

THE MOSLEM WORLD

VOL. XXXI

APRIL, 1941

No. 2

THE DYNAMIC OF EVANGELISM

"The Evangel is the dynamic of God."—Rom. 1:16.

A writer in *The Christian Century* a few years ago gave a rather correct diagnosis of what he called "the Slump in Foreign Missions" and said it was due to three causes: "We have lost the sense of Christ's supremacy, of Christ's sufficiency and of the urgency of our message." Today some voices declare that the Gospel message of the apostles and of the early missionaries who laid the foundations of the national churches in Asia and Africa needs modification by way of addition, subtraction or re-conception. Professor Hocking of Harvard, for example, advocates a new World Faith with elements of value taken from all the living religions of humanity. In his learned lectures (whose conclusion, as he states, "will stand or fall with its metaphysics or more strictly with its theology") he expresses regret for the plurality of religions. But since we must deal with other religions, there are three ways of doing so: "the way of Radical Displacement, the way of Synthesis and the way of Reconception." The first is the old orthodox conception, but it presupposes a theology no longer accepted or acceptable. We know the spirit of this method, and its Biblical authorization. We recall the language of the "Great Commission;" the phrase of John's Gospel, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," and that more specific phrase, "none other name."

As for the theology responsible for these out-moded missionary principles and practices we read: "The idea

of a divine plan, considered as a dated product of God's wisdom and goodness wholly unimaginable to man, is, I fear, an ingenious invention of St. Paul. To take it up again today is to place a halter around the neck of Christianity for those to tug at who are disposed to work upon the more craven fears of the human heart. It is time for robust and honest Christianity to have done with all this rattling of ancient moral chains."

But it is these so-called out-moded missionary principles and this out-moded theology of St. Paul that lie at the very basis of ecumenic Christianity. In regard to the theology of Professor Hocking, a Roman Catholic theologian, Alfons Văth, wrote in *Katholischen Missionen* (1933): "These laymen have before their eyes a future Christianity without Christ's Cross or His Resurrection, without the Holy Spirit and His grace, without Church and Sacrament. Moreover, it is not Christianity, but faith in an obscure divine entity and a religion of humanitarianism."

Others, again, plead for an entire change of missionary method and program. This newer form of "evangelism" wishes to spare the convert any violent break from his old environment. It speaks of "Christianizing Hinduism" and of "evangelizing Islam." A Professor in an American University in the Near East puts it this way: "This approach would not require the Moslem inquirer to forsake his Moslem communal relations, but would rather urge that, continuing to live in the Moslem community, the young convert follow the Jesus-way in that world. Some things, of course, he could not do. Persecution and criticism would be his lot, but not until he was cast out in spite of his endeavors to remain a loyal member of the Moslem community, would he sever his relations with his past environment. Thus the leaven would be kept in the lump; the lamp would be kept in the dark place; the spread of Christianity would be spiritual not organizational; vital not theological, ethical and dynamic and not formalistic. . . . This approach has much to commend it for

it proposes not so much to make individual converts separated in small groups from the Moslem community; it proposes rather to inject into the Moslem community and into Moslem life and thought the spirit and teachings of Jesus, so that like leaven operating in the entire mass, these teachings and spirit may work out their own revolution and change. Thus, it is argued, we will have a truly indigenous Moslem Christian, a truly indigenous Moslem Christian theology, and a truly indigenous form of organized Moslem Christianity."

No. Such a theory of evangelism would prove even less efficient than a merely social-gospel. Christ calls us to be fishers of men. We will not progress far by forsaking the use of all hooks and nets in order to feed the hungry fish in their own environment. Peter on Lake Galilee and Isaak Walton in his *Compleat Angler* would laugh such fishermen to scorn.

In the Madras Conference Findings (Vol 3, pp. 407-410 and pp. 211-214) this very question came up for discussion and a representative group of missionaries among Moslems, from many lands, meeting at Delhi, December 6-7, 1938, adopted a resolution expressing their views:

"After hearing the report of the findings of the inquiry on Muslim evangelism conducted by the Near East Christian Council, the conference discussed at length the following suggestion from that report: 'That the ultimate hope of bringing Christ to the Muslims is to be attained by the development of groups of followers of Jesus who are active in making Him known to others while remaining loyally a part of the social and political groups to which they belong in Islam. The ideal is that there should thus come into being a church whose only head is Christ, and which does not carry the stigma of being an alien institution, drawing men away from their natural social and political connections.'

"On this subject the following resolution was adopted: This conference of Christian workers among Muslims

wish to place on record that while we recognize with gratitude the wide interest in our Lord Jesus Christ evident throughout the Muslim world today, and that many real believers in Christ may never reach the point of identifying themselves with the Christian fellowship, yet we maintain that it is our aim and purpose as Christian missionaries to encourage and teach all to realize the vital necessity of open witness to Christ within the fellowship of the Christian Church."

Unless we ask the Moslem enquirer to make a clear-cut decision, to break with his past to accept a new way of life in Christ, we are really doing him an injustice. The easy way is not the way of the Gospel. A friendlier attitude toward Christ and Christianity is not enough. The way of the Cross means crucifixion, not inoculation. As an experienced Indian missionary wrote: "Inoculation confers immunity. Through its long history Islam has had frequent inoculations of Christianity and its organism has developed a resistance to the contagion of Christianity. Call that resistance 'fanaticism' or 'conservatism' it makes no difference. Until there comes some deep and drastic disturbance of the whole organism by piercing deeply to the heart of the personal units of which it is composed or, to leave our metaphor, until personal conviction is awakened and the dynamic of the Gospel re-energizes the soul of the Muslim, we see little hope of any marked change in Islam of the nature of a re-orientation of its thought and ethic towards Christianity.

"It is our experience that however much we may be able to exhibit the Christian morale, the Muslim will not suffer theological questions to be shelved and it is because they are so frequently shelved by Christians that the Muslim tends to become more and more confirmed in his views of the superiority of Islam. Often the theological enthusiasm of the Muslim is in strange contrast to a certain rationalizing laicism in reluctant advocates of an attenuated Christianity. If the Christian is content to be silent about the Trinity or to relegate it to oblivion, this will not

propitiate the Muslim and make him ready to accept Christian truth. He will continue his triumphant way till he has silenced the Christian on the matter of the authenticity of the New Testament and then invite him to accept Islam. In his dealings with Muhammedans, what the Christian needs is not less theology but more and better theology. One of the complaints we have frequently to make is that Christian theology has hardly any time to express itself in relation to the thought world of Islam and some of us are bending our energies to this task. But to impose on ourselves a silence with respect to our theology is not honest and does not do justice to the intellectual travail of Christianity. It will result in our becoming more inarticulate than we already are and place us in an invidious position when confronted with Islam's dogmatic assurance."

No one has made a deeper and more sympathetic study of Islam than Dr. Duncan B. Macdonald, and none ever put the present-day issue more clearly: "Are the missionaries of the future to be missionaries of Christ or missionaries of the Christian civilization of the West? This is the alternative which we face at present, although it is often disguised behind forms of words which conceal its real nature and essential importance. Do the missionaries of our Christian churches go out to proclaim to the world the unique and divine fact of the Incarnation or to carry to the non-Christian world the benefits—educational, medical, generally humanitarian—which have grown up in our civilization under the stimulus and guidance of the Christian faith?"

What does this unique fact of the Incarnation imply? Why did the Word become flesh? What is the message of the Evangel? It could not be stated more forcibly than by a writer in the latest edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica (Vol. XIX, p. 240): "*Evangelism stands for a certain interpretation of Christianity emphasizing the objective atonement of Christ, the necessity of new birth or conversion and salvation through faith.*" This is a

fair statement of the essentials of the old evangel, the evangel that has not yet lost its power.

Paul made this very message central and primary. "Now, brothers, I would have you know the gospel I once preached to you, the gospel you received, the gospel in which you have your footing, the gospel by which you are saved—provided you adhere to my statement of it—unless indeed your faith was all haphazard." (I Cor. 15:1-2, Moffatt's translation). And what is this message of good news, this gospel, so emphatically introduced by a fivefold repetition? "That Christ died for our sins as the scripture had said, that he was buried and that he rose on the third day." There is no other evangel than these historic facts and their tremendous implications for humanity. Any kind of evangelism that is silent in this respect is no evangelism at all. If Christ died for our sins His death was a reality and His resurrection confirms its necessity and validity as the only atonement for sin. The Cross is the one central message and method and power of Christianity. This evangel is startling news and good news to Moslems. The Koran denies the historicity of the Crucifixion and misunderstands its significance. But that is the very reason we should always present the heart of the Christian Gospel. The word of the Cross is the Gospel and there can be no other. Before that Cross all human wisdom and power and righteousness are bankrupt. We have nothing of our own to share; all is Christ's. Everything we have is His free gift. All superiority complexes of race or birth or position disappear. The Cross pours contempt on all *our* pride, as well as on the pride of the Moslem. This is why the message of the Cross makes missionaries, and the chief of sinners becomes the best ambassador of the grace of God. Those to whom most is forgiven always love most. The love of Christ constrains them; not only the missionary message, but the missionary passion are found in Calvary. There would have been no Apostolic missions, no medieval missions, no modern missions without the experience of redemption and the call to be ambassadors of the Cross.

Among missionaries to Moslems, Raymund Lull, Henry Martyn, Gottlieb Pfander, Bishop Lefroy and Temple Gairdner had essentially the same experience, the same message, the same passion and (we may add) the same love for Moslems. The Gospel for them was a joyful message of redemption. This message did not offer a philosophical theory, not a mere program for material betterment, but victory over sin and death. Such a message the human heart needs and of such a message who would be ashamed?

“We are sent,” in the pregnant words of Hugh Thomson Kerr, “not to preach sociology but salvation; not economics but evangelism; not reform but redemption; not culture but conversion; not progress but pardon; not the new social order but the new birth; not revolution but regeneration; not renovation but revival; not resuscitation but resurrection; not a new organization but a new creation; not democracy but the Gospel; not civilization but Christ. We are ambassadors, not diplomats.”

It is time that a protest be made against the misuse of the word evangelism. It has only one etymological, New Testament, historical and theological connotation, namely, to tell the good news of One who came to earth to die on the Cross for us; who rose again and who ever lives to intercede for those who repent and believe the Gospel. To evangelize is to win disciples, to become fishers of men, to preach the Gospel message to all the nations.

New York City.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER.

SHALL WE TRY UNBEATEN PATHS IN WORKING FOR MOSLEMS?

During the years 1936 to 1938 the Near East Christian Council conducted an Inquiry into the causes of the "relative sterility" of efforts for the conversion of Moslems. Questionnaires were sent out and the replies received were tabulated and sent out again for comment and criticism. This Inquiry was prompted by a deep concern over the fact that, with certain conspicuous exceptions, work has gone on among Moslems decade after decade without the creation of a true indigenous church, or any considerable number of converts out of which such a church might conceivably be formed.

The Inquiry started with the conviction that if, first, the causes for failure could be studied and courageously brought out into the open, then, secondly, that might open the way for discovering new methods or lines of approach which might overcome or avoid those obstacles, so as to lead to a more fruitful effort in this field.

With regard to the first question, the results of the Inquiry were very gratifying. From replies which came from Christian workers of many ways of thinking there emerges a fairly clear and united statement of what those causes of failure are. The Report of the Inquiry says, on this subject:

The replies received have had a cumulative effect in focusing attention upon two *special* hindrances, which appear adequate to explain the lack of success pointed out:

I. *Christian teaching does not mean the same to the Moslem that it does to the Christian.* The Moslem mind has been conditioned by definite teaching against a distorted conception of Christianity; so that some of the most essential elements of the Christian message mean to the Moslem things that are repulsive to him, and would be *equally unacceptable to the Christian* if he saw them in the same way. What is divine truth in the mind of the

Christian worker, as it reaches the mind of the Moslem listener is a falsehood which he rightly rejects.

Illustrations. a) The Christian believes that Jesus is the Son of God, and this is frequently regarded as the crucial test of the acceptance of Christ. To the Christian this means something about Jesus. He is that kind of a being. His character, his power, his peerless teaching proclaim a being who, in that peculiar sense "came forth from God." The Moslem thinks of none of these things. His mind turns to the question "Can God beget children?" For him to say yes means degrading God. He insists that God is not carnal but spiritual and absolute.

b) Christian faith centers around the belief that Christ is divine. The more intimately we come to know Christ, the more vivid is our conviction that He is "God made flesh." But the Moslem, when he hears of the deity of Christ, is immediately *driven away* from a consideration of his wonderful person, because his mind is filled with the thoughts, "God is one, not two or three." And to even think of any other as divine is the horrible sin of "shirk." Similarly and for the same reason, the blessed and mighty work of the Holy Spirit can mean to the Moslem nothing of what it means to the Christian, as a part of the doctrine of the Trinity.

c) The terrible pollution of sin, power to overcome sin, and the forgiveness of sin through Christ; these things are tremendously real to the Christian. But the Moslem is not impressed by our message about sin; first because of the different words used by Moslem and Christian and also because, to him, sin is a matter in an entirely different sphere; to be forgiven, to be freed, means to him merely a relaxation of the strict requirements of the Absolute Sovereign.

d) Similarly the Moslem who hears of the Atonement cannot think of "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." He has been taught to deny the death of Christ on the ground that it would be *wrong* for God to permit a sinless person to suffer for others.

II. *In the thought of the Moslem a change of religion is primarily a change of group-connection and group-loyalty.* "Every convert to Christianity is a dead loss to the community." "The Moslem Community is a noble and sacred thing, a social-political-religious fellowship for which the believer is willing to give his life." "The greatest handicap against which the Christian Missionary has to strive is the power of Moslem solidarity." "There are thousands of men and women who believe in Christ and are trying to follow him, but they cannot bring themselves to face the break with their own community."

The great fact pointed out in these statements is very evident. But is this unwillingness to break with their own community due only to lack of courage or conviction? Not always. Many cases have been reported of true believers in Christ who have refused to break with the Moslem community because they wish to live among their own people, to make Christ known to them!

But even where the deterrent is fear or unwillingness to take the consequences, it is still true that this bond of Brotherhood is one of the strongest bulwarks of Islam; and so long as the Christian missionary undertaking appears to be a frontal attack against this great and (to the Moslem) precious fellowship, so long that powerful instrument will effectively oppose the progress of the Gospel.

We cannot forget that the sad history of the conflict between Islam and Christendom, past and present, makes it inevitable that the Moslem should see in our missionary zeal, merely a part of the imperialistic arrogance to which he has become accustomed; and with his mental equipment we cannot expect him to distinguish between the political and the spiritual elements of imperialism. It is a very sobering thought for all of us to reflect that possibly, if we could see our own spirit as it actually is we might find that the Moslem is not altogether wrong in sensing a spiritual arrogance in our effort to bring him to leave his own group and join ours.

The replies to the second question were far less conclusive and united. They revealed very deep differences of opinion, not so much on the primary question, "What methods or lines of approach offer hopes of better success?" as on the secondary aspect of the question, which might be stated as, "Is it wise and right for us to try some of the new methods suggested?" Discussion which has followed the publication of this report has served to accentuate rather than to bridge those differences of opinion; and also to divert attention from the main results of the inquiry.

In the Conference on Moslem work held in Delhi in early December, 1938, and in the Moslem Lands Group at the Tambaram Conference immediately following it, the Report was brought up for discussion. In both Conferences discussion was almost entirely devoted to a few of the suggestions, mainly regarding unbaptized believers. Objections to the encouragement of such believers were so urgent as to crowd out almost entirely any real consideration of the underlying principles quoted above. These facts

are here stated in order to call attention to the fact, later pointed out by The Near East Christian Council itself, that the following suggestions do not represent accepted plans, but only the opinions of individuals so expressed.

In answer to the second question, "What methods or lines of approach offer hope of better success?" suggestions have been mainly along two lines.

The first is, "The way to overcome these hindrances is more devotion, more effort, more prayer, more faith, and above all, more love." Many and moving expressions of this conviction have come in, and point to the fact that we who would win others to Christ must look first of all to our own faithfulness and consistency as witnesses for Christ.

But other suggestions have come in along quite another line. "We must try to find a way *around* these obstacles," so that we shall not be in the position of attacking Islam frontally, and at its strongest points. These suggestions involve very serious changes in our approach, and should be studied with particular care, keeping in mind, of course, that differing conditions due to political situations and cultural background in different parts of the Near East make the answer found in one area perhaps inapplicable in another.

These suggestions are based upon the belief that it is possible and it is necessary to recast our message and approach to Moslems so that, without relaxing our effort as messengers of Christ, we may win them to Him without overcoming the special obstacles described. Our aim is one—to bring men into direct and personal relationship with Jesus Christ, as Teacher, Saviour and Lord. If this is accomplished, all else can be left to the guidance of the indwelling Christ, whose Spirit works such "diversity of manifestation."

The following proposals are put forward for study, prayer and experiment, as possible ways to attain the goal.

I. *To avoid the obstacle of the Moslem antagonism to the main Christian doctrines;*

1. A sympathetic understanding of the mind and heart of Moslems is a prime necessity for anyone who would bring to them the message of Jesus Christ. Anyone who unthinkingly presents the Gospel only from the point of view of the Christian, without understanding what it will mean to the Moslem, becomes responsible for results which in many cases have proved to be absolutely the opposite of what was intended.

2. Our one effort must be to make Jesus Christ effectively known to the Moslem. Islam has already provided imperfect knowledge of Jesus, and a certain reverence for Him. But we must start with that very imperfect knowledge and proceed to enrich it from

the Gospel story and from the experience of the Christian life, till they can see Him as He is. We must guard carefully against the premature introduction of thoughts which will divert the attention of the inquirer from Christ himself. His reverence will grow to adoration as he becomes acquainted with Christ, and with His power in the life of those who surrender to Him.

3. In view of the almost certain misunderstandings resulting from the discussion of doctrines, doctrinal questions need to be handled with extreme care, remembering that Christ's method left his own disciples to formulate the deepest truths for themselves under God's guidance, and He himself said "Upon this rock will I build my church." Public proclamation of our most cherished beliefs to those unprepared to understand them too often leads to an indignant rejection which closes the heart to the appeal of Christ himself.

4. Get the inquirer to study the New Testament, and especially the Gospels, as the adequate and original source and authority for the understanding of Jesus. Do not urge him to accept *our interpretations*.

II. *To avoid the obstacles which result from the ancient jealousy between the Christian and the Moslem group-organizations;*

5. Remembering that deep suspicion separates these two groups, we need to overcome that suspicion by a frankness and absolute honesty in which acts and words conform to what we profess to hold as our purpose. At all costs we must avoid anything which the inquirer or his neighbors may interpret as clandestine efforts to alienate him from his own people. In this matter the circulation of literature other than the Scripture should be done with understanding watchfulness.

6. It is the conviction of a large number of workers among Moslems that the ultimate hope of bringing Christ to the Moslems is to be attained by the development of groups of followers of Jesus who are active in making Him known to others while remaining loyally a part of the social and political groups to which they belong in Islam. The ideal is that there should thus come into being a church whose only head is Christ, and which does not carry the stigma of being an alien institution, drawing men away from their natural social and political connections. In spite of the stupendous difficulties in the way of such an outcome, many workers are convinced that only as the spiritual significance of Christ is thus separated from external and unhappy connections in past and present can the way be opened for the power of Christ to do its work in the Moslem world.

7. To such followers of Jesus the term "secret believer" has

been applied, sometimes with a degree of deprecation. To clarify our attitude towards such believers it might be stated that we lovingly encourage secret believers to go forward in the Christian life without publicly professing themselves as Christians in the sense of separation from the fellowship of their own people. But the purpose of such a course is to make possible a more effective witness, in life, in words, and in the reading of the Gospels, to the power of Christ in their own lives, among their own people. Experience has shown that unless such effective witness develops into a *group* of such believers, a solitary believer seldom survives. The essential function of the church can never be ignored. The aspiration here expressed is that the church of Christ might take root within the social-political body called Islam, and not as an alien body encroaching from without.

8. If such a line of effort is to be followed, certain very practical questions must be met. The first is that the name Christian, in the Near East, has almost exclusively a racial, political and social group-connotation, and does not suggest either a new way of life or a spiritual rebirth within. If a group of believers is to grow up as indigenous and not alien, they cannot take on themselves that particular name. Some other terminology must be developed.

9. Similarly, baptism is almost universally recognized as the sign of the definite transfer to a new group-connection, and is thus the inevitable signal for casting out the convert from the fellowship of his own people. It does not mean, to the Moslem, as it does to the Christian, repentance, a new birth, and total surrender to our Lord. There are some who believe that some spiritual equivalent of baptism, free from the false significance which has grown up in the thought of the Moslem, can and must be devised.

10. The Moslem community life includes such matters as marriage and divorce, inheritance, etc. Unless a convert is officially transferred to the Christian registry, he is confronted with serious problems in reconciling his new life with such non-Christian relationships. Faith and great patience, with God's guidance must solve these and many other problems of personal status.

11. But the greatest unsolved problem in this connection is that of providing spiritual fellowship and nurture for believers who thus remain a part of their Moslem social-political group. Without such fellowship and nurture the new believers seem doomed to lapse into the old way of life and thought. The hope for such a solution seems to lie along two lines. 1. That indigenous Christians develop such a loving and sympathetic relationship with their neighbors that such spiritual fellowship might grow up without raising the question of propaganda and the transfer of group-loyalties.

12. That young missionaries, in the spirit of self-emptying which brought our Lord into this world, might overcome the barrier between Christian foreigner and Moslem native by "growing up" among Moslem people. Remember the words of the almost-persuaded non-Christian to the missionary, "If I could feel that you love me as much as you care for my soul, it might have been different."

The two quotations given above cover the Findings of this Inquiry. The rest of the Report was made up of an explanatory introduction and extended quotations from comments received in course of the study.

The reason for repeating this material at this time is the conviction that the results of this inquiry deserve more calm and purposeful consideration than they have thus far received. Much earnest thought and prayer and labor, on the part of many busy Christian workers went into this effort. It would be a sad waste if the controversial nature of some of the issues raised should be permitted to prevent adequate consideration of the main issue. Every Christian working among Moslems should face honestly the facts pointed out concerning the two main obstacles noted. Is our present activity actually drawing men to Christ, or repelling them from Him? If the latter, wherein are we responsible, by using the wrong methods, for bringing about the defeat of our purposes, and the purposes of our Master?

To facilitate this further study, I would venture to restate the practical suggestions on which there has been the most vigorous difference of opinion: 1. That in view of the inescapable distortion of ideas about the formal statement of Christian doctrine, all discussion of doctrinal matters should be avoided so far as possible, and that our message should be concerned with Christ's way of living, and the power of Christ himself to enable us to live such lives. 2. That because the name "Christian" is universally understood to refer to racial, political and social group-connections, those who would accept Christ should not be urged to take that name upon themselves. 3. That because the rite of baptism has, in the minds of most people in the Near East, no relation to the beginning of a new life, but is solely the mark of transfer to the Christian community,

the use of that rite for the Moslem convert be discontinued. With regard to points 2 and 3 it has been agreed by all that active witness for Christ, and some form of fellowship among believers are essential for the Christian life. If these external forms are to be relinquished, these essentials of witness and fellowship *must* be assured within the Moslem environment—admittedly a most difficult problem to be worked out.

So much for the Moslem Inquiry conducted by the Near East Christian Council, with the word of caution that the Report is emphatically not a pronouncement of the Council, but a collection of personal opinions and suggestions.

Along the same line I wish now to add some suggestions of my own, quite unconnected with what has gone before. First, I wish to plead that we, as followers of Christ, should cease to think of Islam as an adversary to be overcome, and recognize it as an ally in the spiritual world-crisis of today. As never before, the issue is being drawn between God and no-god, between life guided by moral Realities and life controlled by selfishness unrestrained. In this struggle Islam and Christianity stand shoulder to shoulder. Some of us have been shamed to find that the Moslem has been the first to realize this: as when, more than once, a broken-hearted Moslem has appealed to me, a Christian missionary, for sympathy and advice in the presence of growing atheism and moral break-down among his own people.

Something analogous to this has come to pass in our relationship to the Oriental Churches. Some of us can remember when we, as Protestant missionaries, felt that it was our task to pluck individuals out of those churches, as brands from the burning; and we felt a secret uneasiness at anything which strengthened those churches so as to make the plucking more difficult. That day has happily passed, and we now greatly rejoice at the daily growing strength of those same churches, and are thankful if we can help them, both personally and in the training of their leaders, always in loyalty to the old Churches, to which we

look as the greatest hope for the coming of the Kingdom among their people.

The two cases are not parallel; let us admit; but they are certainly analogous. "Islam" is a noble name for the faith which Moslems and Christians alike inherit from the earliest Monotheism, and which, down the ages, has stood like a rock against the way of life which knows no higher law than self. Most of us have thought in terms of drawing men away from Islam, of gradually undermining and ultimately overthrowing this great structure. Is there not a better way? Can we not rid ourselves of our instinctive feeling of antagonism to Islam as an organism, and think in terms of its regeneration from within? Can we not sincerely give ourselves to the effort to strengthen those forces that tend toward such regeneration?

It is indeed a staggering question to ask how we can aim to strengthen Islam and still be loyal to Jesus our Master. Light on this subject seems to come from a fact noted by one of the speakers at the Hartford Conference¹ who pointed out that Islam has shown a marvellous power to assimilate alien elements into its own life. In various ages it has assimilated philosophy and science and morality from other systems, and has been strengthened thereby. It is not unreasonable to expect that Islam will yet assimilate other and better elements; in fact, that process is going on apace, at several points, which might be mentioned.

There is no essential reason why Islam might not, for its own strengthening, assimilate Jesus Christ.

In direct contradiction to that statement seems to stand the fact of Mohammed. I do not think that it falls to me, or to any other Christian, to discuss that problem. It belongs to those whose loyalty to Mohammed or to Christ is to be made real in their lives. But this can be said: for the Moslem, Mohammed is not a living leader, but a dead hero. They do not call themselves "Mohammedans," and great as is their reverence for him as their prophet, their conception of him is more or less idealized, according to the

¹ Dr. J. E. Merrill, "The Christian Witness to Moslems."

light which individuals have found on the meaning of his life.

On the other hand, written into the Koran is the acceptance of Jesus as a messenger from God, and of the Gospel as his message. Why should it be thought inconceivable that it might some day become a vital part of the teaching of Islam that the Jesus-way of living is the hope of the world, and that the still-living Jesus is the vital power to make that way of life a reality? These are, after all, the essential messages of our faith. It seems an impossible dream, but it is impossible only with men, that some day the mollah in his mosque may be preaching his most powerful sermons on "The Prophet Jesus, on him be peace!" Some day Moslem scholars may unite in a serious and honest effort to discover the original gospel, which tradition says has been lost. From documents written centuries before Mohammed's day they will try to reconstruct the "Gospel" which Mohammed so revered. This reconstruction may not exactly correspond to our New Testament canon; but it would surely put into the hands of Moslems, as a part of their own literature, an adequate picture, from authentic sources, of Jesus and his teaching.

But after all, our purpose is not to look at beautiful dreams; what are we *doing* to make them come true? Already, in many scattered places, there are points where this assimilation of Jesus Christ is taking place. Individuals whom many of us know, and countless others known only to God, have found new life in Christ, but are still a part of their own community. Some, it is true, have not dared to come out; but others, very courageously, have dared to remain among their own, with the definite purpose of working for this assimilation within that great fellowship. Thus far we have given them scant encouragement. We have stood guard, with our creeds and our shibboleths and labels, and, as many a missionary can testify from heartbreaking experience, one by one these flickering flames have been snuffed out, for the lack of a word of courage and understanding sympathy! May God forgive us!

There is much that we can do, when we sincerely turn to the ministry of helpfulness. The heart-hungry Moslem who talks with a Christian friend might go away, not feeling that he has been, bluntly or subtly, enticed away from his faith, but inspired with a new hope of what that faith may mean to him and to his people. What would it mean if every student who goes out from a Christian school with a new vision of life and service could somehow be sent forth with an enthusiasm to build his best into his *own* community, and that best could include *all* that he has seen and sensed during his school days of what Jesus really does to the lives and spirits of people! And so with all our contacts with Moslems. Now there is always the disturbing undercurrent of mutual suspicion that our friendliness is but a veil over an ulterior purpose; or a doubt that that ulterior purpose ought to be pursued, if it is not. If Moslem and Christian could, in perfect frankness and sincerity work together, understanding that what we have to offer is sincerely offered without any demand for a return, then we could truly help. Not tentatively and with reservations, but with all that zeal and self-sacrifice with which our fathers labored along other lines, we could then work for the coming of God's reign among His worshippers, the Moslems.

After all, this situation is not new. John, like many of us, forbade the unknown wonder-worker "Because he followeth not us." Jesus said "Forbid him not." The crux of the matter was that through that stranger, whatever his name or allegiance, the power of Christ was working miracles. Wherever, today, that same power is working its miracles in a transformed life, God grant us the breadth of heart that our Master showed, so that we may be able to forget that "he followeth not us," and not only "forbid him not," but lovingly strengthen, inspire and guide those who would follow Jesus within the great fellowship of Islam.

Auburndale, Mass.

HENRY H. RIGGS.

PUBLIC CONFESSION AND THE CHURCH

The Christian Church in Mohammedan lands faces a situation which has changed radically in the past two decades. The rising tide of nationalism has caused the passing away on a large scale of the Moslem religious sanctions in certain areas. At the same time Christian evangelism and other forms of work have been greatly hindered by government regulations. The present war may lead to even greater political changes in the Near East. In view of the altered situation should there be striking changes in the methods of presenting the Christian message to Moslems and in the actions of converts after they have accepted Christ? Certainly Christian forces wish to take advantage of new opportunities that may present themselves as a result of political and social mutations in the world of Islam.

Prior to the Madras Conference the Near East Christian Council carried out an inquiry concerning methods in Moslem evangelism and suggestions for new techniques. The results were published in a small pamphlet which was presented to the special conference on Moslem work which met in India prior to the Madras gathering. In the replies to questions that came in from many parts of the Mohammedan world there developed an idea, strongly held in certain quarters, that a convert from Islam might better endeavor to stay within his own environment and cause no break by a public declaration of his faith in Christ, seeking to witness by Christian life rather than word in his own family and among his Moslem neighbors. On the other hand there was a very strong feeling that such a method should not be adopted as a principle in work for Moslems, and that a vital Christian church would never

develop in the Mohammedan lands if evangelism were predicated upon such principles.

The former point of view, with emphasis on the convert making no break with his Islamic background through an open declaration of the new faith or the steps of public baptism and reception into the church, was advocated by many in the pamphlet published by the Near East Christian Council. The idea gained currency that the Council had endorsed this plan of procedure in Moslem evangelism, and such a statement was made in a published report from Madras. At the meeting of the Council in March 1939 an action was taken to the effect that this was not the attitude of the Near East Christian Council; a majority in that meeting seemed strongly to hold the opposed view, that missionary bodies should certainly not encourage the "silent" attitude on the part of converts from Islam.

In our views upon this problem a great deal will depend upon our object in the Mohammedan world. If we are here merely to maintain a witness for Christ, or to see that the spark of Christianity continues to glow in these Bible lands, then a policy which would bid converts not confess openly their faith and which would neglect the formation of an organized church might operate. On the other hand, if we are here to win the Mohammedan lands for Christ and have the faith that this can be accomplished, then such an end will no doubt require open confession and the establishment of an organized church.

I.

In order to get a proper background for this question it might be well to think of how the Christian church is situated in Moslem lands and what Mohammedans in general think of Christianity.

In a brief glance at the Christian community today in the Islamic countries we should first notice the Eastern or Ancient Churches. They are still a notable factor in most countries but in general they do not occupy a position of influence such as they once exerted, and could certainly

be much more powerful as Christian forces if they had ways and means of united action. The many divisions of Christianity in the Moslem world and the attitude they have often shown toward each other has been most unfortunate.

On the other hand the Ancient Christian Churches in Moslem lands have given a remarkable witness to their faith, and countless numbers of their members have accepted death rather than deny their faith in Christ. We may realize that such devotion has many times been as much to their race and nation as to Christ; nevertheless, their witnesses to their faith and the keeping alive of their churches down across the centuries, under every sort of persecution, has required tremendous heroism and fortitude. Though minorities, and under all sorts of disabilities, these Christian communities have never been entirely wiped out. They should have much to contribute to the future of the Christian fellowship in Bible lands.

There was a time when the Nestorian Church sent her missionaries to India and China and carried the Gospel to the farthest bounds of the world's greatest continent. That fire was later lost, however, and almost without exception these Ancient Churches have become ritualistic and their worship has become form rather than Spirit. They long since ceased any effort to win their Mohammedan neighbors to Christ. In some instances they have objected quite as strenuously to Moslems entering their churches as the latter did to Christians entering their mosques. Again it may be said that there were many extenuating circumstances, that they were persecuted and scorned and that every attempt to reach Moslems with the Gospel had failed, so that the idea was easy to accept that conversion of a Mohammedan to Christ was not possible.

With the coming of missionaries from Europe and America a new element entered into the Christian life of Moslem lands. At the beginning, in many instances, it was impossible for Christian missions to work for the conversion of Mohammedans. There arose many efforts to revive the Ancient Churches, but in most cases when in-

dividual Christians found a new spiritual life they were not able to change their historic church nor did they feel that they could find there proper spiritual nourishment, and so these groups of renewed Christians formed the "Younger" or Protestant churches that exist today in many of the Moslem lands. These churches contain most of the converts from Islam and from other religions.

The past few years have seen several notable movements within the Ancient churches toward a quickening of spiritual life. The "Zoe" or Life movement in Greece has been a great force for revival and spiritual gain. In the Coptic church of Egypt there have been associations, largely of laymen, who have sought to return to the Bible and to develop an evangelical and powerful life within their historic communion. Among members of the Armenian community in Northern Syria, and in many other regions, there have been movements of a similar nature. All of these things make us feel that the time is drawing near when the various elements of the Christian community in Moslem countries may unite in a concerted effort to win Mohammedans to Christ and that all Christians of whatever communion may welcome the convert into the society of the Kingdom of God.

The Missions came to the Moslem lands with their emphasis on the translation of the Bible into the vernacular and common language of the people, and the production and distribution of Christian literature. Schools were founded so that Christians might be educated and members of all races and creeds prepared for the reception of the Gospel message. Since Christ was the Great Physician a ministry of healing also entered and hospitals as well as other forms of medical work became a very important part of the Christian mission in Moslem lands. It may be said in passing that a great tribute to the effectiveness of these methods lies in the fact that the Dictators have wished to control schools and publication and have founded hospitals as a means of spreading their propaganda.

In the "Younger" churches, which grew up largely

from Christian agencies sent from abroad to carry the Gospel to Moslem lands, the evangelical attitude and the effort to win Moslems to Christ has naturally continued. In this section of the world in founding churches, more emphasis should no doubt be placed upon evangelism than upon self-support. The latter is indeed necessary, but the desire to win all nations and creeds to Christ is absolutely essential to the Christian community in Moslem lands. The Ancient Christian churches in Bible lands are self-supporting, or largely so, but they are not accomplishing much in the way of bringing Mohammedans to Christ. I recall at one time speaking with the Archbishop of an Ancient Oriental Church concerning cooperation. He expressed admiration for the American Mission and a willingness to work with it. When I mentioned evangelism for Moslems, however, he paused and said, "Ah, yes. That is your part of the work; we do not believe in that, you know." But since we have seen such a tremendous change and the passing of reactionary elements in Islam within the past few years we feel there is hope that great changes may come in the Christian community and that in the not distant future all Christian elements may realize their duty to work together in winning the Moslem world for Christ. We also feel that by the time Christians are ready to work together the iron gates of government restrictions may open of their own accord.

The common Moslem idea as to the meaning of Christianity has been very warped and out of focus. They have generally called Christians idolaters or Cross-worshippers, who believe in three gods instead of one, and they have taken the worst things done by Christians as the distinctive marks of their faith. With the background of the Crusades and centuries of conflict, misunderstanding and even hatred should cause little wonder. Drinking of liquor, for example, has long been considered the distinguishing mark of a Christian. The story is told of several missionaries who were calling upon a Kurdish chief in his mountain home. He made the statement that he had

become a Christian. The missionaries seemed rather to doubt this fact in view of his well known reputation for highway robbery and various other such diversions. "Why," he said, "Don't you believe what I say? If you doubt that I'm a Christian come down stairs and I'll show you my jars of wine."

Contact with the outside world through radio and press, the missionary enterprise in all its phases, and especially the distribution of Christian literature has done much within recent years to change the ideas that were implanted in Moslem minds as to the meaning of the term "Christian." With growing literacy it will not be possible to support the many libels on Christianity that have been circulated among Moslems, intentionally and otherwise, for hundreds of years. A pre-requisite to bring the Mohammedan world to Christ is to get before Moslems the real meaning of Christianity as a new spiritual life rather than a national title of certain minorities, and the showing forth of Christ by all Christians both in life and in word. This can only be done by individual Christians who are on fire and light the fire on the altar of other hearts, and in this particular, one convert from Islam can do more than many Christians of other nationalities. It will also require, we believe, the organized Christian church as an institution that goes on across the years. Converts must be prepared as leaders and pastors before the church will ever become really indigenous in Moslem lands and this could not be if they remained silent and did not confess their new faith. In view of the whole background of the Christian community in Moslem lands, and the necessity of getting across to Mohammedans the real nature of Christianity, and looking to the highest missionary statesmanship in taking advantage of conditions as they are and as we believe they will develop, from all points of view we believe that to encourage silence on the part of converts from Islam would be a mistake.

II.

The discussion of various methods in evangelism has been most valuable to workers in all countries. Certain laws and restrictions may make it better policy in some nations for the moment to go slowly on open profession of Christian faith and the normal establishment of the Christian church with its regular public services. There may also be features in this proposal which are of value to all workers for Moslems. We all know of secret believers and in some instances their lives have had a notable influence. But though the church may be in some times driven to the catacombs it should plan to emerge at the first opportunity and realize that its true life must be in open witness and the foundation of an organized Christian society.

In general we believe that there are many and cogent reasons why converts should not be encouraged to keep silence and refrain from joining the church. In the first place it hardly seems a question that should be governed by Mission policy or that missionaries should decide. So important a matter and one fraught with such grave consequences should be decided by the one who will have to bear those consequences. On the one hand his decision might mean the loss of his life, but the opposite decision might mean the loss of his Christian life, which we believe would be worse. Certainly any friend who has been instrumental in bringing a Mohammedan to Christ would point out what Christ and the New Testament say concerning the matter of confession of faith, and give him the background and a full understanding of consequences; but the decision as to whether he would remain silent or confess his faith in public and accept the possible break with family and social group, should be a personal matter between the new convert and the Saviour whom he has accepted.

Some missionaries have said that they could not urge a Moslem to take a step which might cause persecution and trouble and even death, when they were not able them-

selves to share these things with the convert. While this exemplifies a fine spirit and desire to be partaker with the new Christian in hardship as well as joy, it is, we feel, a mistaken point of view. The new Christian is not believing on us nor is he asked to have faith in the missionary or Christian worker. He is pointed to Christ and comes to Him by faith. Christ has suffered as much as the convert will ever be called upon to bear. Let it be said, however, that missionaries and all Christian evangelists for Moslems and all who take upon themselves this high form of service should ever labor in the martyr spirit and be willing and glad to give life if necessary. Just as was our good friend Roger Cumberland who was with us in an executive Committee meeting of the Near East Christian Council just a few weeks before he was killed by the Kurds. We may not all deserve the martyr's crown, but we should all rejoice if the Lord award it to us.

We have found that converts from Islam are in general very strong in their belief that faith in Christ should be openly confessed. Those who have become leaders in the church say that confession and even persecution have been used to strengthen their faith and increase their Christian experience and the feeling of God's nearness. I well recall talking to Dr. Sayeed Khan Kurdistani, who has been called "The Beloved Physician of Teheran." When recounting his past experiences he sighed and said, "Ah, persecution is the better life. I have never experienced such joy and such nearness to my Lord as under persecution."

It is of the essence of Christianity that it must be passed on. If we just receive Christ and endeavor to keep him to ourselves we become like stagnant pools. The Water of Life must flow through us as channels and every follower of Christ should be an evangelist. To keep quiet about one's faith and not disclose it to the family or social group would at least prevent the best efforts as an evangelist, and so we fear the Christian life would suffer. In some areas a man is not received by the church until he has brought

others to Christ, and evangelism, like charity, should begin at home. The witness of a life that follows the pattern of Christ is indeed important, but it should be followed by the word of confession and Christian witness that the life may bear fruit, otherwise it becomes a dry branch—and we know what becomes of such.

Though we believe that the power of Christ can give a person strength for anything, yet we fear few could fail to confess Him and remain outwardly like a Moslem and still keep up the Christian life. The pull of the environment is constant, day and night, and there is very subtle and powerful temptation coming with continual pressure to revert to form, and act like a Mohammedan. It would be the exceptional case indeed that could grow in grace and stand against the awful force of his environment to draw him back into Islam, even if by imperceptible stages. For power to stand against the terrible pull of environment the convert certainly needs Christian fellowship and the encouragement of others who are of similar faith.

This leads us to say that Christianity is a social as well as an individual religion and it is most difficult for a person to grow without public worship and praise and prayer. There is not the least doubt that all of these things can be done alone, but the fact still remains that the life deprived of corporate devotion and worship has lost a great deal. So far as our experience goes, for a new Christian to stand firm in the midst of his former religion takes all the grace of God and all the help he can get from Christian friends as well. If all social contacts are governed by the sanctions of Islam and only private devotions may be Christian, few will be able to live such an outstanding Christian life that it will attract others to the Master. If Christianity is eventually to conquer Islam we believe that converts must have the strength that comes from social devotional life and corporate worship, such as only public adherence to the Christian faith can bring.

There is also a great question as to whether the plan for the silence of believers is possible. Let us consider

the situation of the new Christian who has decided to say nothing about his faith and remain in his Mohammedan family and society. If he begins a real Christian life there are a great many things that will at once set him apart from those who are real Mohammedans. These things, that he will do and not do, will soon make it evident that he is not a Moslem. When his faith is discovered, as eventually it seems to us it must be if he is truly Christian, then there would be a grave question as to whether the family would allow him to remain. They would probably put him out whether he desired to go or not. Rather than merely putting off the evil day the convert might better in the beginning face the matter and endeavor to keep his place in the family and social life, but with full acknowledgment of his new faith. The possibility of so doing grows greater every year. In fact it seems to us that the method of open acknowledgment would succeed in more cases than silence and the effort to cover up, and when the latter was discovered it would be taken for religious dissimulation like that practised in certain cases by Islam and even more generally by Bahatism.

Moreover, no matter how many single individuals should become Christians and remain silent concerning the fact, the church will not be established until converts are willing to come out into the open and take the consequences. Individuals come and go, but the family is a social unit and goes on from generation to generation. So does the established Christian church. Christian families rather than individuals are the foundation stones of the church and there must be an organization of Christians to make a superstructure that will remain. The organized Christian church will have permanence; otherwise as the individuals pass on there will always be the same job to do over again in each generation. We fear that the policy of silence would never establish the church and consequently the Moslem world would never be won for Christ.

Above all else we believe that the encouragement to remain silent about Christian faith is not Scriptural.

Though we must change our missionary methods to meet altered conditions, the New Testament must remain our guide and standard and the words of Christ and the Apostles have Divine authority. In New Testament times churches were only founded by the bearing of persecution, by sacrifice and suffering and travail, and we doubt that an easier method can be discovered. There is no "twilight sleep" procedure for the birth of churches.

Men made all sorts of suggestions and excuses to Christ as to why they should not come openly and at once to be His followers and members of His company, but the reply of the Master was always along the same line: "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me; and he that taketh not his cross and followeth after me is not worthy of me." "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." It is an interesting study and well worth while to read through the Gospels, noticing especially the attitude of Christ in this matter of open confession.

The Apostle Paul tells the Romans: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The blood of the martyrs is still the seed of the church. It will take a great deal in treasure, in life, and in blood to win the Mohammedan world for Christ.

III.

The fact that Islam is divided into almost, if not quite, as many sects as Christianity is no excuse for the latter. Though it may take a long time for movements toward union among Christian bodies to be accomplished we should certainly be able to get together for concerted action in presenting Christ and his way of life to Moslems. Great

progress has already been made in showing the Mohammedan people the real meaning of Christianity, and if all forces that are known by the name of Christ can get together for cooperation they might change Moslem conceptions as to what Christianity really is within a very few years; then the attitude of Mohammedans toward Christians and toward their faith would be very different. The ecclesiastics of Islam have usually portrayed Christianity in terms that would cause scorn and derision. In many countries the Moslem religious leaders have largely lost their power over the people, who are ready to learn the real truth about Christians and about Christ.

The Near East Christian Council is the only general cooperative organization that covers the whole field of the Moslem countries, with the exception of India and the East. The Council was formed by representatives of the Missions and now includes more than forty Missions and other Christian organizations. Recently the constitution has been changed to include churches, and it is hoped that both the Ancient and the younger Evangelical bodies may both enter the organization, so that the Council may be truly representative of the whole Christian movement in Moslem lands. It is not an administrative organization, but merely for joint planning and the exchange of information. Though its capacity is advisory it is of the greatest importance in this most difficult of fields for Christian action. We can hardly imagine the multiplicity of Christian organizations in Bible lands each wishing to go its own way with no common plan, or knowledge of what others are doing. Respecting the differences between us we must get together for a general plan of strategy. The ancient churches as well as the younger organizations have sent fraternal delegates to the meetings of the Near East Christian Council and the history of more than a decade of real service makes us feel that here is an organization that may take a great place in the leadership of Christian forces over the Moslem world when peace comes again to the lands of the Near East.

We can not foresee what conditions will follow the present turmoil, but we know that even greater changes than we have seen in the past decades may be ahead. Through human eyes the Christian task in the world of Islam is indeed hopeless, but not any more so than the task before the Apostles when they confronted the Roman world. Now is the time for Christian statesmanship to formulate a general policy for Christian action in the Moslem world. In the past this had not been possible; in the present great advances should be made in this direction, and we may confidently expect that when peaceful times come again to the Near East, Christian forces will have their greatest opportunity.

May the Christian agencies never adopt a policy that savors of defeatism, or a plan that seems to make it easier to become a Christian in the Mohammedan world by failure to witness openly and testify by joining the only organization in the world that carries forward the Kingdom of God. The faults of the church are only too apparent to us all, and she is pitifully divided and failing to give a strong and united witness to her Lord before Moslems. Yet in this hour we can see the function and power of the church as never before. The Christian church is the one and only worldwide organization that strikes across all racial and national boundaries, that has not broken down in the present world crisis. It is the one great institution that is ministering in mercy to all people everywhere and holding mankind together when such terrible forces are tearing humanity apart.

Rather than silence, all Christians in the Mohammedan world must gird themselves for a stronger, truer, and more vital witness to their faith. They must be willing to suffer and to sacrifice—everything. If they can move forward to greater unity of purpose in such a spirit, then we believe that the greatest opportunity Christian forces have ever had in the Moslem world is not far distant.

DYNAMIC CONVERTS ¹

Recently there has been a good deal of discussion in some Moslem lands, as to the advisability of encouraging secret discipleship on the part of Mohammedans who cannot see their way clear to make a public profession of their faith in Christ.

The number of converts from Islam is small, and even some of these few converts falter and fail. So if we take the outward results as a measure of success, there would be reason for great discouragement. But there are some Moslem converts known to many of us in different lands of the Near East, who shine like bright stars in a dark night. They and their kind have blazed the trail for their Mohammedan brothers. These are our encouragement and hope.

Among them are men of dynamic personalities, new creatures, men who stand out as strong radiant Christians in any group. One of these converts, a friend of mine, is an inspiring leader, in demand year after year in Christian conferences held in various countries of the Near East.

It is to such men that I wish to direct your attention. I point to these few because they are the outstanding tangible results which we can study with profit. Like ourselves, they are not perfect, but they are, perhaps, the nearest approach to what we long for and pray for and work for in greater numbers.

How did these few become what they are? And what is their thought about the Christian witness to their Mohammedan brothers? We want to understand and preserve and utilize that which made them what they are, in so far as we can, in order that we may help their kind to increase.

¹ From discussion at the Conference on Work among Moslems, held in Hartford, November 30, 1940.

I have been making it a point to observe what it is that has happened to them. I have studied to observe their method of approach to the Moslem. I have watched their technique and listened to the content of their message. To me their observations are of value because they have so much in common with Moslems in their background and education. Some of them had their training in Al Azhar in Cairo. They understand the Moslem psychology, and they understand the Moslem need.

It has been my privilege in recent years to be closely associated with a Moslem convert in presenting Christ and the Christian message to Moslems. This convert had his early training in a Moslem institution. For many years now, he has conducted unusual evangelistic work especially among Moslems, but among Christians as well. It has been the custom to meet with Moslem inquirers frequently. These inquirers come voluntarily. They represent a great variety of interests, Government officials, a newspaper editor, religious leaders, school teachers, students, humble workmen.

They come to ask why the evangelist became a Christian, to learn about Christ and His teachings, to ask a personal favor of one kind or another. They come to argue and to oppose. They come with sincere motives and with ulterior motives. They are all met on the common ground of sincerity and love.

The inquirers who know this evangelist are attracted to him, not only because of his message, but because of his friendly interest, his neighborliness, and his spirit of helpfulness. He loves men, and from all classes they come to him for help, sympathy and advice. He does not spare himself. I have known him to miss his meals and his much needed rest again and again, in order to take some friend, Moslem or Christian, to a place where he thought he could get him a job or do him some favor. And that is only an inadequate illustration of his spirit and manner of life.

When some of these inquirers come arguing or asking about the deity of Christ or about the Trinity or about the

resurrection of Christ, he patiently explains his understanding of these teachings, and then he leads them away from these controversial subjects, gradually but naturally to the Bible. From the Scriptures he reads to them about Christ and Christ's teachings. The high standards of Christ's sermon on the mount seem to impress them especially. He readily confesses to them his own inability to live up to these standards as he should. But he freely and genuinely witnesses to them that Jesus has become to him a Saviour. He explains how Christ by His sacrificial death has lifted his burden of sin and brought the peace of forgiveness into his heart. He tells how Jesus by His resurrection and present fellowship helps him to overcome the power of sin in his life. To this convert, as to the Apostle Paul, the Cross is central. And although the Cross is a stumbling block to the Moslem mind, yet this convert lovingly interprets it to his friend as God's greatest gift to him too.

From his own experience he urges them to leave the more difficult questions of doctrine, such as the deity and the trinity, until later, after they have learned more about Jesus Himself. He explains that some of these doctrines are beyond our ability to understand or reason out, but that by and by the Holy Spirit helps us to accept them as God has set them forth in His Holy Word, and we come to believe and are satisfied.

But my aim was to point out these few Moslem converts whom we know, as the desirable results of the presentation of Jesus Christ and His death as the only way to forgiveness of sins and to life abundant.

These men made a choice. They broke with their old surroundings. It was not easy. They suffered. They paid a great price, counting all things loss for Christ. And even though their loss of family and inheritance has been heart-breaking, and even though they have suffered persecution, they bear a radiant witness, based on personal experience, to the fact that the sufferings of this present time, for Christ's sake, are not worthy to be compared, not

only with the glory that shall be revealed, but with the inner joy and peace of the present.

As for the dynamics in Islam, these outstanding converts affirm that they could find there nothing comparable to the challenge of Jesus Christ, even though they sought for it long and earnestly. Voluntarily they turned from that which could not satisfy the longing of their souls, to Him who has become their all in all. They now witness to an inner compulsion: "woe is me if I preach not the gospel."

Doubtless there are many secret believers in Christ who for one reason or another prefer not to be known openly as Christians, so they retain their social connection with Islam. Perhaps they lack the necessary courage to profess their faith in Christ, realizing the hardships that would most likely be theirs if they did. Perhaps it is because they are not sure of a means of livelihood. Perhaps they feel that by remaining secret followers of Jesus they will thus be able to exert a wholesome influence on Islam from within.

Whatever their reason for remaining Moslems outwardly and Christians secretly, such a position encourages hypocrisy whether they will it or not. It also prevents their living a strong Christian life and experiencing the greatest joys of their faith. I think of a number of my friends who are secret believers. They do not possess this dynamic spirit which we have been considering. I feel sorry for them. They seem to yearn for Christian fellowship, and yet fear holds them down so that they cannot express themselves.

And who are we, professing Christians, that we should encourage a clandestine faith on the part of another? Perhaps we think to make it easier for the Mohammedan to become a Christian that way. Christ promises no easy way. He took no easy road Himself. While Christ upholds the importance and sanctity and unity of the home in society, yet He made it clear that man's highest loyalty is to Him. A man's foes may be they of his own household. A man may be called on to leave father, mother, sister, relatives to follow Him. Christ's teaching here is clear.

Christ was very definite about the likelihood of His followers being persecuted, but some of the compensations appear in His exhortation to them: "Blessed are ye when men shall—persecute you. Rejoice and be exceeding glad." We see the actual working out of these principles in these few converts whom we know, who do count it joy when they fall into manifold trials.

It is thus our duty to present to our Mohammedan brothers the full truth about Jesus. This will include the Scripture teaching that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." It will include Christ's own words: "Every one, therefore, who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven, but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven." When our Mohammedan friend understands Jesus Christ and these Christian teachings, then it is for him, not for us, to decide which course to take, and on him alone rests the responsibility for his decision.

Experience has shown that though the number of converts, thus far, has been relatively small, yet he who has experienced Christ as a personal Saviour and found in Him this dynamic for Christian living, decides for himself that there is no choice. He must be out and out for Christ who suffered and died for him, that he might have life now and hereafter.

A MISSIONARY IN THE NEAR EAST. *

THE MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARD SIN

The prevailing view among Christians is that the Muslim view of sin is much less serious than the Christian view. What the Christian knows as a "sense" or "conviction" of sin seems to be far from universal among Muslims. Conscience troubles the Muslim so little that many have wondered if it exists among the rank and file of Muslims. Actions, attitudes, and motives that would cause much uneasiness to the Christian leave the Muslim but little affected, if at all. Yet this apparently universal attitude toward sin has a very definite bearing upon the work of Christian Missions. A slight sense of sin produces a slight regard for the Saviour from sin. Jesus may be regarded highly for other reasons, but not for His power to save from sin, unless a distinct need is felt for such salvation. This sense of the need of salvation can be induced only by the conviction that sin is "exceeding sinful," that it is utterly displeasing to God, and that its detection and punishment are certain. This sense seems to be lacking to the great majority of Muslims.

The reasons for this will occur readily to the student of Islam. The Rev. W. R. W. Gardner in his booklet on the "Qur'anic Doctrine of Sin" calls attention to the fact that although Muslims have a *doctrine* of sin, they have no adequate sense of sin. "The two do not necessarily go together. And, on the contrary, a man may have an incomplete doctrine of sin, and yet have a great sense of sin. A conviction of sin is not dependent on holding any particular views as to the nature of sin; it is much rather connected with the opening of the heart and conscience to realization of the holiness of God." The holiness of God and His hatred of sin are not sufficiently clarified in Muslim

teaching. Disproportionate emphasis on such qualities as unity and power have obscured the quality of holiness, without which no adequate sense of sin can be secured.

Again, Mr. Gardner points out another reason for this lack of a sense of sin among Muslims in the fact that the Qur'an while it speaks "of the necessity of giving more than outward obedience, yet appears to convey the feeling that sin has to do with concrete acts, rather than with inclination and disposition." When sin becomes dependent upon acts which are as closely classified as acts are in Islam, it becomes very difficult to prove that many of the daily acts, however questionable they may be, fall under the class of "forbidden" acts and thus constitute sin.

A further difficulty in achieving a sense of sin among Muslims is their view of forgiveness. God's benevolent attitude toward human weakness and His readiness to forgive when asked to do so are not likely to establish a state of mind that will be greatly distressed or anxious about sin. Only when the individual is led to understand not only the holiness of God, but also His righteousness, will he be apt to take a serious view of his own sin in relation to his enlarged view of the nature of God.

Much more might be said about the reasons for the inadequacy of the Muslim attitude toward sin, but what has been mentioned above may be sufficient to provoke interest in the question which will lead to practical suggestions for the cultivation of a more adequate sense of sin among Muslims. One such suggestion I should like to volunteer.

In a book entitled "Hidāyatul-Sālikīn fī Sulūki Maslakī'l-Muttaqīn," a Malay writer sets forth in seven chapters important considerations for those who are on the Way that leads to Heaven and complete union with God. The chapters in order deal with the Muslim faith, including the usual discussion of the divine attributes; outer obedience; visible sins; secret sins; inner obedience; the *dhikr*; and social conventions. The book is based on various works by al-Ghazali. Copious quotations are made

from al-Ghazali's writings, which are frequently supported by quotations from the Qur'an or the traditions. The two chapters on sin seem to me to be particularly suggestive, as providing a way for the cultivation of a more intimate sense of sin among Muslims.

At the beginning of the book, the writer defines religion as being, negatively, the abandonment of sin; and positively, obedience to God. It is not surprising, therefore, that out of seven chapters, two of them should be devoted to the subject of sin, and two of them to the subject of obedience. With reference to the chapter on visible sin, the writer asserts that sin is committed with all the members of the body, but he dwells especially on the sins involving the following members: eyes, ears, tongue, stomach, private members, hands, and feet. It is unnecessary to follow the author's development of the sins committed by each of these. Suffice it to follow his treatment for the first three.

The Muslim is warned to guard his eyes from seeing anything that is forbidden, from beholding the freshness of youth with sensual desire, from looking upon a Muslim to despise him or think of him shamefully. He is warned to guard his ears from hearing anything that mars or is out of harmony with the *shari'at*, from listening to abuse, for the man who listens is as culpable as the man who utters the abuse, listening to vile speech, listening to destructive and useless conversation, listening to people speak of forgotten evil. He is warned to guard his tongue from falsifying the true with a jest, from breaking a promise, from abusing people (this runs into six subdivisions), from wrongly interpreting the words of another in argument and establishing one's own words as true, self-praise, cursing any of God's creation, praying for any of God's creatures with a wicked prayer, ridicule and jest. The Muslim is reminded that the tongue was made to multiply *dhikrs* and read the Qur'an, to explain the way to God, to counsel the performance of good acts and forbid evil, to reveal the needs of the heart in this world and in the world to come.

Secret sins, or the sins of the heart, are enumerated as gluttony, love of much-talking, anger, hatred, love of property, love of popularity, love of the world, pride, self-admiration, arrogance. These are all enlarged upon in paragraphs, some shorter, some longer. At the close is a quotation from al-Ghazali: "Know that the world is the enemy of God and the enemy of His saints." This has a familiar rendering in the words of John's epistle (I John 2:15): "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."

This is only one example where the subject of sin is treated by a Muslim on a far broader basis than is usually found in Muslim writings. There must be many other such examples. Could they not be brought forth and published so as to provide material for the cultivation of a truer and deeper sense of sin among Muslims? Al-Ghazali in the *Ihyā'* (*Kitābu'l-Taubat*) quotes a tradition about the Prophet Mohammed in which the Prophet says: "There is an oppression on my heart until I ask pardon of God seventy times every day and night. Therefore God Almighty honored him by saying: 'May God forgive your former and latter sins.'" Then comes the additional observation: "If this was the case of the Prophet, what must be the condition of other men?" (See *MOSLEM WORLD*, Jan., 1926). If more views like these from Muslim writers could be made available for Muslims, would they not assist in bringing before them the fact that sin is "exceeding sinful?"

Malacca,
Straits Settlements.

R. A. BLASDELL.

TAKI ED DIN, PRINCE OF HAMA

Among all the heroes of Islam few, if any, are as appealing to westerners as Saladin. His chivalry and courtesy fulfilled so perfectly the western ideal of the *prudhomme*, that he appears scarcely less a hero in western history and legend than he does in the eastern. Like the hero-kings of Europe he was surrounded by a group of paladins whose exploits redounded to the glory of their prince, and who shone in the reflected radiance of his splendor. Among these the names of El Adil Saphadin, Feruk Shah, Meshtoub and Taki ed Din should be familiar as the chief lieutenants of the sultan, but we actually know little of any of them. These were the men on whom the empire of Saladin rested; they were the generals who commanded his armies and the vassals who ruled his provinces. Saladin, like many western rulers, was addicted to nepotism and created appanages for his relatives, but in accordance with the general principle of Arabic feudalism he shifted his vassals about from fief to fief as best suited the needs of the empire. Through the study of one of these vassals we are able to examine the political life of a Moslem Syrian emir in this heroic age of the Ayyubite empire in the twelfth century. ¹

El Malik el Mozaffer Taki ed Din Omar ibn Nour-ed-Doulah Shahanshah ibn Ayyoub ibn Shadi, to give him his

¹ The materials for the life of Taki ed Din are mostly to be found in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Orientaux*, (Paris, 1872-1906) abbreviated as *R.H.C.* In this collection may be found: Abul Feda, *Annales* (*R.H.C.* I); Ibn el Athir, *Kamel Atevarykh* (*R.H.C.* I and II, part 1); Ibn el Athir, *Histoire des Atabecs de Mosul* (*R.H.C.* II, part 2; cited *Atabecs*); Beha ed Din, *Anecdotes et Beaux Traites de la Vie du Sultan Youssof* (*R.H.C.* III); Abu Chamah, *Le Livre des Deux Jardins* (*R.H.C.* IV and V).

Not included in the *R.H.C.* are: Makrizi, *Histoire d'Egypte*, translated by E. Blochet in *Revue de l'Orient Latin* (the years covering the life of Taki ed Din are in vols. VIII-IX [1901-1902]); *The Biographical Dictionary of Ibn Khallikan* translated by Baron McGuckin de Slane, 4 vols., Paris, 1843-1871 (the life of Taki ed Din is II, 391-92); *The Chronology of Gregory Abul Faraj called Bar Hebraeus* edited and translated by E. A. Wallis Budge, 2 vols., Oxford, 1932 (all citations are to the English translation in vol. I). There are also references to him in the western sources, especially: *Le Livre d'Eracles* [continuation of William of Tyre] in *R.H.C. Occidentaux* II (Paris, 1859); *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, edited by W. Stubbs, London, *Rolls Series*, 1864; Ambroise, *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, edited by Gaston Paris, Paris, *Documents Inédits sur l'histoire de France*, 1897. (English translation by M. J. Hubert and J. L. La Monte, *Records of Civilization*. N. Y. 1940).

full name, was the founder of that branch of the Ayyubites which ruled in Hama until 1341, outlasting all the other lines of the house.² Although he was the nephew of the sultan, he seems to have been very near the same age as his uncle, as their careers parallel each other, and Taki ed Din was politically active throughout the rise of Saladin. He first appears in command of an army which broke up the Frankish siege of Damietta, in December 1169, only a few months after Saladin had taken command in Egypt.³

It will be remembered that Saladin had accompanied his uncle Shirkuh into Egypt at the time that Shirkuh was sent by Nureddin to gain the control in that distraught country and to drive out the Franks of Jerusalem who had effected what amounted to almost a conquest of the kingdom. Shirkuh had completed his task and only a few Frankish troops remained to be expelled when he died, leaving the position of vizier of Egypt to his nephew. Saladin had assumed the vizierate, and it was in the final wiping up of the Franks that Taki ed Din made his first appearance.

The success of Saladin alarmed his sovereign Nureddin. In 1172 relations between them became so strained, with such mutual suspicion on both sides that it seemed as if open war must result. It may have been with the idea of securing a base further removed from Syria and the might of his suzerain, that Saladin despatched an expedition into the western territory around Barka. In the conference held at Alexandria to discuss this plan, Taki ed Din was one of the chief advisors of the vizier, and he was placed in charge of the expedition, which was made up of his own men and five hundred cavalry supplied by Saladin.⁴

In 1172 the breach with Nureddin seemed imminent. At a council of the emirs and generals Taki ed Din urged the policy of defiance and open rebellion against Nureddin, but his rash counsel was over-borne by the more prudent advice of Ayyub, Saladin's father, who proclaimed his

² S. Lane-Poole, *The Mohammedan Dynasties*, (London, 1893), pp. 74-79.

³ Abu Chamah, IV, 151 (from El Imad). Saladin was himself only about thirty-two years of age when his uncle Shirkuh died, leaving him in command in Egypt in March, 1169. (See W. B. Stevenson, *The Crusaders in the East*, [Cambridge, 1907] p. 194.)

⁴ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 505.

undying loyalty to the sultan and privately advised his son to delay any open breach but prepare to defend his position.⁵ The result fully demonstrated the wisdom of this policy for Nureddin died while he was still planning an attack on his too powerful vassal and Saladin was left master of Egypt and the strongest man in the Syrian empire.

Taki ed Din does not seem to have played any unusual role in the first years of Saladin's conquest of Syria. In 1175-76 he was for a time governor of Damascus,⁶ but it may well have been that his chief interests were in the war of conquest which his mamelukes Karakoush and Nasr ed Din Ibrahim were waging in the Maghreb.⁷ However, this war was always left in the hands of his mamelukes, and Taki ed Din personally accompanied Saladin in his wars in Syria, as evidenced by his participation in the disastrous battle of Ramleh in 1177. Taki ed Din seems to have been the individual hero of the Moslem army on this rather inglorious occasion; Abu Chamah comments that so firm was his resistance that he would probably have been able to drive back the Franks had he been at all well supported. In this battle Taki ed Din lost his younger son Ahmed, who died in the mêlée, and Abu Chamah's words seem to indicate that his death was, in part at least, due to the hardness of his father's heart.⁸

His truculence and belligerence were demonstrated again in 1179 when he advised Saladin not to treat with the Franks for the surrender of the castle at Beit el Ahzan (Jacob's Ford) which they offered to destroy for 100,000 dinars, but urged that the sultan take the money to hire troops to capture and destroy the place. Saladin followed his advice, and may well have repented thereof as the castle withstood his initial attack and he was forced to engage in a lengthy campaign to reduce it. (Aug.-Sept.,

⁵ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 506; Ibn el Athir, 582; Abul Feda, 42.

⁶ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 521. He evidently did not hold the office long, as Turanshah was appointed very shortly thereafter (Makrizi, 525).

⁷ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 528-531. There was some trouble with Saphadin over this, for he ordered Karakoush arrested and had him imprisoned in Cairo, but he was released the next year and went on with the campaign. Makrizi does not explain the incident. This expedition continued until 1186 at which time Taki ed Din ordered his men to abandon it (Makrizi, *R.O.L.* IX, 20).

⁸ Abu Chamah, IV, 185-86 (from El Imad).

1179). In this siege Taki ed Din again distinguished himself for his fierce valor, receiving wounds which very nearly cost him his life.⁹ Previously to this, however, he had been sent by the sultan to Hama in northern Syria to guard the frontier against the Franks of Antioch and the Turks of Iconium.¹⁰ There he won the greatest single victory of his career, of which he boasted ever after, in a battle in which with only a thousand men he defeated Kilij Arslan of Iconium who was besieging Râban with twenty thousand troops.¹¹ It was from this campaign that he returned to take part in the siege of Beit el Ahzan.¹²

In 1181 he first appears with the title of lord of Hama,¹³ but it is impossible to state just when Saladin conferred that fief upon him. He was not so successful in defending his possessions at this time, being forced to flee from Hama before the victorious advance of Eizz ed Din of Mosul, who conquered Aleppo, and whose coming was the signal for revolts among the populace of the northern town.¹⁴ Taki ed Din apparently fled to Saladin, who dispatched him in 1182 to secure the city of Ḥarim which had offered to surrender to the Franks. Here again he met with reverse, and was unable to capture the place until Saladin himself came with his army and reduced it.¹⁵ The following season was spent in assisting the sultan in his Syrian campaign, Taki ed Din leading raids on Beirut and Acre and commanding in a battle with the Franks at Kaoukab in which he forced them to retreat.¹⁶ That he stood high in the sultan's favor was demonstrated again in January 1183 by the gift of Sindjar, which Saladin had conquered just previously.¹⁷

In December of the same year (1183) Taki ed Din received the most important post which he was destined to hold. Saladin recalled Saphadin from Egypt and sent

⁹ Abu Chamah, IV, 197 (from Ibn alī Thayy), 203-04 (from El Imad), 209 (from a letter of El Fadhel). Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 533. Makrizi dates the siege as ending Tuesday, 21 Rabia II, 575. (Sept. 25, 1179.)

¹⁰ Ibn el Athir I, 635; Abul Feda 49; Abu Chamah IV, 198 (from El Imad).

¹¹ Ibn el Athir, I, 639-41; Abul Feda, 49; Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 532.

¹² Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 533.

¹³ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 545.

¹⁴ Ibn el Athir, *Atabecs*, 332.

¹⁵ Abu Chamah IV, 236-37 (from Ibn Alī Thayy).

¹⁶ Ibn el Athir, I, 653.

¹⁷ Makrizi, *R.O.L.* VIII, 550; Beha ed Din, 70; Ibn Khallikan, IV, 510.

Taki ed Din from Kerak, where he had been assisting him, to take over the viceroyalty of Egypt and the regency for El Afdal, who was named as his father's successor in that kingdom. Taki ed Din purchased from Saphadin the fiefs which the latter held in Egypt, the revenue of which amounted to 7000 dinars, and was given in addition the territories of Fayyum, Anat and Boush. He was, moreover, continued in his lordship of Hama.¹⁸ As viceroy of Egypt, he led the Egyptian army to the siege of Kerak in July 1184, bringing with him the children of Saphadin, who joined their father at Aleppo.¹⁹ Trouble broke out between El Afdal and Taki ed Din, however, and El Afdal appealed to his father against the rule of his cousin. Taki ed Din in turn complained to the sultan that El Afdal was making it impossible for him to govern, as he was remitting fines and taxes which Taki ed Din was endeavoring to collect. Ibn el Athir suggests that Saladin was moved by the consideration that Taki ed Din might be planning to entrench himself in Egypt so that he, rather than El Afdal, could succeed to the throne; Beha ed Din says that Taki ed Din was not so familiar with Egypt as was Saphadin. At any rate, in November 1186, the sultan revoked the appointment as viceroy and recalled Taki ed Din to him in Syria, appointing Saphadin again as viceroy of Egypt.²⁰

This dismissal from the important post of viceroy deeply injured the feelings of Taki ed Din, and for a time he seriously contemplated deserting the service of the sultan and going to the Maghreb where his mamelukes were conquering a new empire. Saladin wrote him, ordering him to come at once to join him in Syria, and the cautious counsels of his friends finally prevailed so that he obeyed rather than risk the anger of the sultan. On November 8, 1186, Taki ed Din joined Saladin in Syria where the sultan

¹⁸ Beha ed Din, 77; Abul Feda, 53; Ibn el Athir, I, 664; Ibn Khallikan, II, 391; Makrizi, *R.O.L.* IX, 9-10, 14. Makrizi gets confused and says that Egypt was given to El Aziz and Syria to El Afdal; later however he states that El Afdal developed a great aversion to Taki ed Din and resented his rule. The political testament naming his heirs and their regents was not made at the time of the original appointment as viceroy, but was given at the siege of Kerak in 1184.

¹⁹ Beha ed Din, 60; Abu Chamah, IV, 250; Makrizi, *R.O.L.* IX, 12; Makrizi gives dates. He came to the siege 19 Rabia II, and departed 15 Shaban.

²⁰ Ibn el Athir, I, 672-73; Abul Feda, 55; Ibn Khallikan, II, 391; Makrizi, *R.O.L.* IX, 19; Beha ed Din, 89. It was at this time that Egypt was given to El Aziz, who was sent down under the tutelage of Saphadin.

greeted him warmly and conferred upon him the lordships of Menbidj, Maarra, Kafartab, Meyafariqin and Djbel Djoum to supplement the holdings he already had at Hama,²¹ thus making him his chief vassal in northern Syria.

As Saladin's chief lieutenant in the north it was natural that Taki ed Din should have been entrusted with the defense of the northern frontier. He occupied Harim in April 1187²² and in June of the same year arranged a treaty with the prince of Antioch, guaranteeing the safety of the frontier from attack in that direction.²³ This peace was arranged in order that Taki ed Din could join Saladin in the great offensive in Palestine which was launched that summer. At the battle of Hattin on July 4, 1187 in which Saladin destroyed the army and the hopes of the Latin Kingdom, Taki ed Din commanded the right wing, made up of the levies from Mosul and Mardin.²⁴ It was through his division that Count Raymond of Tripoli and his companions made their escape from the fatal field.²⁵

After the victory at Hattin, Taki ed Din assisted the sultan in reduction of the country. He was the officer to whom Count Joscelyn surrendered the city of Acre (July 9, 1187) and he received on this occasion a sugar factory, ware-house and other property as his share of the spoils.²⁶ From there he was sent to besiege Tibnin and cut off its communications with Tyre. He was unable to take the castle unaided and had to ask for the help of the sultan to capture it. Saladin came on July 19, 1187, and assaulted the castle which fell to him on July 26.²⁷ While the sultan took the main army to the attack on Jerusalem, Taki ed Din was commissioned to besiege Tyre.²⁸ There

²¹ Beha ed Din, 90; Ibn el Athir, I, 672-73; Abul Feda, 55; Ibn Khallikan, II, 391-92; Makrizi, R.O.L. IX, 19-20. Makrizi says that he already held Maarra and Menbidj as well as Hama and that the sultan gave him Meyafariqin. Taki ed Din ordered all his men to abandon the campaign in the Maghreb and withdrew entirely from Africa. One of his mamelukes refused to obey and was subsequently destroyed by the natives.

²² Abu Chamah, IV, 281.

²³ Beha ed Din 92; Abu Chamah, IV, 281.

²⁴ Abu Chamah, IV, 270, 281; Beha ed Din, 92; Ibn el Athir, I, 684; Abul Feda, 56.

²⁵ Abu Chamah, IV, 286, and references above.

²⁶ *Eracles*, 69-70, variant D; Makrizi, IX, 25; Abu Chamah, IV, 296 (from El Imad); (Makrizi says 2 Jomada, Abu Chamah gives 1 Jomada). *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, R.O.L. IX, 44.

²⁷ Ibn el Athir, I, 690-92; Makrizi, IX, 27-28; Abu Chamah, IV, 306, (from El Imad).

²⁸ Abu Chamah, IV, 315.

the sultan joined him in November, and until the siege was abandoned in January 1188, Taki ed Din served as one of the commanders of the Moslem army.²⁹ In the general dispersal of the army after the failure at Tyre, he led his northern contingents back to Damascus.³⁰

Taki ed Din seems to have spent most of the year 1188 in the north, guarding from Hama the frontier against Antioch.³¹ In October of that year Saladin visited him at Hama and was there magnificently entertained by him. On the occasion of this visit the sultan gave his nephew the lordships of Djebala and Laodicea which Saladin had just taken from the Franks.³² While the sultan campaigned in Antioch, Taki ed Din attacked Tripoli and guarded the invaders from the south.³³

The following summer Saladin found himself confronted by the attempts of the Franks to recapture Acre. He summoned all his host to join him at the siege, Taki ed Din arriving in September.³⁴ On September 14, the prince of Hama commanded the right wing of the Saracens in a battle in which he cut through the Frankish lines and opened up communications with the besieged city.³⁵ He further distinguished himself in the great battle of October 4, as well as in other battles of the siege.³⁶

The approach of the German crusade led by Frederick Barbarossa caused apprehension to the sultan, and Taki ed Din was sent back to the north to watch the movements of the European army. From headquarters at Aleppo, during the months of June to November 1190, the prince of Hama harassed the advance of the Germans, nearly defeating them near Laodicea, and, by blocking the pass at the Nahr el Kelb, forced them to abandon the coastal road and go from Antioch to Acre by sea.³⁷

²⁹ Taki ed Din went to Acre to meet the sultan on November 4, and they came back to Tyre together on November 12. The abandonment of the siege is dated by Abu Chamah as December 1, 1187 (IV, 341-44).

³⁰ Abu Chamah IV, 344.

³¹ Beha ed Din, 106; Abu Chamah IV, 349; Makrizi, IX, 37.

³² Beha ed Din, 117; Abul Feda 59; Ibn el Athir, I, 720.

³³ Abu Chamah, IV, 390-91, 398. Taki ed Din held the Antioch frontier when Saladin went south to besiege Belfort.

³⁴ Beha ed Din, 134-35; Ibn el Athir, II, 7; Abu Chamah, IV, 408.

³⁵ Ibn el Athir, II, 8; Abul Feda, 61.

³⁶ Beha ed Din, 141-44; Ibn el Athir, II, 10, 30; Bar Hebraeus, 331; Abu Chamah, IV, 416, 425; Letter of Saladin to Saphadin given in note, R.O.L. IX, 44-45.

³⁷ Beha ed Din, 165, 181-82; Abu Chamah, IV, 462; R.O.L. IX, 46 note.

With the end of the German menace, Taki ed Din returned to the camp before Acre, arriving on November 3, 1189 and bringing with him Moezz ed Din Sindjar who had deserted and whose return was ordered by the sultan.³⁸ This constant moving about of troops was one of the reasons that Saladin had difficulty in sustaining a prolonged campaign. His soldiers were all feudal levies and refused to serve without some respite during which they might visit their homes. When Taki ed Din had gone back to the north, his place at the siege had been taken by Saphadin; on his return he occupied the position vacated by Kukburi of Arbela who had gone home. The incessant demands for military service necessitated by the frequent campaigns of Saladin bore heavily on his vassals and caused them to demand some limitations to their service. The desertion of Moezz ed Din was not the only case of an emir leaving the host, a matter which caused Saladin considerable difficulty. Taki ed Din was to be a prime offender later on.

Taki ed Din arrived at Acre in time to participate in the important battle which took place on November 11, 1190,³⁹ and remained with the army throughout the winter. His departure was fixed for March 2, 1191;⁴⁰ this was the end of his service under Saladin. That March he returned to the north, to Harran, Edessa, and Djezira which Saladin had given him.⁴¹ It had been agreed that he should distribute these territories as fiefs to his warriors and then return to the host, but instead he went on across the Euphrates to Meyafariqin. The situation seemed favorable for conquest in northern Mesopotamia. In a swift campaign Taki ed Din occupied Hani and Es Suweida and advanced towards Khelat. Seif ed Din Bectimor, sultan of Khelat, raised an army of 4000 men to oppose him, but Taki ed Din routed him and laid siege to his capital city, capturing part of the town. Realizing that his forces were inadequate for the capture of the fortress

³⁸ Ibn el Athir, II, 38-39; Beha ed Din, 191-94; Abu Chamah, IV, 488.

³⁹ Beha ed Din, 197; Abu Chamah, IV, 510-11 (from El Imad).

⁴⁰ Beha ed Din, 204. Further on (p. 210) Beha ed Din says that Taki ed Din and his son Nasr ed Din Mohammed took part in a skirmish on April 6 (9 Rebia I), but this must be a mistaken date for we know that he had gone to the north by this time.

⁴¹ Ibn el Athir, II, 40. Makrizi, IX, 52, merely says that he left before the end of the siege.

however, Taki ed Din withdrew from the siege of Khelat and retreated towards Malazgerd which he invested. The garrison of Malazgerd asked for a truce, at the expiration of which, if they had not been reinforced they would surrender. It was during this truce, just two days before its expiration, that Taki ed Din succumbed to a fever and died on October 10, 1191.⁴²

This invasion of Mesopotamia caused great disturbance in the Moslem Near East. Abu Chamah says that Saladin laid much of the responsibility for the fall of Acre (which capitulated to the Franks on July 12, 1191) to the fact that the emirs of Diarbekr and the north were afraid to come to the host lest their lands be attacked by Taki ed Din.⁴³ Certainly the Caliph of Baghdad wrote protesting to Saladin against Taki ed Din's unprovoked attack on Bectimor, the second of his letters reaching the sultan the day after he received word of the death of his nephew.⁴⁴ El Malik el Mansur Mohammed, his son, continued the war in the north, in opposition to the orders of Saladin, and was responsible for weakening the sultan's resistance to Richard in Palestine.⁴⁵

There are references to Taki ed Din in the *Itinerarium Regis Ricardi* and Ambroise which do not agree at all with the facts of his life as given by the Arabic historians. According to these texts Taki ed Din was present at the siege of Acre in June, 1190, when Richard arrived at the scene.⁴⁶ Further, he was among the Saracen emirs at the

⁴² Ibn el Athir II, 40-41; Abul Feda, 64; Beha ed Din, 280; Ibn Khallikan, II, 392; Makrizi, IX, 56-57; Djemal ed Din ibn Wasil in R.O.L. IX, 56 note. The date for his death is given anywhere from the 9 to the 19 Ramadan (Sept. 30 to Oct. 10).

⁴³ Abu Chamah, V, 4, 17.

⁴⁴ Beha ed Din, 272, 282.

⁴⁵ Beha ed Din, 296.

⁴⁶ *Itinerarium*, 211; Ambroise, line 2325. "*Techedini procurator Paganismi*" (variant reading Kahadini); "*Quahadin li seneschals de paianie*." In the translation of Professor Hubert the passage reads: "He saw the tents of Saladin
And of his brother, Saphadin;
The pagans were so near, almost
They pressed upon our Christian host.
Quahadin, on the other hand,
The seneschal of paganland,
Guarded the seacoast and the shore
And on our host waged constant war
Always alert to make attack
To harry us and force us back."

Gaston Paris refuses to accept Stubb's identification of this Quahadin as Taki ed Din; but his refusal is based on the grounds that the later reference to Taki ed Din does not refer to him as the seneschal. As there was no such title among the Saracens this cannot be considered a valid reason for rejecting the identification. I have not been able to find any Kahadin present in the army at Acre, and am inclined to accept the identification, although recognizing that Taki ed Din was not actually there.

battle of Arsur on September 7, 1191 where his banner, emblazoned with the strange device of a pair of trousers, caused considerable comment among the Christians.⁴⁷ That neither of these references can be correct is demonstrated by the chronology of his campaign in Mesopotamia as given above. There may be some doubts as to his departure from Acre as early as March, 1190 in view of Beha ed Din's statement that he was present at a skirmish in April; but there was certainly no opportunity for him to get down from the north, engage in the battle of Arsur, and get back in time to die at Malazgerd on October 10. The only possible explanation of this error on the part of the western chroniclers is that the Christian writers had heard of the fame of Taki ed Din as one of the great and puissant warriors of Islam, and that in describing the Moslem host they included the name of a man they knew to be one of its chief heroes.

It is wholly on the evidence of these writers that his armorial device of a pair of trousers rests. A. Mayer records this description in his *Saracenic Heraldry* but explains it away, as he does not recognize trousers as a legitimate device among the Saracens.⁴⁸ I should be inclined to doubt the accuracy of its attribution to the prince of Hama.

Of Taki ed Din's character we know but little. His valor and personal bravery we know from his conduct in battle; his rashness and truculence were equally evidenced by his recorded actions. That he was conventionally religious and pious is shown by his charitable foundations,

⁴⁷ *Itinerarium*, 272, Ambroise, lines, 6563-6568.

"La iert Vamiralz Dequedin,
Un des parenz Salahaïn,
Qui et portrait en sa baniere
Enseignes d'estrange maniere:
Ca estoit une baniere as braies,
C'erent ses enseignes veraies.

In Hubert's translation:

"There was the emir Dequedin
Who was kinsman to Saladin
And who bore high aloft his banner
Emblazoned in fantastic manner.
It bore a blazon in the guise
Of breeches; this was his devise."

⁴⁸ A. Mayer, *Saracenic Heraldry* (Oxford, 1933) p. 243, thinks that the breeches described by the chroniclers were really bends dividing a shield, which was the device of the later Ayyubites of Hama. Taki ed Din's arms were previously thought to be either a pen-box or a pair of polo sticks. S. Lane Poole (*Saladin*, London, 1898, p. 320) suggests that the breeches were probably a crude depiction of a device derived from an Egyptian cartouche.

the college of Manazil al-Izz at Cairo and other foundations at Edessa.⁴⁹ He was hard of heart, according to El Imad,⁵⁰ and Bar Hebraeus says of him, "This man was a violent hater of the Christians and without mercy shed the blood of the oppressed Armenian peasants."⁵¹ Abul Fedá, one of his descendants said of him, "Taki ed Din was distinguished by his bravery and by his energetic character; his death deprived the house of Ayyub of one of its principal supports. He had talent and education and composed very well in verse."⁵² Ibn el Athir comments on his particular abilities in the art of fortification as shown by his works at Laodicea and at Hama.⁵³

There can be no doubt that Taki ed Din enjoyed the affection and admiration of his great uncle Saladin. Beha ed Din tells with dramatic detail of the sultan's excess of sorrow on the news of his nephew's death, which so unmanned him that he almost forgot the campaign in which he was engaged, and had to be brought back to reality by Beha ed Din himself.⁵⁴ The statement of the *Eracles* that Taki ed Din was the husband of Saladin's sister⁵⁵ is unsupported by any of the Arabic writers, and as the *Eracles* makes Taki ed Din's son the nephew of the sultan and ignores the fact that Taki ed Din stood himself in that relationship to Saladin, the statement can have but little value.

His accomplishments as the founder of a dynasty were considerable. The conglomerate of his fiefs in 1191 was formidable. In Syria he held: Hama, Maarra, Salemiya, Menbidj, Qalat Nadjm, Djebala, Laodicea, Balatanos and Bikisrail; in Mesopotamia, Harran, Edessa, Samosata, Diarbekr, Meyafariqin and El Mouezzer.⁵⁶ The bulk of his inheritance went to his son Mohammed who succeeded him at Hama. His son Ahmed was killed at Ramla in 1177 as has been noted above,⁵⁷ and another son, Shahanshah,

⁴⁹ Ibn Khallikan, II, 391; Makrizi, *R.O.L.* IX, 57.

⁵⁰ El Imad quoted by Abu Chamah, IV, 185-86.

⁵¹ Bar Hebraeus, 338.

⁵² Abul Fedá, 64.

⁵³ Ibn el Athir, I, 720; Abul Fedá, 59.

⁵⁴ Beha ed Din, 30.

⁵⁵ *Eracles*, 69-70, variant D.

⁵⁶ Abul Fedá, 63; Abu Chamah, V, 4.

⁵⁷ Abu Chamah, IV, 185-86, and see above.

became the father of that Mozaffer Suleiman who ruled Yemen in 1214-1215.⁵⁸

This Shahanshah was his eldest born, and was, according to the *Eracles*, a favorite with the sultan. He was captured by the Templars sometime before 1177, and remained a prisoner for seven years, being released finally upon payment of a large ransom and the surrender of all the Templars whom the sultan held captive.⁵⁹ However he seems to have played no important role in history and probably predeceased his father, as his younger brother inherited their father's fiefs.

The career of Taki ed Din is in no respect unusual. It is precisely because his life is so typical of those of the Syrian emirs of the twelfth century that it is worthy of record. He presents an excellent example of the way in which a great feudal seignury was built up in the Moslem East, and gives a good picture of the warlike life which was led by those heroes who surrounded the great Saladin.

*University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

JOHN L. LA MONTE.

⁵⁸ S. Lane Poole, *Mohammedan Dynasties*, p. 76, table.

⁵⁹ The *Eracles*, 72-73, variant D, and Abu Chamah, IV, 185-86, give somewhat variant accounts. According to the *Eracles* Saladin entrusted the boy to a renegade Frank, John Gale, for instruction in the arts of chivalry. But Gale betrayed his trust and sold the boy to the Templars who imprisoned him in Roche Guillaume, which Taki ed Din in consequence besieged. Abu Chamah's version seems preferable. The boy was in the north when a Damascene came to him and said that Saladin had ordered him to lead him to him. Shahanshah complied but instead of being taken to the sultan was sold to the Templars. He was ransomed after seven years.

LUTHER AND MOHAMMEDANISM

Introduction. The writings of Martin Luther encompass many fields of interest. His writings on the Turks in particular, as well as his general references to the Koran, Mohammed, and the Turks are manifold. There is much that still remains to be explored by modern scholars. This study concerns itself directly with primary sources—the works of Luther himself, without referring to what others *state* Luther thought or said concerning the Turks and the spread of Mohammedanism. As far as possible, the English translations of standard writings have been used, but the Weimar Edition of Luther's Works has been carefully studied in order both to check the English versions and to find material that has not previously been translated from the original German and Latin. All references and quotations from the Weimar Edition are the present writer's own translations. Notation is made whenever a published English translation is used in this text.

I.

Luther's Attitude Toward the Turks and Mohammedanism. To the modern mind the encyclopaedic interests of the Renaissance seem remarkable if not phenomenal. Dr. Martin Luther was no exception to this broad interest—scholarly and otherwise, of the Man of the Renaissance. Eagerly he sought out information which was not readily available. He decried the state of ignorance prevailing in Germany and in Italy regarding the Turks and the religion of Mohammed. "To be sure, it has and often has disgusted me and still does, that neither our great lords nor our scholars have been at any pains to give us any certain knowledge about the life of the Turks in the two classes,

spiritual and temporal.”¹ A quest for information continued throughout Luther’s life.

In order to satisfy this deficiency, Luther hoped to publish a German translation of the Koran.² Although this plan did not come to fruition, Luther was instrumental in publishing several works of others on this and kindred subjects. In 1530 he wrote a “Vorwart zu dem Libellus de ritu et moribus Turcorum.”³ In 1543 he supplied a “Vorrede zu Theodor Bibliandus Koranausgabe.”⁴ The most important, however, was the reissue of a work several centuries old, to which Luther appended a lengthy Introduction and a Conclusion. His “Verlegung des Alcoran Bruder Richardi” is required reading if one would understand Luther’s attitude toward Islam.⁵ This was issued in 1542. To all intents and purposes Luther was the editor of this new edition.

Over a period of years, Luther’s attitude changed somewhat. In the early days of the Turkish “threat,” he opposed war and urged tolerance. Such an attitude in those days was tantamount to “appeasement” in the twentieth century. Luther defended his resolution of 1518: “To make war against the Turks is nothing else than to strive against God, who is punishing our sins by means of the Turks.”⁶ Similar statements are made in his letters and other writings and are recorded in the *Tischreden*.⁷

Though he did permit war against the Turks in later years, and even urged war for the defense of the people, Luther was still of the opinion that the Turks constituted a punishment from God. Therefore, the only way to defeat them was to repent and to find God. In 1536 he spoke to friends in this vein.⁸ So too, he wrote to Elector John Frederick in May, 1538.⁹ Such was the import of his sermons on the Fifth and Ninth Sundays after Trinity

¹ *On War Against The Turks*, 1529. Holman Edition, V. p. 93.

² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

³ Weimar Edition, Vol. XXX, Pt. ii.

⁴ Weimar Ed., Vol. LIII.

⁵ Weimar Ed., Vol. LIII.

⁶ *In Defense of the Articles of Dr. Martin Luther*, Holman Ed., Vol. III, p. 106.

⁷ P. Smith, *Correspondence of Luther* “Letter to Spalatin December 21, 1518” Vol. I, p. 141. *cf.* *On War Against the Turks*, Holman V, pp. 80-89, *Tischreden*, Weimar, III, No. 3257A etc.

⁸ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 6155.

⁹ *Briefe*, Weimar Ed., VIII No. 3236.

in 1544.¹⁰ Throughout his works there are numerous prayers for the conversion of the Turks and for the repentance of the Christians.¹¹

Even while advocating the propriety of fighting the Turk, Luther held out for a spirit of tolerance in matters of faith. Neither the Turkish nor the Christian sword could convert the world. "Let the Turk believe and live as he will, just as one lets the papacy and other false Christians live. The emperor's sword has nothing to do with faith; it belongs to physical, worldly things, if God is not to become angry with us."¹² Similarly we hear from his lips this confession, "I do not believe my bow and my sword can help me. If God will not help us, it's all up."¹³

The polemical works of Luther against the Pope and the Turk reveal little of the inner attitudes of the Reformer. To him, both the Pope and the Turk were signs of the Last Days. "The Turk commands in the East, the pope in the West. These are the last and most perilous times."¹⁴ In 1530 he wrote to Elector John Frederick, "I reckon this epoch of the Gospel light as none other than the time in which God shortens and restrains tribulation by means of the Gospel as Christ says in Matthew 24. . . . for if the world had to stand longer as it has hitherto stood, the whole world would become Mohammedan or skeptical and no Christian would be left."¹⁵ Toward the end of his life, Luther wrote, "After the Turks, the Last Judgment follows quickly."¹⁶ Many other similar eschatological references are to be found in the letters, sermons and table talk of Luther.

The Turk is frequently linked with the Devil and the Antichrist. But even this charge is mitigated by the fact that similar charges are levelled against the papal hierarchy. The Turk, the Servant of the Devil, can only be overcome if in their lives men defeat the devil.¹⁷ So too, "They both

¹⁰ Weimar Ed., XXII.

¹¹ Sermon on Mark 7:31-37, 1526, Weimar Ed., X, p. 353 *Tischreden*, Weimar I-VI *passim*.

¹² *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 104.

¹³ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., III, No. 3687.

¹⁴ Reported in Smith, P. and Gallinger, H.P. *Conversations with Luther*, p. 147.

¹⁵ Quoted in P. Smith, *Correspondence of Luther*, II, p. 517.

¹⁶ *Preface to Revelation*, 1545, Holman Ed., VI, p. 486.

¹⁷ *On War against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 89.

have one God, the Devil; the pope is a liar, the Turk a murderer." ¹⁸

The papal hierarchy being the more present evil in the eyes of Luther, was therefore a greater enemy and a worse abomination than the Turk. Perhaps it is not advisable in these modern times to quote at any length these Reformation polemics. Perhaps one will suffice (a comparatively mild one)—“Turk and pope do not vary in the form of religion unless in ceremony. The one has the ceremonies of Mosaism, the other of Christianity; however, both ceremonies are degenerate. So the Turk mutilates the ablutions of Moses, and the Pope perverts the true use of Baptism and the Eucharist.” ¹⁹

Luther's zeal for uprightness of heart did not cease with attacking his foes. Frequently he preferred the Turks to his German fellow-citizens: “Among us there is worse blasphemy and more horrible sins against the First Table of the Law.” ²⁰ Again, men should clean up their own hearts and houses before seeking to set the world aright: “If you do it not, what would it help you though you performed all the miracles of the saints, and murdered all the Turks, and yet were found guilty of having disregarded your neighbor's need and having thereby sinned against Love?” ²¹

In concluding this all too hasty summary of Luther's attitude we may add that his polemics against the Turks were less harsh and severe than those against the Papacy. His consent to encourage the people to war with the Turks is watered down by his constant emphasis that his own people are as bad as the Turks—even worse—and need hope for no victory until they give testimony of a greater righteousness and faithfulness than is manifested among the Turks.

¹⁸ *Tischreden*, Weimar, III, No. 3055A. *cf.* Letter to Melanchthon on April 25, 1530 in *Briefe*, Weimar, V, No. 1552. Sermon on Twenty-Third After Trinity 1544, Weimar, XXI, p. 367, and *Verlegung des Alcoran*, Weimar, LIII, *passim*.

¹⁹ *Tischreden*, Weimar, I, No. 1095. *cf.* *Treatise on Good Works*, Holman, I, p. 261, “Letter to John Frederick 1530,” in Smith, II, p. 517, *To Christian Nobility*, Holman, VI, p. 82. *Babylonian Captivity*, Holman, II, p. 233, Sermon for Second Advent 1522, Weimar, X, p. 119, “Letter to John Lubeck, February 8, 1539,” *Briefe*, Weimar, VIII, No. 3297, etc.

²⁰ *Tischreden*, Weimar, II, No. 1574.

²¹ *Treatise on Good Works*, Holman, I, pp. 239-240.

II.

Luther's Knowledge of Mohammedan Doctrines and Practices. A fair knowledge of Islam can be gleaned by the student reading the works of Luther. In most of his material, Luther's knowledge was unusually accurate. Perhaps occasionally he misinterprets the Koran, and this, unfortunately is still being done.

The most impressive characteristic about Luther's knowledge of the Turks and of their religion is the almost total absence of important gaps. The religion of the Turks, to be sure, is not completely noted in the many references among Luther's writings and sayings, but little of significance or importance in Islam of faith or life (so nearly synonymous with Islam) is lacking in our abstracted studies from Luther. It must be assumed, as of others, that Dr. Luther did not write everything he knew about any specific subject, so that his knowledge of Mohammedanism probably was broader than the following discussion would seem to indicate.

Luther was one of the early scholars to recognize the syncretistic aspect of Islam. At any rate, he recognized that Mohammed had borrowed deliberately and had assimilated innocently much of the religious culture that had preceded him and that was existent around him. This knowledge he gleaned not solely through reading the Koran, but from other sources of information about the Turkish religion. Luther noted the similarity between Jewish and Islamic ceremony: "The Jew can agree more readily with the Turk than with the Christian. The Jew and the Turk agree on the truth of God, neither believes the Trinity or Baptism. Both agree on circumcision and on other external ceremonies."²² This would indicate a source other than the Koran, for that Book does not mention circumcision. Modern scholars have recognized the Jewish culture and cultus in Islam.²³

The relationship between Islam and Christianity has

²² *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 6195.

²³ cf. Torrey, *Jewish Foundation of Islam*.

been treated by modern writers.²⁴ Some four centuries ago, Dr. Martin Luther recognized the dependence of Mohammed on extraneous Christian sects. There may be some difference of opinion as to whether he named the correct Christian antecedent, but that is relatively unimportant. Mohammed is called at one time an Arian.²⁵ The Turk is an Arian who swears by the evangelists, by the Creator, and by the Resurrection of the dead.²⁶ Luther also saw an influence upon Islam from other Christian sects. "All history shows that Mohammed came from the Arians, the Macedonians and the Nestorians, in which he was situated from the very beginning for some time."²⁷

There is no special reference to the pagan Arab antecedents of Islam, which are readily recognized today. However, Luther's summary of the Islamic faith includes Jewish, Christian and pagan roots: "Thus a faith is patched together out of the faith of Jews, Christians and heathen. He gets it from the Christians when he praises Christ and Mary and the apostles and other saints. He gets it from the Jews that people are not to drink wine, are to fast at certain times of the year, wash like the Nazarites, and eat off the ground and go on with such holy works as part of our monks do, and hope for everlasting life."²⁸

Mohammed as an individual personage did not interest Luther. The occasional remarks in the Table Talk are insignificant. Luther finds grist for the polemical mill in the attitudes toward marriage evidenced by the founder of Islam. From the Koran Luther has knowledge of Mohammed's claim to visions and divine revelation, etc. "He praises and exalts himself highly, and boasts that he has talked with God and the angels."²⁹ Other remarks are related intimately to Luther's understanding of the Koran and the Turks in general so that one would be treading on treacherous territory to treat of them as applicable solely

²⁴ cf. Bell, *Origin of Islam In Its Christian Environment*, and Lammens, *Islam Beliefs and Institutions*.

²⁵ *On Councils and Churches*, Holman Ed., V, p. 206.

²⁶ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V. No. 6498.

²⁷ *Letzen Worten Davids*, Weimar Ed., LIV, p. 160.

²⁸ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V. p. 95.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

to Mohammed, the man. There seem to be no historical references or allusions to the life-history of Mohammed in the works of the Reformer. Perhaps there was available to Luther no source of biographical material other than the Koran.

By way of introduction to the doctrines of Islam as they were understood and interpreted by Luther, we must view his conception of the Koran. Luther knew the Koran to be the primary source of Turkish beliefs. It was their Bible. He compared it, however, to other human works on religion, such as the decretals of the pope and the Talmud of the Jews.³⁰ He denied the divine character claimed for the Koran by Muslims. The Koran is not the true light from God.³¹ It is entirely a work of human skill and ingenuity. "He rules by the Mohammedan Koran or Law, in which law there is nothing of God, but merely human speculation about God's Word and Spirit."³²

The sources of the Koran as well as the roots of Islam, were understood by Luther to be Jewish and Christian. "Nestorians and Jews have certainly helped compose the Koran. Nestorians have become Arians who believe that Christ is not God, but is nevertheless a Great Lord. The Jews say, the Messiah when He comes shall not die as the Scripture says."³³ Both of these truths are recognized by students of the Koran in modern times. Other teachings of the Koran are to be noted separately.

Luther well understood that the Koran was intended to rank above the Old and New Testaments. Luther believed Mohammed to have taught, "That the Gospel is indeed true, but it has long since served its purpose; also that it is hard to keep, especially on the points where Christ says that one is to leave all for His sake, love God with the whole heart and the like. Therefore God has had to give another new law, one that is not so hard, and that the world can keep, and this law is the Koran."³⁴

For the instruction of the Christians, Luther intended

³⁰ Sermon on Sunday After Easter, 1528, Weimar Ed., XXI, p. 330.

³¹ *On Isaiah Nine*, Weimar Ed., XL, p. 604.

³² Sermon Against the Turks, 1529. Weimar Ed., XXXII, p. 168.

³³ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 5536.

³⁴ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 101.

to put the Koran into the German language. Unfortunately he did not have time to carry out this ambition. It is interesting but unimportant to note that Luther reckons approximately twelve thousand words in the Koran.³⁵ In summary: "I will not now read from the Koran of Mohammed, since it is utterly uncouth, with fabricated, deliberate, shameful lies, which openly permits murder, adultery, unchastity, the destruction of marriage, and other shameful abominations and deceptions."³⁶

The doctrine of God is an important part of Islam and Christianity. Luther recognized the great difference between the monotheism of Christianity and of Mohammedanism. His main point of objection and attack was the rejection of the Trinity by Turkish rationalism. It will serve our purpose to lead up to this polemical debate.

The strict monotheism of the Muslim religion was known and understood by Luther. He would not give them any praise on this score, saying by way of criticism, "Their belief is praised by some because they believe in one God."³⁷ Luther linked the monotheism of the Turks to that of the heretical Christians who place undue emphasis upon the Fatherhood of God. "They all say, they know the Father—but even the Turks say that!"³⁸ The similarity of Jew and Mohammedan is noted by Luther in this monotheistic belief. "With their Koran and Talmud, they show and prove that there is no more than the one single God."³⁹

Time and again reference is made by Luther to the fact that the Turks and Mohammedans swear by one God. "They swear by one only God, Creator of heaven and earth, by his angels, by the four evangelists, and by the eighty heaven-descended prophets, of whom Mohammed is the greatest. They reject all images and pictures, and render homage to God alone."⁴⁰ So the Turks are iconoclasts, despisers of images.⁴¹ God is Creator of Heaven and earth,

³⁵ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 5428.

³⁶ Sermon on Eighth Sunday after Trinity, Weimar Ed., XXII, p. 150.

³⁷ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., III, No. 3571A.

³⁸ Sermon for Sunday after Ascension Day, 1526, Weimar Ed., X, p. 276.

³⁹ Sermon for Trinity Sunday, 1528, Weimar Ed., XXI, p. 510.

⁴⁰ Hazlitt, *Table Talk* DCCCLXXIX p. 359. cf. *Tischreden*, I, No. 904, IV, No. 4092.

⁴¹ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman V, p. 101.

the Giver of the Law.⁴² So God is the one, the only, the unique God who cannot die and can have no wife.⁴³

Luther traced the similarity of *Allah* to *Eloha*, and he considered it a corruption of the Hebrew.⁴⁴ This may be etymologically incorrect, both words probably being derived from some third Semitic language, but Luther did recognize the relationship of the two names for God. However, the Reformer does not recognize the significance of the article *al* in the short creed: "They have taught in the Koran that they shall boast constantly with these words, 'There is no god but God.' All this is really a device of the devil. For what is it to say, 'There is no god but God' without distinguishing one God from another? The devil too is a god and they honor him with this same word; of that there is no doubt."⁴⁵ Whether modern scholarship is correct in giving the definitive *Allah* the status of a proper name rather than the indefinite "god", or whether Luther may not have had a point worth taking is a matter for debate. Perhaps Luther was misled by the Latin of the Koranic source since we have no reliable assurance or evidence that Luther knew Arabic.

The doctrine of the Trinity was and still is the stumbling-block to Mohammedans. Luther recognized this and many references could be quoted on this point. Luther understood the logic of the Muslim perfectly, but he could not accept it. "The Turk also has an argument which is thus: Cursed is everyone who prays to any god beside the one God; the Christians do this, ergo! Minor proof: They believe in God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit."⁴⁶ Luther, as have his followers, put revelation above reason. "The Jews, Turks, heathen must consider such teaching as the worst error and highest heresy, and say that we Christians are silly and foolish when we make three Gods, since it is unreasonable that there be more than one God."⁴⁷

To Luther, such a conception of God was little more

⁴² Sermon for Trinity Sunday, 1528, Weimar Ed., XXI, p. 512.

⁴³ *Letzen Worten Davids*, Weimar Ed., LIV, pp. 67-68, 88-89.

⁴⁴ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 101.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁴⁶ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 5568.

⁴⁷ Sermon for Trinity Sunday, 1528, Weimar Ed., XXI, p. 510. *cf.* also *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., I, No. 904, III, No. 3571A, etc.

than that of the pagan. Any one could learn the same from nature and through human speculation. "Thus the Jews and Turks speak of Him, that He has created Heaven and Earth, given the Law; which is all quite clear, for man can know the nature of God through the work of His Creation, and even in that, God shows us what we should do."⁴⁸ This denial of the Trinity is practically the same as the denial of the Deity of Jesus Christ. To deny the Trinity is to be ignorant of the promised and revealed Seed and to blaspheme the Only Begotten Son of the Father.⁴⁹

The place of Christ in Islam is recognized and understood by Luther. "They pay the most honourable testimony to Jesus Christ saying that He was a prophet of pre-eminent sanctity, born of the Virgin Mary, and an envoy from God, but that Mohammed succeeded him and that while Mohammed sits in heaven on the right hand of the Father, Jesus Christ is seated on his left."⁵⁰

Luther recognized that the Muslim ranks Christ with the other heaven-sent prophets. "He believes nothing more of Christ than that he is a holy prophet, like Jeremiah or Jonah, and denies that he is God's Son and true God. Besides, he does not believe that Christ is the Savior of the world, who died for our sins, but that He preached to His own time and completed His work before His death, just like any other prophet."⁵¹ This is a true summary of the attitude toward the Christ among Muslims. Luther also understood the logic of this article. "They put their reason in a nutshell and say—God has no wife, therefore he can have no son."⁵²

The denial of the Atonement and of the Resurrection of Christ was also known to Luther. The Turkish acceptance of the Ascension of Christ seemed to Luther to be inconsistent with other beliefs. "The Turks say the truth of Christ that he was taken into heaven. By that they

⁴⁸ Sermon for Twenty-fourth After Trinity, 1544, Weimar Ed., XXII, p. 376.

⁴⁹ cf. *Disputation with Schmiedenstede*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, ii.188. *Disputation with Hegemon*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, ii, p. 388.

⁵⁰ Wm. Hazlitt, *Table Talk*, DCCCLXXIX p. 359. cf. *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., II, No. 2537; III, No. 3571A, B; IV; No. 4092, etc. *On War Against the Turks*, *passim*. Holman V., etc.

⁵¹ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman, V. p. 94.

⁵² *Letzen Worten Davids*, Weimar Ed., LIV, p. 48.

defeat themselves. Mohammed is dead, but Christ is living, caught up in heaven, therefore Christ is greater than their Mohammed." ⁵³ A summary of the shortcomings of the Mohammedan doctrine of Christ is contained in the Preface to *Libellus*: "Mohammed denies (*negat*) that Christ is the Son of God. He denies that He has died for our sins. He denies that He rose for our Life. He denies that faith in Him remits sin and justifies us. He denies His coming judgment of the living and the dead. Perhaps there is a resurrection of the dead, but he believes in a judgment by God. He denies the Holy Spirit and His gifts." ⁵⁴

The above statement is one of the very few in the writings of Luther which include reference to the Holy Spirit as denied by the Turks. Luther realized that among the Muslim Turks there was no place for the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. To this fact he ascribed the uncertainty and the lack of assurance of salvation among Mohammedans: "Mohammedans, papists, sacramentarians have nothing of this assurance; they do not hold to the Word of God but to their own self-righteousness. Therefore they perform many things, make sacrifices, but they are still always in doubt. Who knows whether God is pleased? Or whether I have done enough? Perhaps I am still unworthy." ⁵⁵

With many medieval scholars, Luther considered the reverence with which the Turk regarded Mohammed as akin to idolatry. Muslim apologists should remember that Luther saw the same danger in the Roman worship of the icons of saints: "How completely the Turk holds our Lord Jesus Christ and His Kingdom for a mere nothing, compared with himself and his Mohammed." ⁵⁶ Or again, "The Turk also does the same thing (as Judges 17:1ff), he names the true God in his worship and means him who created heaven and earth. Likewise do the Jews, Tartars and now all unbelievers. Nevertheless it is all sheer idolatry." ⁵⁷

⁵³ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, No. 5536.

⁵⁴ *Vorwort zu dem Libellus de ritu et moribus Turcorum*, Weimar Ed., XXX, Pt. ii. pp. 207-208.

⁵⁵ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., III, No. 2933 B.

⁵⁶ *Preface to the Prophets*, 1532, Holman Ed., VI, p. 397.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 401.

The Protestant Reformers took as their key "Justification by Faith alone." With this as their standard they judged the religion of others. So Dr. Martin Luther discovered the religion of Catholic, Jew, Muslim and heathen to be faulty. It lacked the truth of the Protestant faith. Luther speaks contemptuously of "Mohammed with his doctrine of works."⁵⁸ That the Muslim religion was a religion of works, was understood by Luther. "He believes that he will become holy and be saved by works."⁵⁹ "It is a papist, sophist, Turkish argument that works merit justification and eternal life."⁶⁰ Luther is correct when he says, "They seek faith through certain merits and works, so that they prescribe certain rules of dress, dietary regulation, fastings and so forth, like the righteousness of Papist and Turk which consists solely in such externals."⁶¹ In so far as the Mohammedan religion is a legalistic religion these charges are correct.

We have already noted the relationship of Islam to the Mosaic religion. In this item of belief, "The Turks have retained many features of the law of Moses, but the good fortune of War and Victory makes him proud and puffed up so that he believes he has a new religion."⁶² The Turks further taught, so Luther believed, that in the keeping of the Law is great reward, that through the teaching of the Law one becomes a Servant of God and saint on the earth."⁶³

According to Luther, the worship of God among Muslims consisted mainly in the keeping of rules and the following of ceremonial regulations: "Their service of God is kept strictly and rigorously with prayers and fastings."⁶⁴ Prayer was to the One, the Only God, Creator of Heaven and of Earth.⁶⁵ In prayer there is orientation of body as well as the spirit. "The saints in the Old Testa-

⁵⁸ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 95.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁶⁰ *Disputation with Palladius and Tilemann*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, i, p. 255. Also with Schmedenstede, XXXIX, ii, p. 189.

⁶¹ *On the Psalms*, Weimar Ed., XL, Pt. iii, p. 409.

⁶² *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., I, No. 904. *cf.* II, *Disputation Against the Antinomists*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, i, p. 480.

⁶³ Sermon on Trinity Sunday 1528, Weimar Ed., XXI, p. 510. *cf.* Sermon Against Turks, Weimar Ed., XXX, pt. ii, p. 170.

⁶⁴ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., I, No. 904.

⁶⁵ *On the Psalms*, Weimar Ed., XL, pt. iii, pp. 124, 126, 338.

ment, when they prayed did not simply pray to God in heaven, but as the Turks and Jews pray today they turned body and mind toward the temple in Jerusalem." ⁶⁶ Luther does not make it clear whether he recognized the difference of orientation in the Qiblah toward Jerusalem by Jews and toward Mecca by Muslims.

On other matters of the religious life and activities of the Turks, Luther was without definite information. He had heard in a roundabout way of Muslim religious chapters and monasteries. ⁶⁷ Probably some report of the dervishes had come to him when he wrote: "The Turks, so I have heard, have priests and pious men who do many things in ecstasy. They are seized and are sometimes thrown prostrate insensible, where, on coming to themselves they speak sublimely and wonderfully. The common folk view these things, and seeking the great men there, of course they think them to be of a special holiness." ⁶⁸ The manifold swearings of the Muslims have already been noted.

The morals of the Turks of Luther's time came in for their lion's share of castigation. In his polemical writings, the Mohammedans are considered to be the worst of liars, murderers, blasphemers, and adulterers. ⁶⁹ However, this merely puts them in the same class as the papists against whom the same charges were laid.

The sinfulness of Turks is arraigned along with that of the papists. "The Turks and papists, because they do not fight or resist sin, but follow and obey, are ignorant or at least do not understand death." ⁷⁰ This sinfulness is traceable to the greed and the lust for wealth which is evident among the Turks. "Where the great God Mammon is strong, there everyone believes and does what he wills, and what he thus believes and does, that must be right." ⁷¹

In less polemic moments, Luther was able to note some virtues in the Turks and the followers of the Prophet. The temporal rule of the Sultan received some praise to the shame of Christian rulers: "It is said there is no better

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

⁶⁷ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 94.

⁶⁸ *I Disputation against Antinomists*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, i, p. 391.

⁶⁹ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 113.

⁷⁰ *II Disputation Against the Antinomists*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, pt. i, p. 496.

⁷¹ *Verlegung des Alcoran Bruder Richardi*, Weimar Ed., LIII, p. 390.

temporal rule anywhere than among the Turks who have neither spiritual nor temporal law, but only their Koran; and we must confess that there is no more shameful rule than among us, with our spiritual and temporal law, so that there is no estate which lives according to the light of nature, still less according to Holy Scripture."⁷² The increase in the Turkish domain is laid to this noble rule and to the allegiance of the people to their sovereign. "Among the Turks they are held best who are diligent to increase the Turkish kingdom."⁷³ "So today the Turk has rule because he rules quite civilly, he preserves peace and punishes criminals."⁷⁴ There may be the possibility that herein Luther "damns with faint praise."

The friendship of Muslim for Muslim was known to Luther, even if from secondhand sources. "It is said that the Turks are among themselves, faithful and friendly and careful to tell the truth. I believe that, and I think that they probably have more fine virtues in them than that."⁷⁵ Among the other virtues he noted was the opposition to images and pictures of God.⁷⁶ Similarly many approving remarks are made concerning their temperance and fasting.⁷⁷ In fine, "In a different spirit from the true teaching of Scripture the Turkish Mohammedanism and the Jewish Talmud, as well as our Anabaptists do good works in order to live, and so they obey and serve the Law of God, they follow and uphold it, and by a hypocritical passion for holiness they strive and labor, fearing to wear coats, to be sullen; they do not drink wine, they love to do great fastings and to speak many and lengthy prayers, etc."⁷⁸

The contemnation of marriage among the Turks disturbed Luther greatly. It was the third of the great charges which he laid against them in his *On War Against the Turks*.⁷⁹ Mohammed, the Koran and the Turks were all adulterous works of the devil. "The Turks are the

⁷² *To The Christian Nobility*, Holman Ed., II, p. 149.

⁷³ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 96.

⁷⁴ *Disputation against Palladius and Tilemann*, Weimar Ed., XXXIX, pt. i, p. 248.

⁷⁵ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 100.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁷⁷ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., Vols. I-VI, *passim*.

⁷⁸ Sermon on Eighth Sunday After Trinity 1544, Weimar Ed., XXII, p. 149.

⁷⁹ Holman Ed., V, p. 99.

people of the wrath of God, 'Tis horrible to see their contempt of marriage. 'Twas not so with the Romans." ⁸⁰ "Such Epicurianism rules even among the Turks that a man does not seek marriage but each takes as many wives as he desires, seizing them and driving them from others, or buying them and leading the women like a horsedealer. They do not know what marriage is!" ⁸¹ The Turks are linked with the celibate clergy as "destroyers of marriage." ⁸² In short, "Mohammed's Koran thinks nothing of marriage, but permits everyone to take wives as he will. Therefore, it is customary among the Turks for one man to have ten or twenty wives and to desert or sell any of them that he will, when he will, so that in Turkey women are held immeasurably cheap and are despised; they are bought and sold like cattle. Although there may be some few who do not take advantage of this law, nevertheless this is the law, and anyone can follow if he will." ⁸³

The attitude of the Turks toward Christians, as Luther viewed it, was one of harsh cruelty and anarchy. "The Turk's Koran or Creed, teaches him to destroy not only the Christian faith, but also the whole temporal government. His Mohammed commands that ruling is to be done by the sword, and in his Koran the sword is the commonest and noblest work." ⁸⁴ To Luther the enmity of the Turk for the Church was not only a matter of literary allusion but was one of practical importance for spiritual and temporal life. Luther believed the end came soon after the Turks, so the Mohammedans are equated by Luther with the sixth angel in the second woe of Revelation. ⁸⁵

The intolerance of the Turk was recognized by Luther. "Although some praise his government because he allows everyone to believe what he will so long as he remains the temporal lord, yet this praise is not true, for he does not allow Christians to come together in public, and no one can openly confess Christ or teach against Mohammed." ⁸⁶

⁸⁰ Wm. Hazlitt, *Table Talk*, DCCCLXXV, p. 355.

⁸¹ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., IV, No. 5116, etc.

⁸² *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., VI, No. 7042, etc.

⁸³ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 99.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

⁸⁵ *Preface to Revelation*, Holman VI, pp. 483-484.

⁸⁶ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 93.

The hatred of Turk for Christian and the lust for cruel revenge was noted by Luther in his writings and reported in his conversations. "Christ's kingdom is a kingdom of grace; Mohammed's is a kingdom of revenge and wrath."⁸⁷ "For the Turk there is no other people so hateful upon the face of the earth as the Christians. He strives against none with more bloodthirstiness than against the Christians."⁸⁸ This hatred gave evidence to itself in the warfare of the Turks. Luther gave due credit to the might of Turkish swords and saw little hope for Germany or Rome to prevail without true repentance and the help of God. "The Turk is a skilled enemy who does not fight by strength and daring, but by deceit and by strategy: He harasses by impeding men, not fighting them. He does not take the offensive or fight unless he is sure of victory."⁸⁹ Luther believed the Turks went into battle against the Christians with the cry "Allah" on their lips.⁹⁰ The Turk martyred in such a struggle was assured of salvation.

Luther believed the ravages of the Turks were unreasonable. They destroyed everything in their way and transported anything or anyone of worth to other lands.⁹¹ This observation is probably nothing less than that which could be said of any warrior lusting for victory and booty in those ancient days and perhaps even in our "enlightened" twentieth century.

Finally, the idea of the Turkish heaven derived from the perusal of Luther's writings is that held by the common man. The descriptions of heaven in the conversations of Luther make it to be a great banqueting scene with much profligate wealth in evidence and with naked women serving both the tables and the lusts.⁹²

In conclusion, we must state that Luther's attitude toward Islam was partly characteristic of the unfair polemic atmosphere of the age, but partly in advance of his age with regard to self-judgment and the urging of tolerance.

⁸⁷ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., II, No. 1516.

⁸⁸ *Sermon Against the Turks*, Weimar Ed., XXX, pt. ii, p. 169.

⁸⁹ *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., II, No. 2706.

⁹⁰ *On War Against the Turks*, Holman Ed., V, p. 101.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 114. cf. *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., II, No. 2752.

⁹² *Tischreden*, Weimar Ed., V, Nos. 5739, 5386, 5728, 5672, etc.

Luther had first-hand knowledge of the Koran, and only a second-hand and inadequate knowledge of other aspects of Islamic and Turkish culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hazlitt, William. *Table Talk of Luther*.
 Holman Edition, *Luther's Works*, 6 vols.
 Treatise on the New Testament that Is the Holy Mass, 1519.
 On Making the Ban, 1520.
 To the Christian Nobility, 1520.
 The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, 1520.
 Treatise on Good Works, 1520.
 In Defense of the Articles of Dr. Martin Luther, 1521.
 On War Against the Turks, 1529.
 Exhortation to the Clergy at Augsburg, 1530.
 Preface to the Prophets, 1532.
 On Councils and Churches, 1539.
 Preface to Revelation, 1545.
- Smith, Preserved, *Letters and Correspondence of Luther*, 1912, 2 vols.
 To Spalatin, December 21, 1518.
 To Philip of Hesse, October 9, 1528.
 To Nicholas Hausman, October 26, 1529.
 To Wenzel Link, October 28, 1529.
 To John Frederick, Elector, February (?), 1530.
- Smith, Preserved, and Gallinger, H. P. *Conversations with Luther*, 1915.
 Weimar Edition. *Luther's Werke*.
 Sermons on the Gospels, 1522, Vol. X, 1925.
 Sermon on Genesis, 1527, Vol. XXIV, 1900.
 Roth's Winterpostille, 1528, Vol. XXI, 1928.
 On War Against the Turks, 1529, Vol. XXX, pt. ii. 1909.
 Sermon Against the Turks, 1529, Vol. XXX, pt. ii. 1909.
 Vorwart zu dem Libellus de ritu et moribus Turcorum, 1530, Vol. XXX,
 pt. ii. 1909.
 On The Psalms, 1532-33, Vol. XL, pt. iii. 1930.
 Disputation with Palladius and Tileman, 1537, Vol. XXXIX, pt. i. 1926.
 Disputation Veste Nuptiali Vitebergae, 1537, Vol. XXXIX, pt. i. 1926.
 I Disputation gegen Antinomer, 1537, Vol. XXXIX, pt. i. 1926.
 II Disputation gegen Antinomer, 1538, Vol. XXXIX, pt. i. 1926.
 III Disputation gegen Antinomer, 1538, Vol. XXXIX, pt. i. 1926.
 Promotions disputation von Schmedenstede, 1542, Vol. XXXIX, pt. ii.
 1932.
 Verlegung des Alcoran Bruder Richardi, 1542, Vol. LIII, 1920.
 Vorrede zu Theodor Bibliander's Koranausgabe, 1543, Vol. LIII, 1920.
 Letzen Worten Davids, 1543, Vol. LIV, 1928.
 Crucigers Summerpostille, 1544, Vol. XXII, 1929.
 Promotionsdisputation von Petrus Hegemon, 1545, Vol. XXXIX, pt.
 ii. 1932.
 Tischreden, Vols. I-VI, 1912-1921.
 Briefe, Vols. I-VIII, 1930-1938.
 On Isaiah Nine, 1543-44, Vol. XL, pt. iii. 1930.
 On Isaiah Fifty-Three, 1544, Vol. XL, pt. iii. 1930.

Hartford, Conn.

C. UMHAU WOLF.

STRONGHOLD OF MUSLIM CHINA¹

Linhsia, which I visited recently, seems to mean very little to most people, even in China, but when we begin to talk about "Hochow," the old name for the same region, everybody who knows anything about China's Northwest pricks up his ears. Though Linhsia is only one of the two thousand odd *hsien* of China, it has won a unique name for itself as the home of Mohammedan rulers and outlaws in the Northwest. It accounts for some seven provincial governors and five divisional corps commanders. The home of Ma Pu-fang, Governor of Chinghai Province, lies sixty *li* west of the *hsien* city (a *li* is about a third of a mile), while that of Ma Hung-k'uei, Governor of Ningsia, is fifty *li* to the southwest, and the two noted villages are only thirty *li* apart. On the other hand, Linhsia, or Hochow, is also known as the hotbed of all the "Mohammedan uprisings." Of these, one proverb observes that there is "a small one every thirty years and a big one every sixty years," while another reduces the time by half.

Apparently the worst struggle of all took place late in the Manchu Dynasty, for the twelfth year of Tung Chin's reign is still on every one's lips. There are no accurate statistics regarding lives lost and damage done, but a total of half a million casualties for both sides is not an exorbitant estimate. The most recent uprising, under Ma Chung-ying, took place as late as 1928, in the seventeenth year of the Chinese Republic. Ma Chung-ying was still in his teens when he started this great conflagration, which spread as far as Sinkiang, and, since he was not only young but also small, he was known as *hsiao ssu ling*, the small commander. As it happens, the colloquialism for "small"

¹ Reprinted, by permission of the Editor, from the December, 1940 issue of *Asia*, New York, N. Y.

in the Northwest is "ka"; hence the common local reference to Ma Chung-ying sounds not unlike "gasoline."

The city of Hochow, about two and a half days' journey by mule caravan from Lanchow, is situated in the middle section of the valley of the Ta Hsia; hence its new name of Linhsia, or, translated à la basic English, "On-the-Bank-of-the-Hsia-River." Labrang, the noted Tibetan center in Kansu Province, lies about two hundred *li* up the river in a westerly direction, while about the same distance down-river, the Hsia and the Tao join the Hwang Ho, or Yellow River, as two of its three chief tributaries. . . . The south suburb, or Muslim section of Linhsia, is equal in size to the rest of the town and is far the most lively part of it; trade seems brisker there and population thicker. The towered roofs of the mosques stand up in clear outline against the horizon. . . . The Labrang trade with the outside world is carried on here by the Mohammedans.

Industry and frugality and a keen business sense seem to be among the strong characteristics of the Muslims. Miserliness is often carried beyond reasonable bounds, and usury is pursued to the extreme. One soon becomes aware of a group solidarity and a dare-devil pluck that are not commonly found among other Chinese communities. Education, however, is particularly backward; illiteracy is almost universal. The clergy make it their business to see to it that none of the children of their congregation go to the ordinary Chinese school, and instead organize classes of their own, in which even little tots are taught the Arabic alphabet written on the hip bone of the sheep.

For decades the effort on both the Mohammedan and the non-Mohammedan side seems to have been toward separation and segregation. Mutual ignorance and suspicion, plus economic pressure and hardship, prepare the stage for "uprisings" which may result from almost any minor irritation. The terrible episode of the eighteen seventies, for instance, is said to have started with an altogether insignificant incident. When the elders in a village in Shensi decided to stage theatricals as an expression of

thanksgiving to the gods, the Mohammedan community would not participate or contribute funds because of their religious principles. This refusal was accepted on the understanding that no Mohammedan would be admitted to the performances. But some Mohammedan children sneaked in and were given a sound beating by the elders. Then their parents and friends came to protest and the cry went abroad that the Muslims had "rebelled." So rebel they did, and bloodshed spread over a large part of the Northwest and continued for almost a decade.

There seems to be every reason for Linhsia to be a thriving town except for these recurrent "uprisings." But ruins in the south suburb as a result of what happened in 1928 are still plainly visible, and people are only too ready to talk about the good old days of prosperous Pa Fang (meaning the "Eight Blocks," another name of the south suburb) before the reign of terror introduced by the Ga-so-line and followed by the Kuominchun, or People's Army. After I had listened to a number of individual stories of the sad struggle, I could not suppress the persistent query, "What has been this man's loss and suffering?"

Linhsia is full of fascinating people. Mr. La Shih Chun, for instance, is the best Mohammedan scholar around Hochow. He is in his seventies and a member of the Kansu Provincial Government Committee. When I called on him, he asked me many questions regarding the attitude of foreign countries toward China and the possibilities of another European war. He even went on to discuss the beauty of Paris. You see, some twenty years ago, when he made his pilgrimage to Mecca, he was wise enough to spend an extra couple of months in travel in Europe. Those who can actually make the *haj* from China are naturally not many, but the annual exodus of even a handful serves as a reminder of a sweeping world-wide movement, and the psychological orientation of the whole Muslim world toward Mecca has brought about a unity of consciousness comparable to that of Catholicism in its more prosperous days. The prevailing fashion of growing long beards

among the Chinese Muslims, for instance, is quite recent and can be traced back to one of the returned pilgrims who enthusiastically urged it as a symbol of unity with Arabia and Egypt. Those of us who have come from the sea-coast and whose contacts with foreign countries have been with the United States and Western Europe require a considerable degree of reorientation in the Northwest when it comes to discussing international affairs.

Ma is such a common surname among the Muslims of the Northwest that the proverb has it, "Out of ten Muslims nine are Ma; he who is not a Ma, is then surely a Ha." The super-magistrate over the five *hsien*, or districts, in the region has this common Muslim surname, and is referred to as Ma Chuan Yuan because of his office. Ma Chuan Yuan, who is in his sixties, but still vigorous, has passed through many uprisings and joined in many a battle. Since he has usually been on the side of law and order, he has been appointed to his present post by the government in recognition of that fact, although he can hardly read and certainly not write. The really interesting thing about my interview with him was his explanation of the strange-sounding language which had greatly perplexed me in the inn in the South Section of Linhsia district, where we had spent the night. According to Ma Chuan Yuan, in the fourteenth century, toward the end of the Yüan Dynasty, the descendants of one of Genghis Khan's clans adopted Islam. This infuriated their kinsmen, who forced them to flee the country. There were probably several hundred of them, and they were not allowed to settle down anywhere until they reached what is now the East Section of Linhsia, a land not of milk and honey, but of thorns and yellow earth. There must be some 100,000 of these Mongol Mohammedans by now (Ma Chuan Yuan is himself one of them) and they have spread into parts of several *hsien*. Life has been hard, and there is no education to speak of. Written language has been entirely forgotten, but all through the six centuries they have clung to the Mongolian spoken language, and even today most of them know only

Mongolian. Ma Chuan Yuan's nephew, for instance, who has attended Nankai Middle School at Tientsin and the Military College at Nanking, told us that he began learning spoken, as well as written, Chinese in school when he was twelve. There you are: a community of one hundred thousand, Mongol by race, Mohammedan by religion and Chinese by culture. What a gold mine of material must be awaiting the patient and competent philologist and ethnologist!

The history of the Mongol Mohammedans reenforces my conviction on the question of the race of the Chinese Muslims. The longer I stay in China's Northwest, the less I know what people mean when they talk about the Chinese "Mohammedan race." To begin with, a large number of Muslims in China are converted Chinese. After one big massacre all of the non-Mohammedan Chinese that were left alive over a whole district adopted Islam. We have even come across several Mohammedan families by the name of Kung—that is, descendants of Confucius. Since Chinese Buddhists do not become Indians and neither are followers of Jesus considered Jews anywhere in the world, why should Chinese Muslims become any the less Chinese? To be sure, there are Muslims in China who are different racially from ordinary Chinese. We have long heard of the Chan Hui, or Turbaned Muslims, of Chinese Turkistan; the Salar Hui of Chinghai are also well known, and here in Hochow we come across the Mongol Hui. These different racial groups and many other minor ones that make up the so-called "Chinese Mohammedan race" are probably no more closely related to one another than are the Germans and English. And the insistence that there is a racial unity among Chinese Mohammedans, with the insinuating suggestion that this unity might well serve as the foundation for an independent political organization, is understandable only as coming from the spokesman of the Japanese military. It is true that the Muslim religion, through its vigorous discipline over the daily life of its adherents and, might we suggest, through its policy of

keeping them in ignorance as far as possible, has brought about a high degree of psychological unity and sense of group dependence. But, after all, the problem of Chinese Muslims is a problem of religion and culture plus a belated and passing phase of military feudalism; and to discuss it from the angle of racial minorities is certainly misleading.

To leave Linhsia without visiting Piehtsang and Hanchiachi, the two villages in the West Section of the district responsible for producing so many generals and governors, would have been inexcusable. With the fine spirited mules and horses that the local garrison commander provided for me and my companion, we made the sixty *li* to Piehtsang in less than five hours. Piehtsang is situated on a hillside, with a streamlet running down below, and with more trees and shrubbery than in any other village in Kansu proper that I have visited. It is the home of the Ma family which has brought forth a whole chain of Governors of Chinghai Province. To differentiate among them, Ma Chi is referred to as the late Governor, Ma Lin, his brother, as the retired Governor, and Ma Pu-fang, who is now in office, as the young Governor. Ma Pu-ching, who is in virtual control of the Kansu Corridor, is an older brother of Ma Pu-fang, and both are sons of Ma Chi.

Ma Lin, who was in retirement and at home, received us and entertained us royally. He is in his sixties and a heavily built man—a kinder person, people seem to think, than most of the rest of the clan. He filled the gap as Governor of Chinghai after his brother's death and before his nephew attained the necessary prestige. In the fall of 1936, young Pu-fang, who probably thought that his uncle had overstayed his time, made things so hot for him that the old uncle found it expedient to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. He has since been made a member of the National Government Committee. In his conversation with us he expressed keen interest in the development of the war against Japan and high admiration of and unwavering loyalty to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. He seemed punctilious in his religious observances, and I could

see for myself that the Ma family mosque was a very handsome structure. Arriving on the same afternoon with us was the Number One steward of the household of the Mongol Prince of Labrang, who had come with a gift of horses to inquire after the health of the retired Governor. This Prince and his household are Mongol by race but have long been assimilated into the more vigorous culture of the Tibetans, even to the point of giving up the Mongolian language in favor of Tibetan. And so the ex-governor's guest-court that day became the meeting place of very mixed cultures.

Hanchiachi is a much bigger village than Piehtsang and the home of a series of Governors of Ningsia Province. In the days of the Manchu Dynasty Ma Fu-lu was an officer in charge of a brigade of Mohammedan soldiers, and during the Boxer Uprising in 1900 he died fighting in Peking. The command was transferred to his brother Ma Fu-hsiang, who, in the early days of the Chinese Republic, served as Governor of Anhwei and Mayor of Tsingtao. Ma Hung-k'uei, the present Governor of Ningsia, is the son of Ma Fu-hsiang, while Ma Hung-pin, the Commander of the Eighty-fourth Army Corps, is the son of Ma Fu-lu. And all these Ma's come from Hanchiachi. Governor Ma Hung-k'uei is a more traveled man than the average: in fact, his upbringing and background are much more of China proper than of the Northwest. His home in Hanchiachi has long been uninhabited and has fallen into disrepair, and the family mosque is nothing remarkable either. But he has founded a whole group of schools, in memory of his father, which are the best in the district.

The day I was to leave Linhsia happened to be one of the two big Mohammedan festivals of the year, known as the festival of the "Killing of the Sheep," and I was happy to be invited to attend a great open-air service, which made a fitting climax to my trip to this Mohammedan district. I left the city with the prayerful wish that peace and prosperity might reign there, for both Muslims and non-believers alike.

SHIAH ISLAM¹

Islam in the light of Shiahism may be briefly stated for the benefit of the readers, as it is Shiahs alone who have continued all these thirteen hundred years to preserve, uninfluenced by political and dynastic considerations, the teachings and directions of the great Arabian World Teacher in their original purity. No one who realises the immense potentiality of the Prophet's universally admitted tradition known as Hadis Saqlain² can doubt for a moment that to remain on the right path of Islam in order to get salvation the Prophet had directed the Muslims to remain closely attached to the Quran and his Ahlul-Bait. The Shiah faith is based on this sure foundation and after the Prophet the Shiahs regard the Quran and the Prophet's chosen family alone as the rightful guide and none else. It is in pursuance of the Prophet's directions that the Shiahs regard the noble Ali, son of Abi Talib, as the immediate Khalif and the spiritual successor of the Prophet, being the Imam (leader) of the world and the guide chosen by God about whom the Prophet had, on the well-known occasion of the feast of Ashira proclaiming his prophetship, declared that "Ali is my brother and the executor of my will. He is my Khalifa amongst you. Listen to him and obey him."³

On the historical occasion of the halt at Ghadir when the Prophet was returning from his last pilgrimage to Mecca the Master in view of his approaching end took advantage of the large following to announce formally that Ali was the leader of those whose leader was the Prophet

¹ Reprinted without change from *The Muslim Review*, Lucknow, India, vol. XXVI, No. 2, February, 1940, pp. 16-23, by the courteous permission of the Editor, S. Abid Husain Naqavi, B.A., B.L.

² See *Niabiul Moaddat*, published in Constantinople, pages 38 and 39.

³ *Kanzul Amal*, Vol. 6, pages 392 to 397 published at Dairat al-Ma'arif, Hyderabad (Deccan).

and delivered the well-known passage in the Quran to the effect that that day the religion had been completed, clearly indicating that the Prophet had by the will of God appointed Ali to be after him the leader of the world. This announcement of Ali's succession to the headship of Islam for the future guidance of the people had been the occasion for the Quranic declaration there and then that by that action Islam had reached the stage of perfection. Therefore the belief in the succession and spiritual guidance of Ali and the Prophet's inspired descendants is an essential condition of adherence to complete or perfected Islam. Obviously there is no sense in allying one's self to its imperfect part and seeking perfection of guidance therefrom. The Hashmites and the Prophet's family and dependents believed in this perfected chain of Islam. Even the religiously minded prominent companions of the Prophet held the same conviction. This was the teaching and the guidance of the noble Prophet under inspiration from the All-wise, All-knowing God. This alone is the right path of guidance, as the innumerable traditions of the Arabian Master indicate to an unprejudiced mind anxious to find out the truth and the straight road to salvation.

The Shiah version of Islam holds reason and rationality in the domain of religion to be the guiding factor. Rationality and the *Shariat* altogether tally with each other.

The belief about God is that he has ever been in existence, does not need anybody's aid or assistance, and is the One that has no partner. He has knowledge of everything howsoever small or great and has power over all the creation. He has no body or its component parts. He does not enter into other's body. He does not possess a form nor can He be seen from eyes or hinted at from gesture. He has no progeny nor is He Himself born from something else. The belief in more than one God in whatever form or shape it may be is wholly untenable. Matter and spirit, light and darkness, angels and the others are His creation. The oldest of all is God alone.

Except Him all are His creation. God is just and is the embodiment of all that is good. He is free from defects and blemishes. His actions are based on wisdom and good policy. None of His doings is either meaningless or superfluous or based on a wrong line. He conferred power of action and initiative on mankind, who are free agents of their action for the exercise of that power conferred upon them. They alone are responsible for its right and wrong application. They are not a helpless set driven contrary to their will in a wrong direction. God does not inflict wrong upon any one nor does He withhold from any one the fruit of his action or labour.

For the guidance of the creation, God has sent from time to time messengers, who from the moment of their existence to death were all sinless persons. The appointment of such messengers is the special gift of God. The created cannot raise some one to that dignity. Such messengers of God used to be superior to all men of their times in point of culture. We believe in the happenings of miracles which mean an abnormal occurrence. The proof that one had been a true messenger of God could only be in his time by means of miracles and later by continuous traditions. The Prophetship of the last and the final messenger of God is also proved by the same set of reasons and evidences which the votaries of other religions employ to prove the authenticity of their devoted messengers. The Holy Prophet of Arabia, Muhammed (may the blessings of God be upon him and his descendants) was the last of the prophets who put before the world God's final message for perpetual guidance in a code to suit the needs of all ages and climes. This final message brought by the last and the greatest of prophets, who was the best of all the creation, is to remain in force till the Day of Judgment. His religion is Islam, which was also the religion of all the preceding prophets. The changes from time to time which were made were due to the needs and requirements of the times. The message finally delivered by the Arabian Prophet will not be abolished or

replaced nor will another prophet come till eternity. Any one who puts forward a claim or any plea to be a prophet or messenger is a liar and a cheat. The other books that were sent by God prior to the Quran for the guidance of mankind, were all true and sacred. But unfortunately none of the inspired books except the Quran have remained in their original purity.

After the Arabian master, the system of his succession in the Khilafat and Imamatus (leadership) was confined to twelve persons, namely Ali and his descendants, who like our Prophet were all sinless and the preservers of his religion. They were all chosen by God to the office of succession to the Prophet and the Shiahs believe that in the same manner as it is the exclusive discretion of God to choose a prophet who is superior in merits and culture to all the persons of his times, the choice of such prophet's spiritual successors also rests exclusively with God. The appointment of the Prophet's successor for the exalted office of Khalifa by the choice of mankind cannot be either fair or reasonable. How could the populace be competent to make the right choice by election or nomination to an office the decrees of which office they were not competent to pass? It is obvious that the laws of the divine religion and the interpretations of the Quran and the Prophet's numerous traditions could not be left safely in the hands of the men in the street. The wisdom of the Divine mission was safe in the keeping of the Prophet who was the city of knowledge and Ali who was the gate of the city.⁴ The successors to, and the executors to the will of, the preceding prophets had been appointed by those prophets with the inspiration of God. Similarly the last of the Prophets appointed his own successors and the executors of his will, who were as follows in order of succession:

1. 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, the cousin and first disciple of the Prophet, assassinated by ibn Muljim at Kufa, A.H. 40 (A.D. 661).

⁴ This is the substance of a well-known tradition of the Prophet.

2. Hasan, son of 'Ali and Fatima, born A.H. 2, poisoned by order of Mu'awiya I, A.H. 50 (A.D. 670).

3. Husain, son of 'Ali and Fatima, born A.H. 4, killed at Kerbala on Muharram 10th A.H. 61 (Oct. 19th, A.D. 680).

4. 'Ali son of Husain and Shahrbanu (daughter of Yezdigird the last Sasanian king), generally called Imam Zeynul 'Abidin, poisoned by Walid.

5. Muhammad Bakir, son of the above-mentioned Zeynul 'Abidin and his cousin Umm 'Abdi'llah, the daughter of Imam Hasan, poisoned by Ibrahim ibn Walid.

6. Ja'far-i-Sadik, son of Imam Muhammad Bakir, poisoned by order of Mansur, the 'Abbaside Caliph.

7. Musa Kazim, son of Imam Ja'far-i-Sadik, born A.H. 129, poisoned by order of Harunur-Rashid in A.H. 183.

8. 'Ali ibn Musa er-Riza, generally called Imam Riza, born A.H. 153, poisoned near Tus in Khurasan by order of the Caliph Ma'mun in A.H. 203, and buried at Mesh-hed, which derives its name and its sanctity from him.

9. Muhammad Taki son of Imam Riza, born A.H. 195, poisoned by the Caliph Mu'stasim at Baghdad in A.H. 210.

10. 'Ali Naki, son of Imam Muhammad Taki, born A.H. 213, poisoned at Surra-man-Ra'a A.H. 254.

11. Hasan 'Askari, son of Imam 'Ali Naki, born A.H. 232, poisoned in A.H. 260.

12. Muhammad, son of Imam Hasan 'Askari and Narjis Khatun, also called "Imam Mahdi," "Hujjatu 'llah" ("the Proof of God,") "Bakiyyatu 'llah" ("the Remnant of God,") and "Kaim-i-al-i-Muhammad" ("He who shall arise of Muhammad.") He bore not only the same name but the same Kunya—Abu'l-Kasim—as the Prophet, and it is not lawful for any other to bear this name and this Kunya together. He was born at Surra-man-Ra'a, A.H. 255 and succeeded his father in the Imamate A.H. 260.

These were the responsible God-ordained successors whose lead and authority was binding on the faithful. The authority of men chosen by the citizens for the performance of the duties of a spiritual office could not in reason and fairness be binding on all Muslims. Such a choice in the case of a mundane potentate or the head of a kingdom may be relevant but not for the high office of the Prophet's succession to propagate and defend the new faith by reason and rationality; and good conscience and culture. There have been only fourteen sinless persons in Mohammed's Islam *viz.*, the Prophet and his daughter, Fatima and Ali and his eleven descendants in the order of spiritual succession noted above, who from Ali downwards were all the vice-regents of the Prophet and the executors of his will in the domain of the religion. It is a blasphemy to incorporate any or all of these fourteen blessed personalities with God in any sense or to any extent. It is equally damning to regard as prophet any of them except the Prophet himself. Similarly it is nothing but misguidance to be inimical to these saintly descendants of and the spiritual successors to the Prophet. To lower them from their dignity or to treat them as inferior in any respect to their contemporaries is a sure sign of misguidance from the straight road of salvation in Islam. Their enemy is a pagan and not a Muslim. The Jew, ibn Saba, who called Ali a god, was a Kafir and the Shiahs regard him as a non-believer in Islam. Any effort to raise these divinely chosen Imams above their rightful rank merits as much grave condemnation as an effort to reduce them from their place in the creed.

The Shiahs regard with honour and respect due to their exalted position as mothers of the faithful such wives of the Prophet who were obedient to the Prophet and God. Such companions of the noble Prophet who have been praised in the Holy Quran and whom the Prophet held in esteem and affection, are held in high honours by the Shiahs who hold themselves aloof from only such companions who played false and earned the

condemnation of God and the Prophet for their double dealing.

It is right to believe in the Day of Judgment.

The Shiahhs strongly believe that the exalted office of the prophet has never been conferred upon a Kafir or an idolator, a tyrant or a sinner nor amongst the forefathers of the whole line of prophets and messengers any one has been a Kafir. Similarly the forefathers of the Prophet's Khalifas (successors and vice-regents) have all been unitarians and Muslims.

We believe that the Meraj attained by our Prophet was a personal one.

We also hold the belief that prophets and their spiritual vice-regents and successors, called Imams, did not receive knowledge from any human being other than prophets and Imams and that the knowledge possessed by them was a gift from God.

The Shiahhs consider it an essential qualification in the person who leads a congregational prayer, that he should be a just man. They do not allow a person indulging openly in vices and sins to lead the public prayer.

The Shiahhs treat Ka'aba as the House of God towards which direction they pray.

The Quran they regard as the guide in all walks of life. It is a revealed book and the living miracle of the noble Prophet the like of which has been neither accomplished by any one else nor is to be reproduced ever.

Holy shrines and noble tombs they deem as objects of respect and not in conflict with religion, for prayer and submission is to God alone. Respect shown to the graves and tombs of prophets and spiritual leaders, who worked and died in promulgating and practising divine teachings does not amount to worship. Mourning for the Prophet's second grandson, Imam Husain, is a special feature of theirs. They regard the sufferings of Imam Husain and the other Imams of the House of the prophet as the misfortunes of Islam, which they naturally lament as events responsible for having misdirected Musalmans into ways

and beliefs not in consonance with the Quranic teachings about peace and good-will and the Prophet's clear directions and express guidance.

Shiahs do not take the oath of allegiance towards any holy man or religious priest. They hold such a submission is due alone to the Prophet and the Imams of the House of the Prophet. They do not uplift Muslim Kings and potentates to the dignity of the Prophet's Khalifa or God's vice-regent.

In the absence of the Imam, they regard it unlawful to engage in a holy war (Jihad). It is only permissible to them during such absence to defend themselves and their rights and possessions against an aggression.

A. F. BADSHA HUSAIN, B.A.

The Rise of Modern Turkey

In a lengthy review of John Parker's *Modern Turkey*, by a British Orientalist, the writer gives a summary of the astonishing changes that have taken place, and of the leadership behind these changes:

"Of all the Central Powers in the last war Turkey alone has profited. Hungary and Bulgaria have stood still, Austria has committed suicide and Germany has lost her soul. Turkey, under the inspiring leadership of her 'Father Turk,' has regenerated herself. An English officer, who speaks excellent Turkish, and occupied a post under the pre-war Turkish Government, went out the other day to organize earthquake relief. On his return he declared that he was astounded at the change which twenty-six years had wrought in the mentality of Turkish officials.

"Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was no sentimental philanthropist. A fellow-countrywoman who knew him well described him as 'cynical, materialistic, ambitious, heartless, variable, superstitious, utterly unscrupulous and satanically shrewd.' Hard as nails, all his defects were redeemed by his love for his country and his determination to raise Turkey to the place in the world to which the qualities of her people entitled her. He did not aim at the conquest of other peoples. In his famous speech he said: 'History shows no example of the success of a policy of pan-Islamism or pan-Turanianism. The policy indicated for us by history, science, reason and logic is a national policy; that it to say, first of all to aim at the true happiness and prosperity of the country and nation, and to rely on our own strength to preserve our existence within our national frontiers; not to weary the people with distant aims, but to look for humane and civilized treatment and reciprocal friendship from the civilized world.'"

BOOK REVIEWS

Not to Me Only. By Caleb Frank Gates. Princeton University Press, Princeton. pp. 340. \$3.00.

Like the great Apostle, the author of this exceedingly interesting and modest autobiography has fought a good fight, finished a great missionary task and kept the faith. So he, too, is justly confident of that crown which, as Paul said, is given, "Not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing." The title of the book, its touching dedication to Mrs. Gates, the companion of many years, and the golden thread of a dauntless faith that unites all the chapters are appropriate to this record of a half-century of stalwart service.

We cannot understand a man unless we know his environment. Biography is a thread, but history is a web in which time is broad as well as long. In less than sixteen pages, the author records the first twenty-four years of his life. Then follow three sections, or parts, which deal with Turkey in the reign of Abd ul-Hamid, through war and revolution, and the building of a new nation. Dr. Gates is best known as the former president of Robert College in Istanbul; before that, of Euphrates College at Harput and as one who was missionary, not only in relief work but as a missionary-diplomat in trying days. He arrived in Turkey at a time when religious liberty was unknown. "Missionaries had first entered Turkey hoping to lead Moslems to accept the Christian religion, but Mohammedan religious sentiments were so strong that converts from Islam were in danger of death, either by official action or through mob violence."

But his life spans the period which ushered in the new republic. "Suppression, destruction, reconstruction. These three words describe the periods of Turkish history during the fifty-one years of my residence in that country. The years from 1881-1894 were a period of suppression in which Abd ul-Hamid did everything in his power to obstruct reform. The period of destruction, from 1894 to 1924, began with the massacres and ended with the exchange of populations. Reconstruction could begin only after the débris of the Ottoman Empire had been cleared away. The story of the winning of the Republic is the last chapter of the tale of destruction and the preface to a new era."

During these three periods, we have the work of a distinguished educator, an unofficial diplomat and one who was always and everywhere a true Christian and friend of Moslems. Through locust plagues, massacres, deportations, a world war, the revolution and the building of a new nation, he played a part of heroism and obedience against insuperable obstacles and frequently was in personal danger. The book deals with epochs rather than mere events. Dr. Gates had warm sympathy for the Oriental churches and pays a deserved

tribute to the maligned Armenian people. There is, perhaps, too little on Islam as a formative influence in old Turkey. On the other hand, we meet teachers, engineers, statesmen and civic leaders who bear witness to the influence of missionary life in the Near East. Dr. Gates prepared for the rebuilding of Turkey long before Mustafa Kemal appeared on the horizon. The last chapter tells of Dr. Gates' visit to Robert College on the seventy-fifth anniversary of its founding when he received the honor that was due him and the joy of witnessing the extraordinary changes in the land of his adoption. This autobiography is remarkable because it has no portraits, nor illustrations, but the index is excellent and the cover maps are clear. This courageous story of life in Turkey before the revolution will bring heartening reassurance in these dark days of disillusionment to all who hope that liberty and truth will yet rule, not only throughout the Near East but throughout the world.

New York City.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER.

Al-Farooq; a Life of Omar the Great, the Second Caliph of Islam.

Vol. I, by Maulana Shibli Numani: translated by Zafar Ali Khan. Lahore, Muhammad Ashraf Co., 1939. pp. xxvii, 306, with folding map.

It would perhaps be a profitable task to assemble from the early Arab books of Biography, Traditions, Jurisprudence, etc., the material concerning 'Umar, and attempt, after sifting this mass of varied material by the critical methods of modern historical research, to see what picture we could reconstruct of this powerful figure who for a number of years dominated the scene of early Islam. The picture we have of him in the histories is so overlaid by legend and pious embellishment that it is often difficult to see the real man, and almost impossible to decide what his peculiar contributions to the new State really were. When in later years it became the practice of piety to attribute the beginnings of everything not attributable to the Prophet himself to the four Rightly Guided Caliphs, and make them the early exponents of all the features that developed with the growth of Islam, 'Umar came in for an unusual share of this accretion, which has further distorted the picture.

The Life of 'Umar by Shibli Nu'mānī is not a critical work, but a popular digest of the familiar material of the Arabic historians, interspersed with some reflections and some apologetic in view of the changed tastes and attitudes of a modern age. It appeared originally in Urdu, and the first part is here offered to the general public in an English dress. The Publisher's note in introducing the work, is somewhat unfair to it, for it raises expectations by telling us that the author ransacked the Libraries of Constantinople, Beirut, Alexandria (he probably means Cairo), Paris, Berlin and London, for his material, and so leads us to anticipate new material. In this first volume, however, there is not a fact of importance utilized that is not well known from printed Arabic texts, and indeed there are a great number of texts available in print which do not seem to have been utilized at all in the compilation.

The author has a great enthusiasm for 'Umar, and gives rein to his enthusiasm. This first volume, however, deals for the most part with the Life of the Prophet and the Annals of the Early

Caliphate, in which 'Umar, of course, was vitally concerned, but which are nevertheless narrated from the traditional point of view, and not from that which one would expect in a biography of 'Umar himself.

The mistakes in Arabic words are very numerous, though this may be due to the translator rather than to the original author, for in the Urdu text they would for the most part appear, one assumes, in their original Arabic form.

The printing and general get-up of the book are excellent, and are a great credit to the enterprising House of Sheikh Muhammad Ashraf of the Kashmiri Bazaar in Lahore, who has done so much for Islamic studies in recent years.

*Columbia University,
New York City.*

ARTHUR JEFFERY.

Sons of Sinbad: An Account of Sailing with the Arabs in their Dhows, in the Red Sea, around the Coasts of Arabia, and to Zanzibar and Tanganyika: Pearl-ling in the Persian Gulf: and the Life of the Shipmasters, the Mariners and Merchants of Kuwait. By Alan Villiers. Illustrated with Photographs and Charts by the author. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940. pp. 429. \$3.75.

The title of this book recalls the fact that Arabs sailed the seven seas long before Columbus discovered America; the sub-title is an accurate summary of its contents.

Alan Villiers is an American who had the cordial help of British officials; he was named Sheikh Majid by the Arab sailors from a tradition that the explorer Vasco da Gama's pilot was an Arab of that name. He knows more of navigation and geography than of Arabic but most of all he knows human nature and like Freya Stark loves the Arab in spite of Bedouin squalor, filth and fatalism. The story is as realistic and outspoken as is Dr. Harrison's recent volume "Doctor in Arabia." The author is in the succession of Doughty, St. John Philby, Bertram Thomas and other travellers in Arabia. Yet he is in a class by himself because his observations are of the Arab at sea and not of the Arab on shore. From Aden he takes us in a great dhow—of 150 tons burden—to the coasts of Hadramaut, Italian Somaliland and the African coast ports to Zanzibar. Then follows his three thousand mile zigzag journey up the Persian Gulf to Kuwait. And why did he go? "It seems to me, having looked far and wide over twenty years of a seafaring lifetime, that as pure sailing craft carrying on their unspoiled ways, only the Arab remained. Only the Arab remained making his voyages as he always had, in a wind-driven vessel sailing without benefit of engines. Only the Arab still sailed his wind ships over the free sea, keeping steadfastly to the quieter ways of a kinder past I had always been interested in Arab dhows, and always admired the Arab for the fine independence and the quiet good manners of his well-adjusted life."

Without chart, barometer or clock the Arab captain seemed to know every strip of beach and rock, and his skill in navigation was superb even in the monsoon storms. "We were sunburned, hungry, tired; I knew little Arabic and understood almost nothing of the gibberish those Yemenite sailors spoke." But this was at the

outset and in the Red Sea. No other writer has ever described such a voyage of Sinbad as we have in this volume with its fifty superb full-page illustrations. Accurate in his observations, colorful in his style and always sympathetic to the Arab-sailors the author holds the attention of the reader and to this reviewer he brought back vivid memories of similar coastal voyages fifty years ago. The day always begins with prayer, by all on board. An infidel might suffer Jonah's fate. "There was no hypocrisy in these strong faces which looked toward Mecca. It was obvious that their religion was a real and living thing . . . a form of very real communion with a very real God." The Moslem Friday sabbath was never observed at sea. Some of the sailors would chant the Koran from memory, but all of them on shore seemed to forget its precepts. The ports of call were temptation or revelation.

At Zanzibar Mr. Villiers saw the effect of an American cinema on the Arab mind. "The picture of life which was given in that film was both sick and sickening. With Nejdi beside me making caustic comments and asking awkward questions, the real significance came home to me. It was more than a poor show: it was a damaging mirror held up to us all. And it was a very poor commentary to be shown there to an audience of Indians and Arabs, most of whom were as bewildered as Nejdi."

In addition to many human documents and studies of sturdy honest, amusing, fantastic or villainous characters the book contains a mass of accurate information on everything nautical and of Arab life at sea. It is therefore inexcusable that there is no index. But if you seek adventure strange and engrossing, far from the wars of the western world and its restless confusion, this is your book.

New York City.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER.

The New Spirit in Arab Lands. By H. I. Katibah. New York, 1940. pp. 320. \$3.00.

Dealing with Arab lands—the heart of Islam—this book scrutinizes the pre-war landscape, and surveying the present-day structure seeks to face the wave of the future. All who study the Near East, the Moslem world and Islamic-Christian relations will find here thought-provoking material. Among the drawbacks of the work is the surprising lack of harmony between the parts. Indeed one misses an all-embracing thesis weaving together the many threads of the narrative. Essentially the twenty chapters are a series of somewhat discordant studies, varying in merit and incoherently bound together. It is true that the author claims no authority in the fields on which he draws, but examination of the source material utilized leaves the impression that a good deal of "collecting" was done at random. The construction of the apparatus and index is anything but scientific.

It is doubtful whether the Arab cause is served through apologetic composition. Nor can censure of the West alone help absolve the Arabic-speaking peoples from their errors. To remedy ruinous policies, to rectify the wrongs of the past and to end age-long schisms is not achieved by minimizing the seriousness of those issues upon which hinges the national and international destiny of the Arabs.

The preaching of the Christian message in Arab lands meets in the book with half-hearted approval that soon lapses into an enigmatic, if not hostile, attitude. To be sure, Christian missions are accorded the recognition that they stood in the forefront of progressive movements. But the author hastens to remind us that "it was a Christianity channelized and organized by the help of science and a new gospel of cooperation that inspired the Arab masses" (p. 40 bottom). In discussing the origins of the Arab re-awakening there is no hint in what Mr. Katibah writes that Napoleon's expedition to Egypt was of any significance. The author cautiously evades any commitments as to the limitations upon freedom imposed by the nascent nationalism. One learns, for instance, that the minority groups looked askance at the rising tide of patriotism, but is not told whether there is any basis in fact for the reluctance in Lebanon and elsewhere to espouse the pan-Arab doctrine. These and kindred phases of the "new spirit" deserve more thorough elucidation than the author gives, since they shed light on the nature and reality of things. Compensation for this defect can hardly be found in the excursus on Zionism. Throughout the volume, published privately by the author (303 Fifth Avenue, New York City), one encounters divers manifestations of faulty style and careless proof-reading. If upon these and other grounds the book is denied a place among first-rate performances, other qualifications would, nevertheless, compel one to thank the author for his courageous attempt to pioneer in a field where contemporary writing leaves much to be desired.

*Princeton Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N. J.*

EDWARD J. JURJI.

Offenbarung nur in der Bibel, by Johannes Witte. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937. pp. 34. RM 1.20.

In this brochure, the author tries to answer some of the objections raised against his book, *Die Christus-Botschaft und die Religionen* (1936). Witte takes, with Luther, the position that the non-Christian religions, according to the judgment of the New Testament are only "Irrtum und Irrweg, Schuld und Verderben." He disagrees with Schlunk, who maintains that the revelation of God is traced historically through creation, redemption, and sanctification; Witte, on the other hand, differentiates between revelation and the *Wirken* of God. Although God has revealed himself in creation and in the conscience, yet Witte maintains that man in consequence of his sin was not capable of recognizing God in this revelation. Thus he practically denies a general revelation and natural theology. Yet what shall we do about such eloquent passages as Ps. 19: 1-4; Isa. 40: 12-17; Job 38-41? In his opinion, God has spoken only in the Bible, both in the Old and in the New Testament. "In dieser Heilsgeschichte hat sich Gott offenbaret, *nur in ihr*" (p. 30). Christianity is a unique religion, and according to Witte, Christ is the only guarantee that there is a God, and through Him alone can we know God. Only in the Bible does our writer find true monotheism. At the same time, while he finds so little value in other religions, he might have mentioned the fact that the investigations of Father Wilhelm Schmidt

and others among various primitive cultures have clearly shown that monotheism was the earliest form of religion. We heartily endorse his faith in the Bible as the Word of God and his insistence on salvation through Christ. At the same time, it seems evident that God had witnesses in other nations besides Israel, and that even the heathen have a limited knowledge of Him. In this connexion, we may think of the words of Saint Peter (Acts 10:34-35): "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."

Princeton N. J.

HENRY S. GEHMAN

Persian Painting. From Miniatures of the XIII-XVI. Centuries, with an introduction by Basil Gray. Iris Books. Oxford University Press, New York, Toronto, 1940. Folio, pp. 13 text, 12 color plates. \$2.75.

Mr. Basil Gray, who is the author of various books and articles on Persian miniatures and co-author of the well-known scholarly treatise *Persian Miniature Paintings*, now presents us this charming and concise study. In the short introduction, which precedes the descriptions of the twelve color plates, he analyses the essential characteristics of the different schools of painting, and draws an interesting analogy between the development of Persian poetry and Persian painting. Judging from available material, he reaches the conclusion that Persian painting was "two or three hundred years behind poetry in reestablishing itself after the break in national culture caused by the Arab conquest." In the absence of earlier examples of Persian painting, i.e., paintings imbued with early national characteristics, which were prevalent during the Sāmānid and Ghaznavid periods, this statement will probably remain unchallenged. There are, however, a few early paintings that reveal certain perfections in style and exhibit certain mannerisms in composition which are undoubtedly of Iranian origin. For instance the miniatures of the Kitāb-i Samak-i 'Ayyār in the Bodleian Library are good examples of this early Iranian style. Two of the three volumes of this rare manuscript were exhibited in the London Exhibition of 1931, and three of its miniatures have been reproduced.

The date assigned to the miniatures of the Kitāb-i Samak by Messrs. Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray (c. 1200) seems reasonable. Dr. Ernst Kühnel considers the manuscript to be contemporary with the early works of the Baghdād School, but does not question its Iranian origin. His chief reason in dating it about fifty years later (c. 1250), is that the cloud patterns and other details of the miniatures betray certain Mongolian influences. But is it not possible that these Mongolian elements, which are essentially Chinese, might have crept in long before the invasion of Chingiz Khan? We know from reliable historical sources that the Seljūqs and their successors who ruled in Iran, such as the Atābeks of Azerbaijan, the Siphahbuds of Mazanderan, and the Khwārazmshāhīs of Khiva, all sustained commercial as well as cultural relations with China.

Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray have assigned the miniatures of

the Kitāb-i Samak to West Persia without naming any specific school,¹ while Kühnel attributes them to the Seljūq School.² To whatever school they are ascribed, there is one thing of which we are certain, and that is their Iranian origin. It is true that the assignment of a definite style of painting to the works of this early period depends entirely upon the discovery of further and earlier material, but Mr. Gray's statement that "no style was established before the 14th century," is questionable and remains to be seen. Perhaps for reasons which have not been set forth, Mr. Gray has deliberately omitted the paintings of the Kitāb-i Samak and those found in other early manuscripts. The inclusion of at least one of these paintings and a brief reference in the text to its origin would have been very helpful.

The twelve reproductions in color were selected by Dr. Hans Zbinden with the advice of Mr. Gray and Mr. Stchoukine, and consist of three Persian paintings in the British Museum, two in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, one in the Bibliothèque Egyptienne, Cairo, one in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, two in the collection of Sir Bernard Eckstein, Bart., Uckfield, and three in the collection of M. Henri Vever, Paris. The color work has been handled on the whole with great skill and gives a clear picture of the beauty of the originals and produces a charming effect.

The notes to the plates have been written by Mr. Gray himself and are very informative and reliable. The long vowel marks and other signs of the consonants have been omitted from the transliteration of Persian and Arabic words, but the *hamzah* and the *'ayn* in most cases have been correctly inserted.

This handsome volume will be useful to the scholar as well as to the layman, and is within the reach of a modest budget. The author is to be congratulated for the publication of this valuable study.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

M. A. SIMSAR.

Everyday Arabic. By H. M. Nahmad and C. Rabin, Ph.D., Dipl. O.S., with a preface by Professor H. A. R. Gibb. London, J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1940; Philadelphia, Pa., The David McKay Company, 604-8 South Washington Square. pp. 99. 5s.

This work contains "conversations in Syrian and Palestinian Arabic with word lists, a helpful introduction and remarks on the pronunciation and grammar of the Syrian colloquial." The conversations are in roman transliteration with English translation on the opposite page, after the fashion of foreign language books accompanying phonograph lesson records. The book does not present the literary Arabic of public address or broadcast nor does it teach the reading and writing of Arabic. It provides material for instruction by ear and tongue. A trained Palestinian or Syrian teacher could use the book to advantage, as could others who know classical Arabic and wish to learn the colloquial.

Lessons teaching a language, whether the student's own or a foreign tongue, should conform to the grammatical organization of

¹ See Laurence Binyon, J. V. S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, *Persian Miniature Painting*, pp. 41-42, pls. XII-XIII, Oxford University Press, London, 1933.

² See Arthur Upham Pope, *A Survey of Persian Art*, vol. III, p. 1830; vol. V, pl. 815 A, Oxford University Press, London and New York, 1938-39.

the language and present it progressively. The first sentences should be short and simple in structure, declarative, negative and interrogative in kind. The lessons should present the elements of the language in their natural groups; all of the nominative pronouns, for instance, should be given together, to help the student to learn that they have a common use. Similarly the forms of the various tenses of the verb should be kept together, to exhibit their similarity and facilitate their application to other root combinations. Formal grammar offers a lifeless method of language instruction, while conversation lessons are usually hit-and-miss affairs. This review advocates the progressive presentation of the natural grammatical structure of a language through normal conversation about common matters.

E. E. C.

Days of our Years. By Pierre van Paassen. New York, Hillman-Curl, Inc., 1939. pp. v, 520.

It may seem strange to readers of *THE MOSLEM WORLD* to encounter a review of this kind of book within its covers. But the vivid panorama of life in our time spread on its pages will have special interest because of the inclusion of many scenes from Moslem countries and communities. Pictures of Damascus, of the region around Lake Chad, of Palestine and Egypt, are some of those which may be viewed here. Graphic as these scenes are, they can not compare with the impressive realism of the description of life in the Near East, drawn with bold strokes by an accurate and observing reporter.

Here one can find descriptions of a Moslem in contemplation (as at page 261); of the distressing moral conditions prevalent in the hinterland (as at pages 322f.); or, if one is seeking for *mirabilia*, there is the letter, shown to the writer by the abbot of an Ethiopian Church, which purports to have been written by the Prophet himself, and which seeks to prove the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin! The pictures of political life, and of relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine (pp. 363f), make lively reading, although they are probably somewhat tendentious. They are colored with unusual personal details, of which the interview with the "Grand Mufti" of Jerusalem (pp. 363f) is an example.

This work has recently passed into a second, enlarged, edition. It is a worthwhile review of men and events, and may be commended to readers who can appreciate a book which has some strong passages, and not a few of great beauty.

*Lutheran Theological Seminary,
Philadelphia, Pa.*

GEORGE R. SELTZER.

Stripling. By Youel B. Mirza. New York, Wilfred Funk, 1940. pp. 319. \$2.50.

The author has written several juvenile books of fiction with their plots laid in the Near East, drawing on his boyhood memories of the Assyrian villages of Northwest Persia for local color. The editor comments enthusiastically on Mr. Mirza's familiarity with Near Eastern languages and his ability to translate colloquialisms into English which maintains the flow and flavor of the native tongue.

Perhaps the generous use of "inshallah," as Mr. Mirza transliterates this common Arabic phrase is evidence of this. However, unfortunately, the author seems to have confused the various invocations of "allah," bringing them all together as "inshallah." Perhaps the bald reference to ordinarily veiled sexual subjects is more convincing evidence of the author's acquaintance with the Near East. This book would seem to be an unconvincing and misleading volume to both the casual reader and the scholar.

New York City.

HERRICK B. YOUNG.

The Philosophy of Silence. By Alice Borchard Greene, Ph.D. New York, Richard R. Smith. pp. 254. \$2.50.

The Western world today is far more interested in violent action than in deep reflection or silence as a means to constructive ends. The din of war and the voice of strife here find a powerful antidote to those who will receive it. The title of the book arouses curiosity and its contents challenge thought. The author has read widely in the vast literature of Mysticism and the bibliography indicates at least more than passing acquaintance with its Islamic form, Sufism. Dr. Greene deals with the different kinds of silence and their use in the technique of meditation and self-discipline. Here she draws distinction between the Eastern and Western mind: "The Sufi strives, therefore, to lose his individual consciousness in ecstatic self-abandonment, so as to merge with the One. Such complete negation of the self calls for severe self-discipline to the end of burning out the lower impulses, passions and selfish thoughts. This process, very difficult even for the Easterner, is far more so for the Westerner, who has extroverted his life-force to an extent almost unknown in the East. And so, in passing, it might be mentioned that Eastern disciplines are right for the Easterner; but the Westerner must harness, control and transform his energy through the use of techniques appropriate to his differently oriented way of life. The attempt to graft Eastern methods on to Western extroversion has often proven abortive."

In Zen Buddhism and Taoism she finds examples of Silence as a bodily healing power, while healing of the soul is sought in the growing movement among Catholics and Protestants in Retreats. There are further chapters on the mystical experience of the Yogis and the Trappists. The final chapters on Silence as a Challenge to Authority, as a Source of Knowledge and some Practical Suggestions remind one however of the cynical remark that "Mysticism begins with mist and ends in schism." But the greater part of the argument is sober, convincing and helpful. As the author points out: "The greater mystics have forfeited nothing of their efficiency and contribution to the practical world. St. Francis needed all the diplomacy of a statesman in conducting the affairs of his order and his relations with the Pope. St. Theresa was a first-class administrator. Catherine of Sienna would rank high today in the world of social service. Francis Xavier was an explorer and scholar of unusual stature. Ignatius Loyola was a soldier and organizer of the first rank. Plato and Plotinus rendered yeoman service to philosophy. Their teachings are still being chewed upon, but have

hardly yet been digested by the world's greatest scholars." The volume is dedicated to the Founder and director of the School of Applied Philosophy in New York, with which apparently the author is also connected.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER.

The Mystery of Mar Saba. By James H. Hunter. Evangelical Publishers, Toronto and New York. pp. 414. \$1.50.

The author, formerly on the staff of the *Toronto Globe*, is now managing editor of the *Evangelical Christian*, and knows the Near East and especially Palestine. This is a mystery-novel, dealing with intrigues, foreign spies, British rule and Arab-Jewish relations in the Holy Land. The rather weird plot of a German archaeologist is blasted. The intelligence system that makes such intrigue dangerous stretches from Dan to Beersheba and the hero of this religious detective story is a wealthy American. Clean as the desert air, full of excitement and with a welcome flavor of Calvin's theology we commend this fascinating volume as good comment on a page of contemporary history.

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER.

CURRENT TOPICS

Orphaned Missions of the Netherlands Indies

The Rev. Fred J. Barny, writing in the *Intelligencer-Leader*, describes the situation as follows:

"The Netherlands Indies or, as commonly spoken of in this country, the Dutch East Indies is that vast collection of islands lying between continental Asia and Australia. They extend for a distance of 4,000 miles along the equator and include several of the largest islands of the world as also some that are mere rocks jutting out of the sea. As they differ in size, they differ in density of population, development and christianization.

"Few people realize that this is the outstanding mission field of the world in several respects. First, it has the largest Christian community in any non-Christian area of the world, consisting of 1,665,771 members exclusive of about a half million Roman Catholics. Second, it has the largest autonomous 'younger church' anywhere, the Batak Church with 430,000 members. In addition there are altogether eight autonomous churches, several of them larger than the South India United Church of British India, or the Church of Christ in China, and together, larger than the churches of China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines combined. Finally, it is in this field alone that the evangelization of Moslems has prospered. In the days of the Trading Company mission work as such was not carried on, but *krankenbezoekers* were regularly sent out with their ships whose task was the religious care of the Dutch colonists and the conversion of the heathen. To conserve the fruits of this work the Protestant Church of the Netherlands Indies was organized as the state church which in 1936 was made independent. This includes generally the European community and several of the native churches though these preserve their autonomy.

"At the beginning of May there were about 20 missions active in the whole of the Indies. Of these, 11 are Dutch missions and on the 10th of May they were suddenly cut off from all contact with the homeland. The Colonial Government recognizes certain "consuls" whom the home societies send out as their representatives in all dealings between the government and the missions. To these consuls the management of the 11 missions was entrusted and the government made them responsible for the two German mission fields. They therefore have to direct and finance these 13 missions, in which work they are assisted by a Missions Emergency Board made up of leaders in mission and church work. There were naturally manifold problems to be settled, the chief ones being concerned with finance and personnel.

"As regards the latter there were 143 men missionaries engaged

in the work of these missions. Of these 64 were Germans, who were interned with the rest of the German residents. (Of the women only a few were interned while most were forbidden to continue their work. Recent reports state that all the women have been released.) Of the Dutch missionaries, a few are engaged temporarily in outside employment for reasons of economy so that now less than half the original number have to carry all the work. They were located as the needs of each field demanded and now every one is doing at least two men's work, some much more. Out of this stress one good has resulted in that in many cases greater responsibility has been put upon the native pastors and teachers."

Dr. C. C. Adams' Broadcast on Muhammad Abduh

Part of an address delivered in Arabic by Dr. C. C. Adams of the American University, Cairo, on the occasion of the celebration of the 35th anniversary of the death of Muhammad Abduh, organized by the Egyptian State Broadcasting Company:

"It is an honor and a privilege to participate in this memorial occasion, the purpose of which is to revive the memory of that great Egyptian scholar and writer, reformer and patriot of the past generation, the late Sheikh Muhammad Abduh. The invitation to participate has come to me as a foreigner who has given some study to his life and work, and I express my thanks and appreciation for this honor, which I accept, not as a personal honor, but as a recognition by the Egyptian people of the attention which Western scholars have given to the work of Muhammad Abduh. And on the other hand, that a foreigner should participate in this occasion is in itself a tribute from Western scholars to the memory of Muhammad Abduh and an acknowledgment of his influence.

"It is with truth that he is spoken of as belonging to the past generation, for today is the thirty-fifth anniversary of his death. Thus more than a third of a century has passed since his death during which it has been possible for Egypt in particular and the rest of the world in general, whether Eastern or Western, to estimate the volume of his work and the extent and permanency of his influence. During these years, many important events in the world's history have taken place, and many important changes have befallen the world's ways of thinking. In all of these events and these changes of thought Egypt has shared fully, so that in many important respects we today stand not only in another generation but also in a very different generation from that in which Sheikh Muhammad Abduh lived. Yet we find that his memory has persisted and our celebration at this time testifies to a feeling at least on the part of many, that this generation is indebted to him as was his own generation. The time has not come, of course, for the final judgment regarding the value of his work to be delivered. It will be left to the future to show how extensive and how permanent has been his influence in the life of this nation and in that of the wider Arabic-speaking world. Yet it is fitting that the Egyptian people should at this time once more recall his life and services on behalf of Egypt. Since his

contribution to modern Egyptian life and letters is recognized by scholarship outside of Egypt it may be permitted to me to say a word about him from the point of view of Western Scholarship.

"Mustafa Abd el-Raziq Bey, who is one of the best-known of the former pupils of Sheikh Muhammad Abduh, in the Introduction to the French Translation of 'Risalat al-Tawhid' which he made in collaboration with Mtre Bernard Michel in 1925, has placed 'al-ustadh al-imam' among 'The creators of modern Egypt.' Indeed among these he holds a distinct place, says Abd el-Raziq Bey, because he was not content to borrow from the West only its material benefits, nor, on the other hand was he satisfied with the wholesale adoption of western customs and western learning; but he attempted to make a synthesis of the scientific results attained by the West with the fundamental ideas of Islam, and thus his work has value for the whole world of Islam. He is, therefore, says Mustafa Abd el-Raziq, to be regarded as 'one of the founders of modern Islam.'

"This is an admirable summary of the two-fold aspect of the work of Muhammad Abduh. Among Western scholars familiar with his work it is generally held that the first aspect is the more important of the two and he will be remembered more for his work on behalf of Egypt, his practical reforms and his inspiring influence, through his writings and through his personality, than for what he accomplished on behalf of Islam as a whole. Thus Professor Gibb, of Oxford University, who is known in Egypt as a member of the Arab Academy, has said, 'It is probably in this connection (that is, his connection with the development of modern Egypt) that he best deserves to be remembered, rather than as an original thinker and reformer destined to exercise a general influence throughout the Islamic world.' Horten, the German scholar, similarly has said that Muhammad Abduh was not a great thinker and philosopher such as Ibn Sina, and that consequently he met with only partial success when he attempted to criticise the whole system of theology and philosophy and restate it in a form suitable for the present day, and in agreement with Western scientific ideas. At the same time, Western scholars recognize the immensity of such a task and they give him full credit for having recognized both the need and the opportunity and for having attempted the task. Furthermore, they acknowledge that in this wider task, he accomplished some worth-while results. Thus, the same German scholar who has just been quoted says that, 'he accomplished all that could have been expected in the not exactly favorable circumstances.'"

Allah and the Sons of Sinbad

There is no substitute for direct contact with popular Islam if one desires to know the heart and strength of its creed. Palgrave and Doughty knew far more about the theology of Islam than arm-chair Orientalists. Alan Villiers (whose book is reviewed in this issue of our Quarterly) learned in his voyages around the Arabian coasts that Allah is always a present passenger and always merciful. A discerning review of the book calls attention to this fact:

"The captain sailed by rule of thumb, and set his course by guess and by God; these words are to be understood in their plain meaning; the captain, we read, "Took a rough bearing of Ras Asir and transferred it, using his thumbs as parallel rules to the chart"

"Even if Villiers had not stated, when discussing the earnings of Arab sailors, that 'insurance was against the rules of their religion', we should have inferred an objection to preparedness for contingencies. Where a certain conception of the Deity is clearly held, such preparation would be either unnecessary or futile. This conception was clearly held by all these Arab seamen. What is specifically noteworthy to readers who may have come to associate the religions of Europe with non-intervention, is the punctilious observance of religious ritual on a ship where no thought was given to the precautions of experienced seamanship

"Their neglect of the precautions which would have averted danger was matched by their skill in meeting it. But it was not for them to foresee—it stands out that both for captain and crew the disposer supreme and judge of the waters is Allah."

Bernard Shaw and Islam

A most interesting article under this caption appears in *The Messenger* (Sylhet, Assam) by an Indian Moslem. After mentioning Thomas Carlyle's verdict on Mohammed, he quotes a similar eulogy by Bernard Shaw. Then he writes:

Bernard Shaw has been appropriately compared to Voltaire, the licensed jester of the 18th century. Those who have studied the works of Voltaire know that at first he wrote in praise of the Prophet. His play "Mohamet" was not a success on account of the inveterate prejudice which Europe always had against Islam and its founder. In order therefore to pander to the debased taste of the France of the 18th century, Voltaire wrote against the Prophet. In his letters to Catharine of Russia, Voltaire makes very uncomplimentary references to the Prophet. Even Carlyle whose essay "Hero as a Prophet," reveals an unbiased impartial study of Islam and the life of its founder, in his essay on Dante damned the Prophet. Bernard Shaw too has done the same thing. Musalmans should not feel elated when they hear a non-Muslim make eulogistic references to Islam and the Prophet. If a non-Muslim praises the Prophet, he gives proof of his fair-mindedness. If he has studied the Quran and the life of the Prophet thoroughly and praises them he deserves credit. But if he does so out of ignorance or to gain cheap popularity as many Europeans are doing today no heed should be paid to such praises. The Prophet's position is in no way affected whether people praise him or condemn him; particularly when the former are actuated with ignorance and the latter with prejudice.

Bernard Shaw refers to the Prophet in his play "St. Joan." Cauchon, a character in the play, refers to the Prophet as an Arab camel-driver who drove Christ and his church out of Jerusalem

and ravaged his way west like a wild beast until at last there stood only the Pyrenees and God's mercy between France and damnation and continues, "Yet what did the camel-driver do at the beginning more than that shepherd girl is doing?"

The opinions expressed by Bernard Shaw on Islam in various other books show that his earlier reference to the Holy Prophet and his teachings was not based on conviction but it was intended to gain cheap popularity. It may be recalled that sometime back the students of the Azhar University protested against the uncomplimentary references to Islam in the St. Joan drama, which was proscribed by the Fuad I University. The result of the protest was that Dr. Taha Hussain had to resign.

Reaction of the Old Islam to New Egyptian Womanhood

The following article, entitled "The Degradation of Woman," appeared in the May 10, 1940, issue of *Al Islam* (Egypt):

For a long time we have refrained from speaking of these wearisome feminine subjects for they became very boring. We thought that after the disease had become serious in all classes, women's groups and people generally would be likely to stop seduction and whispering suggestions, and send out a plea for virtue among women. Therefore we kept the silence of despair, waiting for time to clear the issue. Now we find men who are accounted sons of the country declaring their intentions and refusing to do anything except to take refuge in this matter of freedom between the sexes—a thing which God has forbidden—thereby opposing the decree of God's book that a woman should remain in her home and not show her beauty to strangers.

We did not think for a day that these "philosophers" would demand modesty of women or that they would find fault with the degraded condition of womanhood which has become a byword. But we did think (though some thought it evil) that our philosophers would be satisfied with directing the play behind the scenes. It was not enough, however—they must display their wickedness on the stage.

Perhaps some of these heroes found that present conditions were most suitable for proclaiming their intentions, so they attacked the men who opposed their views about woman and beat down her own cry to return to her home and work in training her children instead of busying herself with such petty things as dancing, loose conduct and mingling of the sexes, in *that* crowd.

Among other evil signs of the times and lack of religion we find that the broadcasting station is a center for these people with all its wide influence. It has given them a choice place from which to send out every day the kind of thing that injures principle and virtue. Every year they have an anniversary to recall the leader of the "unveilers," and you see them celebrating what is called the reform for woman and her salvation from her prison and entry into European circles—a thing they consider a great accomplishment. Their late leader did not expect to have such anniversaries because he knew his teachings would find no support in religion or defenders

among the Moslems. Indeed, he formerly advocated the Islamic veil (segregation) and made plain the harm of too much freedom. If this leader had conceived what perversion time would make in his aims and that the foremost champions of lust would bask in his light, what regrets would he have had!

We shall not inveigh against the speeches of the advocates of freedom even though their intentions are plain, for they are acting on an agreed platform. We shall not hold it against them that Satan is pleased and God angered. The real fault lies with the broadcasting station which is the official voice of the Islamic government and on which is spent tens of thousands of pounds from the pockets of people who continue to believe that freedom between the sexes is a terrible evil. The Moslems could get but one night for the celebration of the birthday of their prophet but the advocates of unveiling got two nights to celebrate the death of their great man. Who can imagine a greater hurt to the feelings or greater impertinence in broadcasting forbidden things than this? Further, the head of the Egyptian University and the Director of Cultural Activities and certain women spoke on the subject of freedom between the sexes and it is our right to speak also, making clear the judgment of God and common sense on their opinions.

Medical Missions in War Time

The Church Missionary Society Medical Auxiliary has the largest number of workers in the field that it has ever had. Its out-patient attendances have passed the two million mark; in-patients have reached 82,000. This last number should be multiplied five times, if the degree of evangelistic opportunity among relatives is to be measured. Curtailment on account of the war must be severe this year, and yet, in some miraculous way, the "few loaves and fishes" seem to be stretching to reach the multitudes.

The C.M.S. suddenly finds itself a partner in the largest missionary medical school in the world, owing to the moving of refugee students and medical schools from the Japanese-occupied areas to Chengtu in Western China. In India, the way is being prepared, through personal contacts, for medical mission advance into Waziristan, dour fortress of Islam on India's northwest frontier. Iran is keeping open its four hospital centres, in spite of staff losses. A rally of local support has staved off for the time being the danger of having to close Nablus Hospital in Palestine. In Africa, where the medical side of evangelistic work is less advanced than the pastoral side, the work is perhaps harder hit by the war than in some other areas. But everywhere the line holds. At latest reports, not a single hospital anywhere has been shut down.—*The Open Door*.

Work for Lepers in Nigeria

During the past few years, an extensive work among the lepers of Northern Nigeria has been developed by the Sudan Interior Mission, in cooperation with the Government. Nearly 1,000 of these afflicted people are now being cared for in three Leper settlements, all situated in Moslem areas.

Dr. E. B. Payne writes from Sokoto: "The work in new places is 'not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord.' Sitting down to talk brings results, whereas standing up to preach often only brings trouble. When the people come to know you, then is your time of opportunity. We are now in the month of Ramadan, the great Moslem fast. It is the season which tests the stability of the Christians, and those who turn their backs on Mohammed, in face of pressure and ridicule, become usable in the service of Christ."

Some years ago, an ardent young Moslem made a clean break with his old religion, and openly accepted Christ. He passed through a period of restless indecision, but is now being greatly used to other Moslems who are going through similar experiences. He and his wife are valuable helpers in one of the Leper Settlements.

A Basic Arabic Word List

Basic English with its vocabulary of 850 common words is now used in a new translation of the Bible which the Cambridge University Press has in preparation. This new use of Basic English should be exceedingly useful in Mission Schools. Meanwhile, the Hebrew University Press, Jerusalem, has published a Basic Word List of the Arabic daily newspapers. According to this study by Dr. Moshe Brill, 2300 words comprise 90% of all the words in daily use.

The study was made by taking two daily newspapers, one published in Cairo, the other in Jaffa, and reading them for a year and recording the words used in particular paragraphs, some dealing with editorial notes, some with local and foreign news, some with the description and discussion of current events. These results were checked by reading the same papers, and several others, for a period of half a year. The purpose of this second count was to determine the relative stability of the frequency list in the first count. The inference is that in the teaching of the Arabic language to pupils whose main purpose is to acquire a reading knowledge of the daily Press these 2,000 words should form the basic vocabulary.

It is important to establish such a vocabulary because a knowledge of current Arabic is recognized as one of the subjects which all the pupils in the Hebrew secondary schools of Palestine should acquire. And while Arabic must give some place to the classical literature, it is important that the young generation should be conversant with the ordinary language of the Press. Those who have made the study are preparing a students' Arabic dictionary, based on their research, which will include the translation of the words into English and Hebrew. Their studies may perhaps induce a movement for establishing the basic Arabic of 1,000 words comparable with the "Basic English" vocabulary.

Yemen in 1940

The present war is changing the situation not only in the Mediterranean basin, but also along the shores of the Red Sea. In an

article on The Red Sea, in the *Royal Central Asian Journal* for October, 1940, Sir Harold Wilberforce-Bell traces the history of "this oldest water-way of the world" down the centuries and tells of its present importance. We give his views on Yemen:

"As to the Yemen itself, that tightly closed but most fascinating country, with an ancient civilization stretching back at least to 1000 years B.C., like all Europeans I had great difficulty in getting into it, and was only allowed to move about under very strict supervision. No people could be more friendly than the country-folk of the highlands, and none more courteous than most of the great personages, though the latter doubted my motive for being there. The treaty between Britain and the Yemen was negotiated by the present Governor of Aden in 1934; but in the autumn of 1937 the Italians had made their new treaty and sent a mission to San'a, accompanied by lavish expenditure of money. We found Italian influence paramount, principally in the shape of doctors resident in the chief cities, a whole group of them all in one large community in San'a. On the other hand, the Aden Government had secured the services of two British doctors, Dr. and Mrs. Petrie, of the Scottish Mission at Shaikh 'Othman, and these, with a nursing member of the same mission, were the only British residents in the Yemen. The importance cannot be too much emphasized of maintaining the British doctors who have succeeded Dr. and Mrs. Petrie, and increasing their numbers if the Imam will allow—not only for their devoted medical work among the people, but for keeping a nucleus of British influence in this vital spot. For admittedly Britain has missed many chances in the past of establishing her influence in the Yemen."

Princeton University

Summer Seminar in Arabic and Islamic Studies

June 21 to August 2, 1941

The third Summer Seminar in Arabic and Islamic Studies will be held in the Graduate College, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., under the directorship of Professor Philip K. Hitti, for a period of six weeks beginning Saturday morning, June 21, 1941. The courses are open to a limited number of men and women of graduate standing and are designed to meet the needs of new students as well as those who attended the Seminars of 1935 and 1938. Teachers and students of philosophy and religion, Near Eastern and medieval history, Romance languages and fine arts will be offered an opportunity to acquire first-hand knowledge of some of the sources in the Islamic phases of their respective subjects.

Courses will be offered in the Arabic, Turkish and Persian languages, as well as in Arab history and literature, Turkish history, and Islamic art and archeology.

Visiting lecturers will deliver each a series of lectures dealing with different phases of Islam, Moslem culture in Spain and Sicily, the Eastern Mediterranean and Central Asia.

The tuition fee for the Seminar is \$40.00. Fees for room and board at the Graduate College are \$20.00 a week per person. A limited number of grants-in-aid are available, mainly through the

coöperation of the American Council of Learned Societies, for specially recommended and qualified students. Enrollment is limited to 33 students.

For further information address Dr. Nabih A. Faris, P. O. Box 342, Princeton, New Jersey.

Sir Edward Denison Ross

We condense from *The London Times* the following obituary notice of the Orientalist and author to whom many students of Islam owe much:

Sir Denison Ross, C.I.E., the first Director of the School of Oriental Studies, London University, simultaneously professor of Persian in the university, and since the beginning of 1940 head of the British Information Bureau at Istanbul, died recently at Istanbul at the age of sixty-nine. No orientalist of our day was so widely known and so unlike the popular conception of a savant. He had a remarkable flair for obtaining a colloquial acquaintance with foreign languages, and could speak well and amusingly in public in half a dozen European, in addition to several oriental tongues.

Edward Denison Ross, son of the Rev. Dr. A. J. Ross, vicar of St. Philip's, Stepney, was born on June 6, 1871. After being educated at Marlborough and at University College, London, he studied oriental languages in Paris and Strasbourg. In collaboration with the late Ney Elias, he translated the "Tarikh-i-Rashidi" of Mirza Haidar Dughlat, cousin of the Emperor Babur, who founded the Mogul dynasty in India. With the late F. H. Skrine, I.C.S., Ross visited some of the remote countries of which Mirza Haidar wrote, and another collaboration brought "The Heart of Asia."

In 1901 Ross went to Calcutta as Principal of the famous Madrasah for the education of Moslems, a post which was combined, in 1906, with that of Curator of Records, Government of India, which carried the rank of assistant secretary in the Education Department. He seized the opportunity to edit and publish the Persian correspondence carried on in the latter part of the eighteenth century with Indian princes by Clive, Warren Hastings and other governors of Fort William.

In the middle of the Four Years' War, on plans formulated by a committee under the chairmanship of the first Lord Cromer, the School of Oriental Studies, London University, was tardily established. Ross was appointed the first Director, and though hampered by most inadequate financial resources from Government, he made of the School, then housed in Finsbury Circus, the great institution it is to-day.

The director was well fitted for the Chair of Persian bestowed on him by the university; but outside that field he was not a profound scholar, nor did he shine as an administrator. But he had the gift of teaching and the gift of inspiring. He started on their way many competent scholars who, when sufficiently advanced, were confronted by the limitations of his own scholarship. He was too restless for patient toil in research, but all who met him were impressed by the width of his knowledge, his enthusiasm for all forms

of knowledge, and his broad humanity. He could read thirty or more languages with ease.

When Sir Denison retired in the summer of 1937, after twenty years of directorship, some 7,000 students had passed through the school, which by that time, had one hundred teachers, forty-three of whom were permanent. It was generally recognised that he had done a work of first rate imperial importance and that the school had abundantly justified its claims to a building of its own on the new university site.

Dr. Jacob E. Enderlin

The last number to come to hand of *Der Nahe Osten*, the magazine of the Evangelical Church Mission to Muhammadans of Wiesbaden, carried on its front page the news of the death in Germany on the 15th of July, 1940 of Dr. Jacob Enderlin, who was for many years in Egypt identified with the work of the German Mission. At Darau and at Assuan in Upper Egypt, he had built up their small but very active Mission, which felt its special field to be that of the Nubian Muslims, a field so largely neglected by other Mission bodies. Besides having a fine knowledge of Arabic he was well acquainted with the two more common Nubian dialects, and during the last years of his service in Egypt has been connected with the School of Oriental Studies in Cairo to teach Nubian, as well as share in the instruction in Colloquial Arabic.

From close association with the people he had an unusually sound knowledge of practical Islam, and this was recognized in his own country by the conferring on him of a Doctorate in Theology. In Cairo he had organized a Nubian Club to serve the numerous groups of that race employed in the great city, and was a much beloved figure in their community. He had retired home after severe heart strain just before the outbreak of War, and his loss will be mourned by all who knew his quiet, unassuming piety, and genuine love for the Muslim peoples. He had been a warm supporter of the MOSLEM WORLD since the appearance of its first number.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

BY SUE MOLLESON FOSTER

Union Theological Seminary Library

I. GENERAL

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS POETRY. Gustave von Grunebaum. (In *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Baltimore. March, 1940. pp. 23-29).

Abū 'l-Atāhiya, author of the *Zuhdiyyat*, was the first to give religion its due place in Mohammedan poetry, for the Prophet and his immediate followers neglected it or displayed actual hostility to it.

IBN KHALDUN: a North African Thinker of the Fourteenth Century. Erwin I. J. Rosenthal. (In *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester. October, 1940. pp. 307-320).

Account of the life and work of an Arabic historian, who wrote a "Universal History" which dealt particularly with the Berbers and the Arabs of Spain.

SOME REFERENCES TO JEWS IN PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIC LITERATURE. Ilse Lichtenstadter. (In *The Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, Philadelphia. Vol. X, 1940. pp. 185-194).

The Jews of the time were well versed in their laws and traditions and strongly attached to their faith.

II. ARABIA

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

THE EXILARCHATE IN THE EASTERN CALIPHATE, 637-1258. Alexander D. Goode. (In *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia. October, 1940. pp. 149-169).

Briefly sketches the principal events of each ruler's reign and appends a chronological table beginning with Nahum in Hadrian's time.

LES ROUMAINS ENTRE L'ORIENT ET L'OCCIDENT. Louis Elekes. (In the *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie*, Budapest. Decembre, 1940. pp. 461-469).

Traces the divergent elements producing Roumanian civilization, among them the Turkish influences.

IV. KORAN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

'ABD AL-ḤAḤK AL-ISLĀMĪ. M. Perlmann. (In *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia. October, 1940. pp. 171-191).

Treats of a tract written in the fourteenth century by a Jewish convert to Islam in which he explains his objections to Judaism.

ISLAM, CHRISTIANITY AND MONOPOLY. Maulana Abdul Majid. (In *The Islamic Review*, Woking. August, 1940. pp. 287-290).

Discusses and compares the statements of Christ and Mohammed regarding everyday business and social problems.

THE IṢRĀQI REVIVAL OF AL-SUHRAWARDI. Edward J. Jurji. (In *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Baltimore. March, 1940. pp. 90-94).

Describes the philosophy of a twelfth century mystic of Islam, who was an extraordinary exponent of Sufi Illumination.

THE PEACOCK ANGEL IN THE SPRING. E. S. Drower. (In *The Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. October, 1940. pp. 391-403).

An account of rites at the elaborate Spring festival at Baashika near Mosul and of a visit to the Temple of Shaikh 'Adi in the Hakkari Mountains.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

THE MUSLIM STATE IS DEMOCRACY AT ITS BEST. Sirdar Ikbāl Ali Shah. (In *The Islamic Review*, Woking. August, 1940. pp. 306-310).

States the liberties given by Islam to individuals and to minorities in the state.

SLAVERY AND ISLAM. Maulvi Aftabud Din Ahmad. (In *The Islamic Review*, Woking. August, 1940. pp. 296-301).

Argues for the expediency of the enslavement of war captives.

SOME ASPECTS OF RURAL EDUCATION IN PALESTINE. Humphrey Bowman. (In *The Asiatic Review*, London. October, 1940. pp. 773-779).

Finds the growth of Arab schools for boys and girls amazing and rejoices in their close cooperation with the Department of Health.

STRONGHOLD OF MUSLIM CHINA. Y. Mei. (In *Asia*, New York. December, 1940. pp. 658-660).

Numbering over 1,000,000 and leading frugal, industrious, illiterate lives, the Moslems of northwestern China offer an interesting study.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

AFGHANISTAN HAS NO FRONTIERS. Felix Howland. (In *Asia*, New York. December, 1940. pp. 633-636).

Examines the political and economic possibilities of this country whose rich oil deposits may some day be of vital importance to Great Britain, Russia or Germany.

ANGLO-EGYPTIAN FRIENDSHIP. The Egyptian Ambassador. (In *The Asiatic Review*, London. October, 1940. pp. 799-801).

Defense of a common interest leads to loyal cooperation between these two powers.

BRITAIN AND THE AXIS IN THE NEAR EAST. Albert Viton. (In *Foreign Affairs*, New York. January, 1941. pp. 370-384).

The collapse of France has left Great Britain to cope single-handed with all Mediterranean complications, in which task she is receiving noticeably indifferent aid from the Mohammedan states.

THE MIDDLE EAST IN WESTERN POLITICS. V. Minorsky. (In *The Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. October, 1940. pp. 426-461).

The author examines three episodes in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries involving the Mongols, the Turcomans, and the Safavids and shows that each leads to closer cultural and commercial relations with the European Powers.

THE NEAR EAST TO-DAY AND TOMORROW. Albert Viton. (In *The American Scholar*, New York. Winter, 1940-41. pp. 72-83).

Despite decades of so-called "Westernization," the Arab states have remained backward in matters technical and Great Britain need count on very little actual military assistance from any one of them.

NIGHTMARE IN THE NEAR EAST. Albert Viton. (In *Asia*, New York. November, 1940. pp. 570-572).

British inaction and apathy in her military preparations in the Near East has resulted in half-hearted Arab cooperation.

OLD-NEW BATTLE GROUNDS OF EGYPT AND LIBIA. W. Robert Moore. (In *The National Geographic Magazine*, Washington. December, 1940. pp. 809-820).

Describes the changes war and defense programmes are making in these ancient lands.

THE RED SEA. Lieut.-Col. Sir Harold Wilberforce-Bell. (In *The Royal Central Asian Journal*, London. October, 1940. pp. 415-426).

Surveys European influences at work in this area during the nineteenth century and stresses Britain's need for absolute control of the Sea for the protection of her interests.

RIGHTS OF SMALL NATIONS AND ISLAM. Sirdar Iqbal Ali Shah. (In *The Islamic Review*, Woking. August, 1940. pp. 302-305).

Justice and equality for all is a Mohammedan principle.

VII. MISSIONS TO MOSLEMS.

THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO ISLAM. Jens Christensen. (In *The United Church Review*, Saharanpur. October, 1940. pp. 230-234).

This is the first of a series of lectures at the Henry Martyn School of Islamics and emphasizes the need for a realization of the divine command "Go" as the first essential for missionary work.

THE KINGDOMS OF THE WORLD. Thomas Cochrané. (In *World Dominion and the World To-day*, London. November-December, 1940. pp. 367-372).

An account of conditions in Algeria, Morocco, Libia and Tunisia, laying stress on the work of missions and the need for men in that field.