distinct and separate periods within which they might endeavour to become reconciled and renew their conjugal intercourse; but should all their attempts to become reconciled prove unsuccessful, then the third period, in which the final separation was declared to have arrived, supervened.

Mahmood, son of Waleed, narrates a tradition that the Prophet was apprised of a certain individual who had given to his wife these three separate notices of divorce at one and the same time, and that then the Prophet, becoming exceedingly wrath, addressed the party thus: "Darest thou thus trifle with the commands of God, and that even in my presence?" Observing that the Prophet was greatly excited and angry, a person, approaching him, asked, "Shall I go and slay the offender?" for by the wrath of the Prophet he was erroneously led to suppose that the crime committed was grave enough to merit that severe punishment."

In like manner the Prophet had said that "a woman who demands divorce without strong and unavoidable necessity, will ever remain a stranger to the fragrance of Paradise."

The reader will find all these traditions expressly mentioned in Mishkat, in the chapter appropriated to "Divorce."

Now, it will be evident to every reflecting reader that the

indulgence of divorce allowed by Islam, under such circumstances as those above specified, is not in the least repugnant to the laws of society, but, on the contrary, is greatly conducive to its health, prosperity, and welfare.

Contemplating the subject from a religious point of view, we find that in Judaism, divorce is allowed in all cases and under all circumstances, and that even Christians admit its propriety and lawfulness in one instance; but John Milton has almost exhausted the subject by his able and learned treatment of it; and we cannot resist the temptation of quoting the following passage from his work, entitled "A Treatise on Christian Doctrine":—

"Marriage, by its definition, is a union of the most intimate nature, but not indissoluble or indivisible, as some contend, on the ground of its being subjoined, Matt. xix. 5, *they two shall be one flesh.* These words, properly considered, do not imply that marriage is absolutely indissoluble, but only that it ought not to be lightly dissolved. For it is upon the institution itself and the due observance of all its parts, that what follows respecting the indissolubility of marriage depends, whether the words be considered in the light of a command, or of a natural consequence. Hence it is said, *for this cause shall a man leave father and mother . . . and they two shall be one flesh;* that is to say, if, according to the nature of the institution, as laid down in the preceding verses, Gen. ii. 18-20, the wife be an help-meet for the husband; or, in other words, if good-will, love, help, comfort, fidelity remain unshaken on both sides, which, according to universal acknowledgment, is the essential form of marriage. But if the essential form be dissolved, it follows that the marriage itself is virtually dissolved.

"Great stress, however, is laid upon an expression in the next verse—*what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.* What it is that God hath joined together the institution of marriage itself declares. God has only joined what admits of

union, what is suitable, what is good, what is honourable; he has not made provision for unnatural and monstrous associations, pregnant only with dishonour, with misery, with hatred, and with calamity. It is not God who forms such unions, but violence, or rashness, or error, or the influence of some evil genius. Why, then, should it be unlawful to deliver ourselves from so pressing an intestine evil? Further, our doctrine does not separate those whom God has joined together in the spirit of his sacred institution, but only those whom God has himself separated by the authority of his equally sacred law; an authority which ought to have the same force with us now as with His people of old. As to Christian perfection, the promotion of which is urged by some as an argument for the indissolubility of marriage, that perfection is not to be forced upon us by compulsion and penal laws, but must be produced, if at all, by exhortation and Christian admonition. Then only can man be properly said to dissolve a marriage lawfully contracted, when, adding to the Divine ordinance what the ordinance itself does not contain, he separates under pretence of religion whomsoever it suits his purpose. For it ought to be remembered that God, in His just and pure and holy law, has not only permitted divorce on a variety of grounds, but has even ratified it in some cases, and enjoined it in others, under the severest penalties.—Ex. xxi. 4, 10, 11; Deut. xxi. 14, xxiv. 1; Ezra x. 3; Nehem. xiii. 23, 30.

"The third passage is Deut. xxiv. 1: *When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.* There is no room here for the charge of hardness of heart, supposing the cause alleged to be a true and not a fictitious one. For since, as is evident from the institution itself, God gave a wife to man at the beginning to the intent that she should be his help and solace and delight, if, as often happens, she should eventually prove to be rather a source

of sorrow, of disgrace, of ruin, of torment, of calamity, why should we think that we are displeasing God by divorcing such a one? I should attribute hardness of heart rather to him who retained her, than to him who sent her away under such circumstances; and not I alone, but Solomon himself, or, rather, the Spirit of God itself speaking by the mouth of Solomon—Prov. xxx. 21, 23: *For three things the earth is disquieted, and for four which it cannot bear; for an odious woman when she is married.* On the contrary, Eccles. ix. 9: *Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which He hath given thee;* the wife therefore *which He hath given thee* is she *whom thou lovest*, not she whom thou hatest; and thus, Mal. ii. 16, *whoever hateth*, or, *because he hateth, let him dismiss her*, as all, before Junius, explain the passage. God therefore appears to have enacted this law by the mouth of Moses, and reiterated it by that of the Prophet, with the view, not of giving scope to the hard-heartedness of the husband, but of rescuing the unhappy wife from its influence wherever the case required it. For there is no hard-heartedness in dismissing honourably and freely her whose own fault it is that she is not loved. That one who is not beloved, who is, on the contrary, deservedly neglected, and an object of dislike and hatred; that a wife thus situated should be retained, in pursuance of a most vexatious law, under a yoke of the heaviest slavery (for such is marriage without love) to one who entertains for her neither attachment nor friendship, would indeed be a hardship more cruel than any divorce whatever. God therefore gave laws of divorce, in their proper use most equitable and humane; He even extended the benefit of them to those whom He knew would abuse them through the hardness of their hearts, thinking it better to bear with the obduracy of the wicked than to refrain from alleviating the misery of the righteous, or suffer the institution itself to be subverted, which, from a Divine blessing, was in danger of becoming the bitterest of all calamities.

"Christ himself, v. 9, permitted divorce for the cause of fornication, which could not have been, if those whom God had once joined in the bands of matrimony were never afterwards to be disunited. According to the idiom of the Eastern languages, however, the word fornication signifies, not adultery only, but either what is called *any unclean thing*, or a defect in some particular which might justly be required in a wife, Deut. xxiv. 1 (as Selden was the first to prove by numerous Rabbinical testimonies in his *Uxor Hebræa*); or it signifies whatever is found to be irreconcilably at variance with love, or fidelity, or help, or society, that is, with the objects of the original institution,—as Selden proves, and as I have myself shown, in another treatise, from several texts of Scripture. For it would have been absurd, when the Pharisees asked whether it was allowable to put away a wife for every cause, to answer that it was not lawful, except in case of adultery, when it was well known already to be not only lawful but necessary to put away an adulteress, and that, not by divorce, but by death. Fornication, therefore, must be here understood in a much wider sense than that of simple adultery, as is clear from many passages of Scripture, and particularly from Judges xix. 2:—*his concubine played the whore against him;* not by committing adultery, for in that case she would not have dared to flee to her father's house, but by refractory behaviour towards her husband. Nor could Paul have allowed divorce in consequence of the departure of an unbeliever, unless this also were a species of fornication. It does not affect the question that the case alluded to is that of a heathen, since whoever deserts her family *is worse than an infidel,* 1 Tim. v. 8. Nor could anything be more natural or more agreeable to the original institution than that the bond which had been formed by love, and the hope of mutual assistance through life, and honourable motives, should be dissolved by hatred and implacable enmity and disgraceful conduct on either side. For man, therefore, in his state of innocence in Paradise, previously to the

entrance of sin into the world, God ordained that marriage should be indissoluble; after the fall, in compliance with the alteration of circumstances, and to prevent the innocent from being exposed to perpetual injury from the wicked, he permitted its dissolution, and this permission forms part of the law of nature and of Moses, and is not disallowed by Christ. Thus every covenant, when originally concluded, is intended to be perpetual and indissoluble, however soon it may be broken by the bad faith of one of the parties, nor has any good reason yet been given why marriage should differ in this respect from all other contracts, especially since the apostle has pronounced that *a brother or a sister is not under bondage*, not merely in a case of desertion, but *in such cases*, that is, in all cases that produce an unworthy bondage, 1 Cor. vii. 15: *a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us in peace, or to peace;* He has not therefore called us to the end that we should be harassed with constant discord and vexations, for the object of our call is peace and liberty,—not marriage, much less perpetual discord and the slavish bondage of an unhappy union, which the Apostle declares to be, above all things, unworthy of a free man and a Christian. It is not to be supposed that Christ would expunge from the Mosaic law any enactment which could afford scope for the exercise of mercy towards the wretched and afflicted, or that his declaration on the present occasion was intended to have the force of a judicial decree, ordaining new and severer regulations on the subject; but that, having exposed the abuses of the law, he proceeded after his usual manner to lay down a more perfect rule of conduct, disclaiming on this, as on all other occasions, the office of a judge, and inculcating truth by simple admonition, not by compulsory decrees. It is therefore a most flagrant error to convert a Gospel precept into a civil statute, and enforce it by legal penalties."

One of the gravest charges which has been brought against Islam, and which is represented to be hostile to the laws of

society, is the lawfulness of slavery. We say "hostile to the laws of society," since, on viewing the subject through a religious medium, neither Jews nor Christians can be bold enough to find fault with or object to it, since almost every page of the Old Testament teems with passages which admit the legality of slavery, and since there is nowhere to be found in the New one a single passage that forbids the same inhuman practice. Before making any remarks of our own upon this subject, we shall quote the following remarks of Godfrey Higgins:—

"It seems unfortunate for the cause of humanity that neither Jesus nor Mohammed should have thought it right to abolish slavery. It may be said that when they directed their proselytes to do to others as they would be done unto, they virtually abolished it. This is plausible, but unfortunately it is not in practice true. The domestic slavery of the Mohammedans is no doubt indefensible, but what is this compared to the cruelty and horrors of the African slave trade, and the plantations of the West Indies? We hear enough in all conscience of Popes of Rome and Archbishops of Canterbury, of Councils and Convocations, of Bulls, Articles, Canons, and Concordats; but when did we ever hear of any public act of these men against this horrible traffic? Show me the Bull, show me the Canon or Act of Convocation. The Bishops of Rome and Canterbury themselves deserve the epithet of *panders to the base passions of their followers*, which they give to Mohammed, for not having, when the atrocity of this traffic was clearly proved, excommunicated all those engaged in carrying it on, as was done by the Quakers.

"I am aware that they may make a plausible defence, by alleging that they cannot excommunicate a man for the fact of being the owner of slaves, because the legality of slavery is admitted in almost every page of the Gospels and Epistles; as wherever the word *servus*, or δουλος, is found and translated servant, the word used ought to be *slave*—the word *servus* literally meaning a person bought or sold in a market, the

freedman answering to our hired servant. But if domestic slavery be unfortunately allowed to Christians, it by no means follows that the African slave trade is allowed, the horrors of which could never have been suspected by the ancients, and which in every respect differs from their domestic slavery.

"Although the Prophet did not, as he ought to have done, abolish that horrid custom, he did not leave it altogether unnoticed, but, in declaring that all Mohammedans are brothers, and that no man should hold his brother in slavery, he at once liberated a vast mass of mankind. The moment a slave declares himself a believer he is free. Although Mohammed did not in this go so far as he ought to have done, yet he did something, and that was better than nothing; and while it has probably induced some to avow themselves proselytes without conviction (on which account it will be reprobated and attributed to a bad motive by the pious Christian, whose zeal is warmed by a live coal from off the altar), yet it has saved from misery millions upon millions. Another modification of slavery, or alleviation of its evils, is to be found in the ordinance, that in the sale of slaves the mother shall on no account be separated from the children—a crime committed by our West Indians every day. I have not observed any ordinance of this kind in the Gospels; therefore Mohammed did not copy it from them.

"We make many professions of a wish to convert the poor Negroes; I advise our Missionary Societies to use their enormous wealth in giving the Negroes their freedom as soon as converted, declaring them brothers, after the example of the Mohammedans. I can assure them that this will make more proselytes than all their sermons.

"The *Westminster Review* says:—'His law of slavery is, "If slaves come to you, you shall"—*not* imprison and then sell by public sale, though no claimant appears, as in the nineteenth century is the law of Christian England in her provinces, but—"redeem them;—and it is forbidden to you to send them

forth." And this was a man standing up in the wilds of Arabia in the seventh century!'

"Mohammed says:—'Unto such of your slaves as desire a written instrument, allowing them to redeem themselves on paying a certain sum, write one; and if ye know good in them, give them of the riches of God which He hath given you.' I have not found this in the Gospels."

With all due thanks to that learned author for his talented and warm defence of Islam, we would observe that, to his remark, "Another modification of slavery, or alleviation of its evils, is to be found in the ordinance, that in the sale of slaves the mother shall on no account be separated from the children," may be added several other ordinances which were equally well suited for the "modification of slavery" and "the alleviation of its evils." The following ordinance greatly contributes to the abolition of slavery:—"All persons in your possession are your brothers, both of you being of one human race; therefore treat them with kindness, feed them and clothe them in the same manner as you do yourselves." The above ordinance produced so much effect upon the minds of the people, that all persons in former times clothed their slaves with the same cloth which they themselves wore, allowed them to sit along with themselves at the same table and partake of the same food as they did, and when on a journey the master and the slave used to ride on the same camel, and walk by turns.

In his splendid Caliphate, Omar, consider him as you may—either as a successor of the Prophet, or as the monarch of the greatest empire in the world—used to lead, by the nose-string, in the burning sands and scorching wind, with mingled emotions of delight and self-approval, the camel mounted by his slave, whose turn it was to ride. Fatimah, the Prophet's daughter, used to sit with her female slaves, and grind wheat together, so that the labour and trouble might fall equally on both. If this be the slavery which Sir Wm. Muir represents as "disorganizing

society," we cannot conceive what equality of rights would be. Such a slavery, indeed—if slavery it can be called at all—would highly organize society and improve public morals. The Prophet went further, and ordered that no one should address his male or female slaves by that degrading appellation, but by the more decent as well as affectionate name of "My young man," or "My young maid." According to his order, no act upon earth is more meritorious, more deserving of God's favour and blessing, than the granting of liberty to slaves; and Mohammed concentrated his chief pleasure in this. All the above will be found in Bokharee, in the chapter devoted to the freedom of slaves. To the remark of Mr. Higgins that "it is unfortunate for the cause of humanity that neither Jesus nor Mohammed should have thought it right to abolish slavery," we wish to add that Mohammed *did* almost entirely abolish slavery.

The rules by which one man became the slave of others, in ancient times, and which were in force among the Pagans, and also upheld by the sacred lawgiver, Moses, were practised in Arabia so late even as in the lifetime of the Prophet; but he in a very short time entirely rejected all those rules; so that all that can be found in Islam relative to slavery is the following verse of the Koran:—"When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter, and bind them in bonds, and either give them a free dismission afterwards, or exact a ransom, until the war shall have laid down its arms" (chap. xlvii. 5).[1] It will be evident from the above passage that the order for making captives of the unbelievers, when overpowered, was with the intention of saving their lives. Two rules are laid down for the treatment of such captives after the war: one is, that of giving them a free dismission; the other that of exacting a ransom. No third

[1] This rule cannot hold good in the present time, as almost all wars are now waged on account of political misunderstandings, whilst those referred to by this rule must be undertaken for reasons which we shall presently explain.

mode of treating them is mentioned. But when the captive cannot give ransom, and when the owner is unwilling to grant him his liberty, in that case alone he can become a slave, remaining so only until he pays ransom, or till the owner emancipates him. It must, therefore, be now evident to our readers that the Prophet did almost entirely abolish slavery.

Our lawyers are divided in their opinions as to the circumstances under which free dismission is to be granted to war-captives. Some maintain that they are to be liberated only when they consent to reside within the Moslem territories, as subjects of the Mussulman authorities. Others, however, and with much plausibility, hold that war-captives should be granted a free dismission, without being subjected to any conditions whatsoever, and that after being freed they are at liberty to reside within the dominions of the Mohammedans as subjects, or to return to their own country. It will be evident from the above-quoted passage of the Koran that that Holy Book lays down no condition whatever for a free emancipation, and that therefore the opinion of the latter authors is the more authoritative of the two.

We are not a little sorry to witness the wretched character of the domestic slavery practised (as in some Christian countries also) in Mohammedan States; but we assure our readers that those who either practise it themselves or allow others so to do are evidently acting in opposition to the principle of their religion, and must one day stand as guilty sinners before the awful tribunal of the Infallible Judge.

Sir Wm. Muir remarks that in Islam "freedom of judgment in religion is crushed and annihilated."

Now, the precise import of this *dictum* of Sir William is very difficult to comprehend; for we are quite at a loss to find what it is in Islam that crushes aud annihilates "freedom of judgment" in religious matters, and what there is in other religions that allows it.

The Jews, whose books form the basis both of Christianity and Mohammedanism, implicitly believe that every word of the Old Testament, including the historical parts, notwithstanding the authors are unknown, is a Revelation from on high, and therefore infallible, and that every person must, without the least hesitation or objection, and without making any use of his reasoning powers, put faith therein.

As for the Christians, they are divided into two classes as regards belief—those who believe in the *plenary* inspiration of the Scriptures, and those who believe them to be only *partially* inspired—the latter denying inspiration to the purely historical parts, and confining it to matters of doctrine, etc., etc.

But, independently of this modified belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures, Christians are required to give their assent to two other main and indispensable articles of faith, which still more effectually crush and annihilate "freedom of judgment in religious matters;" and therefore in this respect Christians are worse off than God's chosen people.

The first of these articles of belief is that of "The Trinity in Unity, and the Unity in Trinity," and a very peculiar one it is; for the very word *Trinity* was not introduced to express the three sacred persons of the Godhead until the second century after Christ, when Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, invented it; nor was the doctrine of the Trinity settled until the Council of Nice, or Nicea, held three hundred and twenty-five years after Christ, and at which the doctrines of Arius were condemned. Nor is this all, for, by the labours of Porson, and other eminent Greek scholars, it has been proved that the text—which is the sole authority for the doctrine—is an interpolation; therefore if the merit of belief is to be estimated in proportion to its difficulty, great indeed must be that of Christians. Now, every person, before he can bear the name and enjoy the religious privileges of a Christian, must implicitly believe in this doctrine. All Christians declare that, notwithstanding this dogma is wholly

opposed to nature and reason, it must be believed in, blindly and doggedly, all exercise of reason and judgment being interdicted.

The second principle is the doctrine of *the sacrifice of Christ for the past, present, and future sins of mankind*—a doctrine alike antagonistic to nature and to reason, and which crushes and annihilates "freedom of judgment in religion." This doctrine, by doing away with man's responsibility for his actions, opens the floodgates of vice and immorality, since the greater and more numerous sins a person commits, the greater is the goodness of the Redeemer;—and hence, the greater the sinner, the greater the saint! It must not be, however, supposed that, in consequence of this doctrine, Hell will be unpeopled, because all unbelievers—and "their name is legion"—will occupy its gloomy regions. Another article of the Christian faith, equally mischievous to society, is that of predestination; for should the believer in it be of a confident, hopeful disposition, he easily persuades himself that God has, from all eternity, inscribed his name in the Book of Life, and therefore, were his crimes and sins as numerous as the sands on the sea-shore, they would not blot his name out of the page of salvation. If he be of a saturnine, gloomy character, he feels confident that his name does not appear on the page of life, and therefore he has no inducement to curb the evil propensities of his natural disposition.

With respect to Islam, it can be safely and confidently asserted that its nature is diametrically opposed to the remark of Sir Wm. Muir, and that, perhaps, there is no religion upon earth superior to it in respect of the liberty of judgment which it grants in matters of religious faith.

We shall here quote the following remark of a celebrated French author—M. de St. Hilaire—demonstrating, as it does, that in support of our own observations we can adduce as witnesses not only our co-religionists, but also liberal and judicious professors of other religions—nay, even of Christianity itself.

"There is nothing mysterious," writes the above-named author—"nothing supernatural, in Mohammedanism. It is itself averse to being concealed under any mask, nor is it to blame if a few obscurities are still to be found in it, for from its very origin it has been as candid and ingenuous as was possible." All the Mohammedan traditions are, according to Islam, open to the free judgment of every person, as well as for free inquiry and investigation, as regards the narrators and also the subject-matter, and he is at liberty to reject entirely all such traditions which, according to his free and unbiassed judgment, and after patient investigation, prove themselves to be contrary to reason and nature, or which, by any other way, are found to be spurious.

But we do not find any such liberty granted us as regards either the Old or the New Testament. Not even the grandest, and indeed the main, principle of Islam—the existence of God and his Unity—is required by that religion to be blindly and slavishly accepted by its professors. The Koran itself teaches and inculcates this sublime doctrine, not by a compulsory iron hand, but by arguments and by appealing to Nature. It first establishes the existence and unity of God by the existence of all objects in Nature, and then requires us to embrace that eternal truth. "Look over the world," says that Holy Book—"is it not wonderful, the work of Allah?—wholly a sign to you, if your eyes were open! This earth—God made it for you . . . appointed paths in it. You can live in it—go to and fro on it. Great clouds born in the deep bosom of the Upper Immensity—where do they come from? They hang there. The great black monsters pour down their rain-deluges to revive a dead earth, the grass springs, and tall leafy palm-trees, with their date-clusters hanging round. Is not that a sign? Your cattle, too—Allah made them;—serviceable dumb creatures: they change the grass into milk; you have your clothing from them. Very strange creatures: they come ranking home at evening

time . . . and are a credit to you! Ships, also—huge moving mountains: they spread out their cloth wings—go bounding through the water there, Heaven's wind driving them;—anon they lie motionless—God has withdrawn the wind—they lie dead and cannot stir! Miracles? . . . What miracle would you have? Are not you yourselves there? God made you—shaped you out of a little clay! Ye were small once; a few years ago ye were not at all. Ye have beauty, strength, thoughts; ye have compassion on one another. Old age comes on you, and grey hairs; your strength fades into feebleness; ye sink down, and again are not. Ye have compassion on one another . . . Allah might have made you having no compassion on one another—how had it been then?"—The Koran is full of passages, like the above, inculcating the worship of the Unity of God, both by argument and a reference to Nature.

The remark that "the sword is the inevitable penalty for the denial of Islam," is one of the gravest charges falsely imputed to this faith by the professors of other religions, and arises from the utter ignorance of those who make the accusation. Islam inculcates and demands a hearty and sincere belief in all that it teaches; and that genuine faith which proceeds from a person's heart cannot be obtained by force or violence. Judicious readers will not fail to observe that the above-quoted remark is entirely contrary to the fundamental principles of the Moslem faith, wherein it is inculcated, in the clearest language possible—"*Let there be no* FORCING IN RELIGION, *the right way has been made clearly distinguishable from the wrong one*" (chap, x. 98). And also, "*If the Lord had pleased, all who are on the earth would have believed together;* AND WILL THOU FORCE MEN TO BE BELIEVERS? *No man can believe but by the permission of God, and He will pour out His indignation on those who will not understand*" (chap. ii. 257).

The principle upon which Moses was allowed to use the sword—to extirpate all idolators and infidels, without exception of

one single individual — is by no means applicable to Islam. Mohammedanism grasped the sword, not to destroy all infidels, and Pagans, not to force men to become Moslems at the sword's point, but only to proclaim that eternal truth—the unity of the Godhead throughout the whole extent of the then known globe.

According to Islam, the best and the most meritorious act is the preaching and making generally known the existence of one invisible God. It could hardly be expected that, in the infidel countries there could be sufficient personal security for such Moslems who might choose to inculcate by precept, exhort by preaching, and practice openly the worship of the unity of God, and therefore appeal was at once made to the sword in order to establish the superiority of the Moslem power, and to insure security and tranquility for such Mohammedans as might choose to preach the wholesome doctrine of their faith, and to live in peace in those countries, so that their habits, conduct, and manner of living might serve as example for the unbelievers. The effect so desirable, viz., that the Moslems might live in peace and preach the worship of the one only true God was only attainable by one of three ways. First: The voluntary conversion of the people. Secondly: The establishment of peace and security by means of alliances, offensive and defensive, and, Thirdly: By conquest. As soon as the desired object was secured the sword was immediately sheathed. If tranquillity was established by either of the two last methods, the parties had no authority to interfere with the religious observances of the subject or of each other; and every person was at liberty to observe, unmolested by any one, all the ceremonies and rites, whatever they might be, of his creed.

The preceding observations likewise show clearly the gross mistake into which some writers have fallen, when they assert that in Islam "toleration is unknown." But in saying this, we do not mean to deny that some of the later Mohammedan conquerors were guilty of cruelty and intolerance, but that the

doctrines of our religion ought not to be judged from their actions. We must, however, inquire, in order to discover whether they acted according to it or not, and we shall then arrive at an undeniable conclusion that their actions were in opposition to the doctrines of their religion. But, at the same time, we find that those conquerors who were anxious to act according to the doctrines of their religion did practice tolerance, and granted amnesty, security, and protection to all their subjects, irrespective of caste or creed. History furnishes us with innumerable instances of the tolerance of Moslem conquerors, and we shall here quote a few remarks made by various Christian writers which prove the tolerant spirit of Islam. A Christian writer who, of all others, is the least expected to show any partiality towards Islam, in an article upon the general history of Spain, thus expresses himself upon the subject.

"One remarkable feature," says he, "of their (the Ommiades of Spain) rule deserves mention, as it contrasts them so favourably with the contemporary and subsequent rulers of Spain, even to the present time (19th century), and that is their *universal toleration in religious matters*" (Chambers's Cyclopædia).

Godfrey Higgins writes on the subject as follows: "Nothing is so common as to hear the Christian priests abuse the religion of Mohammed for its bigotry and intolerance. Wonderful assurance and hypocrisy! Who was it expelled the Moriscoes from Spain, because they would not turn Christians? Who was it murdered the millions of Mexico and Peru, and gave them all away as slaves because they were not Christians? What a contrast have the Mohammedans exhibited in Greece! For many centuries the Christians have been permitted to live in the peaceable possession of their properties, their religion, their priests, bishops, patriarchs, and churches; and at the present moment the war between the Greeks and Turks is no more waged on account of religion than was the late war between the negroes in Demerara and the English. The Greeks and the Negroes

want to throw off the yoke of their conquerors, and they are both justified in so doing. Wherever the Caliphs conquered, if the inhabitants turned Mohammedans, they were instantly on a footing of perfect equality with the conquerors. An ingenious and learned Dissenter, speaking of the Saracens, says, 'they persecuted nobody; Jews and Christians all lived happy among them.'

"But though we are told that the Morescoes were banished, because they would not turn Christians, I suspect there was another cause. I suspect they, by their arguments, so gained upon the Christians, that the ignorant monks thought that the only way their arguments could be answered was by the Inquisition and the sword; and I have no doubt they were right as far as *their* wretched powers of answering them extended. In the countries conquered by the Caliphs, the peaceable inhabitants, whether Greeks, Persians, Sabeans, or Hindoos, were not put to the sword as the Christians have represented; but after the conquest was terminated, were left in the peaceable possession of their properties and religion, paying a tax for the enjoyment of this latter privilege, so trifling as to be an oppression to none. In all the history of the Caliphs, there cannot be shown anything half so infamous as the Inquisition, nor a single instance of an individual burnt for his religious opinion; nor, do I believe, put to death in a time of peace for simply not embracing the religion of Islam. No doubt the later Mohammedan conquerors in their expeditions have been guilty of great cruelties these Christian authors have sedulously laid to the charge of their religion; but this is not just. Assuredly, religious bigotry increased the evils of war, but in this the Mohammedan conquerors were not worse than the Christians."

The same author remarks that "the exertions of the missionaries of the Christians, though evidently allowed the greatest latitude, do not appear to have had any great success. I have some doubt as to what would happen, even in this *enlightened*

age, as it calls itself, if the Grand Seignior were to send (as our missionaries did a Mr. Drummond to Geneva, to teach their peculiar doctrines) one of the richest of his Mufties to build a mosque, and to preach the doctrines of the Koran in the centre of London. I suspect, a well grounded fear that this would cause a renewal, under the auspices of the priests, of the fires of the year eighty, or of those of more recent date at Birmingham, would cause our ministers to answer him by the mouth of one of our admirals, who might entertain an opinion that it was possible to bombard Constantinople."

John Davenport, in his "Apology," writes in the following strain:—"It was at the Council of Nicea that Constantine invested the priesthood with that power whence flowed the most disastrous consequences, as the following summary will show: the massacres and devastations of nine mad crusades of Christians against unoffending Turks, during nearly two hundred years, in which many millions of human beings perished; the massacres of the Anabaptists; the massacres of the Lutherans and Papists, from the Rhine to the extremities of the North; the massacres ordered by Henry VIII. and his daughter Mary; the massacres of St. Bartholomew in France; and forty years more of other massacres, between the time of Francis I. and the entry of Henry IV. into Paris; the massacres of the Inquisition, which are more execrable still, as being judicially committed; to say nothing of the innumerable schisms, and twenty years of popes against popes, bishops against bishops; the poisonings, assassinations; the cruel rapines and insolent pretensions of more than a dozen popes, who far exceeded a Nero or a Caligula in every species of crime, vice, and wickedness; and, lastly, to conclude this frightful list, the massacre of twelve millions of the inhabitants of the New World, *executed crucifix in hand!* It surely must be confessed that so hideous and almost uninterrupted a chain of religious wars, for fourteen centuries, never subsisted but among Christians, and that none of the numerous nations,

stigmatized as heathen, ever spilled a drop of blood on the score of theological arguments."

The celebrated Mr. Gibbon, the greatest of the modern historians, and whose authority cannot be doubted or questioned, writes as follows: "The wars of the Mohammedans were sanctified by the Prophet, but, among the various precepts and examples of his life, the Caliphs selected the lessons of *toleration* that might tend to disarm the resistance of the unbelieving. Arabia was the temple and patrimony of the God of Mahomet; but he beheld with less jealousy and affection the other nations of the earth. The polytheists and idolators who were ignorant of his name might be lawfully extirpated, but a wise policy supplied the obligations of justice, and, after some acts of intolerant zeal, the Mahometan conquerors of Hindostan have spared the pagodas of that devout and populous country. *The disciples of Abraham, of Moses, and of Jesus were solemnly invited to accept the more perfect revelation of Mahomet; but if they preferred the payment of a moderate tribute, they were entitled to the freedom of conscience and religious worship.*"

The author of an article, entitled "Islam as a Political System," inserted in *The East and the West*, thus expresses himself on the subject under consideration:—"Mahomet was the only founder of a religion who was at the same time a temporal prince and a warrior. Their power lay exclusively in restraining violence and ambition; his temptation was ambition, and the sword was at his disposal. It is therefore to be expected that, making religion a means to temporal power, and having obtained that sway over the minds of his followers by which they accepted as law and right whatever he chose to promulgate, his code should be found at variance with all others, and even in opposition to those dictates of justice which are implanted in the breasts of all men. If, then, we find that it is not so—if we find him establishing maxims of right in international dealings, of clemency in the use of victory, moderation in that of power,

above all, *of toleration in religion*, we must acknowledge that, amongst men who have run a distinguished course, he possesses peculiar claims to the admiration of his fellow-creatures." Again, he says :—" Islam has never interfered with the dogmas of any faith, never persecuted, never established an Inquisition, never aimed at proselytism. It offered its religion, but never enforced it; and the acceptance of that religion conferred co-equal *rights* with the conquering body, and emancipated the vanquished States from the conditions which every conqueror, since the world existed, up to the period of Mahomet, has invariably imposed. For its proselytes there was no obligation of denial and revilement of their former creed; the repetition of a single phrase was the only form required or pledge exacted."

"A spirit the very reverse of this (intolerance)," remarks the same author, "is evinced in every page of the history of Islam, in every country to which it has extended; so that in Palestine a Christian poet (Lamartine) has exclaimed, twelve centuries after the events to which we are referring, 'The Mahometans are the only tolerant people on the face of the earth'; and an English traveller (Slade) reproaches them with being too tolerant." What a contrast do these remarks of so many impartial and liberal *Christian* writers afford to the unsupported assertion of Sir Wm. Muir—"TOLERATION IS UNKNOWN" in Islamism ! !

SECTION III.—*Benefits and Advantages which Judaism and Christianity derived from Islam.*

The reason for mentioning Judaism and Christianity jointly is, because we believe that Jesus Christ did not, for the most part, alter or reject any of the doctrines contained in the Law of Moses; and his own declaration—"Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17)—demonstrates the truth of our

assertion. Christianity, therefore, must, necessarily, be represented as having been benefited by Islam in those particulars in which Judaism was advantaged. Judaism undoubtedly proceeded from a Divine source, and it inculcated and taught that eternal truth—the existence and Unity of God—only to such an extent as was necessary for securing eternal salvation, and capable of being comprehended by individuals living at that period. The perfection of God was promulgated by Islam, and the doctrine of Judaism also received its perfection.

The Divine Unity is said to receive its perfection when three qualifications unite in one—viz.: Unity of the Essence of God—that is, when no other person or object is represented to be a partner thereof; Unity of the Attributes of God—that is, when those attributes cannot be applied to other objects; and Unity of the Reverence and Adoration of God—that is, when that reverence and worship cannot be paid to any other object except God himself. The first two of these qualifications were imperfectly promulgated by Judaism, while the third was left entirely unnoticed. Islam gave complete perfection to the first two, and, by fully indicating and fixing particular methods of paying reverence and offering adoration to God, completed the perfection of the Unity of Godhead; and it is in reference to this fact that God says, in the Koran, "This day have I perfected your religion for you, and have completed my mercy upon you; and I have chosen for you Islam to be your religion."

In the Pentateuch nothing is mentioned respecting the day of resurrection and the state of the soul after death. The rewards of virtue were—triumph over the enemy, longevity, and freedom from penury; while, on the other hand, the punishment for the sins of mankind was death, plague, famine, and other adversities. Other prophets after Moses, including Christ, preached something respecting the final day, resurrection and the condition of the soul after death; but none of those prophets mentioned them at the length and perfection as was done by Islam,

for whom the task was purposely reserved by God. As it was almost impossible to describe and delineate those spiritual conditions—the afflictions of the souls of sinners, and the happiness of those of the virtuous—otherwise than by comparing them to such objects and conditions as can be perceived and felt by the senses of man, it was therefore promulgated under the allegory of Paradise and Hell, and the various modes of enjoying the happiness or of suffering the torments, afflictions, etc.

All Jews and Christians, previously to Islam, imputed to many prophets and holy personages acts of the grossest immorality; and although, according to us, these passages had nothing to do with the doctrines of their religion, yet they were, notwithstanding, considered to be such by all Christians and Jews.

Islam vindicated the pure character of those godly personages, and triumphantly refuted the charges brought against them by Jews and Christians. Mohammedan divines examined the whole of the Pentateuch, and exposed all the mistakes of the Christians and Jews. They traced these mistakes either to the wrong interpretation of the passages of the Pentateuch by Jews and Christians, or to errors in early Codices, or to historical blunders; and, had it not been for Islam, the character of those prophets and holy individuals—of Abraham, Lot, Isaac, Judah, of the wives and sons of Jacob, of Aaron, David, and Solomon, for example—would have been as disparaging in the eyes of the present generation as that of culprits condemned to transportation for life or to expiate their crime upon the scaffold.

Section IV.—*Advantages derived from Islam by Christianity particularly.*

No religion upon earth is more friendly to Christianity than Islam, and the latter has been to none more beneficial and advantageous than to Christianity. The whole interest of Chris-

tianity concentrated in that extraordinary character, Jesus Christ, and in the Essenian, John the Baptist; and it was with the most steady resolution, and the most undaunted heart, and the most unflinching perseverance that Islam fought against Judaism in favour of Christianity, and openly and manfully did it declare that the mission of John the Baptist was undoubtedly true, and that Jesus Christ was unquestionably "the Word of God" and "the Spirit of God." What other faith, then, can pretend to have proved itself more beneficial to, and to have done more for, the cause of Christianity than Islam. The worst of corruptions that crept into Christianity after the Apostles, was the doctrine of the Trinity—a doctrine which was at once in opposition to eternal truth and contrary to the pure precepts inculcated by Christ. It is to the eternal glory of Islam that it re-established the worship of the Unity of the Godhead, and revived that pure religion inculcated and promulgated by Christ himself; it constantly warned the then-called Christians of their errors, and invited them to accept the true religion—a religion preached by Christ. Many Christians, whose eyes were opened by the loud watchword of Islam, perceived the degraded state into which they had been plunged, and thenceforward strove to recover their former position in the scale of the religions —in general, of the world. This class of men is now distinguished by the proud appellation of Unitarian Christians.

Now, were this Unitarianism taken away from the world for a moment, the following remark of Gibbon would be in every respect apposite:—"If the Christian apostles, St. Peter or St. Paul, could return to the Vatican, they might possibly inquire the name of the Deity who is worshipped with such mysterious rites in that magnificent temple. At Oxford or Geneva they would experience less surprise; but it might still be incumbent on them to peruse the Catechism of the Church, and to study the Orthodox Commentators on their own writings and the words of their Master."

The greatest of all boons conferred by Islam upon Christianity is the spirit of resistance which it breathed into the Christians against the exorbitant power of the Popes, under which they had so long groaned. The Pope was looked upon as the infallible vicar of Christ. He could open the gates of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven. He arrogated to himself the power of purging away, by means of *Indulgences*, the sins of whomsoever he pleased. He was invested with full power to make what was unlawful, lawful. In fact, in the authority he possessed, and the jurisdiction he exercised, he was in no way inferior to Christ himself. The Koran, in the following passage, pointed out the evils flowing therefrom, reprimanded the Christians for their slavish servility, and exhorted them to throw off so ignominious a yoke, and to seek out the truth for themselves.

The Koran says:—"Say, O ye who have received the Scriptures—come to a just determination between us and you—that we worship not any besides God, and associate no creature with Him, and that the one of us take not the others for Lords (the High Priests and the Popes) besides God" (chap. iii. 57).[1] When this passage was revealed, Adee Ibni Hatim, a new convert to Islam, said to Mohammed, "O Prophet of the Lord, we did not use to worship the Pope as our God." Whereupon the Prophet replied, "Had he not the power to pronounce to be lawful that which was unlawful, according to religion, and *vice versâ?* And did you not put faith in his words as in the words of God?" He replied, "Verily, O messenger of the Lord—that we used to do." The Prophet rejoined, "This is to take others for Lords (Popes) besides God." For a time this wholesome truth, inculcated by the Koran, was looked upon by Christians with impatience and hatred; but as truth never fails,

[1] "Besides other charges of idolatry on the Jews and Christians, Mohammed accused them of paying too implicit an obedience to their priests and monks, who took upon them to pronounce what things were lawful, and what unlawful, and to dispense with the laws of God."—*Sale's Koran*, vol. i. p. 63, 2nd *Note*.

at the last, to impress itself upon the minds of men, it gradually engrafted itself upon that of Luther, who, when he came in contact with the above-quoted passage of the Koran, at once comprehended the truth it inculcated, and, clearly perceiving the slavish and degrading position in which his co-religionists were plunged, at once stood up to preach publicly against that servile practice; and although some of his adversaries denounced him as being a Mohammedan at heart,[1] he never desisted from his endeavours, and, at last, succeeded in effecting the grand reform generally known as Protestantism, or the Reformation; and for this emancipation of the human mind from the worst of all slavery—a priestly one—Christianity should for ever remain thankful to Islam.

[1] "Thereupon Genebrard, on the Papal side, charged the German Reformers, chiefly Luther, with endeavouring to introduce Mohammedanism into the Christian world, and to take over the whole clergy to that faith. Maracci is of opinion that Mohammedanism and Lutheranism are not very dissimilar—witness the iconoclastic tendencies of both! More systematically does Martinus Alphonsus Vivaldus marshal up exactly thirteen points to prove that there is not a shadow of difference between the two. *Mohammed points to that which is written down—so do these heretics.* He has altered the time of the fast—they abhor all fasts. He has changed Sunday into Friday—they observe no feast at all. *He rejects the worship of the Saints—so do these Lutherans.* Mohammed has no baptism—nor does Calvin consider such requisite. They both allow divorce—and so forth."—*The Quarterly Review*, No. 254.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

MOHAMMEDAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

خطبةٌ
على كتب المسلمين
الفها
المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفي الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

حسبنا كتاب الله

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," FELLOW OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1869.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Strong Belief of Mohammedans in the Unity of God ; their diffusion of Civilization over a large portion of the Globe 1

Merits of a book not to be judged from the reputation of its author only, but also from his intention in writing it 2

Four Branches of Mohammedan Theology 3

I. Hadeeses, or Sayings of the Prophet . . . . . *ib.*

Rules by which their authenticity was determined . . . 4

Works upon Hadeeses, which are considered more trustworthy than the rest 5

Some causes which made certain Hadeeses untrustworthy 6, 7

II. Seyar, or Ecclesiastical History 7

Authors upon Seyar did not use much caution in treating the subject . . . . . *ib.*

Traditions of Seyar not trustworthy unless supported by valid reasons 8

III. Tafseer, or Commentary upon the Holy Koran 9

The Commentaries contain doubtful traditions of Jewish origin 10

What portions of the Commentaries are excellent . . . *ib.*

Various authors and their different views 11, 12

Writers who employed philosophical arguments were not popular 13

IV. Mohammedan Law or Fikah . . . . . *ib.*

The task of writers upon Mohammedan Law very difficult 14

Sources of Mohammedan Law 14, 15

Mohammedan Lawyers liable to mistakes. Their opinions not necessary in religious doctrines 15

The four great Mohammedan Lawyers, and their acknowledgment of the above-mentioned opinion 16

ESSAY

ON THE

MOHAMMEDAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

THE Mohammedans were, from the days of the great Restorer of the worship of the UNITY, everywhere distinguished by their enthusiastic, firm, and unshaken belief in the one invisible and holy God, and paid great attention to their theological literature; but it was not until the Abassides, the successors of the Ommiades, were firmly seated in the Caliphate that the Moslems began to cultivate the arts of peace. It was about the middle of the eighth century that, under the Caliphs, the liberal arts were patronized, and that, in a Mohammedan's breast, the love of science shared equally his fervent zeal for the promulgation of the Koran. It is indeed a singular and extraordinary feature in the Arabian character, that when the descendants of Ishmael had received the proper impulse, they should overrun the departments of science with the same facility which characterized their successes in the East, and that the conquests effected by the pen should be as brilliant but more enduring than those won by the scimitar. To the Mohammedans, therefore, a very considerable portion of the old world has been indebted for its present civilization and enlightenment, it being from the western borders of Europe that radiated, as from a centre, those beams of knowledge which gradually instructed the minds of millions

of God's rational creatures. "Broadly speaking," says an impartial writer, "the Mohammedans may be said to have been the enlightened teachers of barbarous Europe from the ninth to the thirteenth century; Arabian philosophy, medicine, natural history, geography, history, grammar, rhetoric, and the golden art of poetry, produced an abundant harvest of works, many of which will continue to live and teach so long as there will be generations to be taught."

In considering the merits and demerits of our earliest writers on theology, it should be recollected that they wrote at a period long before the established laws of criticism were known in Arabia, and that, consequently, if the soarings of their imaginations and the boldness of their metaphors were unrestrained, their occasional violation of the rules of propriety and good taste were equally so.

It is also obvious that no correct opinion of the excellencies and the defects of a writer can be formed, nor any just idea of his real object be arrived at, except by those who possess a competent knowledge of the rules of composition and modes of thought prevailing at the time when the author wrote, or which are, in some way or other, connected with his subject; and it is chiefly owing to the want of this information that foreign critics have, occasionally, committed the grossest blunders when venturing to express an opinion upon the merits of our religion.

Other circumstances contribute to increase the difficulty of forming a correct estimate of a writer's talent. Thus, of two works by the same author, the one has been considered as a great success, while the other is passed over as unworthy of attention. Take, for instance, Mohammed Ismael Bokhary محمد اسمٰعيل بخارى, whose book, entitled صحيح بخارى "Saheeh Bokhary," is a standard one, while, on the contrary, his "Tareekh Bokhary" تاريخ بخارى has no reputation whatever. Again, similarity of name has, not unfrequently, occasioned the authorship of a work to be attributed to a wrong person,

and sometimes a book which, although containing the famous sayings of some learned man, is supposed, when edited by a different person, to have been written by him whose sayings it records, and in consequence of that impression is attributed to that person, such book is considered as a standard one, thus receiving an honour to which it is not entitled, as was the case with the "Tafseer-i-Ibn-i Abbas" تفسیر ابن عباس (Commentary upon the Holy Koran).

These preliminary remarks finished, we shall now proceed to address ourself to the task of making generally known the very peculiar, if not mysterious, character of the art of theological authorship as practised by the Mohammedans. And this we shall accomplish by explaining the different modes in which authors used to write on the different branches of our theology, such as the "Hadeeses" حدیث or "Sayings of our Prophet;" "Seur" سیر or "Ecclesiastical History;" "Tafseer" تفسیر or "Commentary on the Holy Koran;" and "Fekah" فقه or "Mohammedan Law." Our intention in so doing being solely that of tracing out a right path for the guidance of future critics on our religion, since many, ignorant of the circumstances which accompany our theological literature, have indulged in the bitterest invectives and sarcasms at the expense of our religious books, an example too often blindly followed by succeeding writers.

I.—حدیث HADEESES OR SAYINGS OF THE PROPHET.

These were never committed to writing during the time of the prophet and of his associates اصحاب, and not even in that of the contemporaries of such of the prophet's associates تابعین, for two reasons; first, their not being immediately required by the public; secondly, because the art of authorship was but then in its infancy in Arabia. In those times the memory was deemed the safest repository for such matters, nor

was it before the second century of the Hegira that the Hadeeses were committed to writing.

Another difficulty arose, for as various fictitious Hadeeses had, from various causes, become blended and mixed up with the real ones, it was, after a time, found to be no easy task to distinguish the true ones from the rest. But, notwithstanding this, many persons of acknowledged ability and erudition took upon themselves the responsibility of separating the real sayings of the prophet from the false ones, and, to a certain extent, succeeded in their task.

The following are a few rules by which the credit and authenticity of Hadeeses were determined by such writers :—

First. The narrator of any Hadees had to trace the names of the successive narrators through whom he came to learn the Hadeeses, back either to Mohammed himself, or as far as it was in his power so to do.

Secondly. It was necessary that the narrator himself, as well as all the persons through whom the Hadees had been successively traced, should be truthful and trustworthy; the Hadees was often rejected if even a single one of its narrators was not considered to be so. The object of the first rule was to subserve this one.

Thirdly. Upon writing the Hadees it was made compulsory to note down the names of the narrators up to whom it had been traced, the object being to enable the public to make known any information they might possess respecting the general conduct of such narrators and how far they might be considered as deserving of credit.

Fourthly. Some writers adopted, in addition to the above, the custom of noting down the degrees of credit in which each Hadees was held.

All the Hadeeses were written down, at different periods, upon these principles, and the works written on Hadeeses have become so numerous that, were they collected into one mass,

camels would be required to transport them from one place to another. From among this immense number of works on the Hadeeses, the following are considered, comparatively, as more entitled to credit than the rest.

(1) Bokhari بخاری, (2) Muslim مسلم, (3) Tirmezee ترمذی, (4) Abu Daöd ابو داود, (5) Nasae نسائي,* (6) Ibn-i-Majah ابن ماجه, (7) Moatta Imam Malik موطا امام مالك. The credit in which these books of Hadeeses are held more than others is on account of their containing those Hadeeses which have been related by, possibly, trustworthy persons only, which is not the case with the other books of Hadeeses. It should, however, be borne in-mind that, as the above-named books may contain some of doubted truth, or apocryphal Hadeeses, so the rest may contain some genuine ones.

This degree of uncertainty, however, as regards the authenticity of the former class of books is so trifling as not to deter learned Mussulmans from placing—albeit not on religious grounds—implicit belief in them, so long as no proof is adduced of their being spurious. But this is by no means the case with

* The author of "Nasae" نسای named Aboo-Abdur-rahman Ahmed, being asked by the people whether all the Hadeeses contained in his work were genuine, replied in the negative,—"Seratul Mustakeem" ازوی پرسید ندکه کتاب سنن توهمه صحیح است گفت لا "صراط المستقیم"

محمد اسمٰعیل بخاری Mohamed Ismael Bokhari B. 194 H. (or 810 A.D.) D. 256 H. (or 870 A.D.)

مسلم Muslim B. 204 H. (819 A.D.) D. 261 H. (875 A.D.)

ابو عسی محمد ترمذی Abu Isa Mohamed Tirmizee B. 209 H. (824 A.D.) D. 279 H. (892 A.D.)

ابو داود Aboo Daood, B. 202 H. (817 A.D.) D. 275 H. (888 A.D.)

ابو عبد الرحمٰن احمد نسای Aboo Abd-ul-Rahman Ahmad Nasae, D. 303 H. (915 A.D.)

ابو عبد الله محمد ابن ماجه Aboo Abd-Ullah Mohamed Ibin-majah, D. 293 H. (906 A.D.)

امام مالك Imam Malik, B. 95 H. (713 A.D.) D. 179 (795 A.D.)

the latter class of books: the Hadeeses therein contained being considered entitled to belief, only so long as no evidence is produced which impugns their credibility.

At the time when these books of Hadeeses were written from oral traditions, the narrators did not always repeat the very words of the Prophet, but gave the substance of what the Prophet said, in their own.

Hence, it is obvious that the utmost care must be taken in any endeavour that may be made to establish certain facts by attaching a meaning to particular words of a Hadees, for we are not quite sure whether the Prophet actually used them or not.

Many Hadeeses, treating of one and the same subject, will be found at variance with one another; so that it is difficult to affirm any one of them to be right, and the rest to be false. For removing the above-mentioned difficulties, several rules have been laid down, under the name of Usul-i Ilm Hadis اصول علم حديث; some of which, however, it is possible may not, under certain circumstances, enable us to attain the object for which they were framed.

All Hadeeses of an extravagant and eccentric character are considered doubtful, while such as are contrary to what the Koran declares, are to be rejected altogether, in the same manner as Ayesha did the Hadees حديث سماع موتى, which said, "The dead can hear;" because it is at variance with the assertion in the Koran: "And thou canst not make those hear who are in the grave" وما انت بمسمع من فى القبور, which act of Ayesha is well known to every Mohammedan.

Such persons as were in the habit of reciting a great number of Hadeeses were, on that very account, suspected by the people of being false and untrustworthy traditionists; and if any one was found to have narrated even one false Hadees, this was sufficient to cause all his others to be doubted. Hence, many biographies كتب اسماء رجال of such traditionists have been written for the purpose of discovering those who are or are

not entitled to credit. Majdoddeen مجد الدين فيروز آبادى, a celebrated scholar, has, in his book, Sifr-us-Sa'adat سفر السعادة enumerated ninety-three subjects, and has asserted that all Hadeeses relating to any one of them are spurious. Many other talented writers have also treated upon apocryphal Hadeeses احاديث موضوعة.

Persons, therefore, who may be inclined to comment upon the principles of our religion; to write concerning our ecclesiastical history; or discuss various points of our sacred literature, must not be content, as many critics are, with quoting such Hadeeses as those just described for their authorities in support of their opinions and convictions, but should, first of all, patiently and carefully investigate the truth of the source whence such Hadeeses are said to have been derived.

It is either from being unacquainted with, or from neglecting, the above essential rules, that several foreign writers have—unconsciously it is to be hoped—been guilty of great injustice when writing either the Prophet's biography, or history, especially when, for the fair and legitimate arguments of a sound and liberal criticism, they substitute invective, ridicule, and sarcasm.

II.—SEYAR سير, OR ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

The authors of the books of Hadeeses, anticipating that the subject on which they wrote might, at some time or other, give rise to theological controversies, and form a groundwork for numberless new-fangled dogmas, which could not but prove detrimental to true religion—were, in some degree, cautious when dealing with so delicate a question. Such, however, was by no means the case with our writers upon our ecclesiastical history; for having no apprehensions of this kind, and being, moreover, well aware that the productions of their pen neither involved any subject for polemics, nor furnished a *locus standi*

for innovations in religion, they wrote with less restraint and were less solicitous about the style of their compositions. The most fruitful source of their subject matter being that of oral tradition, every story related to them by individuals was eagerly welcomed by them, and inserted in their books without the least enquiry or investigation as to the nature of the tradition itself, or the character of the party furnishing it.

The object of these writers being neither that of verifying any story, nor of investigating the origin of any tradition, but simply that of collecting into one *corpus traditionum* whatever stories were connected with the subject they were writing upon, the task of searching into the truth or falsehood of this or that tale was left exclusively to the reader's diligence and judgment. This practice rapidly became general, while, at the same time, that of noting down the name of the contributor gradually fell into disuse. These books likewise contained many traditions, said to have been related by persons who lived long before the writer himself. Others, too, there were, of which nothing whatever is known, not even so much as the channel through which they came to the knowledge of the compiler. In such books were also recorded many traditions respecting ancient prophets, as well as stories and fables at one time rife among the Jews, but the origin of which now lies buried in impenetrable darkness. Hence, of all the various departments of Mohammedan literature, the one which most needs emendation, and requires the closest attention of the reading public, is that of Seyar سیر, or our ecclesiastical history.

The mere fact, therefore, of these books having been the productions of some eminent scholars, in days of yore, does not entitle them to any degree of credit, and therefore it ought to be withheld until they be found to possess those intrinsic qualities, the absence of which could not but prove fatal to their authenticity.

Considered from this point of view, therefore, Tarikh of Mohamed Ismaul Bokhari تاریخ محمد اسمٰعیل بخاری and

Tarikh Mohamed Jarir Tibree تاریخ محمد جریر طبری, and Seerat-i-Shami سیرت شامی, and Seerat Hishamee سیرت هشامی and Ibn Sad, secretary of Al-wakidi کاتب الواقدی, and the much lauded productions of very distinguished scholars, stand upon a par with Madarij-ul-nabovat مدارج النبوت, Kisas-ul Amtrya قصص الانبیاء, Meraj nama معراج نامه, Shahadat nama شهادت نامه, Moulad مولد, etc.; and other *opuscula* emanating from ordinary authors.

In writing the life of our Prophet, or, in tracing our ecclesiastical history, very few European writers have devoted to their subject that degree of patient research and enquiry due to its importance; on the contrary, actuated, it is to be feared, by prejudice and enmity, they wilfully blinded themselves to the light which glared in upon them, and thus proved the truth of the saying, "*None are so blind as those who will not see.*"

III.—تفسیر COMMENTARY UPON THE HOLY KORAN.

Many eminent persons have commented upon the Holy Koran. Some have written on its eloquent style and beautiful diction; others have pointed out the peculiar mode of reciting it with proper accent, emphasis, and tone. Others, again, have explained, and elucidated the various commandments enjoined therein. Some have devoted their time and labour to the task of endeavouring to discover on what occasions certain verses were sent down from God; and others have supplied the preacher with texts for the subject of his sermon; and, lastly, others have taken all the above subjects collectively whereon to comment. The writers of these commentaries were compelled to have recourse to eccesiastical history, the Hadeeses, etc., an account of which we have already given. It is, indeed, much to be regretted that the said commentators should have pressed into

their service the numerous false traditions and fictitious tales contained, as before said, in those ecclesiastical histories, etc.; for such commentaries,—especially those that were written for the preacher's use, and contain fanciful and extravagant stories about the prophets, or that pretend to describe the forms of angels, heaven and hell, and their attributes,—giving, moreover, whimsical accounts from ecclesiastical history,—abound with traditions wholly undeserving of credit. These traditions were current among the Jews, who were, however, unable to adduce any proof of their credibility. There are also many sayings which are attributed to some religious writers, but it is as difficult to ascertain whether they were really the sayings of those persons as to discover how they became known to such commentators.

The portions of these commentaries which treat of the eloquence and the beautiful style of the Koran, as well as the peculiar tone to be used in reciting it, are, most undoubtedly, excellent. With the exception of these parts, all the traditions and stories contained in such commentaries are not equally true, being mingled together like real and mock pearls, the task of the purchaser being to select the genuine ones, whence it follows that whosoever, without due discrimination, quotes stories from any of such commentaries, making them a foundation for criticizing our holy religion, cannot but fall into the grossest errors.

The three kinds of books above-mentioned are, therefore, for writers upon religion, at one and the same time, a store of both worthless and precious matter; nevertheless Mohammedan authors have adopted various means by which they are enabled to avail themselves of this fruitful source.

Many learned men, when treating of the omnipotence of God, hold that it lies within His power to do whatsoever pleases Him, however contrary the act may be to reason and the laws of nature. This is a dogma in which they so conscientiously and pertinaciously believe, that every attempt to shake their faith

therein would, most assuredly, prove abortive; in fact, they would doggedly refuse to listen to, or entertain, for one moment, any proposition or argument which did not harmonize with their own favourite convictions. To such simple-minded and sincere persons was given the name of "heavenly men." كما قيل اهل الجنة بلهٌ. The following is the mode of authorship adopted by these pious and virtuous persons: they consider all traditions whatever to be trustworthy, and, consequently, describe every fact related therein to be true, so much so, that if a tradition be handed down to us in various forms, and if there be several traditions respecting one and the same event, they admit all such traditions as genuine, and affirm that a similar event occurred as many times as were equal to the number of the traditions recorded respecting it.

The works of such authors, therefore, who wrote not from a calm and well digested consideration of the subject, but from the impulse of a blind zeal and enthusiasm, are unworthy the criticism of a foreign *savant*, who, having based his arguments upon the traditions contained in those books, endeavours to deduce therefrom conclusions injurious to our religion.

Besides the above classes of books there is also another, written exclusively for the use of those, who, so far from indulging any doubts, have a lively and implicit belief in Mohammedanism. The object for which such books were written being to make the Mohammedan reader interested in the faith, and to arouse his religious enthusiasm.*

* Kazee Abool Fazel says that he did not write his book called the *Shifa*, for those persons who do not believe in the Prophet and his miracles . . . . . but for those who do believe and have faith in him, so that their love for Mohammed might be increased, and their faith in Islam strengthened, and that, moreover, they might be induced to perform righteous deeds.—(*v.* Shifay Kazee Ayaz).

قال القاضى ابوالفضل حسب المتامل ان يحقق ان كتابنا هَذا لم نجمعه لمنكر نبوة نبينا ولا لطاعن فى معجراته فتحتاج الى نصب البراهين

These writers have, in their works, described events without any distinction as to their being true or false, and without any attempt to investigate the real meaning of those events, so that a critic who founds his argument on any false tradition contained in any such book, does not fairly judge our religion.

Some of these virtuous and learned persons who held this kind of opinion, greatly enlarged the sphere of their authorship. Attributing the possibility of everything to the omnipotence of God, and, hence, considering every fact to be true, they sought to defeat the critics hostile to their religion, by proving, with the aid of logical arguments, the possibility of the occurrence of this or that fact.

These books are, indeed, so intelligibly and conclusively written, that any believer, whatsoever, in religious miracles cannot find fault with any of the doctrines advanced in them, without subjecting the religion which he himself has faith in, to the like objections.

But to one, who, rejecting all Revelation, believes only in natural religion, the reasons furnished by these books, half-based as they are upon faith, are like a man, who, having but one leg, remains without the power of locomotion.

Other divines, however, who were more learned than the rest, adopted a philosophical method in their authorship; endeavouring to prove that religion coincides with science, they investigated the truth of every tradition and explained the meaning of

عليها و تحصين حوز تها حتى لاتتوصل المطاعن اليهاونذكرشروط المعجزة والتحدى وحده وفساد قول من ابطل نسخ الشرايع ورده بل الفناه لاهل ملة المليين‌لد عوته و المصد قين لنبوته ليكون تاكيدًا فى محبتهم و منماة لاعمالهم و ليزدادوا ايمانًا مع ايما نهم *

(شفاء قاضى عياض)

each, *per se*. Shah-Vali-Ulla of Delhi شاہ ولی اللہ دہلوی رحمۃ اللہ علیہ is considered as the latest of such learned philosophical divines, but it is much to be regretted that such works as his should not have been more generally introduced, a circumstance partly attributable to their contents being beyond the comprehension of ordinary readers, and partly to their being unpalatable to those virtuous authors who object to adducing any reasons for their belief, and are, moreover, unwilling that philosophy should be called in to prove religion.

The divines of the former class who have laboured to bring forward philosophical reasons for their belief have been accused by the latter of being enemies of the orthodox faith, and have been called disbelievers in Islam, an accusation from which even Shah-Vali-Ullah شاہ ولی اللہ himself has not been able to escape.

But another defect is to be found in these books, which is that the arguments employed in them are founded on the principles of the old philosophy—principles many of which have either become obsolete, proved to be false, or have been explained in a different manner, by modern science or philosophy. This defect, however, is not confined to writers upon Mohammedan theology only, but is to be found in the theological writers of other religions also who discuss religion upon philosophical principles. It consequently becomes the duty of the followers of every religion, who wish to preserve it pure and unadulterated, to revise the works which have been written on the principles of ancient philosophy, and to write new books on the principles of modern philosophy, thus enabling the principles of their religion to be discussed upon those of natural science.

IV.—فقہ MOHAMMEDAN LAW, OR THE FIKAH.

While Mohammedan theological works were in the above-mentioned condition, the task of the writers upon our law

became necessarily very difficult. Under these circumstances, they considered the Koran,* the truth of which was universally admitted, as the best and most important source whence to derive the principles of our law; next to the Koran, such of the sayings of the Prophet, the authenticity of which had been satisfactorily proved; and lastly, those of the Prophet's surviving associates. Some writers, indeed, regard the sayings, even of the companions of the Prophet's associates, as an available source for the same object.

There were many cases, however, that either presented themselves to the minds of the lawyers, or actually occurred, which had never been anticipated or contemplated, whether in the Koran itself or in the Hadeeses, and concerning which, consequently, no positive decision could be found, on a first trial, either in the Koran itself or in the above-mentioned books. In this dilemma our writers upon law, made a fresh attempt to find a *dictum* which should meet such cases, in the Koran or the Hadeeses; and in this they fortunately succeeded by considering the way in which words had been used in the above authorities, as well as the different meanings of which such words were susceptible; and wherever an instance was found of one case resembling another, the same decision served for both.

These writers sometimes took the decision given by the Koran upon particular cases as applicable generally, and at other times discovered exceptions to the general decisions of the Koran. The same writers also laid down some principles and rules, by using which, decisions might be found in the Koran upon peculiar or extraordinary cases, and this formed a new branch of our theology

* During the Prophet's lifetime, the Koran was not written *in extenso*, as it now appears, but only detached portions thereof; other parts had been confided to memory, and some persons were found who had committed even the whole of it to memory. From the above united sources, the Koran was, in the time of Abu-Bekr, composed in its present form, and was pronounced to be correct by persons who had heard it recited by the Prophet himself.

under the name of اصول فقه—the principles of Mohammedan law. General books have also been written by which decisions have been derived from the Koran, respecting the material or physical actions of men. Such books are called کتب فقه, Treatises or Books upon Mohammedan Law, or the *Fikah*. The last of these books, written on the principles of the حنفی Hamufi sect, is the Fatawa Alumgeeree فتاوی عالمگیری, composed by order of the Emperor Alumgeer. Great credit and many thanks are due to the authors of such works, for the vast labour and trouble they undertook in writing them, and no doubt an equal respect should be entertained as well for the productions themselves as for their writers; but with the exception of those decisions plainly enunciated in the Koran or in the genuine Hadeeses, all the rest being but mere deductions from the aforesaid decisions (of the Koran) must not be considered as enunciating the true principles of our religion. Foreign writers and critics have generally fallen into mistakes by considering such deduced or second-hand decisions as constituting our true religion.

No doubt those eminent scholars who so deduced these decisions from the original principles of Islam were far more learned than ourselves, but at the same time they were quite as liable to error as we are, so that it can, by no means, be predicated of all such deduced decisions that they are entirely immaculate, or free from mistakes. Hence it follows that our law books are full of two kinds of principles and decisions; the one class being those original decisions of our religion which are considered faultless, the other such as are deduced from the former class, and which, for that very reason, may be said to be liable to mistakes. It is, therefore, the duty of those who investigate, or who criticise our law, first to distinguish the one class of decisions from the other; because if any fault be found with any decision of the latter, it ought not to be imputed to our religion, but to the learned man who deduced those decisions from our religion, and who cannot be entitled to any higher rank than

that of a lawyer of our religion. The *four great lawyers* of our religion hold a like opinion.*

* Aboo-Haneefa ابو حنيفه one of these lawyers, when explaining any principle of our law, used to declare, that what he himself said should be considered as the best opinion he could form on the subject, and as entitled to credit only so long as until a better one was found to challenge our belief. Imam Malik امام مالك, another of these four, held that a principle enunciated by any one but the Prophet was liable to error. Imam Hambal امام حنبل, also a great authority, insisted that entire dependence should not be placed upon what he said, but that the Koran and the Hadeeses should be consulted. Lastly, Shafai شافعى on one occasion told Ibrahim Moozame ابراهيم مزنى, one of his pupils, that he ought not to rely upon his opinion, but must form one for himself from the Koran and the Hadeeses, inasmuch as the sayings of every one, except those of the Prophet, were liable to mistakes.

قال الشيخ عبد الوهاب الشعراني في اليواقيت كان ابو حنيفه رحمه الله اذا افتى يقول هذارای النعمان ابن ثابت يعنى نفسه و هو احسن ما قدرنا عليه فمن جاء باحسن منه فهو اولىٰ بالصواب

وقال كان الامام مالك رحمه الله تعالىٰ يقول مامن احدٍ الاهو ماخوذ من كلامه و مردود عليه الا الرسول صلى الله عليه و سلم

ثم قال وكان الامام احمد رحمه الله يقول ليس لاحدٍ مع الله و رسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم كلام وقال ايضًا للرجل لا تقلد ونى ولا تقلدنّ مالكاً ولا الا وزاعي ولا النخعى ولا غيرهم وخذ وا الاحكام من حيث احذوا من الكتاب والسنة وروى الحاكم والبيهقي من الشافعى رحمه الله انه قال يومًا للمزنى يا ابراهيم لا تقلد ني فى كل ما اقول وانظر فى ذلك بنفسك فانه دين وكان رحمه الله يقول لا حجة فى قول احددون رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم *

Aboo Haneefa, B. 80 Hijra (699 A.D.) D. 150 Hijra (767 A.D.) Imam Malik, B. 95 H. (613 A.D.) D. 179 H. (795 A.D.) Ahmud Hambal, B. 164 H. (780 A.D.) D. 241 H. (855 A.D.) Shafaee, B. 150 H. (767 A.D.) D. 204 H. (819 A.D.)

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON

MOHAMMEDAN TRADITIONS.

خطبةٌ

علي الروايات المرويات في الاسلام

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

يا ايها الذين امَنوا اِن جاءكم فاسق بنباء فتبيَّنوا اَن تُصيبوا

قوما بجهالة فتصبحوا علي ما فعلتم نادمين

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SECTION I.—How Mohammedan Traditions came into Existence .	1
The assertion of the Prophet that he was no other than a mortal	2
Mohammed's direction as to transmitting his sayings to others .	3
SECTION II.—Punishment awarded by the Prophet to persons who should fail to deliver the Hadeeses truly and faithfully . .	4
SECTION III.—The Style of Composition employed in the imparting of a Tradition	6
SECTION IV.—Value of Hadeeses as regards the communication of them from one narrator to another	7
SECTION V.—Value and importance of Hadeeses as judged by the character of the narrators	9
SECTION VI.—Degree of Authenticity of the narrators as judged by their acquirements.	10
SECTION VII.—Mohammedans were permitted to relate traditions from the Jewish Scriptures	11
SECTION VIII.—Causes of difference among Traditions	11
SECTION IX.—Apocryphal Hadeeses	12
Supplement	16
Works upon Hadeeses enumerated by Dr. Sprenger as authoritative, never acknowledged by Mohammedans as genuine and authentic unless subjected to the process of proper examinations	17
Sir William Muir's remark—that "in the lapse of time" the Moslems "invested Mohammed with supernatural attributes"—refuted	17-19
Refutation of the remark of Sir Wm. Muir that "the wants of the expanding empire required an enlargement of the administrative Code of the Coran"	20
The sayings and practice of Mohammed never regarded as inspired, except those only which he himself said were of divine origin	21
No Caliph, or any other Mohammedan ruler, ever interfered with private individuals in their task of collecting the Hadeeses.	21

PAGE

That to say, the subject matter of traditions is not to be taken into consideration when their genuineness is to be determined, is incorrect 25

Refutation of the remark of Sir Wm. Muir that there are no "trustworthy witnesses for events preceding Mahomet's birth, or for the details of his childhood, few of them even for the incidents of his youth". 26-30

Refutation of the remark of Sir Wm. Muir that we cannot accept as true the traditions that contain the "misrepresented actions" and charges imputed to the enemies of Mohammed . . . 31

Refutation of the remark of Sir Wm. Muir that "the ambition of the narrator to be associated with Mohammed," etc., etc., caused exaggeration, false colouring, and even invention (of traditions). 32

That some remarks of Sir Wm. Muir respecting Mohammed and the early Moslems, are unjust 33-34

The remark of Dr. Sprenger and Sir Wm. Muir "that Mohammed highly praised and acknowledged the idols and gods of the Koreishites" is groundless 35-48

The examples of fabricated traditions given by Sir Wm. Muir are not correct 48-50

The charge made by Sir Wm. Muir that pious frauds are allowable in Islam is incorrect, and the instances he adduces do not apply 50-56

ESSAY

ON

MOHAMMEDAN TRADITIONS.

Section I.—*How they came into Existence.*

From the earliest times of Mohammedan history the Holy Koran has always continued to be, as it will for ever remain, a real and abundant source of Mohammedan law; and it is the belief of every Mussulman that the Prophet himself always acted conformably to the Koran—that is, in perfect obedience to the commands contained in that holy book, both when expressly enjoined or only tacitly implied. It was in accordance with this grand principle that Ayeshah taught us, by her rejection of the hadees which declared the dead could hear, to discard, at once, without inquiry, as apocryphal and spurious, every hadees that clashed with the injunctions of the Koran.

But when we believe that the Prophet received the Wahee Ghair Mutloo, or Hadees, that is, in other words, a revelation in which was declared the sense only of what he afterwards delivered to his followers in his own words, then, of course, it becomes incumbent upon us to search after and collect the sayings of the Prophet himself. When, moreover, we believe that no genuine hadees can be contrary to the import of the Koran, then, indeed, we shall find in the course of our inquiry and investigation, that of true hadeeses there are three descriptions only. Of these, one would be in confirmation and support of the Koran; another would serve by way of explanation of,

and comment upon, some of the passages in that sacred writ, while the third would bear reference to such matters as have not been taken cognizance of by the Holy Koran.

But the Prophet himself has informed us that (leaving the Holy Koran out of question) all his sayings are not to be considered as revelations; but that the two following kinds only are to be taken as such: First, those which he himself declared had been divinely revealed; and secondly, those which have reference to religious dogmas, to morals, or to the state and condition of the soul in the world to come. Consequently, with the exception of the hadeeses of the above-mentioned two kinds, the rest of the sayings and actions of the Prophet are looked upon by us in the same light as those of any other holy, virtuous, and truly pious personage; and this our assertion the Prophet himself supports, when he says, "Verily, I am nothing more than a mortal. Accept and act according to what I say relative to your religion; but when I order you anything on my own account, then, verily, I am also a man."

انما انابشر اذا امرتكم بشيٍ من امردينكم فخذوه و اذا امرتكم بشيٍ من راي فانما انابشر

Upon examining the sayings and deeds of our Prophet, we find some of them relating to our religion, others connected with the peculiar circumstances of his life, some bearing upon society in general, and others, again, concerning the art of government.

Of the above classifications of Mohammed's sayings and practice, the last three only are of a nature requiring to be investigated and discriminated as to which of them are inspired and which are not, and therefore we should accept as really inspired those sayings only the authority for, and proof of, which are sufficient to justify us in so doing.

Although our Prophet has expressly and repeatedly ordered us always to follow his footprints as closely as possible, never-

theless that command has been understood as being relative to religion exclusively; as for us Mohammedans, we have tried to follow his example, to the best of our ability, in the remaining three of the above-mentioned points. The difference between these two modes of procedure being that, in the first case, we are bound and obliged, as a matter of duty, to follow it; while, in the second one, we do so advisedly on our own account, for the purpose of procuring honour for ourselves in the next world, and out of attachment, reverence, love, and gratitude to our Prophet, so that without, in the least, disparaging religion, we can quit that path, if compelled so to do, by time or by circumstances.

All these and the like considerations obliged us to collect and investigate all the sayings of our Prophet. During even Mohammed's lifetime, the dominions of Islam had become extensive, and the converts to it numerous: it was impossible for every Moslem to be in personal communication with the Prophet, and hence it became indispensable that his (the Prophet's) sayings and deeds should be made to come to the knowledge of such of his followers as were at a distance from him; and it was for this reason that, as will appear from the following hadees, the Prophet approved of this being done. Ibni Masood represents himself as having heard from the Prophet, "May God prosper that person who heard my words, and faithfully delivered them unto others, for, verily, there might be among the latter some one who might heed my word better than the deliverer himself." (Termizee, etc.)

عن ابن مسعود قال سمعت رسول الله صلعم يقول نضّر الله امرءًا سمع منا شيئًا فبلّغه كما سمعه فَرُبَّ مُبَلَّغٍ او عي له من سامع (رواه الترمذي و ابن ماجة وراه الدارمي عن ابي الدرداء)

It was from this time that tradition first came into credit.

Although we find that even during the Prophet's lifetime certain individuals used to commit to writing some detached hadeeses, and that immediately after his death the custom still continued on the increase, yet, in both those periods, it was so limited as not to attract any special notice or attention. Besides there were still living so many persons who had themselves heard the Prophet, and those who had not could so easily make themselves well acquainted with his sayings and deeds, that no necessity was felt for making a collection of all such sayings and practice of the prophet.

In course of time, however, when those aged persons who had seen and heard the Prophet began to depart, one by one, from this life, the absolute necessity for collecting the hadeeses became more and more urgent; so much so, indeed, that at the commencement of the second century of the Hejra, several truly virtuous and pious persons, who regarded this world with contempt, and devoted themselves entirely to religion, undertook the task of collecting the hadeeses. Such is the true and faithful account of Mohammedan traditions and hadeeses.

Section II.—*Punishment awarded by the Prophet to persons who should fail to deliver the Hadeeses truly and faithfully.*

We have already shown that the custom of delivering hadeeses to other persons commenced during the lifetime of Mohammed, and by his direction. It now, therefore, remains for us to make known how particular the Prophet was respecting the faithful transmission of hadeeses from mouth to mouth, and for this purpose we think it will be quite sufficient to quote the very words of the Prophet. Ibni Abbas makes Mohammed state, "Convey to other persons none of my words except those which ye know of a surety. Verily he who purposely represents my words wrongly, would find a place nowhere for himself but in fire." (*Termizee*).

عن ابن عباس قال قال رسول الله صلعم اتقوا الحديث عني الا ما علمتم فمن كذب علي متعمدا فليتبوء مقعده من النار (رواه الترمذي)

Samrah, son of Jundob, and Moghayera, son of Shobah, represent the Prophet as saying, "Whoever communicates my words to others, but without being sure of their correctness, verily, he is one of the two liars" (*i.e.* one, he who utters a direct falsehood, and the other, he who represents a statement as true, although he himself thinks it to be untrue). (*Moslim*).

عن سمرة بن جندب و المغيرة بن شعبة قالا قال رسول الله صلعم من حدّث عني بحديث يري انه كذب فهواحد الكاذبين (رواه مسلم)

Notwithstanding, however, all this precaution on the part of our Prophet, we find that false and spurious traditions did creep into Islam, precisely in the same manner as false traditions and apocryphal books found their way into Judaism and Christianity; the only difference as to this point between Islam and the two last-mentioned faiths being, that Moslem divines have never suffered pious frauds to form one of their religious doctrines; and as they always regarded such an act in the light of a great crime, so they never endeavoured to save the originator of such traditions, however pure and virtuous the intention might have been with which he introduced them, from hell-fire, the abode which the Prophet himself had appointed for such a transgressor; while, on the contrary, the Christian Fathers of the Church, as Origen and others, manifestly acting against their inward convictions, considered pious frauds in matters of religion not only allowable but even meritorious and deserving of God's favour.[1]

[1] Sir W. Muir relates, in his Oordoo History of the Christian Church, that in the second century a question arose among the Christians on this point, whether, in their discussions upon matters of religion with idolators and heathen philosophers, it was right or not to adopt the same style of arguments, and the same weapons as were used by the opposite party? Guided by the opinions of Origen and others, the question was decided in the affirmative. It was certainly a result

SECTION III.—*The Style of Composition employed in the imparting of a Tradition.*

For the purpose of expressing how a hadees had been communicated from one person to another, certain introductory verbal forms were selected by duly qualified persons, and it was incumbent upon every one about to narrate a hadees, to commence by that particular form appropriated to the said hadees, and this was done with the view of securing for each hadees the quantum of credit to which it might be justly entitled.

These introductory verbal forms are as follow: (1) حدثنا "He said to me;" (2) سمعته يقول "I heard him saying;" (3) قال لنا

of their determination, that the Christian doctors proved superior in the contest, and asserted their advantage over their opponents; but at the same time, *this triumph was attended with some damage to the interests of truth and fairness.*—People were led to *suspect* that for this reason were those *spurious* books issued, which *after this century made their appearance in great numbers.* In the same way, the philosophers used sometimes to put forth books upholding some particular doctrine; *and by ascribing the authorship to eminent men, they secured for their productions that attention and consideration which they would not have received had the names of the real authors been appended. In like manner, the Christians who argued in the style of the philosophers, used to write books and issue them under the name of an apostle, or of a pupil of an apostle, or of any other person of note and renown.* This practice, which originated in the third century, was perpetuated for many centuries in the Romish Church. *It is, however, a very culpable practice, and opposed to the principles of eternal truth.*—Muir's Church History, Part II., ch. 3. Mosheim writes as follows:—The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it *not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie for the sake of truth and piety.* The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment before the Christian era. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous *forgeries of books under the names of eminent men*, the Sybilline verses, and other similar trash, a large mass of which appeared in this and the following centuries. I would not say that the orthodox Christians forged *all* the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the gnostic sects; yet that the *Christians* who were free from the heterodox views *were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.*"—Eccl. Hist. ch. iii. p. 70, edit. 1860.

Mosheim again writes upon the same subject as follows:—"There were various causes requiring this to be done at an early period, and particularly this, that not long after the Saviour's ascension, various histories of his life and doctrines, full of impositions and fables, were composed by persons of no bad intentions, perhaps, but who were superstitious, simple, and *addicted to pious frauds;* and afterwards *various spurious writings were palmed upon the world, inscribed with the names of the holy apostles.*"—Eccl. Hist., Part II., chap. ii., p. 36.

"He told me;" (4) ذكرلنا "He related to me;" (5) اخبرنا "He informed me;" (6) انبانا "He informed me;" (7) عن "From."

The first four introductory forms were to be used only in the case of an original narrator communicating the very words of the hadees to the next one below him. The fifth and sixth introductory verbal forms were used when a narrator inquired of the narrator immediately above him whether such or such a fact, or circumstance, was or was not correct. The last form is not sufficiently explicit, and the consequence is that it cannot be decided to which of the two persons the hadees related belongs, so that unless other facts be brought to bear upon it, it cannot be satisfactorily proved whether there be any other persons, one, or more than one, intermediary between the two narrators. As to any external facts that might prove what was required to be known, the learned are divided in their opinions.

First: If it be known of a certainty that the narrator is not notorious for fraudulently omitting the names of other parties forming links in the chain of narration, and who also lived at such a time and in such a locality that it was possible, although not proved, that they visited each other, then it might be taken for granted that there were no other narrators intermediary between these two.

Secondly: Other learned authorities add that it must be proved that they visited each other, at least once in their life-time.

Thirdly: Others assert it must be proved that they remained together for such a time as would be sufficient to enable them to learn the hadees, one from the other.

Fourthly: Some hold that it must be proved that one of them really learned the hadees from the other.

Section IV.—*Value of Hadeeses as regards the communication of them from one narrator to another.*

Whenever a hadees is narrated, its value and importance are to be estimated from the links forming the chain of narration.

First: مسند یا مرفوع *Mosnud or Mar'foo* (a hadees which is said to have been narrated by the Prophet). This appellation is given to a hadees when the narrator expressly says that some certain thing has been said or performed by the Prophet himself, or has been done by others in his presence. If the chain of narrators up to Mohammed is complete, the hadees, in that case, is called مرفوع متصل *Marfoo Muttasil* (a hadees which is said to have been related by the Prophet, and the list of whose narrators is complete); but if the chain of narrators is not complete, then it is called مرفوع منقطع *Marfoo Munkata* (a hadees represented to have been related by the Prophet, but of which the list of narrators is incomplete).

Second: مرسل یا موقوف *Morsal* or *Moukoof* (a hadees related by an associate of the Prophet without having been ascribed to the latter). If the chain of narrators up to the associate is complete, the hadees would, in that case, be called مرسل متصل *Morsal Muttasil*, but if incomplete, then it would be called مرسل منقطع *Morsal Munkata.*

Opinions of learned men are much divided as to whether or not the hadees *Morsal Muttasil*, should be considered as genuine and authoritative. But such a hadees of the associate as describes an event or a place which he himself did not see, should not justly be regarded as having an equal authority as one mentioned by the Prophet. Perfectly just and true are the opinions of those learned persons who maintain that the hadeeses related by Ayesha as to the manner in which revelations began to be communicated to the Prophet are not to be taken as authority.

Third: مقطوع *Maktoo*, that is, hadeeses related by those persons who saw the associates of the Prophet, but which have not been traced up to the associates. This hadees is also respectively called مقطوع متصل *Maktoo Muttasil* and *Maktoo Munkata* when the chain of its narrators is either complete or incomplete.

Fourth: روایت *Riwayat* (tradition). This is quite distinct from any of the above-mentioned ones, and the name is given to such hadeeses as commence in this wise—"it has been related," or "such and such a person thus narrated it." Hadeeses of this kind are no more entitled to credit than is public gossip. It is from such hadeeses that our commentators and historians, both sacred and profane, have made their works so voluminous, and it is this rubbish and nonsense that diminishes the credit of Hishamee, Tabukati Kabeer, otherwise Katibul Wakedee and others.

Section V.—*Value and importance of Hadeeses as judged by the character of the narrators.*

Whenever the value and genuineness of any hadeeses are judged from the character of their narrators, their respective merits are considered in the following order:—

First: صحیح *Saheeh* (genuine). This appellation is given to that hadees, all whose narrators were truly pious and virtuous persons, who had never been charged with any misdemeanour, and who were distinguished for their truth and integrity.

The quantum of credit reposed in such hadeeses was much increased by their having been, separately, related by individuals of the same character as the above. There are very few hadeeses of this kind.

Second: حسن *Hasan* (of mediocre credit). This title is given to that hadees, all whose narrators do not approach in moral excellence to those of the first one, but nevertheless are much esteemed for their piety and general good character, and also to such hadees the source of which is well known. There are many hadeeses of this kind, and which form the subject matter of our best works on hadeeses.

Third: ضعیف *Daeef* (weak). This appellation is given to those hadeeses of whose narrators only one or more do not ap-

pear to resemble those of the first or second class. The degree of weakness of such hadeeses is formed from its causes, and our books upon hadeeses of the second rank are full of those of this description.

Fourth: غريب *Ghareeb* (scarce). This appellation is given to such hadeeses whose narrators have related but very few hadeeses.

Section VI.—*Degree of Authenticity of the narrators as judged by their acquirements.*

The associates of the prophet, and those persons who lived immediately after them, used to relate, with the exception of the Koran, the sense of the Prophet's words, in their own language, unless they had to use some phrases containing prayers, or when they had to point out to others the very words of the prophet. It is natural to suppose that deeply learned persons would themselves understand and deliver, to others, the sense of the sayings better than persons of inferior parts, and therefore narrators have been divided into seven grades.

First: Persons highly conspicuous for their learning and legal acquirements, as well as for their retentive memory. Such persons are distinguished by the title of ايمة الحديث *Aimatul hadees,* that is "Leaders in Hadeeses."

Second: Persons who, as to their knowledge take rank after the first, and who but very rarely committed any mistake.

Third: Persons who have made alterations in the pure religion of the Prophet, without carrying them to extremes by prejudice, but respecting whose integrity and honesty there is no doubt.

Fourth: Persons respecting whom nothing is known.

Fifth: Persons who have made alterations in the pure religion of the Prophet, and, actuated by prejudice, have carried them to extremes.

Sixth: Persons who are pertinaciously sceptical, and have not a retentive memory.

Seventh: Persons who are notorious for inventing spurious hadeeses. Learned divines of our religion are of opinion that the hadeeses related by persons of the first three classes should be accepted as true, according to their respective merits, and also that hadeeses related by persons coming under the three last classes, should be, at once, entirely rejected; and that the hadeeses related by persons of the fourth class, should be passed over unnoticed so long as the narrator remained unknown.

Section VII.—*Mohammedans were permitted to relate traditions from the Jewish Scriptures.*

Our prophet expressly gives us permission to relate traditions from the Jews; an assertion for the support of which we think it sufficient to quote a hadees of the Prophet to that effect.

Abdollah, son of Ammar, makes the Prophet as saying "Convey my words to the people, although they might be no more than a verse, and relate traditions from the Jews, and there is no harm therein. Whosoever constructs falsehoods upon me shall have fire for his abode" (*Bokharee*).

عن عبدالله ابن عمرٍو قال قال رسول الله صلعم بَلِّغُوا عني و لوايةً و حدثوا عن بني اسرائيل و لا حرج و من كذب علي متعمدا فليتبوء مقعده من النار (رواه البخاري)

Section VIII.—*Causes of difference among Traditions.*

We should not be justified in concluding that, whenever a difference is met with in traditions, these latter are nothing more than so many mere inventions and fabrications of the narrators, since, besides the fabrication of hadeeses, there are also other natural causes which might occasion such differences; and we

shall now consider those natural causes which produce such variety among hadeeses.

(1). A misunderstanding of the real sense of the saying of the Prophet.

(2). Difference of the opinions of two narrators in understanding the true sense of the Prophet's saying.

(3). Inability to enunciate clearly the sense of the Prophet's saying.

(4). Failure of memory on the part of the narrator—in consequence of which he either left out some portion or portions of the Prophet's saying, or mixed up together the meanings of two different hadeeses.

(5). Explanation of any portion of the hadees given by the narrator, with the intention of its being easily understood by the party hearing it, but unfortunately mistaken by the latter for an actual portion of the hadees itself.

(6). Quotations of certain of the Prophet's words by the narrator, for the purpose of supporting his own narration, while the hearers of the narration erroneously took the whole of it as being the Prophet's own words.

(7). Traditions borrowed from the Jews erroneously taken to be the words of the Prophet, and the difference existing between such Jewish traditions was thus transferred to those of the Mohammedans. The stories of ancient persons and early prophets, with which our histories and commentaries are filled, are all derived from these sources.

(8). The difference which is naturally caused in the continual transmission of a tradition by oral communication, as it has been in the case of traditions having miracles for their subject-matter.

(9). The various states and circumstances in which the different narrators saw the Prophet.

Section IX.—*Apocryphal Hadeeses.*

There exists no doubt respecting the circumstance of certain

persons having fabricated some hadeeses in the Prophet's name. Those who perpetrated so impudent a forgery were men of the following descriptions:—

(1). Persons desirous of introducing some praiseworthy custom among the public, forged hadeeses in order to secure success. Such fabrication is restricted exclusively to those hadeeses which treat of the advantages and benefits which reading the Koran and praying procure to any one, both in this world and the next; which show how reciting passages from the Koran cures every disease, etc.: the real object of such frauds being to lead the public into the habit of reading the Koran and of praying. According to our religion the perpetrators of such frauds, or of any others, stand in the list of sinners.

(2). Preachers, with a view of collecting large congregations around them, and of amusing their hearers, invented many hadeeses, such hadeeses being only those which describe the state and condition of paradise and of hell, as well as the state and condition of the soul after death, etc., in order to awaken the fear of God's wrath and the hope of salvation.

(3). Those persons who made alterations in the pure religion of the Prophet, and who, urged by their prejudices, carried the same to extremes, and who, for the purpose of successfully confronting their controversial antagonists, forged such hadeeses in order to favour their own interested views.

(4). Infidels who maliciously coined and circulated spurious hadeeses. Our learned men, however, have greatly exerted themselves in order to discover such fabricated hadeeses, and have written many works upon the subject, laying down rules for ascertaining false traditions and for distinguishing them from genuine ones.

The modes of procedure were as follows:—Such persons examined the very words employed in such hadeeses, as well as their style of composition; they compared the contents of each hadees with the commands and injunctions contained in the

Koran, with those religious doctrines and dogmas that have been deduced from the Koran, and with those hadeeses which have been proved to be genuine; they investigated the nature of the import of such hadeeses, as to whether it was unreasonable, improbable, or impossible.

It will now be evident to our readers that the hadeeses considered as genuine by us Mohammedans, must indispensably possess the following characters:—The narrator must have plainly and distinctly mentioned that such and such a thing was either said or done by the Prophet; the chain of narrators from the last link up to the Prophet, must be unbroken; the subject related must have come under the actual ken of its first narrators; every one of the narrators, from the last up to the Prophet, must have been persons conspicuous for their piety, virtue, and honesty; every narrator must have received more than one hadees from the narrator immediately preceding him; every one of the narrators must be conspicuous for his learning, so that he might be safely presumed to be competent both to understand correctly, and faithfully deliver to others, the sense of the hadees; the import of the hadees must not be contrary to the behests and injunctions contained in the Koran, or to the religious doctrines deduced from that Sacred Book, or to the hadeeses proved to be correct; and the nature of the import of the hadees must not be such as persons might hesitate in accepting.

Any hadees thus proved genuine can be made the basis of any religious doctrine, but notwithstanding this, another objection may be raised against it which is, that this hadees is the statement of one person only, and, therefore, cannot, properly, be believed in implicitly. For obviating this, three grades have been again formed of the hadeeses thus proved as genuine. These three grades are the following:—متواتر *Motawatir*, مشهور *Mashhoor*, and خبر احاد *Khabari Ahad.*

Motawatir is an appellation given to those hadeeses only that

have always been, from the time of the Prophet, ever afterwards recognized and accepted by every associate of the Prophet, and every learned individual, as authentic and genuine, and to which no one has raised any objection. All learned Muhammedan divines of every period have declared that the Koran only is the hadees Mutawatir; but some doctors have declared certain other hadeeses also to be Mutawatir, the number, however, of such hadeeses not exceeding *five*. Such are the hadeeses that are implicitly believed and ought to be religiously observed.

Mashhoor is a title given to those hadeeses that, in every age, have been believed to be genuine, by some learned persons. These are the hadeeses which are found recorded in our best works that treat of them, and, having been generally accepted as genuine, form the nucleus of some of our religious doctrines.

Khabari Ahad (or hadeeses related by one person), is an appellation given to hadeeses that do not possess any of the qualities belonging to the hadeeses of the first two grades. Opinions of the learned are divided whether or not they can form the basis of any religious doctrine.

Persons who undertook the task of collecting hadeeses had neither time nor opportunity for examining and investigating all the above particulars, and some of them collected together all the hadeeses whatsoever that came under their notice, while others collected only those hadeeses whose narrators were acknowledged to be trustworthy and honest persons, leaving entirely upon their readers the task of investigating and examining all the above-mentioned particulars, as well as of deciding their comparative merits, their genuineness, and the quantum of credit due to them. We regret to say that the odds and ends, waifs and strays, and refuse of all hadeeses, have been welcomed by our historians.

Christian writers, ignorant of the rules and regulations that have been so established by learned Mohammedan Divines for ascertaining the intrinsic value and genuineness of any hadees,

when they accidentally read any of our histories which, as before said, contain nothing but the worst of all hadeeses, vainly flatter themselves that they have become acquainted with all the *minutiæ* of Islam, and begin to criticise and ridicule our religion; but when these their so much lauded productions come under the eyes of Mohammedans, the only effect produced by them is laughter at the ignorance and prejudice conspicuous in them, mingled with regret at the useless sacrifice of time and talents.

SUPPLEMENT.

Although we have elsewhere given a full and detailed account of Mohammedan traditions, nevertheless, we cannot, in justice, pass over unnoticed the information afforded us by two of the most esteemed Christian biographers of our prophet—A. Sprenger, M.D., and Sir William Muir.

The former of the above authors says but very little respecting Mohammedan traditions and their narrators, and, indeed, the little he so ventures to mention betrays the paucity of his acquaintance with his subject; so much so, indeed, that he may justly be compared to one who, plunged in the thick darkness of ignorance, is, while seeking the light of truth, deceived and led astray by the false meteors of prejudice and obliquity of judgment, so that, while in pursuit of nonentities, he loses the substance. One remark of his is, however, worth consideration. He states that "the most important, in a theological point of view," are "the six canonical collections of the Sunnees," namely "Cahyh of Bokhary . . . Moslim . . . The Sonan of Abu Daöd . . . Tirmidzy . . . Nasay Ibni

Majah;" besides these there are some other collections (mostly founded on the preceding ones) which are much esteemed among the Sunnies, as that of Darimy's, that of Daragotony, of Abn Nayna, of Ismayhy, of Bargany, of Ahmad Sonny, of Bayhagy, of Homaydy, of Khattaby, of Baghawy, of Razyn, of Jazary Ibnal Athyr (Mobarik), of Ibnal Janzy, of Nawawy."

Now, in the first place, the last fourteen are not at all "founded" on the six preceding ones, inasmuch as the former contain many other unauthentic and untrustworthy hadeeses which are no where to be found in the latter; and, secondly, none of the hadeeses, whether they be contained in the former or in the latter, are ever acknowledged genuine or authoritative, so as to be made the basis of any religious doctrine, so long as they have not been subjected to the process of all the examinations which we have mentioned above.

Sir Wm. Muir, however, dwells, at some length, upon the topic of Mohammedan traditions and traditionists, but we regret to state that the entire character of his composition clearly indicates that, before having arrived at any conclusion by an unprejudiced and candid investigation, as well as by fair, just, and legitimate reasoning, his mind was prepossessed by the idea that all these traditions were nothing else than mere fabrications or inventions of the narrators and other persons; and this, as if he were proceeding to perform the task of proving all traditions to be such, and not of arriving at the truth, whatsoever that truth may be, which last object is, or at least should be, the sole aim of every public writer. His very line of argument betrays the *animus* which directs his pen. Thus, commencing by the remark that "the habits of the early Moslems favoured the growth of tradition," he goes on to say, "on what topic would the early Moslems more enthusiastically descant than on the acts and sayings of their Prophet." He is of opinion that it was these traditions, which, in the lapse of time, invested Mahomet with supernatural attributes." "The mind (of his followers) was

unconsciously led on to think of him as endowed with supernatural power. . . . . *here was the material out of which tradition grew luxuriantly.* Whenever there was at hand no standard of facts, whereby these recitals might be tested, the memory was aided by the *unchecked efforts of the imagination.*" "Superstitious reverence, with which the traditions of the companions (of the Prophet) were regarded by the succeeding generations," was, according to him, "the result which the lapse of time would naturally have upon the minds and the *narratives.*"

Now, such being the line of Sir William's reasoning, what, it may be asked, would become of the most pious and virtuous person upon earth, were we to look upon his every deed and saying through the obfuscated and perverted medium of fraud and hypocrisy, were we to misconstrue and misrepresent all his words and actions, putting upon them the worst construction it were possible for malice to invent?

May not all the miraculous deeds of Moses—his "rod being turned into a serpent," "his hand" becoming leprous, "the river being turned into blood," "the plague of frogs"—and his other miracles performed in Egypt; the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, the falling of manna and quails from heaven, the hewn tablet of stone written upon by the finger of God, the Almighty's preferring the Israelites before all the rest of the world, His giving them the name of "my chosen people," and His conferring upon them all the blessings that were so conspicuous—and lastly, His honouring Israel with the exalted appellation of "*My first-born Son*;"—may not, we repeat, all these be considered as only so many amusing tales, invented and fabricated by that prophet's ardent and zealous followers—the Israelites—who, through "superstitious reverence," through "fond devotion," in the lapse of time, invested their prophet "with supernatural attributes." May it not be equally well applied to Moses that "the majesty of his character gained

greatness by contemplation, and, as time removed him farther and farther from them (his followers), the lineaments of the mysterious mortal, who was wont to hold familiar intercourse with the messenger of heaven (nay, with God himself), rose in dimmer but in more gigantic proportions. The mind was unconsciously led on to think of him as endowed with supernatural power and ever surrounded by supernatural agency." What would become of Jesus and his devout and zealous followers were every one to discard, as merely so many fabrications and idle inventions, the traditions which represent Christ as rising from among the dead, and showing His wounded hands to His followers, His ascension into heaven, and His sitting there, at the right hand of God,—that is, according to the Trinitarian system, at the right hand of himself?

A respect, however, for intellectual power forbids us to put the worst construction upon the sayings and deeds of men who have gained for themselves a world-wide renown for their piety and virtue; nor, indeed, can it be denied that it behoves every author, when about to criticise the writings of others, to bring with him to his task a mind free from prejudice and illiberality.

Mohammed's companions and their successors were men who entirely devoted themselves to God; they worshipped truth, and regarded this world with contempt; they were honest, sincere, and virtuous; and the collectors of our hadeeses undertook journeys for the purpose of amassing in one *corpus* the sayings of their prophet: they suffered severe persecution from the local powers that were; they had to encounter a host of difficulties, to endure hardships and privations almost incredible, but never did they flinch or desist from their task, all which undeniably proves them to have been actuated by religious and pious motives; and we should be in no way justified were we to describe them as acting from cant and hypocrisy, and unwarrantably condemn their works upon an unfounded assertion of their being nothing but fabrications and inventions.

Sir Wm. Muir mentions that "the wants of the expanding empire required an enlargement of the administrative Code of the Coran." He says "that which well sufficed for the patriarchal simplicity and limited social system of the early Arabs became utterly inadequate for the hourly multiplying wants of their descendants." This, according to Sir Wm. Muir, together with other causes of the like nature, "called loudly for the enlargement of the scanty and naked dogmas of the Coran, and for the development of its defective code of ethics." In this observation he is entirely mistaken. The compilers of hadeeses had nothing to do whatsoever with the expansion of empire or with the administrative Code. They were men entirely devoted to religion. They compiled hadeeses, those sayings of their prophet, solely from religious motives. Of the hadeeses they compiled, religion forms by far the greatest proportion, not even one-twentieth referring to matters of administration. We do not believe all the hadeeses, respecting the administration, to be inspired ones, as we have fully explained in another place. The Koran, as well as the Prophet, left, with the exception of certain laws, every thing respecting the art of government entirely to the discretion of the head of the state to introduce, with the advice of learned and wise counsellors, such measures as circumstances and the spirit of the age might require. Having mentioned that "the Coran was, at first, the sole authoritative rule of conduct;" the same author says that "it no longer sufficed for its original object," and that "the deficiency was supplied by the Sunnat, or the sayings and practice of Mahomet." He also writes that "he (Mohammed) had never held himself to be infallible, except when directly inspired of God; but this new doctrine assumed that a heavenly and unerring guidance pervaded every word and action of his prophetic life."

There is no doubt that we Mohammedans endeavour to imitate the example of our Prophet in all spiritual as well as secular matters, but it is highly unjust to represent us as believing that

"a heavenly and unerring guidance pervaded every word and action of his prophetic life." All his sayings and practice concerning worldly matters are, with the exception only of those which he himself said were of divine origin, looked upon by us in precisely the same light as those of any other virtuous and pious individual. We have fully described and explained this point above.

"The work" (of fabrication and propagation of tradition), Sir Wm. Muir says, "too closely affected the public interests and the political aspects of the empire to be left entirely to private and individual zeal," and, for the support of his assertion, he quotes the following sentence from Sprenger, who, himself, took the intimation from Quastalany's Commentary on Bokharee. The sentence is: "The necessity of writing down every authentic record of Mohammed which could be collected, being urgent, the Khalif (Omar) issued a circular order to that effect, and commissioned Abu Bakr bin Mohammed, more especially, with the task of collecting traditions."

Now, no Caliph whatever, or any other Mohammedan ruler, ever interfered with private individuals in their task of collecting the hadeeses; and the mere assertion of Quastalany cannot, therefore, be accepted as an historical fact. We challenge all those persons who maintain that "the Caliph Omar II. issued circular orders for the formal collection of all extant hadeeses" to point out even a single one of those many now existing works upon hadeeses which had been compiled by order of any of the Caliphs, or of other rulers; and we do this the more confidently, since it is undeniable that, so far to the contrary, every one of them, without exception, was compiled by holy persons who were exceedingly averse even to appear at the Court of the Caliphs of their own time; and the latter were, in reality, emperors, and not the successors of the Prophet, for his successorship terminated thirty years after his death.

Sir Wm. Muir, quotes, in a note, the weakest and most un-

authentic traditions from Wackedee, the last of which is that Omar (the successor of Abu Bacr), intended to write down the Sunnat, and prayed to the Lord regarding it, for a month, when, at last, he was ready to commence the work, he desisted, saying, "I remember a people who recorded a writing similar thereunto, and then followed after it, leaving the book of the Lord."

These traditions, we have repeatedly said, are no more entitled to credit than is public gossip.

After enumerating the causes of the difference existing between traditions; namely, the common weakness of man's memory, the errors and exaggerations, the prejudice and bias, as well as the spirit of party and of faction that crept into Islam after the death of Osman, Sir Wm. Muir says that during this century the main fabric of tradition grew up and assumed permanent shape. Towards the close the extant traditions began to be systematically sought out and publicly put upon record. The type then moulded could not but be maintained, in its chief features, at least, ever after."

We have nothing here to observe upon the causes of the difference among traditions, having already fully explained them elsewhere. But we may express our great surprise at finding that, although Sir Wm. Muir believes that nearly all the extant traditions of the Mohammedans are mere fabrications, yet, nevertheless, he has based all his remarks upon the traditions of Wakedee, who has, as before mentioned, recorded none but the weakest of them; and freely uses them against us at his good pleasure; whereas, according to the received canons of criticism and of unprejudiced authorship, as well as agreeably to his own convictions, he ought to have first investigated and discriminated genuine traditions from fabricated ones. It is the want of this last requisite that characterizes the works of all Christian writers upon Islam, who, nevertheless, have an excellent digestion for their own prodigies, and it is this defect that we have so repeatedly animadverted upon in our Essays.

But if Sir Wm. Muir be merely desirous of revealing to the public the higgledy-piggledy condition, the unauthenticity and the spuriousness, of Mohammedan traditions, our religion, in that case also, is not in the least affected or disparaged. The Mohammedans did not allow this matter to remain in silence, for we find that works have been written with the sole intention of discriminating false hadeeses from genuine ones, that laws and regulations and strict tests have been made for ascertaining their merits, genuineness, and authenticity; that the fabricators of false hadeeses had been reprobated as sinners, while every other possible means had been employed for this purpose. We cannot refrain from remarking that matters are worse in Judaism, and still more so in Christianity. In the latter, apocryphal books, and codices without number, swelled the bulk of religious books that were daily used in every church, and which were such ripe causes of angry disputes among the faithful, that, upon Constantine the Great embracing Christianity, one of the objects for which he summoned the Council of Nice (Nicea), A.D. 320, was to ascertain which Gospels were genuine and which spurious.[1]

[1] The first Christians were reproached with having forged several acrostic verses upon the name of Jesus Christ, which they attributed to an ancient Sybil. They were also accused with having forged letters purporting to be from Jesus Christ to the King of Edessa, at the time no such king was in existence; those of Mary; others from Seneca to Paul; letters and acts of Pilate; false gospels, false miracles, and a thousand other impostures, so that the number of books of this description, in the first two or three centuries after Christ, was enormous.

The great question which agitated the Christian Church, touching the divinity of Christ, was settled by the Council of Nicea, convoked by the Roman Emperor, Constantine, in 325 after Christ. The fact of Christ's divinity was denied and disputed at this Council by not less than eighteen bishops and 2,000 inferior clergy; but, after many angry discussions and disputes, Jesus was declared to be the only son of God, begotten by God the Father. Arius, one of the eighteen dissenting bishops, headed the Unitarian party, namely, those who denied Christ's divinity, and being, on that account, considered as heterodox, he was sent into exile, but was, soon after, recalled to Constantinople, and having succeeded in making his doctrines paramount, they became established throughout all the Roman Provinces, notwithstanding the efforts of his determined and constant opponent, Athanasius, who headed the Trinitarian party. It is recorded in the supplement of the pro-

After having mentioned the baneful influences that were at work under the intolerant reign of Almamoon, and after stating that "the general collection of traditions was effected under similar influences," Sir Wm. Muir says "the prodigious amount of base and fictitious material may be gathered from the estimate even of Mohammedan criticism. Upon this topic the opinion of Dr. Weil may be received with confidence and approbation. 'Reliance,' he writes, 'upon oral traditions, at a time when they were transmitted by memory alone, and every day produced new divisions among the professors of Islam, opened up a wide field for fabrication and distortion. There was nothing easier, when required to defend any religious or political system, than to appeal to an oral tradition of the Prophet. The nature of these so-called traditions, and the manner in which the name of Mohammed was abused to support all possible lies and absurdities, may be gathered most clearly from the fact that Bokhari, who travelled from land to land, to gather from the learned the traditions they had received, came to the conclusion, after many years' sifting, that, out of 600,000 traditions ascertained by him to be then current, only 4,000 were authentic. And out of this selected number the European critic is compelled, without hesitation, to reject, at least,

ceedings of the same Council of Nicea, that the Fathers of the Church, being considerably embarrassed to know which were the genuine and which the non-genuine books of the Old and New Testament, placed them altogether indiscriminately upon an altar, when, those to be rejected are said to have fallen upon the ground!!

The second Council was held at Constantinople in 381 A.D., in which was explained whatever the Council of Nicea had left undetermined with regard to the Holy Ghost, and it was upon this occasion that there was introduced the Formula, declaring that the Holy Ghost is truly the Lord proceeding from the Father, and is added to and glorified together with the Father and the Son. It was not till the ninth century that the Latin Church gradually established the dogma that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. In 431 the third General Council assembled at Ephesus, decided that Mary was truly the mother of God, so that Jesus had two natures and one person. In the ninth century occurred the great schism between the Latin and Greek Churches, after which not less than twenty-nine sanguinary schismatic contests took place at Rome for the possession of the Papal Chair.—VOLTAIRE.

one half.' Similar appears to have been the experience of the other intelligent compilers of the day. Thus Abu Daud, out of 500,000 traditions which he is said to have amassed, threw aside 496,000 and retained as trustworthy only 4,000."

We perfectly agree here with the opinion, both of Dr. Weil and Sir Wm. Muir, but, at the same time, we regret to say that, instead of acting in accordance with the remark of Dr. Weil—"that the European critic is compelled to reject, without hesitation, at least, one half of the number (4,000)," selected by Bokharee, the so-called European critics, not being content even with the 4,000 of Bokharee, descend to base the truth of their work upon such as those of Wakedee, Hishamee, the Moulood Namah, the Meraj Namah, and others that contain nothing but puerile absurdities, rejected even by Mohammedans themselves.

Sir Wm. Muir is perfectly right in stating that "the collectors, though unsparing in the rejection of untrustworthy traditions, did not discriminate those that were trustworthy by any intelligent canon," but he should have borne in mind, as we have above stated, that was not the time for the collectors to discriminate the trustworthy from the untrustworthy traditions by any intelligent canon, and that they left this task to their posterity.

Sir Wm. Muir says that "it was not the *subject matter* of a tradition, but simply the *names* attached thereto that decided the question of credit. If these were unimpeachable, the tradition must be received. No inherent improbability, however glaring, could exclude a narration, thus attested, from its place in the authentic collections."

Sir Wm. Muir is mistaken in his conclusion. It was not the business of the collectors to criticise the subject matter of any hadeeses, and the very appellation given them corroborates our assertion. Their task was to *collect* hadeeses, and they did collect all those whose narrators were honest and trustworthy persons, and left the criticism of the *subject matter* to the readers.

In his course of description, Sir Wm. Muir acknowledges the honesty of the narrators, but maintains that, nevertheless, fabricated traditions are mixed up with the trustworthy ones, and, in order to discriminate between the genuine and the apocryphal traditions, he states that "the points on which the probability of a tradition will mainly depend, appear to be, whether there existed a bias among the Mohammedans generally, respecting the subject narrated; *second*, whether there are traces of any special interest, prejudice, or design on the part of the narrators; and, *third*, whether the narrator had opportunity for personally knowing the facts."

We have no hesitation in accepting the last two of the three rules fixed by Sir Wm. Muir, for they are two of the so many rules we have mentioned above. It is the first rule that perplexes us, and which we demur to accepting at all as a rule for investigating whether such and such a hadees is genuine or false, and in either case how much truth or falsehood it contains.

In this our perplexity we, of course, immediately referred to the explanation thereof, which we found to be altogether at variance with what we had expected, in consequence of which we shall now proceed to consider it.

To discuss the above topic efficiently, Sir Wm. Muir considers the narrative from two points of view—period and subject. The period he divides into several portions, the first being "up to entrance of Mahomet on public life." "For the account of this period of the Prophet's life," he says, "the witnesses are either younger than he, or of equal age, and therefore they are not trustworthy witnesses, for events preceding Mahomet's birth, or for the details of his childhood, few of them even for the incidents of his youth."

To all appearance the statement seems to be correct, but a fallacy lurks in the circumstance that, in the first place, he has taken for granted that "the era of the first propagation of tradition was subsequent to the Prophet's decease," whereas there

exist the strongest possible reasons warranting the belief that the custom of narrating traditions commenced during the Prophet's lifetime; and, secondly, that he assumes it as a fact that all the companions, even those also who perished during Mohammed's lifetime, were either younger than he, or of the same age; whereas it is an established historical fact that many of the Prophet's associates were much older than he, or, at least, sufficiently older to have been the eye-witnesses of the events immediately preceding Mohammed's birth, as well of his childhood and his youth, and correctly to remember and faithfully to transmit them to others; and it is the deposition of such witnesses that is accepted by us as authentic and trustworthy.

Besides all this, to rest the investigation of the truth of any circumstance entirely upon the existence of eye-witnesses is tantamount to acting contrary to the established laws of evidence, which are acknowledged throughout the whole civilized world. In addition to eye-witnessses there are several other circumstances which apply in a manner equally forcible, at least to establish the truth or the fallacy of any event, the difference being that an event declared to be correct by an eye-witness is accepted without the least hesitation, while, in the second case, the amount of opinions in its favour preponderates. Therefore, in ascertaining the truth of the events of any period of our Prophet's life, we cannot do more than what we should do in ascertaining the truth of the deposition of witnesses, according to the received laws of evidence which are derived from the intellectual faculties of man, irrespective of any religion.

Sir Wm. Muir states that "if the attention was not specially attracted by the event, it would be in vain to expect a full and careful report; and, after the lapse of many years, the utmost that could be looked for from such a witness, would be the bare general outline of important facts." This principle he applies "forcibly to the biography of Mahomet, up to the time when he became the prominent leader of a party." He extends this

remark "to the entire interval preceding the period when he stood forth *publicly* to assume the prophetic rank, opposed polytheism, and came into open collision with the chiefs of Mecca;" and insinuates thereby that a full and correct account of our Prophet's life, prior to his assuming a public character, is impossible.

We would have, unhesitatingly, welcomed this gratuitous principle, the bantling of Sir Wm. Muir's ingenuity, were we not at a loss what to make out of the circumstances attending the lives of Moses and Jesus, before their assuming a public character.

Leaving entirely aside the question that we are acting not only in accordance with the principles of the Christian and Jewish faith, but according to our own religion also, we are more interested in the private lives of Moses and Jesus than in that of Mohammed, because in the life of the latter we do not find any circumstance whose truth entirely depends upon the authenticity of any event in his private life. Such, however, is not the case with Jesus and Moses. The truth of the whole public lives of both these prophets entirely depends upon the authenticity of their private lives. How are we to know of a certainty that the obscure babe, whom the daughter of Pharoah discovered floating in an "ark," on the river Nile, was identical with the legitimate child of Levi, with the individual whom the world calls Moses? Again, how are we to know of a certainty that the child called by us "the Word of God," "the Spirit of God," the child who was born without having any father, was identical with the Jesus Christ of this world? These two points are of as private a nature, and as difficult, nay, we may say, as impossible to be proved true, as anything in the world can be. Were we to accept as correct the above mentioned principle of Sir Wm. Muir, we fear that it might prove fatal to our religion; and therefore, horror stricken at the very idea, we can never be expected to acquiesce in so damaging a principle.

We are not satisfied with the mere assertion that Sir Wm.

Muir's principle is incorrect, but we shall go further and discover the fallacy which perplexes us in accepting as authentic the account of the private lives of Mohammed, Jesus Christ, and Moses.

The fallacy consists in the too vaguely expressed phrase, "After the lapse of many years," which expression is against the acknowledged laws of evidence. Properly speaking, it would have been correct to have said, *after the lapse of such a period as to render impossible the probability of a legitimate investigation, and the authenticity of the result.* But such a period did not lapse to the private life of Mohammed. There were still alive some persons who had witnessed his birth, his infancy, his childhood, and his youth, and although "their memory and imagination" were not "busy in particularly noting the events of his life," still it is not a legitimate conclusion that they forgot all whereto they had been eye-witnesses. When "a poor orphan, a quite inoffensive citizen," an individual "who was, perhaps, of all the inhabitants of Mecca, the least likely to have the eyes of his neighbours turned upon him,"—when such an obscure person, we repeat, assumes a public character, the most important of its kind, and the most offensive to his family, to his neighbours, and to his fellow countrymen in general, it is natural enough to conclude that every individual around him would, most likely, narrowly criticise his private life and actions, and would compare every circumstance of his private life with the corresponding facts which happened before all of them, and whereto they were, all of them, eye-witnesses.

Sir Wm. Muir proceeds to state that "it follows necessarily that, in all cases affected by either of the foregoing rules, circumstantiality will be a strong token of fabrication. And we shall do well to adopt the analogous canon of Christian criticism, that any tradition, the origin of which is not actually contemporary with the facts related, is *worthless exactly in proportion to the particularity of detail.* This will relieve us of a vast

number of extravagant stories, in which the minutiæ of close narrative and sustained colloquy are preserved with the pseudo-freshness of yesterday."

When we have proved that "the foregoing rules" of Sir Wm. Muir are entirely wrong, according to the acknowledged principles of evidence, then it must follow that the conclusion deduced by him, that "circumstantiality will be a strong token of fabrication," is also incorrect, and does not properly apply to the private life of Mohammed. His assertion "that any tradition, the origin of which is not strictly contemporary with the facts related, is worthless exactly in proportion to the particularity of detail," is also contrary to the law of evidence. It would be more correct to say that "a tradition," the *narrator* of which, and not the *origin* of which, "is not strictly contemporary with the facts related, is worthless, exactly in proportion to the particularity of detail. The conclusion at which Sir Wm. Muir arrives by applying "the canon of Christian criticism" to Mohammedan traditions is, that he is relieved of "a vast number of extravagant stories in which the minutiæ of close narrative and sustained colloquy are preserved with the pseudo-freshness of yesterday." But we are very sorry, indeed, to have to state that he is also mistaken in this his conclusion, which is likewise entirely contrary to the accepted laws of evidence. Whenever any tradition is narrated, in which all minutiæ "are preserved with the pseudo-freshness of yesterday," and which the spirit of the times and circumstances declare to be impossible, the suspicion which it excites on this account is respecting the character of the *narrator*, and not regarding the *subject matter* of the tradition, and, therefore, it follows that when the character of the narrator is proved, by the critical rules of the collectors of the traditions to be, in every way, unimpeachable, then, of course, there remains not the least hesitation in accepting as true the subject matter also.

Sir Wm. Muir now enters upon and considers the second

period, or that "marked section of time which intervenes between Mahomet's entrance on public life and the taking of Mecca." The pith and purport of all his remarks are that we cannot accept as true the traditions that contain the "misrepresented actions," the "unfounded accusations," and the exaggerated charges imputed to the enemies of Mohammed, because all the unbelievers, either the inhabitants of Mecca or those of Medina, having become Moslems, and all the Jews, Christians, and Pagans having been extirpated, there remained no one to impugn the "one-sided assertion;" and also because as Mohammed himself cursed the infidels, what Mohammedan would dare be their advocate? and, consequently, they, the infidels, were "held in abhorrence by the traditionists," and the historians ever kept "a jealous eye on the character of the testimony against them." Without either entering into detail, or observing that the same remark holds good with respect to other prophets and their followers, we submit it to the impartial judgment of our readers, asking them whether it be at all possible that all the traces of virtue, honesty, and truth—those precious endowments of nature, which constitute the essence of the moral faculties of man—were entirely blotted out of the breast of millions of rational beings, and that all of them, with one heart and voice, degraded themselves by descending to commit the basest of actions—the uttering of a falsehood, and to the misrepresenting of facts which had taken place before all of them, and whereunto they had all been eye-witnesses. The very fact that the eye-witnesses of all those circumstances amounted to millions of millions, establishes the impossibility of the misrepresentation of those very facts.

When considering the "personal bias," Sir Wm. Muir states that "the ambition of the narrator to be associated with Mahomet," for his name "threw around nobility and veneration," and his friendship imparted a rank and a dignity," that the ambition "of being closely connected with any of the supposed

mysterious visitations or supernatural actions of Mahomet," for, "to be noticed in the Revelation was deemed the highest honour that could be aspired to," put a premium upon "the invention or exaggeration of superhuman incidents," and caused "exaggeration, false colouring, and even invention (of traditions)."

When an author, by such bias, prepossession, and prejudice, becomes utterly partial, then, of course, there is no help for it. How is it possible to conceive that the early converts to any religion whatsoever, whose belief in their religion is sincere, who, in the innermost recesses of their hearts believe that to follow the example of their prophet is the surest and safest path to salvation, and that to disobey his commands and injunctions is to incur eternal damnation;—how is it possible, we would ask, that all such pious and virtuous persons should have, all at once, become deaf to the mandates of their prophet, as well as blind to the written injunctions and precepts of their Sacred Book, and should have indulged in lying, fraud, hypocrisy—in short, in vices and crimes of every description? Take, by way of example, any religion whatsoever, Hindooism, Buddhism, Paganism, Judaism, Christianity with its thousand sects, Catholics, Protestants, Unitarians, Trinitarians, Wesleyans, Baptists, Jumpers, Mormons, etc., etc., and you will find in the early converts to each and every of them a spirit of virtue, truth, honesty, and sincerity, of zeal, implicit belief, and self-devotion, as well as a fear and horror at the very idea even of setting at nought the commands of their prophet and the laws of their religion. It will suffice to quote but one of thousands of instances that might be adduced to corroborate the truth of our assertion, and it is this: Zyed Ibni Sabit, when required by Abu Bukr to collect the *disjecta membra* of the Koran into one volume, remained horror stricken for a while, and then, with mingled emotions of fear, anger, and impatience, asked the latter how he dared to command that to be done which had not been

done in the presence of the Prophet himself? How is it conceivable that these men who so much feared and reverenced their Prophet, who knew nothing but truth and truth alone, should have immediately debased themselves by indulging in vices and perpetrating crimes of the blackest dye?

In the same spirit he goes on to state that, "we have unquestionable evidence that the bias of party effected a deep and abiding impress upon tradition." Among many other causes of the circulation of spurious traditions, he cites "national bias common to the whole of Islam, and therefore, the most fatal;" "tendency to exalt Mahomet and ascribe to him supernatural attributes." He believes that all such puerile nonsense originated with Mohammed, for he has no "*doubt*" that "real facts have not seldom been thus adorned or distorted by the colouring of a superstitious fancy." He further adds that, "to the same universal desire of Mahomet's glorification must be ascribed the unquestioned miracles with which even the earliest biographies abound." The next victims which fall under Sir Wm. Muir's unsparing indignation are the "supposed anticipations of Mahomet (and of Islam) by Jewish and Christian priests." The genealogy of Mohammed he declares to be fabricated, and, therefore, spurious. "The desire," he says, "to regard, and, possibly, the endeavour to prove the prophet of Islam a descendant of Ishmael, began even in his (Mohammed's) life-time." Again he observes that "the converse principle is likewise true; that is to say, traditions founded upon good evidence and undisputed, because notorious in the first days of Islam, generally fell into disrepute, or were entirely rejected, because they appeared to dishonour Mahomet, or countenance some heretical opinions. The nature of the case renders it impossible to prove this position so fully as the preceding ones, since we can now have no trace of such traditions as were early dropped." The above summary of a long and tedious account manifestly prôves that the latter is the composition of one who professes a hostile religion, and that

it is written in a strain suitable to, and consistent with, a prejudiced antagonist, who is generally not over scrupulous, either in his assertions, or his language, or in his respect for legitimate inquiry, and who looks down, with sovereign contempt and groundless suspicion, upon what regards every other religion than his own, but more especially that one from which his own faith may have, in any way, suffered. Were we required to point out a parallel to this uncalled for and intemperate assertion, we would name the violent and blasphemous expressions adopted by the Jews when speaking of Jesus Christ and His religion. Sir Wm. Muir states that "traditions founded upon *good evidence* and *undisputed*, because notorious in the first days of Islam, *generally fell into* disrepute or were entirely rejected, because they appeared to dishonour Mahomet or countenance some heretical opinions." Strange to say, however, that, for what he himself asserts so confidently and dogmatically, and in the clearest and broadest language possible, as if, indeed, it were an established historical fact that admitted of no doubt, he adduces no authority, but, with the utmost self-satisfaction, disposes of the case at once by merely stating that "the nature of the case renders it *impossible* to prove this position . . . . since we can now have no trace of such traditions as were early dropped." Such is the influence and such the effect of bigotry and prejudice! That differences did occur in Mohammedan traditions we readily admit, but we confidently and emphatically deny that they are attributable to the discreditable causes assigned by Sir Wm. Muir, since they solely originated in those which we have mentioned above.

We are not a little shocked and pained to find Christian writers not only falsely and unjustly bringing in grave and heavy charges against Mohammed, but also exulting when they flatter themselves, but without reason, at having discovered a blur on the fair reputation of our prophet. The notion appears to have originated with A. Sprenger, M.D., who discussed the

subject in an article in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and, again, in his biography of Mohammed. Our high respect for the character and attainments of Sir Wm. Muir, as well as a knowledge of his profound acquaintance with Oriental literature, had led us to indulge a sincere hope that he would expose, as they deserve, the one-sided assertions and imputations of Dr. Sprenger, and, by a calm and deliberate investigation, and an impartial judgment, vindicate the integrity of the Prophet of Arabia. But alas! how fallacious was that hope!

Dr. Sprenger, after quoting the chapter of the Koran, entitled "the Star," states "that Mohammed highly praised and 'acknowledged' the idols and gods of the Koreishites, and that when he prostrated himself, the latter also joined with him in doing the same. He rests the truth and authenticity of the whole story on the authority of the author of Mawahib Alladoniyah.

Sir Wm. Muir dwells upon the subject thus: "There is, apparently, a well supported story which attributes to Mohammed a momentary lapse and compromise with the idolators of Mecca." He bases the authenticity of his remark upon the account given by Wackedee, Tebari, and, more especially, upon "an interesting passage in elucidation of the authenticity of the story," given by the author of Mawahib Alladoniyah, who "traces the objections and doubts to the fear of heresy and injury to Islam."

As all the different traditions and opinions of learned Mohammedans on this point are quoted by the author of Mawahib Allodoniyah in his work, we think it sufficient to cite the passage of the last mentioned author, giving, at the same time, a thorough explanation of it; and to render this the more easy, we shall divide the passage into sections. The passage runs thus:—

First: "Those persons who had taken refuge in Abyssinia, hastened from that place to Mecca, and arrived there at the time when the Prophet recited (in his prayer) the chapter of the Koran,

entitled '*the Star.*' In his recitation of the same passage, when he came to the words, '*Do you see Allat and Alozza and Manah, the third idol of yours?*' Satan added: '*They were the sublime Gharaneek* (*idols*) *and their intercession will be of use to you.*' When the Prophet finished reciting the whole chapter he prostrated himself, and the idolators did the same along with him, being under the delusion that the Prophet had spoken well of their Gods. Satan spread this news rapidly among the people, so much so that it reached Osman-ibni-Mazoon and his friends, and other Mohammedans who were in Abyssinia. They said one to another that the Meccans had become Mussulmans, and had performed prayers along with the Prophet, and that Islam had now become secure in Mecca; they, thereupon, returned from Abyssinia very soon.

و قدم نفر من مها جرة الحبشة حين قراء عليه السلام و النجم اذا هوي حتي بلغ افرئيتم اللات و العزي و منات الثالثة الاخري القي الشيطان في منيته اي في تلاوته تلك الغرانيق العلي و ان شفا عتهن لترجي فلما ختم السورة سجد صلي الله عليه وسلم و سجد معه المشركون لتو همهم انه ذكر آلهتهم بخير و فشي ذلك بالناس و اظهره الشيطان حتي بلغ ارض الحبشة و من بها من المسلمين عثمان ابن مظعون و اصحابه و تحد ثوا ان اهل مكة قداسلموا كلهم و صلوا معه صلي الله عليه وسلم و قدامن المسلمون بمكة فاقبلوا سراعًا من الحبشة

Second: "When the idolators recovered from their delusion, and found that Mohammed did not utter what they had imagined, they grew hostile to him more than ever.

و لماتبين للمشركين عدم ذلك رجعوا الي اشدما كانوا عليه

Third: "Kadi-Ayaz dwells upon this story in his work called

'Shefa,' and has fully and satisfactorily proved its spuriousness and unauthenticity, but the doubt that has been entertained respecting it will be shown hereafter.

و قد تكلم القاضي عياض رضه في الشفاء علي هذه القصة و توهين اصلها بمايشفي و يكفي لكن تعقب في بعضه كما سياتي

Fourth: "The following is a summary, in a few words, of what Imam Fakhroddeen Razee mentions in his commentary: '*This story is false and apocryphal, and its circulation is unlawful. God says that the Prophet does not speak any thing of his own accord, but what God reveals unto him, and God has likewise said that whatever has been or will be revealed unto him he shall never forget.*

و قال الامام فخرالدين الرازي مما لخصته من تفسيره هذه القصة باطلة و موضوعة لايجوز القول بها قال الله تعالي و ماينطق عن الهوي ان هو الا وحي يوحي و قال تعالي سنقرئك فلا تنسي

Fifth: "'*Baihaki denies the circumstance of this story being a tradition at all, and says that its narrators are all individuals of suspected and impeached character.*

و قال البيهقي هذه غير ثابتة من جهة النقل ثم اخذ يتكلم في ان رواة هذه القصة مطعونون

Sixth: "'*Bokharee gives, in his work, a tradition that the Prophet, after having recited the chapter entitled "the Star," prostrated himself, and was followed in doing the same by all the Mohammedans and idolators and other men and Genii, and in that tradition no mention is made respecting the Gharaneek (idols); several other traditionists have related the same, but none of them have ever mentioned any thing about the Gharaneek.*

و ايضا فقد روي البخاري في صحيحه انه عليه السلام قراء سورة النجم و سجد معه المسلمون و المشركون و الانس و الجن و ليس فيه حديث الغرانيق بل روي هذا الحديث من طرق كثيرة و ليس فيها البتة حديث الغرانيق

Seventh: "'*There is not the least doubt that he is an infidel who mentions that the Prophet showed respect to the idols, for it is an established fact that the chief and main desire of the Prophet was the abolition of idolatry, and were we to allow it as true, then, verily, adieu to implicit belief in his law, for the same suspicion and doubt are sure to take hold of our mind respecting the other orders and commandments, and the following command of God:—"O Prophet! convey to the people what God hath revealed to you, and in case of not performing the same, verily, you will fail to perform your mission"—will be contradicted, for the curtailment of any Revelation is just like to its interpolation. These considerations, and the like, lead us to conclude that the story is a fabricated one, and, indeed, it has been alleged that it (the story) has been coined by some of the infidels, and has no foundation.*" Here ends the summary of Imam Ghezelee's remarks.

و لاشك ان من جوز علي الرسول تعظيم الا و ثان فقد كفرلان من المعلوم بالضرورة ان اعظم سعيه كان في نفي الا و ثان ولو جوزنا ذلك ارتفع الا مان عن شرعه و جوزنا في كل و احد من الا حكام و الشرايع ان يكون كذلك و يبطل قوله تعالي يا ايها الرسول بلغ ما انزل اليك من ربك و ان لم تفعل فما بلغت رسالته فانه لافرق في الفعل بين النقصان في الوحي و الزيادة فيه فبهذه الوجوه عرفنا علي سبيل الاجمال ان هذه القصة موضوعة و قدقيل ان هذه القصة من وضع الزنادقة لا اصل لها انتهي

Eighth: "But it is not so," says the author of Mawahib, "it has, indeed, a foundation. Ibn-i-Abu Hatim, Tebree, and Ibnol Monzeer have related it in a different way from Shoba, and Shoba from Abi-bashr, and Abi-bashr from Said Ibni-Jobair. It has likewise been mentioned by Ibni Mardooyah, Bazzar, as well as by Ibni Ishak in his work called "Seerut," and by Mosa bine Ukbah, in his work entitled "Maghazee," and by Abu Mashir, in his book called "Seerut." All the above have been mentioned by Hafiz Imadoddeen-ibni-Kaseer and others.

و ليس كذلك بل لها اصل فقد خرجها ابن ابي حاتم و الطبري و و ابن المنذر من طرق عن شعبة عن ابي بشر عن سعيد ابن جبير و كذا ابن مردويه و البزار و ابن اسحاق في السيرة و موسي ابن عقبة في المغازي و ابو معشرٍ في السيرة كما بيَّنه عليه الحافظ عمادالدين ابن كثير و غيره

Ninth: "Hafiz Imadoddeen, however, also remarks that the chain of the narrators of all traditions respecting it is broken, and some of the links are wanting, and that they have no trustworthy authority. Our doubts (says the author of the Mawahib) respecting the above remark will be explained hereafter.

لكن قال ان طرقها كلها مرسلة و انه لم يرها مسندة من و جهٍ صحيح و هذا متعقب بما سيا تي

Tenth: "Shaikhol Islam, and Hafiz Abul Fazal Askalanee, also affirm the authenticity of the above traditions; the latter remarks that Ibni Abu Hatim and Tebree have narrated it from Ibni Munzir, and he from Shoba, who related it from Abu Bushr, and he again from Saeed Ibni Jobair, who said the Prophet recited at Mecca the chapter entitled 'the Star,' and when he came to the words, '*Do you see Allat and Alozza and Manah, the third idol of yours?*' Satan made flow from his tongue the words: '*They are sublime Gharaneek* (*idols*), *and their interces-*

sion will be of use to you.' The idolators thereat remarked that the Prophet had never, except on this occasion, spoken well of their gods. The Prophet afterwards prostrated himself, and they did the same along with him. On this occasion was the following verse sent down to Mohammed from on high:—'*We have sent many prophets and apostles before thee, but none of them could escape and avoid the temptations of Satan.*' (Our readers, we hope, will keep in mind that the tradition describes the events that happened at Mecca while the above passage was revealed at Medina, which proves the tradition to be spurious.)

وكذا نبه علي ثبوت اصلها شيخ الاسلام و الحافظ ابوالفصل العسقلاني فقال اخرج ابن ابي حاتم و الطبري و ابن المنذر من طرق عن شعبة عن ابي بشر عن سعيد بن جبير قال قراء رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم بمكة و النجم فلما بلغ افرأيتم اللات و العزي و مناة الثالثة الاخري القي الشيطان علي لسانه تلك الغرانيق العلا و ان شفا عتهن لترتجي فقال المشركون ما ذكر آلهتنا بخير قبل اليوم فسجد و سجدوا فنزلت هذه الاية و ما ارسلنا من قبلك من رسول و لا نبي الا اذا تمني القي الشيطان في امنيته الايه

Eleventh: "Bazzar and Ibni Mardooyah have narrated this tradition from Omayah Ibni Khalid, who related it from Shoba, who, before narrating the tradition, remarked, on account of his uncertainty, that he thought it had been related from Saeed Ibni Jobair, who related it from Ibni Abbas; Bazzar also states that none but Omayah Ibni Khalid (who is an eminent man and of reputed character) has been able to trace the tradition up to the companions of the Prophet. (Our readers, however, will remember that he also has not traced the tradition successfully, because he was not certain respecting the individual from whom he narrated it.)

و اخرجه البزار و ابن مردويه من طريق امية بن خالد عن شعبة فقال في اسناده عن سعيد ابن جبير عن ابن عباس فيما احسب ثم ساق الحديث و قال البزار لايروي متصلا الا بهذ الا سناد تفرد بوصله امية بن خالد و هوثقة مشهور

Twelfth: "Bazzar likewise states that this very tradition has also been related by Kalbee from Abu Saleh, who related it from Ibni Abbas. Kalbee's traditions (says the author of the "Mawahib") have been rejected, for he is a person of suspected veracity and of impeached character.

و قال انما يروي هذا من طريق الكلبي عن ابي صالح عن ابن عباس انتهي و الكلبي متروك لايعتمد عليه

Thirteenth: "The same tradition has been narrated by Nahhas, but on different authorities, of whom Wackedee is one. Ibni Ishak dwells upon this topic at considerable length, in his work called 'Seerut,' on the authority of Mohammed Ibni Kaab. It has also been mentioned by Ibni Ukbah, in his work entitled 'Maghazee,' on the authority of Ibni Shahab and Zohree. Abu Mashur has given it in his book called 'Seerut,' on the authorities of Mohammed Ibni Kaabi Kirzee, of Mohammed Ibni Kais, and of Tebree. It has also been stated by Ibni Abee Hatim, on the authority of Asbat, who related it from Sodee. Ibni Mardooyah also mentions it on the authority of Abbad Ibni Sohaib, who related it from Yahyah Ibni Kaseer, who again narrated it from Kalbee, who narrated it from Abee Salih, and he from Abee Bukr Hazalee, and Ayoob, who related it from Akramah and Solaiman Taime, and the last three from Abbas. Tebree also gives it on the authority of Aufee, who narrated it from Ibni Abbas; the subject matter and sense of all what these persons related being much the same. All these traditions, except the one narrated by Saeed Ibni Jobair, are either weak

in themselves or the chain of their narrators is broken. But the fact that so many traditions bear testimony to one and the same event, leads to the conclusion that there must have been some materials to form the basis for the grand superstructure. (Our readers, perhaps, remember that, in the Eleventh Section, Saeed Ibni Jobair's authority has also been proved insufficient and void.)

و كذا اخرجه النحاس بسند اخرفيه الوا قدي و ذكرها ابن اسحٰق في السيرة مطولا و اسندها عن محمد ابن كعب و كذلك ابن عقبة في المغازي عن ابن شهاب عن الزهري و كذا ابو معشر في السيرة له عن محمد ابن كعب القرظي و محمد بن قيس و اورده من طريقه الطبري و اورد ابن ابي حاتم من طريق اسباط عن السدي و رواه ابن مردويه من طريق عباد ابن صهيب عن يحيي ابن كثير عن الكلبي عن ابي صالح و عن ابي بكر الهذلي و ايوب عن عكرمة و سليمان التيمي عن من حدثه ثلاثتهم عن ابن عباس و اوردها الطبري من طريق العوفي عن ابن عباس و معناهم كلهم في ذلك و احد و كلها سوي طريق سعيد بن جبير اما ضعيف و اما منقطع لكن كثرة الطرق تدل علي ان للقصة اصلا

Fourteenth: "There are two other authentic traditions respecting the same circumstance, although their narrators have not been successfully traced up to the companions of the Prophet. One of them has been related by Tebree, on the authority of Unis Ibni Yazeed, who heard it from Ibni Shahab, who was told by Abu Bukr, son of Abdorrahman, son of Harth, son of Hisham. The other has been narrated by the same author, on the authority of Motamar, son of Solaiman and of Hammad, son of Salmah, both of whom related it from Daöd, son of Abee Hind, who related it from Aliyah. (Our readers will

remember that as the chain of authorities is not complete, the tradition is worthless.)

مع ان لها طريقين اخرين مرسلين رجالهما علي شرط الصحيح احد هما ما اخرجه الطبري من طريق يونس ابن يزيد عن ابن شهاب حدثني ابو بكر ابن عبدالرحمن بن الحرث عن ابن هشام فذكر نحوه و و الثاني ما اخرجه ايضا من طريق المعتمر ابن سليمان و حماد ابن سلمة كلاهما عن داود ابن ابي هند عن العالية

Fifteenth: "Hafiz Ibni Hajar mentions that '*Ibni Arabee, according to his wont, declared that Tebree mentioned many traditions which were totally unsupported and utterly worthless, but that this remark was incorrect.*' The same personage (Hafiz Ibni Hajar) declares to be incorrect the remark of Kadee Ayaz, '*that the authorities for the tradition are not trustworthy, and the chain of its narrators is incomplete, and that the latter are of weak authority, uncertain as to facts, contradictory in their remarks, and that links are wanting to make the chain of narration complete.*' He also pronounces as incorrect Kadee Ayaz's conclusion, that none of the persons who suppose the tradition to have originated *with the successors of the companions of the Prophet, or with any of the commentators, have endorsed any authority thereunto, nor have they traced any one of them up to its originator, and that the channels through which the traditions have been derived are foul and polluted ones.*

قال الحافظ ابن حجر و قد تجراء ابن العربي كعادته فقال ذكر الطبري في ذلك رواياتٍ كثيرةً لا اصل لها و هو اطلاق مردود عليه و كذا قول القاضي عياض هذا الحديث لم يخرّجه اهل الصحة و لا رواه ثقة بسند سليم متصل مع ضعف نقلته و اضطراب رواياته و انقطاع اسنانيده و كذا

قوله و من حكيت عنه هذه القصة من التابعين و المفسرين لم يسندها احد منهم و لا رفعها الي صاحب و اكثر الطرق عنهم في ذلك ضعيفة واهية

Sixteenth: "Hafiz Ibni Hajar also states that 'it has been mentioned by Bazzar *that there exists no authority for this tradition worth adducing, except the tradition narrated by Abee Bashar, on the authority of Saeed Ibni Jobair, but even in that the completeness of the chain of its narrators is also doubted. The authority of Kalbee is utterly void and worthless. After this Bazzar proves the spuriousness of the tradition by argument.*[1] *He rejects it on the ground that, had it really happened, a majority of the true believers would have become apostates, which is reported to have never occurred.*' Here ends the remark of Hafiz Ibni Hajar.

قال و قدتبين البزار انه لايعرف من طريق يجوز ذكره الا طريق ابي بشرعن سعيد بن جبيرمع الشك الذي و قع في و صله و اما الكلبي فلايجوز الرواية عنه لقوة ضعفه ثم رده من طريق النظر بان ذلك لو و قع لارتد كثيرممن اسلم قال و لم ينقل ذلك انتهي

Seventeenth: "The above argumentation," says the author of Mowahib, "is not legitimate, for when a circumstance is narrated by a score of authorities of different sources, it is reasonable to conclude that the materials for its foundation must, nevertheless, be something, as I have above remarked: that it possesses three authentic authorities, but the chain of its narrators is incomplete. Those persons who regard a tradition, having an incomplete chain of narrators, as authentic and au-

[1] Our readers will not forget that Sir Wm. Muir has quoted this portion only, leaving out all the preceding remarks which prove the invalidity of the authorities which support the tradition.

thoritative, can very properly maintain this tradition also as such, but those persons also who deny the conclusiveness of such a tradition would be justified in considering this one as an exception to their general canon, for, in this case, authorities are so divided, that each of them tacitly gives material support to the other."

وجميع ذلك لايتمشي علي القواعد فان الطرق اذا كثرت و تباينت مخارجها دل ذلك علي ان لها اصلا و قد ذكرنا ان ثلاثة اسانيد منها علي شرط الصحيح و هي مراسيل يحتج بمثلها من يحتج بالمرسل و كذا من لا يحتج به لاعتضاد بعضها ببعض (مواهب)

Here ends the long account of this tradition, as given by the author of the Mawahib. He is, however, much mistaken in his concluding remarks, for, when none of the narrators of the so many different versions of the same tradition make up a complete chain, how can the tradition be then said to have been derived from various sources? Traditions possessing an incomplete list of their narrators, can be considered as authentic only when they have other proofs to appeal to for establishing their own genuineness; when they are not at variance with the import of other authentic hadeeses as well as with the injunctions and commandments enjoined in the Holy Koran; but when a tradition, such as the one under consideration, manifestly contradicts the commands given in that Sacred Book; when it is wholly inconsistent with the character of the Prophet; when it is not in harmony and concert with the spirit of Islam; how can it, with any regard to justice and reason, be included in the canon given by the author of Mawahib?

Such persons also who are in favour of the tradition, acknowledge and maintain, in the clearest language possible, that it possesses no sufficiently good and reliable authority for its support. On what authority, then, it may be asked, did Sir Wm.

Muir so confidently assert that "there is apparently a *well-supported* story which attributes to Mahomet a momentary lapse and compromise with the idolators of Mecca."

Leaving it for our readers to form their own opinion as to the authenticity of this tradition, we shall now undertake the task of tracing the story to its source, by means of the mass of recondite materials furnished us by the author of the Mawahib Allodonyah in the above quoted passage. We assert that the phrase, "they are sublime Gharaneek (idols), and their intercession will be of use to you," *was never uttered* by the Prophet, for the author himself acknowledges, in the second section, that "when the idolators recovered from their delusion, and found that Mohammed did not utter what they had imagined, they grew hostile to him more than ever."

There was a period in the life of Mohammed when the infidels treated him in the most cruel and brutal manner, annoying and tormenting him in every way their devilish malice could invent; they seized every opportunity of interrupting him in his public preaching, disturbed him when at his prayers, and when he praised the only true God, they lauded the power of their own false ones. It appears that on this occasion the Prophet was performing his prayers in the Kaaba, and the infidels were, perhaps, according to their custom, interrupting him.

When the Prophet recited, as he was wont to do, the chapter of the Koran entitled "the Star," and, in his recital, he came to the phrase, "Do you see Allat and Allozza and Manah, the third idol of yours?" Some one of the infidels, with the intention of praising their idols, added: "They are sublime idols, and their intercession will be of use to you;" and when the Prophet, on finishing the whole chapter, according to custom, prostrated himself, in his prayer, before his God, the infidels, as if in rivalry, prostrated themselves also before their deities. Opinions soon became divided, both among the believers and the infidels, as to who was the person that uttered these words; some thought

them to have been delivered by the infidels, others opined that it was the Prophet who spoke them, and as the repeater of the phrase could not be discovered, the Mussulmans, in derision, called out that it was Satan or the Devil; and thus arose these contradictory opinions. There is not the slightest doubt, however, that the companions of the Prophet never thought that these words were uttered by the Prophet, and, accordingly, no traditions are to be found that may, with propriety, be attributed to the Prophet's companions or their successors.

But after a time some writers gave it a place in their works, notwithstanding which it was proved to be spurious by the learned. They are, therefore, the same spurious traditions which have been mentioned by Tebree, Wackedee, and Ibni Ishak.

The tradition that imputes the uttering of these words to the infidels while Mohammed was praying, obtained strength and credit, and one tradition respecting it is given by the author of Mawahib Allodonyah, as follows: "It is related that when the Prophet, in his citing the chapter, came to the words, "Do you see Allat and Allozza and Manah, the third of your idols?" the infidels thought that the next expression would surely be in dishonour to their gods, and therefore, anticipating his intention, they vociferated, "they are sublime idols, and their intercession will be of use to you," thus making their own words dovetail in with the Prophet's; and as, when the latter was reading the Sacred Book, they would interrupt him, exclaiming, "do not listen to the Koran," and annoy him by "talking nonsense aloud," and it being the Devil who instigated them so to do, the words were therefore attributed to Satan—an appellation employed to qualify those persons who were the source of all the wickedness.

و قيل انه لما و صل الي قوله و مناة الثالثة الاخري خشي المشركون ان يا تي بعد ها بشي يذم آلهتهم به فبادروا الي ذلك الكلام فخلطوه

في تلاوة البني صلعم علي عادتهم في قولهم لا تسمعوا لهذا القران و الغوا فيه و نسب ذلك للشيطان لكونه الحامل لهم علي ذلك اوالمراد بالشيطان شيطان الانس (مواهب)

When enumerating "the considerations which should be regarded as confirming the credit of tradition," Sir Wm. Muir states that "when a tradition contains statements in disparagement of Mahomet, such as an indignity shown to him by his followers, or an insult from his enemies, after his emigration; . . . . his failure in any enterprise or laudable endeavour; or, in fine, any thing at variance, either in fact or doctrine, with the principles and tendencies of Islam, there will be strong reasons for admitting it, because, otherwise, it seems hardly credible that such a tradition could be fabricated, or, having been fabricated, that it could obtain currency among the followers of Mahomet."

This is, indeed, a *unique* "consideration for confirming" the credit of any tradition! Are we to accept as true and authentic all such traditions that have been coined and fabricated by the professors of any religion hostile to Islam, and that have obtained currency among Mohammedan divines, who have quoted them in their works, for no other purpose than that of refuting and proving them to be false and spurious? Such, indeed, has been the case with Jews, but more especially with Christians, who invented many idle stories respecting Mohammed and Islam, merely with the malicious intention of putting the worst construction upon the new religion and the character of its founder.

When enumerating the "examples of capricious fabrication," Sir Wm. Muir states that, "for instance, a score of witnesses affirm that Mahomet dyed his hair; they mention the substance used; some, not only maintain that they were eye-witnesses of the fact during the prophet's life, but produced, after his death, relics of hair on which the dye was visible. A score of others,

possessing equally good means of information, assert that he never dyed his hair, and that, moreover, he had no need to do so, as his grey hairs were so few that they might be counted. Again, with respect to his signet ring, a matter involving no faction, family interest, or dogma, the traditions are most discordant. One party relate that, feeling the want of a seal for his despatches, the Prophet had a signet ring prepared for that purpose, of pure silver. Another party assert that Khalid Ibn Said made for himself an iron ring, plated with silver, and that Mahomet, taking a fancy to the ring, appropriated it to his own use. A third tradition states that the ring was brought by Amr bin Said, from Abyssinia; and a fourth, that Mandz Ibn Jabal had it engraved for himself in Yemen. One set of traditions hold that Mahomet wore this ring on his right hand, another on his left; one, that he wore the seal inside, others, that he wore it outside; one, that the inscription on it was صدق الله, while the rest declare that it was محمد رسول الله. Now, all these traditions refer to one and the same ring, because it is repeatedly added that, after Mahomet's death, it was worn by Abu Bucr, by Omar, and by Othman, and was lost by the latter in the well Aris. There is yet another tradition, that neither the Prophet, nor any of his immediate successors, ever wore a ring at all."

There is no doubt that the grey hairs of the Prophet were very few, so much so that they could be counted, and that he never, in his whole life, dyed his hair. Those persons who were very intimate with him affirm the same. As black hair, before getting grey, generally becomes brownish, those persons who saw these brownish hairs of the Prophet thought that he dyed his hair, and it was the brownish hair that was produced before other persons. No one ever described the substance with which the Prophet dyed his hair. All that the hadees says with regard to it, is that it was the substance which he used to put upon his head when bathing. The traditions given by Sir Wm. Muir

in the note do not appear to contradict each other. By this explanation it is clearly and undeniably established that the different traditions respecting the above circumstances were no designed artful fabrications of any person, but that they were occasioned by natural causes, and by these alone. The same reasoning may be applied to the circumstance of wearing the signet ring: the Prophet had several rings, and how or on what fingers they were placed was a matter of perfect indifference; therefore, in whatever manner he was seen wearing his rings by any person, the latter related it to others. Thus all these traditions are so easily reconcilable with each other, that we can discover no reason for representing them as "discordant traditions." Sir Wm. Muir has, unfortunately, allowed his preconceived and gratuitous impressions so to make him divaricate from the right path of reasoning, that he looks upon everything connected with Islam, however simple and natural that thing may be, with doubt and suspicion, branding it with the name of forgery, invention, fabrication, etc., etc. Sir Wm. Muir's experience, as a literary man of the first class, ought, most assuredly, to have taught him that mere assertions, unsupported by argument and by proofs, ever recoil to the destruction of the very purpose they were intended to subserve. Every well-minded and judicious reader must be pained when he finds Sir Wm. Muir so far forget the respect due to fair authorship as to bring a false charge against Mohammedanism in the following words: "The system of pious frauds is not abhorrent from the axioms of Islam. Deception by the current theology of Mahometans is allowable in certain circumstances. The Prophet himself, by precept as well as by example, encouraged the notion that to tell an untruth is, on some occasions, allowable." In his note, also, to this passage, he observes that "the common Moslem belief is that it is allowable to tell a falsehood on four occasions: 1st, to save one's life; 2nd, to effect a peace or reconciliation; 3rd, to persuade

a woman; 4th, on the occasion of a journey or expedition." "The first," he says, "is borne out by Mahomet's express sanction. Ammar ibn Yasir was sorely persecuted by the Pagans of Mecca, and denied the faith for his deliverance. The Prophet approved of his conduct. "If they do this again, *then repeat the same recantation to them again.*" *Katibul Wackedi* (p. 227½). Another tradition, preserved in the family of Yasir, is as follows: 'The idolators seized Ammar, and they let him not go until he had abused Mahomet and spoken well of their gods. He then repaired to the Prophet, who asked of him what had happened.' 'Evil, oh Prophet of the Lord.' 'I was not let go until I had abused thee and spoken well of their gods.' 'But how,' replied Mahomet, 'dost thou find thine own heart?' 'Secure and steadfast in the faith.' 'Then,' said Mahomet, 'if they repeat the same, do thou, too, repeat the same.' Mahomet also said that Ammar's *lie* was better than Abu Jahal's *truth*."

"Mark, now," as Shakespeare says, "how a plain tale shall put you down." In the first place, the hadeeses quoted by Sir Wm. Muir are entirely untrustworthy and unauthentic; and, secondly, the language employed by him is not precise;—in other words it is too indefinite. In giving the first allowable occasion of speaking falsehood, he says, "to save one's life." Now, instead of this categorical, nay, bold declaration, Sir William should have particularized all the conditions, restrictions, and circumstances that might justify such a departure from truth. If the sham and disreputable dress in which Sir William clothes these traditions were doffed, the naked facts deduced from the premises by legitimate and candid argumentation would be, that if infidels, or any other cruel and tyrannical persons should, by violence, torture, or the threats of death, extort from any one a denial of that which his conscience and his moral instincts convince him is true, and which when under such affliction he still continues implicitly to believe, in such a case, if he deny

the same, he is in no way liable to the penalties awarded to apostacy.

That "vows made in pain, as violent as void," may be lawfully retracted, is proved by the memorable instance of the conduct of Francis I., of France, who, having been made prisoner by the Emperor Charles V., at the battle of Pavia (1525), and *forced* by the latter to sign and swear to the disgraceful treaty of Madrid, no sooner found himself at liberty than he retracted his promise to abide by it, on the score of compulsion, and was actually absolved from the compulsory oath he had so taken, by Pope Clement VII.

It is spontaneity, as regards the agent, which determines the guilt or guiltlessness of man's actions, and it is by this criterion that they are pronounced vicious or virtuous by the reflecting world. Are the words or actions which have been extorted from a man by torture and threats of death to be placed in the same category, and to be visited with the like punishment, as those of one who thinks and acts without constraint?

This "axiom," which reveals the high morality and eternal truth of Islam, which is nothing but a faithful portrait of unerring and genuine nature, and which is, indeed, quoted by Sir Wm. Muir, but in so objectionable and offensive a dress, is very simply and clearly expressed in the Koran, as follows: "Whoever denieth God, after he hath believed, *except him who shall be compelled against his will, and whose heart continued steadfast in the faith,* shall be severely chastised" (chap. xvi. v. 108).

On the authority of the above passage our lawyers have concluded that this question can be viewed in two different ways. First: *Azeemut* (*virtue*), that is, if any one is unfortunately placed under such circumstances, he can maintain the truth, despite all kinds of torture and of violence inflicted upon him by his enemies. Second: *Rukhsat* (*permission*), that is, if any one is unfortunately placed under such circumstances, he can, while tacitly believing in the truth, recant, and thus escape the

tortures which otherwise he would suffer at the hands of his persecutors. It is, indeed, surprising to find that Sir Wm. Muir considers this *eternal truth* as one of the *pious frauds* allowed by Islam, and we are equally astonished at his having expressed himself in language marvellously laconic, "to save one's life"—a term which the Koran, notwithstanding its being famous for the conciseness of its language, takes a full verse to express.

The second occasion on which a falsehood is permitted to be spoken is, according to Sir Wm. Muir, when any one effects "a peace or reconciliation;" this, he says, "is directly sanctioned by the following tradition:—"That person is not a liar who makes peace between two people, and speaks good words to do away their quarrel, *although they should be lies.*"

Now the tradition is as follows:

عن ام كلثوم قالت قال رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم ليس الكذاب الذي يصلح بين الناس فيقول خيرا وَيَنْمِي خيرا (متفق عليه مشكواة)

قال القاضي البيضاوي اي يبلغ ما يسمعه و يدع شره (كرماني)

the *faithful* rendering of which is:—Ommi Kolsoom makes the Prophet say "That person is not a liar who effects a reconciliation between two persons, and utters good words, and speaks conciliatory phrases." Considering the high attainments of Sir Wm. Muir as an Arabic scholar, we are sorry to find that, instead of using the original, he had recourse to Capt. A. N. Matthew's erroneous version of the Mishkat. Kaddi Baidavee explains the above passage in this way: "That person is not a liar who, with the intention of effecting peace between any persons, narrates to one of them only the kind and reconciliatory words of his opponent, and suppresses the harsh and inflammatory ones." As in our religion, voluntarily declining to mention, in full, an event when relating it, is considered a vice, and, under certain circumstances, a direct

falsehood, so, for this reason, the hadees in question was expressly mentioned by the Prophet.

Respecting the third and fourth occasions on which the telling of falsehoods is allowable, and which are "to persuade a woman," and to proceed on "a journey or expedition," Sir Wm. Muir says: "As to the third, we have a melancholy instance that Mahomet did not think it wrong to make false promises to his wives, in the matter of Mary, his Egyptian maid; and, regarding the fourth, it was his constant habit, in projecting expeditions (excepting only that to Tabuk), to conceal his intentions, and to give out that he was about to proceed in another direction from the true one."

These traditions are not, in the least degree, genuine and authentic, and therefore are not entitled to the smallest credit, for not one single word is to be found respecting them in any of the books which are regarded as authorities on the subject of hadeeses; and, therefore, as it is the strength or weakness of the foundation which determines the character of the superstructure in those respects, so no hadees can claim any right to be believed when the tradition whereon it rests has no proof of genuineness. As to pious frauds, they were never so much as dreamt of by any Mohammedan, the very idea being in direct opposition to that eternal truth which is the essence of the Koran, and which it breathes in every line. It was, on the contrary, as history unquestionably proves, an article of religion with the Pagans, the Jews, and the Christians,[1] and we are astonished

[1] In the "Christian Mythology Unveiled" we find the following remark:—"That most ingenuous and fair dealing son of the Church, Mosheim, whose authority and unimpeachable veracity have never been questioned, even by divines, certifies as follows:—'The Platonists and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim that it was not only lawful, but praiseworthy, to *deceive*, and even to make use of the expedient of a *lie, in order to advance the cause of truth and piety*. The Jews, who had lived in Egypt, had learned and received this maxim from them (the Pythagoreans and Platonists) before the coming of Christ, as appears incontestably from a multitude of ancient records; and the Christians were infected from both these sources with the same pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falsely

to find that, according to Christian belief, St. Paul himself did not consider it as a vice, much less a sin, as the Christians prove by his own words, as follows: "for if the truth of God hath more

to great and venerable names.' The above extract refers to the second century only, when numerous gospels, epistles, etc., were fabricated and falsely fathered, in the manner stated by Mosheim; but in the fourth century there were few exceptions to the *standard maxim, that it was an act of the highest merit to deceive and lie whenever the interests of the priesthood be promoted thereby.* . . . . . Blondel, when speaking of the second century, says, 'whether you consider the immoderate impudence of impostors, or the deplorable credulity of believers, it was a most miserable period, and exceeded all others *in pious frauds.* . . . . . Casaubon complains as follows:—'I am much grieved to observe, in the early ages of the *Church*, that there were *very many who deemed it praiseworthy to assist the divine word with their own fictions, that their new doctrine might find a readier admittance among the wise men of the Gentiles*'" (p. 80–82).

In the same book we find the following remark:—"And whenever it was found that this 'New Testament' did not at all points suit the interests of its priesthood, or the views of political rulers in league with them, the necessary alterations were made, *and all sorts of pious frauds and forgeries were not only common but justified by many of the Fathers*" (p. 52).

Again, the author of the same book remarks: "In regard to the true history of our *Church* during the first three centuries we know nothing whatever, except that which comes through the most polluted channels; for the traditions and fabulous writings of the Fathers, who lived in those periods, *are not deserving of the slightest credit; these men being notorious for nothing but pious frauds and forgeries;* yet even in these professional arts they were far excelled in the following century, by the famous Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, *who had no equal in fitting up and trimming off a 'word of God' to suit the general interests of the Church.* He says of himself, *'I have related whatever might be redounded to the glory, and I have suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of our religion'*" (p. 66).

"The writings of several of the Fathers display a strange mixture of superhuman austerity, and common human levity, bordering on licentiousness. The visible struggles for victory, between the appetites of the flesh and the alarms of conscience, are frequently ludicrous. Although some of them may have repented old pleasures, they thinly conceal a wish to solicit new ones. But such is merely the frailty of human nature: it is only when they presume to possess the purity of angelic nature that we are indignantly shocked. Their crude and absurd opinions, clothed in barbarous Latin, are interlarded in every sermon preached by Catholic Priests, and are cited more frequently than the doctrines of the inspired Evangelists, or even the maxims of Christ; but it is to be hoped that the reveries of Tertullian —'*de habitu mulieris*,' and of St. Basil—'*de vera Virginitate*' are not disclosed to the younger females. The Fathers have contributed to injure the Christian religion, by making it *Heathenish*, more than all the sceptical writers have done since philosophy undertook to examine the doctrines of revelation. The former poisoned the springs; the latter have only endeavoured to prevent the water from being tasted. Their credulity, owing to their utter inexperience of human nature, and of human

abounded through my *lie* unto his glory, why yet am I also judged a sinner?" (Rom. iii. v. 7).

Islam is truth; it is the religion of truth and morality, *par excellence;* and, as such, justly claims a paramount superiority over all others in which the leaven of falsehood is found, more or less, to prevail.

affairs, and their total ignorance of natural science, *aided by their shameless perversion of Scripture*, introduced into the Roman Church a swarm of fantastic absurdities, which credulity still greedily swallows, notwithstanding the remonstrances of reason. Nor is this the whole of their offending. They sapped the basis of morals; they inculcated the maxim (I use the words of Mosheim) '*that it is an act of virtue to deceive and lie when, by such means, the interests of the Church may be promoted.*' It is not surprising that this licentious principle opened the floodgates of lies, fables, and forgeries, which early deluged the Christian land, and encouraged the evasions and mental reservations which, at this hour, distinguish and disgrace Roman Catholic Christians. From the first to the last of the Fathers, nothing characterizes them so much as being the abettors of profane frivolity, credulity, bigotry, and deceit. Yet such are the personages who have been canonized by the successors of St. Peter."

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY ON THE HOLY KORAN.

خطبةٌ

علي القران و هو الهدي و الفرقان

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

انه لقران كريم في كتاب مكنون لايمسه الا المطهرون

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

PAGE

SECTION I.—Manner in which the Holy Koran was delivered to Mohammed 1

SECTION II.—Was the Revelation ever written down? . . 2-5

SECTION III.—Arrangement of Chapters and Verses: how effected and by whom 6-8

SECTION IV.—The Prophet used to recite the Koran himself, and exhorted other true believers to peruse it frequently 8-12

SECTION V.—Various readings of the Koran 12-18

SECTION VI.—*Nasikh* and *Munsookh* 18-27

SECTION VII.—Did the Prophet forget any of the passages of the Koran? 27-29

SECTION VIII.—Compilation of the Holy Koran in the Caliphate of Abu Bukr 29-32

SECTION IX.—Distribution of the copies of the Koran in the Caliphate of Osman 32-40

SUPPLEMENT 40

Remarks of Higgins respecting the introduction of the Koran into Europe 40-41

Ignorant and absurd remarks of Prideaux and Gibbon respecting the Koran 41-42

Refutation of the following remarks of Sir William Muir:—

(1) Respecting Nasikh and Mansookh 42-43

(2) Respecting certain passages of the Koran having been destroyed or become obsolete 43-44

(3) Respecting the systematic arrangement of the Koran . 44

(4) Respecting the "careful recension" of the Koran in the Caliphate of Osman 45-51

(5) Respecting the "instances of withdrawal or omission of passages from the Koran". 51-58

ESSAY ON THE HOLY KORAN.

SECTION I.—*How the Holy Koran was revealed unto the Prophet.*

THE Holy Koran was delivered to Mohammed neither in the form of graven tablets of stone, nor in that of cloven tongues of fire; nor was it necessary that the followers of Mohammed, like those of Moses, should be furnished with a copy or counterpart, in case the original should be lost. No mystery attended the delivery of it, for it was on Mohammed's heart that it was engraven, and it was with his tongue that it was communicated to all Arabia. The heart of Mohammed was the Sinai where he received the Revelation, and his tablets of stone were the hearts of true believers.

Ayesha thus describes the manner in which the revelations were made to the Prophet. "Verily," says she, "Harith bin Hisham asked Mohammed, 'How did the instructions come to you?' The Prophet replied, 'Sometimes like the sound of a bell—a kind of communication which was very severe for me; and when the sounds ceased I found myself aware of the instructions. And sometimes the angel would come in the form of a man, and converse with me, and all his words I remembered (Bukhari and Muslims).'"

عن عايشة ان الحارث بن هشام سال رسول الله صلعم فقال يا رسول الله كيف يا تيك الوحي فقال رسول الله صلعم احيانا يا تيني مثل صَلصَلة الجرس و هو اشد علي فيفصم عني و قد و عيت عنه ما قال و احيانا يتمثل لي الملك رجلا فيكلمني فا و عي ما يقول . . . . . .

(متفق عليه)

The mode of receiving Revelations, which has been explained by the Prophet in the above-quoted Hadees, is void of mystery; but we shall, for the present, leave this point, as well as the one respecting the Revelations themselves, untouched, intending, as we do, to treat of them at length when we arrive at that part of the Prophet's life when he received the Divine Revelation for the first time.

Section II.— *Was the Revelation ever written down?*

Previous to Islamism, as well as during the Prophet's lifetime, Arabia was without any established or regular method of education. The only two departments of knowledge were a natural eloquence, and Ilmul Ansab (knowledge of genealogical descent), to acquire which no process of academical training was required, since they exclusively depended upon verbal communication from mouth to mouth. Hence it was that in those days vast numbers of persons, totally ignorant of the art of reading and writing, were to be found in Arabia; the number, consequently, of persons competent to both those arts was very limited, the former as contrasted with the latter being designated as Ummee (illiterate), although, in reality, there was but very little, if any, difference between the two.

Not the least doubt now exists that the Prophet was wholly unacquainted with the art of writing, being also, as a matter of course, unable to read the handwriting of others; for which reason, and for this only, he was called *Ummee*. While innumerable trustworthy and authentic traditions and hadeeses corroborate this our assertion, not one, even the least reliable, is to be found that contradicts it. Indeed it must be obvious that had Mohammed learnt reading and writing, it was not a fact likely to have been passed over in silence by his associates, companions, and followers—a fact, too, of which his wives, his relatives and, more especially, his uncles who had brought him up, could not

possibly have remained ignorant. But even if Mohammed had disingenuously concealed his ability to read and write, he would not have had the audacity so boldly and emphatically to have passed himself off as the unlettered Prophet mentioned by God in the Koran, who was to be raised from among the unlettered people of Arabia; for, in that case, he must have been fully aware that his opponents would have eagerly seized the opportunity of exposing his craft and impiety, and of profiting by such an exposure; while he, self-condemned, would be utterly unable to resist the formidable attack of their sarcasm, and totally unable to compel them to give him credit for sincerity, or induce them to enter into his views. But besides all this, such vile hypocrisy would not have benefited Mohammed in the least, inasmuch as his being able to read and write could not, in the least degree, have disparaged the miracle of the Holy Koran, the more so as in Arabia reading and writing were by no means indispensable to eloquence.

Neither Mohammedan historians nor traditionists have ever denied that the art of writing was prevalent in Arabia, it being customary among the people of that land to write their poetical productions, and then suspend them for competition on the gates and walls of the Kaaba, and of which the Saba Moallika (the seven so suspended for competition) are so renowned throughout the whole Mohammedan world. They all, indeed, assert that writing was practised, although in a very small degree comparatively, and that they who practised this art were comparatively very few in number.

We Mohammedans believe that the Revelations delivered to Mohammed from time to time were of two kinds: first, those wherein were revealed the very words delivered to us by the Prophet; and, secondly, those in which was delivered the sense of what he afterwards communicated to us in his own words. The former we technically term *Wahee Matloo*—وحي متلو—or the Koran, or the word of God; and the latter *Wahee Ghair Matloo*—وحي غير متلو

—or Hadees. When some of the passages of the Koran were revealed to the Prophet, he used to call for an amanuensis, and to dictate to him what was thus revealed, so that the words of the Revelation might not run the risk either of being forgotten or lost. This our assertion is corroborated by many passages of the Holy Koran itself, and especially by the one which says, "None should touch the sacred book but the purified;" as well as by the Hadees related by Ibni Abbas.[1] It appears that this custom of writing down the revealed portions of the Koran was adopted at the very dawn of Revelation, for we find that before Mohammed's flight to Medina—a period when Islam was but in its infancy, and consequently, weak, the few converts to this religion possessed copies of such Revelations, and that in the family of Omar there was one—a fact which we learn from a very authentic account of Omar's conversion. The tradition related by Abu Daöd informs us that when the Revelation was headed by the well-known formula, "In the name of the most merciful God," etc., it was the beginning of every chapter—

عن ابن عباس قال كان رسول الله صلعم لايعرف فصل السورة حتي ينزل عليه بسم‌الله الرحمن الرحيم (رواه ابو داؤد)

The whole chapter was not revealed at one time, but some verses were revealed at one time, and others at another time; so that the transcripts were not in order, nor were they bound up together, but were on separate parchments, bones, stones, palm-leaves, etc.

There are four reasons which lead us to conclude that all the Revelations had been taken down on parchments, etc., and were in the same disorderly state while in the possession of various persons.

First: Bokharee relates a tradition from Saïd Ibni Jobair that

[1] For this Hadees see p. 6 of this Essay.

Ibni Abbas had all the longest chapters of the Koran collected in his possession, even during the lifetime of the Prophet.

عن ابن عباس قال جمعت المحكم في عهد رسول الله صلعم فقلت له وما المحكم قال المفصل (بخاري باب تعليم الصبيان القران)

Second: Bokharee relates a tradition from Katadah that the latter questioned Anas respecting the person who collected the Koran during the lifetime of the Prophet, whereupon Anas replied that they were the four *Ansars* (Aids), viz., Obey, Ibni Kaab, Moaz Ibni Jabal, Zaid Ibni Sabit, and Abu Zaid.

حدثنا قتادة قال سئلت انس بنَ مالك من جمع القران علي عهد النبي صلعم قال اربعة كُلُّهم من الانصار أبي بن كعب و مُعاذ بن جبل و زيد بن ثابت و ابو زيد (بخاري باب القراء)

Third: Bokharee relates a tradition from Somama and Sabit, that Anas exclaimed, "The Prophet is dead, and none but four persons have collected the Koran!"—viz., Abu Darda, Moaz Ibni Jabal, Zaid Ibni Sabit, and Abu Zaid.

عن انس قال مات النبي صلعم و لم يجمع القران غير اربعة ابو الدرداء ومُعاذ بن جبل و زيد بن ثابت و ابو زيد (بخاري باب القراء)

Fourth: This is the Hadees which maintains that during the Caliphate of Abu Bukr, Zaid Ibni Sabit collected the different portions of the Koran in one volume; and we also learn therefrom that when Zaid applied himself to the task of collecting into one *corpus* all the different passages of the Holy Koran that were revealed from time to time, and which were, without any regard to system or method, in the possession of various individuals, he succeeded in bringing together, although without any regard to order, all the *disjecta membra*.[1]

[1] For this Hadees see p. 30 of this Essay.

Section III.—*Arrangement of Chapters and Verses: how effected, and by whom.*

We learn that the arrangement of the chapters and verses of the Holy Koran was effected during the lifetime of the Prophet, and at his suggestion and under his direction—a fact which will become still more evident from the following tradition of Ibni Abbas, who states that, "I questioned Osman, 'Pray, what possessed you that you had the two distinct chapters, entitled, respectively, *The Spoils* and *The Declaration of Immunity*, written and joined together without affixing thereto the formula, In the name of the most merciful God, etc.? thus classing these two chapters with the seven long ones?' He replied, 'It was customary with the Prophet, when many chapters were revealed to him, and even when any portion of a Revelation was sent down to him, to send for persons to write down the instructions given, on which occasions he would say, "Write these Revelations in such and such a chapter;" and the chapter of *The Spoils* was one of the chapters that were communicated at Medina, and in it mention is made of the battle of Bedr; and the chapter entitled *The Declaration of Immunity* was the last Revelation. And the subject-matter of the chapter of *The Spoils* was almost identical with that of *The Declaration of Immunity;* and the Prophet died without having explained whether the latter chapter was a part of the other or distinct therefrom. On this account I had them placed near each other, and did not have the formula,—In the name of the most merciful God,—written between them, and that I put these two chapters among the seven long ones.'"

وعن ابن عباس قال قلت لعثمان ما حملكم علي عمد تم الي
الا نفال وهي من المثاني والي البراة وهي من المائين فقرنتم بينهما
و لم تكتبوا بسم‌الله الرحمن الرحيم و وضعتموها في السبع الطوال ما

حملكم علي ذلك قال عثمان كان رسول الله صلعم مما يا تي عليه الزمان ينزل عليه السور ذوات العدد و كاد اذانزل عليه شي دعا بعض من كان يكتب فيقول ضعوا هولاء الايات في السورة التي يذكر فيها كذا و كذا و كانت الانفال من اوايل مانزل با المدينة و كانت براة من آخوة القران نزلا و كانت قصتها شبهة بقصتها فقبض رسول الله صلعم و لم يبين لنا انها منها فمن اجل ذلك قرنت بينهما و لم اكتب سطر بسم‌الله الرحمن الرحيم و وضعتها في السبع الطوال (رواه احمد و الترمذي و ابو داؤد)

Another tradition from Bokharee informs us that Abdoollah Ibni Masood learnt from the Prophet above seventy chapters by heart.

عن شقيق بن سلمة قال خطبنا عبدالله فقال و الله لقد اخذت من في رسول الله صلعم بضعا و سبعين سورةً (بخاري باب تاليف القران)

In another tradition, Bokharee gives the names of persons famous for having the Koran by heart, as follows :—Abdoollah, Ibni-Masood, Salām, Moaz Ibni Jabal, and Obey Ibni Kaab. Another tradition states that in the battle of Yamama, fought shortly after the death of the Prophet, there were seventy persons among the killed who had committed the whole of the Koran to memory. All the above traditions contribute to prove —first, that although the Koran might, during the lifetime of the Prophet, have been written down on parchment, etc., in never so much disorder and confusion, yet, in learning it by heart, the system and arrangement was, as noticed in one of the above traditions, made known by the Prophet himself. Secondly, it is thus demonstrated, that as persons had learnt the

Koran by heart, systematically, the Surahs and Ayas (chapters and verses) must have been arranged in the Prophet's lifetime.

SECTION IV.—*The Prophet used to recite the Koran himself, and constantly exhorted other true believers to peruse it frequently.*

On this subject we think it will be quite sufficient to quote, without any comment or remark of our own, some Hadeeses which are considered as genuine and authentic ones:—

(1). Osman represents Mohammed as saying, "The best man amongst you is he who has learnt the Koran and teaches it." (*Bokharee.*)

عن عثمان رضي الله عنه قال قال رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم خيركم من تعلم القران و علمه (رواه البخاري)

(2). Ukbah-ben-Aamil relates that "the Prophet came out, and we were in the Suffah of the Musjid, and he asked, 'Which of you likes to go, every day, to *Bushan* or *Akik*, and bring two female camels, with large humps upon their backs, without stealing them or taking them away by force and incommoding a relation?' We replied, 'O messenger of God, we all like it!' He said, 'Does not one of you come in the morning to the Musjid, and teach or repeat two verses of the Book of God? which is better for him than two camels; and three verses are better for him than three camels, and four verses than four camels;—in this way are verses better than numbers of camels!'" (*Moslim.*)

عن عقبة بن عامر قال خرج رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم ونحن في الصفة فقال ايكم يحب ان يغد و كل يوم الي بطحان اوالعقيق فياتي بناقتين كو ما وين في غير اثم و لا قطع رحم قلنا يا رسول الله كُلُّنا نحب ذلك قال افلا يغدو احدكم الي المسجد فيعلم اويقرأ ايتين من

كتاب الله خيرله من نا قتين و ثلثٌ خيرله من ثلثٍ و اربعٌ خيرله من اربعٍ و من اعداد هِنَّ من الابل (رواه مسلم)

(3). Ayesha makes Mohammed say, "The skilful in reciting the Koran are classed with the angels and the prophets, who are great and virtuous; and that person who reads the Koran, but whose tongue is not fluent in reading it, for him are two rewards" —one the reward for reading, and the other for trouble. (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن عايشه قالت قال رسول الله صلعم الماهر بالقران مع السفرة الكرام البررة و الذي يقراء القران و يتتَعتَعُ فيه و هو عليه شاق له اجران (متفق عليه)

(4). Ibni Omar represents the Prophet as stating, "No one is to be envied but two persons—one, a man to whom God has given the Koran, and he rises in the morning with it, and reads it day and night; the other a man to whom God has given wealth, and who distributes it in alms and other good works day and night." (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن ابن عمر قال قال رسول الله صلعم لاحسد الا علي اثنين رجل اتاه اللهُ القرانَ فهو يقوم به اناء الليل و اناء النهار و رجل اتاه الله مالا فهو ينفق منه اناء الليل و اناء النهار (متفق عليه)

(5). Abu Musa makes the Prophet state:—"The condition of a Mussulman who reads the Koran is like the fruit of the orange-tree, whose odour and taste are equally agreeable; and that of a Mussulman who does not read the Koran is like unto the date, which has no scent, but only a sweet taste; and the condition of any hypocrite who does not read the Koran is like the colocynth, which has no scent, but a bitter taste; and the hypocrite who reads the Koran is like the sweet basil, whose scent is sweet, but the taste bitter." (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن ابي موسي قال قال صلعم مثل المو من الذي يقرأ القران مثل الاترجة ريحها طيب و طعمها طيب و مثل المو من الذي لا يقراء القران مثل التمرة لا ريح لها و لا طعمها حلو و مثل المنافق الذي لا يقراء القران كمثل الحنظلة ليس لها ريح و طعمها مرٌ و مثل المنافق الذي يقراء القران مثل الريحانة ريحها طيب و طعمها مرٌ (متفق عليه)

(6). Abu Hurairah represents the Prophet as stating:— "Learn the Koran and read it; then, verily, the condition of him who has learnt the Koran and read it, and stood up at night by it, is like that of a bag filled with musk, which diffuses its fragrance over every place; and, verily, the state of him who has learnt the Koran, and slept, and not stood up at night while having the Koran in his belly (*i.e.* remembering it), is like a bag of musk with its mouth tied up." (*Tirmizee, Nasaee, and Ibni Majah.*)

عن ابي هُريرة قال قال رسول الله صلعم تعلموا القران فا قراُوه فان مثل القران لمن تعلم فقراء و قام به كمثل جراب محشوٍ مسكا تفوح ريحه كل مكان و مثل من تعلمّه فر قد و هو فى جوفه كمثل جراب أُوكي علي مسك (رواه الترمذي و النسائي و ابن ماجة)

(7). Ibn Omar makes Mohammed say, "Verily, hearts take rust, like iron when water gets to it." It was asked, "O messenger of God! what purifies and cleanses a sullied heart?" He answered, "Remembering death constantly and repeating the Koran." (*Baihakee.*)

عن ابن عمر قال قال رسول الله صلعم إنّ هذه القلوب تَصدَاء كما يصداء الحديد اذا اصابه الماء قيل يا رسول الله و ما جلاء ها قال كثرت ذكر الموت و تلاوة القران (رواه البيهقي)

(8). Abdoollah Bini Masoud says :—"The Prophet addressed me when he was in the pulpit, saying, 'Read some portion of the Koran to me.' I replied, 'Shall I read the Koran to thee, seeing that it has been sent to thee? (*i.e.* thou art the most worthy to recite the Koran).' He said, 'I like to hear it from others.' Then I read the chapter entitled *Women*, till I came to this section, 'Then what shall be the condition of infidels when I bring a witness from each tribe against itself, and shall bring thee, O Mohammed! as witness against these people?' Then the Prophet said, 'This is enough for thee now.' Then I turned my face towards the Prophet, and saw his eyes shedding tears." (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن عبدالله بن مسعود قال قال لي رسول الله صلعم علي المنبر اقراء علي قلت اقراء عليكَ و عليكَ أُنزِلَ قال اني احب ان أَسمَعَهُ من غيري فقراءتُ سورة النساء حتي اتيت الي هذه الآية فكيف اذا جئنا من كل امة بشهيد و جئنا بكَ علي هؤلاء شهيدا قال حسبكَ الآن فالتفتُ اليه فاذا عيناه تذر قان (متفق عليه)

(9). Abu-Saïd-al Khudree relates :—"I was sitting among the decrepid and the poor of the refugees, and verily the nudity of some of them was covered by others of their companions, and a reader was reciting the Koran to us, when, unexpectedly, the Prophet came in and stood by us. Then the reader stopped reciting, and the Prophet, saluting us, said, 'What are ye doing?' We replied, 'We are listening to the Book of God.' The Prophet said, 'Praise be to God, who has created my followers, with whom I have been commanded to sit!' Then he sat down in the midst of us, putting himself on an equality with us, so that there was now no difference between us. After this he made a sign with his hand, saying, 'Sit you thus in a circle.' Then the company sat down in a ring, their faces being

turned towards the Prophet, who said, 'Rejoice, O ye poor refugees! for you will be attended by perfect splendour at the day of resurrection; and you will enter into Paradise before the rich, by half a day; and half a day of the world to come makes five hundred years of the one in which we now live.'" (*Abu Daöd*).

عن ابي سعيد الخدري قال جلست في عصابة من ضعفاء المها جرين و ان بعضهم ليَسْتَتِرُ ببعض من العُري و قارِيٌ يقرء علينا اذ جاء رسول الله صلعم فقام علينا فلما قام رسول الله صلعم سكت القاري فسلم ثم قال ما كنتم تصنعون قلنا كنا نستمع الي كتاب الله تع فقال الحمد الله الذي جعل من امتي من أُمِرْتُ ان اصبر نفسي معهم قال فجلس و سطنا ليعدل بنفسه فينا ثم قال بيده هكذا فتحلقوا و برزت وجوههم له فقال ابشروا يا معشر صعاليك المها جرين با لنور التام يوم القيمٰة تد خلون الجنة قبل اغنياء الناس بنصف يوم و ذلك خمسماية سنة (رواه ابو داوُد)

Section V.— *Various Readings of the Koran.*

The term *various readings* is the one used by Christian writers when expressing the difficulty they encountered, owing to the various readings or *variantes* to be found in the early Codices of the Scriptures. But both these various readings themselves, and the circumstances which occasioned them, differ *toto cœlo* from those that are to be met with in the Holy Koran; consequently, if we take these readings in the sense so attributed to them by Christian writers, and employed by them in that sense, it may be safely asserted that there are no various readings in the Holy Book of the Mohammedans.

When mentioning the origin and nature of various readings, the Rev. Mr. Horne states that "Among two or more different readings one only can be the true reading; the rest must be either designed alterations or the mistakes of the copyist." In the Holy Koran, however, such is not the case, for all the different readings found therein are, however paradoxical it may at first appear, equally true.

Again, when enumerating the sources of various readings, the same reverend author observes that "The different readings would be naturally produced by (1). the negligence or mistakes of the transcribers; (2). the existence of errors or imperfections in the manuscripts copied; (3). a desire on the part of copyists to improve the text, without sufficient authority; and (4). wilful corruptions made to serve the purpose of a party." Now neither of the above-named sources are applicable to the various readings of the Koran, the real nature of which readings is as follows:

(1). The whole of the Koran was not revealed to Mohammed at one and the same time, one verse of a chapter having been revealed at one time and others at another; then would follow a few verses of a chapter whose subject matter was quite different from that of the one of which some of the verses had been revealed previously, and this chapter also being left unfinished, a fourth chapter was commenced, and so on; and, consequently, its manuscripts also, which were on many separate parchments, were in the like state of disorder; and although the Prophet indicated the exact and true system of arranging the chapters and verses *to some particular* persons, nevertheless *all* individuals who possessed the scattered fragments of the manuscripts of the Koran were ignorant of it, and thus was occasioned the variety of arrangement in reading. Some persons connected some verses to those to which they did not properly belong.

(2). The difference of punctuation.

(3). The difference of the pronunciation of this or that word, as prevailed among the various districts of Arabia. Altogether there were seven different kinds of pronunciation.

(4). The difference in the orthographical signs, or vowel marks, but instances of this were rare.

(5). The difference in the way of using *Seeghas*, or the *forms of verbs*; this was occasioned by the idioms peculiar to particular tribes.

It will now be quite evident that the various readings of the Koran had nothing whatever to do with the *sense* or *acceptation* in which the words were to be taken, and that they are, consequently, wholly different from those of the Jewish Scriptures, and that, strictly speaking, to designate differences such as are above mentioned—*various readings*, is a gross and unpardonable perversion of terms.

The better to elucidate our above observations, we shall now proceed to quote a few Hadeeses bearing upon the present question.

(1). Jabir states that "The Prophet came to us when we were reading the Koran, and there were *Arabs* as well as *Ajams* (natives of any other country except Arabia) among us, and the Prophet said 'Keep on reading the Koran, for every one's reading is good,' meaning, every one's pronunciation was correct. Then he said 'There will come crowds of men who will read the Koran straight on, with good voices, like as an arrow is made straight; and they will ask for their wages in this world, and will not look for reward in that which is to come.'" (*Abu Daöd and Baihakee.*)

عن جابر قال خرج علينا رسول الله صلعم و نحن نقراء القران و فينا الاعرابي و العجمي فقال اقرؤافكل حسن و سيجي اقوام يقيمونه كما يقام القدح يتعجلونه و لايتا جلونه (رواه ابو داود و البيهقي في شعب الايمان)

(2). Obey Ibni Kaab states that the Prophet met Gabriel and said, "Verily, O Gabriel, I have been sent to an ignorant nation

that has not learnt to read and write; some of them old women, some old men, some boys and some girls, some of those men who never read any book." Gabriel replied, "Verily, O Mohammed, the Koran has been sent down in seven dialects." (*Termizee.*)

عن ابي ابن كعب قال لقي رسول الله صلعم جبرئيل فقال يا جبرئيل اني بعثت الي امة اميين منهم العجوز و الشيخ الكبير و الغلام و الجارية و الرجل الذي لم يقراء كتاباقط قال يا محمد ان القران انزل علي سبعة احرف (رواه الترمذي)

(3) Ibni Abbas makes the Prophet state, "Gabriel taught me to read the Koran in one dialect, and when I recited it he taught me another, which I also recited, and so on, till at last the number of dialects was increased to seven." Ibni Shahab said, "I have been told that those seven dialects have the same meaning, and are not at variance in the pointing out either what things are lawful or what things are forbidden." (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن ابن عباس ان رسول الله صلعم قال اقراء ني جبرئيل علي حرف فرا جعته فلم ازل استزيده و يزيد ني حتي انتهي الي سبعة احرف قال ابن شهاب بلغني تلك السبعة الاحرف انما هي فى الامريكون و احدا لا يختلف في حلال و لا حرام (متفق عليه)

(4). Omar Ibni Khuttab relates, "I heard Hisham-bin-Hakim-bin-Hizam read the chapter entitled *Furkan* in a manner different from that in which the Prophet taught me to read it; and when I read it as I was taught, and he (Hisham) read it quite otherwise, I was near being angry with him; after that I waited till he had finished, then I threw my mantle round his neck, and, dragging him along, brought him to the Prophet, and said, 'O

Prophet, verily I heard this man read the chapter *Furkan* in a different way from that which you taught me.' The Prophet replied, 'Let Hisham be released,' and he said to him, 'Read the chapter;' and he did so in precisely the same manner he had before done. The Prophet then said, 'Thus this chapter descended.' After that he said to me, 'Read it;' which I did in the way I was accustomed to do. Here also he said, 'Thus did the chapter come down. Verily, the Koran was sent down in seven dialects; then read it just as is agreeable and easy to you.'" (*Bokharee and Moslim.*)

عن عمر بن الخطاب رض قال سمعت هشام بن حكيم بن حزام يقرء سورة الفرقان علي غير ما اقراؤ ها و كان رسول الله صلعم اقرانيها فكدت ان اعجل علية ثم امهلته حتي انصرف ثم لببته برداية فجئت به رسول الله صلعم فقلت يا رسول الله اني سمعت هذا تقراء سورة الفرقان علي غير ما اقرأنيها فقال رسول الله صلعم ارسله اقراء فقراء القرأة التي سمعته يقراء فقال رسول الله صلعم هكذا انزلت ثم قال لي اقراء فقرأت فقال هكذا انزلت ان القران انزل علي سبعة احرف فاقراؤ ما تيسر منه (متفق عليه و اللفظ لمسلم)

(5). Ibn Masood relates:—"I heard a man read in one dialect, and the Prophet in a different one, and I brought the man to Mohammed, informing the latter of the circumstance. And I perceived displeasure in the Prophet's features on account of our disputation, and he said, 'You are both good readers; then do not object to each other's style of reading; for verily they that were before you objected to one way of reading the Scriptures, and they were ruined'" (*Bokharee*).

عن ابن مسعود قال سمعت رجلا فقراء و سمعت النبي صلعم يقراء

خلا فها فجيت به النبي صلعم فا خبرته فعرفت في و جهه الكراهة فقال كلا كمايحسن فلا تختلفوا فان من كان قبلكم اختلفوا فهلكوا (رواه البخاري)

From what has been mentioned above, every reader must be convinced that the various readings of the Koran, and those of the Scriptures, are of quite a different nature from each other. That kind of various readings which we have mentioned under the first head was almost extinct in the Caliphate of Abu Bekr, when Zaid Ibni Sabit collected the different passages of the Koran into one *corpus*, and was altogether abolished in the Caliphate of Osman, who caused the Koran collected by Zaid Ibni Sabit to be copied, and many transcripts of it to be made, and distributed the latter among the Moslims.

The difference of punctuation still obtains, but it is very carefully marked in the Koran. This difference, however, is so slight and trifling as not in the least to affect or alter the sense or meaning of the passage. The difference of pronunciation is also becoming nearly extinct, in consequence of the successful efforts which have been made to adopt the pronunciation of the Koreish tribe as the true *norma loquendi;* for it was in the dialect of that tribe that the Koran was revealed, and in which Mohammed himself was wont to recite it. But there being some letters in the dialect which other tribes *cannot pronounce*, this difference cannot be altogether done away with; and when we hear a Badouin, for instance, reciting passages from the Koran, we at once know that the difference still prevails. This difference, however, will be perceived only in the recitation of the Koran, and not written on paper, for this simple reason—that this kind of difference cannot be expressed in writing, and must be *heard* in order to be appreciated.

The difference of orthographical signs arose partly from the difference of the derivation of a word according to the various

dialects, partly from etymological rules, and partly from those of syntax. In the Korans furnished with notes and commentaries this difference is also very carefully marked and explained, and hence it will be quite evident, from perusing such a copy of the Koran, that this difference also does not in the least alter or affect the original sense of the passage wherein it occurs. The difference in the mode of employing *Seeghas*, or verbal forms, owes its origin to the same cause which occasioned the difference of orthographical signs, and is also marked and explained in the annotated Korans.

By the various readings of the Koran, which we have above enumerated and explained, it becomes evident that the real sense of the Koran is not in the least altered or affected, and that Mohammedans are not justly liable to the charge of having interpolated, curtailed, and disguised certain passages, or of having wilfully corrupted their sacred Book, or of having suppressed certain Codices inimical to their views and interests. This branch of literature is called *Ilmi Tajweed* (the knowledge of reciting the Koran)—a subject on which many learned authors have written at considerable length.

Section VI.—*Nasikh and Mansookh, or the Cancelling and Cancelled Verses of the Koran.*

Christians have, by the words *Nasikh* and *Mansookh* (literally, cancelling and cancelled), as applied to certain passages of the Koran, erroneously understood that the former renders the latter nugatory, on account either of its imperfection or of some doubt attached to it. This, however, is incorrect as regards the case of one passage of the Koran cancelling another one, inasmuch as Mohammedan divines, deeply versed in theology, have adopted this expression to signify quite a different circumstance from that which Christian writers understand by it. It is a religious duty of Mohammedans to believe that God is omniscient—that

is, that He has a perfect knowledge of all that is past, present, and to come; therefore were we to understand by *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* that God, for some cause or other, cancelled a former Revelation by a later one, we should be implying that, at the time of the first Revelation, God had lost His power of omniscience, which opinion, according to Islam, savours of infidelity. It is, therefore, evident that those learned persons who first employed this technical expression did not mean to imply what the Christians have understood thereby.

The expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* apply to two things: first, to the law of a prophet who preceded another one. For example, according to any law which preceded that of Moses, a person could marry the sister of his wife during the lifetime of the latter. This law was abrogated by Moses, who declared that a person could not marry his wife's sister during her lifetime, but might do so after her death. Again, Moses allowed a man full power to divorce his wife, and expel her from his house whenever he pleased. This was done away with by Jesus Christ, who said that a man could not divorce his wife under any circumstances, except she be guilty of adultery.

Mohammed likewise said that a man might divorce his wife, but that, if he did so without some very great necessity or cogent reason, he would be guilty of a very great sin.

These technical terms, *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, are thus applied by Mohammedan divines: the former, to a law which supersedes one that preceded it; the latter, to the law so superseded by the *Nasikh*.

Now, the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, when employed as now described, do not at all apply to the Koran, inasmuch as no law has been revealed to mankind since that Holy Book.

We shall not here discuss this point, but conclude by briefly observing that the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* are not applied by Mohammedan divines to the laws of preceding prophets in the sense in which they are regarded by Christian writers.

From the above remarks the reader will perceive that the following verse of the Koran does not apply to the subject of our Essay, namely, the existence of the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* in the Koran, or in the Mohammedan Law:—

"It is not the desire of the unbeliever, either among those to whom the Scriptures have been given, or among the idolators, that any good should be sent down unto you from your Lord; but God will appropriate His mercy to whom He pleaseth, for God is exceeding beneficent. Whatever commandment we shall abrogate or cause thee to forget, we will bring in better than it, or one like unto it. Dost thou not know that God is almighty?" (chap. ii. ver. 99 and 100).

The above passage from the Koran does not, we think, imply that one verse of the Koran was cancelled by another, but that it merely means that God can give better commandments—that is, laws—than He has given before; moreover, it is relative to the Jews, whose first given laws were somewhat altered by those given to Mohammed.

The second object to which the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* are applied, is either the Holy Koran or the Mohammedan Laws. Mussulman doctors have employed these expressions for certain verses of the Koran, and for certain hadeeses, but not in that sense in which the Christian theologians view them. There are to be found in the Koran, and in the sayings of the Prophet, commandments relating to one and the same matter, but under different circumstances; and, when one of those circumstances no longer remained, the commandment relating thereto does not remain in force, while the commandment which is intended to meet the altered circumstance then comes into operation; the former commandment being called *Munsookh*, and the one subsequent to it, *Nasikh*. This, however, by no means implies that the former commandment was in any way defective, but that the circumstance to which it was applicable has ceased to exist, and consequently that the commandment itself ceases to be in

force; but that, should the same circumstance again present itself, the same commandment will come again into operation, and that the one which was subsequent to it will then, in its turn, cease. For instance, when the commandment prohibiting the use of wine as a drink was first sent down to Mohammed, the Prophet forbade the use even of green cups (used by the Arabians solely for the purpose of drinking wine); but, when the use of wine was quite done away with among the Arabians, the Prophet allowed them the use of green cups. To cite another instance, so long as the true believers remained subject to the idolators at Mecca, they were commanded to bear patiently all the wrongs and severities which their rulers inflicted upon them; but as soon as the Moslems had left the dominions of the idolators they were allowed to fight against the unbelievers of Mecca. Now, in both these instances the prior commandment was termed *Munsookh*, and the subsequent one *Nasikh*; and, should the like circumstances again present themselves, the *Munsookh* may once more be brought into force.

There were also certain Mosaic laws, respecting different matters, which the Prophet at first adopted, until peculiar commandments were sent down to him touching the said matters. Such Mosaic laws are also termed *Munsookh*. The meaning of the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, as explained above, shows that the expressions are merely technical ones, and it is for this reason that some of the Mohammedan doctors believe that the terms *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, in their literal and genuine interpretation, are not at all to be found in the Koran, rejecting, as the former do, the following hadeeses, on the ground of their being unsupported by any reliable authority :—

(1). Jafir makes the Prophet state that "My words do not revoke those of the Koran, while the words of that Sacred Book cancel mine, and the latter portions of the Koran abrogate the former ones."

Ibni Omar represents the Prophet as saying that "Some of

my words cancel others, as some of the passages of the Koran abrogate others."

The following is a highly authentic and authoritative hadees, which at once rejects the truth and genuineness of the two hadeeses above quoted, as well as of the plausibility and correctness of the unsupported assertion of those lawyers who hold that one passage of the Koran cancels another. The hadees referred to is as follows:—Omar relates from his own father, who learnt the same from his father (the grandfather of Omar), that "The Prophet overheard some persons who were disputing among themselves respecting the interpretation of certain passages of the Koran. The Prophet addressed the disputants by saying, 'It was for this very reason that your predecessors were destroyed. They caused one passage of the Book of God (Scriptures) to clash against another, whereas the fact is that one part of the Book of God supports and confirms another. Therefore do not ye contradict one part of the Koran by another, but reconcile, yourselves, the import of the two passages, as far as it lies in your power, and, should you fail in so doing, then repair to a doctor and learn the meaning from him.'"

عن عمرو ابن شعيب عن ابيه عن جده قال سمع النبي صلعم قوما يتد اروْن في القران فقال انما هلك من كان قبلكم بهذا ضربوا كتاب الله بعضه ببعض وانما نُزِل كتاب الله يصدّق بعضه بعضا فلا تكذبوا بعضه ببعض فما علمتم منه فقولو به و ما جهلتم فكلوه الي عالمه (رواه احمد و ابن ماجة)

The hadees just quoted above clearly proves the circumstance of their being no *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* in the Koran.

The above must be considered as merely a philological discussion, and both the parties interested—namely, those who believe in the existence of the *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, and those

who do not—arrive at the same result, and therefore it is unnecessary, on our part, to examine here the genuineness of the authority of the above two hadeeses (which we ourselves believe to be false and spurious), as both the parties interested believe, in point of fact, one and the same thing.

When the Mohammedan lawyers had undertaken the task of compiling and epitomizing law books, according to the injunctions and behests in the Koran, they gave, with the intention of facilitating the inquiry, a still more comprehensive and wider signification to the terms *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*; but to which, in this case, with the exception of their being technically and idiomatically employed, neither their primitive and literal meaning, nor the interpretation we have mentioned, can be properly applied. Considering the meaning of a certain verse to be extensive and general, they represent the commandment it gives respecting a certain matter, as a general one, and upon their meeting with some other verse, also, respecting the same matter, enjoining some peculiar injunction, they call the latter commandment an *exception*. They also technically term the former *Munsookh* and the latter *Nasikh*. This we shall elucidate by an instance, explaining the following verses from the Koran:—"And such of you as shall die and leave wives, ought to bequeath their wives a year's maintenance, without ejecting them from their houses: but if they go out voluntarily it shall be no crime in you for that which they shall do of themselves, according to what shall be reasonable. God is mighty and wise" (chap. ii. v. 241).

و الذين يتوفون منكم و يذرون ازواجًا وصية لاز و اجهم متا عا الي الحول غير اخراج فان خرجن فلا جناح عليكم فيما فعلن في انفسهن من معروف و الله عزيز حكيم (سوره بقرايت ۲۴۱)

The real and simple meaning of the passage of the Koran we have just quoted, is, that those persons who die and leave their

wives behind them should bequeath at least one year's maintenance for the latter, so that (as in all the necessary requirements of this world, the female is wholly dependent upon her husband) the wife might not, in her days of grief and disappointment, be subject to any difficulties or privations in the loss of the husband. Our lawyers, however, maintain that three commandments can be drawn from it: (1). The husband *must* bequeath a year's maintenance for his widow.—(2). The widow *cannot* claim from her deceased husband's estate more than one year's maintenance.—(3). The widow *cannot* marry another person before the expiration of one year's time, reckoning from the date of her husband's decease.

When, by the aid of their professional ingenuity, they had elicited the above facts from the passage in question, they met with another passage, which is as follows:—"Such of you as die and leave wives, their wives must wait concerning themselves four months and ten days, and when they shall have fulfilled their term, it shall be no crime in you for that which they shall do with themselves. According to what is reasonable. God well knoweth that which ye do. And it shall be no crime in you, whether ye make public overtures of marriage unto such women within the said four months and ten days, or whether you conceal such your designs in your minds. God knoweth that ye will remember them" (chap. ii. 234 and 235).

و الذين يتوفون منكم و يذرون از و اجا يتربص بانفسهن اربعة اشهر و عشرا فاذا بلغن اجلهن فلا جناح عليكم فيما فعلن في انفسهن بالمعروف و الله بما تعملون خبير و لا جناح عليكم فيما عرضتم به من خطبة النساء او اكننتم في انفسكم علم الله انكم ستذكر و نهن و لكن لا توا عدو هن سرًا الا ان تقولوا قولا معروفا (سوره بقرايت ۲۳۴ و ۲۳۵)

On finding in the passage above quoted the precise time fixed

for the widow to wait, after her husband's death, before marrying another person, they (the lawyers) saw that this passage plainly contradicted the third interpretation, which they had by their legal chicanery twisted out of the first passage; they technically employed the term *Munsookh* for the third interpretation of the first passages, and that of *Nasikh* for the second passage. After that, a third passage fell under their consideration. That passage runs thus: "They (widows) also shall have the fourth part of what ye shall leave, if ye have no issue; but, if ye have issue, then they shall have the eighth part of what ye shall leave, after the legacies which ye shall bequeath and your debts be paid" (chap. iv. 14).

و لهن الربع مما ترکتم ان لم یکن لکم ولد فان لکم ولد فلهن الثمن مما ترکتم من بعد وصیة توصون بها اودین (سوره نساء ایت ۱۴)

The same lawyers, finding that in this passage the due share of the widow was plainly mentioned, concluded that their two remaining interpretations of the first passage were *Munsookh*, and this passage was *Nasikh*.

Every judicious reader knows that these lawyers are not the Popes of Islamism, they being as devoid of infallibility as any other individual. Our sacred book, the Koran, is within the reach of every person, and every one has the right of finding out the truth from it, for himself. Every Mussulman is justified in discarding the opinions of the above-mentioned lawyers, if he pleases, and can maintain (and he has a right so to do) that there is no *Nasikh*, no *Munsookh*, in the above-quoted passages, and that each of them has a separate meaning of its own.

Now we would ask, do the expressions *Nasikh* and *Munsookh*, technically employed by the lawyers for the sole purpose of facilitating their inquiries and investigations, affect in any way the revelation of the Koran, as has been not only erroneously,

but we regret to say, wilfully, misunderstood by the Christians? It is a matter of great regret that the illustrious historian Gibbon, and Sir Willliam Muir, the learned biographer of Mohammed, should have, merely by reason of their ignorance of the true and real sense for which the terms *Nasikh* and *Munsookh* had been employed by our lawyers, committed so palpable an error as to remark, respectively, as follows:— "Instead of a perpetual and perfect measure of the Divine will, the fragments of the Koran were produced at the discretion of Mahomet; each revelation is suited to the emergency of his policy or passion, and all contradiction is removed by the saving maxim that any text of Scripture is abrogated or modified by any subsequent passage" (Gibbon's Decline and Fall).

"Though the convenient doctrine of abrogation is acknowledged in the Coran, yet the Mussulmans endeavour, as far as possible, to explain away such contradictions. Still, they are obliged to confess that the Coran contains not fewer than 225 verses cancelled by later ones" (Life of Mohammed, Intr., p. xxii.).

In the outset of this Essay we noticed that the Revelations made to Mohammed were of two kinds, one in which the *very words* were revealed, and which now form the *Koran*, and the other in which was revealed the *sense only*, and which the Prophet afterwards delivered to his followers in his own language. Some persons erroneously took certain revelations of the second kind for those of the first kind, and not finding those revelations in the Koran, concluded that there were some passages of the Koran which had been cancelled, and, being not allowed to be read, had been taken out of that sacred book. This opinion of such persons is altogether wrong, and possesses no authority whatever for its support. Nor does there exist any authority for the supposition that any passages, not being allowed to be read, had been taken away from that holy book. We shall dwell upon this point at some length in our "Supplement" to this Essay.

SECTION VII.—*Did the Prophet forget any of the passages of the Koran?*

We Mohammedans believe that the Prophet remembered all the Koran that was revealed to him, and that he dictated the same to his amanuenses without forgetting one single word. There is only one passage of the Koran, as well as a hadees, which we think it necessary to say something about on this occasion. "We will enable thee to rehearse our revelations, and thou shalt not forget any part thereof except what God shall please" (chap. lxxxvii. 6).

سنقرئك فلا تَنسى الا ما شاء الله (سورة سبح اسم ايت ٦)

Baidavee comments upon this passage as follows: "*We will enable thee to rehearse,*" he says, either means that we will teach thee through our angels, or we will enable thee to recite through our revelations. "*And thou shalt not forget.*" This, he says, means that you will always remember it, perfectly well, although you are illiterate, and that this also forms one of our signs for you. "*Except what God shall please.*" This is the portion which has occasioned much discussion among the learned. Baidavee and other commentators have not explained it on the authority of Mohammed, but have only guessed at its meaning, and have, by their own imagination, mentioned three possible solutions or interpretations. First, he is of opinion that it might imply the abrogated passages, but we have shown just above that there are no cancelled passages: he thinks also that it might mean the accidental forgetting of any portion, and, to confirm his conjectures, he quotes a tradition, having no authority for its authenticity, that the Prophet was reciting the Koran in the prayer and forgot to repeat one passage; whereupon Obey thought that that passage had been abrogated; and when the prayer was over, he asked the Prophet about it, whereupon the latter replied, "No, but I forgot to read it." Third, he thinks it may mean that he (Mohammed) would never forget a single portion of it.

(سنقرئك) علي لسان جبرئيل او سنجعلك قار يا بالهام القراة (فلا تنسى) اصلا من قوة الحفظ مع انّك أمّي ليكون ذلك ايةً اخري لك . . . . (الا ما شاء الله) نسيا نه بان نسخ تلاوته و قيل المراد به القلة و الندرة لماروي انه عليه السلام اسقط ايةً في الصلواة فحسب أُبَيٌّ رض انها نسخت فساله فقال نسيتها اونفي النسيان راسا فان القلة تستعمل للنفي (بيضاوي)

But we are of opinion that, in reality, the exceptional clause under question does not at all imply that he (the Prophet) would forget any portions of the Koran, or that God would cause them to be forgotten; but that they are intended to magnify the grandeur and power of the Almighty, who says that "You (Mohammed) will never forget any portion thereof, except if God please otherwise." The author of Kasshaf also supports our assertion, when he says that "In such cases the exceptional clauses do not, in reality, imply exceptions;" and he thus explains it by the following example:—That if any person were to tell another one, "You shall be a sharer of my property, except if God please otherwise," the latter phrase does not at all convey the idea of *exception*.

في الكشاف كما تقول لصا حبك انت سهيمي فيما املك الا ما شاء الله لا يقصد استثناء شي (كشاف)

Bokharee relates a hadees from Ayesha, who said that "The Prophet heard a person reading the Koran in a mosque; thereupon the Prophet said, 'May God bless you! You have caused those passages of the Koran to come again to my remembrance.' Some traditions add, further, 'which I had forgotten.'"

عن عايشة قالت سمع النبي صلعم رجلا يقراء في المسجد فقال

يرحمه الله لقد اذ كرني كذا و كذا ايةً من سورة كذا (بخاري باب نسيان القران)

عن عايشة قالت سمع رسول الله صلعم رجلا يقراء في سورة بالليل فقال يرحمه الله لقد اذ كرني كذا و كذا ايةً كنت أُنسِيتُها من سورة كذا (بخاري باب نسيان القران)

What the Mohammedans deny, in thus representing Mohammed as forgetting any revelation, is its being altogether blotted out from his breast, and therefore its being irrecoverably lost; but we ourselves do not deny such forgetfulness as reported in the above hadees; for we hold that the Prophet, being a man, and *only* a man, it was but natural that, at some time or other, his memory might prove treacherous, and fail him, but that afterwards, either upon hearing what he had so forgotten, or by his recollecting some other idea with which the one forgotten was associated, he again recollected it. The same is the purport of a portion of the Fathol Kadeer, a commentary on the Bokharee.

Section VIII.—*The Compilation of the Holy Koran in the Caliphate of Abu Bukr.*

A full and correct account of the compilation of the Holy Koran is given in a genuine and authentic hadees, which we cannot do better than now quote.

Zaïd Ibni Sabit relates that "Abu Bukr sent a person to me, and called me to him, during the battle with the people of Yemamah; and I went to him, and behold! Omar was with him; and then Abu Bukr said to me, 'Omar came to me and said, "Verily a great number of the readers of the Koran have been slain on this day of battle with the people of Yemamah, and really I am afraid that, if the slaughter should be severe, much from the Koran will, in consequence, be lost, and, verily, I

consider it advisable for you to order the Koran to be collected into one *corpus*." I said to Omar, "How can I do a thing which the Prophet has not done?" He rejoined, "I swear, by God, this collecting of the Koran is the best way." And Omar used to be continually returning to me and saying, "You *must* collect the Koran," till at length God opened my breast so to do, and I saw that what Omar had thought was advisable.'"

Zaïd Ibni Sabit also relates that "Abu Bukr said to me, 'You are a young and prudent man, and I do not suspect you of forgetfulness, negligence, or perfidy; and, verily, you used to write for the Prophet the Revelations sent down to him from above;—then search every place for the Koran, and collect it.' I answered, 'I swear, by God, that if people had ordered me to carry about a mountain with me from place to place, I should not feel it so heavy as I do the order which Abu Bukr has given for collecting the Koran.' I said to Abu Bukr, 'How do you do a thing which the Prophet of God did not?' He replied, 'By God, this collecting of the Koran is a good act.' And he used perpetually to return to me, until God opened my breast upon the matter, whereon his and Omar's had been before opened. Then I sought for portions of the Koran, whether written upon leaves of the palm-tree, on white stones, or in the hearts of those who remembered them, until I found, in the possession of Abu Khuzaimah Ansaree alone, the last part of the chapter entitled *Repentance*. This copy of the Koran then remained in the possession of Abu Bukr until God caused him to die; after that, Omar had it as long as he lived; after him it remained with his daughter Hufsah." (*Bokharee.*)

عن زيد ابن ثابت قال أرسل اليَّ ابو بكر رض عند مقتل اهل اليمامه
فاذا عمر بن الخطاب عنده قال ابو بكر إنَّ عمر اتاني فقال ان القتل
قدا ستحرّ يوم اليمامة بقراء القران و اني اخشي ان استحر القتل
بالقراء با المواطن فيذهب كثير من القران و اني اري ان تامر بجمع

القران قلت لعمر كيف تفعل شيئًا لم يفعله رسول الله صلعم قال عمر هذا و الله خير فلم يزل عمر ير اجعني حتي شرح الله صدري لذلك و رايتُ في ذلك الذي راي عمر قال زيد قال ابو بكر انك رجل شاب عاقل لا نتهمك و قد كنتَ تَكتبُ الوحي لرسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم فتتبع القران فا جمعه فو الله لو كلفوني نقل جبل من الجبال ما كان اثقل علي مما امرني به من جمع القران قال قلت لا بي بكر كيف تفعلون شيًا لم يفعله رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم قال هو و الله خير فلم يزل ابو بكر يرا جعني حتي شرح الله صدري للذي شرح له صدرَ ابي بكر و عمر فتَتَبَّعْتُ القران اجمعه من العُسُب و اللِخاف و صُدُور الرجال حتي و جدتُ اخر سورة التوبة مع ابي خزيمة الانصاري لم اجد ها مع احدٍ غيرِهِ "لقد جاء كم رسول من انفسكم عزيز عليه ما عنتم" حتي خاتمه براة و كانت الصحف عند ابي بكر حتي تو فاه الله ثم عند عمر حياته ثم عند حفصة بنت عمر (رواه البخاري)

By the above hadees three things are satisfactorily explained: first, by the words, "*If the slaughter should be severe, much of the Koran will be lost,*" it becomes evident that up to this time no portion of the Koran was lost, and that it was just as much as had been revealed to the Prophet.

Secondly, we are enabled to know, of a certainty, that the whole of the Koran had been learned by heart by many persons.

Thirdly, that there was no verse of the Koran which, after inquiry and investigation, was not found written either on parchment, bones, leaves, etc., etc.

Therefore, from all that we have just mentioned, as well as from the following Hadees, we arrive at the conclusion that

the entire Koran, without the loss of one single verse, was collected by Zaid Ibni Sabit, and that it is the same identical one which we now possess.

This hadees states that Bokharee related a tradition from Abdul Azeez, who said that he and Shaddad called upon Ibni Abbas, and Shaddad asked him whether the Prophet had left anything else (that is, any other revelation besides the Koran); whereupon Ibni Abbas replied, nothing more than what is already bound up together. Abdul Azeez said that they then went to Mohammed, son of Ali, and asked him the same thing, and that he gave them a like answer.

عن عبدالعزيز بن رُفيع قال دخلت انا و شداد بن معقل علي ابن عباس فقال له شداد بن معقل اترك البني صلعم من شي قال ما ترك الا ما بين الدفتين قال و دخلنا علي محمد بن الحنفية فسا لناه فقال ما ترك الا ما بين الدفتين (بخاري)

SECTION IX.—*Distribution of the copies of the Koran in the Caliphate of Osman.*

The copy of the Koran collected by Zaid Ibni Sabit came down in a perfect state to the Caliphate of Osman, who caused numerous copies of it to be taken and distributed among the Moslems. The following is the hadees which gives the full details of this fact: Anas Ibni Malik relates that "There came to Osman, Hudaifah, who had fought with the people of Syria, in the conquest of Armenia, and also in Azarbeejan with the people of Irak, and that, being shocked at the different ways adopted by the people in reading the Koran, he said to Osman, 'O Osman! assist this nation before they differ among themselves, in the way of reading the word of God, as much as the Jews and Christians differ.' Then Osman sent a person to Hafsah, ordering her to send to him the Koran in her possession,

and saying, 'I shall have a number of copies made of it, after which I shall return it to you.' Hafsah having made over the Koran to Osman, he sent for Zaid Ibni Sabit Ansaree, and Abdoollah ben-Zobair, and Said Ibni Aas, and Abdul-rahman Ibn Harith bin Hisham, all of whom, except Zaid Ibni Sabit were of the Koreish tribe. And Osman said to the three Koreishites, 'When you and Zaid Ibni Sabit differ about any part of the dialect of the Koran, then do you write it in the Koreish dialect, because it came not down in the language of any tribe but theirs.' When the above-named Koreishites had done as Osman had commanded, and when the number of copies had been made, Osman returned the original to Hafsah, and had a copy sent to every quarter of the countries of Islam, and ordered all the other leaves upon which the Koran was written to be burned. Ibni Shahab said, "Then Kharijah, son of Zaid Ibni Sabit, informed me that the former had heard his father saying, 'As I was compiling the Koran I missed one verse of the chapter entitled *The Confederates*. But verily I heard that verse from the Prophet. Then I searched for the verse, and found it with Khuzaimah Ansaree, and entered it in the chapter of *The Confederates*.'" (*Bokharee.*)

عن انس بن مالك ان حذيفة بن اليمان قدم علي عثمان و كان يُغازي اهل الشام في فتح ارمينية و اذر بيجان مع اهل العراق فا فزع حذيفة اختلا فهم في القراءة فقال حذيفة لعثمن يا امير المومنين ادرك هذه الامة قبل ان يختلفوا في الكتاب اختلاف اليهود و النصاري فارسل عثمان الي حفصة ان ارسلي الينا بالصحف نَنسخها في المصاحف ثم نَرَد ها اليك فارسلت بها حفصة الي عثمان فامر زيد ابن ثابت و عبدالله ابن الزبير و سعد بن العاص و عبدالرحمن بن الحارث بن هشام فنسخو ها في المصاحف و قال عثمان للرهط القر شيين الثلثة اذا

اختلفتم انتم و زيد ابن ثابت في شي من القران (وفي حديثٍ "في عربية من عربية القران" باب نزل القران بلسان قريش) فا كتبوه بلسان قريش فانما نزل بلسانهم ففعلوا حتي اذا نسخوا الصحف في المصاحف رد عثمان الصحف الي حفصة و ارسل الي كل افق بمصحف مما نسخوا و امر بما سواه من القران في كل صحيفة او مصحف ان يحرق قال ابن شهاب و اخبرني خارجة بن زيد بن ثابت انه سمِع زيد بن ثابت قال فقدت اية من الا حزاب حين نسخنا المصحف و قد كنت اسمع رسول الله صلي الله علبه وسلم يقراء بها فالتمسنا ها فو جدنا مع خزيمه بن ثابت الانصاري "من المو منين رجال صدقوا ما عاهدو الله عليه" فالحقنا ها في سورتها في المصحف (رواه البخاري)

It must be remembered that the expression, "the different ways adopted by the people in reading the Koran," implies the same difference which has been fully discussed under the head of *Various Readings*; and also that the copies made in the Caliphate of Osman were the faithful reproductions of the original, without the least alteration, interpolation, and curtailment, and that no difference of dialect was ever found. By the tradition of Zaid Ibni Sabit we find that the only revelation found in Khuzaimah Ansaree's possession, were the last verses of the chapter entitled *Repentance*, but the tradition of Anas informs us that the revelation found with Khuzaimah Ansaree was the twenty-eighth verse of the chapter called *The Confederates*. To reconcile these two antagonistic remarks, we think that the latter traditionist mentioned by mistake the *second* revelation for the *first* one, or that the latter revelation might have been, by some accident, lost from the compiled copy of Zaid Ibni Sabit, and after a search was found written in a copy in Khuzaimah's possession.

SECTION X.—*The fact of the Koran being perfect of its kind, proves its Divine origin.*

We cannot, on this occasion, permit ourselves to pass over in silence the remarks of the learned Bishop Middleton, who says that "The Scripture Greek is utterly rude and barbarous, and abounds with every fault that can possibly deform a language; whereas we should naturally expect to find an inspired language pure, clear, noble, and effective, even beyond the force of common speech, since nothing can come from God but what is perfect in its kind. In short, we should expect the purity of Plato and the eloquence of Cicero." (Essay on the Gift of Tongues.)

Now, the Koran being perfect in its kind, must necessarily have had a Divine origin, and, conversely, since it was revealed, it must therefore be perfect in its kind; for there can be nothing perfect from mortal man, who is himself imperfect. This our proposition is supported by the following passages of the Koran itself:—"If ye be in doubt concerning that Revelation (the Koran) which we have sent down to our servant (Mohammed), produce a chapter like unto it, and call your witnesses, besides God, if ye say truth; but if ye do it not, nor ever shall ye be able to do it, justly fear the fire whose fuel is men and stones, prepared for the unbelievers" (chap. ii. 21, 22).

و ان كنتم في ريب مما نزلنا علي عبد نا فاتوا بسورة من مثله و ادعوا شهداء كم من دون الله ان كنتم صادقين فان لم تفعلوا و لن تفعلوا فا تقوا النا رالتي و قود ها الناس و الحجارة اعدت للكافرين (سورة بقرايت ٢١ و ٢٢)

"Say, verily, if men and genii were purposely assembled, that they might produce a book like this Koran, they could not produce one like unto it, although the one of them assisted the other" (chap. xvii. 90).

قل لئن اجتمعت الانس و الجن علي ان ياتو ابمثل هذا القران
لا يا تون بمثله و لو كان بعضهم لبعض ظهيرا (سوره بني اسرائل ايت ٩٠)

The import of the passages just quoted is, as above stated, that nothing which is perfect in its kind can proceed from man, who is himself imperfect; but that God alone, who is himself all perfect, is the source of everything perfect in its kind—a fact which becomes the more clear and convincing from the consideration that one of even the simplest and least complicated objects of nature has never been equalled, not to say surpassed, by one produced by art.

Now, although it is possible for a man to produce an object which might stand unparalleled in the wide circle of objects so produced by art, and that, despite the many attempts of other individuals to approach it in excellence, it might still continue to remain unequalled, nevertheless it could not strictly and properly be said to be perfect of its kind. There are four things in which the excellence of the Koran may be said to consist: (1) its surpassing clear, noble, affecting, and persuasive eloquence; (2) its theological principles; (3) its moral principles; (4) the principles of civil and criminal law, as laid down in it. The first of the above-mentioned four things was addressed to the Arabians exclusively, since the Koran was delivered in their language; but the remaining three were addressed to the whole world, and we boldly and confidently assert, in the face of all our antagonists, that a like unto it has never been and never will be produced, on this side eternity, by an uninspired man.

It was owing to an ignorance of the above facts that Gibbon, the historian, was misled into making the following remarks:—

"In the spirit of enthusiasm or vanity the Prophet rests the truth of his mission on the merit of his book; audaciously challenges both men and angels to imitate the beauties of a single page, and presumes to assert that God alone could dictate this incomparable performance. This argument is most powerfully

addressed to a devout Arabian, whose mind is attuned to faith and rapture, whose ear is delighted by the music of sounds, and whose ignorance is incapable of comparing the productions of human genius. The harmony and copiousness of the style will not reach, in a version, the European infidel; he will peruse with impatience the endless incoherent rhapsody of fable, precept, and declamation, which seldom excites a sentiment or an idea, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds." We have already stated that the excellence of the Koran as regards eloquence was confined to Arabia exclusively. The same author remarks also as follows :—" If the composition of the Koran exceed the faculties of a man, to what superior intelligence should we ascribe the Iliad of Homer or the Philippics of Demosthenes?"

We have above acknowledged the possibility of the existence of an object of art, the excellence of which might defy any attempt to equal or surpass it—an excellence which might continue to remain unparalleled in the whole circle of other artificially produced objects of the same species—and yet, notwithstanding all this, it might still not be the perfect one of its kind.

The same historian mentions that "The Divine attributes exalt the fancy of the Arabian missionary, but his loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the Book of Job, composed in a remote age, in the same country, and in the same language." We should not be justified in accepting this *dictum* of Mr. Gibbon, incompetent as he is to decide upon the comparative merits of the Koran and the Book of Job[1]; but this

[1] The following is from an article on Islam in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 254, for October, 1869:—" Mohammed is said to have convinced a rival—Lebid, a poet-laureate of the period—of his mission, by reciting to him a portion of the now Second Surah. Unquestionably it is one of the very grandest specimens of Koranic or Arabic diction, describing how hypocrites 'are like unto those who kindle a fire without, and think themselves safe from darkness; but while it is at its biggest blaze God sends a wind, the flame is extinguished, and they are shrouded in dense night. They are deaf, and dumb, and blind . . . Or, when in darkness, and

we can assert, without the fear of contradiction, that the most learned of the Arabian doctors have declared that, so far as composition is concerned, the Koran is the model of eloquence, and has never been, and never will be surpassed.

The following are a few extracts taken from Christian authors in support of our assertion :—

Carlyle says :—"Sincerity, in all senses, seems to me the merit of the Koran—what had rendered it precious to the wild Arab men. It is, after all, the first and last merit in a book—gives rise to merits of all kinds—nay, at bottom, it alone can give rise to merit of any kind."—*Lectures on Heroes*, p. 235.

Godfrey Higgins writes :—" Like the Gospel of Jesus, the Koran is the poor man's friend. The injustice of the great and rich is everywhere reprobated. It is no respecter of persons. And it is to the immortal honour of the writer of that book—be he Mohammed, the illustrious prophet of Arabia, or his third successor, the Caliph Othman, as the author believes—not a precept in it can be pointed out which contains the slightest leaning to political servility. And, as the *Westminster Reviewer* has justly observed, if there be anything that ever holds an Eastern despot in check, it is probably an unceremonious verse from the Koran in the mouth of a daring remonstrant."—*Apol. for the Life of Mohammed*, p. 42.

The writer of an article upon Islam in the *Quarterly Review* says :—" And it is exactly in these transitions, quick and sudden as lightning, that one of the great charms of the book, as it now stands, consists ; and well might Goethe say that ' as often as we approach it, it always proves repulsive anew ; gradually, however, it attracts, it astonishes, and, in the end, forces into admiration." '—p. 343.

amidst thunder and lightning, rain-filled clouds pour from heaven, they, in terror of the crash, thrust their fingers into their ears . . . But God compasseth the infidels around. . . . The flash of the lightning blindeth their eyes ;—while it lights up all things, they walk in its light—then darkness closes in upon them, and they stand rooted to the ground.' "

Again, he says :—" Those grand accents of joy and sorrow, of love, and valour, and passion, of which but faint echoes strike on our ears now, were full-toned at the time of Mohammed ; and he had not merely to rival the illustrious of the illustrious, but to excel them ; to appeal to the superiority of what he said and sang as a very sign and proof of his mission."—p. 345.

Again, he remarks :—" We turn, in preference, at once to the intrinsic portion of this strange book—a book by the aid of which the Arabs conquered a world greater than that of Alexander the Great, greater than that of Rome, and in as many tens of years as the latter had wanted hundreds to accomplish her conquests ; by the aid of which they alone, of all the Shemites, came to Europe as kings, whither the Phœnicians had come as tradesmen, and the Jews as fugitives or captives—came to Europe to hold up, together with these fugitives, the light to humanity—they alone, while darkness lay around, to raise up the wisdom and knowledge of Hellas from the dead, to teach philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and the golden art of song, to the West as well as to the East, to stand at the cradle of modern science, and to cause us late *epigoni* for ever to weep over the day when Granada fell."

Mr. Sale writes as follows :—" The Koran is universally allowed to be written with the utmost elegance and purity of language, in the dialect of the tribe of Koreish—the most noble and polite of all the Arabians—but with some mixture, though very rarely, of other dialects. It is confessedly the standard of the Arabic tongue, and, as the more orthodox believe, and are taught by the book itself, inimitable by any human pen (though some sectaries have been of another opinion), and therefore insisted on as a permanent miracle, greater than that of raising the dead, and alone sufficient to convince the world of its divine original.

" And to this miracle did Mohammed himself chiefly appeal for the confirmation of his mission, publicly challenging the

most eloquent men in Arabia—which was at that time stocked with thousands whose sole study and ambition it was to excel in elegance of style and composition—to produce even a single chapter that might be compared with it. I will mention but one instance, out of several, to show that this book was really admired for the beauty of its composition by those who must be allowed to have been competent judges. A poem of Labeed Ebn Rabia—one of the greatest wits in Arabia, in Mohammed's time—being fixed up on the gate of the temple of Mecca—an honour allowed to none but the most esteemed performance—none of the other poets durst offer anything of their own in competition with it; but the second chapter of the Koran being fixed up by it soon after, Labeed himself (then an idolator), on reading the first verses only, was struck with admiration, and immediately professed the religion taught thereby, declaring that such words could proceed from an inspired person only. . . . The style of the Koran is generally beautiful and fluent, especially where it imitates the prophetic manner and Scripture phrases. It is concise, and often obscure, adorned with bold figures, after the Eastern taste, enlivened with florid and sententious expressions; and in many places, especially where the majesty and attributes of God are described, sublime and magnificent."—*Prel. Disc.*, Sect. iii., p. 83, 84.

SUPPLEMENT.

The remarks of Christian writers upon our Koran, self-evidently absurd as they are, nevertheless cannot be passed over without some reply. The form in which the Koran had been introduced into Europe has been well described by Godfrey Higgins, who remarks:—"If a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures were published, in which every word capable of the change was altered from the reserved and decent one to that which was vulgar and immodest, and where a licentious commentary was attached to every passage where the subject could, by any perversion, he made the vehicle, attended with insupportable mistranslations and misconstructions, for the sake of hanging an odious meaning upon the writer, it would give *some* idea of the medium through which the Koran was introduced to Europe."—*Apol. for the Life of Mohammed*, p. 41.

Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, says:—"The original of this book (the Koran), he (that is, Mohammed) taught them, was laid up in the archives of Heaven, and that the Angel Gabriel brought him the copy of it, chapter by chapter, according as occasion required they should be published to the people."

Unsupported and absurd as the above remark is, it is unentitled to the least credit: it will suffice to observe, in answer to it, that, whenever any Mohammedan happens to read, he remains astonished and confounded, and finds himself perfectly at a loss to understand its meaning, or to guess whence and where it originated.

Such surprise is increased tenfold upon finding that, notwithstanding his high and just pretensions to a minute acquaint-

ance with Mohammedanism, Mr. Gibbon, drinking deep of the same source of ignorance, remarks as follows: "The substance of the Koran, according to himself or his disciples, is uncreated and eternal, subsisting in the essence of the Deity, and inscribed with a pen of light on the table of his everlasting decrees! A paper copy in a volume of silk and gems was brought down to the lowest heaven by the angel Gabriel." By no means less astonishingly confounding are the following incorrect but interesting inventions of Dean Prideaux, who says: "He (Mohammed) had the paper (transcript of the Koran) brought to him again, which he laid up in a chest which he called the '*Chest of his Apostleship*,' and Abu Beker, who succeeded the Impostor first made the collection, for when Mosailema, who in the last years of Mahomet set up for a prophet as well as he, had, in hopes of the same success, in like manner composed an '*Alcoran*,' and published it in a book to his followers, Abu Beker thought it necessary to publish *Mahomet's* also in the same manner."

The above are a few examples of hundreds of such absurdities which pervade all the Christian works upon Islam. Sir William Muir alone seems to have adopted the course of reasonable authorship, and, by his reasoning, exhibits some acquaintance with Mohammedan theology, but we regret to say he has selected for discussion those traditions only which Mohammedans themselves consider as the weakest, the most doubtful, and least entitled to credit. He has, at first, devoted all his abilities to prove that, at the time of Mohammed, reading and writing were not unknown in Arabia, and that "the revelations were generally committed to writing . . . . upon palm leaves, leather, stones, or such other rude materials as conveniently came to hand." This fact we have ourselves acknowledged, and no Mohammedan ever denied it; on the contrary, we take it as the strongest proof of the Koran being the same, word for word, as it was revealed to the Prophet. Sir William dwells

at some length on the abrogation of passages, which, according to Islam, is incorrect, not being supported by any testimony. Thus, for instance, he says, "Much of the Koran possessed only a temporary interest, arising out of circumstances which soon ceased to be important; and it seems to be doubtful whether the Prophet intended passages of this nature for public worship, or even for eventual currency. Such portions, it is little likely, he would take any pains to preserve."

The above mistake simply arose from the wrong interpretation which the Christians have understood by the term *Munsookh;* and we can safely say, that, if taken in the sense in which the Christians have understood it, there are no *Munsookh* passages in the Koran at all, but that, if taken in the sense in which some Mohammedan lawyers had technically employed the expression, then there were no passages of "temporary interest," and all of them were intended for perpetual currency.

Sir William Muir quotes, in his notes, the following traditions from Maracci and Weils: "There is a tradition that Abdallah Ibn Musud wrote down a verse from Mohammed's mouth, and next morning found it erased from the paper, which the Prophet explained by saying that it had been recalled to heaven. In later traditions the incident is told with the miraculous addition that the erasure occurred simultaneously, in the copies belonging to a number of Mohammed's followers." The above tradition, we know not whose, is evidently an invention, like that of Grotius's pigeon; and we concur with Sir William Muir in concluding that it has no truth, and "of course is a fabrication."

In explanation of the expression "entire revelation," Sir William Muir says, "In speaking according to Mahometan idiom, of the 'entire revelation,' I mean, of course, that which was preserved and current in Mahomet's later days, exclusive of what may possibly have been lost, destroyed, or become obsolete." According to Mohammedan "idiom," Sir William Muir's

expression, "entire revelation," would mean *all* the revelations that were ever made to the Prophet, and we assure our readers that, as will be proved hereafter, no revelations "have ever been lost, destroyed, or become obsolete."

There is no doubt that the present arrangement of the Koran, as we have above shown, had been made known and sanctioned by the Prophet himself. Sir William Muir says, "Now the Coran as handed down to our time, follows, in the dispositions of its various parts, no intelligible arrangement whatever, either of subject or time, and it is inconceivable that Mahomet should have enjoined its recital invariably in the concatenation. The chaotic mingling of subjects, ever and anon disjoined as well by chronology as by the sense; a portion produced at Medina, sometimes immediately preceding a passage revealed long before at Mecca; a command placed directly after a later one which cancels or modifies it; or an argument suddenly disturbed by the interjection of a sentence utterly foreign to its purpose—all this forbids us to believe that the present, or, indeed, any complete arrangement was in use during Mahomet's lifetime."

We Mohammedans believe that the present Koran is as systematically arranged, and is as harmonious as regards the sense, as any book can possibly be. Numberless works have been written for the express purpose of pointing out and clearly explaining the connexion which runs through all the chapters and verses. But the composition of the Koran is so concise and laconic that the connexion between two passages whose sense superficially appears to be "foreign" to each other requires some explanation, and, to those who are ignorant of it, it seems "jingling" and "wearisome, confused jumble, crude, endless iterations, long-windedness, entanglement, most crude, incondite." We are sorry to say that Sir William Muir's objections are too general to be answered. Had he pointed out any particular passages which to him appeared to have been "ever and anon disjoined, as well by chronology as by sense,"

or "arguments which seem to him to be suddenly disturbed by the interjection of a sentence utterly foreign to their purport," we assuredly would have taken upon ourselves the responsibility of explaining those difficulties to him and of pointing out the real connexion between them. As to the remark about "a command placed directly after a later one, which cancelled or modified it," we have repeatedly said that the ignorance of the real signification on which the terms Nasikh and Munsookh had been originally employed by the Mohammedan doctors, had caused this remark to emanate from that learned author's pen.

After describing the mode of the compilation of the Koran in the Caliphate of Abu Bukr, Sir William proceeds to the Caliphate of Osman, and says that "the original copy of the first edition was obtained from Hafsah's depository, and a careful *recension* of the whole set on foot. In case of difference between Zaid and his coadjutors, the voice of the latter, as demonstrative of the Coreishite idiom, was to preponderate; and the *new collation was thus assimilated* to the Meccan dialect, in which the Prophet had given utterance to his inspiration."

We are at a loss to guess as to the source whence Sir William Muir derived the above remark. As far as Mohammedan literature is concerned, no such thing is mentioned in any book, hadees, or tradition. What we decidedly object to is the use of the following three expressions in the above remark:—(1) *recension*; (2) *was thus assimilated*; (3) *new collation*. No tradition whatsoever informs us that there ever was a "careful recension" of the Koran compiled by Zaid. The hadees which describes this circumstance, and which we have noticed above, has the following words—فنسخوا هافي المصاحف—which mean, "Then they had several copies taken of it."

The same hadees also has إذ اختلفتم انتم وزيد ابن ثابت في شئي من القران—that is, "When ye differ from Zaid Ibni Sabit in anything in the Koran." Although the "*thing*" in

which they might differ is, as yet, too vague, still we find it explained just below it, where it is stated فكتبوه بلسان قريش— "then write it in the Koreish dialect." Now, it becomes quite evident that the "*thing*" was no other than the difference of pronunciation. The hadees related by Bokharee has it still more plainly, for he says, في عربيه من عربية القران—that is, "If you differ in any dialect of the many dialects of the Koran." The phrase, "was thus assimilated to the Meccan dialect" implies that there did occur some difference, and that the compilers did alter it. In the hadees the compilers are undoubtedly ordered to prefer the Koreish dialect to all others, should they meet with any differences; but no hadees or tradition mentions that they did meet with differences, and that they did make corrections.

We are not aware on what ground Sir William Muir has used the words "new collation," or where he could have obtained such an intimation. In his note upon the same circumstance, he says, "to escape the scandal and inconsistency of the transaction here detailed, it is held that the Coran, as to its external dress, was revealed in seven dialects of the Arabic tongue. It is not improbable that Mahomet himself may have originated or countenanced some idea of this kind, to avoid the embarrassment of differing versions of the same passages of revelation." The passage is composed in a strain in which the spirit of deep-rooted prejudice is observable on the very surface. It is inconsistent with the established laws of just reasoning, with the acknowledged principles of morality and decency, to impute fraud, deceit, and hypocrisy to persons distinguished for piety, virtue, candour, sincerity, and integrity. We shall reserve the above point for our readers to canvass, and we shall not enter upon a discussion concerning it, since we hold that persons truly pious and virtuous, of whatsoever religion they may be, are as much entitled to our esteem, respect, and reverence as our own holy personages themselves.

The only *true* remark which escapes Sir William Muir is that "there is probably in the world no other work which has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text;" and it is our belief that it will so continue to remain for ever; a fact which verifies the following prophecy mentioned in the Koran. God says in that Holy Book: "We have surely sent down the Koran, and we certainly will preserve the same from corruption" (chap. xv. v. 9).

Sir William Muir, in the course of his description, says, "If the text of Abu Bucr's Coran was pure, and universally received, how came it to be so soon corrupted, and to require, in consequence of its variations, an extensive recension?" We have very clearly proved above that Abu Bukr's copy did not come to be "corrupted." Nor did it require an extensive "recension."

The causes given by Sir William Muir for the variety of readings in the Koran are not at all correct, and we have, under the head of "Various Readings," produced, in detail, all that could possibly be said on the subject.

Sir William Muir proceeds to state that, "while, however, it is maintained that we have now the Coran *as it was left* by Mahomet, there is no ground for asserting that passages once given forth as inspired may not, at some subsequent period, have been changed or withdrawn *by the Prophet himself*." There existed no revelations which came down to Mohammed that are not in the Koran; and the hadees related by Abdul Azeez, which has already been quoted, and which says, "The Prophet left nothing behind him, except what is bound in this," clearly establishes our assertion; but having elsewhere promised to dwell upon this point at some length, we shall take the present opportunity of so doing.

To establish his assertion above quoted, Sir William Muir adduces the following authorities. These are the remarks he quotes from Katibul Wakedee: "Omar praised Obey Ibn Kab, and said, 'That he was the most perfect reader of the Koran

We indeed,' he added, '*are in the habit of omitting some portions included by Obey in his recitation*, for Obey is wont to affirm, I heard the Prophet saying so, and I omit not a *single word* entered in the Coran by the Prophet: whereas the fact is, that parts of the book were revealed in the absence of Obey,' which cancel or alter some of the verses which he repeats." The above remark, which is redolent of Sir William Muir's style of composition, is quite contrary to the import of the original hadees related by Omar, and the words italicized are entirely wanting in the latter. We quote the original hadees itself along with a faithful English translation. This hadees is given by Bokharee, who says that it was related to him by Omar, the son of Ali, who learned it from Yahyah, who was told it by Sofian, to whom it was related by Habeeb, who had it from Saïd, son of Jobair, who heard it from Ibni Abbas, who related that it was said by Omar that " the best repeater (of the Koran) among us is Obey, and the best judge among us is Ali; and verily we omit some of the sayings of Obey because of his assertion that 'I do not omit anything which I heard from the Prophet,' whereas the fact is that God himself said, 'Whatever commands we cancel or cause thee to forget, we give thee better in their stead, or the like thereof.' "

حدثنا عمرو بن علي قال حدثنا يحي قال حدثنا سفيٰن عن حبيب عن سعيد بن جبير عن ابن عباس قال قال عمر اقرأ نا ابي و اقضا نا علي و انا لَنَدَعُ من قول ابي و ذلك ان ابيا يقول لا أَدَعَ شيًا سمعتة من رسول الله صلعم و قد قال الله تعالي ما ننسخ من اية اوننسها

(بخاري كتاب التفسير)

It will be evident now that in the above hadees it is nowhere mentioned that Omar used to omit some portions of the Koran which Obey was accustomed to repeat. The real sense of the

hadees is, that when the personages named in that hadees applied themselves to the task of deducing all commandments from the Koran, Obey maintained that there were no Nasikh or Munsookh passages (in the same sense in which the Mohammedan lawyers had employed them) in the Koran, and considered as true all the commands deduced from all the passages. Ali, however, was of opinion that some passages had been cancelled by others, and thus the difference of opinion between Ali and Obey had been occasioned. In consequence of this Omar said, that although Obey is the best repeater of the Koran among us, yet Ali is the best judge—that is, he can deduce commandments and laws from the Koran better than all of us, and therefore we omit some of the commands which Obey deduced, and concur with Ali. This our interpretation is verified by the hadees itself, when it says that "Ali is the best judge among us;" for if the hadees is respecting various readings exclusively, then the phrase quoted just above has no connection whatever with what remains of it.

Our assertion is demonstrated by the very important circumstance that Bokharee, the greatest and highest acknowledged authority amongst the Mohammedans, mentions this hadees, where he dwells upon the question of *one commandment cancelling another*, and not where he discusses the *variety of readings*. Bokharee gives the same hadees, but in a somewhat modified shape, on another occasion, when he dwells upon the difference among readers. We quote this original hadees also, and subjoin a literal translation. He says that it was related to him by Sadkah, son of Fazal, who heard it from Yahyah, who related it from Sophian, who again heard it from Habeeb, son of Abi Sabit, who related it from Saïd, son of Jobair, and he from Ibni Abbas, who related that it was said by Omar that "Ali is the best judge among us, and the best repeater of the Koran among us is Obey. Verily we omit the *pronunciation* of Obey, who maintains that 'I have learnt it from the Prophet himself, and

shall not abandon it on any account;' whereas God himself says, 'Whatever commands we cancel or cause thee to forget, we give thee better in their stead, or the like thereof.'"

حدثنا صدقة بن الفضل قال اخبرنا يحيي عن سفيٰن عن حبيب بن ابي ثابت عن سعيد بن جبير عن ابن عباس قال قال عمر علي اقضانا و ابي اقراء نا و اِنَّا لَنَدَعُ من لحن ابي و ابي يقول اخذته من في رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم فلا اتركه لشي قال الله تعالي ما ننسخ من اية اوننسها نات بخيرٍ منها اومثلها (بخاري باب القراء)

The Arabic word which we have rendered by *pronunciation* is لحن—*Lahen*—that is, *intonation*; but as the Koran is also chanted in the same tone, it is likewise applied to the pronunciation of the passages of the Koran.

This hadees is doubtful, from two considerations: first, although this hadees and the one preceding it were both related by the same persons, yet, in the former, the word قول—*Koul*—(*saying*) is used, while in the latter one لحن—*Lahen*—pronunciation, is employed. We therefore believe that Sadkah, son of Fazal, who related this hadees, committed an error when he used the word *pronunciation* instead of *saying:* secondly, that the phrases, "Ali is the best judge amongst us," and "Whatever commandments we cancel or cause thee to forget, we give thee better in their stead, or the like thereof," have no imaginable connection with the peculiar tone of chanting the Koran; and therefore we are of opinion that Sadkah misunderstood the first hadees, and delivered it in its wrong dress. But let us, for argument's sake, suppose, for a moment, this hadees to be the correct one of the two, it means nothing more than that Omar preferred the intonation of Ali to that of Obey. How forced, then, is the inference drawn therefrom by Sir William Muir,

when he makes Omar say, "We, indeed, are in the habit of omitting some portions included by Obey in his recitation!"

Sir William Muir gives from Wakedee another tradition, which, he says, is as follows:—"Ibni Abbas stated that he preferred the reading of Abdallah Ibn Masud, for Mahomet used to have the Koran repeated by him (by Gabriel) once every Ramazan, and in the year of his death it was twice repeated, and Abdallah was present (on both occasions), *and witnessed what was repealed thereof and what was changed.*" The latter part of this tradition has no reliable authority for its support, nor do we find it anywhere in any of the trustworthy and genuine hadeeses; and if it be at all in Wakedee, which we shall never cease to doubt, even then it would be entitled to no credit; for all unsupported and untrustworthy traditions in Wakedee are no more entitled to credit than Tom Moore's story of Lalla Rookh. Again, let the truth of it be taken for granted, merely for the sake of argument, how does it demonstrate Sir William Muir's assumption that "the Koran may not contain some passages once revealed, but subsequently cancelled or altered?" As the Revelation, which says, "Whatever commands we cancel or cause thee to forget, we give thee better in their stead, or the like thereof," has been fully discussed and explained above, we do not consider it necessary to say anything further on this point.

Sir William Muir gives, in the form of notes, some traditions as "the only instances of withdrawal or omission of passages from the Koran."

First: Upon the slaughter of the seventy Moslems, at Bir Mauna, Mahomet pretended to have received a message from them, through the Deity, which is given by different traditionists (with slight variations) as follows: بلغوا قو منا عنا انا لقينا ربنا فرضي عنا و رضينا عنه. "Convey to our people this intelligence respecting us, that we have met our Lord, and that he is well pleased with us, and we are well pleased with him" (*Katibul Wackidi*). "After this had been repeated by all the believers

for some time, as a verse of the Coran, it was cancelled and withdrawn."

In the first place, the genuineness of the tradition itself is doubted and denied; and, secondly, the assumption of Sir William that "after this had been repeated by all believers for some time, as a verse of the Coran, it was cancelled and withdrawn," is utterly unsupported, and we do not find it in any of the trustworthy and authentic traditions.

Secondly: Omar is said to have addressed his subjects at Medina—"Take heed, O ye people, that ye do not abandon the verse that commands stoning for adultery, and if any one say *we do not find two punishments* (*i.e.* one for adultery and another for fornication) *in the Book of the Lord*, I reply, I have seen the Prophet of the Lord executing the punishment of stoning for adultery, and we have put in force the same after him, and, by the Lord, if it were not that men would say '*Omar hath introduced something new into the Coran*, I would have inserted the same in the Coran, for truly I have read the verse والشيخ و الشيخة اذا زنيا فا رجمو هما البتة, *the married man and the married woman, when they commit adultery, stone them both without doubt*" (*Katibul Wackidi Weils Mahomet*).

In the first place, this is a misconstruction and a misrepresentation of the original hadees. What we mean by it is, that the Arabic phrase inserted in it is not to be found in the original hadees at all, and there exists no authority whatever to the effect that the Mohammedans ever took it as a revealed passage of the Koran. Secondly, that the composition of the phrase is so miserably bad that, leaving Arabs out of the question, not even a foreigner would ever represent it to be the production of even a second or third rate literary Arabian, far less that of God himself. We shall now relate this circumstance from its very commencement, and, in the course of our statement, shall quote the original hadees also, whereby it will be found that the Arabic phrase in question is not contained therein.

The Koran assigns the following punishment for adultery: "If any of your women be guilty of whoredom, produce four witnesses from among you against them, and if they bear witness against them do not allow them to go out of your houses until death release them, or God afford them a way of relief" (chap. iv. v. 19).

و اللا تي يا تين الفاحشة من نسا ئكم فا ستشهد واعليهن اربعة منكم فان شهدوا فا مسكو هن في البيوت حتي يتو فا هن الموت اويجعل الله لهن سبيلا (سورہ نساء ایت ۱۹)

Another passage, prescribing punishment for adultery, is as follows: "The whore and the whoremonger shall ye scourge with a hundred stripes" (chap xxiv. v. 2).

الزاني و الزانية فا جلدوا كل و احد منهما مايۃ جلدہ (سورہ نور ایت ۲)

Afterwards the Prophet declared as follows, respecting adultery, and which has been related by Moslim as follows: "Obad, a son of Samit, makes the Prophet state, 'Learn ye from me that God has afforded a way for adulteresses, which is, that married persons should be punished for adultery as they deserve, and unmarried, as they deserve. Married persons should receive for adultery one hundred stripes, and should be stoned; unmarried persons should receive one hundred stripes, and should be exiled for one year.'"

عن عبادۃ بن الصامت قال . . . . قال خذوا عني قد جعل الله لهن سبيلا الثيب بالثيب و البكر بالبكر الثيب جلد مائۃ ثم رجما با الحجارۃ و البكر جلد مائہ ثم نفي سنۃ (مسلم باب حدالزنا)

There is no doubt, however, that the Prophet himself had, according to the Jewish code, caused to be stoned some married persons, indicted and convicted of whoredom, but it is impossible to prove that he made such an order *after* the above-quoted passage of the Koran had been revealed.

After the death of Mohammed, the Mohammedan divines appear to have been soon divided, with respect to the proper punishment for adultery, and it appears that three distinct opinions arose out of the two passages of the Koran, and the one hadees above quoted.

(1.) In the first passage of the Koran it is mentioned, "do not allow them to go out of your houses until death relieve them, or God afford them a way of relief." Some doctors have concluded that it is this "way of relief" which is explained in the hadees already quoted above, and which says, "married persons should receive for adultery one hundred stripes, and should be stoned, and unmarried persons should receive one hundred stripes, and should be exiled for one year." It appears to us that the above opinion alone is the source of the mistake, that the order which appoints stoning also as the punishment for adultery, was one of the revealed portions of the Koran.

(2.) Some doctors conclude that, of the two above-quoted passages of the Koran, the second cancelled the first, and that the punishment for the crime, committed either by a married person or by a bachelor, was agreed to be one hundred stripes.

(3.) Other learned persons, while believing that the first passage was cancelled by the second one, came to the conclusion that, as there was no decided punishment mentioned in the first passage, the punishment mentioned in the hadees should be inflicted upon the married persons, and that mentioned in the second passage of the Koran should be inflicted upon bachelors. The above we learn from Navavee also.

This difference of opinion has lasted to the present day, inas-

much as the Motazlee and the Kharjee, two great sects of Mohammedans, hold, even now, that stoning is not the punishment for adultery, and the author of the present Essay himself, although he belongs to neither of the above-mentioned sects, but is a Sunnee, holds the same opinion. It seems that Omar held the third opinion, and, therefore, when he succeeded to the Caliphate he explained the same to many persons, causing it to be put in force throughout his dominions. Wakedee has given this hadees with much interpolation and curtailment, and Sir William Muir has copied the same in his biography of Mohammed. We quote here below the original hadees as given by Moslim, subjoining thereto a true and faithful version in English.

"Omar, when occupying the pulpit of the Prophet, said: 'Undoubtedly Mohammed was the true Prophet of God, and God revealed unto him the Holy Koran, and one of the commandments which[1] God sent down to Mohammed was that of stoning; we saw that commandment, read it, and understood it.' The Prophet himself ordered persons to be stoned, and we did the same after him. I fear that after a time men would say, 'among the commandments of God we do not find stoning;' then, verily, they would be misled by not obeying this order, truly sent down by God, and there is no doubt that stoning is the punishment sent down by God for married men or women who commit adultery, either after its having been proved by witnesses, or by the woman's conception, or the party accused acknowledging the commission of the crime."

قال عمر بن الخطاب و هو جالس علي منبر رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم ان الله بعث محمداصلعم بالحق انزل عليه الكتاب فكان مما انزل الله عليه اية الرجم قر اناها و عيناها و عقلناها فرجم رسول الله

[1] Those commandments which the Prophet received through the Wakee Ghair Matloo. See p. 3 and 4 of this Essay.

صلعم و رجمنا بعده فا خشي ان طال بالناس زمان ان يقول قايل ما نجد الرجم في كتاب الله تعالي فيضلوا بترك فريضة انزلها الله و ان الرجم في كتاب الله حقٌّ علي من زنا اذا احصنَّ من الرجال و النساء اذا قامت البينة او كان الحَبَلُ او الا عتراف (مسلم باب حدالزنا)

اما قوله صلعم فقد جعل الله لهن سبيلا فا شارة الي قول الله تعالي فامسكوا هن في البيوت حتي يتو فا هن الموت او يجعل الله لهن سبيلا فبين النبي صلعم هذا هو ذلك السبيل و اختلف العلماء في هذه الاية فقيل هي محكمه و هذا لحديث مفسر لها و قيل منسوخة بالايةّ التي في اول سورة النور و قيل ان اية النور في البكرين و هذه الاية في الثيبين (نواوي)

قوله فكان مما انزل الله عليه اية الرجم قراناها و عيناها و عقلناها ارادبة اية الرجم " الشيخ و الشيخة اذا زنيا فا رجمو هما البتة" (نواوي)

و في ترك الصحابة كتابة هذا لاية دلالة ظاهرة ان المنسوخ لايكتب في المصحف (نواوي)

قوله فا خشي ان طال بالناس زمان ان يقول قايل ما نجدا الرجم في كتاب الله فيضلوا بترك فريضة هذا الذي خشيته قد و قع من لخوارج و من و افقهم (نواوي)

و اجمع العلماء علي و جوب جلد الزاني البكر مائه و رجم المحصن و هو الثيب و لم يخالف في هذا و احد من اهل القبلة الا ما حكي القاضي عياض و غيره عن الخوارج و بعض المعتزلة كا لنظام و اصحابه فا نهم لم يقولوا بالرجم (نواوي)

In this translation we have substituted, respectively, the words, *order* and *command*, for ايۃ—*ayat*, and كتاب—*kitab*; and we can cite many instances of their being so employed in the Koran itself, and the hadeeses. Our antagonist, however, has a right to object to this our translation, and to insist upon our using "verse" and "book" instead of "order" and "command," respectively, which are the literal meanings of ايۃ—*ayat*, and كتاب *kitab*. We shall now give another translation, using the words *verse* and *the Koran* instead of *order* and *command*; and it will be evident to our readers how absurd the hadees becomes, in that case. "Omar, when occupying the pulpit of the Prophet, said, 'Undoubtedly Mohammed was the true prophet of God, and God revealed unto him the Holy Koran; and one of that which God sent down to Mohammed is the verse of stoning, and we saw it, and read it, and understood it.' The Prophet himself ordered persons to be stoned, and we did the same after him. I fear that after a time men would say, 'We do not find stoning in the Koran'; then, verily, they would be misled by not obeying this order, truly sent down by God; and there is no doubt that stoning is the punishment specified in the Koran for men and women who commit adultery, after it has been either proved by witnesses, or by the female's conception, or by the acknowledgment of the accused party himself.'"

Do not the two portions of the latter hadees—"We do not find stoning in the Koran," and "There is no doubt that stoning is specified in the Koran"—clash together and contradict each other?

Quitting this philological discussion, we now direct our attention to the main point, and ask, Where is to be found, in this hadees, the following passage, which Sir Willam Muir represents himself to have copied from Wakedee? The passage is this:—"And, by the Lord, if it were not that men would say, 'Omar hath introduced something new into the Coran,' I would have inserted the same in the Coran; for truly I have read the verse

والشيخ و الشيخه اذا زنيا فا رجمو هما البته. The married man and the married woman, when they commit adultery, stone them both, without doubt."

With the desire of making their work voluminous, and of parading their intimate acquaintance with the subject they write upon, our commentators and historians have eagerly scraped together all the trash and puerile nonsense which had become current among the public, and introduced the same into their books; but we assure our readers that every Mohammedan discards them as so many absurdities, and Islam rejects them with disgust and scorn.[1]

In the third instance of "withdrawal or omission" of verses, Sir William Muir gives "a tradition quoted by Maracci, to the effect that a verse about a valley of gold has been omitted." In the fourth example he gives "the tale by Abdallah Ibn Masud, of his 'discovering that a verse had disappeared during the

[1] In his commentary of the "Moslim," Navavee writes that by the "commandment" referred to in the passage—"one of the commandments which God sent down to Mohammed was that of stoning; and we saw that commandment, read it, and understood it." Omar had in view the following verse:—"The married man and the married woman, when they commit adultery, stone them both without doubt." The same commentator further observes that, as the above quoted verse does not exist in the Koran, it may be asserted with certainty that the abrogated verses were not inserted in that Sacred Writ. It will, however, be evident to every judicious reader that the above remark of Navavee is neither a saying of the Prophet nor a religious doctrine, but merely the opinion of a commentator—an opinion, at the same time, far from being a satisfactory one, as it is open to the following objections:—First: He does not even endeavour to prove that the verse in question was actually one of the verses of the Koran. Secondly: He adduces no grounds to the effect that Omar had the selfsame verse in view. Thirdly: From the wrong premisses he has drawn a wrong conclusion; inasmuch as he first takes it for granted that the verse under consideration was really one of the verses of the Koran, and that it was this very verse that Omar had in view, and afterwards wrongly infers that "cancelled verses were not inserted in the Koran." Not a few of our histories and commentaries are unfortunately replete with passages like the above, based upon wrong data, and supported by nothing whatever but the conjectures of the writer himself. Christian authors and critics, on account of their utter unacquaintance with the subject, take them to be genuine hadeeses, and eagerly build upon them groundless charges against Islam.

night from his leaves;'" and in the fifth instance he gives "the passage regarding the goddesses of Mecca;" but since he himself disposes of them, by alleging that all of them are false and apocryphal, it would be needless, on our part, to kill the slain.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

HISTORY OF THE HOLY MECCA,

INCLUDING AN ACCOUNT OF THE DISTINGUISHED PART ENACTED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH,

BY THE ANCESTORS OF MOHAMMED.

خطبةٌ

علي بيت الله الحرام و السوانح التي مضت فيها قبل الا سلام

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

ان اوّل بيت وضع للناس ببكة مبارگا و هُدًي للعالمين

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO.; 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Erection of the Temple of the Kaaba in the 42nd century, A.M., or 19th century B.C., by Abraham and Ishmael . .	1
Grounds for believing the Kaaba to be of Abrahamic origin .	1-2
Traditions respecting the origin of the Black Stone . . .	3-4
Origin of the Tawaf	4-5
Refutation of the remark of Sir William Muir that all the ceremonies connected with the Kaaba—the kissing of the Black Stone and erection of the Temple itself—"have no conceivable connection with Abraham" . . .	5-7
Reconstruction of the Temple of the Kaaba by Bani Jorham, by the Amalekites, by Cosaee, by the Koreish tribe, by Abdoollah Ibni Zobair, and by Hajjaj Ibni Yusuf .	7-8
Origin of the well of Zemzem	8-9
Various appellations of the Kaaba	9
Names of the personages and tribes in whose possession the Temple of the Kaaba successively remained . .	9-10
Account of the conspicuous part enacted by the Ancestors of the Prophet, in connection with the History of the Holy Mecca	10-12



THE TEMPLE OF





THE HOLY KAABA.

ESSAY

ON THE

HISTORY OF THE HOLY MECCA,

INCLUDING AN ACCOUNT OF THE DISTINGUISHED PART ENACTED IN CONNECTION THEREWITH,

BY THE ANCESTORS OF MOHAMMED.

THE most ancient and authentic of all the local traditions of Arabia—traditions that have, from the very first, been acknowledged, without the least hesitation, as perfectly true and unquestionable by nearly every nation and tribe of that vast peninsula—represent the temple of the Kaaba as having been constructed in the 42nd century A.M., or 19th century B.C., by Abraham, who was assisted in his work by his son Ishmael.

Besides these traditions, there are also many other circumstances connected with the nature of the building itself, which are strongly corroborative of its having most undoubtedly been of Abrahamic origin.

We find, moreover, that it was a practice with Abraham to raise altars for God's worship on every spot where he himself had adored Him. "And the Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land; and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him" (Gen. xii. 7). "Then Abraham removed his tent, and came down and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord" (Gen. xiii. 18).

This practice was not exclusively confined to Abraham, being observed by his descendants also. "And he (Isaac) builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the Lord, and pitched

his tent there; and there Isaac's servants digged a well" (Gen. xxvi. 25).

These altars were made of unhewn stones, placed vertically, like pillars; and the spot whereon these altars were so raised was emphatically called, by way of distinction, the "House of God," or "Beth-el," with the ulterior intention that, at some future time, there should be erected, on the self-same locality, an edifice for the due celebration of God's worship—a building, in fact, answering to a synagogue, church, or mosque of the present times. "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel" (Ex. xxiv. 4). "And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it" (Ex. xx. 25). "And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he called the name of that place Beth-el, but the name of that city was called Luz at the first. . . . And this stone which I have set for a pillar shall be God's house" (Gen. xxviii. 18, 19, 22).

Before the erection of the temple of the Kaaba, the Black Stone was no other than one of the numerous altars erected for the suitable performance of God's worship, and was, together with other stones, laid up in one of the corners of the same temple on the occasion of its construction. The custom of erecting these pillar-like altars of unhewn stone for the worship of God—a custom indisputably confirmed by the Scriptures to have been always observed and practised by Abraham himself and his descendants—demonstrates the truth of the assertion that the temple of the Kaaba was indeed of Abrahamic origin. Nearly all the traditions respecting the temple of the Kaaba and the Black Stone, with which Oriental writers have favoured us, are nothing more than idle fictions, inasmuch as the origin of not one of them can be traced up to Mohammed; the characters

and veracity of the narrators themselves are alike subject to suspicion; and, lastly, they are so utterly void of any reliable authority as scarcely to justify the loss of time and space occasioned by the mere mention of them, were it not that an account of the contents of three of them have some degree of interest attached to them. Two of these traditions are from Termizee alone, and the third from Termizee, Ibni Majah, and Darmee.

In the first of them it is stated that "The Black Stone came down from Paradise, and it was originally white as milk, but the enormous sins of mankind turned it black." The second states that "It is a spinel ruby, one of the precious stones of heaven; that God deprived it of its lustre and brilliancy; for, otherwise, the world would have been illuminated by it from one end thereof unto the other." The third is that "On the day of judgment God will grant the Stone eyes and a tongue, whereby it will recognize and name those persons who had kissed it in this world."

These traditions also are as little entitled to our belief as any of the rest. They possess no trustworthy authority for their support, and their correctness is strongly impugned by those authors who have recorded none but true and genuine traditions.

On the contrary, there are many ancient writers of high authority who give us candidly what they believe to be the true origin of the Black Stone, thereby tacitly refuting the above-mentioned accounts hazarded by injudicious and unscrupulous authors.

From the work entitled "The History of Mecca," by Abee Waleed Mohammed, we shall now quote a few of the opinions of the writers alluded to in the preceding paragraph.

The author of the above-named book gives it as the opinion of Shobee, a very ancient and honest authority, that while Abraham was occupied in erecting the temple of the Kaaba, he desired Ishmael to furnish him with so conspicuous a stone as should distinctly mark the spot or starting-point of the circuit intended to be made round the edifice; and it was this Black Stone which Ishmael placed at his father's disposal.

In the same book, the tradition narrated by Abdollah Ibn Amur clearly and distinctly proves that the Black Stone is a piece of rock from the Abba Kobais mountain, in the vicinity of Mecca, and that it was brought to the temple of the Kaaba for the same purpose as that assigned by Shobee.

The same author states that the stone became black owing to the two fires that had broken out, on two separate occasions, in the temple—one prior to the introduction of Islam, and the other in the days of Ibni Zobair—and that the latter burned so fiercely as to split the stone asunder in three pieces, which Ibni Zobair afterwards caused to be reunited by means of silver hooks and rings.

From what we have above stated it will be evident that the three before-mentioned traditions are entirely false and spurious; but even supposing that, for mere argument's sake, we were to consider them as entitled to credit, the language in which they are presented to the reader is not to be taken literally, but figuratively, since the idea meant to be conveyed is that, on the day of judgment, not one of man's actions when on earth will remain concealed from God's perfect omniscience; the object of expressing this and many similar ones by rhetorical figures being to facilitate its comprehension by ordinary minds. The same remark applies to the expressions—That on the last day man's hands shall be evidence as to what he has performed, his tongue declare all the words of his lips, and the earth upon which he walked make known his demeanour or conduct thereon, etc., etc.; the summary of all this being that every action of man's life shall be made known to God.

By a critical examination of the works of Bokharee and other eminent authors, who have written upon traditions and *hadeeses*, it appears to us that the real origin of the Tawaf, or making the circuit round the temple of the Kaaba, must have arisen thus. In the then imperfect state of civilization, the inhabitants of the Arabian Peninsula had a rude but very earnest, enthusiastic, and devout mode of performing prayer. They would assemble in

great numbers, and nearly half naked, round the temple of the Kaaba, and there, warmed and excited by zeal and enthusiasm, till they were almost frantic, they would make, in procession, the tour of the temple, dancing, jumping, and vociferating aloud, but in tones of mingled love and devotion, the name of God; then, again, kneeling down, they would, with the utmost reverence, imprint on the corners of the temple a kiss, in which were mingled the warmest devotion with respect the most profound. The same custom, although, of course, modified by various circumstances, and, more especially, by the progress and influence of civilization, is kept up even in the present day. The philosophic Gibbon, speaking of the Kaaba, has this remark: "The genuine antiquity of the Kaaba ascends beyond the Christian era; in describing the coast of the Red Sea, the Greek historian, Diodorus, has remarked, between the Thamudites and the Sabeans, a famous temple, whose superior sanctity was revered by *all* the Arabians." If, in the time of Diodorus, the Kaaba was "a famous temple, whose superior sanctity was revered by *all* the Arabians," then we must ascribe its origin to a very remote period indeed.

Sir William Muir writes, "according to this theory, how shall we account for the tradition current among the Arabs that the temple and its rights were indebted for their origin to Abraham and Ishmael? This was no Moslem fiction, but the popular opinion of the Meccans long before the era of Mahomet, otherwise it could not have been referred to in the Coran as an acknowledged fact, nor would the names of certain spots around the Caaba have been connected, as we know them to have been, with Abraham and with Ishmael." Notwithstanding the above remark, Sir William pertinaciously denies the Abrahamic origin of the temple of the Kaaba; but for this his denial of that indisputable truth, a truth which has never been, in the least degree, questioned by any historian except himself, he brings forward no substantial and convincing reasons. Weak in their very selves, as are the grounds upon which he bases the

(supposed) truth of his erroneous notion, they appear to us to be the following:

First: He takes it for granted that the settlement of Ishmael, near Mecca, and the circumstance of Joktan's being the patriarch of the Arabians, are all mere fictions and fables, devoid of all historical truth and probability. We have, however, with the assistance of the manifold Arabian local traditions of the Scriptures, and that of many of the European historians, indisputably proved every one of the above circumstances to have been *facts* established and acknowledged by history, both sacred and profane.[1]

Secondly: Sir William *conjectures* and *supposes*, with much self-gratulation, that "there is no trace of anything Abrahamic in the essential elements of the superstition. To kiss the Black Stone, to make the circuit of the Kaaba, and perform the other observances at Mecca, Arafat, and the Vale of Mina, to keep the sacred months and to hallow the sacred territory, have no conceivable connection with Abraham, or with the ideas and principles which his descendants would be likely to inherit from him; such rites originated in causes foreign to the country chiefly occupied by the children of Abraham. They were either strictly local, or, being connected with the system of idolatry in the south of the Peninsula, were thence imported by the Bani Jorham, the Caturah, the Azdites, or some other tribe which emigrated from Yemen and settled at Mecca."

We have, however, in the outset of this our Essay, perfectly proved, to the satisfaction, it is hoped, of all impartial and unprejudiced readers, that the Black Stone and the temple of the Kaaba possess a manifest and close connection with the religious practices of Abraham and his descendants; that it bears the name of "The House of God," or Beth-el, an appellation which is the distinguishing characteristic of all such altars erected by Abraham himself, and that the temple of the Kaaba was also built by Abraham in conformity with those religious practices, according

[1] See "Essay on the Historical Geography of Arabia."

to which, after a lapse of time, the descendants of his second son built the temple of Jerusalem.

Thirdly: He says that "the native systems of Arabia were Sabeanism, Idolatry, and *Stone-worship*, all closely connected with the religion of Mecca."

From what we have observed, in the commencement of this Essay, it will be perfectly seen that the practice of the "*Stone-worship*," which Sir William Muir represents to have been exclusively native to Arabia, originated with Abraham, Jacob, Isaac, Ishmael, and Moses themselves, who used to erect pillar-like, isolated, and naked stones, to pour oil over them, and to worship them in every way.

After all these unfortunate conjectures and gratuitous fictions, he hazards a "*supposed* history of the rise of Mecca and its religion;" and after having supposed everything and taken it for granted, he naturally, and as a matter of course, falls into the impossibility of reconciling the production of his own fertile brain with Arabian history; but his pen is no less vigorous and telling than his imagination is airy and active, so that, in one moment, by bringing his fancy into play, he surmounts all impossibilities by a few strokes of his pen. But as these emanations from his quill are neither historical facts, nor local traditions, nor scripture truths, but the mere offspring of Sir William's wonder-working fancy, and, destitute as they are of all support and corroboration from reliable authority, we do not think it worth while to give them a place in our Essay.

As time rolled on, the temple erected by Abraham and Ishmael became time-worn and dilapidated, and was repaired for a second time by the Bani Jorham tribe, but we possess no authority for enabling us to fix correctly the time of its reconstruction.

Having again fallen into a ruinous condition, it was rebuilt by the Amalekites. It appears that, previously to the daily increasing influence of the descendants of Ishmael, that of the Amalekites diminished, but that after some time, it again recovered its power and influence over Mecca. This period appears to be the

same when Jozaimah, the second king of the Hyarah dynasty, defeated them in a bloody engagement, which took place about a hundred years before the Christian era.

Some writers have fallen into a palpable error by representing the Amalekites, a tribe of the Arabul Baidahs, who lived long before the Bani Jorham, to have been the first who repaired the temple of the Kaaba, and that the Bani Jorham tribe followed their example. The error of these writers consists in their confounding together the two tribes of Amalekites, of which the one flourished long before that of the Bani Jorham, while the other lived after them. The remark of the author of the work entitled "Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca," and which rests upon an authentic hadees from Ali, is perfectly correct, wherein he mentions the Bani Jorham first, and the Amalekites after them, as the tribes who successively repaired the temple of the Kaaba. When the building again fell into a decayed condition, it was rebuilt by Cosaee; after that, when it suffered very severely from the fire which accidentally broke out in it, it was restored to its former state by the Koreish tribe. In the days of the Mussulman domination, it was re-erected by Abdoollah Ibni Zobair. After this the building was partially repaired by Hajjaj Ibni Yusuf. This was the last occasion of the reconstruction of the edifice, but, from time to time, its environs, domes, minarets, and surrounding chambers, etc., have continually remained under architectural operations, until it assumed its present magnificent and imposing form, which we fervently hope may go on increasing in splendour and beauty: the accompanying plate is a faithful representation of this edifice—the object of love and reverence for every faithful Mussulman.

The Zemzem, which is a well at present, was, in days of yore, a small rill of water flowing from some one of the neighbouring hills, it being the same fountain which Hagar discovered in the desert, and where she and her son, and many of the Bani Jorham tribe, settled. After a time, however, the water ceased issuing from its mountain source, and the little stream completely dried

up. A considerable time afterwards Abdol Muttalib, the grandfather of Mohammed, had a well dug on the very spot where the spring was originally, and this well is still extant.

The original name of the temple of the Kaaba was "Beth-el," that is "The House of God," but it received the general appellation of "Kaaba" as being of a cubical form, that is, its length, breadth, and height are all equal to each other. It is also called Bakka and Mecca, on account of the numerous congregations which annually gather on the spot. Its other designation is Ommol Cora, that is "the Mother of Cities," on account of its being the oldest city in Arabia, and it has many other titles given to it for similar reasons.

The temple was, for the first time, covered over with cloth by Abu Karab, of the Hymiar dynasty, about 600 years before the Christian era. This custom has continued from that time to the present, but with this alteration, that formerly they used to put a new covering over the old worn out one which remained still on it; but now, the former cover is removed, and the new one substituted in its place. At the time of its erection, the temple of the Kaaba remained in the possession of Ishmael, after whose death his descendants became the supreme guardians of the sacred building. As the Ishmaelites and the Jorhamites were so closely connected together by the ties of such near relationship, and as the descendants of Ishmael, excepting Kadar, had, for the most part, migrated to different portions of the Peninsula, the guardianship of the "House of God" passed, in the course of time, from the hands of the descendants of Ishmael to the Jorhamites. After another considerable interval of time the Amalekites recovered their lost power and became the sole owners of the temple of the Kaaba. On this occasion the Ishmaelites and the Jorhamites united together in driving out their common foe, and having succeeded in so doing, the Jorhamites became, for the second time, the masters of the hallowed edifice. Bano Bakr and Bano Khozaa now conspired against the Jorhamites, and, uniting their forces, suddenly attacked the

latter; a long and sanguinary battle ensued, and the Jorhamites were totally overpowered and routed. The supreme charge of the sacred temple now fell into the hands of the Khozaa tribe. The first person who assumed the government of Mecca and the administration of the Kaaba was Amr, son of Lahee. He is the same person in whose reign the idols were placed in the Kaaba for the first time. After this Kosaee قصي, uniting himself with the Bani Kananah tribe, marched against the Bano Bakr and Bano Khozaa tribes, and the latter, giving him battle, were signally defeated. Kosaee now seized the reins of government from the hands of the vanquished, and assumed supreme authority over Mecca and the Kaaba. Kosaee, who flourished five generations before Mohammed, restored the government of Mecca and the Kaaba to the Koreish tribe, of which he now became the supreme representative. From Kosaee the charge of the Kaaba descended to his eldest son, Abdul Dar عبدالدار, from whom the chief offices held by him were transferred to his brother, Abdi Manaf عبدمناف. The principal offices in connection with the Kaaba were five altogether: 1st, Sicaya and Rifada, the exclusive privilege of supplying water and food to the pilgrims; 2nd, Kiyada, the command of the army in time of war; 3rd, Siva, the right of becoming standard bearer; 4th, Hijaba, the guardianship of the temple of the Kaaba; 5th, Daval Nadwa, the right of becoming president of the council.

After the death of Abdi Manaf, a family misunderstanding arose between the descendants of the deceased, on which account the offices were divided in the following order:—Hasheem was invested with the charge of Sicaya and Rifada, while the descendants of Abdul Dar retained the custody of the Kaaba, the presidency of the council, and the right of becoming standard bearer. Respecting the splendid munificence with which Hasheem discharged the office of providing for the pilgrims, Sir William Muir writes that "Hasheim, thus installed in the office of entertaining the pilgrims, fulfilled it with a princely magnificence. He was, himself, possessed of great riches, and many

others of the Coreish had also, by trading, acquired much wealth. He appealed to them as his grandfather Cossai had done: 'Ye are the neighbours of God and the keepers of his house. The pilgrims who came honouring the sanctity of his temple are his guests; and it is meet that ye should entertain them above all other guests. Ye are especially chosen of God and exalted with this high dignity, therefore, honour his guests and refresh them. For, from far distant cities, on their lean and jaded camels, they come unto you fatigued and harassed, with hair dishevelled and bodies covered with dust and squalor of the long way. Then, invite them hospitably, and furnish them with water in abundance.' Hasheim set the example by a munificent expenditure from his own resources, and the Coreish were forward to contribute, every man according to his ability. A fixed cess was also levied upon them all. Water sufficient for the prodigious assemblage was collected in cisterns, close by the Kaaba, from the wells of Mecca, and in temporary reservoirs of leather, at the stations on the route to Arafat. The distribution of food commenced on the day on which the pilgrims set out for Mina and Arafat, and continued until the assemblage dispersed. During this period, that is, for five or six days, they were entertained with pottage of meat and bread, or of butter and barley, variously prepared, and with the favourite national repast of dates. Thus Hasheim supported the credit of Mecca. But his name is even more renowned for the splendid charity by which he relieved the necessities of his fellow citizens, reduced by a long continued famine to extreme distress. He proceeded to Syria, purchased an immense stock of bread, packed it in panniers, and conveyed it on camels to Mecca. There the provisions were cooked for distribution; the camels were slaughtered and roasted, and the whole divided among the people. Destitution and mourning were suddenly turned into mirth and plenty, and it was (as the historian adds) 'as it were the beginning of new life after the year of scarcity.'"

Hasheim left his dignities to his elder brother, Almottalib,

after whom his nephew, Abdul Muttalib, the son of Hasheim, succeeded to his paternal offices. It was in the time of Abdul Muttalib that Ashram the Abrahah invaded Mecca, but was discomfited in his attempt and compelled to make a disgraceful retreat. As to the story of the miraculous birds sent by the Almighty against Ashram, it is so well known to all Orientals, as well as to those Christian authors who have written upon eastern topics, as to render it unnecessary for us to say more respecting it than that it has been so much exaggerated and falsely coloured by spurious and extravagant traditions, as to render it no easy task to discover the spuriousness of traditions and the truth of the original story, and we are sorry to say that the already occupied limits of this Essay will not allow us here to enter upon so long and tedious a discussion.

Abdul Muttalib bequeathed his offices to Zobair, his eldest surviving son, who transferred them to his brother, Abu Talib, but he, finding the offices too expensive and onerous for himself, gave them over to his younger brother Abbas. The latter, however, had not sufficient means to discharge, with credit, both the Sicaya and Rifada, and, in consequence, the latter passed into the rival branch descended from Abdi Manaf. But Arabia was now prepared to witness a religious, social, and public change. The "Year of the Elephant" had already given birth to Mohammed, who was destined to be the instrument for carrying out that unparalleled reformation. He was brought up under the tender and paternal care of Abdu Muttalib and Abu Talib. Shortly after the death of the latter he was obliged to quit his native city and seek an asylum in Medina. Mecca now considered herself secure, and indulged with pleasure and safety in the worship of her idols, when lo! she suddenly finds herself besieged by Mohammed, who conquers her with scarcely any opposition, destroys her images and idols, and, to his eternal glory, restores the worship of the unity of God.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

PEDIGREE OF MOHAMMED.

خطبةٌ

علي حسبه و نسبه عليه الصلواة و السلام

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

ان اللهَ اصّطفي ادمَ و نوحًا و آل ابراهيم و آل عمران علي العالمين

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Arabs used to commit their Pedigree to memory, or to record it in verse: difficulties resulting therefrom to historians	1-3
Various opinions respecting the Pedigree of Mohammed	3-4
Genealogy of the Prophet as given by Baihakee, Ibni Hisham, and Ibni Arabee	4-5
Genealogy of Mohammed as given by Barookh and Jerah	5-6
Reasons for the latter's Genealogy being considered the correct one	6-7
Genealogical list, from Mohammed up to Adnan, universally accepted; opinions of writers divided as to the same list, from Adnan upwards; universal belief that Adnan was descended from Ishmael	6-10
Remarks of Gibbon, Forster, and Sir William Muir respecting Mohammed's Pedigree	10-12
Table	12


غالب
Ghalib.
هذيل
Hozail.
قس
Kais.
خزيمه
Khozaimah.
جعد
Jaad.
آمنه بنت وهب
ام رسول الله صلعم
Aminah, mother of the Prophet of God.
خويلد
Khowailid.
خديجه ام المومنين
Khadeejah, wife of the Prophet of God.
نوفل
Nowfil.
المطلب
Almottalib.
هاشم
Hashim.
عبدالشمس
Abdosshams.
عبدالمطلب
Abdol Muttalib.
أميه
Ommayah.
عبدالكعبه
Abdol Kaabah.
ضرار
Zarar.
قثم
Kasam.
الزبير
Alzobair.
المقوم
Almokkavvim.
جهل
Jehil.
عبدالله
Abdollah.
ابو طالب
Abu Talib.
الغَيداق
Alghaidak.
ابو لهب
Abu Lahab.
الحرث
Alharth.
حمزه
Hamaz.
العباس
Abbas.
محمد رسول الله
** MOHAMMED,
THE TRUE PROPHET OF GOD.
امير المومنين علي*
Ali.


محمد رسول الله
** MOHAMMED,
THE TRUE PROPHET OF GOD.
فاطمه زهرا
Fatimah.
امير المومنين علي*
Ali.
امام حسين
Hosain.
امام حسن
Hassan.
امام زين العابدين
Zainolaabideen.

ESSAY

ON THE

PEDIGREE OF MOHAMMED.

THE Arab nation was, in the dark ages, in a state of the most crass ignorance, as neither literature, properly so called, nor any one of the sciences, had as yet appeared among them. The only two characteristics which particularly distinguished them was a rude, but expressive and powerful eloquence, and a wonderfully retentive memory, which enabled them to trace their line of descent—a faculty which they emphatically called علم الانساب Ilmal Ansab (The Knowledge of Descent). The Arabs, indeed, prided themselves upon their descent, and took the greatest delight in referring to it on every possible occasion; and hence the indispensable necessity of every individual being able to recollect, not only his own pedigree, but also that of any opponent he might have, so as to quash any boasting pretensions advanced by the latter. The art of writing being unknown to them, the names of their ancestors have not been recorded. Under these circumstances the memory was deemed the safest depository for all that was worthy of being recollected, and every person, therefore, learned by heart the names of as many of his forefathers as he could. We find also the names and deeds of the most illustrious and renowned personages recorded in verses which were exultingly recited on public occasions, such as annual fairs, the battle field, etc., etc. The consequence of all this was, that although every individual perfectly well knew to which tribe he belonged, and with which also his neighbours, countrymen and opponents were equally well acquainted, he, nevertheless, could not repeat the names of his ancestors, successively,

up to the first patriarch of the tribe. He could only state the names, for a few generations backward, with which his memory supplied him, or those which were recorded in verse.

The historian, therefore, who undertook the task of furnishing a complete genealogical list of such persons had to encounter the above-mentioned obstacles, obstacles which he never succeeded in surmounting.

The identity of the names of two different individuals was another source of such difficulties, for if, in an ascending line of succession, there were two persons, and sometimes there were many more than two, of the same name, the historian, mistaking the latter for the former, passed over in silence all the intermediate personages. It was also a custom prevailing throughout Syria and Arabia that, instead of mentioning the name of the real father of an individual, the party was called either the son of the patriarch of the tribe himself, or of some other illustrious personage belonging thereto. This will be made very clear by referring to the Gospel of St. Matthew, chap. i. v. 1, which is as follows: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

It was also another custom of the Arabs, that, after repeating the names of all their ancestors they could recollect, to mention the last as the son of the patriarch, a peculiarity which still further increased the difficulty the above referred to historians had to encounter.

The same obstacles present themselves when we direct our attention to the genealogy of our Prophet; but as not one single individual in Arabia ever entertained the least doubt that Mohammed was descended from the Koreish family; that the latter traced its descent from Moid, son of Adnan, and that Adnan was a descendant of Kedar, son of Ishmael, Mohammed was never obliged to say anything respecting his genealogy, and, therefore, no genuine and authentic hadees relative to this circumstance now exists. When genealogists differed in tracing the pedi-

gree of the Prophet, Katibul Wakidi makes Mohammed say "كذب النسابون Genealogists lie." Masoudee gives another tradition, in which he represents the Prophet to say—

ولذلك (اي لتنازع الناس في النسب) نهي النبي صلعم عن تجاوز معد لعلمه من تبا عد الانساب وكثرة الاراء في طول هذه الاعصار (مروج الذهب مسعودي)

"Do not trace my descent beyond Moid, son of Adnan," for the Prophet knew the difference that existed respecting the names of various personages as well as the time that had elapsed. Other traditions make the Prophet state "I am the descendant of the two sacrificed," by which he meant, as some interpret, Ishmael and Abdoolah. Abulfeda relates a tradition from Ommi Salma, Mohammed's wife, who makes the Prophet say that "Adnan عدنان is the son of Adad ادد, and Adad is the son of Zaid زيد, who is the son of Bara بَرا, and Bara is the son of Irakoseera عراق الثرى." Ommi Salma also related that by Zaid is meant Homaisaa هميسع, that Bara is equivalent to Nabat نبت, and that Irakossara is the same as Ishmael اسمعيل.

All the above-mentioned traditions have no authority for the proof of their genuineness, and are not entitled to the least particle of credit. Ishmael was never sacrificed, as we have amply proved in our Essay "On the Historical Geography of Arabia," and the account of the offering up of Abdoolah is false. The only tradition mentioned by Tirmizee claims some credit. Abdoollah, the son of Masood, represents the Prophet as saying

عن عبدالله بن مسعود قال قال رسول الله صلعم ان لكل نبي ولاة من النبيين و ان ولي ابي و خليل ربي ثم قرا "ان اولي الناس بابراهيم الذين اتبعوه و هذا لنبي والذين امنوا و الله ولي المومنين" * رواه الترمذي *

"Verily, for every prophet there are prophets as friends, and, verily, my friend and near relation and forefather, Abraham, the friend of God, is mine;" and after that he says that the Prophet repeated the following passage of the Holy Koran: "Verily, the men who are the nearest of kin to Abraham are they who follow him, and this Prophet and they who believe in him: God is the patron of the faithful." There are five persons, namely, (1). Baihakee; (2). Ibni Hisham; (3). Ibni Arabee; (4). Barookh, son of Nariyah, Secretary of the Prophet Jeremiah; (5). Jerah, who have themselves investigated the genealogy of Mohammed, and have traced it down from Abraham to Moid, son of Adnan.

The first of them says that Adnan عدنان is the son of Adad ادد, son of Almokavvim المقوم, son of Yahoor یاحور, son of Yareh یارح, son of Yarab یعرب, son of Yashab یشحب, son of Nabit نابت, son of Ishmael اسمعیل, son of Abraham ابراهیم.

Ibni Hisham mentions in his "Kitabul Maghazee and Siyar" that Adnan عدنان is the son of Adad ادد, son of Nahoor ناحور, son of Sood سود, son of Yarab یعرب, son of Yashab یشحب, son of Nabit نابت, son of Ishmael اسمعیل, son of Abraham ابراهیم.

The second edition of the same book gives the names in the following order:—Adnan عدنان, son of Adad ادد, son of Sam سام, son of Yashab یشحب, son of Yarab یعرب, son of Alhomaisa الهمیسع, son of Sanoo سانو, son of Yamed یامد, son of Kedar قیدار, son of Ishmael اسمعیل, son of Abraham ابراهیم.

Ibni Arabee gives the genealogy in the following succession:—Adnan عدنان, son of Add اد, son of Adad ادد, son of Alhomaisa الهمیسع, son of Nabit نابت, son of Salaman سلامان, son of Kedar قیدار, son of Ishmael اسمعیل, son of Abraham ابراهیم.

All the above-mentioned genealogies are entirely wrong, as is proved, both by very authentic local traditions, which have risen

into historical importance, and by the period elapsed between Adnan and Abraham.

As for the remaining two genealogies, given respectively by Barookh and Jerah, we do not find any reasons why we should not put faith in that given by Barookh; and the genealogy of Jerah appears to us to be a continuation of that given by Barookh, but as nearly the same names occur in both of them, some writers have taken them, in mistake, for one and the same genealogy, as given by two distinct writers. We shall now state the Prophet's genealogy, which we have, after close investigation and deep research, ascertained, and which is nothing more than a union of the two genealogies, as given separately by Barookh and Jerah.

(1) Abraham ابراهيم begat (2) Ishmael اسمعيل, and Ishmael begat (3) Kedar قيدار, and Kedar begat (4) Awam عوّام, and Awam begat (5) Aws عوص, and Aws begat (6) Mur مُر, and Mur begat (7) Samaee سماي.

Samaee begat (8) Rozah رُزاح, and Rozah begat (9) Najib ناجب, and Najib begat (10) Mosir مُعصِر, and Mosir begat (11) Eeham ايهام, and Eeham begat (12) Aftad أفتاد, and Aftad begat (13) Eesa عيسى, and Eesa begat (14) Hassan حسّان, and Hassan begat (15) Anfa عنفا, and Anfa begat (16) Arova ارعوا.

Arova begat (17) Balkhee بلخي, and Balkhee begat (18) Bahree بحري, and Bahree begat (19) Haree هري, and Haree begat (20) Yasn يَسْن, and Yasn begat (21) Homran حُمران.

Homran begat (22) Alroaa الرعا, and Alroaa begat (23) Obaid عبيد, and Obaid begat (24) Anaf عنف, and Anaf begat (25) Askee عسقي, and Askee begat (26) Mahee ماحي, and Mahee begat (27) Nakhoor ناخور, and Nakhoor begat (28) Fajim فاجم.

Fajim begat (29) Kaleh كالح, and Kaleh begat (30) Badlan بدلان, and Badlan begat (31) Yaldarum يلدارم, and Yaldarum begat (32) Hera حرا, and Hera begat (33) Nasil ناسل, and Nasil begat (34) Abilawam ابي العوّام.

Abilawam begat (35) Matasaweel متساويل, and Matasaweel begat (36) Baroo برو, and Baroo begat (37) Aws عوص, and Aws begat (38) Salaman سلامان, and Salaman begat (39) Alhomaisa الهُميسع, and Alhomaisa begat (40) Adad ادد, and Adad begat (41) Adnan عدنان, and Adnan begat (42) Moid معد.

Moid begat (43) Hamal حمل, and Hamal begat (44) Nabit نابت, and Nabit begat (45) Salaman سلامان, and Salaman begat (46) Alhomaisa الهُميسع, and Alhomaisa begat (47) Alyasaa اليسع, and Alyasaa begat (48) Adad ادد, and Adad begat (49) Add اد, and Add begat (50) Adnan عدنان, and Adnan begat (51) Moid معد.

Moid begat (52) Nazar نزار, and Nazar begat (53) Modir مُضِر, and Modir begat (54) Ilyas الياس, and Ilyas begat (55) Modrikah مدركه, and Modrikah begat (56) Khozaimah خزيمه, and Khozaimah begat (57) Kananah كنانه, and Kananah begat (58) Alnadr النضر, and Alnadr begat (59) Malik مالك, and Malik begat (60) Fahr فهر, and Fahr begat (61) Ghalib غالب.

Ghalib begat (62) Lavee لوي, and Lavee begat (63) Kaab كعب, and Kaab begat (64) Morrah مرّة, and Morrah begat (65) Kelab كلاب, and Kelab begat (66) Kosaiee قُصي, and Kosaiee begat (67) Abdi Manaf عبدمناف, and Abdi Manaf begat (68) Hashim هاشِم, and Hashim begat (69) Abdol Muttalib عبدالمطلب, and Abdol Muttalib begat (70) Abdollah عبدالله, and Abdollah begat (71) Mohammed محمد رسول الله صلعم.

The reasons whereby we come to the conclusion that the above genealogical list is correct and authentic, are the following :—

Ishmael was born in 2094 A.M., or 1910 A C.

Mohammed was born in 4570 A.M. or 570 A.D.

Therefore the time elapsed between these two personages is 2476 years. During this period, according to our genealogy, there are, *in toto*, seventy generations from Ishmael down to Mo-

hammed. This calculation of ours is perfectly correct according to the course of descent generally adopted, namely, about three generations during a century.

In the genealogy we have here given is included that given by Barokh (Abrakhia), secretary to the prophet Jeremiah, which comes down as far as Moid, the forty-second personage according to our genealogy. A local tradition maintains that Nebuchadnezzar attacked Arabia, and having routed Adnan and the Jorhamites, devastated Mecca, and carried off to Babylon multitudes of captives. But God protected Adnan's son, Moid, whom, in compliance with the divine commands, Jeremiah and Abrakhia took with them and brought up, in security, in the land of Harran. Now the prophet Jeremiah flourished in the thirty-fifth century, A.M., or the sixth century A.C., and, according to the general course of generations, Moid lived also at the same time, and, therefore, according to this calculation, the local tradition above mentioned and the historical work of Abrakhia singularly coincide, as far as facts are concerned.

Jerah, in his genealogy, enumerates the names of persons, commencing with Mohammed up to Hamal, the forty-third personage, according to our genealogy, but, after that, he completed the genealogy by writing Hamal, the son of Kedar, son of Ishmael. By this, many persons understood, but erroneously, that the genealogy so given by Jerah was distinct from that given by Barokh. But, in truth, it was not so, for, by his thus abruptly concluding the genealogy, he only followed the ancient Arab customs, according to which, as already shown, after mentioning all the names they could recollect, or which they might deem necessary to record, as the case might be, used to join, in like manner, the name of the last-mentioned person with that of the primordial patriarch.

It will be evident to our readers that, from Mohammed up to Adnan, the fiftieth in our list, the genealogical list is universally accepted, nor do any writers whatever presume to question it,

but from Adnan upwards, opinions are divided. Thus Baihakee mentions his being told by his tutor, Abu Abdoollah, that Mohammed's genealogy up to Adnan was perfectly correct and reliable, but that from Adnan upwards there existed no trustworthy authority; it must, however, be borne in mind, that the above is nothing more than the opinion of a learned individual, and not a religious hadees.

قال البيهقي المذكور وكان شيخنا ابو عبدالله الحافظ يقول نسبة رسول الله صلعم صحيحة الي عدنان وماوراء عدنان فليس فيه شي تعمد عليه (ابوالفدا)

As the Arabians were very closely related to the Jews, inasmuch as being descended from Ishmael, the brother of Isaac, they were, consequently, their cousins, it was but natural that, for any information upon such thing as they did not themselves understand, or which their Prophet had not explained to them, they should have recourse to their Jewish relatives, more especially as our Prophet unhesitatingly and expressly gave them permission to follow the Israelites in all matters on which he had not spoken to them, and to search in the Jewish books for information on that of which they were ignorant. For the purpose of obtaining a correct knowledge of the genealogy of the Ishmaelites, many early converts to Islam directed their close attention to the Jewish histories, and it is with reference to this circumstance that (as Sir William Muir relates) Wakidi makes the following remarks: "And I have met with no difference of opinion in respect of Moid being of the children of Kedar, son of Ishmael; but this discrepancy in the genealogy between them gives proof that it (*i.e.* the genealogy) has not been preserved, but has been taken from the Jews; and they have translated it unto them, and they have differed therein; and if this (genealogy) had been really correct, then the Prophet of the Lord had been better acquainted with it than any other person: so my conclusion

is that the genealogical detail ends with Adnan, and that we must hold back from anything beyond that till we reach Ishmael, son of Abraham."

ولم اربينهم اختلافا ان معد من اولاد قيدربن اسمعيل و هذا الاختلاف في نسبه يدل علي انه لم يحفظ وانما اخذ ذلك من اهل الكتاب وتر جموه لهم فاختلفوا فيه ولوصح ذلك كان رسول الله اعلم الناس به فا الامر عندنا علي الانتهاء الي معد بن عدنان ثم الامساك عماوراء ذلك الي اسمعيل ابن ابراهيم (كاتب الواقدي)

Sir William Muir is perfectly right in remarking that "this is a clear admission that, up to Adnan, Mahomet's genealogy is *native*, that is, derived from indigenous Arabian traditions, but, beyond Adnan, that it has been borrowed from the Jews."

We are, however, of opinion that, up to Adnan, the forty-first in our list, the genealogy of the Prophet is derived from pure Arabian tradition, and that, from Adnan upwards, it is taken from Jewish history.

We are very much surprised to find so many Christian writers wasting their time and misapplying their talents in a useless search after what no Mohammedan ever attempted to deny,—the connection between Islamism and Judaism,—and, having found it, as they needs must do, tauntingly accusing us of borrowing this thing and filching that thing from the Jewish dispensation, as if Islam had no foundation of its own to rest upon, but was wholly dependent upon Judaism, as Christianity is. So far from even wishing to deny the resemblance between these two divinely inspired Revelations, we Mohammedans deem it our highest honour to be the true and faithful followers of every true and divinely commissioned Prophet.

The fulfilment of God's promise that he would raise up a prophet from among the Ishmaelites, the brethren of the Israel-

ites, did not depend upon whether or not the generations of the Ishmaelites, from Mohammed up to Ishmael, were handed down to us in full and complete order of succession, nor whether they were taken from Jewish or Arabian tradition. Its fulfilment depended upon the fact of *a* descendant of Ishmael being blessed and honoured by being divinely inspired, and that descendant was Mohammed. All the Arabians, as well as the Jews and other neighbouring nations, together with all the early historians, whether Mohammedans or of any other country, never entertained the least doubt in believing, or hesitation in acknowledging, Mohammed to be a descendant of Abraham. Where, we would ask, is the man bold enough to doubt truth? We shall now quote some of the remarks made by learned authors upon this subject.

Albufeda writes that, "up to Adnan the genealogy of the Prophet is universally accepted as true, and there exists no difference in the opinions of authors respecting it. That Adnan is one of the descendants of Abraham is equally credited. Opinions are divided as to the number of generations between Adnan and Ishmael; some assert that there are forty in all, while others maintain that there are seven only."

و نسبه صلعم الي عدنان متفق عليه من غير خلاف و عدنان من ولد اسمعيل بن ابراهيم الخليل عليه السلام من غير خلاف لكن الخلاف في هذه الاباء الذين بين عدنان و اسمعيل فعد بعضهم منها نحو اربعين رجلا و عد بعضهم سبعة (ابوالفدا)

The accomplished historian, Gibbon, says that "the base and plebeian origin of Mahomet is an unskilful calumny of the Christians, who exalt instead of degrading the merit of their adversary. His descent from Ishmael was a national privilege or fable; but if the first steps of the pedigree are dark and doubtful, he could produce many generations of pure and genuine nobility."

The following remark, coming, as it does, from the Rev. Mr. Forster, is the deposition of an unwilling witness. "Thus far we have traced the vestiges of Kedar by the light of ancient geography. It remains to be seen what accession of proof may arise from a comparison of the classical indications with the traditions of the Arabs. For, however questionable, in the opinion of European criticism, the unsupported testimony of Arabian tradition, it is plainly impossible, on the received laws of just reasoning, to deny the conclusiveness of its independent concurrence with history, sacred and profane. Now it was the immemorial tradition of the Arabs themselves that Kedar and his posterity originally settled in Hedjaz. From this patriarch the tribe of the Koreish, in particular, the sovereigns of Mecca, and the guardians of the Kaaba, always boasted their descent. And Mohammed himself, in the Koran, upheld his claims to the princely and priestly honours of his race on this very ground, as an Ishmaelite of the stock of Kedar."

Sir William Muir alone stands against the unanimous opinion of the learned, and by his gratuitous conjectures contradicts the most glaring facts, unquestionably proved by history, both sacred and profane. He remarks as follows:—"To the same spirit we may attribute the continual and palpable endeavour to make Mahometan tradition and the legends of Arabia *tally with the scriptures of the Old Testament, and with Jewish tradition.* This canon has little application to the biography of Mahomet himself; but it has a wide and most effective range in reference to the legendary history of his ancestors and of early Arabia. *The desire to regard, and possibly the endeavour to prove, the Prophet of Islam a descendant of Ishmael, began even in his lifetime . . . . . thus were forged the earlier links of the Abrahamic genealogy of Mahomet, and numberless tales of Ishmael and the Israelites, cast in a semi-Jewish, semi-Arab mould.*"—Life of Mah. Intro. p. lxix.

The above remark, the production of Sir William Muir's *own*

imagination, unsupported as it is, cannot be accepted as conclusive, without resting upon some historical foundation, and therefore is not in the least entitled to credit.

We shall subjoin to this a genealogical table (in which we shall follow the example of George Sale) of our Prophet up to Adnan, together with its various branches and offsets into which it was divided in the course of time. As the author can pride himself upon being a descendant of one of those offshoots, he deems it his greatest honour to give his own genealogy along with that of the Prophet.

گرچه خوردیم نسبتي است بزرگ
ذرهٔ افتاب تا بانیم

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON THE

PROPHECIES RESPECTING MOHAMMED.

AS CONTAINED IN BOTH

THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

خطبةٌ

علي بشاراته المذكورات في التوراة والانجيل

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا عِندَهُم فِي التَّوراةِ والإِنجِيل

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," FELLOW OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1869.



فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

According to the Holy Koran, the advent of Mohammed foretold in the Scriptures 1

Causes of the erroneous notion of some Moslem authors that the Scriptures have been falsified and the prophecies respecting Mohammed wilfully suppressed 2–3

A few of the prophecies respecting Jesus Christ quoted, to familiarize the reader with the obscure and enigmatical style adopted by sacred writers when foretelling any event . . . 5–8

Prophecies respecting Mohammed 9

First.—Gen. xvii. 20 and Gen. xxi. 12, 13, Promise of God to bless Ishmael 9–12

Second.—Deut. xviii. 15, 18. Promise of God to the Israelites of raising up, from the midst of their brethren, the Ishmaelites, a prophet like unto Moses 12–13

Third.—Deut. xxxiii. 2, and Hab. iii. 3. The shining forth of God from Mount Paran, the mountains of Mecca 14–15

Fourth.—Solomon's Song v. 10-16. The Prophet delineated and foretold by name 15–16

Fifth.—Hag. ii. 7. The Prophet foretold by name 16-17

Sixth.—Isaiah xxi. 7. Jesus represented as a rider upon an ass, and Mohammed as a rider upon a camel, which latter is the characteristic conveyance of Arabia 17–18

Seventh.—John xiv. 25, 26, and John xvi. 7. The promise of Jesus to send the Periclyte, Ahmed 18–26

Eighth.—Luke xxiv. 49. The promise of Jesus to send "the promise" of God upon the Israelites, and his ordering them to continue to revere Jerusalem until they "be endued with power from on high" 27

Ninth.—John i. 20-25. John the Baptist's acknowledgment of the advent of another prophet besides Jesus 27-28

ESSAY

ON THE

PROPHECIES RESPECTING MOHAMMED,

AS CONTAINED IN BOTH

THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

ACCORDING to the injunctions of the Koran, hereafter to be quoted, we Mohammedans implicitly believe that the Advent of our Prophet Mohammed was expressly and indubitably foretold both in the Old and the New Testament.

The Holy Koran represents Moses as praying in this wise: "And write down for us good in this world, and in the life to come; for unto thee are we directed." God answered, "I will inflict my punishment on whom I please; and my mercy extendeth over all things; and I will write down good unto those who shall fear me, and give alms, and who shall believe our signs, who shall follow the Apostle, the illiterate Prophet, whom they shall find written down with them in the Law and the Gospel; he will command them that which is just, and will forbid them that which is evil; and will allow unto them as lawful the good things which were before forbidden, and will prohibit those which are bad; and he will ease them of their heavy burden and of the yokes which were upon them. And those who believe in him, and honour him, and assist him, and

follow the light which hath been sent down with him, shall be happy" (chap. vii. ver. 155, 156).

The Holy Koran also says, "And when Jesus, the son of Mary, said, O children of Israel, verily I am the Apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the Law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an Apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be Ahmed احمد. And when he produced unto them evident miracles, they said, This is manifest sorcery" (chap. lxi. ver. 6).

As neither the Holy Koran, nor the Prophet, in his Hadeeses, informs us in what part of the Old and the New Testament these allusions to our Prophet occur, Mohammedan divines undertook the task of searching them out, but in the course of this inquiry, were greatly shocked at witnessing the then neglected condition of the Scriptures; for, in fact, no original manuscripts of them where anywhere to be met with; all the existing copies or apographs differed from each other. On the one hand, serious discrepancies were to be found upon a comparison of the Oriental with the Western MSS.; while, on the other hand, the Samaritan and the Septuagint versions were utterly irreconcilable with each other. As for the early translations into other Oriental tongues, they differed so much, that they could scarcely be thought to have been translated from one and the same original. Again, there was no continuous or connected chain of evidence necessary for establishing, beyond the possibility of doubt, the authenticity of such codices, to which sort of evidence the Mohammedans were so much accustomed. The same learned divines were still more astonished and grieved when they read those passages of the Scriptures which attribute to virtuous and holy personages acts of the most immoral description—acts which the Mohammedans are taught, by their religion, to believe impossible to have been committed by individuals so pious and devout. Hence a suspicion arose in their breasts as to the authenticity of the copies then extant of the Scripture—sa

suspicion which waxed stronger and became more deeply rooted when they recalled to mind the following passage of the Holy Koran: "Of the Jews there are some who pervert words from their places" (chap. ii. ver. 46). They consequently declared, without the least hesitation, that the Scripture had been corrupted and perverted by the Jews and the Christians—more especially those passages that contained the prophecies relative to Mohammed.

It must, however, be here borne in mind, that this opinion was hazarded by those persons only who had no pretensions to literary distinction, who were wanting in perseverance, and who treated the subject superficially. But real men of letters, learned doctors and divines of world-wide fame and renown, who investigated the question unintermittingly—whose researches went deep into the subject, and who grasped it by its root, adopting similar views to those we have above presented to the reader—affirmed that the corruption of Books alluded to in the Holy Koran did not imply the wilful perversion of words, but that of meanings, and the clerical mistakes in the manuscripts. They, therefore, like the first, did not desist from their pursuit, but still continued their search after the above-mentioned passages. Their labours and perseverance were rewarded by success, for they at length did discover those passages—and they were very numerous—of the Scriptures and Jewish traditions wherein the advent of our Prophet is foretold.

Although appreciating very highly the valuable results of the indefatigable labours of these respected divines, I, nevertheless, do not consider it necessary to give them a place in my Essay, because, however valuable they may be, they are not entirely exempt from defects.

First. The Mohammedans give the designation of *Injeel*, to the whole Gospel collectively, and of *Tourah*, to the Old Testament; and therefore when they quote any prophecy from the Gospel or from the Old Testament, they vaguely and too generally

state the one to be taken from Injeel, and the other from Tourah, without specifying the particular passages wherein the prophecy occurs.

Secondly. In mentioning such prophecies, they neither quote the text wherein the prophecy is to be found, nor adduce any codex whatsoever as their authority—in short, they merely give the sense of the original in their own words. Hence, as this reading is at variance with the copies now extant, we are unable to ascertain to which of the codices such and such a prophecy actually belongs, and which of the two is spurious.

Thirdly. Besides the Books composing the Old and the New Testament, the latter contained also many others that are now either not procurable or are rejected as apocryphal. It cannot, therefore, be ascertained whether the prophecies mentioned by these divines—and which either do not coincide with, or are not founded upon, the copies now extant—were taken from those Books which are considered as apocryphal, or from the unprocurable ones.

Fourthly. There is not the least doubt that some prophecies were not mentioned in any Book, but were handed down through tradition. This our assertion is corroborated by the following passage from St. Matthew. The prophecy mentioned therein is handed down by oral tradition, and is not to be found in any Book: "And He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which is spoken of by the prophets—He shall be called a Nazarene" (Matt. ii. 23). Those prophecies, therefore, which the above-mentioned learned Mohammedans took from tradition, although, very probably, correct, possess no reliable authority; for which reason we cannot avail ourselves of them. On these grounds, therefore, I have thought it advisable not to give the said prophecies a place in my Essay.

Some prophecies are from those Books that are rejected as apocryphal ones, and although we possess sufficient proofs to the effect that some of them are not spurious, still we do not

deem it necessary to mention those prophecies in our Essay. It will, therefore, suffice for us to mention those prophecies only which are to be found in the Old and New Testament that are now in use.

Again, in the Old and the New Testament there are two kinds of prophecies—one which, if interpreted impartially, and without any prejudice, will be found, self-evidently, to apply to our Prophet exclusively; while the other, although it refers to some prophet exclusively, yet it cannot be satisfactorily ascertained who that prophet is; so that each nation might justly claim it as referring to a prophet of their own. We shall, therefore, pass over those prophecies that are classed under the second head.

It must be evident to our readers that the number of prophecies relative to our Prophet which we have, under these circumstances, passed over, is comparatively greater than that we have inserted in our Essay. The style adopted by the sacred writers, when speaking of prophecies, was so vague, obscure, and even enigmatical, that were we to place any of them before our readers without any comment, they would be perfectly at a loss to guess their meaning, and still more so to unriddle them. To familiarise them, therefore, with the mode of foretelling adopted by the sacred writer, we shall first mention some of the prophecies respecting Jesus Christ; we shall next enumerate the prophecies respecting our own Prophet which occur in the Old and the New Testament; and, having so done, we feel confident that, upon a fair and unprejudiced comparison of the two, the former will appear obscure and doubtful, but the latter clear and convincing.

1st. The following are a few of the prophecies respecting Jesus Christ:—The dominions of Ahaz, King of Judah, being invaded by Kezin, King of Syria, and Pekah, King of Israel, the prophet Isaiah comforted Ahaz, telling him not to fear, for that the enemy should not prevail against him; and, to convince Ahaz of the truth of this assurance, the prophet told the king,

" Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel" (Isaiah vii. 14).

Although it is evident from the eighth and ninth chapters of the same Book that the son so foretold was already born at that very time, yet St. Matthew, nevertheless, insists that it was Jesus Christ who was the object of the prophecy in question. Thus he says, " When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child by the Holy Ghost. . . . Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is—God with us" (Matt. ii. 18, 22, 23).

2nd. Thus Micah, addressing Beth-lehem, says, " But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (Micah v. 2).

As Jesus Christ was born at Beth-lehem, St. Matthew says that the above prophecy was respecting him[1] (Matt. ii. 6).

3rd. The prophet Hosea, when describing the Israelites, says, " When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (Hosea xi. 1).

St. Matthew is of opinion that the above prophecy was respecting Jesus Christ, for he says, " Behold the angel of the Lord appeareth unto Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word; for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was

[1] " And thou, Beth-lehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel."

spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son" (Matt. ii. 14, 15).

4th. When describing the miserable condition of the Israelites, the prophet Jeremiah says, "A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel, weeping for her children, refused to be comforted, because they were not" (Jerem. xxi. 15).

St. Matthew also represents the above passage as foretelling the advent of Christ, for he says, "Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wrath, and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy, the prophet, saying, In Ramah was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping and great mourning; Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted because they were not" (Matt. ii. 16-18).

5th. The prophet Isaiah, when declaring that the distress of Jerusalem should not continue any longer, says, "Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as it was in her vexation, when, at the first, He lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterwards did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined" (Isaiah ix. 1).

St. Matthew is of opinion that therein also is Jesus Christ foretold, inasmuch as he says, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee; and, leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulun and Nephthalim, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias, the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulun and the land of Nephthalim, by the

way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. The people which sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up" (Matt. iv. 12-16).

6th. The prophet Malachi, when reprimanding the Israelites on their not obeying the commandments of God, says, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Malachi iii. 1).

The prophet Isaiah, when comforting the Israelites and Jerusalem, says, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make straight in the desert a highway for our God" (Isaiah xl. 3).

St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke all agree in asserting that the above passages foretell the advent of Jesus Christ; for, say they, John the Baptist, when he administered baptism, only prepared a highway for Christ, and was wont to say that "There cometh one mightier than I after me." See Matt. iii. 1, 2, 3, and 11; Mark i. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8; Luke iii. 2-4.[1]

[1] (1) "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, (2) And saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, (3) For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight. (4) I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.—Matt. (1) The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God. (2) As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (3) The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight. (4) John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. (5) And there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins. (6) And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins, and he did eat locusts and wild honey, (7) And preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. (8) I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.—Mark. (1) Annas and Caiaphas, being

Now, having, as we hope, given the reader a clear idea of the style adopted by the sacred writers when foretelling any event, we shall proceed to mention the prophecies respecting our Prophet.

In the following passages of Genesis, God promised to bless Ishmael and to multiply his seed :—

FIRST.

וּלְיִשְׁמָעֵאל שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ הִנֵּה ו בֵּרַכְתִּי אֹתוֹ וְהִפְרֵיתִי אֹתוֹ וְהִרְבֵּיתִי
אֹתוֹ בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד שְׁנֵים־עָשָׂר נְשִׂיאִם יוֹלִיד וּנְתַתִּיו לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל :

Gen. xvii. 20.

"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation" (Gen. xvii. 20). It is said in Gen. xxi. 12, 13 :—

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־אַבְרָהָם אַל־יֵרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ עַל־הַנַּעַר וְעַל־אֲמָתֶךָ
כֹּל אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמַר אֵלֶיךָ שָׂרָה שְׁמַע בְּקֹלָהּ כִּי בְיִצְחָק יִקָּרֵא לְךָ זָרַע :
וְגַם אֶת־בֶּן־הָאָמָה לְגוֹי אֲשִׂימֶנּוּ כִּי זַרְעֲךָ הוּא : Gen. xxi. 12, 13.

"And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed." The promise of God to bless Ishmael was fulfilled by appointing Mohammed, a descendant of Ishmael, the prophet for the entire world.

Those persons who are antagonistic to us maintain that this

the high priests, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness; (2) And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, (3) As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias, the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.—Luke.

promise of God was to the effect that twelve great princes should be born of Ishmael's loins, and that the blessing conferred upon the latter was of a temporal and not of a spiritual character.

In the above quoted passages the impartial reader will find three distinct expressions made use of:—"I have blessed him;" "I will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly;" "I will make him a great nation." Now, we would ask, is it fair and reasonable to represent the above three distinct expressions as implying one and the same thing merely, viz., the multiplication of children?

The promise that God made to Isaac was as follows:—"And the Lord appeared unto him the same night, and said, I am the God of Abraham, thy father; fear not, for I am with thee, *and will bless thee and multiply thy seed* for my servant Abraham's sake" (Gen. xxvi. 24). How surprising, indeed, is it that the latter promise should be of a spiritual character, while the former is of a temporal one!

God said to Abraham, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called" (Gen. xxi. 12); and also that "I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him" (Gen. xvii. 19).

The covenant which God thus promised to establish was as follows:—"And the Lord said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes and look from the place where thou art, northwards and southwards and eastward and westward, for all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered" (Gen. xiii. 14-16). Is it fair, is it candid, is it impartial, to assert that all the promises made by God to Isaac were spiritual in their nature, while those concerning Ishmael were all temporal ones?

We shall now examine, more in detail, God's promise to Abraham respecting Isaac:—"And the Lord appeared unto

Abraham, and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land" (Gen. xii. 7). "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen. xv. 18).

"Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee and bless thee, for unto thee and unto thy seed I will give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham, thy father. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xxvii. 3, 4). "And behold, the Lord stood above it (the ladder), and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the Lord God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest to thee will I give, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, and to the north and to the south; and in thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xxviii. 13, 14).

"Which covenant He made with Abraham, and His oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and unto Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance" (Ps. cv. 9, 10, 11).

"And the Lord said unto him, This is the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed. I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither" (Deut. xxxiv. 4).

Having thus placed before an impartial and unprejudiced reader all the passages that treat of the covenant of God made with Abraham respecting his descendants, we ask, first, why should they not be applicable to Isaac and Ishmael jointly? since, by Gen. xxi. 12—"And also of the sonof the bondwoman will I make a nation, *because he is thy seed*—we learn that the latter was also regarded by God as one of the progeny of

Abraham; and, secondly, what is there in the covenant (which is about nothing else than the land of Canaan) of God respecting the Israelites that gives it a spiritual character, and what is wanting in the promise made respecting Ishmael which makes it of a temporal one?

SECOND.

נָבִיא מִקִּרְבְּךָ מֵאַחֶיךָ כָּמֹנִי יָקִים לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵלָיו תִּשְׁמָעוּן׃
נָבִיא אָקִים לָהֶם מִקֶּרֶב אֲחֵיהֶם כָּמוֹךָ וְנָתַתִּי דְבָרַי בְּפִיו וְדִבֶּר
אֲלֵיהֶם אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֲצַוֶּנּוּ׃ Deut. xviii. 15, 18.

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." "I will raise up a prophet from among their (Israelites') brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him" (Deut. xviii. 15 and 18).

In the above quoted passages our prophet is evidently foretold, for God declared to all the Israelites that He would raise up a prophet from among their brethren. Now, we hesitate not to affirm that it is impossible that the words—brethren of Israel—could have any other meaning than that of Ishmaelites, and these never had any prophet but Mohammed.

It is admitted, both by Jews and Christians, that revelations to the Israelitish prophets were not made in the very words as given in the Scriptures, but only their purport, which they afterwards delivered to the people, in their own language. But the Holy Koran was, on the contrary, revealed to our prophet, word by word, as it now is—a fact which makes the expression, "and will put my words in his mouth," inapplicable to any one except Mohammed.

In promising to raise up a prophet, God tells Moses that, "I will raise up a prophet from among their brethren, LIKE UNTO THEE." But we find in Deut. xxxiv. 10, that "there arose not a

prophet since in *Israel* LIKE UNTO MOSES." There cannot, then, remain a single doubt but that the promised prophet must have been from among the *Ishmaelites, the brethren* of the *Israelites.* We must now inquire whether Mohammed was *like unto* Moses, or not, and we come to an undeniable conclusion that he was. By his own account, Moses was forced by his enemies to leave his native country :—so was Mohammed. The place in which both these prophets took refuge was identical, for it was Medina, anciently called Yathṛab, founded by Yathroon or Jether, in whose house Moses took shelter. The manner in which the words of God were heard by Moses and Mohammed was the same. Mohammed was commanded, like Moses, to wage war with the unbelievers. As Moses brought his whole, but distracted, nation from out of Egypt, and united them into one compact body, glorifying the one Holy Deity, so Mohammed brought out his much-divided and idolatrous nation from the darkness of false worship, and united them into one powerful and irresistible whole, worshipping and adoring the Godhead. Moses conquered countries and established a kingdom in order to give wider extent and more durability to his religion, and Mohammed did the same. Upon Moses was conferred a law which was followed and obeyed by all the Israelites; and it may be asserted, without the fear of contradiction, that since Moses, there has been no prophet, except Mohammed, upon whom was bestowed so magnificent a Law as that which forms the groundwork of Islam. Who, then, but those who are solely influenced by blind prejudice, can deny that the prophet thus foretold (Deut. xviii. 18) was truly Mohammed himself?[1]

[1] Several other writers have compared Moses and Mohammed. Renan, in his "Life of Jesus Christ," writes that "Moses and Mahomet were not men of speculation; they were men of action. It was in proposing action to their fellow-countrymen, and to their contemporaries, that they governed humanity." The writer of an article entitled "Islam," in the "Quarterly Review" for October, No. 254, thus expresses himself on the subject. "But Mohammed felt the awkwardness and danger of his position as the protected of his great foe (Abu Lahab) very keenly,

THIRD.

וַיֹּאמַר יְהוָה מִסִּינַי בָּא וְזָרַח מִשֵּׂעִיר לָמוֹ הוֹפִיעַ מֵהַר פָּארָן וְאָתָה
מֵרִבְבֹת קֹדֶשׁ מִימִינוֹ אֶשְׁדָּת לָמוֹ : Deut. xxxiii. 2.

"And he said, the Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shined forth from Mount Paran, and He came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them" (Deut. xxxiii. 2).

אֱלוֹהַּ מִתֵּימָן יָבוֹא וְקָדוֹשׁ מֵהַר־פָּארָן סֶלָה כִּסָּה שָׁמַיִם הוֹדוֹ
וּתְהִלָּתוֹ מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ : Hab. iii. 3.

"God came forth from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the Heavens, and the earth was full of praise" (Hab. iii. 3).

Mount Paran is identical with the mountain of Mecca, as we have already proved in our "Essay on the Historical Geography of Arabia." There remains not the least reason to doubt that by the expression, "He shined forth from Mount Paran," is meant the Revelation of the Holy Koran and the Law to Mohammed.

In an article on "Islam," in the "Quarterly Review" for October, 1869, page 299, we find a passage which we cannot do better than quote upon the present occasion :—"And the Sifre, in a kind of paraphrase of the special verses themselves, literally continues

and he resolved to turn away from the place of his birth, even as Abraham had done, and Moses, and other prophets, and try to gain a hearing elsewhere."

"Whereupon they swore allegiance into his hands. This over, he selected twelve men from among them. Jesus had chosen twelve apostles, and Moses, his elders of the tribes of Israel."

"In the year 10 of the Hijrah he undertook his last solemn pilgrimage to Mecca, with at least 40,000 Muslims, and there, on Mount Arafat, blessed them, like Moses, and repeated his last exhortations; chiefly telling them to protect the weak, the poor, and the women, and to abstain from usury."

"For the last time he addressed the faithful, asking them, like Moses, whether he had wronged any one, or whether he owed aught to any one."

as follows: 'The Lord came from Sinai,' that means:—the Law was given in Hebrew; 'and rose up from Seir unto them,' that means:—it was also given in Greek. [Rumi.] 'And He shined forth from Mount Paran,' that means, in Arabic, ... It is not to be denied that Sinai and Seir are constantly used for Israel and Esau—Edom—Rome; while Paran plainly stands for Arabia, whether or not it be the name of the mountains round Mecca, as is contended."

FOURTH.

Solomon, when delineating the features of his beloved, says,—

דּוֹדִי צַח וְאָדוֹם דָּגוּל מֵרְבָבָה: רֹאשׁוֹ בֶּתֶם פָּז קְוֻצּוֹתָיו
תַּלְתַּלִּים שְׁחֹרוֹת כָּעוֹרֵב: עֵינָיו כְּיוֹנִים עַל־אֲפִיקֵי מָיִם רֹחֲצוֹת
בֶּחָלָב יֹשְׁבוֹת עַל־מִלֵּאת: לְחָיָו כַּעֲרוּגַת הַבֹּשֶׂם מִגְדְּלוֹת מֶרְקָחִים
שִׂפְתוֹתָיו שׁוֹשַׁנִּים נֹטְפוֹת מֹר עֹבֵר: יָדָיו גְּלִילֵי זָהָב מְמֻלָּאִים
בַּתַּרְשִׁישׁ מֵעָיו עֶשֶׁת שֵׁן מְעֻלָּפֶת סַפִּירִים: שׁוֹקָיו עַמּוּדֵי שֵׁשׁ
יְסֻדִים עַל־אַדְנֵי־פָז מַרְאֵהוּ כַּלְּבָנוֹן בָּחוּר כָּאֲרָזִים: חִכּוֹ מַמְתַקִּים
וְכֻלּוֹ מַחֲמַדִּים (محمدים) זֶה דוֹדִי וְזֶה רֵעִי בְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלִָם:

Solomon's Song, ch. 5, ver. 10-16.

"My beloved is white and ruddy; the chiefest among the ten thousand; his head is as the most fine gold; his locks are bushy and black as a raven. His eyes are as the eyes of doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk, and fitly set. His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers; his lips like lilies, dropping sweet-smelling myrrh. His hands are as gold rings set with the beryl; his belly is as bright ivory overlaid with sapphires; his legs are as pillars of marble set upon sockets of fine gold, whose countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars; his mouth is most sweet. Yea, he is altogether lovely (the praised—محمد). This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem" (Song of Solomon, ch. 5, ver. 10-16)

Although the portrait drawn by Solomon in the above passage is poetical, yet it is but the mere counterpart of our Prophet. In the last passage, however, Solomon mentions his beloved by name—Mohammed—محمد. The word "lovely," used in the English Bible, is a substitute for the Hebrew one מַחֲמַדִּים—"*Mohammadim*." As this name of our Prophet is a noun adjective, the sacred poet uses it in a manner answering both the interpretation of a proper name and an adjective. The rendering of it by "lovely," as is done in the English Bible, is too free, and, therefore, incorrect; the literal rendering of the word is "*illustrious*," or,—"*the praised*."

The Hebrew word *Mohammadim* is the plural form of Mohammad, and it is a grammatical rule of that language to employ the plural forms of the proper names belonging to illustrious personages, or when speaking of common nouns, when specifying some great and noble object. Thus, for example, the word Ellovah, an appellation given to the Deity, is rendered, by the plural, Ellohim, when God is spoken of; and Baal, the name of an idol, is rendered Baalim. The same rule is observed in the word Ashtaroth, another idol (Jud. ii. 11-13).

FIFTH.

וְהִרְעַשְׁתִּי אֶת־כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם וּבָאוּ חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם וּמִלֵּאתִי אֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה כָּבוֹד אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת׃ Hag. ii. 7.

"And I will shake all nations, and the *desire* of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts" (Hag. ii. 7). This is also another manifest prophecy respecting our Prophet, and grievously are the Christians mistaken in ascribing it to Jesus Christ, for had he been foretold by it, St. Matthew, who by inspiration had recorded every prophecy respecting his Master found in the Old Testament, was by no means likely to have passed over the one in question, unnoticed. The able and learned Godfrey Higgins has treated of it at some

length, and very satisfactorily. He represents the Mohammedans and Christians as holding a conversation thereon, which is quoted below.

"But he (Mohammed) was also, as his followers say, foretold by name in the Old Testament. The reverend and very pious Mr. Parkhurst, a most unwilling witness, on the root חמד H.M D., says 'This word is applied to all sorts of sacred things, both of the true and false worship, which were to the respective parties eminently *the objects of their desire and affections*. See, *inter al*, Hag. ii. 7, 'And the desire of all nations shall come' וחמדת כל הגוים זכא. From this root the pretended prophet Mohammed or Mahomet had his name.'

"On this passage of Mr. Parkhurst's, a Mohammedan would exclaim, 'Here you see, that he was actually foretold by name in the Old as well as in the New Testament, that the application of this prophecy to Jesus Christ, has, in fact, been a mistake; it was intended, as the name shows, for the person sent by Jesus himself to complete His mission, and referred to by Him in the word επαγγελιαν, Luke xxiv. 49, and for this I have the authority of your own celebrated divine, Parkhurst. That it was meant for Mohammed, and not for Jesus, or the Holy Ghost, the Holy Spirit, or a Divine influence, is evident, because it foretells the former by name. No Mohammedan corruption of a text can be pretended here.'"

SIXTH.

וְרָאָה רֶכֶב צֶמֶד פָּרָשִׁים רֶכֶב חֲמוֹר רֶכֶב גָּמָל וְהִקְשִׁיב קֶשֶׁב רַב־קָשֶׁב׃

"He saw two riders, one of them was a rider upon an ass, and the other a rider upon a camel, and he hearkened diligently with much heed" (Isaiah xxi. 7). In our opinion, the above passage is the faithful rendering of the original Hebrew. In the English Bible, however, it is thus translated, "And he saw a chariot with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of horses and

a chariot of camels: and he hearkened diligently with much heed." The Vulgate has it as follows: "He saw a chariot of two horsemen, a rider upon an ass and a rider upon a camel; and he hearkened diligently and with much heed." None of the above passages affect, in any way, the prophecy contained therein.

There can be no doubt that, of the two riders represented by the prophet Isaiah, as being the restorers of the true worship of the Godhead, the rider upon the ass is Jesus Christ, because he so made his entry into Jerusalem; and that by the rider upon a camel is meant the Prophet of Arabia, of which country the camel is the characteristic conveyance.

SEVENTH.

Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων· ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα, καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν. Κατα Ιωαννην, xiv. 25, 26.)

"These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter,[1] which is the Holy Ghost,[2] whom the

[1] The word Parakletos (comforter), we presume, was really Periklutos (illustrious), but that the former was mistaken for the latter, as is amply shown by the Rev. Mr. Horne, in his Introduction to the "Critical study of the Scriptures," a few reasons for which we quote here below:—

"Errors or imperfections in the manuscript, from which a transcriber copied, are a further source of various readings.

"Besides the mistakes arising from the strokes of certain letters being faded or erased, others of a contrary nature may arise from the transparency of the paper or vellum, whence the stroke of a letter on one side of the leaf may seem to be a part of a letter on the other side of the leaf, and thus different words may be produced.

"A third source of various readings is critical conjecture, or an intended improvement of the original text. In reading the works of an author of known literary reputation, we ascribe grammatical or orthographical errors, if any are to be found, rather to a mistake of the printer than to a want of knowledge in the writer. In the same manner the transcriber of a manuscript attributes the faults of his original to the errors of a former copyist, and alters them as he supposes they were written by the author. But if he carries his critical conjectures too far, he falls himself into the error which he intended to avoid. This may be done in various ways.

"(1) Thus, the transcriber may take an expression to be faulty which in reality is not so, or he may mistake the sense of the author, and suppose he has discovered a grammatical error, when in fact he himself construes falsely—or the grammatical error intended to be corrected proceeded from the author himself.

"(2) Further, some critical copyists have not only corrected ungrammatical or

Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv. 25, 26).

Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν, συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς· (*Κατα Ιωαννην*, xvi. 7).

"Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you" (John xvi. 7).

We have not the least doubt that the word *παρακλητος*, rendered in the English Bible, Comforter, was not the one uttered

inaccurate expressions, but have even converted inelegant into elegant phrases; and they have likewise omitted words that appeared to them superfluous, or the difference of which they did not understand.

"(3) Of all the sources of various lections the most ample, according to Michaelis, and the most productive of spurious passages in the New Testament, is the practice of altering parallel passages so as to render more perfect their conformity to each other. The Gospels in particular have suffered in this way; and St. Paul's Epistles have very frequently been interpolated, in order to make his quotations from the Old Testament harmonise with the Septuagint version, where they differed from the exact words of the latter.

"(4) Lastly, some critics have altered the New Testament in conformity to the Vulgate versions, and thus produced various readings.

"Wilful corruptions, in order to serve the purposes of a party, whether Orthodox or Heterodox, are another source of various readings.

"It is a fact that some *corruptions have been designedly made by those who are termed Orthodox, and have subsequently been preferred, when so made, in order to favour some received opinion, or to preclude an objection against it.*"

[2] The explanatory phrase, or the words used in opposition—*which is the Holy Ghost*—does not appear to have been contained in the original text, as no where else in the Gospel the use of a similar mode of explanation is to be found. The Rev. Mr. Horne, in his Introduction to the "Critical Study of the Scriptures," says:—

"Lastly, the ignorance or negligence of transcribers has been a most fruitful source of various readings, by their mistaking marginal notes or scholia for a part of the text. It was not unusual, in ancient manuscripts, to write in the margin an explanation of difficult passages, or a word synonymous to that in the text, but more usual and more easily understood, or with the intent of supplying a seeming deficiency, any or all which might, in the copies taken from the manuscript in which these notes were written, be easily obtruded into the text itself." We are therefore of opinion that the explanatory phrase above alluded to was originally a note, and not a part of the text, and that it was confounded with the latter by some ignorant copyist.

by Jesus Christ, but that it was περικλυτος—*illustrious* or *renowned*—answering in every respect to the Arabic word احمد (Ahmed); but as this is a question much discussed by literary men of note, it will therefore suffice for us to lay before our readers, on the present occasion, some of their remarks thereon. Sir William Muir says that "*the word Ahmed must have occurred by mistake in some early Arabic translation of the Gospel of St. John for 'the Comforter'*— περικλυτος *for* παρακλητος—*or was forged as such by some ignorant or designing monk in Mahomet's time.* Hence the partiality for the name, which was held to be a prophecy of Mahomet." (Biog. Mah. vol. i., p. 17, note). If, however, we were to believe, as Sir William says, that *some designing monk did indeed* FORGE *the word, then it must be admitted that* THE SCRIPTURES WERE CORRUPTED BY THE CHRISTIAN MONKS.

The following is the opinion of the learned Mr. Godfrey Higgins. We have quoted his remarks word for word:—

"It was the universal tradition, as well as the words of the record, the Gospel Histories, that Jesus, before His ascension, promised His disciples that he would send a person to them, in some capacity or other; the Greek of our Gospels says, as a *Παρακλητος*, translated,—Comforter.

"The Mohammedans maintained, and yet maintain, that Mohammed was this person foretold by Jesus Christ, the same as Cyrus was by Isaiah—both by name; that he was called by Jesus, not by a word which ought to be rendered in the Greek language, as in our Gospel Histories, παρακλητος, but περικλυτος, which means not *Comforter*, but *famous*, or *illustrious*, and which in Arabic is the meaning of the word *Mohammed*; that the Gospel of the Christians (John xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, and xvi. 7) had originally the latter of those words, but that it was corrupted to disguise the truth. They also allege that the Christians cannot deny that there are corruptions, or various readings, in their present copies, and they say that all the auto-

graphs were destroyed to conceal this passage. The fact of the loss of the autographs cannot be denied, and is a fact very difficult satisfactorily to account for; and as for ancient copies, there does not exist one before the sixth century.

"In reply to this it will be said, that it may be proved, by passages in Tertullian and other ancient fathers, that the true reading of the Gospel Histories was, anciently, long before the time of Mohammed, as it is now, and, therefore, that they have not been corrupted. But it will be necessary to show that the works of these ancient fathers have not been corrupted, which they may have been. Those who would destroy the ancient manuscripts of the Gospel Histories would not scruple at re-writing a skin of parchment on which an ancient father's work was written; and it is admitted by the first divines of the Christians that they have been corrupted to serve other purposes; and those who would do it in one case would do it in another. That the word being confessed to be Hebrew, if it be wrong written, it is much more likely that the early Christian writers —*the greatest liars upon earth*—should lie to serve their own purposes, than that St. John, a Hebrew, understanding both Hebrew and Greek (even without allowing to him the gift of tongues), should have made a mistake and rendered the word by wrong Greek letters—κλητος, instead of κλυτος—and that, therefore, it follows that the text of John has been corrupted.

"They further add, that it is a well-known fact that a person was expected by great numbers of Christians, in accordance with the prophecy, from a very early period, which shows that the construction put on the passage in the Acts by the Roman Church and by Protestants was not general. Of this, Montanus, in the second century, earlier than Tertullian, furnishes an example. He was considered by his followers to be the promised person, which afforded to his opponents an opportunity for propagating the unfounded and malicious report that he pretended to be the Holy Ghost. That it was to meet these

persons, particularly Montanus, that the Gospel Histories were falsified, long before the real true Paraclete, or Periclyte, as Mohammed, by his success, is proved to have been. That after the time of Montanus, but long before the time of Mohammed, Manes was also held by his followers—who constituted, as M. Beausobre has proved, a great, learned, and powerful sect—to be the promised person. These persons seem, of all others, to have been the most likely to have understood the language in which Jesus spoke; and they could not discover the person in the twelve tongues of fire. But the result proved that Manes was not the person, and that his followers were mistaken.

"They also add that it is perfectly clear that the Christians might have preserved the precious autographs, if they had thought proper, as easily as they have preserved the relics of great numbers of saints—the remains of St. John the Baptist, the Virgin, the bodies of St. Peter, Paul, &c.—all of which are to be seen every day in Italy.

"The Mohammedans, who must be heard in this case, will not fail to press upon the Christians that all the manuscripts were destroyed or falsified to conceal this mistranslation; that if they were not, why were they destroyed? and the Christians will be put to no little difficulty to find a satisfactory answer; for the fact of the destruction of the manuscripts cannot be denied, as they do not exist. But they will go further, and allege that, taking the Christians on their own ground, that a Comforter was promised, it is a mere abuse of language to say that the appearance of the twelve tongues of fire can be this person; that, in fact, Mohammed answers to this person, and that there never has been any one but *he* who does. That the Acts of the Apostles, the book of the Christians, itself by no means says or implies that the filling of the Apostles by the Holy Spirit was the sending of the Comforter promised, and that the language will warrant no such conclusion.

"That at the Feast of Pentecost this Comforter or Para-

cletos is said to have come to the Apostles, but that certainly a cloven fiery tongue settling upon each Apostle, communicating to them at that moment the power of speaking all languages, would appear, to a person whose mind was not prejudiced by education, to be a strange way for a person to come; and with respect to the mere endowment with the Holy Ghost, this could not be necessary, because it appears from the 22nd verse of the 20th chapter of John, that Jesus himself had already endowed them with this gift a little before His Ascension, not two months before the day of Pentecost, the time of which we are speaking.

"That the Book of the Acts nowhere says that these fiery tongues, giving them the power of speaking all languages, was the promised Comforter, which it would have done if so they had been.

If, in answer to this, it be said that the gifts related in Matthew, and the endowment with the Holy Spirit recorded in the 22nd verse of the 20th chapter of John, were only temporary and were withdrawn, the Mohammedan will reply that this is a mere subterfuge not warranted by the text or context. These passages from the sacred book of the Christians, the Mohammedans have a right in argument to quote against them, though they do not admit their authority.

The argument of the Mohammedans respecting the translation of the word into παρακλυτος instead of παρακλητος received a strong support from the mode adopted by St. Jerome in the Latin Vulgate, in rendering it by the Latin word Paraclitus, instead of Paracletus. This shows that the copy from which St. Jerome translated must have had the word παρακλυτος, and not παρακλητος. This also strongly supports the Mohammedan assertion relating to the destruction of the old manuscripts.

Upon the meaning of this word παρακλητος much diversity of opinion has arisen among divines. The celebrated Michaelis says, 'Ernesti has very properly remarked, that it signifies neither Advocate nor Comforter;' and adds 'Ego

certissimum arbitior παρακλητον, ubi de Spiritu Sancto dicitur, nihil aliud significare quam doctorem, magistrum, divinæ veritatis interpretem.' I agree with him in his opinion of the impropriety of the common translation, though, instead of Doctor or Magister, I would rather use—Monitor. The meaning which he has given it has been adopted by many, yet his mode of demonstration is somewhat extraordinary; for, instead of attempting to discover παρακλητος in a classic author, and explain its meaning from actual use, he has recourse to the verb from which it is derived, and the assistance of a pretended Hebraism.

"Respecting this word the learned and venerable Bishop Marsh observes, 'We have the choice, then, of three interpretations of παρακλητος—1, that of Advocate, its classical sense, and adopted by the Greek Fathers; 2, that of Interpres, given by Ernesti, and grounded on the authority of the Chaldee word פרקליט, which admits that sense, and was probably used by Christ himself; 3, that of Monitor, adopted by our author, on the authority of a passage in Philo.' Hence it is very evident that great uncertainty and doubt hang over the meaning of this celebrated word, and of the nature of this messenger which Jesus promised to send. This, I think, cannot be denied.

"Of the Gospel of Barnabas Mr. Sale says, in the Preface to his translation of the Koran, page 98:—'This Book appears to be *no* original forgery of the Mohammedans, though they have no doubt interpolated and altered it since, the better to serve their purpose; and in particular, instead of the Paraclete, or Comforter, they have, in this Apocryphal Gospel, inserted the word Periclyte—that is, the famous or illustrious—by which, they pretend, their Prophet was foretold by name, that being the signification of Mohammed in Arabic; and this they say to justify that passage of the Koran where Jesus Christ is formally asserted to have foretold his coming under his other name of Ahmed, which is derived from the same root as Mohammed, and of the same import.'

"It must be confessed that the word, as written by Bishop Marsh, and as it is almost certain that it must have been used (as he observes) by Jesus Christ, appears strongly to support the assertion of the Mohammedans, as here stated by the very learned Mr. Sale. I am of opinion that the Mohammedans have as much right to render this word by the word Periclite or Periclyte as the Christians have by the word Paraclete. Nay, more: I maintain that the balance of probability is on the side of the Mohammedans, because the Christians cannot be justified in rendering the Chaldee *jod* in the last syllable by the Greek letters ε or η instead of the letter ι.

"The Chaldee i or jod is the tenth letter of the alphabet, and has the power in notation of number ten; and it ought, if the word is to be literally transferred from one language to another, to be rendered by the letter in the Greek which stands for the number ten, and was originally the tenth in the alphabet before the Greeks lost the *digamma*, as I have abundantly proved in my Essay on the 'Celtic Druids.'

"But I go further than this, and I say that if the word used by Jesus was פרקליט, PRQLIT, and that this word does mean, as Mr. Sale says, illustrious, then that the translation of it into the Greek word παρακλητος is wrong (a various reading), and that all the translations of both Bishop Marsh and Ernesti are wrong, and that it ought to be rendered by a term answering to the word *illustrious*, which of course must be περικλυτος.

"But this ought not to be translated *a Paraclete*, as a proper name, but a name of description, as the Mohammedans do, viz., *illustrious*. If this were a Chaldee, Hebrew, or Arabic word, used by Jesus, it ought to have the sense given to it which the word in those languages means. If it be a Chaldee word derived from an Arabic root, then it ought to be rendered in the meaning which the Arabic root conveys, and then it would be illustrious, or an illustrious person.

"If my reader will turn to his Scapula, he will see that

the word κλυτος is used for an illustrious man, both by Homer and Hesiod. Thus, I think, there is quite plausibility enough in the argument of the Mohammedans to render it no way wonderful that there should be much difficulty in convincing them that they are wrong. This is saying the least. But I have not seen their argument refuted.

"The following is the passage which the Mohammedans say was expunged:—'And when Jesus, the son of Mary, said, O children of Israel, verily I am the Apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the Law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an Apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be Ahmed.'

"But I have something still more to say respecting this celebrated word PRQLIT. It is admitted by Bishop Marsh, on authority not to be disputed, when quoted in argument by a Mohammedan, that it is a Cyro-Chaldee word, or an Arabic word, not Greek. One or both of these languages must have been spoken, or at least understood, by Mohammed, and there is no reason to believe that the Greek translation of the word would ever become a subject of discussion by him. What had he to do in Arabia with GREEK TRANSLATIONS of the speeches of Jesus? What had they to do there? Of what use could they be to people who did not understand a word of them, but who understood the original spoken by Jesus? He would take the word as handed down to him by tradition, or, if written, in the word named by Mr. Sale, which meant—illustrious, and he probably never inquired any further. How absurd to suppose that he would go to writings in a foreign language to explain to him the meaning of a word in his own! He received the word as a human person, like many other sects in that day, and would as little allow it to mean the third person of a Trinity as the Unitarians do at this day. It is even possible that he might receive it in the sense of—illustrious, and might never have any doubt or dispute on the subject."

EIGHTH.

Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους. (*Κατα Λουκαν*, xxiv. 49.)

"And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke xxiv. 49).

It is entirely incorrect to consider the above passage as meaning that the promise of Jesus was to send the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, because the facts of their living in the City of Jerusalem, and the coming of the Holy Ghost, had no necessary dependence upon, or connection with, each other; since, had the Apostles gone out of the city, the Holy Ghost would have come to them as freely as if they had remained therein. "Tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem," does not imply that they must not go beyond its precincts, or that they must continue to dwell within the city,—inasmuch, as before said, their living within or without it had nothing whatever to do with the coming of the Holy Ghost.

All that Jesus meant by the words in question was, that they must continue, as formerly, to revere the City of Jerusalem, and turn their heads towards it until "I send the promise of my Father upon you," and "until ye be endued with power from on high."

Thus is this prophecy fulfilled in the person of our Prophet Mohammed, after whose advent the reverence which hitherto had been paid to Jerusalem was transferred to that of the House of God erected by Abraham—the Kaaba.

NINTH.

Καὶ ὡμολόγησε, καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο. καὶ ὡμολόγησεν, Ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν Τί οὖν; Ἠλίας εἶ σύ; καὶ λέγει, Οὐκ εἰμί. Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, Οὔ. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, Τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς. τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; Ἔφη, Ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, εὐθύνατε

τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου! καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης. Καὶ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις, εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὔτε Ἠλίας, οὔτε ὁ προφήτης. (*Κατα Ιωαννην*, i. 20-25.)

"And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees. And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" (John i. 20-25.)

In the above-quoted passage three prophets are referred to—one, Elias; the other, Christ; and the third—"that prophet." All the Jews believed that the prophet Elias was not dead, but only concealed from mortal view. As for Christ (the Messiah), they believed, and still do believe, that He will come one day or other; but, from the passage above, it appears that they must have been expecting another prophet besides Jesus Christ—a prophet so conspicuous that to designate him by a mere pronoun —*that*, instead of by *name*—was quite sufficient. This illustrious prophet was none other but he respecting whom God said unto Moses, "I will raise up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee;" of whom Solomon said, "My beloved is white and ruddy . . . Yea, he is altogether *lovely* (the praised—محمد). This is my beloved, and this is my friend;" alluding to whom the prophet Haggai said, "The *desire* (the praise—حمدة) of all nations shall come." This renowned Prophet, we repeat, was Mohammed (محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم), the last, and, of all, the greatest.

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.

ESSAY

ON

SHAKKI-SADAR AND MERAJ,

THAT IS,

THE SPLITTING (OPEN) OF THE CHEST OF MOHAMMED;
AND HIS NIGHT JOURNEY.

خطبةٌ

علي حقيقة شق الصدر و ما هية المعراج

الفها

المفتقر الي الله الصمد سيد احمد عفى الله عنه

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT OF THIS ESSAY HAS BEEN REVISED AND CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

و ما جعلنا الرويا التي اريناك الا فتنة للناس

BY

SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADOR, C.S.I.,

AUTHOR OF THE "MOHAMMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE," HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, AND LIFE HONORARY SECRETARY TO THE ALLYGURH SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 8 AND 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.

فانظر الي الابل كيف خلقت

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Birth of Mohammed	1
Date of Mohammed's birth investigated	*ib.*
The traditions respecting the events said to have occurred on the night of Mohammed's birth proved to be unauthentic	1-2
Abdul Muttalib repairs to the Kaaba with the infant in his arms and offers up thanksgivings unto God	2
The infant receives the names of Mohammed and Ahmed	2
The infant Prophet is intrusted to Halimah as his nurse	3
Foster-relationship regarded by the Prophet as binding as that of blood	*ib.*
Mohammed's eloquence	4
Death of Amina	*ib.*
Remarks upon several stories relative to Mohammed's childhood	4-5
Death of Abdul Muttalib	5
Abu Talib accepts the guardianship of the orphan Prophet	5
The account of Mohammed's accompanying Abu Talib on the latter's journey to Syria void of trustworthy authority	*ib.*
Mohammed enters manhood and receives the surname of *Ameen*	*ib.*
SUPPLEMENT	6
Opinions of Mohammedan writers respecting ecclesiastical histories and biographies of Mohammed	*ib.*
Refutation of the remark of Sir William Muir respecting Mohammedan traditions	6-7
Three different kinds of traditions enumerated	7
Various traditions respecting the birth and childhood of Mohammed referred to the different heads to which they belong	8
The circumstance of Mohammed's having been born circumcised, discussed	9
Various traditions respecting the seal of prophecy carefully investigated, and their authenticity discussed	9-11
General remarks upon several traditions respecting the life of Mohammed	11-15
Discussion upon Mohammed's reported epilepsy	15-21
Discussion upon the authenticity of the circumstances—that a cloud sheltered the nascent Prophet; that Bahira recognized Mohammed; and that Mohammed accompanied his uncle on the occasion of the latter's mercantile expedition to Syria	21-25

ESSAY

ON THE

BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF MOHAMMED.

ABDOLLAH, the son of Abdul Muttalib, and the father of Mohammed, was, when 24 years of age, affianced to Amina, the daughter of Wahab, one of the Koraish tribe. During his wife's pregnancy he set out on a mercantile expedition to Yatherub or Medina; but dying before his wife was delivered, he was buried in Dar-i Nabigha, among the Bani Najjar. Mohammed was therefore a posthumous child. Oriental historians are, for the most part, of opinion that the date of Mohammed's birth was the 12th of Rabi I., in the first "*year of the Elephant*," or fifty-five days after the attack of Abraha; but great difference of opinion exists among those writers who have endeavoured to reconcile the "*year of the elephant*" with that of the Christian era.

There is, however, no doubt now that the "*year of the elephant*" corresponded with that of 570 A.D., because, according to all historians, Mohammed fled from Mecca to Medina in 622 A.D., that is, thirteen years after the first revelation, which he received at Mecca when forty years of age; which dates, when added together, amount to fifty-three lunar years; and, after subtracting therefrom one year, in order to compensate for the difference between the solar and the lunar years, fifty-two years only will remain. These fifty-two years, when subtracted from 622, leave 570, which is the year of the Prophet's birth.

Traditions, which relate that on the night of Mohammed's birth the palace of Kesra was shaken as by an earthquake, four-

teen of its pinnacles being thrown down in consequence; that the sacred fire of the Persians, which had burned unintermittingly from time immemorial, suddenly, and without any assignable cause, became extinguished; that the officiating priests saw strange visions; and that the lake of Sala was suddenly dried up; rest upon no reliable and respectable authority for the truth of them, and are therefore not believed in as religious traditions. In fact, they evidently appear to have been borrowed from the poets, who make use of the figure synecdoche.

According to some traditions, which, though they cannot confidently be said to be genuine and authentic, yet have no reason against their being so called, Amina despatched a messenger to Abdul Muttalib to inform him of the birth of the child; upon which he immediately went to her, and, taking the infant in his arms, repaired with it to the Kaaba, and recited some verses of thanksgiving unto God. According to Sir William Muir, this "prayer of Abdul Muttalib at the Kaaba is also apocryphal, being evidently composed in a Mohammedan strain." That the prayer should have been in a "Mohammedan strain" will not, however, appear surprising, if it be considered that an idea of the true God was not altogether unknown to Mohammed's forefathers; a very strong proof of which is to be found in the circumstance of Abdul Muttalib's having given to his son (the father of Mohammed) the name of Abd-allah, that is, servant of God. Mohammed was suckled for a short time by his mother herself, and by Suaiba, a freed-woman of his uncle, Abu Lahab. Suaiba had also suckled Hamza, the Prophet's uncle, so that Hamza and Musruk, the son of Suaiba, were Mohammed's foster-brothers. Abdul Muttalib gave the name of *Mohammed* to the child, while Amina gave him that of Ahmed, in obedience to the command of an angel who had appeared to her in a dream, thus accomplishing the prophecies both of the Old and the New Testament, of which prophecies we have already given a full account in one of our foregoing Essays. On the seventh day, Abdul

Muttalib offered sacrifice, to which were invited all the members of the Koraish tribe.

It was the custom of the principal Meccan families to intrust their infants, when only eight days' old, to the care of nurses, with whom the child remained as long as was agreeable to the parent.[1]

According, therefore, to the above usage, the infant Prophet was intrusted to Halima, who took him with her, and was accustomed to carry him once in every six months and show him to his mother and the rest of the family. When two years old he was weaned, on which occasion also Halima carried him to Amina, who, thinking that the climate of Mecca would not agree with him, once more intrusted him to the nurse who, as usual, showed him to his mother twice in the year, until he attained the age of four years, when Amina took the charge of him entirely upon herself. Halima, therefore, is considered as the Prophet's foster-mother; her husband, Haris, the son of Abdul Azza, as his foster-father, and her children—Abdullah, Onaisa, Hazama, called also Sheman, as his foster brothers and sisters.

Foster-relationship was ever regarded by the Prophet as obligatory as that of blood, and he therefore felt for Halima, not only great respect and kindness, but even affection, always treating her with the same respect and deference as he did his mother; so much so, indeed, that, upon one occasion, he spread out his mantle, so much the object of respect and reverence for all Mohammedans, for her to sit upon.

Such great regard shown by the Prophet for foster-relationship; the kindness with which he treated Halima and her children; his gratitude for the affection shown him by his foster relatives are, all of them, striking instances of the highest degree of moral feeling, benignity, and kind-heartedness.

The tribe of Bani-Koraish, especially that branch of it called

[1] The time for the infant's remaining with the nurse was not fixed, but entirely depended upon the position in life, and the circumstances of the parents.

the Bani Saad, amongst whom the Prophet spent his childhood, were renowned throughout Arabia for the purity and eloquence of their language, and hence the powerful and persuasive eloquence of the Prophet. So highly indeed was this qualification appreciated by the Arabians, that a person not possessing it was actually looked upon with contempt, and considered as one of the vulgar, although he might be a member of some high and noble family.

Sir William Muir also says that "his (Mohammed's) speech was thus formed upon one of the purest models of the beautiful language of the peninsula, and . . . . when his eloquence began to form an important element towards his success, a pure language and an elegant dialect were advantages of essential moment."

Upon reading any of the ordinary or familiar sayings of the Prophet, we find them in a style not unlike those of other eloquent and gifted Arabians; but, upon perusing the sacred pages of the Holy Koran, our astonishment and admiration are excited to the utmost at the vast difference of the two styles, which appear not to belong to one and the same person, and can only be accounted for by considering the former as proceeding from a mortal, and the latter from an immortal, tongue.

When the boy was six years old, Amina took him to Medina to show him to her other relatives there, but a short time after she died at Ahwa, on her way back to Mecca; and upon the boy's reaching that city, his grandfather, Abdul Muttalib, undertook upon himself the charge of the future Prophet, ever treating him with paternal fondness.

Several stories relating to Mohammed's childhood are mentioned by Sir William Muir—such as his frolicking with little girls at Medina; his putting to flight the birds that perched upon his housetop; his biting the back of his foster-sister; his weeping at his mother's tomb, when on his way from Medina to Hodaiba. These, with others of the like stamp, are all unsupported

by any reliable or trustworthy authority. But, even admitting all such relations to be true, we can perceive nothing more in them than the indulgence of childish propensities, since we see in Mohammed, not a god, but a man like ourselves.

Upon Mohammed's reaching his eighth year, his grandfather, Abdul Muttalib, died at the very advanced age of eighty-two years, and, as Sir William Muir has noticed, as "he (Mohammed) followed the bier to the cemetery of Hajur, he was seen to weep," a circumstance which, although Sir William appears to wish us to consider it as surprising, is by no means so, since the youth did but give vent to those tender emotions of the heart which the God of Mercy has instilled into it for the comfort and the happiness of man.

After the death of Abdul Mutallib, the guardianship of Mohammed was undertaken by Abu Talib, the uncle of the orphan, being the brother of Abdollah by the same mother. He also behaved to the child with the greatest kindness, watching over him with the care of a tender and anxious parent. When Mohammed had reached the age of twelve years, it so happened that his uncle, Abu Talib, was necessitated by his commercial affairs to undertake a journey to Syria, and when the business was over he returned to Mecca. The circumstance mentioned by Sir William Muir,—that Mohammed went to Syria with Abu Talib, who had, at first, declined to take the former with him, but that, when on the eve of departure, the boy, "overcome by the prospect of so long a separation, clung to his protector," and Abu Talib being moved, carried the boy along with him,—is altogether void of any trustworthy authority. Mohammed's childhood had now passed away, and he stood forth a youth, endowed with every virtue that could win the affections and command the respect of all around him. High moral feeling, patience, courage, rendered still more attractive by elegance of manners and a fascinating address, were so united in him, that he received the name of امین *Ameen*—that is, "Union of all virtues."

SUPPLEMENT.

With the historical facts of the life of Mohammed, as already mentioned, are connected a few traditions, to which Sir William Muir has given a place in his "Biography of Mohammed." Strange to say, however, he has contented himself with leaving the question undecided, by merely alleging that "the miracles attending the birth of Mohammed are very favourite topics with modern Moslems," and without inquiring which of those miracles the Moslems consider as worthy their attention, and which not. Both *Seyar*, or ecclesiastical histories, as well as the biographies of Mohammed, the productions of learned Mohammedan writers, are regarded by all Mussulmans as traditions which require a thorough investigation before being accepted as genuine and authentic. Now, traditions of this character are not considered by Mohammedans as absolutely deserving of credit, so long as satisfactory reasons are not adduced for establishing their truth. No Mohammedan divines, and no educated men, therefore, have received them with anything like satisfaction, but, on the contrary, all their efforts have been directed to the task of investigating and distinguishing, once for all, which of such traditions are true and which are false.

Sir William Muir, when mentioning in his work and determining the quantum of credit claimed by these as well as many other traditions, which contain both spurious and genuine ones indiscriminately, has cut the matter short by declaring that they are *all* spurious,—the mere fabrications of the traditionist's brain. With every respect, however, for that learned author, it may be said that mere assertion, without proof, is inadmissible, because, if universally adopted, it would supersede argument altogether; in short, it would be cutting the Gordian knot, instead of untying it.

Suppose any person were to assert (which has been done)[1] that John the Baptist was nothing more than a common man, belonging to the Jewish sect of the Essenians; that Jesus Christ was one of John's disciples; that it was not until after the crucifixion that the followers of Christ invested him with miraculous and divine powers, and that until then Jesus was no more than a common Jew; what difference would there be, let us ask, as to the quantum of credit to be given to these assertions, and to the wholesale charges which have been brought against the traditions of the Mohammedans?

If, in matters of common life, no man can be required to "pin his faith" upon the mere *ipse dixit* of any person, however respectable or however talented he may be, how much less should the assertion or "*thinking*" of any author be held to be conclusive in matters so weighty as those in question? We must, therefore, be excused if we consider Sir William Muir's "*thinking*" "that the traditions themselves should be utterly discarded as utterly untrustworthy," as not entitled to our acquiescence, until the correctness of such opinion be proved to us by argument and substantiated by facts.

It must be borne in mind that Mohammedans regard the traditions as of three kinds: the first consisting of those traditions which, having reasonable grounds for their being considered as genuine, are universally accepted as true. In the second kind are included popular traditions, whose occurrence is not contrary to the usual course of nature, and concerning which no proof exists of their being spurious and untrustworthy, so that under these circumstances they are neither absolutely rejected nor implicitly relied upon. And the third kind includes such traditions as, appearing to be altogether impossible, and having been proved to be false and apocryphal, are entirely rejected. Nothing, therefore, can be more incorrect than to represent Mohammedans as

[1] See "A Voice from the Ganges."

considering *all* these traditions as true, and deriving satisfaction therefrom.[1]

We now proceed to deal with the traditions enumerated by Sir William Muir in his work, and to show under which of the above-named heads they ought to be placed. For instance, the terrific and unaccountable noise that so alarmed Amina; the sudden appearance of a white bird, which calmed her agitation and restored her confidence, by placing its wings upon her bosom; Amina's thirst, and the cup of delicious beverage presented to her by an invisible hand; the celestial voices and the tread of unseen feet, when no one was near her; the descending of a sheet from heaven for the purpose of screening Mohammed from mortal view; the warbling of the birds of paradise; and the scattering of heavenly perfumes from on high: all these are stories, borrowed in all probability from some Moulood, and which the least educated Mussulman knows to be the mere coinage of a heated imagination, invented by poets for the purpose of embellishing the history of Mohammed. Such being the character of the above traditions, they can only be ranked with those that have been rejected.

Of a like character as these last-mentioned ones are the romantic tales of Mohammed's prostrating himself upon the earth; his praying earnestly for the pardon of his people, and his reciting the Mohammedan creed at the very moment of his birth; the apparition of the three sun-like brilliant figures from heaven, of which one held a silver goblet, the second an emerald tray, and the third a silken towel, wherewith to wash the infant seven times; and their addressing him as "the prince of all mankind."

It appears to us somewhat extraordinary that Sir William Muir should have included—in the number of the traditions which he qualifies as prodigies, marvels, and occurrences con-

[1] We have already discussed this point at full length in our "Essay upon the Mohammedan Traditions."

trary to the usual course of nature—the fact of Mohammed's having been born circumcised. This, however, is by no means to be considered as a marvel or miracle, being merely a *lusus naturæ*. Many instances of various similar freaks of nature might be quoted; cases of hermaphroditism, for instance, to show that an occasional deviation from nature's natural course is by no means uncommon; a fact which at once accounts for Mohammed's being born *minus* a prepuce, without the intervention of a miracle. That Mohammed came into the world circumcised may also be proved by the fact that the rite of circumcision was never performed upon him, although this was a duty of the most sacred kind, and which was considered highly sinful to neglect among the pre-Islamic Arabs.

Concerning the seal of prophecy, Sir William Muir says that it was stated by Safia that "the seal of prophecy was written upon his (Mohammed's) back, in letters of light." Now, all authentic hadeeses unanimously declare that it was nothing more than a small fleshy excrescence covered with hair—black moles and very small warts. No learned Mohammedans believed that any letters were written upon it. The Prophet himself never, in familiar conversation, asserted that it was the seal of his prophetic mission, nor did he ever bring forward the circumstance as a proof of his being the true Prophet of God, as Moses did the miracle of his hand becoming suddenly leprous, as a token for the children of Israel. The real fact appears to be that, as everything connected with the Prophet was regarded with reverence, his followers, thinking that it would be rather derogatory to the Prophet himself, as well as a want of respect and consideration on their own part to call the fleshy excrescence of his body with the common name of mole or wart, figuratively designated it by a more exalted appellation of the "prophetic seal."

Some persons thought that letters were engraven upon this fleshy excrescence itself, as upon an ordinary seal, an idea which

has been contradicted most explicitly, and clearly shown to be erroneous by all Mohammedan divines and learned writers. Is it not very surprising, not to say very unfair, that we should be represented as accepting, for a proof of our Prophet's mission, the very circumstance, the truth of which we deny *in toto?*

Bajori relates the saying of Askalani, that the tradition of there being letters inscribed upon the fleshy excrescence on the Prophet's back was not genuine, and that it was a mistake on the part of Ibni-Habban to have believed it to have been so. Bajori also mentions that some learned men were of opinion that those who imagined that letters were actually inscribed upon "the Seal of Prophecy" (the fleshy excrescence) had fallen into an error, having been misled by the word "Seal;" as the seal which the Prophet was accustomed to wear upon his finger as a ring had actually letters engraven on it, while the fleshy excrescence itself had no letters engraven on it at all.

و اما رواية كاثر المحجم اوكركبة عنز أوكشامة خضراء اوسوداء و مكتوب فيها محمد رسول الله اوسطر فانك المنصور لم يثبت منهاشي كما قاله العسقلاني و تصحيح ابن حبان لذلك و همّ و قال بعض الحفاظ من روى انه كان علي خاتم النبوة كتابة محمد رسول الله فقد اشتبه عليه خاتم النبوة بخاتم اليد اذا لكتابة المذكور انما كانت علي الثاني دون الاول * حاشية البا جورى علي الشمايل *

There also exists a hadees (hereto subjoined) which clearly explains what the Mohammedans understood by the term "seal of prophecy." Rimsah mentions that, accompanied by his father, who was a physician, he went to the Prophet's house, that his father seeing what was on the Prophet's back, asked permission of the latter to remedy it, but the Prophet replied, "You are my friend, but God is the *true* physician."

عن ابي رمثة . . . . قال دخلت مع ابي علي رسول الله صلعم فراي ابي الذي بظهر رسول الله صلعم فقال دعني اعالج الذي بظهرك فاني طبيب فقال انت رفيق و الله الطبيب (رواه في شرح السنه)

The above hadeeses so clearly explain the belief of the Mussulmans respecting the "Seal of Prophecy" as to render wholly unjustifiable the manner in which it has been treated by Sir William Muir.

Traditions about the light which, emanating from Amina, rendered visible the streets and palaces of Bostra; that Mohammed, as soon as he was born, supported himself on his hands, and taking up a handful of earth, raised his hand to heaven; and that Amina, when pregnant with Mohammed, felt, according to one of these traditions, no weight or inconvenience from the embryo; while another tradition represents her as saying, "I never felt an embryo heavier than that of Mohammed;" these and all like traditions, are entirely void of support and authority, and cannot be accepted as genuine and authoritative ones.

As the tradition recording the circumstance of the supernatural light that issued from Amina, has been mentioned in a way not perfectly agreeing with the tradition itself, we therefore here quote the original tradition, together with an English translation of it.

Irbar mentions Mohammed as saying, "I will tell you what is my origin. I am the object of the prayer of Abraham; of the prophecy made by Jesus Christ; of the dream of my mother, who, when about to give me birth, dreamt that there issued from her a light which illumined all the palaces of Syria."

عن العرباض ابن سارية عن رسول الله صلعم انه قال . . . سأخبركم باول امري انا دعوة ابراهيم و بشارة عيسي و رويا امي التي رأت حين وضعتني و قد خرج لها نوز اضاء لها قصور الشام (رواه في شرح السنه)

Although no sufficient authority exists for proving the genuineness of the above tradition, nevertheless, even if its authenticity be conceded, there is nothing in the fact itself, that is, a dream, which is at all surprising, much less supernatural.

Sir William Muir says that "Monday is, by all traditionists, regarded as a remarkable day in Mohammed's history, on which the chief events of his life occurred." But the learned author is here mistaken, for the observance of Monday is not regarded by Mohammedans as either a religious duty or an article of faith. The truth is that many learned men, when noting down the days on which any events worthy of note occurred in the history of Mohammed, found Monday to have been one of them, and accordingly included it in their list as a matter of accidental coincidence, while there were others who differed from them on this point.

Sir William Muir, when enumerating the "several palpable fabrications" in the original text of Wakedi, says that this author stated, "that Amina told Abdul Muttalib of the command of the angel that the child should be called Ahmad;" after which Sir William proceeds to state that the name of Ahmad احمد was very rare in Arabia; that the names derived from the root Hamd (حمد) were common, and that, besides the Prophet, there were five other different persons named Mohammed.

On Wakedi's authority, he adds "that these names were given by such Arabs as had learnt from Jews, Christians, or soothsayers, that a prophet so named was about to rise in Arabia, and the parents, in the fond hope each that his child would turn out to be the expected prophet, called it by his name."

If implicit belief is placed in the passage, "And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael," . . . (Gen. xvi. 11), as well as in the passage, "And God said, Sarah, thy wife, shall bear thee a son indeed, and thou shalt call his name Isaac" (Gen. xvii. 19); and also in the passage, "*And she* (Mary) *shall*

bring forth a son, and thou (Joseph) SHALT CALL HIS NAME JESUS; *for he shall save his people from their sins*" (Mat. i. 21),—on what grounds, let us ask, can it be denied that the angel appeared to Amina, and desired her to give the name of *Ahmed* to the child, of which she was shortly to be delivered?

A most satisfactory proof of the truth of this tradition is, as shown in our "Essay on the Prophecies respecting Mohammed," that the Prophet was foretold by the name of Mohammed, in the Old Testament, and by that of Ahmed in the New; it was highly necessary, therefore, that, in order to fulfil these prophecies, God should make known to Amina the appellation of *Ahmed*, an appellation that was never, or but very rarely, given to Arabians.

It appears very remarkable, however, that Sir William Muir should assert that "the word *Ahmed* must have occurred by mistake, in some early Arabic translation of John's Gospel, for the *Comforter*, περικλυτος for παρακλητος, or was forged as such by some ignorant or designing monk in Mohammed's time." Mohammedan divines never asserted that, before the Prophet, these appellations were never given to other persons in Arabia. On the contrary, they rejected all such traditions, and very faithfully and honestly endeavoured, Wakedi being one of them, to find out (and they succeeded) that these names were given to other persons in Arabia.

The fact, however, that there did exist persons of these names,[1] or the assertion that these names were given by the parents, each in the fond hope that, peradventure, his child may turn out to be the promised prophet does not, in any way, affect the prophecies, because, whatever the parents might have coveted, the Prophet was the same person intended by God; an opinion which we are

[1] We find the same circumstance attending the name of Jesus. "The name of Jesus, which was given him, is an alteration from *Joshua*. It was a very common name; but afterwards, mysteries, and an allusion to his character of Saviour were, naturally, sought for in it."—See Renan's "Life of Christ."

the more justified in maintaining, when we reflect upon the extraordinary acts he performed,—acts which were entirely unprecedented in the history of the whole globe; upon enjoying that felicity which is the gift of the religion of God; which he preached in his life time, and left as the richest heir-loom to posterity; upon his promulgating that truth and righteousness which, after the revolution of ages, have remained unalterable and uncorrupted, and shall so continue to all eternity.

It is, therefore, by no means surprising that Amina should have been alarmed at the appearance of the angels, and should, according to the custom of the Arabs, in such cases, have hung pieces of iron on her neck and arms as a charm or amulet;[1] but, on the contrary, it strongly corroborates the fact of Amina's having actually seen her heavenly visitors.

What, then, becomes of Sprenger's judgment and candour when he concludes, from the above circumstance, that Amina had a nervous and epileptic temperament!!!

Amina's account of the vision or dream in which she was informed that the babe would be suckled by one of the tribe of Abu-dzueib; Halima's surprise upon hearing her husband's name; the sudden and abundant flow of milk, both in Halima and her camel, upon receiving the infant Mohammed; the swiftness of the white ass when returning from Mecca; and the circumstance of Halima's cattle growing fat, and yielding abundance of milk, etc., etc., are, all of them, traditions that have no other authority for their support than that they were related by Halima, for which reason they are classed under the second head, which presupposes their occurrence to have been possible. Why, indeed, should we not consider the above traditions as true as the passages: "And Laban said unto him, I pray thee, if I have found favour in thine eyes, tarry; for I

[1] A similar custom still obtains in many parts of England, where it is not unusual to see a horseshoe nailed outside a stable door, to prevent evil spirits from injuring the horses.

have learned, by experience, that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake" (Gen. xxx. 27); "For it was little which thou hadst before I came, and it is now increased into a multitude; and the Lord hath blessed thee since my coming" (Gen. xxx. 30); and also Gen. xxx. 36–42, all of which show that God created Laban's cattle less strong than those of Jacob.

Sir William Muir proceeds to state, on Wakedi's authority, the circumstance of the opening of Mohammed's chest and the cleansing of his heart, when he was four years of age; and, on the authority of Hishami, infers therefrom that the infant was attacked with epilepsy.

In our "Essay on the Shakki-sadar and Meraj," we have dwelt upon this subject at some length, and have proved, to the best of our ability, that it was nothing more than a portion of, or episode to, the dream of the Prophet on the night of the Meraj, or journey to heaven; that it never occurred in the body, but was purely imaginary; and that the traditionists differ in assigning the time when the operation was performed; some affirming it to have taken place during infancy, others during his youth when at Mecca, while others assert that it occurred during the night journey.

Taking it for granted that the circumstance happened just as Sir William Muir has mentioned, we shall now endeavour to nullify the inference which the above talented writer has, on the authority of Hishami, drawn from the tale so related, namely, that the infant Prophet had had a fit of epilepsy.

Sir William says that Hishami and other later writers add that the husband of Halimah concluded that the boy had "had a fit."

But this translation of the passage from Hishami is incorrect. We have in our possession an edition of Hishami's book, printed and published at Gottingen in 1858, under the care and supervision of Dr. Ferdinand Wustenfeld, and we here quote the original passage verbatim, as well as its translation into English.

قالت و قال لي ابوه يا حليمه لقد خشيت ان يكون هذا الغلام قد أُصِيبُ فا لحقيه باهله

" Halima said she was told by his (the Prophet's) foster-father (Halima's husband) that ' O Halima, I fear that the infant has received an evil spirit—that is, is under the influence of an evil spirit—therefore let him be sent back to his family.' "

The fact that Halima's husband did not mean to infer, by these words, that the infant was suffering from any actual disease, is also verified by the following remarks of Amina, made by her on the occasion of Halimah's returning the infant to her. " Ah !" exclaimed she, " didst thou fear that he was under the influence of evil spirits" افتخوفت عليه الشيطان.

We do not find in Hishami the word *Omeeb* اميب, mentioned in Sir William Muir's note, p. 21, v. i.; neither does that word imply " had a fit," as the writer had been led to understand. In Hishami there is given the word اصيب *Oseeb,* as we have mentioned above, and as shall be perfectly shown hereafter. As there is but very little difference in the appearance of the two words, Sir William appears to have fallen into a mistake, from having quoted a faulty manuscript.

Almost every Christian writer of Mohammed's life asserts as a fact that the Prophet suffered from epilepsy. At first we were at a loss to conceive how such an idea, like Grotius's story of the pigeon, could have ever entered the pericraniums of the Christians. History does not inform us that any Christian physician went to Arabia for the purpose of examining the bodily condition of Mohammed, nor is there anything said on the subject by Oriental writers. Whence, then, could such a notion have originated, and by whom was it encouraged and propagated ?

After considerable research we have at length ascertained that this false and ridiculous notion is to be attributed: first, to the

superstition of the Greek Christians, and secondly, to the faulty translation of the Arabic text into Latin.

Upon a reference to page 20 of the "Life of Mahomet," by Prideaux, printed at London in 1712, the notion in question will be found to have originated in it, and also, in the mis-translation into Latin, by Dr. Pococke, of some of the passages in Abulfeda's work. This translation was, along with its original in Arabic, printed from Pococke's manuscript, at Oxford, in 1723. We shall first quote the text from this edition, and then point out the various mistakes therein, as well as in the translation.

فقال زوج حليمة لها قد خشيت ان هذا الغلام قد أُصِيبَ بالحقية باهله فاحتملته حليمة وقدمت به الي امه

Fa kala zoajo Halimah laha kad Khasshaito Anna hazal Gholam Kad Oseeba bil hakkeeyut bi ahlehee fah tamalut ho Halimah wa Kaddamut bihe Ila Ommehe. The faithful translation of which is: "Then Halima's husband said to her, 'I fear that the infant has contracted (the influence of the evil spirit), therefore return him to his family; and she brought the boy to his mother;'" while the version of the Arabic into Latin runs thus: "*Tunc maritus Halimæ; multum vereor, inquit, ne puer inter populares suos morbum Hypochondriacum contraxerit. Tollens itaque eum Halima ad matrem ejus Aminam reduxit;*" its English rendering being: "Then Halimah's husband said, 'I am greatly afraid of the boy's catching the Hypochondriacal disease from some of his companions; therefore, taking him (the boy) from Halimah, he carried him back to his mother, Amina.'" It should be observed that by the "Hypochondriacal disease" is probably meant epilepsy, or the falling sickness.

The mistake occasioned in the text is that, instead of the expression *fa alhakeehe* فالحقيه, which means "*reach him,*" is used that of *bil hakkeeyute* بالحقية, which implies "right," or "indeed;" but when the translator found that he could not re-

concile the passage with the whole text,—for how could he?—he omitted the meaning of the word بالحقية in the translation. Again, upon coming to the word *Oseeba* أصِيبَ, he translated it "*contraxerit*,"[1] or "caught," but not finding in the original what he caught, and it being necessary, both for the sense of the passage, as well as for grammar, to find some object which he (the boy) caught, he supplied it, at a guess, by *Hypochondria*, the falling sickness.

The fact is, that when the Arabs used such ambiguous expressions, they meant thereby the influence of the evil spirit.

The origin of this mistake appears to have been rooted in the superstition of the ancient Greeks. "Owing to the mysterious and extraordinary character of the convulsions of epilepsy, it was always supposed by them to be due, in a very special manner, to the influence either of the gods or of evil spirits."

Two objections here present themselves. First, why should Arab idioms, and the modes of expression peculiar to that language, be interpreted conformably to Greek superstition? Secondly, admitting that the Arabs really did ascribe the falling sickness to the influence of evil spirits, it seems very odd and unreasonable that, wherever such an expression is mentioned, we should understand thereby that nothing but epilepsy is meant; especially when we know to a certainty that the Arabs attributed to the influence of evil spirits the cause of all such things, the nature whereof they did not know themselves. In support of what is here said, we quote the opinion of a very learned, judicious, and liberal author, who says, "The assertion so often repeated, that Mohammed was subject to epileptic fits, IS A BASE INVENTION OF THE GREEKS, who would seem to *impute* that morbid affection to the apostle of a novel creed, as a stain upon his moral character, deserving the reprobation and abhorrence

[1] It is evident by the Latin translation also that the word in question is Oseeba اصيب, and not اميب, as has been understood by Sir William Muir.

of the Christian world."[1] Nor can we omit quoting here the opinion of the profound historian Gibbon, who observes "His (Mohammed's) epileptic fits, AN ABSURD CALUMNY OF THE GREEKS, would be an object of pity rather than abhorrence." In another place he remarks: "The epilepsy, or falling sickness, of Mohammed is asserted by Theophanes-Zonaras, and the rest of the Greeks, and is *greedily swallowed by the gross bigotry* of Hollinger, Prideaux, and Maracci; the titles (*the wrapped up, the covered*) of two chapters of the Koran can hardly be strained to such an interpretation; the silence, the ignorance of the Mohammedan commentators is more conclusive than the most peremptory denial; and the charitable side is espoused by Ockley, Gagnier, and Sale."

We now proceed to consider, under a medical point of view, the false and groundless imputation that Mohammed was afflicted with epilepsy.

"Epilepsy is a form of disease characterized by sudden insensibility, with convulsive movements of the voluntary muscles, and occasionally arrest of the breathing, owing to spasms of the muscles of respiration and temporary closure of the glottis. The epileptic not uncommonly gets insane, often loses his memory, and becomes subject to a certain want of acuteness, and a depression of spirits which unfit him for the regular business of life. Disorders of digestion are also frequent, and there is a constant want of tone and vigour in all the bodily functions, which communicate an habitual expression of languor to the epileptic. Added to this, it can hardly be matter of surprise that the knowledge of his infirmity should deeply influence the mind of the epileptic, and produce a distaste for active occupations, especially for such as expose him to more than ordinary observation."[2]

Our duty now, therefore, is to inquire if all or any one of the

[1] "Apology for Mohammed and the Koran," by John Davenport.
[2] "Chambers's Cyclopædia.."

symptoms were to be found as occurring in any portion of the Prophet's life, from his infancy until his death.

No historian, whether Mohammedan or Christian, mentions that any one of the above symptoms was to be found in Mohammed, but, on the contrary, they have all unanimously affirmed that Mohammed was vigorous and healthy, both in his infancy and his youth. Indeed, Sir William Muir himself says that "at two years of age she" (Halima) "weaned him and took him home; that Amina was so delighted with the healthy and robust appearance of her infant, who looked like a child of double the age, that she said 'Take him with thee back again to the desert,'" etc., etc. In his youth he is said to have been strong, healthy, and robust.[1] He walked very quickly, and firmly trod the ground. Through the whole of his life he was exposed to great perils and hardships, all of which he bore with unflinching patience and courage.

He restored that worship of the *Unity* of the Godhead in a manner alike without precedent or example, and established the science of theology on such sound and reasonable principles as are without their parallel in the world. It was he who brought the laws which regulate society, and enforce morality, to a state of perfectibility never before attained. It was he through whom came, for the welfare and happiness of mankind, that criminal, civil, religious, and military code, unique of its kind. It was he who, during his life-time, conquered the entire peninsula of Arabia, united the different tribes into one strong, compact, and formidable nation, which rapidly overran as conquerors the greatest part of the then civilized world. Is it, then, we would ask, compatible with reason and justice to suppose that achievements like these could have been the work of a wretched, imbecile epileptic—achievements which none but a man in the fullest possession of all his faculties, mental and corporeal, could ever

[1] For a curious proof of this, see "Dictionaire Historique et Critique de Bayle, Art. Mahomet. Note S.

have performed, and which, by their very nature, presuppose a divine agency?

Sir William Muir says that Halimah being "again startled . . . . by observing a cloud attendant upon the child, sheltering him from the sun," etc., etc., "set out finally to restore the boy to his mother." Upon this passage he gives it as his opinion that "if there be any truth in the tradition, it probably implies a renewal of symptoms of the former nature." Again, he says that "the attacks which alarmed Halimah, as fits of an epileptic nature, exhibit, in the constitution of Mohammed, the normal marks of those excited states and ecstatic swoons which, perhaps, suggested to his own mind the ideas of inspiration, as by his followers they were undoubtedly taken to be evidence of it."

The tradition that a cloud should so shelter the Prophet, and him alone, from the sun, seems to be, in itself, impossible, and therefore false. Had this actually occurred, many of Mohammed's associates and companions, who were constantly near him at all times, must have noticed the circumstance, and, consequently, it could not fail to have been mentioned in many authentic hadeeses. This, however, is not the case, all of them being silent upon the subject.[1] Among the many ways by which the spread of a wrong tradition among the people may be accounted for, one of them is the accidental occurrence of the very thing to which the tradition relates. It is possible, therefore, that the Prophet might have been seen by some person, under the partial shadow of a cloud, and that he related the circumstance to another, who, again, told it to a third, and so on, till it got into general circulation, and as *Fama volat, viresque acquirit eunde*, it became, at length, a common belief that the cloud always enveloped the head of the Prophet. Now, traditions such as the above, that have no authority for their genuineness, are never accepted by our learned divines.

[1] On the contrary, some hadeeses, relative to the subject of prayer, mention the circumstance of the sunshine falling upon the person of the Prophet as upon that of any other person.

Although we have shown the imputation of Mohammed's being subject to epileptic convulsions to be altogether void of truth, nevertheless, we must be allowed to place before all impartial and candid readers the opinion of Sir William Muir, viz., that the epileptic swoons of Mohammed gave him the idea of his divine mission, and that such was the belief of his followers; and then ask whether it be at all reasonable to suppose that a man, whom every one knew for an epileptic, should adduce his epileptic swoons as proofs of his being the Prophet of God, sent to destroy the idolatry of his countrymen; should be believed as such by all about him, by his family and by all the learned of Arabia, every one of whom apostatized from the religion of his forefathers, and placed implicit faith in his word and doctrines?

After describing Mohammed's visit to his mother's tomb, and giving his reason for not praying for her salvation, Sir William Muir remarks that "it (the prohibition of praying for those who die not in the Mussulman faith) forms a singular instance of the sternness and severity of the dogmas of Mohammed in respect of those who died in ignorance of the faith."

But for our part we must confess that we cannot find any severity or sternness whatever in not praying for such persons, who did not believe in the Unity of God, but died in a state of utter incredulity; on the contrary, our impression is that it was a most efficient and likely means for inducing the living to abandon idolatry, and acknowledge the unity of the Godhead.

Upon learning that the above fact was considered as "the sternness and the severity of the dogmas of Mohammed," we directed our attention to the Christian system for the purpose of discovering, if possible, what mild, charitable, and merciful provisions it contained on behalf of those persons who, although believing in God, refused to acknowledge Christ to be his son. Greatly, however, to our disappointment, we could only find still severer denunciations against unbelievers: thus, in the Athanasian

Creed, which is appointed by the Church to be read on certain days, throughout all Protestant churches in England, after specifying all the articles that a person *must* believe, as if belief were a matter of compulsion, it is declared expressly—"And this is the Christian faith, which, except a man believe, he *cannot* be *saved*." Where, then, is the superiority, as to charity and mercy, of the Christian over the Mohammedan religion?

Sir William Muir states that "the whole family rose from their frugal meal, hungry and unsatisfied if Mohammed were not present, but were satisfied when he shared it with them;" and says, moreover, "this had a tendency to glorify the nascent Prophet." Now the Mohammedans do not believe this tradition as a genuine and true one; there does not exist any trustworthy authority for the truth of it, and therefore it falls under the second head. But why should not the above circumstance be believed to be possible, when we believe in the passage of Matthew xiv. 19, 20: "And he (Jesus) commanded the multitude (5,000 in number) to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves and the two fishes, and, looking up to heaven, he blessed and brake, and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude, and they did all eat and were filled, and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full."

Sir William Muir mentions that Bahira recognised the Prophet, when on his journey to Syria, from among a company of other persons, by the hovering of a cloud over his head, the bending of the boughs of trees to shelter him from the sun; that he (Bahira) questioned Mohammed and examined his body, in order to find on it the seal of prophecy, etc., etc. If it be believed at all that Mohammed did actually accompany his uncle, Abu Talib, on the occasion of the latter's mercantile expedition to Syria, it is not by any means surprising that Bahira should have imagined all this, because at that time the Jews, as well as the Christians, were expecting a Messiah, and a περικλυτος. All

these traditions, however, must be classed with those which have no trustworthy authority in support of them. The tradition which gives the account of Bahira and of Abu Talib's journey to Syria, in company with Mohammed, and wherein it is stated that Abu Talib sent Mohammed back from Syria, under the charge of Abu Bakr and Bilal, is not mentioned in Moslim and Bokharee, the most authentic and authoritative works upon traditions, but it is eagerly welcomed by Tirmizee and other less scrupulous authors. There are numerous sound reasons which entirely and, at the same time, satisfactorily demonstrate the unauthenticity of the tradition under consideration; but it will suffice, we think, to quote here the remark of Dr. Sprenger, as given by Sir William Muir, wherein the former perfectly proves the absurdity of the tradition in question. "Tirnidzi says that Abu Talib sent Mahomet back from Syria by Abu Bakr and Bilal, which (as Sprenger shows) is absurd, seeing that the former was two years *younger* than Mahomet, and the latter not then born."

After describing Mohammed's journey to Syria (which circumstance we have mentioned to be unsupported by trustworthy authority), when only twelve years of age, with Abu Talib, Sir William Muir says that "the ruined sites of former grandeur, rendered more affecting by wild stories, strange and startling details, and tragic traditions; the national and social customs of christening the churches with their crosses, images, other symbols of faith, the ringing of bells, effected a deep impression and imprinted a charm upon the reflecting mind "(can the mind of an epileptic child be susceptible of such impressions?)" of Mohammed."

We somewhat hesitate to coincide with this remark, because this very boy, whose youthful mind was so much affected upon seeing the cross, the images, and other symbols of Christianity, did, in his after life, oppose these very things, strongly prohibit the adoption of any one of them, forbid the use of the cross and

the worship of images, declare that God had no son, and in opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity, preach, inculcate, and propagate the worship of the *one only* God.

But, admitting that all the above-mentioned objects did make an impression upon the mind of the boy, another idea naturally suggests itself to us, which is, that a child whose first four years were passed in a desert, and who, during the next eight ones, was surrounded by idolatry and intellectual darkness; who, when only twelve years of age, possessed a heart capable of receiving a deep impression from whatever objects presented themselves to his eye, from the ruins of time-destroyed buildings, from churches, crosses, images, and other Christian symbols; and who was endowed with so much reason, sagacity, and genius as enabled him to deduce from those objects conclusions so perfect and ideas so sublime concerning the invisible Deity and the immortality of man's soul;—the idea, we repeat, irresistibly strikes us that such a child must have been born a *prophet*, who had nature herself for his instructress; and that it was of him that Christ himself prophesied, when He said: "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the περίκλυτος (Ahmed) will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send him unto you."

STEPHEN AUSTIN, PRINTER, HERTFORD.