THE MOSLEM WORLD

VOL. XXXII · APRIL, 1942 · No. 2

ISLAM IN WAR TIME

What is the immediate duty of the Christian churches towards the Moslem peoples of the world, including those involved in the present conflict? The readers of this Quarterly have long been interested in the welfare of the Moslems. That interest should not cease because it is now necessary to fight in order to preserve the principles of freedom, justice and honor, not only for Christians, but for all the races and religions of the world. Rather the desire to be helpful to others should increase, and plans should be made to show the Moslems what the true aim of Christianity really is in regard to the welfare of the nations, and to provide the full benefits of those great Christian principles of freedom, justice and honor for all the peoples of the earth.

The present world conflict is obviously a war of aggression, and it is the time for Christians also to be aggressive, for the good of others. When the Moslems see more Christians actively engaged in working for the benefit of the peoples of other races, then there is hope that the followers of the Arabian Prophet will realize that Jesus Christ did indeed bring Good News to the world, and that it would be well for the world if all nations were to become followers of Christ.

War all over the world is restricting travel, and is limiting activity in many lands, but this gives unusual opportunities for the kind of preparation which is much needed to equip those young missionaries who should be

ready later on, when peace among the nations is again established, to go out among all races with a thorough knowledge not only of the teachings of their own faith, but also of those of other religions. For those who should be planning now to work among the Moslems it is particularly necessary that they should acquire a thorough knowledge of the exceedingly difficult Arabic language, and should have some acquaintance with the vast literature in that language which is connected with the Koran, and also with all the intricacies of the teachings of Islam and the classical writings which are current among Moslems not only in Egypt, Syria and Arabia, but also in Iran, India, Afghanistan, Malaysia and China.

My own experience is that I was sent out in 1890 to start work among the Malays at Singapore with absolutely no special preparation for reaching a people who believe universally in Islam and the teachings of the Koran; and although I had already made a close study of the Malay language and could speak it readily, I soon realized that I knew nothing whatever of their religious beliefs, had never read any of the Koran or any other Mohammedan literature, and could not understand their religious terminology. It had never been suggested to me that it would help me in my work among the Malays to know some Arabic and something about their religion and their religious life. Some years later I bought an Arabic grammar and tried to learn the language, but found that no Malay would undertake to teach me. Finding that all the best literature on the Malay language had been written by the Dutch, I engaged an Amsterdam Jew in Singapore to teach me the language, and was soon able to speak as well as to read Dutch. I also got a Chinese man to teach me the Amoy dialect which is current in Malaya, and after a while was able to preach in Chinese as well as in Malay; but with Arabic and Islam I could do nothing. Finally I wrote to Dr. Zwemer asking him what I could do to get some knowledge of Arabic and of Islam, and he turned my letter over to that great Arabic missionary scholar

Dr. Gairdner, who wrote and strongly urged me to go to Hartford and study with Dr. Macdonald, which he had done himself, though living in Cairo. That led me to take the first opportunity to go to Hartford, and in the years 1918-20 I studied two full years with Dr. Macdonald. But unfortunately I never was able to make any use among the Malays of the knowledge of Arabic and Islam which I had thus acquired, for when I returned to Singapore in 1920 it was found that my health was already so seriously impaired by long years of work without respite in a tropical climate that it became necessary for me to leave permanently. Since then my service for the Malays has consisted mainly in the preparation of literature in the Malay language, and in my efforts to help the younger generation of missionaries to get a more thorough preparation for work among the Mohammedan peoples in all parts of the world by studying the history and teachings of Islam, and above all by a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, and by a study of the literature and teachings current among the common people.

I would strongly urge that the various Mission Boards who are planning to send out the next generation of missionaries to work among the various Mohammedan races should never send men out to this difficult task without adequate preparation. I mean that all missionaries to Moslems should learn as much as possible of the Arabic language and literature before they are sent out. Never should anyone be sent to the mission field as I was, without any knowledge either of Arabic or of Islamics, for my experience proves to me that the Arabic of the Koran and of the vast storehouse of religious literature in Islam cannot be learned on the field, at least not in any field except perhaps Arabia or Egypt. Let the rising generation of missionaries have a fair chance of understanding the people and their faith, and of handling adequately the task to which they are being sent.

Hartford, Conn. W. G. SHELLABEAR.

HOW ISLAM CAME TO THE MALAY PENINSULA

Six hundred years ago, the Malay Peninsula was strongly under the influence of a Hindu Kingdom, the remains of which are still discernible in parts of the country, though not so much so as in Java. Buddhistic influence was strongly felt to the north in Siam and Indo-China and had crept in to some extent into the north of the Malay Peninsula, but not sufficiently to compete with Hinduism. Islam apparently was unknown in the Peninsula—at least it was not sufficiently strong to receive the notice of Marco Polo (1292) or Ibn Battuta (1345). The city of Malacca, the first stronghold of Islam in the Peninsula, had not been built, and it is doubtful if at that time there were more than a few fishermen's houses along the coast at that place. The ancient city of Singapore was on the verge of destruction at the hands of the great Majapahit Empire in Java. The ancient kingdoms of the northern part of the Peninsula were in decay, and that part of the Peninsula was under the immediate domination of Siam. The great Kingdom of Sri Vijaya had been broken up, and the strong Buddhist influence felt previously in its domains in Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula was considerably weakened. In Sumatra Islam had already made its entrance from the Coromandel Coast in Southern India. Ibn Battuta gives considerable attention to the Faith which he found so well established there at the time of his visit. So much for the immediate background at the time of the entrance of Islam into the Malay Peninsula. For a clearer understanding of its course, let us now investigate some of the details involved in that entrance.

First of all, it is necessary for us to orientate ourselves properly geographically. The Malay Peninsula is a long,

finger-like projection of the southeastern portion of the continent of Asia. It extends far into the midst of a great island world. To the immediate east are Borneo and Celebes and, still farther, the Philippine Islands. To the south is Java, the seat of the ancient Majapahit Kingdom. To the immediate west is the large island of Sumatra, and still farther to the west is India, always close in cultural influence to the Malay Peninsula. To the immediate north are Siam and Indo-China, and still farther north are Burma and China. By the sea-route, the Malay Peninsula is approximately midway between India on the west and China on the north and east. We shall see how both of these countries strongly influenced the development of the Malay Peninsula.

Let us next investigate the political connections of the Malay Peninsula with its neighbors. Before the year 800 A.D., the powerful kingdom of Sri Vijaya in Sumatra had conquered the Malay Peninsula and had established itself firmly, especially in the north. The connection between Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula was very close throughout this period. Before the end of the twelfth century this great kingdom was broken up. From that time until the Mongol invasion of the whole country under Kublai Khan at the close of the thirteenth century, the influence of Siam was politically strong throughout the Malay Peninsula, so much so that even ancient Singapore was a vassal of the King of Siam. Following the invasion of the Mongols, there is an increasingly close political connection of the island world, including the Malay Peninsula, with China. The advent of the Ming Dynasty (1368 A.D.) corresponds roughly with the destruction of ancient Singapore and the founding of Malacca. From a famous document of that period, known as the Ming Document, we learn a great deal of the relation which existed between China and the Malay Peninsula as well as other islands of the Malay Archipelago. We learn, for instance, that as early as 1403 an envoy was sent from China to Malacca, just recently founded, to establish the new ruler on his throne. Malay

envoys were sent to China in return, and in 1414 the young Malay prince himself went to the Chinese court to report the death of his father and to ask the support of the Chinese Emperor for his claim to the throne of Malacca. This was granted, and advice of the action was sent to Siam. From this time the support of the Chinese Emperor was regularly given to the Malacca dynasty to such an extent that the political connection between Siam and the Peninsula was badly weakened. The association of China with the Malay Peninsula was principally a political one and was not nearly so strong culturally as was the association with India, but the political connection was strong enough to prevent the prevalence of Siamese power with its strong Buddhist influence from penetrating far into the Peninsula.

Finally, the cultural aspect of the background of the Malay Peninsula must be understood in order to appreciate the preparation which had been made for the entrance of Islam. In the first place, the animistic beliefs of the ancient Malays have persisted down to the present time and show no signs of being eliminated in the near future. Before the entrance of Islam, these beliefs were strongly colored with Hinduism, and Hinduism is still blended with animism in the Malaya of the present day. Hinduism, of course came from India, either directly, or by way of Sumatra. We must look to India for strength of cultural influence in Malaya in the early days, as we look to China for strength of political influence. Not only in religion, but also in the development of various arts now coming to light by archaeological research is the influence of Indian culture manifest in the life of Malaya. From his archaeological researches, H. G. Quaritch Wales, M.B.R.A.S., discerns four main waves of Indian expansion in the Malay Peninsula.

The first wave is from the first to the third centuries A.D. In this period the motive seems to have been trade, and little attempt was made to settle in the country. Little remains in the country to indicate the Indian influence of

this period, but there are some traces, and other indications exist in the geographical data of Ptolemy.

The second was from about 300 to 500 A.D. and brought with it a strong Buddhist influence. This wave seems to have entered the Peninsula from the north, and extended through the northern states of the Peninsula. There are many evidences of Indian settlements of this period.

The third wave was from about 550 to 750 A.D. and brought with it the Hindu Pallava colonists. It is also most marked in the northern states of the Peninsula.

The fourth wave was from about 750 to 900 A.D. It is believed to have come from South India and reveals the influence of Pala Mahayanist culture. These four waves were pre-Islamic but indicate a very ancient and persistent connection between India and the Malay Peninsula. The main religious influence in the country was Hindu, with a strong Buddhist tinge in the North.

We have here noted many of the factors in the general pre-Islamic background of the Malay Peninsula. Let us now note the relation of the island of Sumatra (1) to India and (2) to the Malay Peninsula, for we shall see that this island played an important part in the entrance of Islam into the Malay Peninsula.

Lying to the west of the Malay Peninsula and considerably nearer to India is the island of Sumatra. From very early times Indian traders came to Sumatra. One of the attractions of the island was its spices, and the spice trade with India developed at a very early date. As commerce between the two countries increased, factors of the life of India were introduced into Sumatra until the island soon bore traces of strong Indian influence. From 500 A.D., or perhaps even earlier, the dominant religious influence in Sumatra was Hindu and came from India. For the most part the invasion of Sumatra from India was a peaceful one and seems to have been carried on principally by traders.

We have already noted the spread of the Sri Vijaya Kingdom from Sumatra to the Malay Peninsula and how

firmly that kingdom became established in the Malay Peninsula. It was truly a great kingdom, and during the period of its existence there was a very free and intimate intercourse between the two countries. Tribute was collected from the princes of the Peninsula, but in return much of lasting value was brought into the Peninsula from Sumatra. Hinduism, which then prevailed in Sumatra, spread throughout the Peninsula, not only in a strictly religious sense, but also in the sense of a well developed culture which also bears that name. These were great days for the simple people of the Peninsula, and under the warm influence of this kingdom, the population of the Peninsula were brought far on the road of development.

We are now ready to note how Islam first entered the Malay Peninsula, and as we have already noted, this synchronizes with the rise of Malacca as the foremost power in Malaya. The story recorded in the *Malay Annals* about the entrance of Islam into the Malay Peninsula runs briefly like this: the Malay Sultan had a dream in which Muhammad spoke to him and told him that the next morning a boat from Jeddah would reach Malacca, from which a man would land. The Sultan was instructed to do whatever this man told him. Sure enough, the next morning the boat came and a man descended from the boat and worshipped on the shore. The people were amazed to see him and ran to tell the Sultan. The Sultan came with his elephant, brought the man to the palace, and was instructed in the faith of Islam, and "all the great men accepted Islam and the Sultan ordered all the people, large and small, old and young, female and male, to accept the faith of Islam." So runs the story, but many difficulties arise in accepting this version. A very obvious fact is that if the story is to be credited, the Sultan must have had considerable previous knowledge of Islam to have recognized Muhammad in his dream, and a second one is that a whole people does not change its religious faith so easily and quickly as is represented here. It is evident that we must look farther for the explanation we seek.

Some forty years after the visit of Ibn Battuta to Sumatra, a prince was compelled to flee from Java because of conspiracy against the government. He was kindly received at ancient Singapore where he lived for several years. He finally repaid the kindness shown him by murdering the king of Singapore. After reigning there for a few years, he was expelled by his enemies and fled northward. Eventually he arrived at Malacca, which at that time was only a small and unimportant fishing village. There he decided to build a city. Soon after this, ancient Singapore was completely destroyed by the Majapahit Kingdom of Java, and Malacca became rapidly stronger, until long before the end of the century she was mistress of the Straits of Malacca, controlling all the commerce passing through the Straits and requiring all boats to call at Malacca to pay dues. She had grown to become the foremost city of southeastern Asia, as all the trade from the West to the Far East passed through the Straits of Malacca.

Malacca was established near the end of the fourteenth century, A.D. Its first king did his work well, so that during his lifetime his rule was firmly established. His son and successor stepped into a kingdom well-built, firmly established, and already recognized by the Chinese Empire. He maintained the connection with China and continued to rule his own country wisely. For assistance rendered to the Muslim kingdom of Pasai in Sumatra, he was offered a princess of Pasai in marriage. Shortly after, the new king became a Muslim. The bonds with Pasai were evidently close during this period, for it appears that not only was there an alliance in time of war, but also friendly relationship in time of peace, so that questions with regard to the interpretation of fine points of religion were referred to the learned men of Pasai. The name of the new king was Muhammad Iskandar Shah. From that time Islam progressed rapidly in the Peninsula. The influence of Malacca was at that time widely felt throughout the Peninsula, and the religion which was espoused by

the Malacca Kingdom was certain to carry great weight in other parts of the country.

The path trod by Islam, then, in its progress to the Malay Peninsula seems to have been from India through Sumatra to Malacca. The entrance of Islam into Sumatra came as the result of trade between Sumatra and India, especially with the traders from the Coromandel Coast in South India. They not only got the ear of the princes of Sumatra, but gradually persuaded them to accept Islam as their religion. When this was accomplished, it was not difficult to gain the consent of the people to the new religion. Not all the princes of Sumatra, by any means, accepted Islam, and to this day the struggle proceeds there between Muslim and pagan rulers. However, certain states became definitely Muslim, and from these went forth those who were to influence the rulers of the Peninsula and islands of the Malay Archipelago to accept Islam. We have already seen how this was effected in the case of Malacca, and as Malacca was the dominant power in the Peninsula at that time, Islam spread with considerable rapidity through the Peninsula. The process was hastened at the beginning of the sixteenth century when Malacca fell before the Portuguese. At that time the influential Malays were scattered, some going to other states in the Peninsula, others going to islands of the Archipelago. These became missionaries of Islam wherever they went and assisted greatly in its spread.

Aside from the more immediate connection with Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula has always had, and still has, direct connection with India, and also with Arabia. With the entrance of quicker means of communication, the major dependence upon Sumatra has decreased, and that upon India and Arabia for direct religious encouragement has increased. Still, the Malays of the Peninsula send at present large numbers of young men to religious schools in Sumatra. The influence of Indian and Arabian Muslims is strong in the country. Of course, much remains to be said of the present state of Islam in the Peninsula and its

comparison with Islam in other parts of the Islamic world. Food for thought also lies in the manner of the entrance of Islam into these parts as compared with the entrance of Christianity with the best military equipment of the west and forcing the Malays to relinquish their city and much of the country. These must await separate treatment, but the original path of Islam into the Malay Peninsula now seems relatively clear.

Malacca, S. S. R. A. BLASDELL.

Women without Rights

Mildred Cable, known to all for her intrepid courage in crossing Central Asia and for her missionary work writes, under the above title reviewing *Woman in Islam:* (see our January issue, p. 94)

"Pleading the cause of the Moslem women of India to-day, a well-known Moslem lady is quoted. She writes of their large families; the duties, which include the carrying of heavy water-jars, the cleaning of cowsheds, the cooking, the washing, the nursing of children, and she says: 'They seldom get more than three or four hours' sleep at night,' and asks, 'Is this the life of a human being or of a beast of burden?'

"Yet the well-off women of the *zenanas* fare no better, for, under Islamic rule, woman is the victim of a system which relegates her to the *harem,* where her mental and spiritual development is made well-nigh impossible. In some lands, she is covered by a *burka,* and within this degrading wall of cloth, she must live and move. She walks about like a corpse in its grave-clothes, and may never lift the veil in the presence of a man.

"Some brave pioneers among the women of Islam have dared to cast such restrictions aside, and have engaged in public service at considerable risk of themselves and their reputation. Public opinion on the subject of a professional career for Moslem women is definitely conservative, but at least one woman holds an 'A' licence for flying, a number of others pursue literary careers, some assist their husbands in the production of the best papers and periodicals; but these are very exceptional, and the great masses of the women of Islam are still the chattels of the men, and are without rights or means of redress.

"When we read that at the last census, 1931, it was revealed that, out of a total of 6,222,712 girls under five years of age, 217,819 were married, and 6,305 were either widows or divorced, nothing more need be said. Such facts should be studied and considered by Christian women, who, through the liberation of Christ's teaching, have their own liberty."

—*World Dominion.*

AN AMERICAN EXPERIMENT IN PEACE-MAKING: THE KING-CRANE COMMISSION

I.

One of the most serious and perplexing problems to come before the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 was that of the Near East, involving the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, a polyglot mediæval autocracy astride the great land and sea routes between Eurasia and Africa—the richest prize, perhaps, of the World War.

Imperial Germany had brought the Ottoman Empire into the war in the fall of 1914 and some months later the Allied Powers began to blue-print their shares of the Ottoman Empire, once winged victory had perched securely on the standards of the Entente. To be brief, the Inter-Allied secret agreements, beginning with the Anglo-Russian accord of March 12, 1915, assigning control over Constantinople and the Straits to Tsarist Russia, allocated Syria, Cilicia and their hinterlands to France, Mesopotamia to Great Britain, and Armenia and a portion of Kurdistan to Russia. Later on, Italy was to be allowed not merely to hold the Dodecanese Islands, but to have extensive compensations on the coast of Asia Minor in the regions of Smyrna and Adalia.[1] Palestine, which originally was to have been under Anglo-French control, was to become a British mandate, and, under the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, to include a Jewish "National Home." Britain, meanwhile, had made a number of agreements, not all of them consonant with one another, promising in-

[1] In general see H. N. Howard, *The Partition of Turkey: A Diplomatic History, 1913-1923* (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1931), Chs. 4, 5, and 6; Robert J. Kerner, "Russia, the Straits and Constantinople, 1914-1915," I. *Journal of Modern History* 3 (September 1929), 400-15, and "Russia and the Straits, 1915-1917," VIII *Slavonic Review* 24 (March 1930), 589-93. See also E. A. Adamov, *Konstantinopol i Prolivy* (Moscow 1925-26), 2 volumes; *Razdel Aziatskoi Turtsii* (Moscow 1924).

dependence and unity to the Arabs, especially under the Sherif Hussein of the Hejaz and King Ibn Saud of the Nejd. Altogether Great Britain admitted some nineteen secret commitments involving the fate of the Near East and its peoples prior to the opening of the Conference of Paris.[2]

The foundations of this projected structure, however, were shaken somewhat rudely by the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in November 1917, and the formulation of genuinely liberal principles of peace-making in the famous Wilson Fourteen Points in January 1918 and subsequent addresses in which the problems of a new order of peace and security were discussed.[3]

II.

It was natural that serious, if informal, deliberation concerning the Near Eastern question should begin immediately after the various delegations first arrived in Paris. So difficult were the problems, however, that peace did not come until 1922, after three and one half years of bitter struggle between the Greeks and Turks. The controversy at the Peace Conference involved something more than the clash of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers who were concerned with the control of the trade routes, strategic highways and natural wealth of the Near East. Arabs, Armenians, Greeks, Jews and Turks, to mention only the more vocal and significant groups, were at Paris to present their own sets of demands. Each had a plausible case, each was convinced of the complete justice of its cause.

Fundamentally, it was the fact of these serious discords

[2] See Miscellaneous No. 3 (1939). *Correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., K.C.I.E., C.S.I., His Majesty's High Commissioner at Cairo and the Sherif Hussein of Mecca. July 1915—March 1916. With a Map.* Cmd. 5957. Also Great Britain. Foreign Office. *Statement of British Policy in the Middle East for Submission to the Peace Conference* (if required). February 18, 1919, 18 pp. *Appendix on Previous Commitments of His Majesty's Government in the Middle East; Memorandum on British Commitments* to King Hussein. These papers are in the collection of Professor W. L. Westermann at the Hoover War Library, Stanford University.

[3] Especially R. S. Baker and W. E. Dodd, *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson* (New York, Harpers, 1927), III, 160-61. Also the Lloyd George address of January 5, 1918 in G. Lowes Dickinson, *Documents and Statements Relative to the Peace* (New York, Macmillan, 1919), 106-115.

which led some at Paris to think in terms of sending an expert commission to the Near East to examine the problem on the spot and find out, as such an investigation could, what the situation was. Only on such fact-finding could a just and secure peace in the future be based. Such a course had been recommended in private memoranda submitted to some future members of the American Delegation as early as November 1918.[4] On January 30, 1919, a few days after the formal opening of the Peace Conference, the Supreme Council adopted a resolution calling for the partition of the Ottoman Empire and the adoption of the mandate system for the Near Eastern peoples who were to be trained for political independence. By the beginning of February that body began to hear the claims and counterclaims of the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

As early as February 1 the American Commission to Negotiate Peace was considering a project to send Dr. James L. Barton, of the Near East Relief, and Dr. Frederic C. Howe to investigate conditions in that troubled and troublous area, but the project was later dropped, as was a subsequent idea of sending Dr. Leon Dominian.[5]

It was a letter from President Howard Bliss of the American University at Beirut, Syria, on February 7, 1919 to President Wilson, however, which seems to have laid the essential foundations for the sending of a Commission of Inquiry to the East.[6] Dr. Bliss told the President how much the people of Syria were relying on his ideals and on the Anglo-French Declaration of November 1918 promising them freedom. The Arabs wanted a "fair opportunity to express their own political aspirations." Bliss

[4] William H. Hall, Editor, *Reconstruction in Turkey. A Series of Reports Compiled for The American Committee of Armenian and Syrian Relief.* For Private Distribution Only. 1918. 243 pp. Also Harold A. Hatch and William H. Hall, *Recommendations for Political Reconstruction in the Turkish Empire.* For Private Distribution. November 1918. 7 pp. Lybyer's copy was received November 27, 1918. Marked confidential. See also W. H. Hall, "Reconstructing Turkey," XVIII *Asia* 11 (November 1918), 945-51.

[5] Minutes of the *Daily Meetings of the Commissioners Plenipotentiary, American Commission to Negotiate Peace,* February 1, 10, March 6, 1919. Hereinafter cited as *M. A. C.* See also Caleb F. Gates, *Not To Me Only* (Princeton 1940), 252, and James L. Barton, *Story of Near East Relief,* 97-100, for references to the Judson Commission's visit to Persia.

[6] From the Woodrow Wilson Papers (cited as WWP), Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. See Howard Bliss to President Wilson, February 7, 11, 1919, Wilson to Bliss, February 11, 1919; WWP IX-A 25. Also unpublished *Memoirs of Charles R. Crane.*

had heard rumors of a possible American Commission to the Near East, and voiced his satisfaction:

If such a Commission is adequately backed by the French and British authorities at home *and in Syria* the result of their investigations ought to be helpful. In my opinion an international Commission would have certain marked advantages over a purely American Commission and perhaps the change will still be made. I believe that the report of any Commission, made up of fair, wide-minded and resourceful men, would show that the Syrians desire the erection of an independent state or states under the care, for the present, of a Power, or of the "League of Nations." I believe the Power designated by the people would be America, for the Syrians believe in American disinterestedness; or England, for the people trust her sense of justice and believe in her capacity. I believe that French guardianship would be rejected for three reasons: Serious-minded men in Syria fear that the people of Syria would imitate France's less desirable qualities; they do not consider the French to be good administrators; they believe that France would exploit the country for her own material and political advantage. They do not trust her. If America should be indicated as the Power desired I earnestly hope that she will not decline.

The Bliss letter was ably seconded by the plea of the Emir Feisal before the military representatives of the Supreme Council on the same day. Bliss also made a statement before the Supreme Council on February 13, the day before President Wilson left Paris for a month's stay in the United States. In view of the Anglo-French military occupation of Syria, Dr. Bliss explained that it was impossible to obtain "an accurate statement of the Syrian point of view except by an examination on the spot by commissioners authorized by the Peace Conference."[7] When he appeared before the American Commissioners on February 26, however, Bliss was informed that while the matter could be pushed, in accord with Great Britain, "no decision was imminent."[8]

The idea of an Inter-Allied Commission also ran through other channels. Already, for example, a mission under Mr. William C. Bullitt had gone to Russia for the purpose of investigating the situation created by the

[7] See David Hunter Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris, with Documents* (cited as *M. D.*), XIV, 392.

[8] *M. A. C.*, February 26, 1919. Lansing was already very skeptical about a Commission.

November Revolution.[9] Moreover, Professor A. C. Coolidge and a staff of experts had gone into Central Europe to study conditions. When Professor R. J. Kerner, a member of the Coolidge mission, returned to Paris on March 8, he roomed with Professor A. H. Lybyer, then a member of the Balkan section of the American Delegation, who was about ready to terminate his work at Paris. In daily conversations the two discussed the problems of the Conference, especially those of Central Europe and the Near East, and Dr. Kerner suggested the possibility of a mission, similar to the one on which he had served, for the Near East.

It was with such a background and at President Wilson's firm insistence, that the Supreme Council decided to send a Commission of Inquiry to Syria on March 20. The American President suggested[10]

> that the fittest men that could be obtained should be selected to form an Inter-Allied Commission to go to Syria, extending their inquiries, if they led them beyond the confines of Syria. Their object should be to elucidate the state of opinion and the soil to be worked on by any mandatory. They should be asked to come back and tell the Conference what they found with regard to these matters . . . . If we were to send a Commission of men with no previous contact with Syria, it would, at any rate, convince the world that the Conference had tried to do all it could to find the most scientific basis possible for a settlement. The Commission should be composed of an equal number of French, British, Italian and American representatives. He would send it with *carte blanche* to tell the facts as they found them.

Within the next two days Wilson drew up the instructions for the proposed Commission, and they were formally approved on March 25 by the Supreme Council. The instructions requested the Commission to visit the Near East and to become as fully acquainted as possible with the state of public opinion and with the social, economic and political conditions of the region, and to form an opinion concerning such a division of territory and assignment of

[9] William C. Bullitt, *The Bullitt Mission to Russia. Testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate* (New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1919), 151 pp.
[10] R. S. Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, III, Document 1, p. 16-19; David Lloyd George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference* (New Haven, Yale, 1939), II, 693-95.

mandates which would be "most likely to promote the order, peace, and development of those peoples and countries." [11]

Almost immediately, however, a struggle centering around the project of the Commission ensued. The controversy really involved the substantial question as to the fundamental disposition of the Near Eastern peoples and lands. While the British were somewhat slow to act, and the French and Italian delegations seemed to have no intention of appointing commissioners, the American group was selected within a few days. Wilson wanted men of sound and liberal judgment, not necessarily experts on the Near East, to head the American section. Both Vance McCormick and George Rublee were considered, but shortly thereafter the President settled on Dr. Henry C. King, President of Oberlin College, and Mr. Charles R. Crane, of Chicago and New York. Both men were well known, both had traveled widely; both knew how to estimate difficult and complicated problems. [12]

When Professor Albert H. Lybyer heard of the King-Crane appointment on March 31, his friend, Professor Kerner, advised that he apply to be secretary of the American group, and within a short time Lybyer became the General Technical Adviser of the American Section. [13] Within a brief period, Professor W. L. Westermann, Chief of the Western Asia (Turkish) Division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, secured the appointment of Dr. George R. Montgomery as Technical Adviser for the Northern Regions of Turkey, and Captain William Yale as Technical Adviser for the Southern Regions of Turkey. Like Lybyer, Montgomery and Yale were acquainted with the Near East through residence and study. At about the same time, Captain Donald M. Brodie was

[11] American Commission to Negotiate Peace. *Future Administration of Certain Portions of the Turkish Empire Under the Mandatory System. Instructions for Commissioners from the Peace Conference to make Enquiries in Certain Portions of the Turkish Empire Which Are to be Permanently Separated from Turkey and put under the Guidance of Governments Acting as Mandatories for the League of Nations.* Papers of Henry Churchill King (KP), 3 pp.

[12] Emir Feisal to Wilson, March 24, 1919; WWP IX-A 33. Also R. S. Baker to Woodrow Wilson, March 21, 1919; Vance McCormick to Wilson, March 23, 1919; WWP IX-A 32, 33. *The Diaries of Vance C. McCormick* (privately published), March 21, 22, 1919. See also R. S. Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, I, 77-78.

[13] A. H. Lybyer to Mrs. Lybyer, March 29, 1919; A. H. Lybyer, *Diary*, March 31, 1919. These items are in the Papers of A. H. Lybyer (cited as LP).

chosen to act as secretary, and Laurence Moore as business manager, of the American group.

The process of organizing the American Section of the Inter-Allied Commission on Mandates in Turkey and stimulating the others to activity continued throughout April and May 1919. The Americans immediately began to study the Near Eastern problem in detail, to gather a great deal of material preparatory to direct, first-hand investigation, to hold conferences, and to consult with American and foreign experts. [14]

Plans for action matured slowly, however, and the project sailed through very stormy waters. Early in April Lybyer outlined an ambitious itinerary for the Commission, [15] calling for visits to Turkish Anatolia and Mesopotamia, as well as Syria and Palestine. By the middle of the month, when the Americans had expected to be off to Syria, a crisis was reached in the fortunes of the Commission. At the suggestion of Mr. Joseph C. Grew, Secretary-General of the American Delegation, Lybyer wrote a letter to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, outlining the conflicting attitudes concerning the dispatch of an American Commission to Syria, if the full inter-Allied Commission failed to materialize. While King, Crane and Lybyer believed that an American group could do some good, Professor Westermann held that a Commission would do a great deal of harm, without achieving anything constructive or adding to the information already available in Paris itself. [16] The situation was not improved when, the next day, a French memorandum opposing the Commission fell into American hands. [17] The result was that when the American Commission to

[14] For example see KP for *Dr. King's Notes on Trip: Commission to Turkey, Notes: Data Gathered, Data Still Desired from Experts.* There were numerous conferences and interviews.

[15] LP. Lybyer to King, April 4-5, 1919. *Preliminary Project of Itinerary for the Interallied Turkish Commission.*

[16] LP. Lybyer to Grew, April 16, 1919.

[17] WWP IX-A 75. From the Division of Western Asia. *Abstract of Memorandum Which Accidentally Came Into Our Hands, Presumably Intended for the French Foreign Office, on the Syrian Matter.* [From Mr. Frazier's Office. Memorandum for the President]. According to Lybyer's *Diary*, April 17, 1919, Robert de Caix "accidentally" had left the document behind.

Negotiate Peace met on April 18 the members agreed "to give up entirely" the idea of sending a group to the Near East. [18] When Professor Kerner heard of this action he sensed the critical development and advised that Dr. King ask immediately to see President Wilson, a somewhat difficult thing to do, though a month later such a conference was to lead to a way out of the *impasse*. King, in any case, was ready to go home, while Charles R. Crane was planning to go to Constantinople, to take Lybyer with him, nominally as his private secretary. [19]

By April 22, however, the American group had recovered from an apparent knockout blow, and once more was to prepare to leave for the eastern Mediterranean. The Emir Feisal, who was leaving for Syria, had written to President Wilson urgently insisting on an investigation. Moreover, the British, prodded into action by a strong telegram from General Sir Edmund Allenby, the Commander-in-Chief in the Near East, had appointed an exceedingly able group, with Sir Henry McMahon, former High Commissioner in Egypt, and Commander David Hogarth, the distinguished authority on the Near and Middle East, as Commissioners, and Professor Arnold J. Toynbee, as Secretary, and were now very anxious to go. [20] By the latter part of April it appeared that even Clemenceau was ready to act, though, in fact, he was not, and another month of delay, confusion and obstruction was to follow, while the American group continued active preparations to leave for their duties in the Orient.

III.

Fearful, no doubt, lest the Peace Conference reach unfortunate decisions concerning the disposition of the Near Eastern peoples, the entire American group sent an important memorandum to President Wilson on May 1 regarding the dangers of a selfish exploitation of the Otto-

[18] *M. A. C.* April 18, 1919. LP. Grew to Lybyer, April 19, 1919.
[19] Lybyer *Diary*, April 18-20, 1919.
[20] WWP IX-A 45. The Emir Feisal to President Wilson, April 20, 1919; Col. E. M. House to President Wilson, April 21, 1919. See also Lybyer *Diary*, April 16, 1919; Crane *Memoirs*.

man Empire. [21] In this, their first report, the King-Crane Commission expressed the belief that the unity of Asia Minor at least and perhaps the entire Ottoman Empire should be preserved under some kind of mandatory system, though the rights of nationalities should be recognized and due weight should be given to the interests of Great Britain, France and Italy. But a selfish exploitation of the region would give rise to grave difficulties in the East, bringing no profit to the Allies, and producing serious dangers in the world at large. That plea did not prevent the supreme Council from making a tentative disposition of the mandates on May 7. Moreover, on May 14, the Greeks were permitted to land forces at Smyrna, partly in order to block Italian action, a tragic mistake destined to lead to three and one half years of murderous warfare on the Anatolian plateau. Admiral Mark Bristol, the American High Commissioner in Constantinople, who sensed the gravity of the situation, already was urging the sending of a Commission to investigate conditions. [22]

In the interim, the King-Crane group studied, held conferences, and had a number of interviews. On May 7, for instance, President Caleb F. Gates, of Robert College, Constantinople, who did not believe an investigation necessary, discussed the problems of the region, urging that the Ottoman Empire be kept intact under an American or British mandate. Professors Westermann and Lybyer, Dr. Dominian, Captain Yale, and many others gave lectures on various aspects of the Eastern Question with which they were especially familiar. [23]

By the middle of May the prospects of the Commission

[21] WWP IX-A 75 and LP. Mandate Commission. *Copy of Note sent to President, May 1, 1919. Memorandum on the Dangers to the Allies from a Selfish Exploitation of the Turkish Empire,* 4 pp. The memorandum was signed by Henry Churchill King, Charles R. Crane, Albert H. Lybyer, George R. Montgomery and William Yale. In general the Commission proposed: 1) British mandates in Mesopotamia and Palestine; 2) recognition of King Hussein as King of the Hejaz; 3) Great Britain's general supervision of Arabia, with maintenance of the "open door"; 4) possible acceptance of a "liberally interpreted" French mandate over Syria, though this was not based on the desires of the Syrians; 5) a general American mandate in the non-Arabic portions of the Ottoman Empire, with subsidiary special mandates for Armenia, Anatolia, and a Constantinopolitan State.

[22] See the illuminating dispatches from Admiral Bristol, February to May 1919, copies of which are in KP.

[23] For notes on these conferences see LP, KP and notes of Donald M. Brodie. See also Caleb F. Gates, *Not To Me Only,* 260-61. Gates opposed the commission because he thought the facts were readily available and feared the consequences of delay and confusion in the Near East.

were approaching another crisis. As early as May 6, Dr. King wrote to Colonel House insisting that pressure be brought to bear on the French to appoint their men. He felt it "reasonable to ask that the delay should not continue." [24] However, on May 8, Professor Felix Frankfurter, in behalf of the Zionist Organization, wrote to President Wilson expressing his fears lest the appointment of the Inter-Allied Commission would postpone the Near Eastern settlement beyond Wilson's stay in Paris and lead ultimately to a disposition of the problem contrary to the Balfour Declaration, on which Zionist hopes had centered. Wilson did not reply until some days later, and finally, in response to Frankfurter's request for a reassuring word, remarked that he had never dreamed that a renewed assurance of his adhesion to the Balfour Declaration was necessary. But he made no promise concerning the sending of a Commission to Syria. [25]

The crisis now came and passed quickly. On May 20, Colonel House received an urgent communication from the Hejaz Delegation expressing determined opposition to any attempt to settle Near Eastern problems without consulting the Arabs, and insisting on the sending of an investigating Commission. House transmitted the letter to President Wilson and told him that "it was something of a scandal that this Commission had not already gone to Syria as promised the Arabs." When Dr. King called on House on May 20, he was advised that House had suggested Monday, May 26 for the departure of the American group, "regardless of the French and English." [26]

President Wilson received a telegram from Emir Feisal on May 22 advising him that on his arrival in Syria he had "found everybody anxiously awaiting the arrival of the Commission." [27] At the same time, Henry White, a member of the American Delegation, wrote the President

[24] WWP IX-A 51. H. C. King to Col. House, May 6, 1919; also House to Wilson, May 6, 1919.
[25] WWP IX-A 55 and LP. Felix Frankfurter to President Wilson, May 8, 14, 1919; President Wilson to Felix Frankfurter, May 13, 16, 1919.
[26] WWP IX-A 56. The Hejaz Delegation to Colonel House, Paris, May 20, 1919. Transmitted to President Wilson. See also House Diary, May 20; King to House, May 21, 1919 (KP).
[27] WWP IX-A 57. Originally sent on May 4, the Feisal telegram was transmitted through Sir Gilbert Clayton on May 6 from Cairo.

approving the principle of "impartial commissions" for investigating such problems as those involved in the Near East and the Balkans. If the idea proved feasible, the Conference might be adjourned temporarily to await the report of a number of commissions and reassemble in the fall in London, rather than Paris.[28] Finally, Dr. King, Mr. Crane and Professor Westermann called on the President on May 22, and Wilson told them of his conviction that the investigation should be made.[29]

The formalities were soon completed, for there was now no question about going to the Near East. On May 25 Mr. Crane left for Constantinople, to be followed by the rest four days later. The British commissioners, who were preparing for the journey, did not go, though they offered all assistance and expressed their "good luck" in the American attempt to "solve the worst riddle" which faced the Peace Conference.[30] The French made no effort to assist or to send their own commissioners. But after long delay, President Wilson, at last, had decided that, whatever the state of information in Paris, only an investigation in the Near East itself could provide a proper, objective basis for a genuine settlement.

IV.

Without lingering long in Constantinople, where Admiral Bristol and other American officials anxiously awaited their arrival, the King-Crane Commission went almost immediately to Palestine, arriving on June 10, 1919. The Americans remained in the Palestine-Syrian area until July 21, when they took ship again for Constantinople, where the findings were to be analyzed and prepared for

---

[28] WWP IX-A 57. Henry White to the President, May 22, 1919; Lord Bryce to Henry White, May 19, 1919.

[29] See King *Diary*, May 22, 1919. KP. *Memorandum of Points Desired to be Taken up with the President* (Original in King's Notebook). See also King to Bohn, May 23, 1919 (KP).

[30] E. G. Forbes Adam to A. H. Lybyer, May 28, 1919 (LP). David G. Hogarth had written to Lybyer on May 21 indicating preparations of Sir Henry McMahon and himself to leave within a few days. He was presuming that President Wilson would act immediately in three matters: "1. Suspension of assignment of Turkish mandates, leaving us some honest purpose and character. 2. Insistence on the French appointing their Commission and joining us without delay. 3. Provision of transport to Palestine (and in Palestine by the British)." Toynbee had become ill and could not go, in any case.

the report to the President and the Peace Conference.

The survey in Palestine and Syria was made in the light of the previous study in Paris. The method of the Commission [31]

was to meet in conference individuals and delegations who should represent all the significant groups in the various communities, and so to obtain as far as possible the opinions and desires of the whole people. The process itself was inevitably a kind of political education for the people, and, besides actually bringing out the desires of the people, had at least further value in the simple consciousness that their wishes were being sought. We were not blind to the fact that there was considerable propaganda; that often much pressure was put upon individuals and groups; that sometimes delegations were prevented from reaching the Commission; and that the representative authority of many petitions was questionable. But the Commission believes that these anomalous elements in the petitions tend to cancel one another when the whole country is taken into account, and that, as in the composite photograph, certain great, common emphases are unmistakable.

Altogether some thirty-six important towns were visited and delegations from many other centers were heard. Representatives from some 1,500 villages appeared before the Americans and some 1,863 petitions were received. Twice telegrams were sent to the President. On June 12 the two Commissioners sent President Wilson a telegram from Jaffa concerning the alarming situation and expressed their doubt that "any British or American official here believes it is possible to carry out the Zionist program except through the support of a large army." [32] On July 11, after studying the problem in both Arab and French-occupied Syria, Professor Lybyer and the two Commissioners sent a cable to the President from Beirut describing the "unexpectedly strong expressions of national feeling" which they had found, as well as the firm opposition to French supervision and the Zionist plans for a separate Palestine. The Syrian National Congress, which had met on July 2-3 in Damascus, had given clear expres-

[31] "The King-Crane Report on the Near East. A Suppressed Official Document of the United States Government," *The Editor and Publisher*, Vol. 55, No. 27 (December 2, 1922), Second Section, pp. i to xxviii, p. lv. There is a carbon of the original in KP. Hereafter cited as *Report*.

[32] Henry C. King and Charles R. Crane to President Wilson, June 12, 1919 (KP).

sion to the Arab point of view.[33] While neither Dr. Montgomery nor Captain Yale agreed, Dr. King, Mr. Crane and Professor Lybyer were coming to the conclusion that Syrian unity should be preserved under an American or British mandate, with a constitutional monarchy under the Emir Feisal.

When the Commission returned to Constantinople it had two tasks to perform. One was to investigate conditions in the Constantinople region, preparatory to reporting on the Turkish problem proper, since it was then decided that an investigation of Anatolia and Mesopotamia on the ground was impossible. The second was to prepare the final report. The investigations were carried on through a series of interviews and consultations with Turks, Kurds, Chaldeans, Greeks and Armenians, not to mention American officials and missionaries. In general the Armenians demanded independence for a "large Armenia," the Greeks claimed both the Smyrna and the Pontic regions, while the Turks desired the preservation of the territorial integrity of the old Empire, with a constitutional monarchy and under the supervision of an American or a British mandate. For the most part the Americans seemed to favor the latter solution.[34]

As the American Commission settled down to the business of preparing its report, a task which lasted about one month, certain disagreements and controversies which had developed ever since the group had arrived in Palestine and Syria came more clearly into the open. Neither Dr. Montgomery nor Captain Yale had agreed with the methods or the tentative conclusions which had been shaping in the minds of the Commissioners and Professor Lybyer from the very beginning of the Syrian venture. On July 26, therefore, Montgomery and Yale submitted their own con-

---

[33] King-Crane Commission to President Wilson, July 11, 1919 (sent July 15); KP and LP. Captain Yale wrote his impressions, July 8, 1919 to Professor W. L. Westermann, disagreeing fundamentally with the Commission's telegram. LP.

[34] For the interviews in Constantinople see LP. See also KP for the detailed statement of Ahmed Emin [Yalman] Bey presented to the American Section of the International Commission for Mandates in the Near East, 7 pp. Halidé Edib, *The Turkish Ordeal* (New York, Century, 1928), 58-61, has an interesting account. Louis Edgar Browne wrote a number of significant dispatches for the Chicago *Daily News*, August 8, 11, 16, 1919.

clusions in two lengthy memoranda.[35] Dr. Montgomery recommended that Palestine be separated from Syria and placed under a British mandate, that Mount Lebanon be autonomous under a French mandate, and that Syria proper be placed under a joint Anglo-French mandate, with Feisal as prince. Captain Yale, who doubted the genuine character of Arab or Syrian nationalism and questioned the leadership and ability of the Emir Feisal, suggested that Palestine be separated from Syria under a British mandate and constituted as a Jewish National Home, though he admitted that such a solution "was entirely contrary to the wishes of the people of Palestine and those of most of the inhabitants of Syria." Mount Lebanon should be made autonomous, while Damascus, Homs, Hama, Tripoli and Latakia should be united under Feisal with either a British or French, or joint Anglo-French mandate. Neither Yale nor Montgomery, in view of the political imponderables involved, considered the possibility of an American mandate.

After laboring at the task since the latter part of July, Dr. King and Professor Lybyer substantially completed the official report of the King-Crane Commission on August 21, the day before taking ship for Paris, though it was not until August 28 that it was signed, sealed, and delivered to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. Two days later Mr. Crane advised President Wilson by cable of the essence of the official recommendations of the Commission.[36] It was urged that a true mandatory, under American or British administration, be established in Syria, with Feisal as the constitutional monarch. Palestine was to be included within Syria, in accordance with the desires of the majority of the people, and "the extreme Zionist program" was to be "seriously modified." Great

[35] See George R. Montgomery, *Report on Syria*, typed, 9 pp.; Captain William Yale, *A Report on Syria, Palestine and Mount Lebanon for the American Commissioners, Prepared by Captain William Yale, Technical Advisor to the American Section of the International Commission on Mandates in Turkey.* July 26, 1919. Constantinople, 34 pp.; *Recommendations as to the Future Disposition of Palestine, Syria and Mount Lebanon, Prepared by Captain William Yale, Technical Advisor to the American Section of the International Commission on Mandates in Turkey.* Constantinople, July 26, 1919, 11 pp. Though these memoranda differed in their conclusions from the final *Report* of the Commission, they cannot be considered technically as "minority reports."

[36] KP. Cable, Charles R. Crane to President Wilson, August 30, 1919.

Britain was recommended as the mandatory for Mesopotamia, "in strict fulfillment of the spirit of the Anglo-French Declaration of November 9, 1918." A limited Armenian State under mandate was advised, as was one for a separate international Constantinopolitan State under the League of Nations, and one for a continued Turkish State in Anatolia. But all Greek claims for territory in Asia Minor were rejected. A general single, but composite, mandate was suggested for the non-Arabic portions of the Turkish Empire, including the subordinate mandates with governors and a governor-general. Finally it was recommended that the United States be asked to take the whole if reasonable conditions could be fulfilled, but not to take any part without the whole.

Captain Donald M. Brodie transmitted the text of the King-Crane Report to the White House on September 27, 1919, but President Wilson was on his "swing around the circle" in behalf of his foreign policy and fell tragically ill before his return to Washington. There is no evidence that he was ever able fully to read the report while still in office. [37]

Meanwhile the American Commission to Negotiate Peace was anxious to promote a rational settlement of Near Eastern problems. Partly for that reason Captain Yale went to London in the early fall of 1919, consulted many people, and produced a plan which was anonymously published in the London *Times* on October 8. Substantially similar to the principles enunciated in his memorandum, the so-called Yale plan was not seriously considered at all.[38] By the middle of October the Report of the Harbord

[37] See Brodie Papers. Donald M. Brodie, *Memorandum Regarding the Suppression and Publication in 1922 of the King-Crane Report on Mandates in Turkey.* August 28, 1940. The Crane *Memoirs.* Also Charles R. Crane to Donald M. Brodie, November 30, 1934.

[38] The so-called Yale Plan was published anonymously, at Wickham Steed's suggestion, in The London *Times,* October 8, 1919. Basically the plan was as follows: *Palestine* to be constituted as a separate political entity under the Mandate of Great Britain, where the Zionists would be permitted to carry out the ideal of a National Home for the Jewish people; *Mount Lebanon* to be constituted as a separate political unit under a French mandate; *Syria* to be constituted "provisionally" as an independent state with a representative Arab government under a French mandate; *Mesopotamia* to be divided into a northern area embracing the former Ottoman vilayets of Mosul and Bagdad and a southern zone composed of Basra and the Emirate of Mohammederan. The Northern area was to be "provisionally" independent with a representative Arab Government under British mandate, the Southern area to have local self government under British mandate. For Yale's interviews (September 27 to October 14, 1919) and his Report on the "Position of the Syrian Question Today," October 21, 1919 to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, see *Yale Papers.*

Mission, which had studied conditions especially in Anatolia and Armenia, was available.[39] While it did not make positive recommendations, the observations of the Harbord Mission were not dissimilar to those of the King-Crane Report. The American Commissioners in Paris had copies of both the Harbord and the King-Crane documents when they framed a statement for the American Government in Washington on November 26[40] concerning the need for "a definite Turkish policy," declaring that "no territorial spoils so large and valuable as the Turkish Empire" had "ever in our time been divided up by treaty." The Commissioners assumed that the United States would soon ratify the Treaty of Versailles, become a member of the League of Nations, and assume some responsibility for peace in the Near East, but they wanted to know definitely the nature of the policy to be adopted. To guide the negotiators the American Government should decide:

(1) How far it will adopt the recommendations of the Crane-King and Harbord Reports as to the lines on which the Ottoman Empire should be divided;

(2) Whether the so-called "secret" agreements made by other Powers for the partition of Turkey are to be recognized by the United States;

(3) If these agreements are not recognized, whether the United States will be prepared to provide money or troops in order that the territorial and political plans provided for in those agreements may not be carried out;

(4) Whether the United States will be prepared to cooperate in the international control of such portions of Turkey as are not placed under any mandate.

The American delegation thought we should join in the Turkish treaty and refuse to permit any selfish exploitation. Were the United States to take no part, or only an apathetic part, in the Near Eastern settlement, both material and moral interests would suffer. The only real reply was the withdrawal of the last remnant of the American delegation from Paris in December 1919. The

[39] Major General James G. Harbord, *Conditions in the Near East. Report of the American Military Mission to Armenia.* U. S. Senate Document No. 266, 66th Congress, 2nd Session. The Harbord Group had seen a copy of the King-Crane *Report.*

[40] KP. American Commission to Negotiate Peace. *Memorandum on the Policy of the United States Relative to the Treaty with Turkey.* Paris, November 26, 1919. 6 pp.

King-Crane Report itself was suppressed and did not see the light of day until December 1922, when the New York *Times* and the *Editor and Publisher* made it available in full. [41]

V.

The King-Crane Commission's investigation and Report may be evaluated, essentially, in a two-fold manner. Its conclusions and recommendations may be examined in the light of the developments in the years which followed the Peace Conference. Again, the value of this experiment in peace-making may be considered regardless of the temporary character of some of the specific recommendations.

Let us take first the Commission's recommendations concerning Palestine. It is well to recall that while the Commissioners rejected the extreme Zionist program, they did not leave the Jews out of consideration or act in accordance with anti-Semitic prejudices. They were recommending simply in accordance with the facts as they found them in Palestine at the time, only about ten per cent. of whose population was Jewish. Developments within Palestine since 1919 would seem, in part, at least, to justify the recommendations of the King-Crane Commission, for Palestine was to become a battle-ground wherein the forces of British imperialism, centering around the Suez Canal and the control of the eastern Mediterranean, Jewish Zionism and Arab nationalism were to contend for years after the war. Zionism, apparently, was not to recognize the smallness and poverty of Palestine, and was to flower at the very time when Arabic nationalism was itself coming into bloom. [42]

These difficulties have continued until the coming of

[41] There are evidences to indicate that French, British and Zionist pressure was exerted to prevent publication, though it may be true that it was simply the illness of President Wilson, which, in the last analysis, prevented publication. The King, Crane, Lybyer, Brodie and Wilson papers may be consulted on this point.

[42] There is an excellent chapter on "Zionism" in Hans Kohn's *Revolutions and Dictatorships* (Cambridge, Harvard, 1939), Ch. 13. See also Cmd. 3692 (1930). *Palestine: Statement of Policy by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom;* Cmd. 5479 (1937) *Palestine: Royal Commission Report.*

the present struggle, into the picture of which they have also entered significantly. The British have consistently refused to accept the idea of a Jewish state or commonwealth in Palestine, which infuriated the political Zionists, and they did too much in that direction to suit the Arabs. It may well be that one of the results of the present conflict, provided an Allied victory is won, could be a possible solution of the Arab-Zionist antagonism, though it is doubtful if it could be along extreme Zionist lines.[43] But as yet no modern Solomon has come forward with a solution of the problem.

In the case of Syria, the Commission proposed a united country under the constitutional rule of Prince Feisal, with either the United States or Great Britain as the mandatory. It was pointed out that any attempt to force a French mandate on the unwilling Arabs would lead to difficulties, might produce an Anglo-French quarrel, a Franco-Arabic struggle, "and force upon Great Britain a dangerous alternative." The Commission was aware of the long-established French connections with Syria, but it feared the consequences of a French mandate. Again it rejected the Syrian claim to the region of Cilicia. Those familiar with the history of Syria since 1919 may well feel that the suggestions of the King-Crane Commission were justified. Almost immediately the French proceeded to destroy the basic unity of the Syrian community. They had constant troubles of an administrative, economic, political and social nature since 1919, with armed uprisings in 1920, 1925 and 1936. Altogether there were no less than eighteen revolts in Syria against France between 1919 and 1941. A Franco-Syrian treaty of September 8, 1936 promised Syria independence within three years, but consummation of that promise was frustrated by the war. Independence was again promised to Syria, after its

[43] Note especially the position of Dr. Judah L. Magnes, President of the Hebrew University, favoring a bi-national community within Palestine, itself an autonomous unit within a larger union of the surrounding Arabic states. See Judah L. Magnes, *Like All The Nations?* (Jerusalem, 1930), 77 pp.; New York *Times*, July 21, 1941. Dr. Magnes recently emphasized that there was "no chance whatsoever" that the formula, " 'establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth', instead of a national home in Palestine, would be accepted by any responsible Arab or Arab party or any part of Arabic public opinion." New York *Times*, September 21, 1941.

conquest by British Imperial and Free French Forces, in September 1941. [44]

In accordance with the King-Crane Report, Mesopotamia, or Iraq, was placed under a British mandate, and a careful study of the development of modern Iraq, which became independent in 1927 and entered the League of Nations as a sovereign state in 1932, would appear to justify the King-Crane proposal. Likewise, it is interesting to observe that the *vilayet* of Mosul became a part of the Iraq mandate in 1925, as the King-Crane Commission had suggested in 1919.

On the other hand, the problem of Arab federation, for very natural reasons, was not solved, as had been proposed. Nevertheless, within recent months, the British Government has indicated its readiness to work in that general direction. [45]

The recommendations concerning the Turkish nation were somewhat more complicated. The Commission had proposed a general American mandate for the whole of Turkey, including the region of Constantinople and the Straits, the Anatolian region, and Armenia, and rejected all Greek or Italian claims to any portion of Asia Minor. In the case of Turkey proper, it way well be that the Commission underestimated the resurgent forces of a rejuvenated Turkish nation under the able leadership of Mustapha Kemal, or Atatürk. Certainly the Turkish chieftain, and for the most part those around him, did not want a mandate of any kind, though the Turkish nationalists were well disposed toward Americans, and did not outlaw the prospect of that sort of political, economic and educational assistance from abroad which would not infringe on Turkish sovereignty or independence. In the end, few would deny that Turkish independence has worked better than a mandate might have worked. Indeed, it might be argued that the Turks had achieved for them-

[44] Independence was actually proclaimed on September 16, 1941. New York *Times*, September 17, 1941.

[45] See the address of Anthony Eden, British Foreign Minister, May 29, 1941; New York *Times*, May 30, 1941; discussion of federal solution, New York *Times*, September 19, 21, 1941.

selves almost exactly what a mandate might have accomplished along the road of secularization, nationalism and industrialization. A type of internationalization of the region of Constantinople and the Straits was realized in the Conference of Lausanne in July 1923, though this came to an end in the Montreux Convention of July 1936, when Turkish sovereignty was restored over the Straits. [46] Armenian independence, however, did not materialize. Even the limited recommendation of the King-Crane Commission, thanks to the exigencies of world politics, proved impossible of realization.

In view of the American failure to assume any mandatory responsibilities in the Near East, one may raise the general problem of the validity of the Commission's recommendations—for after all, the Commission postulated American membership in the League of Nations and the assumption of a mandate in Syria and Asia Minor. Certainly the King-Crane Commission, after studying the situation as directly and carefully as it knew how and making its recommendations on the basis of the best information and knowledge it could obtain, is not to be blamed for the American failure to assume its obligations in the post-World War world. Indeed, in urging that America assume her rightful place in the world, the Commission warned against that cynicism and disillusionment, which in the form of policies of political isolationism and economic nationalism, contributed so much to the coming of the present catastrophe. [47]

But one may evaluate the work of the King-Crane Commission and its experiment in peace-making from another angle, somewhat divorced from these temporal considerations. Recommendations of any commission are subject to political application, to change from the very beginning. Moreover, with time, even a very short period, some proposals become inapplicable—as perhaps, the recommenda-

[46] Turkey No. 1 (1936). *Convention Regarding the Régime of the Straits With Correspondence Relating Thereto.* Montreux, July 20, 1936. Cmd. 6249.

[47] The refusal to assume mandatory responsibilities in the Near East was of a piece with the extreme program of political isolationism and economic nationalism pursued for many years following the World War of 1914-1918.

tions concerning Palestine, when viewed from the present moment, or the suggestions for an American mandate, viewed from any period since 1922 or 1923. But these considerations have little or nothing to do with the problem of the general validity of this type of investigation in making peace or in any other type of social, economic and political adjustment.

The King-Crane Commission had been sent to Syria and the Near East because President Wilson and others in authority believed that this was the best way to obtain the information necessary for setting up a sound post-war system in the Near and Middle East. While some Americans at Paris objected from the beginning on the ground that all the necessary information was easily available in Paris, President Wilson rejected that notion. This would seem to be a thoroughly sound position. It is one thing to gather information from books, pamphlets, documents and conferences, but such information can best be attested by actual investigation on the ground. Such direct investigation is still a valid, scholarly and scientific procedure even if it proves nothing either positively or negatively over and above what was known in the beginning, for such an affirmation or negation is itself a part of the testing of the knowledge necessary as a foundation for any procedure of investigation. Were the contrary true, personal inquiry on the spot might never be in order.

The methods of investigation which the Commission used were those of balancing common sense with expert knowledge. Before going out to the Near East the Commission studied thoroughly the basic literature on the subject, including the "full and varied reports and material" of the office of the Western Asia Division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace. The quest in Syria, Palestine and Turkey proper was carried on in the light of that background. In Syria and Palestine the American group was careful to see that all shades of opinion were duly represented in interviews, conferences, and petitions. Numerous foreigners in official and unofficial positions were

interviewed. While the Commission spent forty days in the Syrian region, it was not able to visit extensively in Anatolia, Armenia or Mesopotamia. But it did not hesitate to make recommendations concerning these regions, for much information had been gathered, using Constantinople as the center to which delegations came from a wide distribution of places. While the King-Crane Commission may be criticized for not visiting Anatolia, Armenia and Mesopotamia because of lack of time, it is well to note that the Harbord Mission, which did spend time in Anatolia and Armenia, generally substantiated the King-Crane conclusions.

It is true that the Inter-Allied Commission on Mandates in Turkey was incomplete, for only the American Section was ever sent to the Near East. This was, from some points of view, quite obviously a misfortune. In the first place, a genuine Inter-Allied Commission might have made recommendations which would have had more possibility of acceptance by the Peace Conference, though this is not necessarily so. Secondly, the Commission would then have been definitely an official body representing all the Powers at Paris. But it might be stressed that it was not an unmixed harm that the Inter-Allied Commission did not go, for it may well be that the American group obtained a fairer, more exact impression and presented a more unbiased report than a so-called international commission would have presented. Nevertheless, the fact that only the American group went did give room for charges of partiality, of unfairness, and even of ignorance, particularly since only Palestine, Syria and Constantinople were investigated on the ground. Again, if the Inter-Allied Commission had gone, almost certainly it would have been able to get away to the Near East at a somewhat better time than the King-Crane Commission did, though this presupposes an early agreement to that effect. But it was no fault of the Americans that an Inter-Allied group did not go.

It has been pointed out, too, that the King-Crane Com-

mission went to the Near East too late to accomplish effectively its mission, and there is some truth in this charge. It is interesting to note, however, that as late as July 5, 1919 a number of distinguished Englishmen [48] urged the appointment of expert commissions to study a number of problems in Southeastern Europe and the Near East. These gentlemen declared that "any disadvantages that delay may involve would be slight as compared with the evils of making under the pressure of weariness and impatience hasty and perhaps ill-informed decisions which would leave rankling resentments and the seeds of war behind." Again, one may point out that whereas the King-Crane Commission began its work in June 1919, the Harbord Mission did not arrive in Armenia until mid-September and did not complete its work until the middle of October. But the delay in sending the King-Crane group was hardly the fault of the members of the Commission, who were ready to leave Paris by the middle of April, and anxious to begin their work on the ground. The fact that they did not get away until the end of May was to be explained by the defiant opposition of the French to any Commission going to Syria and the objection of the Zionists against an investigation in Palestine, to the failure of the British to press the matter, and to the unfriendly attitude of some Americans, on the ground that all the facts were available in Paris, and the fear that such a Commission might unduly arouse the emotions of the Near Eastern peoples.

As a result, the Treaty of Sèvres was sufficiently advanced to be presented to Turkish hand-picked delegates before the Commission returned to Paris. But since it was not signed until August 10, 1920, there was ample opportunity, as the American Delegation indicated in November 1919, for the application of the King-Crane Report. This was particularly true had the Peace Conference been organized, as originally intended, into a

[48] See the letter to the London *Times*, July 5, 1919, signed by Lord Crowe, Lord Carnock, Viscount Bryce, Sir George W. Buchanan, Frederick Kenyon, Arthur J. Evans, and Sir W. M. Ramsay.

preliminary conference to impose a preliminary treaty on the vanquished states, and then taken more time to negotiate the final treaties of peace. [49]

There can be little or no question concerning the qualifications of the members of the King-Crane Commission, though neither Dr. King nor Mr. Crane was an expert on Near Eastern problems. Both were men of intelligence and independence, whose honesty and impartiality were unassailable. Professor Lybyer, Dr. Montgomery and Captain Yale were well acquainted both by residence and knowledge with the problems of the Near East. [50]

The King-Crane Commission represented one of the first and most unusual attempts to ascertain the desires and wishes of a people in an effort to accord them justice. The Commission was not dissimilar to the various Royal Commissions which the British Government has sent out to various regions within the Empire. [51] It may be compared with Congressional committees or commissions which have been used to investigate numerous problems. The King-Crane Commission was a prototype of the kind of Commissions of Investigation which the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations have used to excellent advantage in the settlement of many of the disputes and conflicts which came before the League of Nations in the heyday of its activities. [52]

Few, indeed, could seriously question the use of an investigating commission such as the King-Crane group as a method of reasonably ascertaining a truthful basis on which to arrange a more enduring peace in the Near East, after sound preparatory work from all other accessible sources. The procedures employed were not only perfectly legitimate and valid, but very often were the only types of investigation which could determine the

[49] Harold Nicolson, *Why Britain Is At War* (Penguin, 1939), Ch. 10.

[50] Captain Brodie's work in compiling the statistical data for the Report was outstanding. Laurence Moore's handling of the finances, about $20,000, was quite efficient.

[51] Note for instance the various Royal Commissions which have been sent out to India and Palestine in the period since 1920.

[52] Compare the investigation of the King-Crane Commission with the work of the League of Nations Commissions which inquired into the problem of Mosul and the Sino-Japanese conflict in Manchuria. See League of Nations: *Question of the Frontier Between Turkey and Iraq* (C.400.M.147.1925.VII) and Appeal by the Chinese Government. *Report of the Commission of Enquiry* [The Lytton Commission] (C.663.M.320. 1932.VII.12).

necessary facts. By such an investigation, after all the other sources have been thoroughly searched and digested, the elements of scientific, expert knowledge were introduced into the peace-making. Moreover, the use of the King-Crane Commission raises the wider problem of the introduction of scholarly and scientific information, not only in the immediate conduct of foreign relations, but in the planning of foreign policy. This would demand a broader foreign service which would have recourse to well-trained social scientists studying and reporting in all the troubled areas, and a great foreign affairs commission, including members of the State Department, the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and all other necessary elements.[53] With such an institutional apparatus, groups like the King-Crane Commission could not only work more effectively and efficiently, but could begin and complete their work sooner than otherwise. A wiser, more sane foreign policy, and a more sound, genuine program of peace would be the result.

It is in the light of this long-range vision that the work of the King-Crane Commission should be considered. In sending the Commission to the Near East in the spring and summer of 1919 President Wilson made a genuinely challenging contribution to the technique of peace-making, a contribution, which, it may be hoped, will set a precedent for the future. The work and the report of the King-Crane Commission justified the confidence which President Wilson had placed in the character, integrity and intelligence of Henry Churchill King and Charles R. Crane and those who were associated with them.

Miami University,
Oxford, Ohio. HARRY N. HOWARD.

[53] Something of this procedure, *ad hoc.*, was suggested by the American Commission to Negotiate Peace in its memorandum of November 26, 1919, in its insistence on the need for a definite Turkish policy. See R. J. Kerner, "The Need for a Foreign Policy-Formulating Body in the United States," Part II *The Commonwealth* (Official Journal of The Commonwealth Club, San Francisco) February 14, 1939, Vol. XV, No. 7, 285-86, 292-95. Also Office of the Historical Adviser, *The Department of State of the United States* (Washington, 1933), 101 pp.; S. Shepard Jones and Denys P. Myers, *Documents on American Foreign Relations* (Boston 1941), III, 758-61.

PRE-ISLAMIC POETRY[1]

There is no denying the backwardness of the study of Arabic poetry, when compared with the achievements of research in other fields of literature. The difficulties of the subject and the scarcity of reliable historical and biographical data certainly contributed to this state of affairs. The real reason, however, is to be found in the inadequate approach to the field which has been, and largely still is, adopted by the specialists themselves.

In imitation of the Arabic grammarians, they considered the so-called classical poetry little else than a treasure-house of philological curiosities, a store from which to collect evidence for lexicological discussion. Not a single one of those who tried their hand at a history of early Arabic literature took the three preliminary steps, that are basic to every study of any occidental literature: to single out for presentation from the mass of works in the Arabic language those intended by their authors as *belles-lettres* (irrespective of the works' prosaic or poetic form); to attempt to ascertain the historical development, and to look upon those works of art from an artistic, or rather an aesthetic angle.

Pre-Islamic poetry, being in itself the most difficult part of all Arabic poetry and the least elucidated by historical tradition, has always been presented as a more or less stable unit, all fluctuation of style and evolution of technique being assigned to a past beyond our grasp. And this in spite not only of the inherent improbability of a literature remaining unchanged through nearly one

[1] This article contains the substance of a paper read at the 153rd meeting of the American Oriental Society at Chicago, April 17, 1941. The references substantiating my contentions can be found, partly in my article "Zur Chronologie der früharabischen Dichtung," printed in *Orientalia* (Rome) n.s. 8. 329 ff., and in the Introduction to a forthcoming publication, "Abû Du'âd al-Iyâdi: Collection of Fragments."

hundred fifty years, but of the explicit, though scattered and insufficient indications to the contrary by some of the Arabic sources.

The apparent homogeneity of the classical poetry suggests that we have to investigate it with subtler and more specifically designed methods—methods which at the same time would safeguard the aesthetical viewpoint. Obviously, our analysis has to dissect both substance and form, the objective being to work out the individual traits of each particular poet, or perhaps the leading peculiarities of groups of poets, provided, of course, such groups or schools could be proven to have existed.

Thus, the motives on the one hand, and the imagery on the other, had to be minutely analysed and even indexed. Close scrutiny of the descriptive technique revealed the fact that the Arab poet made use of a restricted number of types of description, that different poets cultivated different techniques, and that the more complicated types, such as, e.g., the negative comparison, do not occur before a certain terminus a quo, and are, moreover, confined to a sequence of poets, whose imagery, motives, and even vocabulary suggest their literary relationship.

In conformity with the opinions of the later Arabic theorists, it has always been accepted without challenge, that as far as we can go back, the language used by the poets was one and the same "Hochsprache," practically ruling out personal or local variations. The simple though somewhat cumbersome device of word-listing showed that the actual situation has been entirely different. The individual characteristics of one or more poets' vocabulary could be ascertained with satisfactory distinctness, and it became evident that the process of levelling the language peculiarities of the various groups must have started at about the beginning of the sixth century, resulting in the formation of the one and only "Hochsprache" roughly one century later. This "Hochsprache", then, contained the pooled vocabularies of the local schools and trends, contained further a considerable part of the imagery and

technical achievements of the erstwhile semi-independent groups.

Mutatis mutandis, the same procedure had to be followed in the analysis of poetical forms. Thus, e.g., the study of the *nasîb,* the amatory prelude to the standard ode, the *qaṣîda,* again revealed the existence of a small number of types, to the more complex of which a definite origin can be assigned, both in regard to the school and the time in which they were developed.

Meagre though historical tradition is, it suffices to supply the missing links. Above all, aesthetical analysis can at best lead to a relative chronology; dates can only be furnished by references to events. Arabic tradition being what it is, we have to be satisfied with less precise chronological results than we would have elsewhere. I doubt whether it will ever be possible to establish the sequence of the major poets beyond indicating the half-generation to which they belong, or the decade in which they were presumably born.

On the other hand the scattered reports provide us with some chains of poetic tradition by occasionally naming those who handed down the work of such and such a poet, in other words, by giving lists of so-called *ruwât.* (It should be noted, incidentally, that handing down, or reciting the verses of a poet should not be confounded with being his "student" in a more technical sense, as this leads to serious literary and chronological mistakes. It can be shown how some of the *ruwât* belonged to quite different schools or groups than did the poet whose works they preserved.) In connection with the data of the analysis of the poems themselves such notes provide the necessary clues for chronological arrangement. In addition, some anecdotes prove useful in explaining not only some strange similarities between otherwise seemingly unconnected poets, but also in accounting for the progressive unification of "classical" poetry. When we learn that Imru'ul-qais studied the poems of Abû Du'âd al-Iyâdî we no longer wonder why Imru'ul-qais is the only poet outside 'Irâq and

East Arabia who uses the metre Ramal. The biography of Ṭarafa not only explains the mixture of styles in his own poems; but the fact that he shifted, so to speak, from one school (or cultural circle) to another certainly did contribute to diminish the differences between those two schools in the next generation.

I cannot go into details here. What I intended was solely to indicate the method which, to me, seems the only fruitful one, and to sketch the essential result: Arabic poetry in pre-Islamic days undergoes a tangible development which, in some measure, can be described in precise terms. This poetry can further be shown to have been cultivated in a number of "independent" schools, which tended, however, to disappear as the uniformity of the vocabulary and technique spread. I have been particularly concerned with the early part of the Jâhiliyya, including the generation born around 530 A.D. Therefore, I shall now briefly point out the six schools whose existence in this period I believe I have ascertained.

The representatives of the first group all belong to the clan Qais b. Ta'laba of the tribal agglomeration Bakr b. Wâ'il. From about 440 A.D., the presumable birthdate of the first tangible figure, Sa'd b. Mâlik, through al-Muraqqiš the Elder (about 460), 'Amr b. Qamî'a (480), al-Muraqqiš the Younger (500), Ṭarafa, al-Musayyab b. 'Alas (both around 535), down to al-A'šà (about 565), both the genealogical and the artistic continuity is unbroken and can be proved by numerous examples of identical imagery and vocabulary, and, what is particularly striking, by the gradual development of motives, suggested in a few words by the early poets, elaborately presented by their later successors. To 'Amr b. Qamî'a belongs the first complete *qaṣîda* answering the canon of the later theorists that has come down to us.

The next two groups, whose leading figures probably were born around 500 A.D., contributed a great deal to that process of unification of forms and vocabulary which I previously discussed. History explains the parallels

between the manner of expression of 'Abîd b. al-Abraṣ and Imru'ul-Qais—both, incidentally, truly great poets—: although of Kinda descent, Imru'ul-Qais passed his youth amongst 'Abîd's tribe, the Banû Asad, as his father represented the Kinda authority in their territory. 'Abîd's influence can be traced in later minor poets of his tribe. Imru'ul-Qais, however, had, as far as I can see, no direct disciples; neither his restless and short life nor his almost too personal style were favorable to the growth of a group of followers. But his influence went out, penetrating Arabic word and verse throughout the 'arabiyya, making him a sort of a poetic praeceptor Arabiae.

Ṭufail al-Ghanawî (born 520), one of the three specialists in horse description, stands more or less isolated; his contemporary, Aus b. Ḥajar, found an important follower in the contemplative Zuhair b. abî Sulmà.

I have deliberately glossed over the peculiarities of the various groups which I enumerated in order to give a few paragraphs for the sixth and last school, which from the point of view of chronology should have been dealt with first.

The majority of the Arabic grammarians and literary experts have always treated Abû Du'âd al-Iyâdî as a literary outsider, explaining their attitude with the (alleged) fact that Abû Du'âd did not use the standardized Najdite language. This being highly probable in itself as Abû Du'âd spent his whole life in 'Irâq and Eastern Arabia, I decided to collect his fragments in the hope of obtaining some specimens of Arabic dialect poetry. Although I was fortunate enough to bring together three hundred forty-three verses belonging to sixty-six different poems, it became evident that his deviations were purely lexicological and that grammatically he used the same Arabic as did all the others. On the other hand I could not help seeing that his circle of ideas, or rather, what he permitted himself to present in poetical form, differed considerably from the conventions prevailing in other parts of Arabia, reflecting the semi-urban, semi-bedouin type of

life, apparently led by the Arabs within the orbit of Ḥîran influence. More important still: the technique of prosody was richer, more varied, more strictly developed with this "outsider" than anywhere else in classical times. To mention the most striking phenomenon: Abû Du'âd, and he alone, among all poets down to the Prophet's day, makes use of twelve different metres. (e.g., Irmu'ul-Qais only uses ten).

The study of such poets whose biographies suggested some connection with the cultural milieu of Abû Du'âd, or with the court-life of al-Ḥîra, disclosed beyond doubt the existence of a long-lived school of poetical tradition in 'Irâq and Eastern Arabia, generally characterized by similarity of technique, vocabulary, subject-matter, and meter. Not only metrical variety is cultivated, but two metres, the Ramal, and, in a more limited sense, the Ḫafif, have clearly been developed in that region. While it is even possible to distinguish sub-groups within this school, I shall here restrict myself to giving the name and approximate dates of the principal figures.

Abû Du'âd, born about 480.

Mutalammis, born about 500.

Ṭarafa, born about 535, who brought in the influence of the Qais b. Ta'laba group to which he belonged genealogically, thus adding to the richness of the 'Irâqian school.

'Adî b. Zaid, about 545, another outsider to the Arabic authorities, but neatly fitting into this line of development.

al-Muṭaqqib al-'Abdî, about 550; while the Christian 'Adî is a townsman with some experience of desert life, al-Muṭaqqib (and, for that matter, Abû Du'âd, too) is a Bedouin with strong ties to urban civilization. Al-Muṭaqqib himself was again considered outside the pale by the later experts.

al-A'šà, born about 565, who once more brings in the advanced traditions of the Qais clan, and who is particularly important for the influence on him of Sasanian convivial poetry as published by Benveniste and discussed by Christensen.

We still have to account for the metres developed within this school. While I have no explanation to offer for the Khafîf, I suggest that the Ramal was an adaptation to Arabic metrical exigencies of the Pahlavî octosyllabic

verse as it has been presented and analyzed by Benveniste (*Journal Asiatique,* 1930, 2.221). There is certainly no obstacle to accepting Persian influence on the formation of Arabic poetical technique in the districts adjacent to, and under the suzerainty of, Iran. To substantiate this view I refer to the genesis of the Mutaqârib which, as Benveniste has made practically certain, is a derivation from the Pahlavî hendekasyllabic verse.

I am convinced that the continuation of this type of investigation will lead before long to a complete chronological and genetic organization of that vast and rather threatening mass of badly transmitted and difficult verse that has been conveniently labelled classical poetry.

Iranian Institute,
New York City. GUSTAVE E. VON GRUNEBAUM.

Slavery in Abyssinia

The Emperor of Abyssinia, who in the days of his former rule, before the Italian invasion, had issued several edicts against slavery, has now declared its abolition. His reforming way was not easy before, and it will not be easy now. Abolishing slavery there means a complete change in the social life of the people. Slavery, to begin with, is an integral part of the country's Christian religion. As Lord Lugard remarked, the opposition to the abolition of slavery "comes principally from the priesthood, which considers itself the guardian of the Mosaic law and regards slavery as an institution decreed by Jehovah." If we think of our own difficulties in stamping out the Mui Tsai system in Hong-Kong, a small place and our own Crown colony, we shall understand Hailé Selassié's. Wisely, his present policy is one of gradualness. A master may retain his slave if the slave desires it, but every slave may assert his freedom. Lady Simon judged truly in her book "Slavery": "Slavery is so interwoven in the warp and woof of Abyssinian life that the conviction grows that Abyssinia will only be able to free herself from the shackles of this institution by the aid of the generous co-operation of nations who seek not their own advantage but aim at building up the State of Ethiopia." Britain is to-day such a nation.

—*The London Times.*

SUGGESTIVE SYMBOLISM IN ISLAMIC ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Orthodox Islam early decried the use of symbol or the representation of the human or animal form in art and architecture. This severe restriction did much to drive beauty if not the sense of beauty underground. Artistic deism and humanism were almost completely eclipsed, if not entirely so, during the Mecca to Baghdad period. But the creative instinct is difficult to suppress. The expression of beauty at last found its more perfect channels through calligraphy, and thence to well-defined types of art and architecture. One cannot doubt but that the high development of mathematics as pure science enlisted the aid of artistry for a wider application to art and architecture.

Love for and devotion to the golden words of Allah—the Koran—must have been responsible for the splendid specimens of handwritten text and illuminated capitals to make the Bible of Islam a suitable garment for the thoughts of God. The close connection between calligraphy and the arts and sciences is particularly apparent in Islam. In orthodox Islam the very framework of a building, it seems, must needs be supported by the words of Allah. So much, briefly, for the suggestive symbolism in calligraphy.

But the confines of Islam reach well beyond the stricter interpretations of the Arabian desert. We find, amongst the Persians for example, considerable liberty in the use of artistic representation. A Persian carpet is full of interesting thought. Certainly no one who sits before a carpet, painstakingly tying-off knots day after day and month after month, will ultimately fail to weave into his rug a pattern of life both deliberate and thoughtful. That is to say, the symbols in Persian, or other carpets for that

matter, indicate definitely something of the mental life of the maker.

The knot itself represents destiny. A pitcher, conventionalized, represents life, for water quenches thirst. And beside the weaver stands always his cruse. The leaf-forms, whether properly dyed or conventionalized in form and color, indicate fruitfulness and perhaps life itself. The swastika in some form or other, so very frequent, is a symbol of unending labor and toil in this life, of the sameness and determined quality of everything under heaven. The antelope is said to represent freedom and grace, the restfulness that derives from change. The unicorn, strange beast, gambols about at night to represent the moon. The winged genii or *djinn* are the Islamic representatives of Christian angels or cherubs for good or ill. The phoenix speaks of resurrection. The camel, goat, and a host of animals, wild or domestic, expréss qualities of being or expressions of temperament. Nor need one be surprised at any irregularity of design, for it is said that such trickery averts evil luck and insures the good.

Islamic art and artists have made use of a flowing ornamentation, along the border of carpets for example, containing various shapes such as vases and flowers, animals, or even men, which may be quite life-like but which are usually grotesque and conventional. We call it arabesque. It represents moving, comprehensive life, a pattern of all things, and furnishes place for the idiosyncrasies of the artist. It is much like the free use of imagination which often governs the detailed sculpture or carving in Christian edifices.

The use of the circle pattern is said to represent eternity. The zigzag may represent lightning or the waves of the sea. An hour-glass is conventionalized into two triangles to represent, it is said, fire and water, basic elements of life. Often the triangles are so arranged as to be almost superimposed in a so-called "star of David pattern." [Intricate knots are called Solomon's knots. But in any case the star would not be labelled David's but

Allah's.] The meandering line is said to mean continuity of life. The amazing amount of intricate geometrical tracery is almost beyond belief. It is a symbol of the Arabian bent for mathematics, and has been responsible no doubt for considerable influence upon western art and architecture. The pointed arch is an emblem of the faith. It is said to have been first introduced into the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn at Cairo in A.D. 870. The Moors first cusped the arch. The Persians and others introduced the horse-shoe arch. The stalactite column, capital, and cornice decoration is said to have originated out of the mathematical genius of Islam.

But Islam has borrowed much of her symbolism. The deer, leopard, and dragon designs are said to derive from China. The deer is often interpreted to mean darkness, and the leopard to mean daylight. The dragon is given a good place in their naology—he stands for victory and glory. In fact, so much mysticism has been written into the rug that it becomes the most prolific source of Islamic symbolism. These are called the "written pages" of the beliefs of the Faithful.

In Islamic art the most frequently used conventionalized flower is the lotus. There are various explanations for its frequency. Historically, it may be claimed that Mohammedan art derives from Sasanian, Persian and Graeco-Egyptian sources. That is another way of saying that wherever the armies of Islam conquered, her artists consciously or unconsciously adopted the local symbolism and modified it to serve their purposes. The bud of the lotus is said to represent birth; the flower, maturity. In decorative design, rosettes and palmettes are supposed to have originated in the conventionalized lotus, but strangely enough it is seriously contended that the palmette is derived from the human hand. The human hand was a very old representation of God. One wonders what mysterious influences work below the surface of all art, Islamic or Christian! The uses of the "herati" or fish pattern and the tree of life pattern as diaper are also

very suggestive. But though the lotus may have derived from Syria, or Egypt, or elsewhere in North Africa, or even from China by way of Persia, it is said on the authority of historians of art that the Mohammedans themselves first took the lotus to India.

But symbolism in Islam goes beyond the confines of shape and form. Color plays considerable influence in telling us about the great truths of Islamic thought-life. For example, green is the sacred color of immortality. It has become the most important color symbol of Islam. Blue is said to represent air, eternity, and sky. Black is said to indicate sorrow, evil, and vice. Red stands for joy, happiness, life, truth, virtue, and sincerity. Yellow indicates royalty and opulence; orange, sorrow. Rose is said to mean the divine wisdom. In a study of historic ornament one may, to some extent, determine the type of art by the use of color. The ground color in Arabian art is usually a light blue, a creamy yellow, with a bit of red and green. In Turkey the ground colors are usually green and black. In Persia there is much more liberty and variety in the use of color.

The orthodox artist will carefully date his product in terms of the Hegira. He will frequently include quotations from the Koran, whether he be weaver, sculptor, architect, or calligrapher. If he is more liberally-minded he will include verses from the Persian poets. Whether orthodox or liberal theologically, conservative or modern artistically, he will insist that his work *as a whole* represents the eternal determinism of Allah concerning all things, and that his product represents *in its design* the changing order of the world of nature.

Symbolism in architecture is also significant. The elliptical dome resting on pendentives which occupy the angles of a square base is said variously to represent the dome of heaven over the earth, or eternity and time. The best indicative of the determinism of all things is the dome. Its monotony shows no change of line. It fails to reveal the aspiration of the human spirit such as the pointed arch.

It stands for death. I have heard the Turks describe the dome as feminine and symbolic of the universal love of God, and the column, minaret and tower as masculine, symbol of aspiration.

The national flags, coins, stamps, and other insignia are important sources of symbol. The crescent is a symbol of Islam, but certainly not an original designation peculiar to the Mohammedan. It is universal. The star also is a universal emblem of hope and promise. These are symbols only, but from them one may read the history of the race. The evolution of art and architecture is but the rug of time woven on the pattern of transcience. God remains, and God is symbol of the only hope of the changing race.

Mount Vernon, N. Y. HAROLD DEWEY HAYWARD.

SUGGESTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evolution in Art, A. C. Haddon, London and New York, 1914.
A History of Ornament, A. D. F. Hamlin, New York, 1916.
Historic Ornament, Scranton, 1905.
Symbolism and Belief, Edwyn Bevan, New York, 1938.
Oriental Rugs, W. A. Hawley, New York, 1925.
The Practical Book of Oriental Rugs, G. Griffin Lewis, Philadelphia, 1911.
The Oriental Rug, W. D. Ellwanger, New York, 1909.
Masterpieces of Oriental Rugs (2 vols.) Werner Grote and Hasenbalg.
Some Terms Commonly Used in Oriental Design, Harrison & Townsend, London, 1906.
How to Know Oriental Rugs, Mary Beach Langton,
Styles of Ornament, Alex. Speltz, Leipzig, n. d., New York and London, 1926.
Oriental Rugs, John K. Mumford, New York, 1901.
Historic Ornament, Richard Glazier, New York, 1933.
Burlington magazine p. 155-156 v. 53, London, 1928.
Seminary in Islamic Art, Division of Fine Arts, University of Michigan, Ann Harbor, Mich.
Indian Historical Quarterly p. 1-56, Calcutta, 1938, article by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy.
Naology, J. Dudley.

THE MOSLEM'S MOSQUE AND THE CHRISTIAN'S CHURCH

Throughout the far-flung world of Mohammedanism, nothing is more conspicuous in town or city than the tall minarets of the mosques. It is rare that one great mosque stands out alone, dominating some elevated position, as do churches so often in European cities. With certain exceptions, as in Istanbul, Cairo, Damascus, Delhi and Ispahan, the mosque is located in the midst of the town or village, convenient and directly accessible to all as the multitudes come and go in their daily life. The very function of the mosque is thus indicated; it is a *masjid,* in any case, that is, a place for adoration. It may be large and ornate, adequate for the assembling to prayers on Friday, and therefore called a *jami'a,* a meeting place; it may be smaller, a *zawia,* that is, a corner, with modest indications that it is a mosque; or in place of either of these one may find, in a village or beside a stream, a humble *musalla,* a place of prayer.

The mosque of any of these categories is not the counterpart of the church in the Christian community, nor is it so remote from it as to be identified in any way with a pagan edifice maintained for religious purposes. It would probably be easier for a Christian, being monotheistic, to regard the mosque as nearer to his church than to a pagan temple. Both he and the Moslem would recognize the immeasurable distance between their places of worship and the abodes of idolatry. Islam is positive, iconoclastic, and will not suffer the intrusion of the adoration of any other than Allah; to its people, even the Christian church appears to compromise, and to be guilty of tritheism, often idolatry.

The mosque is indeed sometimes thought of as the

"church" of the Moslems, as if the two were analogous. In fact they are very unlike, in their physical and material design and equipment, in their organization, use and general spirit. The Christian church, especially the Protestant church, is intended to serve the community in a variety of ways. Witness the facilities often provided for the intellectual, social and charitable activities of the clergy, officers, members and related organizations.

The mosque exists primarily as a *masjid,* a place of prostration, dedicated to one purpose. There is no elaborate setting of chancel, choir, altar, screen, confessional, baptistry or even pews, all of which the Moslem would put far from him as distracting and unreal. There must be no image or picture of angel or saint; no vestments, no sacerdotalism, no ministration, no clergy robed or mitred; nothing must separate the worshipper from communion with Allah. There must be no choir, soloists or organ, no processional of dignitaries, no collection, no eucharist or other sacraments, other than the correct observance of traditional ritual, postures, prostrations and words which have come to the Moslem from the founder of his faith.

Mats of reed or straw, or (in city mosques) rugs or carpets, constitute the only furniture, save for the *minbar* and the *kursy.* The former is a simple pulpit, elevated several steps above the assembly; the latter is a wooden holder for the open Qur'an, placed before the squatting *Imam,* who most closely approaches a priest in the Mohammedan religious system. In place of all the elaborate architecture of the church or the cathedral, the Mohammedan prefers the simplicity enjoined by the Prophet. If devout Moslems have added decoration, it could be no more than geometric designs, marble or alabaster, graceful arches or stately doors and windows. Occasionally there is placed in some conspicuous place the Holy word, *Allah,* and sometimes with it the name of Mohammed.

Many a man, a mystic, sheikh or saint, has attained distinction locally or thoughout the Moslem world; not one of them, however, has ever been deemed holy enough,

or reached such a degree of sainthood, that he should be beatified and have his likeness placed facing the multitudes in a mosque. No rich endowment, no generous philanthropy, not even martyrdom in the behalf of Islam, could secure that. No likeness of a great benefactor or ruler, not even a Caliph, could be placed in a mosque; the sacrilege of it would start a mob, fired with jealousy for the sanctity of the place and the honor of the one Allah, before whom, by the very words of the Qur'an, the prince and the peasant are of equal consideration.

The dome and minaret, with which we are inclined to associate the mosque, are not essential parts; they are simply added for convenience or protection. The court, with its meticulous provision of the *mihrab* to indicate to the Moslem bowing in prayer the direction of Mecca, and the *minbar,* or pulpit, for the one who leads the assembled worshippers, are indispensable for every mosque.

In most places the non-Moslem must not enter the mosque, while the Christian church is open to every one, even the infidel pagan, who, to the Moslem, is a miserable abomination. There are a few mosques, located in great tourist centers such as Cairo, Damascus, Delhi, Jerusalem and Istanbul, to which a tourist may be admitted, thanks to the revenue it brings, or by government fiat. What to the Christian seems right and logical, that all who desire to enter the place of worship may do so on condition of proper decorum, is to the Moslem an exposure to dishonor and profanation.

Outside of the mosque proper, the minaret serves only as a means to an end, namely to provide an elevated place where the *muezzin* may stand to call the public to prayer. Bells, so common in churches, are absolutely forbidden—Mohammed himself declared they were of the devil. There are no printed bulletins or notices of congregational meetings, for there is no congregation, no membership or organized allegiance to the mosque.

There is one essential adjunct to every mosque which churches need not have, and that is the place of ablutions.

Without the ablutions, the purifications, the washing of prescribed parts of the body, symbolical of the purifying of the soul before communion, the Moslem would not make bold to come before Allah. A well, tank or stream may provide the water, which in any case must pour over the parts of the body by the ceremonial *wudu*—washing the hands or head or feet in a basin would never purify. From ablution the worshipper steps directly to the place of adoration, having deposited his shoes or slippers at the door, or carrying them carefully sole to sole, so as not to dishonor the sacred place. Shoulder to shoulder, "row upon row," as the Prophet prescribed, he and his fellow Moslems stand, bow, kneel and sit while they face the distant *qibla,* Mecca, indicated by the niche, *mihrab,* in the wall. In concentric circles, from Morocco to the Philippines, from Russia to South Africa, they worship in the mosque, except for the few minutes listening to the *khutbah* or sermon, and the reading of selected verses from the Qur'an. The doors are always open, and silently, reverently, the worshipper joins his fellows as the cadences of "Allahu akbar" (Allah is most great), "Mohammedu rasul Allah" (Mohammed is the apostle of Allah), "La ilaha ill' Allah" (there is no deity save Allah), come down from the *muezzin* to the assembly. No one departs until the whole ritual is completed, and one may remain to repeat it in recognition of special circumstances. The audience is not formally dismissed, and there is no loitering or visiting or chattering within the sacred precincts; that may be only outside.

Of course there are no women in the mosque when the men are there; their charms or dress might divert the worshipper's attention from his pious homage. Rarely, indeed, do women attend the mosque, though the demand for doing so and for the permission of the authorities is being more and more noticeable in our day, due to the new spirit, the claim of rights, and a new status for women. But it is still innovation and impious, a dangerous although perhaps inevitable innovation. One can scarcely think of

Christian churches without the free coming and going of men and women, all joining in the social relationships of the place as well as its worship and services.

In the churches the Christian regards it as a sign of humble reverence to remove his hat, to sit or stand with bared head during divine service. No Moslem in a mosque would ever do that; to him it would be irreverent. He will remove his shoes and enter barefoot with only socks on his feet, or as a concession will don a pair of special slippers, sanctified as it were, and permissible for entrance to the mosque as protection against the cold; but during prayer even these must be removed.

The mosque is never used for gatherings for any and every purpose, such as frequently occur in Christian churches, as weddings, lectures, meetings for local benevolences, the discussion of civic affairs or the reception of some distinguished individual. The nearest to an exception is what occurs on the occasion of a funeral. Not that there is the popular though dignified assembling such as we find at Christian funerals, but rather a distinct recognition of the mosque as a gateway, so to speak, for the entrance of the deceased into the life beyond. It is but a very brief ceremony; the funeral procession, whether for a high official of the state, or a poor peasant, finds its way to the mosque before proceeding to the burial. The body is borne on the shoulders of devout Moslems, voluntarily taking turns carrying it, for to such Mohammed promised a blessing. The bier (not the coffin, for there is none for the Moslem) is placed on the floor of the mosque for a few moments while some one repeats short verses from the Qur'an. There is no further ceremony, no chanting, no candles, no eulogy, no singing, no floral decoration, no symbolism. Then the procession passes on to the burial ground—has not the deceased thus acknowledged his Maker and sought admittance into Paradise?

The confessional, suggesting a mediation between Allah and man, is impossible to the Moslem. There is no place for it, or for a priest who might offer absolution. This

eliminates all traces of authority, discipline and administration, in so far as they might indicate that by what the churches call ordination, a setting aside to the priestly office, one may convey to his fellow man special grace, pardon or intercession. The sheikh or religious teacher may assist the Moslem to understand the message of the Qur'an, explain to him the matters of the faith or life as required in traditional Islam, or guide the inquirer into the ways of prayer, even of conduct. But there it stops; the sheikh is not different from the most humble Moslem.

The mosque offers no such thing as membership in an organization. It belongs to the community, usually by the gift of some wealthy citizen, and its upkeep is the care of the heirs, or the state and its department of Wakfs (religious endowments). The mosque bears no relation to other mosques, communities, bishopric, diocese, synod or conference. It recognizes no hierarchy. Let us repeat that the basic reason for its existence is simply that the devout Moslem may appear before Allah in adoration. Allah alone is his judge; every function of the priesthood, and every use of the mosque is dedicated for humble worship and the hearing of the words of the holy Qur'an.

In all my years of experience among Moslem peoples I have never once heard a Mohammedan refer to the mosque as "the house of Allah." "This is the house of God" is not infrequently heard among Christians. The Moslem simply does not regard the building, sacred as it is, as the place where Allah dwells. To him the heavens and the earth, the whole universe, is where He dwells, and to refer to any building as his house, even in a metaphorical sense, would be abhorrent, suggesting the limitation of the concept of the Almighty. The mosque is simply what Allah has ordained as a place designed for communion with Himself. The peals of an organ, the sound that Christians call sacred song, the celebrations, the sacraments, with all their material equipment, appointments and paraphernalia, the Moslem regards as iniquitous and intolerable.

Decorum, order, democracy, concentration on the

purpose of the moment, the cultivation of Moslem piety, all contribute to making the place and the Qur'an, its vital factor, sacrosanct. Once the Moslem has set his face toward the *masjid,* the place of prostration, he cannot be, he will not be, drawn aside to anything else, or have his attention distracted from the object and process of his devotions. Christians often go to church for some other purpose than worship; the Moslem does not. He is there for deep seriousness and meditation, to bind himself nearer to Allah. Possibly it may be, in some cases, as in Christian communities, something akin to spiritual bargaining, a future-life-insurance or compliance with the rigid demands of duty. But who shall say that in a multitude of cases it is not the Moslem's sincere acknowledgment of his responsibility to the Divine Being?

The invitation extended to the Moslem by the evangelistic and propagandist message offers not only the great and fundamental items of a change of faith, of manner of life and the departure from an ancestral religion, but also the proposal to change from the simple, unadorned architecture of the mosque to some form of a Christian church. The whole construction, furnishing and conduct of the churches, traditional and man-made, the ecclesiastical system, environment and organization, present many an occasion to dissuade, not to attract the Moslem, and to make him declare that if this is Christianity, then the farther he remains from it, the better. It raises the question of how wise it would be for Christians to offer to Mohammedan peoples something in the way of a place of worship radically differing from the customary church, divested of the appointments of building, priestly offices, and, to the Moslem, entanglements of the whole ecclesiastic set-up. One can scarcely disapprove of the choice of the Moslem when he prefers the atmosphere, the spirit and the environment of the mosque to what the Christian church seems to him to be. This is not said to condemn the churches with their, to the Christian, beauty of architecture, their symbolisms, their material equipment, and

accustomed appeal to spiritual response. It is rather to emphasize the contrast between two approaches to worship. It is the contrast of the Friends' "meeting house" with the elaborate and ornate church or cathedral, multiplied many times over. It is true that the hush and solemn quiet of the interior of a church may, and often does, appeal to a Moslem visitor, for his innate sense of the meaning of the place does appeal to him. But the less there is of ornamentation or distraction of any kind, the more it is to him the place where a man may come to meet his Maker in adoration, and the more he responds, because of the sheer grip of his religious inheritance.

Philadelphia, Pa. ROBERT S. MCCLENAHAN.

Walter Fairman's Death

Mr. A. T. Upson of the Nile Mission Press writes:

He and I both joined the North African Mission. He was born on 24th April, 1874, thirty days before me; but, by starting his training sooner, at Cliff and Harley Colleges, he reached the mission field a year before me. Mrs. Fairman and he boarded me when camping by the sea the first summer of their married life!

When I left Shebeen-el-Kom to start deputation work for the proposed Nile Mission Press, Fairman succeeded me, and worked there for years. Later, he joined the American United Presbyterian Mission and remained in it.

His outstanding work was that of a preacher. Hundreds flocked to hear him, for his fluency in Arabic preaching was known throughout the Nile Valley.

Here was an Arabic preacher of extraordinary power, yet quite unspoilt and sound on the Rock. His family chose a grand text for the memorial card: "I have kept the faith."

In his capacity of Chairman of the Publication Committee of the Press in Cairo, Dr. Fairman presided at the formal opening and dedication of the new building in Sharia Ibrahim Pasha, on May 2nd, 1939.

Alas, he outstayed his strength, and before they retired to Clacton-on-Sea, in June of that year, he was a broken man. When evacuated from Clacton, his special diet was a great difficulty. Finally on 13th September, they made a temporary home with their eldest son Donald, a master at Bethany School, Curtisden Green, Goudhurst, Kent. After only two days in bed he passed to the fuller Life on 11th October, 1941.

THE GOSPEL OF BARNABAS

Christians in controversy with Moslems have often, during the past two hundred years, been taunted with the charge that the Christian gospel is "not the true gospel," but that the true account of the gospel story is to be found in "The Gospel of Barnabas," which, the charge runs, Christians have suppressed and destroyed. Challenged to prove this assertion, Moslems have uniformly failed to give any fuller statement than the name of the alleged book, and most Christians have heard for the first time of such a document in the heat of Moslem controversy. Often they have thought that their antagonists were themselves mistaken as to the identification of the book in question, and have recalled to mind the fairly well known apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas. In the course of this investigation the writer has even taken some pleasure in deliberately drawing a proffered correction from some eminent New Testament authorities by making discreet inquiries about The Gospel of Barnabas, only to be tactfully "corrected" with a ready response based upon The Epistle of Barnabas.

There are two possible points of departure in this study; first, to begin with the present and work backwards, or, second, to take up the earliest known reference to Barnabas and to trace him and his alleged literary products through the centuries. Liberty will be exercised to adopt both, first sketching the outline historically, and then examining the various documents critically.

The New Testament book of Acts knows a wealthy Cypriot Jew, a Levite, of generous spirit and broad sympathies, the friend and sponsor of Paul, and like the latter, though not one of the original twelve, eventually honored by the title of apostle. Beyond the record of his

association with Paul in missionary service, their eventual separation, and incidental mention of him in two of Paul's epistles, the New Testament is silent.

Tradition, however, has supplied the gap by associating Barnabas with both Alexandria and Rome. It is from Alexandria that the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas had its origin. Competent scholarship assigns this epistle to either a namesake or a plagiarist. Because of a similarity of thought and type of argument between the apocryphal epistle and the anonymous canonical epistle To Hebrews, an early and persistent stream of criticism has assigned Hebrews also to Barnabas. This much for the association of the name of Barnabas with the canonical and apocryphal New Testament.

The next appearance of the name of Barnabas is in the so-called Gelasian Decree. This document contains a list of permitted and forbidden books, and lists as forbidden "The Gospel of Barnabas." It is safe to assume that the ground of the prohibition was the supposed Gnostic teaching of the book, since the Decree itself was an anti-Gnostic document, and the name of this particular book appears in the list with other better known Gnostic material. [1] Several points engage our attention here:

1. The first use of the title, "Gospel of Barnabas."

2. The Gnostic background of the book. This is of interest because the denial of the divinity of Jesus found in Gnosticism is in accord with what we might expect in a Moslem account of the life of Christ, since Moslems accept him historically and as a great prophet, denying to him only divinity and Messiahship.

3. The date of the Gelasian Decree. Catholic tradition has assigned this document to Gelasius I, Pope from 492-496, but modern critical scholarship offers conclusive evidence to prove that whatever may have been the connection of Pope Gelasius with this list, or with a shorter and earlier list, the complete Gelasian Decree cannot be earlier

[1] James, Montague Rhodes. *The Apocryphal New Testament.* Oxford. The Clarendon Press, 1924. p. 21.

than the end of the sixth century, if, indeed, it should not be dated even later.

Special significance attaches here as showing that a Gnostic Gospel of Barnabas might have been in circulation, though condemned by Christian authority, in 550-600 A.D., the approximate time of Mohammed. From such a source some gleams of knowledge of supposedly orthodox Christian tradition might be imagined as filtering into Mohammed's slender stock of Christian information. Indeed the glaring absurdities of the Koran account of Christ can be accounted for only on the ground that Mohammed knew the Christian tradition by hearsay fragments.

Of this lost Gnostic gospel but a single unimportant sentence in Greek has come down to us. A tradition asserts that when the alleged body of Barnabas was exhumed it had a copy of the gospel by Matthew clasped to its breast, and that this gospel contained a denunciation of St. Paul. This could obviously be, not the canonical gospel, but an apocryphal work claiming Matthew's authority. Incidentally, the present text of the Gospel of Barnabas contains in its opening and closing paragraphs a dissent from St. Paul. All Gnostic literature made Paul its object of attack.

The lost Gnostic "Gospel of Barnabas" would probably have had much greater kinship to a Mohammedan version of the gospel than can be shown between it and the New Testament writings. Such things as the "painless birth," the type of eschatology, the elimination of John the Baptist, and the Docetic Passion, would all seem to be items that would appeal both to Gnostics and to Moslems.

There is no known reference to a Gospel of Barnabas from the Gelasian Decree to the opening of the eighteenth century, when considerable attention was first directed to such a book by English Deists. Despite the numerous contacts between Christians and Moslems during the Crusades and the Moslem invasion of Europe, there is no hint that such a book was known to either side. Francis of Assisi, 1182-1286, though residing for a month at the

court of the Sultan of Egypt, never heard of it. Raymund Lull, 1235-1315, the first man to offer a program of intellectual and spiritual approach to Moslems, as contrasted with the program of force, lived a long life devoted to research in all forms of Moslem lore, but gives no hint of having heard of such a work, though he lived in direct contact and controversy with intelligent Moslems at three different periods of his life.

A survey of the eighteenth century discussion of the various supposed texts of the Gospel of Barnabas was given for scholars of this century in an article by W. E. A. Axon, in the *Journal of Theological Studies,* for April, 1902.[2] A reply to Axon's article was made by Canon Lonsdale Ragg, now Archdeacon of Gibraltar, in the same journal in April, 1905.[3] These two articles are said by Canon Ragg to have paved the way for the publication in 1907 of an English translation of an Italian manuscript of the Gospel of Barnabas which at that time was in the Imperial Library at Vienna. This translation was made by Lonsdale and Laura Ragg, and is, of course, the most thorough piece of work that has been done on the whole question of the Gospel of Barnabas.[4] Ragg's work gives the Italian text and the English translation on parallel pages, and in a lengthy introduction summarizes practically everything that is known about this document. Ragg's book, however, emphasizes the Higher, rather than the Textual Criticism of Barnabas. In an unpublished study, James W. Brown, a graduate student of Duke University, undertook "A Critical Analysis of *The Gospel of Barnabas,*"[5] which gives an analysis of the book, chapter by chapter, showing how each passage conforms to or diverges from the canonical gospels. The writer of this article was director of Brown's study and desires to say

[2] Axon, W. E. A., "On the Mohammedan Gospel of Barnabas" in *Journal of Theological Studies,* April, 1902. pp. 441ff.
[3] Ragg, Rev. L. "The Mohammedan 'Gospel of Barnabas' ", in *Journal of Theological Studies,* April, 1905. pp. 424 ff.
[4] Ragg, Lonsdale and Laura, *The Gospel of Barnabas, edited and translated from the Italian MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna.* Oxford, the Clarendon Press, 1907.
[5] Brown, James W. "A Critical Analysis of the *Gospel of Barnabas,*" (M.A. Thesis. Duke University, 1932).

at this point that he is indebted to Ragg and Brown for much of the material used.

That some apologetic value may attach to a restatement of all the pertinent facts about The Gospel of Barnabas appears from the fact that in THE MOSLEM WORLD for July, 1934, there appeared a brief note by the editor of *The Epiphany* in which it was stated "In every Moslem land missionaries constantly hear of the Gospel of Barnabas. Ignorant Moslems assert that this is the true gospel." [6]

The manuscript used by Ragg has been in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna since 1738. It came to that library along with the rest of the literary possessions of Prince Eugene of Savoy. It was presented to the Prince in 1713 by John Frederick Cramer. Jean Toland had borrowed it from Cramer in 1709. This seems to be all that is known about this Italian version. What has become of it since the occupation of Vienna by the Nazis is of course unknown. The physical appearance of the MS. is described by Ragg. No other MS. or copy of one is known now to exist. In 1784 there seems to have existed a Spanish copy which was used by Dr. White, Bampton Lecturer for that year. No one knows what became of that copy, which stated that it was a translation from an Italian original. No one has ever seen an original Arabic MS., nor is there any reason to think that any such version ever existed. [7]

One of the most curious points in the whole history of this document is that while the Gospel of Barnabas claims to have been written by an apostle of Jesus during the first Christian century, it depends throughout not only upon the canonical gospels but upon the Koran itself, which came into being during the lifetime of Mohammed five hundred years later.

The Moslem contention is, of course, that Christians had suppressed this, the true gospel, and that their own previous inability to produce it was due to this iniquitous

[6] "The Gospel of Barnabas Again," by the editor of *The Epiphany*, in THE MOSLEM WORLD, July, 1934, pp. 296-297.
[7] Ragg, *op. cit.*, p. XIII.

Christian conduct. George Sale stated that the Spanish version of Barnabas which mysteriously vanished in England in the eighteenth century claimed that the Italian original from which it was translated was recovered from the private library of Pope Sixtus V.[8] The preface to this lost Spanish version, according to Sale, said:

> The discoverer of the original ms., who was a Christian monk called Fra Marino, tells us that having accidentally met with a writing of Irenaeus (among others), wherein he speaks against St. Paul, alleging, for his authority, the Gospel of Barnabas, he became exceeding desirous of finding this Gospel; and that God, of His mercy, having made him very intimate with Pope Sixtus V, one day as they were together in that Pope's library his Holiness fell asleep, and he, to employ himself, reaching down a book to read, the first he laid his hand on proved to be the very Gospel he wanted. Overjoyed at the discovery, he scrupled not to hide his prize in his sleeve; and, on the Pope's awakening, took leave of him, carrying with him that celestial treasure, by reading of which he became a convert to Mohammedanism.[9]

Such knowledge of the Gospel of Barnabas as ordinary Moslems possess probably comes from Sale's references, since his work has long been known in certain Moslem circles.

The first paragraph of the Italian Gospel of Barnabas used by Ragg asserts that the true doctrine of Jesus has been greatly contaminated, and that it is the purpose of the writer to give a truthful account of Jesus' life and teachings:

> Dearly beloved, the great and wonderful God hath during these past days visited us by His prophet, Jesus Christ, in great mercy of teaching and miracles, by reason whereof many, being deceived by Satan, under the pretense of piety, are preaching most impious doctrine, calling Jesus Son of God, repudiating the circumcision ordained of God forever, and permitting every unclean meat: among whom also Paul has been deceived, whereof I speak, which I have seen and heard in the intercourse I have had with Jesus, in order that ye may be saved, and not be deceived of Satan and perish in the judgment of God.[10]

Ragg has shown that the paper on which the Italian

[8] Sale, George. *The Koran.* William Tegg and Co., London, 1850. "To The Reader" pp. v-ix.
[9] *Loc. cit.*
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

manuscript has been preserved is a coarse cotton paper showing a water mark such as was used in Italy during the sixteenth century. The hand-writing he found, and was supported by competent Italian authorities, to be such as was used in Italy in the sixteenth century. [11] Mary, Martha, and Lazarus are portrayed as proprietors of villages, [12] and are indeed called "signori," reflecting the medieval Italian social organization. An individual described as the "Pontiff" appears in the story. John the Baptist has disappeared and his place is taken by Jesus, who points to Mohammed as the source of his authority. It is interesting that the name of Mohammed appears as a great prophet in a work purporting to be written six hundred years before his birth, and that the Koran is directly quoted. [13]

A very puzzling reference in Barnabas is that to a "jubilee" as falling once every hundred years. [14] There is no jubilee known to the Koran, and the Jewish year of jubilee as described in the Old Testament came at fifty-year intervals. The first jubilee in Christendom was celebrated by Boniface VIII, in 1300, and was supposed to be celebrated thereafter at one-hundred-year intervals. The first jubilee proved such a financial success that Clement VI called for the celebration of the second jubilee in 1350. The time from 1300 to 1350 then is the only one during which even a renegade Christian could have understood the jubilee in the sense used by Barnabas. All the other internal evidence accumulated by Ragg points to a sixteenth century date.

Within the Gospel of Barnabas itself curious inconsistencies and incongruities appear. Jesus is often in Damascus and at Mt. Sinai with the twelve disciples. In the list of the twelve the name of Barnabas appears in the place of Thomas. Nazareth is located on the water, and possibly also Jerusalem, since Jesus is said to have

[11] Ragg, *op. cit.*, xiv.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 433.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-131.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 191.

gone from Nazareth to Jerusalem "by boat."[15] Herod, Pilate, and the High Priest, are spoken of as being on friendly terms with one another and also with Jesus. They comfort him in his distress that people call him God. They promise and secure a decree from the Roman Senate forbidding that he be called God or Son of God. It is even stated that this decree was engraved upon copper and placed in the Temple.[16] Although in the Koran Jesus is spoken of as the Messiah, in "Barnabas" both his Messiahship and divinity[17] are persistently denied. It is insisted that Ishmael and not Isaac was the first-born son of Abraham. The picture of the future life goes far beyond anything in the canonical gospels in its detail, but is more spiritual than that given in the Koran.[18] The possible connection between this concept and that of Dante appears in later paragraphs. Barnabas insists that it was Judas and not Jesus who was arrested and crucified. This insistence upon the Docetic Passion[19] is typical both of Islam and of Gnostic Christianity. The conclusion drawn by Ragg is that this book is the work of a renegade Christian monk, probably Spanish, composed not before the thirteenth century because of its mention of the jubilee, but certainly written out in its present form in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. It is based, he thinks, upon the Bible, Dante, the Koran, and a fertile imagination. It is an obvious puzzle to any intelligent Christian how such a mixture of truth, comedy, falsehood, plagiarism, and invention can be taken seriously. Those who have dealt with Moslems realize, however, that this is not only possible but actual. Professor Samuel C. Chew, in his book, *The Crescent and the Rose,* page 227, notes that an Arabic version, translated from the Italian and entitled *Injīl Barnāba,* sells widely in Egypt and Syria.

As an example of J. W. Brown's textual study, he made an examination of the parables. He found that of

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 211, 223, 227.
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 221, 225.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 311.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 471-473, 481-485.

the twenty-three principal parables given in Barnabas only nine can be directly traced to one of the canonical gospels. These are: The Good Samaritan, The Winepress, The Barren Fig-tree, Pharisee and Publican, The Sower, The Tares in the Wheat, The Prodigal Son, New Wine, Rich Man and Lazarus. [20]

The fourteen parables found in Barnabas which do not occur in the Christian gospels are: The Neighbor and his Creditor, The Shopkeeper, The King's Son-in-law, The Bad Paymaster, The Three Vineyards, The Fruitful Plant, The King and the Slave, Striking Head to Save the Foot, Indiscreet Dispenser of Wine, Good and Bad Figs, The Owner of the Fountain, The Apple Sellers, The Laborer and the Axe, Bad Fish. [21]

Brown also worked out a detailed outline of the life of Jesus as given in the Gospel of Barnabas, and a comparison of the miracles of Barnabas with those of the New Testament. As to the miracles, Barnabas' favorite is that in which Jesus receives his "gospel" from heaven in the form of "a shining book." Second in favor are miracles connected with the ascension of Jesus before the capture of Judas. There are twenty-five other miraculous incidents connected with the life of Jesus, sixteen of which can be associated with similar items in the New Testament. The nine miracles peculiar to Barnabas are of insignificant value. [22] Brown also points out that the favorite method of Jesus in his teaching was the kind of dialogue which is also used in the Koran.

The supposition that Dante is a possible source for Barnabas remains unchallenged, but a new angle on the question of this dependence was given by Miguel Asín in his book *Islam and the Divine Comedy*. Asín, a Spanish Catholic scholar, asserted that Dante was dependent upon Moslem traditions for his eschatological ideas, and demonstrated that thesis to his own satisfaction and seemingly to that of many Dante scholars. [23]

---

[20] Brown, *op. cit.* p. 36.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[23] Asín, Miguel. *Islam and the Divine Comedy*, translated and abridged by Harold Sunderland. London. John Murray, 1926. p. viii.

His book consists of four parts. Part I compares the legend of the nocturnal journey and ascension of Mohammed with the Divine Comedy. Part II is a comparison of the Divine Comedy with other Moslem legends on the after life. Part III deals with Moslem features which were added to preceding Christian legends. Part IV, which, in the writer's opinion should have been Part I, discusses the probability of the transmission of Islamic models to Europe, and particularly to Dante.

The conclusion of Asín is that Dante is indebted to Ibn Arabi, the Spanish Moslem mystic who died twenty-five years before Dante was born (by way of Dante's teacher Brunetto Latini), for his conception of the Divine Comedy. He says:

> Thus the two works agree in subject matter, action and allegorical purpose: in their principal and secondary persons: in the architecture of the astronomical heavens; and in the didactic trend of ideas and the use of literary devices to produce in abstract a natural cyclopaedia. To these features of resemblance must be added the similarity of style: both works are so abstruse and involved at times as to suggest to the reader the mysteriousness of an oracle. In the face of all these reasons it is not too much to say that Ibn Arabi's work is of all Moslem types the most akin to the Paradiso in particular and the whole Divine Comedy in general, insofar at least as the latter may be regarded as a moral and didactic allegory. [24]

In speaking of the Inferno Asín says:

> The general architecture of the Inferno is but a faithful copy of the Moslem hell. Both are in the shape of a vast funnel or inverted cone, and consist of a series of storeys, each the abode of one class of sinner. In each, moreover, there are various subdivisions corresponding to as many sub-categories of sinners. The greater the depth, the greater is the degree of sin and pain inflicted. The ethical system in the two hells is also much alike. The atonement is either analagous to or the reverse of the sin committed. Finally both hells are situate beneath the City of Jerusalem. [25]

In a concluding portion of this work Asín points out that literary imitation is dependent upon three conditions: (1) Resemblances between model and copy. (2)

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 68-69.

Priority of the former. (3) Communication between the two. [26]

Rather curiously it is in this third condition that Asín's book is strongest and weakest. The lay reader, the church historian, the student of Islamics will all be fascinated by the section, all too short, entitled "Communication between Islam and Christian Europe during the Middle Ages." [27] An entirely new light is thrown on this obscure period, and the factors at work, and it was obviously from Spain that such light must come. However, while Asín points out that the Divine Comedy resembles previously existing Moslem models and might have had communication with them, he does not present anything more than a conjecture that Dante actually did have such contact. A gap of twenty-five years exists between copy and model. Some future study may bridge the gap and supply the missing link, but thus far this task has not been done. Fuller and prior consideration should have been given this last step in the argument; otherwise we are dealing only with coincidences, however startling.

Asín is in some perplexity between his conscience as a scientist and his duty as a pious Catholic priest. As a good Catholic, zealous for Christ and especially for his Church, the conclusion is characteristic both as a defense of Dante and as an indictment of Islam.

> In the end we find that it is that perennial source of poetry and spirituality, the Divine religion of Christ, that furnishes the real key to the genesis of Dante's poem, and its precursors, both Christian and Moslem. For Islam, be it once more said, is but the bastard offspring of the Gospel and the Mosaic Law, part of whose doctrines on the after life it adopted. Lacking the restraining influence of an infallible authority whereby the fancy of its believers might have been checked, it assimilated elements from other Eastern sources, and thus came to deck and overlay with all the trappings of oriental fancy the sober picture of the life beyond the grave that is outlined in the Gospel. Dante could, without altering the essence of Christian teaching on that life, draw for the purposes of his poem on the artistic features furnished by the Moslem legend.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 237.
[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 239-245.

In so doing he was but reclaiming for Christianity property that was by rights its own, heirlooms that had lain hidden in the religious lore of the East until restored to the stock of Western culture greatly enhanced by the imaginative genius of Islam.[28]

The bearing of Asín's work on the question of the Gospel of Barnabas is less than one might have expected. Even though all the contentions advanced are admitted, this does not place Barnabas earlier than the fourteenth century, nor add truth to falsehood. If there is a missing link of twenty-five years between Dante and Ibn Arabi, there is one of 1400 years between the "Gospel of Barnabas" and Christ.

Durham, North Carolina JAMES CANNON, III.

The Collection of Arabian Nights in the Case Memorial Library

The Case Memorial Library has just received as a gift, the greatest collection of Arabian Nights in the World. The donor is Dr. Duncan Black Macdonald, Professor-Emeritus of Semitic Languages of the Hartford Theological Seminary, and former head of the Muslim Department of the Kennedy School of Missions. Dr. Macdonald is a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Encyclopedia of Islam, author of numerous books and articles, and a most distinguished scholar. He is the greatest living authority on the Arabian Nights.

The Collection comprises over 1000 volumes, in the various editions and languages of the Arabian Nights; editions of the Persian and Turkish tales; as well as other books on folklore and related material. There are photostat copies of the Manuscripts of the Nights in the Vatican Library and the Bibliothèque Nationale, including one of "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves," the only known oriental source. Ever since 1860 there had reposed in the Bodleian Library of Oxford, an Arabic Manuscript containing the "Story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves" which no student of the Arabian Nights had ever taken the trouble to look up. In 1908 Dr. Macdonald discovered this Manuscript after his return from a vain search for Manuscripts of the Nights in Cairo, Syria and Constantinople. It had been unknown even to Sir Richard Burton.

Some of these editions are rare and not in the British Museum, Library of Congress, or, indeed, in any of the great libraries. Some of these were gathered because of their conformity to the original text; others for their uniqueness, and still another group, for its illustrations. The languages into which it has been translated are Bengalese, Canarese, Chinese, Dutch, English, French, Gaelic, German, Greek, Hindustani, Italian, Japanese, Javanese, Polish, Scottish, Spanish, Swedish, Tamil, Telegu, Turkish, Persian and Urdu.—*Hartford Echoes.*

---

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

BOOK REVIEWS

Islam and the Arabian Prophet. By Dr. G. I. Kheirallah. Islamic Publishing Company, 144 W. 72 St., New York City, N. Y. pp. 175.

The author (at present in charge of the Moroccan Shop, 1533 Boardwalk, Atlantic City) is a native of Egypt and knows the Orient. He is in close touch with the small groups of Moslems in the U. S. A., and this book was written with a purpose: "While Islamic literature is extensive I am unaware of any comprehensive work in the English language from which the student as well as the second generation American Muslim may gain a fundamental knowledge of the religion and its promulgator as known to and understood by the people of the Prophet or his followers."

Among biographies, he expresses his chief debt to the recent study of Mohammed's life by Dr. M. Husayn Haykal of Cairo. On this modern presentation he has drawn heavily. Others to whom he expresses his debt are Muhammad Ali of Lahore and Khuda Bukhsh of Calcutta. The portrait presented is more attractive than critical, more ideal than historic. The style of the writer is excellent, the numerous illustrations well-chosen and the Arabic text of the Koran passages quoted is beautifully printed. Over one-half of the text (pp. 1-114) deals with the Prophet's life, and the remainder sketches the ritual and ethics of Islam. There is one page only on the creed, here called "the cardinal principals (*sic*) of Islam." But the details of ablution and prayer and pilgrimage are given in English and Arabic, e.g., "The women worshippers occupy a section behind the men or a balcony, separated by lattice screening or a transparent curtain. This separation of men from women worshippers is not due only to the practice of the Jewish and Eastern Christian worshippers who did likewise, and still do, but is imperative because of the genuflexions practiced during the ritual."

We learn (p. 152) that "Mohammed was the first among the teachers of mankind to limit polygamy and to raise and safeguard the status of womanhood." Neither Khuda Bukhsh nor Mansur Fahmy in his classic on the subject would quite agree to this statement. Nor can we recall the history of Islam for thirteen centuries and agree that "The Arabian Prophet was the first teacher and reformer to raise his voice against the practice of slavery and the first to take steps to mitigate this evil." History needs to be re-written to accept the statement, "The *jizya* or poll-tax on non-Muslims freed them from military service and guaranteed them religious and secular liberty. . . . . In accordance with its teaching, the Muslims accepted the Jew and Christian as their brothers in the worship of God, and treated them as wards of the faith."

When we read this charmingly written biography of Mohammed we find the same idealization and the glossing over of unfavorable facts. There is an entire absence of documentation in the story of the pensive youth, persecuted for his faith, driven out of his home, married to Khadijah, and receiving the revelations and honors due to God's special and final messenger. "All the Prophet's marriages took place before Muhammad gave out the law governing marriage." This is stated to justify his marriage to Zainab. (*Cf.* the article on *Nikah* in the Encyclopaedia of Islam). We have the same special pleading in the brief chapter on the Jews of Medinah, and on the defeat at Ohud. But what can one make of such a statement as one finds on page 84?—"Up to this time Muhammad had employed a Jewish youth as secretary to pen his *Hebrew* and *Syrian* messages. He now ordered a young Muslim, Zaid Ben Thabit, to *master* these two languages and took him as his personal secretary."

The best one can say is that this ideal portrait of Mohammed and the sketch of Islam is from the brush and pen of a sincere follower of the Great Arabian.

S. M. ZWEMER.

L'Arabia Sa'ūdiana (1938). By Carlo Alfonso Nallina. Raccolta di Scritti editi e inediti. A cura di Maria Nallino. Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente, 1939. pp. xii, 303. Bibliography, illustrations, maps.

In the spring of 1938 the Italian Arabist Nallino, accompanied by his daughter Maria, went to the Ḥijāz. During his many years of work with *Oriente Moderno* Nallino had gathered materials for a study of the Kingdom of Sa'ūdī Arabia; the primary object of his trip was to check and supplement his information by firsthand observation of the administration of the Kingdom and the life of the citizens. After a sojourn in Jidda and an auto journey to al-Ṭā'if in the interior, the Nallinos returned to Italy and the professor began writing his book. He had virtually completed Part I and had drawn up the outline for the remainder when he died in July 1938. In tribute to his memory the Istituto per l'Oriente of Rome planned the publication of his collected works. His daughter, making use of the notes he left behind and information that she herself had acquired, edited *L'Arabia Sa'ūdiana* as the first volume of the set.

Nallino had intended to make a detailed survey of every phase of life in Sa'ūdī Arabia. Had he lived on, the book would have been fuller, but even in its present form it is an extremely valuable compendium of data set forth systematically and accurately. Nallino's procedure is that of the social scientist rather than of the traveler such as Philby and Amîn al-Rīḥānī. Nallino should prove particularly rich to one who cannot use the Arabic works of Ḥāfiẓ Wahba and Fu'ād Ḥamza, while even those acquainted with Arabic may find much that is new.

Part I deals with the political, administrative, and judicial systems of the Kingdom. A brief chronological table sketches Wahhābī history from about 1740 to the Treaty of al-Ṭā'if with the Yemen in 1934. The functions of the King and the Viceroy

of the Ḥijāz and the organization of the central government in Najd and its dependencies and in the Ḥijāz are described. In the section on the army Nallino points out that there is no Minister of War, since the military forces are directly under the King. The royal control is exercised through the Agency of Defense, which, unlike the other organs of the government, extends its activity throughout the whole Kingdom. When the Agency was set up about 1933 the powerful Minister of Finance ʿAbd Allāh Āl Sulaimān was placed at its head. Interesting details are given on the Coast Guard, the Night Patrols [*ʿassa*] and the Air Arm. In the account of the Automobile Service a Limehouse mechanic might recognize such terms as *tāksī* and *lūrī*.

In the section on the local administration of Najd Nallino states with regard to the tribal government of the Bedouins, where it has not been supplanted as it has been in the colonies of Ikhwān: "The only novelty introduced by the Wahhābī movement, and above all by Ibn Saʿūd, is the obligatory observance of Moslem law of the Hanbalite school in place of those customary juridical traditions that were not in harmony with the norms of Islamic religious law." In Najd there are no written codes for the regulation of internal affairs: everything here depends on the will of the King. A table of the administrative districts covers four pages, the data being taken from Fuʾād Ḥamza's *al-Bilād al-ʿArabīya al-Suʿūdīya*, which is more recent and more accurate than the same author's *Qalb Jazīrat al-ʿArab*.

Part II contains discussions of religious, ethnographical, cultural, and economic subjects. A table of the principal tribes of Najd, ʿAsīr, and the Ḥijāz is based on the collation of several Arabic sources and the Admiralty's *Handbook of Arabia*. Nallino's article on Wahhabism in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* is reprinted in part. Penal regulations published in the official newspaper *Umm al-Qurā* of Mecca are translated. There is a description of the collective punishment known as *istiṣbāḥ:* troops surround the camp of the condemned nomads during the night and at dawn receive the command *Ṣubbiḥūhum* ["Attack them in the morning"], the signal for the wiping out of the camp. Ibn Saʿūd is said to have used this severe reprisal on occasion to insure the safety of the highways from the *razzias* of the Bedouins. The impact of the Wahhabism of the government on the daily life of the people may be discerned in the translation of the prohibitions to be enforced by the *Haiʾat al-amr bil-maʿrūf wal-nahy ʿan al-munkar* [Commission for Commanding Good and Forbidding Evil] in each town of the Kingdom. A translation of the message that Ibn Saʿūd sent to the people of the Ḥijāz in 1925 outlines the basic principles of taxation. There is a discussion of the Wahhābī opposition to the *waqf ahlī*, a type of pious foundation giving the *usufruct* to the family of the founder which has often been used to exclude legitimate heirs from the inheritance specified for them by the Koran.

Abundant information is given on the schools and libraries, followed by a survey of modern Hijazian literature and journalism. After notes on the pilgrimage, on entry into the Kingdom by non-Moslems, and on relations with foreign states, Part II closes with a

section on the coinage. The face value of stamps is expressed in the *amīrī* piastre, a unit that is not coined, being twice the value of the current piastre [*qirsh dārij*] that is struck of nickel.

Part III is devoted to Jidda and al-Ṭā'if and the road taken by the Nallinos between the two cities. Although it was not a penetration into the unknown, the trip resulted in the recording of a number of details that earlier travelers had overlooked. Maria Nallino is no doubt the most learned in the ways of Islam of the few Christian women who have ventured into the Ḥijāz.

An appendix of over forty pages contains documents on the structure of the government, on slavery, and on Sa'ūdī nationality, as well as treaties and diplomatic exchanges with foreign states, many of which have already appeared in *Oriente Moderno,* while a few are translated for the first time.

Although the material compressed into this book is in a way encyclopedic in extent, there are of course questions where the Nallinos leave us in the dark. They give the punishment for adultery as the bastinado for a man and flogging for a woman; there is no mention of stoning [*rajm*] such as Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb inflicted in a famous case in the early days of Wahhabism [see Ibn Bishr, *'Unwān al-majd,* 1st ed., p. 14], yet I have been told by a reliable authority of an example of stoning in al-Aḥsā' in the 1920's. In the excellent discussion of the *hujar* or colonies of Ikhwān, Bedouins who have been settled in agricultural villages with no tribal distinctions, nothing is said of the reports that the experiment has not proved very successful. However, there is no point in further enumeration of omissions, for there is enough here to keep the student of Arabia busy for many an hour.

It may not be superfluous to join Nallino in noting that Ibn Su'ūd and Su'ūdī are the official forms. But Ibn Sa'ūd and Sa'ūdī, which seem to me to be sounder classically, are so well established in the Western language that it is perhaps better to continue to use them.

The plan for the remaining volumes of Nallino's collected works is as follows [I understand that vol. II has already been published, but I have not seen it]:

II. Islam: Religious beliefs, Sufism, &c.
III. History and Institutions of Islam.
IV. Moslem and Oriental Law.
V. Astronomy. Astrology. Geography.
VI. Linguistica. Literature. Miscellaneous.

The great edition of al-Battānī's *Opus astronomicum,* the Koranic chrestomathy, and the handbook of the spoken Arabic or Egypt will not be included.

University of California,
Berkeley, Calif. GEORGE RENTZ.

Fulcher of Chartres, Chronicle of the First Crusade. Translated by Martha Evelyn McGinty. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press; London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. $1.00.

This is a worthy translation, well annotated, of an important chronicle, forming Series III, Vol. I in the most useful "Transla-

tions and Reprints from the Original Sources of History," edited by John L. La Monte.

Fulcher himself is sympathetically introduced by the translator. The maps clarify his itinerary. The narrative shows us its difficulties: commissari, communications, reinforcement, climate, unreliable friends, mobile and innumerable (though usually disunited) enemies, which were the difficulties of all the crusades.

The currents of history flow, like those of the Bosphorus, in opposite directions. The eastward movement in Fulcher is colorful in itself and interesting to students of mediaeval society. The Christians showed themselves barbarians to the Moslems: "They did nothing to the women in their tents except pierce their bellies with their lances." They waded ankle-deep in blood in the Jerusalem "Temple," "where the Saracens made their prayers more gladly than elsewhere." And they sowed the seeds of unending hatred.

This has been part of the unseen deeper current westward which, nevertheless, by now has mingled our waters in peace. Fulcher saw "the savage attacks" by which the Byzantine civilization was destroyed, even its "very good land especially fertile for all crops," but he did not see the Arabic civilization. He saw the luxuries of the East, but not the refinements the East will bring us. For example, he notes the plumbing of Jerusalem: "They had gutters in the streets in which all the dirt was washed away in the rainy season." He notes items of loot, but shows no appreciation of "The great Camboya trade." He eats sugar-cane as a novelty, but does not see that it is to be carried westward, with its Arabic name.

A chronicler's narrow vision must be supplemented by that of other chroniclers. It is as one of a series, which should be Arabic as well as Latin, that this translation will gain its full value to the impartial historian.

Beech Point, Stanford,
Kentucky. ROBERT SHELBY DARBISHIRE.

CURRENT TOPICS

Moslem Converts on Trial

A United Presbyterian Missionary at Rawalpindi on the Northwest frontier writes:

Lal Din and his brother Server, converts from Mohammedanism, took a stand for Christ two years ago and ever since then have grown steadily in the Lord until now they would be hard to recognize as the same men. During all this time they have been persecuted, sometimes beaten. They had to leave their village and their lands and goods. Not long ago, just after the harvest, they thought they would go to the village and persuade their old friends and relatives at least to give them back their household goods and some family keep-sakes which they much valued. With my permission and blessing they went on this expedition while I left for the hills of Landour, Mussoorie, where I had been appointed Chaplain for the Kellogg Memorial Church for the summer.

The people of the village were very pleasant to them and invited them to stay for the night, but trumped up a case against them. The villagers made superficial cuts on one of their number to prove that he had been attacked by the converts. Then they called in the police and charged the two with trespass at night, robbery and attempted murder. All of the village was ready to witness against the Christians.

These were very serious charges and might mean 18 to 22 years in jail if proved. I was unable to come to Campbellpur as I was 700 miles away and fully occupied with preaching almost every day of the week. To attend a case in India means hanging about the court house for days at a time. They had no one on their side to witness in their favor. I could have done nothing had I been there as I was not an eye witness. The police, magistrate, and lawyers were all Moslems and against these two men who had denied their religion and accepted Christ. They were out to give them all that was possible in the way of punishment and make them an example to others who dared to think of becoming Christians.

They were in a bad way and I had of course to advance them money for a lawyer, though this was the first time that they had asked anything of me in the way of money. Being an emergency I gladly gave it. I wrote to them often, giving Scripture and impressing upon them the necessity of telling the truth, even if it should seem to go against them. The lawyers are so accustomed to defending their clients by false witnesses and lies that it is difficult for the defendant to tell the truth. The two accused men did tell the truth and everyone in the courtroom thought they were crazy.

Their straightforward statements seemed definitely against them, and even silly, giving away valuable information. People in the courtroom, including the judge decided that the two men must be telling the truth because no one who was lying would make such apparently silly statements. The other side followed the usual custom, and having thought that there would be a big fight, made big plans, even against the missionaries. Their false witnesses outdid themselves so that no one in the courtroom believed what they said. The falseness of the charge was evident. Lal and Server were released without a stain on their character and the other side were punished for perjury.

The trial took three months.

—*Missions on the Borders of Afghanistan.*

New Developments in Sinkiang, China

This is the province in N. W. China with the largest Moslem population and one reads with astonishment of recent progress in agriculture, mining and education. In spite of the war, China moves forward everywhere. The article appeared in *Ta Pung Kao,* translated for *China at War:*

Of vital importance to agricultural development in Sinkiang has been irrigation. The province with an area of 1,834,000 square miles, of which one third is desert, is for the most part dry. Cultivable land totals only about 210,000 *mow* (35,000 acres). The climate in southwestern Sinkiang is mild and suited to the growing of wheat. And there have been great developments in irrigation.

Moving on the province's network of highways built or repaired during the first three-year plan are now a total of 3,000 automobiles. The goal of the second three-year plan will be the training of 360 more drivers and the purchase of 707 more automobiles, thereby increasing the capacity of transportation to 4,413,700 tons. In the way of radio, telegraph and telephone communications, the completion of the first three-year plan saw the addition of 14 radio stations, eight broadcasting sets and 500 amplifiers. Electric wires were installed over an additional 358 miles, and long-distance telephone service over 720 miles. In the Municipality of Tihwa, 1,000 automobile telephones have been installed.

The progress in the development of mineral resources and power has also been considerable. Sinkiang is now self-sufficient in kerosene and has an annual output of 350,000 tons of coal, 20,000 tons of cement, 10,000 tons of iron and a power capacity of 5,000 kilowatts.

For the development of light industries, such as spinning and weaving, manufacture of woolen goods and the making of matches and flour, 42 new factories have been established during the past four years. Ili is the center of the province's light industries.

There are at present in Sinkiang one university, 15 middle schools, 300 primary schools and 122 mass educational schools. They were established and financed by the provincial government. Besides, there are 2,000 private schools of secondary and primary grades with an enrolment of 200,000 students. Students in the Institute of Sinkiang are exempt from all fees while all those in the provincial middle schools are given an annual subsidy of $150 each.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

By Sue Molleson Foster

Union Theological Seminary Library

I. GENERAL

Modern Tendencies in Arabic Literature. M. A. M. Khan. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. July, 1941. pp. 317-330).

French penetration into Egypt in 1798 introduced all sorts of new ideas, many of which have exercised great influence on literature.

Music in Muslim India. S. N. Haidar Rizvi. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. July, 1941. pp. 331-340).

Though theologians insist that Islam always has prohibited music, the fact remains that the Mohammedans have loved this art and carried it with them wherever they have gone.

Music: The Priceless Jewel. Henry George Farmer. (In *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* London. Part II, 1941. pp. 127-144).

Quotes Moslem authorities' opinions for and against the propriety of singing.

II. ARABIA

American Ideas for Arabia. K. S. Twitchell. (In *Asia,* New York. November, 1941. pp. 631-636).

The foresight and enterprise of King Ibn Sa'ud are responsible for the inauguration of agricultural and irrigation methods used successfully in our semi-arid Southwest.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

Place of Islam in the History of Modern International Law. M. Hamidullah. (In *The Islamic Review,* Woking. July, 1941. pp. 266-273).

Argues for Moslem activity in this direction during the Middle Ages as shown in the writings of al-Wáqid'iy and of Imám Muhammad ash-Shaibániy.

Racial Elements in the North East Province of Egypt. Abbas Ammar. (In *The Journal of the Royal African Society,* London. October, 1941. pp. 347-361).

Deals with the Arabization of Sharqiya in early times.

IV. KORAN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

La Prière Rituelle du Musulman d'apprès l'Ihyâ de Ghazâli. A. d'Alverny. (In *En Terre d'Islam,* Lyons. Trimestre I, 1941. pp. 3-19).

An analysis of Book IV, on worship, of al-Ghazali's major work.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

Muslim Conduct of State. M. Hamidullah. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. July, 1941. pp. 275-316).

Describes the conduct of war in all its phases.

On the Turks' Russian Frontier. Edward Stevenson Murray. (In *The National Geographic Magazine,* Washington. September, 1941. pp. 367-392).

Pictures life in a Turkish home at Artvin and tells of a trip as far west as Erzinean.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Abyssinia: The Bridge between Africa and Asia. Sir Sidney Barton. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal,* London. October, 1941. pp. 436-440).

Records the country's history through a hundred years of British influence.

Arab Nationalism and the War. (In *The Round Table,* London. September, 1941. pp. 698-708).

Investigates the origins of the Iraqi revolt of May, 1940, and finds its cause in the disillusionment suffered by the Arab world at the policies of France and Great Britain since 1918.

The Stalemate in India. II. The Moslem Attitude. (In *The Round Table,* London. June, 1941. pp. 548-550).

The Parkistan scheme is still supreme with its opposition to majority rule and its insistence on Moslem zones of influence.

The Strategy of the War. II. Iraq. VI. The Campaign in Syria. (In *The Round Table,* London. September, 1941. pp. 648; 661-667).

Accounts of two much-prized British successes.

Warning from the Near East. Albert Viton. (In *Asia,* New York. September, 1941. pp. 512-515).

Pleads for a drastic political change in Britain's attitude towards the peoples of Asia and Africa.

VII. IRAN

THE IRANIAN BACKGROUND. (In *The Round Table,* London. December, 1941. pp. 82-96).

Traces the development of the country from 1907, when Anglo-Russian commercial influence began, to the present day.

ON THE EVE IN IRAN. Elizabeth Bacon and A. E. Hudson. (In *Asia,* New York. November, 1941. pp. 636-638).

Great Britain and Russia must strive to maintain control in Iran, which is now in a weakened condition from the loss of the powerful Reza Shah Pahlevi.

RIZA SHAH PAHLEVI, 1925-1941. (In the *Royal Central Asian Journal,* London. October, 1941. pp. 444-445).

Notes the progress in national regeneration during the rule of the ex-Shah.

THE STRATEGY OF THE WAR. III. Iran. (In *The Round Table,* London. December, 1941. pp. 39-42).

Report on the pacification of Iran by Russian and British troops in the summer of 1941.

VIII. MISSIONS TO MOSLEMS

EGYPT'S RESURGENCE. H. F. Roe. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day,* London. September-October, 1941. pp. 273-275).

In contrast to marked openmindedness toward economic and social improvements is the growing antipathy to all Christian missionary teaching.

THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN EGYPT. S. A. Morrison. (In *The East and West Review,* London. October, 1941. pp. 195-202).

Discusses the implications of proposed reactionary legislation, contravening the provisions of the Montreux Convention for religious liberty and committing Egypt to a policy of extreme Moslem conservatism.

A SURVEY OF THE YEAR 1941. The Near East. North Africa. (In *The International Review of Missions,* London. January, 1942. pp. 36-52).

Against a background of war and its disturbances there has been a vigorous contact between representatives of various countries and churches due to troop movements and the resettlement of refugees.