PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

FALL 1949 PUBLICATIONS

IRVING LANGMUIR Phenomena, Atoms And Molecules	$10.00
MAX PLANCK Scientific Autobiography	3.75
DAGOBERT D. RUNES Letters To My Son	2.75
ALBERT EINSTEIN The World As I See It (New Abridged Edition)	2.75
MORITZ SCHLICK Philosophy of Nature	3.00
KARL JASPERS The Perennial Scope of Philosophy	3.00

—PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED—

VERGILIUS FERM Encyclopedia of Religion	10.00
VERGILIUS FERM Religion in The 20th Century	5.00
VERGILIUS FERM What Can We Believe?	3.00
JOHN DEWEY Problems of Men	5.00
ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD Essays in Science And Philosophy	4.75
SWAMI AKHILANANDA Hindu View of Christ	3.00
JEAN-PAUL SARTRE Psychology of Imagination	3.75
C. E. M. JOAD Decadence	4.75
D. T. SUZUKI An Introduction to Zen Buddhism	3.75
SAMUEL T. COLERIDGE Philosophical Lectures (1818-19)	7.50
JACQUES DE MARQUETTE Comparative Mysticism	3.75
DAGOBERT D. RUNES, Editor Dictionary of Philosophy (5th Edition)	6.00
DAGOBERT D. RUNES, Editor Twentieth Century Philosophy	5.00

Used as Auxiliary Texts in Leading Universities and Colleges

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, *Publishers*

15 East 40th Street, Dept. 178 New York 16, N.Y.

(Expedite Shipment by Enclosing Remittance)

Oriental Books, Indian & Persian Art, MSS., Bronzes, etc.

DAILY CHINESE
The 3,000 Commonest Chinese Terms
With Index
By RONALD HALL, C.B.E. and NEVILLE WHYMANT, Ph.D., Litt.D.
Cr. 8vo. cloth, pp. 8, 212. Price 15s.

THE ASSAM VALLEY
Beliefs and Customs of the Assamese Hindus
By R. C. MUIRHEAD THOMSON, D.Sc.
With 17 illustrations
8vo. cloth, pp. 96. Price 10/6

FREE WILL AND PREDESTINATION IN EARLY ISLAM
By W. MONTGOMERY WATT, M.A., B.LITT.
With diag. bibliography & index.
8vo. cloth, pp. X, 181. Price 15/-

BRITAIN AND THE ARAB STATES
A Survey of Anglo-Arab Relations, 1920-1948
By M. V. SETON-WILLIAMS
With 4 maps, appendices, bibliography & index
8vo. cloth, pp. IX, 330. Price 21/-

LUZAC & COMPANY, LTD.
Oriental and Foreign Booksellers
Agents to the Royal Asiatic Society; School of Oriental and African Studies, London; Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal; University of Calcutta; Bihar and Orissa Research Society, India; Siam Society, Bangkok; etc., etc.
46 Great Russell Street, London, W.C. 1
(Opposite the British Museum)

THE KENNEDY SCHOOL OF MISSIONS
FOUNDED 1911

THIS School aims to equip men and women for missionary service in all Muslim lands, offering instruction in Conversational and Literary Arabic, including the Qur'ān, and in the Islamic religion and civilizations.

Arabic or English reading courses on Woman in Islam are provided. Large Arabic libraries and other Oriental material facilitate scholarly research and literary work for and about Muslims. Both men and women may qualify for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees.

Courses are given in the religions, cultures, and languages of Africa, China, India, Japan, Latin America and other lands, in Biblical Literature, in the History and Techniques of Mission Practice and Cooperation, Phonetics, and in Hygiene, First Aid and Tropical Diseases.

The Kennedy School of Missions is an ecumenical institution without denominational affiliation and welcomes candidates and missionaries of all Boards and Societies. Courses in the Theological Seminary and the School of Religious Education are available for all students.

Accommodations for families and single students may be reserved in advance. For Yearbook and further information, apply to THE KENNEDY SCHOOL OF MISSIONS, HARTFORD 5, CONNECTICUT.

Robert T. Parsons, Ph.D., Dean

MUSLIM LANDS DEPARTMENT
EDWIN E. CALVERLEY, PH.D.,
Professor of Arabic and Islamics

HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION
Russell Henry Stafford, M.A., D.D., S.T.D., LL.D., President

THE MUSLIM WORLD

VOL. XXXIX | JANUARY, 1949 | No. 1

COMPARISON

Has the comparative science of religion any interest to Christians who believe that they have a message for Muslims and try to proclaim it? Is comparison of any help, or is it perhaps the opposite? Will it place Christianity and Islam on the same level and so make Christian Missions futile, for if there is no essential difference between the two, why then missionary work?

Comparison of religions is an interesting subject but often rather dangerous. Archaeologists build up many of their theories on potsherds, often a frail foundation, others would think. But the foundation for comparison of two religions is sometimes still frailer, for most of its material goes back to dim origins. Deductions about relationship and interdependence are drawn from texts whose similarity "may be due to influence of one upon the other," but might also be due to quite other reasons, so that they prove nothing at all regarding interdependence.

But as for Christianity and Islam the matter is quite different. Islam rose 600 years after Christianity and has not only got a number of similarities in expressions, but the Qur'ān mentions the Biblical religions and gives much of the same material. About that there is no doubt. Quite another question of course is whether Muhammad tried to learn and quote directly from Judaism and Christianity. There are passages in the Qur'ān indicating that his Meccan contemporaries accused him of learning and copying. The important thing however for us here is not to be sure how Muhammad acquired the knowledge of the Bible stories and thoughts, but that they are part of the Qur'ān.

As for the way of his acquiring the knowledge of them,

it is of interest to notice how Muslims themselves explain the common ground "of the two religions, especially the educated" modern Muslims who know something about the contents of the Bible and have learned to apply the scientific historical methods of the West. Will it be possible for them to maintain the traditional Islamic theory of inspiration that every detail of the Qur'ān is direct revelation to Muhammad of things unknown to him before? Or will it change by and by to a theory of inspiration that allows for the existence of the thoughts previously in the conscious knowledge (or sub-conscious) of Muhammad according to what he had heard from Jews or Christians, so that the "revelation" consists in the way the Qur'ān explains or makes use of these stories?

From the Islamic side hitherto very little has been done in this way of comparison, about the question of the Qur'ān's dependence on the previous scriptures of revelation. By Western scholars, believing Christians or unbelievers, quite a lot has been written. Here is not the place to mention names, neither of authors nor books. What we want to compare here is not a lot of details, but the core of the two religions, as far as that is possible. It has been said that any such comparison is unfair and next to impossible, and that much of the missionary literature, specially of the controversial type, is of that unfair kind which does more harm than good by a false comparison. And true it is that false comparisons do harm. Christians should not use them, for Christ taught us to do to others what we want them to do to us.

Our question of comparison here is this: if we try to understand Islam as honestly and nobly as possible, if we listen to what the best and not the worst authors have written about their religion, of old and in our own time, will there then still be scope for our Christian missionwork, or must we in the end admit that Islam has not only God's name (Allah) in common with Jews and Christians, but that it brings a new message from the same God as the Father of Jesus Christ and leads men to that same God and Father? Have we nothing to say but that Islam is one of the

monotheistic religions, nay perhaps even that it is a kind of Christianity, a Christian sect?

The answer to this of course depends on what Christianity means. What is the essence of Christianity? If it is a Tolstoyan or other nationalistic theory that it is an ethical system based perhaps on the Sermon on the Mount, a comparison with Islam would probably leave no scope for Christian missions; for Islam too is able to present a serious ethical rule of life. But if Christianity is allowed to present the New Testament as agreeing to the faith as expressed, e.g., in the Apostolic Creed, then probably both Christians and Muslims would agree that the difference is so essential that the two could not be classified as one religion, perhaps not even as related.

Christians have sometimes called Muhammad the false Prophet. It is an unfortunate and dangerous expression, as it will probably, at any rate by Muslims, be taken as an accusation of subjective falsehood and deceitfulness. Such a judgment, if it is ever to be passed, should be passed as a result of scientific research. But of course, in an objective sense, Christians believing in Christ, the Crucified and Risen, as the Only Way to the Father, would call Muhammad as well as many other great names of history, false prophets in as far as they point to another way to God than Christ and his Way.

But the first Christians, as we know them from the New Testament, believed that no one comes to the Father except through Jesus Christ and that no other name is given by which we shall be saved, and no other foundation can be laid than the one already laid in Jesus Christ. That need not mean that a Christian condemns to Hell all non-Christians. That is not his business. He knows that a servant, not understanding his master's will, will be beaten less than one who knew it and did not do it. He admits that God's Holy Spirit may be working in places and ways he himself cannot control. But at the same time he knows that he as a Christian has no other way of salvation to offer people than Jesus Christ. Missionaries are at work, not to condemn but to pro-

claim salvation; and they need not and they should not take an isolated or hostile position towards Muslims. If Muslims do not want to listen to their direct Christian message, why not try to share with them and co-operate with them in any common interests, if it only does not confuse the religious issue. Let social, educational, medical or any other kind of co-operation take place but let it not be called religious work or missionary work and let it have no other motive than that of loving one's neighbor.

There are many religious expressions common to Christianity and Islam. There may also be religious values in common, but in spite of that there need be no ambiguity or confusion regarding the difference between the two. Christianity has something to offer which Islam has not got and will never be able to get by itself, and, it should be openly admitted, does not want to have, i.e., the Cross and all in Christianity connected with the Cross ("delivered for our offences, raised again for our justification").

That the Cross has become the sign of Christianity nobody denies. That Christ's death and resurrection form the chief subject of the preaching and teaching of the Apostles is clear enough from the Acts and the Epistles. That the Qur'ān rejects all this is no less certain: "neither did they crucify him nor kill him," "no soul is to bear another's burden, but each soul bears its own burden," "the good deeds take away the evil deeds." Christianity does not say that the Cross is "natural" and "rational." On the contrary it is a paradox, it is against the human way of reasoning, as St. Paul put it "unto the Greeks foolishness, unto the Jews a stumbling-block." But Islam on the contrary with all its stress on God's transcendence and power maintains that it is the natural and rational religion. Perhaps Christians and Muslims can agree on this: that if our natural way of thinking is to decide God's way of reaching men and "saving" them, the result will not be far from Islam (or Christian Unitarianism). But since the Cross of Golgatha has been raised and God allowed, nay wished, His chosen servant to die on the Cross, the natural rationalistic way of thinking

about God stands contradicted, and the self-righteous trust in honest living and good deeds has got a death-blow, for when we shall have done all those things which are commanded us, we are to say: We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.

From such a way of thinking Christians can not admit that it is intolerant or preposterous to try to proclaim the Gospel to Muslims. They may admit willingly that mistakes have been committed in expressions and methods, but never in principle. They should condemn all feeling of superiority, for what have they got which has not been given to them? And whatever Christianity may have to boast of is just what the natural mind despises (I Cor. I). Any social or cultural development in "Christian" lands should not be used as a means of justifying or recommending Christian missions.

If Muslims seek to proclaim their faith to Christians, these should not be shocked by that. Hitherto such attempts have been few and weak, at any rate through missionary organizations. Islam even seems to despise these and trust in its being the natural religion that will spread by itself. It is rare to find among Muslims that kind of mission-motive which springs from the desire of a soul to share its best treasure with others, perhaps because the fatalistic way of thinking is so strong among Muslims. But Christians at any rate ought to have that strong motive; if God has revealed the way to Himself to be different from what any human thought would find by itself, how can an honest disciple then keep silent about it, even if it may meet the strongest opposition? Ways and methods may differ at different times. But if the missionary motive is kept pure it will always be able to purify what needs purification; and it will do it even if the criticism comes from Muslims, bitter and sharp.

Alfred Nielsen

Ain Anoub, Lebanon

TWAREG WOMEN OF THE SAHARA

Wandering through Arak's[1] dry wady in 1935, I happened upon the first Twareg woman I had ever met—tall, slim, with her shepherd husband, a dozen skinny goats and a very intelligent *Salūqi* dog. I was trying to find the Tifinag[2] rock inscription that the guardian of Arak rest house had described, but the chance of meeting Twareg was more thrilling than even a Tifinag rock inscription. *"Imuhāg?"* I queried. That word means both "noble Twareg" and "brigands." They looked doubtful, and scanned me carefully—smiling and carefree, this foreigner could not be thinking of them as possible brigands, so they nodded. Actually they were probably *'imgād,* not "noble" Twareg, so the pride of that dignified couple was perhaps tickled. The woman took the initiative throughout, maybe partly because I was a woman. Then to my surprise she begged for a little sugar. I wondered what they could have to eat, so slipped into the rest house with no intention of bringing sugar, and returned with a big loaf of heavy wholemeal bread. Evidently they were pleased, relieved, I thought; the dog sniffed with approval, and we parted. Since then I learned that Twareg often live in summer almost only on the milk of their flocks. They had told me the goats were dry. When we started early next morning for the last long motor day up to Tamangaset, I caught no glimpse of yesterday's friends.

On reaching Tamangaset I at once set about finding a literate Twareg woman. At that time the Twareg did not favor houses; they lived in tents, some distance from Tamangaset. However Mrs. Watson told me of a woman near them who had the reputation of being a Twareg scholar, though neither Twareg by birth nor one of their erstwhile slaves. Mrs. Watson very kindly arranged with the woman to visit me. I found her dour and uncongenial. I do not think it

---

[1] Arak is about halfway between In Salah and Tamañĝaset. It consists of a few huts and the S.A.T.T. motor company's rest house inside a horseshoe of precipitous rocks, like a miniature Muscat without sea.

[2] Tifinaĝ is the script of all Twareg dialects. It is the direct successor of Libyan script.

was shyness,[1, 2] or even gaucheness, but overwhelming conceit, such as is so common among Muhammadans in their relations with others. It might be too much to expect her to take the initiative in teaching, or to develop some line I suggested, but one often encounters almost over-politeness where correction or criticism would be welcome; not so from our stolid, almost wooden, friend; everything I tried was wrong, everything I wrote was failure. I found out that they expect to be entertained with little glasses of strong sweet tea; but how could I prepare tea and have a lesson at the same time! Even had I possessed a kettle, or teapot, or glasses. Now I should delight in learning Twareg tea conversation; that was not my idea then, though I doubt whether that woman would have taught me much anyway. After attempts along various lines that emerged ever less successful, the lesson concluded, was paid for and the time for the next lesson arranged. She never returned.

Soon I heard that the Tifinag expert and authority was Demla, the plump comely wife of the then amènokāl, Musa ag Amàstān. Wanting very much to check what I had found as the current Tifinag alphabet, and also to pay my respects to the reigning chief of Ahaggar (French Hoggar), I took a camel trip to the royal camp at Abilessa. There Demla received me in gracious simple fashion, and verified the alphabet I had collected—I mean the consonants; my vowels were frowned upon as an innovation. However subsequently, when Demla has visited Tamangaset, vowels have not seemed to annoy her. She was pleased with the story of the Lost Sheep, until the final verse—I don't think she realized till then that it was religious. She and the whole royal family disliked references to religion. Their cousins, the present reigning family, including Mèslag ag Amāyās, our amènokāl since April 22nd, 1941, seem less prompt to resent Christian conversation and pleased to accept the fourteen page booklet published by the Scripture Gift Mission in 1945, under the title "Teaching of Jesus Christ."

Shortly after, a slim supple little Twareg woman whom I greeted not far from my house, was friendly, and evidently

knew some Arabic; would she teach me? "Why not?" she replied. So I went along to her house and arranged a time. When I went for lessons she was sometimes grinding or sifting corn, and I did not disturb domestic routine, which she only interrupted to illustrate something, or to let me hear better what she said, or maybe to hear me better. The phonetics were new to me, I found it very hard to reproduce or even to hear clearly, the sounds she made so easily. It was the first Berber tongue I had tackled. My difficulties interested her mildly, I was probably dull of hearing, and perhaps dull mentally. We went over my attempted translation of the late Miss Chapman's *Indian Reader,* with its four Bible stories. She suggested so many words; I wondered which of them were alternatives, meaning much the same thing. We spent most time on Three Faithful Exiles (Dan. III), and the Woman at the Well (John IV), also the Paralytic Man (Mark II). Then one morning their soldier son's platoon came in to Tamangaset. After the official inspection, a rider appeared cantering down the gentle but roughish slope to their house. He dropped lightly from the camel (as is the custom also in Arabia) before crouching it. He and his camel seemed to move in unison, as if it knew beforehand what he wanted, exquisite team work. After being introduced I retired, remarking with some effort: "He is tired by his journey." She responded and I hoped she felt it might be worthwhile to teach. Tabīsaka seemed more thrilled by a few Psalms we translated than by the Bible stories. She was a professional singer. Certainly others who yawned over the stories listened intently to Psalms, specially XXIII and CXXI. How many months these lessons continued I do not remember; I went for only an hour at a time in the morning, while she was working. Then one day she asked me to lend her ten francs (exchange was at sixty-four francs to £1); the next day the family had disappeared. No news or good-byes, just away into the blue. Twice I think since then her husband has visited me, listened to translations with interest, and helped me with them. Once

he remarked something like "We are grateful to you for translating bits from here, there and everywhere." That is perhaps the only expression of appreciation I have had here.

My next teacher was the child of Hausa ex-slaves from the French Sudan, therefore her Tamahaq[3] had a Taïrt[4] dialect flavor. She usually pronounced "j" as "g". The girl was about twelve years old with the ubiquitous name Fātnah. We went over the beginning of Luke's Gospel. She, like her brothers and sisters, knew no Hausa, and only a smattering of Arabic. That did not usually seem to matter, but her vocabulary was too limited for words at all uncommon. She helped me mainly by my hearing how to use, or omit, prepositions and genitives. The trouble with Fātnah was that after a very short time she began to yawn, and was almost asleep long before the end of an hour. She seemed interested sometimes in the narrative. She married a Hausa laborer also from the Sudan. Their only common language was the Algerian Arabic that is current here. He was a cheery kindly man, and they seemed to get on well.

Thereafter I had two men teachers. The second, though not Twareg, was an orphan brought up in Twareg tents, and befriended by the French, for which he felt warm gratitude. He was illiterate, but soon learned vowelled Tifinag—Tamahaq, though to this day he can make nothing of unvowelled writing; and no wonder, for it is like hyper-abbreviated shorthand. He stopped teaching me when Vichy emerged in June 1940. Since then I have had no regular teacher, nor found any one capable of editing manuscripts for publication.

Tabīsaka visited me once, perhaps about 1941, looking wretchedly tired and thin, almost ill. I was very glad to see her, and let her know it. There was obviously much that could be done for her, but I failed. It was during the years of dearth, when I was living on gruel and water and weighed less than 42 kilogram; I had not even enough to keep my

---

[3] Tamahaq is the most northerly Twareg dialect.
[4] Taïrt is the dialect spoken by Twareg of the French Sudan.

pair of pet pigeons. I was also short of money, giving English lessons for a living. I asked Tabīsaka to call again and teach me, but she did not.

One sees far more Twareg men than women in the town, specially towards the end of each month, when they come in for rations. And the men are more accustomed to meet foreigners. Still one day lately I was stopped twice by Twareg women, who asked about Tifinag, and listened to the booklet. They would not buy, but greedily accepted parts of the booklet to take to those who could read. Alas, it is only now that anyone is able to read fluently; the regular old way is to drone vowels around each consonant, and then guess the meaning.

Mlle Micheline Mouchan, an ex-Assistante Sociale stayed here more than a year, and managed to make friends with a number of Twareg women.

The assistant warden of a Swiss Museum, Miss Iolanthe Tschude, was here this year, and made two trips of several weeks' duration to Twareg camps, staying at one camp only for the duration of each trip.

Both these women who visited Twareg camps told me that they carefully avoided anything that could be taken for Christian propaganda. True, the word "propaganda" savors of antagonism. Perhaps "witness" rings more true to our Gospel calling. Far more men than women here have heard the witness of Jesus. Perhaps barely two or three dozen women have heard, whereas one meets men any time in shops and offices and meat markets and vegetable and wood markets. Men seem more open to approach, though there have been several attentive women round those donkey and camel loads of wood. Tifinag is our link. That interests them almost always, and they often encourage me to read from the booklet of Scripture passages. This may be partly through surprise at hearing Tamahaq read fluently (like Arabic or French) for the first time. But the contents interest them too. So you see Twareg, both men and women, can make friends.

Frances M. Wakefield

Tamangaset

THE HISTORY OF ISLAM IN INDIA

On the fifteenth of August, 1947, there came into being as a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations the independent Dominion of Pakistan, the largest Muslim country in the world. From the eighth century onwards, waves of Muslim invaders had swept over the hills and plains of northern India. Muslim armies fought against Muslim, Hindu, Sikh, and British armies, conquered and were conquered. Kingdoms were established, dynasties rose and fell. The trial of arms between Muslims and others came to an end under British rule, and the clash of military might gave way to the inter-play of party politics. After a period of foreign rule, comparatively brief as history goes, 20th century diplomatic methods accomplished what all the armies of Muslim conquerors through the centuries could not do—the establishment in the Indian sub-continent of an independent state comprising much of northern India with a Muslim majority population, ruled by Muslims.

In this series of historical articles, we can hope to give nothing more than a brief and very general survey of the main events relating to the Islamic connection with India, but with world attention focussed on the new Muslim state of Pakistan, it will not be out of place for us to review briefly the history of Islam in India. The series planned is of three articles: First, from the early conquests to the First Battle of Pānipat in 1526, marking the beginning of the Mughal Period. Second, the Mughal Period, the period of the independent dynasties, and the rise of the Sikh power, down to the Mutiny in 1857. Third, Islam in India in the Modern, or British, Period.

I. From Islamic Beginnings in India to the First Battle of Panipat, A.D. 1526

A. *The Arabs in Sindh and Multan.*

Western India early attracted the leaders of the Muslims as a possible field for conquest. Details are lacking, but

it would appear that as early as A.D. 637, only five years after the death of Muḥammad, an Arab army was dispatched to Thana, near Bombay.[1] About 24 A.H. (644 A.D.) or the year following, a man named Hākim bin Jabūlah was especially commissioned to collect reliable information concerning Sindh, with the idea that if he gave a favorable report, an expedition might be sent to that territory. He made his trip, and when he returned and reported, the governor of Iraq asked him to report directly to 'Uthmān, the Khalīfah. Hākim bin Jabūlah's rhymed description has been translated thus: "Water is not deep there; available fruits are sour; the robbers are daring; a small force will be lost, and a large one will starve there." The idea of invasion was dropped for the time being.[2] Later, expeditions were sent to Broach (south of Baroda), to the Gulf of Debal (in Sindh), and to the Kalāt area (in Baluchistan).[3]

At the beginning of the 8th century A.D., Sindh was being ruled over by the members of a dynasty which had been founded by one Rai Chach, the son of Silaij, in A.D. 632. The area was divided into four main provinces. A few years after the beginning of the century, a young Muslim leader named Muḥammad bin Qāsim, only 17 years old, entered Sindh with an army, overcame the opposition of Rai Dāhir, his chief opponent, and besieged Multan in 712 A.D.[4] This was in the time of the Khalīfah Walīd, when al-Hajjāj was governor of Iraq. The occasion for the expedition is said to have been that some Arab ships from Basra were attacked by Indian pirates from Sindh.[5] Multan was a well fortified place, and held out against the invaders until a deserter pointed out to Muḥammad the stream or canal which supplied the city with water. When this was destroyed or diverted, the garrison was at last obliged to surrender. Though successful in his conquest of upper Sindh and the lower

---

[1] Majumdar, Raychaudhri, and Datta, *An Advanced History of India,* Macmillan and Co., London, 1946. p. 181.

[2] Syed Hashimi, "The Arab Rule in Sind," *Islamic Culture,* vol. I, pp. 190-1.

[3] Majumdar, etc., op. cit., p. 182.

[4] Muhammad Habib, "The Arab Conquest of Sind," *Islamic Culture,* vol. III, p. 184.

[5] H. G. Rawlinson, *India: A Cultural History,* p. 223.

Panjab, the young leader incurred the displeasure of the Khalīfah, and was recalled and disgraced.[6]

One reason advanced for the ease with which Muḥammad bin Qāsim accomplished the conquest of Sindh is that there was raging in India at the time a conflict between Buddhism and Brahmanism. Muḥammad had the passive support of the Buddhists, and the active support of the Jats and other cultivating classes, as Dāhir was a Brahman, and these were in many ways harassed by the Brahman rulers.[7]

The area conquered by Muḥammad bin Qāsim was under the authority of the Khalīfah for a century and a half, until A.D. 871. In that year, two Arab chiefs established semi-independent states at Multan and Mansurah. The latter was of the area now comprising the province of Sindh, while Multan was farther up the Indus, and within the bounds of what is now the West Panjab. These rulers retained the fiction of being subordinate to the Khalīfah, but were actually independent. The state of Mansurah lasted until A.D. 976, that of Multan until some time later.[8]

Our information regarding the Muslim rule in Sindh for this period is sketchy, but we do know a little bit about it. Government revenue was from two main sources: the *zakāt* paid by the Muslims, and the *jizyah* paid by the non-Muslims. Under the arrangement then in force, it sometimes happened that Muslims paid more than non-Muslims for the up-keep of the government, as the *zakāt* was from 2½ to 12½% of the income of a Muslim, while non-Muslims paid a flat rate of 5 dinārs, or about Rs. 30 ($9) per year. For deciding legal questions the native peoples had their own local councils, and the Muslims had the qāzī's court. In religious matters the people enjoyed great liberty. Each man was free to profess any faith, and perform worship in his own way. Hindu priests still collected their 3% of land revenue. Even Muḥammad bin Qāsim is supposed to have said, "Build . . . temples, traffic with the Muhammadans,

[6] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, pp. 6-7.
[7] A. Chakrabarti, *Hindus and Musalmans of India,* p. 63.
[8] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 9.

live without any fear, and strive to better yourself in every way possible."[9] A considerable number of people, however, chose to become Muslims in this area, which was even before the partition of India more than 80% Muslim. Professor Muhammad Habib of Aligarh writes, "It is difficult to say how the people were won over to Islam. Muhammad Qāsim never tried to accomplish by the sword what the sword can never accomplish, and the number of conversions during his reign were negligible."[10] He attributes the spread of Islam to the work of missionaries, who labored in the centuries both before and after the sultanate of Delhi. Sir James Douie agrees with this opinion when he writes that though conversions to Islam in the eastern districts of Panjab were chiefly political, the conversion of the western part of the province was largely the result of missionary effort.[11]

The early Muslims in Sindh and Multan left but few architectural remains. There are five tombs in Multan which date from a period earlier than the Mughals. Two of these have undergone such extensive renovation that they can hardly be called "pre-Mughal". The tomb of Rukn i 'Ālam, built in 1320-24, is a splendid monument. More Persian than Indian in its style, it is considered finer than many of the pre-Mughal remains at Delhi itself.

B. *The Ghaznavids, Ghaurids, and the Slave Kings.*

Early in the second half of the 10th century, a Turk, Alptigīn by name, established himself as ruler of a small state with its capital at Ghaznī, between Kabul and Kandahar. Before the end of the century, members of this dynasty had come into repeated conflict with the Hindu rulers of the Panjab, who appear to have been the aggressors.[12] Kabul having been taken from the Hindus by Sabuktigīn in A.D. 988, Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, who succeeded his father Sabuktigīn in the year 997, carried the conflict into India. Between

---

[9] Syed Hashimi, op. cit., p. 204.
[10] Muhammad Habib, op. cit., p. 611.
[11] Sir James Douie, *The Panjab, North-West Frontier Province, and Kashmir,* p. 118.
[12] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 11. (Historical material in this section, not credited elsewhere, is taken from this source.)

the years 1000 and 1026, Maḥmūd is said to have made no less than 17 raids into India, in the course of which he inflicted repeated defeats on his opponents, sacked and destroyed important Hindu temples such as those at Muttra (south of Delhi), Kangra (in the Himalayan foot-hills), and Somnath (in Kathiawar). He annexed the Panjab to his kingdom in the year 1021 A.D., and died ten years later in 1031.

In addition to being a great soldier, Maḥmūd was a man of culture. He left many notable buildings at Ghaznī, and many poets, among them the famous Firdausī, graced his court. We learn much about Hindu thought of the time from the writings of another scholar of Maḥmūd's court, al-Birūnī. Under the patronage of Maḥmūd, al-Birūnī had a chance to make a study of the thought and mind of India. He studied Sanskrit and the vernacular languages, trying to understand the science, philosophy, and institutions of the Hindus. His book on India, completed after the death of Maḥmūd, "still remains the most authoritative first hand source of information on Hindu culture about the time of the Ghaznavids."[13] The work covered the fields of religion, literature, legendary history, geography, astronomy, and mathematics, describing Hindu viewpoints in all of these fields.

Maḥmūd's successors were weaklings, and the kingdom soon felt the effects of the removal of his strong hand. The story of the century and a half between his death in the year 1031, and the first expedition of Muḥammad of Ghaur in 1175 is one of repeated struggles for the succession as weak ruler succeeded weak ruler. The fortunes of the Muslim empire in India waxed and waned as Benares and Hansi were captured, and Hansi, Thanesar, and Kangra were lost to Mahīpāl, ruler in Delhi, in the middle of the 11th century. In the early part of the 12th century, Muḥammad Bahlim, governor of the Panjab under Bahrām, displayed great energy in subduing the minor Hindu chiefs on the borders of the Panjab. His governorship of the province is

---

[13] A. Yusuf 'Ali, "Al-Biruni's India," *Islamic Culture,* vol. I, p. 33.

worthy of note in that he established Muslim rule over areas which had never acknowledged the authority of even Maḥmūd. The city of Nagaur, which was for a time his center of activity, is a full 380 miles south of Lahore.

Until A.D. 1150, the Ghaznavids had ruled from Ghaznī, but in that year, Khusrav Shāh, the son of Bahrām, was driven out of Ghaznī by the Turkmans, who sacked the city. He went to Lahore, and died there in 1160. The Panjab was now all that remained to the Ghaznavids of their once extensive empire. The Turkmans were driven from Ghaznī in 1173 by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Muḥammad, of Ghaur, who appointed his younger brother, Shihāb-ud-dīn Muḥammad, governor of Ghaznī. Shihāb-ud-dīn, usually called Muḥammad of Ghaur, led successive expeditions into northern India from A.D. 1175 onwards, and although he suffered a severe defeat at Thanesar in 1191, he returned the following year to inflict an even more crushing defeat on his adversary, Prithvīrāj.[14] Muḥammad now had complete control of all northern India as far as Delhi. He made his Turkish officer Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, a former slave, his viceroy, with headquarters at Delhi. Muḥammad succeeded his brother as sultan early in the year 1203, but ruled for only three years, as he was assassinated early in 1206.

Syed Hasan Barani says of the Ghaurī sultans that "they were patrons of art and literature. The famous philosopher and theologian, Imām Rāzī, had lived at the court of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Ghaurī, who was very fond of building mosques and colleges."[15]

As Muḥammad Ghaurī's viceroy in India, Qutb-ud-dīn had already made extensive conquests, capturing Hansi, Meerut, Kālinjar, Mahoba and Badaun.[16] Bihar and part of Bengal had also been added to the empire by another of Muḥammad's officers. When Muḥammad died leaving no male heir to succeed him, Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, governor of Kirman, claimed the succession in Ghaznī. But Qutb-ud-

[14] Majumdar, etc., op. cit., p. 278.
[15] Syed Hasan Barani, "The History of Delhi to the Time of Timur," *Islamic Culture*, vol. XII, p. 309.
[16] Majumdar, etc., op. cit., p. 279.

dīn Aibak was powerful, and Nāsir-ud-din Qabācha, governor of Multan, Aibak's son-in-law, acknowledged him as his sovereign. Angered at this, Yildiz attacked Multan, but was defeated by Aibak, who went to Ghaznī. There he was attacked by surprise while celebrating his victory, and had to flee to Lahore. He died in A.D. 1210. Qabācha declared himself independent at Multan, so there was nothing left to Ārām Shāh, who had been proclamed Aabak's successor in Delhi, but parts of Hindustan and the Panjab. He lost these almost immediately to Īltutmish another son-in-law of Aibak. Īltutmish defeated Yildiz and later Qabācha and was recognized as sovereign of India by the Khalīfah of Baghdad in A.D. 1229.[17] He died in 1236, after naming his daughter, Raziyyah as his successor. The nobles refused to consider having a woman as their ruler and chose Rukn-ud-dīn Fīrūz, a son of Īltutmish. He and his mother ruled tyrannically and wastefully, and practically all of the provinces revolted. The governors of Multan, Hansi and Lahore formed a confederacy against Fīrūz. When he went to meet them, Delhi revolted. He returned to Delhi, but was seized and put to death, and Raziyyah was made ruler. Her energy and decision won for her the Panjab, Hindustan, Bengal and Sindh. Raziyyah now came into direct conflict with a group of Turkish nobles who had become powerful enough under Īltutmish to form a league. They were known as "The Forty," and divided up according to their will the important offices both at the capital and in the provinces. Raziyyah appointed an African "master of horse," and thus incurred their enmity. They finally deposed her, and later rulers of the dynasty had to submit to their authority.

Raziyyah's immediate successors were weak and incompetent, and unable to offer any serious opposition to the invasions of the Mongols, which began in 1241. Maḥmūd, a younger son of Īltutmish, became ruler in Delhi in 1246, though his father-in-law, Bahā-ud-dīn Balban, one of "The Forty" was really the power behind the throne. When, in

---

[17] L. Bevan Jones, *People of the Mosque,* p. 186.

A.D. 1265, Maḥmūd died, the last of the line of Īltutmish, Balban ascended the throne.

Before this, "The Forty" had remained in power by combining to make or break the ruler. They had apparently worked on the principle that no one of them should be permitted to become too powerful. But Balban was one of them, and when he became sultan, the others were jealous. One of his first tasks was to set about destroying the confederacy. In A.D. 1268-69, Balban led an expedition to the Salt Range, a range of hills in the north-west Panjab, the strong-hold of the Khokhars, in order to bring the Panjab under his control. In 1270, provincial government was re-established in Lahore, and Balban appointed his son Muḥammad Khān ruler in Multan. This prince was "gentle and courageous, able and learned, a diligent student and a munificent patron of letters."[18] Poets and learned men flocked to his court, and he was the logical successor for Balban, who loved and trusted him. In A.D. 1279, the Mongols crossed the Sutlej, but were badly defeated. In 1285, they attacked Multan, and Muḥammad Khān was killed. Balban was heart-broken by this blow, and died two years later, in 1287. His grandson succeeded to the throne, and under his rule, the Mongols again attacked the Panjab. They were defeated in the neighborhood of Lahore, and were either killed or taken prisoner. As Kaiqubād, Balban's grandson, was a poor ruler, some Turkish chiefs of the Khiljī tribe put him down, and made one of their own number, Jalāl-ud-dīn, sultan. This ended the so-called "Slave Dynasty" which had begun with Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak.[19]

Amir 'Ali has described for us the reforms brought about during the reign of Balban. In his time, most of the forests of northern Hindustan were cleared, the robbers who infested the forests were rooted out, roads were made, and guard houses were placed at regular intervals. This was a great improvement over the general lawlessness which had existed previously.[20]

---

[18] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 78.
[19] V. A. Smith, *The Oxford Student's History of India,* p. 119.
[20] Amir 'Ali, "Islamic Culture in India," *Islamic Culture,* vol. I, p. 344.

Before proceeding with the history of the Khiljī and Tughlaq dynasties it will be well for us to pause for a little to study the general state of affairs in government and religion under the Muslim rulers of India up to this time. The situation with regard to the way the government was carried on seems quite clear. The great fiefs such as Multan, Hansi, Lahore, Bhatinda, Sirhind, etc., were nuclei of Muhammadan influence. The fief-holders were responsible for the preservation of order. Full use was made of Hindu methods of local government. Of conditions under Qutb-ud-dīn, Tara Chand writes, "The employment of the Hindus was a necessity of their rule. . . . When Qutb-ud-dīn decided to stay in Hindustan, he had no other choice but to retain the Hindu staff which was familiar with the civil administration, for without it all government including the collection of revenue would have fallen into utter chaos. The Muslims did not bring with them from beyond the Indian frontiers artisans, accountants, and clerks. Their buildings were erected by Hindus who adapted their ancient rules to newer conditions, their coins were struck by Hindu goldsmiths, and their accounts were kept by Hindu officers."[21]

In matters of local dispute, Hindu caste tribunals decided cases between Hindus, while Muslim disputes were decided by the *muftī* or *qāzī*. Cases between Hindus and Muslims were decided by Muslims, but the decision did not always favor the Muslim, as we might think from reading some historians. Large areas remained under the local rule of Hindu rajas and landowners, who paid taxes when forced to do so. The Hindus would be strong and independent under a weak Muslim, and would be ground down by a harsh ruler.[22]

Muslim historians interpret the early conquests as being for the purpose of spreading Islam, and examples of Muslim iconoclasm and oppression are frequent on their pages. But the descriptions of Muslim-Hindu relationships found in other writings seem to show that the purposes of

---

[21] Tara Chand, *The Influence of Islam on Indian Culture,* p. 37.
[22] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 45.

the conquests were not always religious. We are reminded by A. Chakrabarti that Maḥmūd of Ghaznī "plundered both infidel and true believer with equal ardor," and, again, "He ransacked with equal enthusiasm the Muslim kingdoms of Iran and Trans-Oxania." He goes so far as to say, "Religion was very far from being the central motive of Maḥmūd's raids. He was more eager to plunder India than to Islamize her."[23]

But if some of the rulers were not greatly interested in seeing that their subjects became Muslims, there were others who were interested in the spread of their religion of the One God. Among these were many Sūfīs. Lajwanti Ramakrishna tells us that "almost all the willing conversions were no doubt the result of Sufi preaching."[24] In A.D. 1244, Sayyid Jalāl-ud-dīn settled in Uch, in what is now Bahawalpur State. Many persons in the neighborhood were converted to Islam. Many of his descendants have become revered as saints, and several of the tribes of the Panjab are supposed to have been converted by his grandson, Sayyid Aḥmad Kabīr, known as Makhdūm-i-Jahāniyah.[25]

C. *The Khiljīs, the Tughlaqs, and the Sayyids.*

The story of the brief period of the dynasty of the Khiljīs is a story of fierce religious intolerance and oppression, a story of murder and intrigue.

Jalāl-ud-dīn Khiljī, who became sultan after Kaiqubād, Balban's grandson, had been deposed, ruled from June, A.D. 1290 to July, 1296.[26] He was an old man when he was made sultan, and left most of the fighting to his nephew, who later succeeded him. In the year 1292, he had to defend himself against another invasion of the Mongols. They were driven back from Lahore, and when 3,000 of them surrendered and offered to become Muslims, Jalāl-ud-dīn gave them a suburb of the city of Delhi, which came to be called, therefore, Mughalpura. ("Mughal" and "Mongol" are vari-

---

[23] A. Chakrabarti, op. cit., p. 70.
[24] Lajwanti Ramakrishna, *Panjabi Sufi Poets,* Introduction, p. xvi.
[25] T. W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam,* p. 281-2.
[26] Muhammad Habib, *The Campaigns of 'Ala'u'd-din Khiljī,* p. 126.

ant forms of the same word, and could be used interchangeably without any violence to their actual meaning. I have however, followed the usual custom of speaking of the sporadic invasions of India from time to time by these peoples as invasions of the Mongols, while reserving the term "Mughal" for the rulers of the dynasty beginning with Bābar, in A.D. 1526. Bābar himself traced his descent from the Mongol, Chingīz Khān, through his mother only. Through his father, he was a descendent of Tīmūr the Turk.)

In A.D. 1296, 'Alā-ud-dīn Khiljī, the nephew of Jalāl-ud-dīn, who had done most of his fighting for him, murdered him and became ruler. He had to defend his realm against the invasions of the Mongols five different times. In 1303, he repulsed them very seriously. He found the Muslim converts from among them troublesome, and in A.D. 1297 ordered a general massacre of them.[27]

In the year 1304, the Mongols invaded again. They were defeated by an army under the leadership of Ghāzī Khān. As a reward for this, 'Alā-ud-dīn made the victorious general governor of the Panjab in 1305.[28] Ghāzī Khān was later to become sultan in Delhi.

'Alā-ud-dīn won many victories, and made many extensive conquests, bringing large areas under his rule. He tried to enforce strict prohibition of the use of strong drink during his reign. He also built up a very intricate system of espionage in order to keep in close touch with all that was going on throughout his dominions. His treatment of Hindus was very severe. Tax laws were so harsh as to reduce them all to the same dead level of poverty.

In the 1315, the son of 'Alā-ud-dīn succeeded to the throne. He was a weak ruler, and left all supervision of affairs in the hands of a Hindu convert, Khusrav Khān, while he gave himself up to filthy sensuality. Khusrav Khān murdered him, and tried to organize a Hindu reaction. He ruled for only four months, and then was killed by Fakhr-ud-dīn

---

[27] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 121.
[28] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 110.

(who ruled later as Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughlaq), son of Ghāzī Khān, the governor of the Panjab. Ghāzī Khān was asked to assume the royal power, and in 1320 became Sultan at Delhi with the name of Ghiyās-ud-dīn.[29]

Perhaps the leading literary figure of the Khiljī period was Amīr Khusrav. Born at Patiala in 1253, he was one of the greatest of all poets of India who wrote in Persian. He was at court for a time, where he made a name for himself in the field of music as well as poetry, but later he retired from public life. The period of his life and work extended beyond the historical limits of the Khiljī dynasty, as he was the teacher of the elder son of Balban, of the Slave dynasty, and died in 1325, the same year that Muḥammad bin Tughlaq became sultan.

Ghiyās-ud-dīn reigned from 1320 to 1325. He was personally a rigid Muslim, punctilious in the observance of all the ordinances of his faith,[30] and a good administrator. He tried to make amends for some of the misgovernment of his predecessors by reducing taxation on agricultural lands to a tenth or eleventh of the produce.[31] He died in 1325, when his pavilion crashed down on him, whether by accident or because it had been weakened purposely by the order of his son Fakhr-ud-dīn is not certain.

Fakhr-ud-dīn ascended the throne as Muḥammad bin Tughlaq. Of him we read that he was "learned, merciless, religious, mad."[32] He was a scholar in his own right, being eloquent, skilled in Arabic, Persian, logic, mathematics and Greek philosophy. "He abstained from strong drink, the ruin of so many of the kings of Delhi, led a moral life, and was distinguished for his personal gallantry. But all these fine qualities were more than neutralized by his savage temper and insane ambitions, so that his reign stands out as one of the most calamitous in Indian history."[33] One of his mad schemes was to transfer the capital from Delhi to

---

[29] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 125.
[30] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 129.
[31] Stanley Lane-Poole, vol. III of *History of India,* edited by A. V. W. Jackson, p. 128.
[32] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 125.
[33] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 125.

Daulatabad, in the Deccan. The mere changing of the capital was not so bad, but he insisted that the whole population of the city should migrate with him. It was not long before they were all forced to move back again. Many people suffered great hardship in this connection. During his reign, Bengal and the Deccan secured their independence.

Muḥammad Tughlaq died in A.D. 1351, after a reign marked by repeated invasions of the Mongols and by frequent rebellions by governors of outlying provinces. He left no sons, and the nobles chose as his successor his cousin Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq. Fīrūz Shāh was one of the best rulers in Delhi before Akbar. He tried to make amends for those who had been oppressed under his predecessor. He made great improvements in the administration and won the affection of his subjects. He ruled from A.D. 1351 to 1388. The one weak point in his otherwise good rule was his religious intolerance. In an appraisal of the reign of Fīrūz Shāh, H. G. Rawlinson tells us that, "Religious tolerance was unknown to him, and he considered it to be a religious duty to employ every means in order to induce his Hindu subjects to embrace Islam."[34]

After the death of Fīrūz Shāh in 1388, there was a prolonged struggle for the succession, and when, ten years later, Tīmūr the Turk entered India by way of Multan, he met little opposition. His forces went on from Multan to Lahore, which he destroyed. Near Delhi, he defeated and massacred an army of many Muslims, estimated variously at from 50,000 to 100,000, and sacked the city without mercy.[35]

Tīmūr did not stay long. When he left, he put Khizr Khān in charge of the Panjab and upper Sindh. In A.D. 1414, Khizr Khān entered Delhi as its sovereign, and established the so-called "Sayyid Dynasty," which ruled precariously until A.D. 1451. There were many rebellions in this period, and much of the time of the Sayyid rulers was taken up in attempting to prevent further defections.[36]

---

[34] H. G. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 236.
[35] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 127.
[36] *Cambridge History of India,* vol. III, p. 201.

D. *The Lodhi Dynasty.*

In the year 1451, when the last of the "Sayyids," 'Ala-ud-dīn, abdicated, Bahlol Lodhi, governor of the Panjab, became sultan in Delhi. A good soldier, Bahlol Lodhi succeeded in restoring the frontiers of the kingdom as far as Bihar. His son, Sikandar, who succeeded him in A.D. 1488 or 89, took even Bihar. Sikandar ruled until 1518, when he was succeeded by his son, Ibrahīm. Under Ibrahīm, several of the provinces, including the Panjab, rebelled. Daulat Khān, governor of the Panjab, invited Bābar, the ruler of Kabul, to assist him, and Bābar agreed to lead an expedition into India.

As the coming of Bābar marks another important transition, let us pause again for a few notes on government, religion, etc., in the later period of the Sultanate of Delhi.

Government in this period was despotic, with much rebellion and many assassinations. There was extensive local autonomy. A strong ruler could keep his subordinates in the provinces in check, but a weakling quickly lost his empire. Our story of the period from A.D. 1193 to 1526 has been limited chiefly to the fortunes of Delhi, and the account of the various dynasties which ruled from that city. The influence of Islam in this period was extended to many out-lying areas which sometimes were brought under the rule of the sultan of Delhi and sometimes were independent under their own rulers. The chief of these more or less independent states or semi-independent provinces were Bengal, Jaunpur, Gujarat, Kashmir, Malwa, Khandesh, and the kingdoms of the Deccan.

The movements in literature and architecture of the previous period continued much the same. Many of the princes were patrons of Persian literature, and many buildings were built. The architecture was designed in various foreign styles, modified by the Hindu architects. They were often copies of buildings in Damascus, Mecca, and other places.[37]

This period is the period of the development of the

[37] V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 144.

Urdu language as a medium of communication between the foreign conquerors and their Hindu subjects. "Urdu" is the Turki word for "camp," and is the same word originally as the English word "horde." Urdu follows the verb system of Hindi, and all but a few of the verbs (not including those formed by adding the Hindi "karna," meaning to do or make, to Persian and Arabic forms) are Hindi. The amount of intermingling of Persian and Arabic words is great in the north-western Panjab, and in general becomes less as one goes east and south. Delhi and Lucknow, as early centers of culture, are still recognized as the places where the best Urdu is spoken.

In religion, this period saw the beginnings of several eclectic movements, more or less permanent in their results. The teachings of Kabīr, who died about 1518 A.D., gained for him a following among both Muslims and Hindus. He taught that all institutional religion was a hollow sham. He was a mystic, and wrote much poetry, which is quoted all over north India and Pakistan.[38]

Another such teacher was Gūrū Nānak, who was born at Nankana Sahib (named for him) in Lyallpur district, now Pakistan, in A.D. 1469, and died in 1538, twelve years after Bābar's victory at Pānipat. His followers multiplied rapidly and became the fourth largest religious group in prepartition India, numbering several millions. Nānak condemned idolatry, priestly domination, and the bondage of caste and ritual.[39]

Such was the situation when Babar answered the invitation of Daulat Khān and came to India, to become later sultan of Delhi, and founder of the Mughal Dynasty.

James D. Brown

Gujranwala, W. Panjab, Pakistan

AL-MUḤĀSIBĪ AND HIS AL-RI'ĀYA

A. *Life and Works of al-Muḥāsibī.* Abū 'Abdallah Ḥārith Ibn Asad al-Muḥāsibī was born at Basra in 781 A.D.[1] There are several anecdotes relating to his father. These center around the statement that he was a wealthy man and bequeathed a large sum to his son.[2] Since the father was a heretic[3] al-Muḥāsibī refused to accept the legacy[4] and, instructing that it be turned over to the government, chose a life of poverty.

He came to Baghdad at an early age and obviously received a good education. His writings indicate that he had been well drilled in the theological disciplines of his day. There is reason to believe that he, like al-Ash'arī later, had a Mu'tazilite training and then abandoned it. For, while he came to repudiate Mu'tazilitism as such, he continued to use its dialectic method.[5] It is in relation to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal that his connection with Mu'tazilitism was thrown into sharp relief. At the heighth of al-Muḥāsibī's career Ibn Ḥanbal came into prominence in the religious affairs of Baghdad.[6] Ibn Ḥanbal, foe of all heresy and especially that of the Mu'tazilites, would be quick to accuse al-Muḥāsibī of unorthodox views. Most probably he, like al-Ash'arī again, held a middle position, neither accepting the severe orthodox literalism of Ibn Ḥanbal nor following the extreme rationalism of the Mu'tazilites. His mysticism would even fall under the suspicion of such a strict dogmatist as Ibn Ḥanbal, and yet one senses in al-Muḥāsibī's writings the

---

[1] As we shall see, the writings of al-Muḥāsibī are available in some abundance but in all this material there is little of a biographical nature. For a list of references to al-Muḥāsibī in other Arabic works see, Margaret Smith's edition of *Kitāb al-Ri'āya,* p. xv. See also, Margaret Smith, An Early Mystic of Baghdad, Chap. 1

[2] al-Qushairī places the amount at 70,000 dirhams.

[3] Variously called Wāqifī, Rāfiḍī and Magian.

[4] Because of his belief that the Prophet had forbidden inheritance from members of heretical sects.

[5] See, Massignon, *Essai sur les Origines du Lexique Technique,* p. 211.

[6] Caliph al Ma'mūn gave official approval of the Mu'tazilite position and suppressed the party of orthodoxy. Under al-Mutawakkil this position was reversed; orthodoxy gained official sanction and the Mu'tazilites were vigorously persecuted.

desire to make mysticism comply with orthodox Islam.[7]

Al-Muḥāsibī seems to have gained a position of eminence and respect among the learned men of Baghdad, in spite of this conflict. 'Aṭṭār refers to him as "that lord of saints, that pillar among the devout, that great and revered leader, that man of eminent qualities, who was among the most learned of the Shaykhs in regard to things material and spiritual, and in conduct and counsel was an approved spiritual influence unto men, so that the saints of his time accepted his authority in regard to every branch of knowledge."[8]

The conflict between al-Muḥāsibī and Ibn Ḥanbal became so severe that al-Muḥāsibī was forced to leave Baghdad. After some time in Kufa he returned to Baghdad, but Ibn Ḥanbal's influence was so much in the ascendency at that time that al-Muḥāsibī found it necessary to live in seclusion. It is related that due to this hostility only four persons attended his funeral when he died in 857 A.D.

Al-Muḥāsibī was a copious writer. Massignon's list of his works includes seventeen titles.[9] This number can be increased to twenty one,[10] of which eighteen are known to be extant.[11] Only four of these works have been published.[12]

Scholars agree that the *Kitāb al-Ri'āya,* which we have chosen to translate is his best and most comprehensive work. It has been called the "finest manual of interior life which Islam has produced."[13] It is a book of substantial size, well ordered and carefully written. We see at work a writer of keen analytical ability, a mind which can thrust through

---

[7] Shahrastānī classes al-Muḥāsibī as holding orthodox views on the divine attributes, even though he explains that he made use of *kalām.* He also states that the Ṣifātiyya, among whom he classes al-Muḥāsibī, were later called Ash-'arites; *Kitāb al-Milal wa'al-Nihal,* p. 64, 65.

[8] 'Aṭṭār, *Tadhkirat kirat al-Awliyā,* I, 225; quoted in Smith, *An Early Mystic of Baghdad,* p. 7.

[9] *Op. cit.,* p. 212.

[10] See, Smith, *op. cit.,* p. 44ff.

[11] Margaret Smith lists seventeen titles as being extant. The *Kitāb al-Ghayba,* which she does not account for, is in the Princeton Univ. Library according to *Garrett Collection of Arabic MSS,* Hitti, no. 2053.

[12] *Kitāb al-Ri'āya,* ed. Margaret Smith, 1940; *Kitāb al-Tawahhum,* ed Arberry, 1947; *Bada' man anāb ila Allāh,* ed. Ritter, 1935; and *Kitāb al-Ṣabr wa'l-Riḍā,* (a fragment), ed. Spies, *Islamica,* VI, 3, pp. 283ff.

[13] Quoted from Massignon in Smith, *Early Mysticism of the Near and Middle East,* p. 225.

the superficialities and vanities which so easily beset all men, and a soul which is sincere in the search for an inward moral perfection.

B. *Al-Muḥāsibī and the Development of Muslim Mysticism.* For some time scholars have been aware of al-Muḥāsibī and his works,[14] but his position in the history of Muslim mysticism has yet to be adequately recognized. From the point of view of date, geographic location, number of existing works, the quality of his writing, and the nature of his ideas, al-Muḥāsibī is in a key position to supply information for the understanding of early Islamic mysticism.

The first half of the ninth century is an important period in this development and the Basra-Baghdad-Kufa area is of significance geographically. At this formative stage Islamic mysticism found an exponent of rare ability who was able to take its beliefs and present them in an organized form with considerable thoroughness and completeness.[15]

A thorough examination of al-Muḥāsibī's writings promises to throw light upon a number of questions in the development of Muslim mysticism. Among these is the relation of an early quietistic asceticism to the more speculative and often ecstatic mysticism of later times. There is to be found in his writings a more normal type of mysticism which may be a combination of, or a link between, the two forms. Al-Muḥāsibī condemned certain rigorous ascetic practices and corrected the quietistic tendencies of his predecessors.[16] *Dhikr* is, for him, largely an intellectual act of remembrance[17] and not an exercise to induce a trance state, as it later became. *Sama'*, for which al-Muḥāsibī prefers *istimā'*, is concentration for the purpose of keener spirit-

---

[14] Alfred von Kremer, in his *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Leipzig, 1868), gave a brief discussion of al-Muḥāsibī and credited Sprenger with having called attention to his writings in the Calcutta Review (no date). Margoliouth gave still further attention to this mystic in the *Transactions of the Third Internat. Congress for the Hist. of Rel.*, 1908, pp. 292ff. Massignon gave a more complete account in his *Essai sur les Origines du Lexique Technique*, pp. 211-225.

[15] Cf., Massignon, op. cit., p. 212.

[16] Ibid. p. 223. See, "al-Ri'āya", p. 47.

[17] "Al-Ri'āya", pp. 24, 37, etc.

ual understanding[18] and not the "séance" of more extreme mysticism.

Al-Muḥāsibī was an ascetic, to be sure, but his teachings go beyond the negative sort of asceticism which is usually connected with the term *zuhd.* His asceticism of the heart and of the members was, in its first instance, purgative but beyond this purification was the desire for positive spiritual excellence. Worldly distractions are to be avoided so that the mind and spirit may function more effectively.[19] His discussion of inner concentration and spiritual meditation is in line with the finest mysticism.[20] The heart is to be examined constantly against the appearance of sins which would separate one from God.[21] This is important for the sake of gaining bliss instead of punishment in the world to come but such is not its sole significance. The servant of God uses this process of purification as a means of drawing near to God, so as to know His friendship and His love and to have intimacy with Him.[22] Furthermore, while conduct is to be judged by the approval of God rather than by the approval of men, al-Muḥāsibī gives attention to the need of right living with other people.[23]

In relation to the final goal of the mystic al-Muḥāsibī again displays the more normal type of mysticism. This ultimate relationship with God is intimate, but it is more on the basis of purity of heart, and of understanding and fellowship than of "mystic union." In this respect al-Muḥāsibī is more in line with Evagrius and Isaac of Nineveh than with Pseudo-Dionysius and Stephen Bar Sudaili.[24]

Al-Muḥāsibī also forms an important link in the general development of mystical thought and practice in the Near East. We observe, for example, a Muslim mysticism which has reached a rather advanced stage of development at the

---

[18] Ibid. pp. 1ff.
[19] *Al-Ri'āya,* p. 28f.
[20] Ibid. p. 2 & 27.
[21] Ibid. p. 10.
[22] Ibid. p. 7.
[23] Ibid. p. 47 & 52.
[24] Wensinck says, "Isaac is more concerned with the state of purification and illumination that with that of perfection and unification"; *Mystic Treatises of Isaac and Nineveh,* p. xxvii. See also art. by W. Thomson, THE MOSLEM WORLD, January, 1945, p. 64.

beginning of the third Muslim century, and which seems to have become the dominant type of mysticism in Islam for the next century or more. This would discount the importance of any influence from India, or connect that influence with a distinctly later type of mysticism. We have also noted in al-Muḥāsibī a mysticism more akin to that of St. Basil, Evagrius Ponticus and Isaac of Nineveh than to Pseudo-Dionysius and Stephen Bar Sudaili with their stronger tinge of neo-Platonism.[25] This, combined with the early date of al-Muḥāsibī's writings, lends support to the belief that whatever Greek influence may have come to bear upon mystical thought in Islam was either of a later date or more indirect than some scholars would have us believe. A consideration of al-Muḥāsibī's ideas would seem to add weight to the theory that Muslim mysticism was, very largely, a product of the Mesopotamian valley, and that borrowings and influences are more apt to be found in the Syriac Christianity with whose mystical asceticism it shared much in spirit as well as geographic location.

This is said without forgetting that al-Muḥāsibī was, above all, a good Muslim.[26] His writings give little evidence of direct appropriation from Christian teaching[27] and it would be false to imply that he took any major portion of his system of thought directly and consciously from Christian sources. Asín goes too far and is too literal in citing evidence that much of mystical asceticism in Islam was lifted directly from Christian teachings. The truth of the matter lies somewhere between Asín and Massignon, and al-Muḥāsibī is a good case in point. Al-Muḥāsibī is careful to base his teachings squarely upon the Qur'ān, the Sunna and the

---

[25] Cf., Hausferr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualite Orientale", *Orientalia Christiana Perodica,* 1935, vol. I, 124, 125. MacDonald, *Development of Muslim Theology,* p. 181.

[26] More orthodox in his position than the controversy with Ibn Ḥanbal over *kalām* would indicate.

[27] In spite of the obvious "Parable of the Sower" (al-Ri'āya, p. 2f). This striking passage, coming as it does at the very beginning of *al-Ri'āya* has, without doubt, led scholars to over-estimate the belief that "he draws largely on Jewish and Christian sources for the purpose of edification" (Nicholson, *Legacy of Islam,* ed. Arnold and Guillaume, p. 214), or that the work shows "evident traces of the use of the Gospel" (Margoliouth, op. cit., p. 292). It should be noted that no other passage in this long treatise reveals any such direct connection with Christian teaching.

concensus of the Ulamas. In the scattered remarks of his Muslim predecessors, and especially in the teachings of such men as Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, al-Dārānī and al-Anṭākī, we see considerable evidence that al-Muḥāsibī built his system of thought upon those rudiments of mystical belief and practice which had developed within the Islamic tradition. This Muslim mysticism, having its growth on the same soil with Syriac Christian mysticism, inevitably developed, whether by direct influence or by force of common religious atmosphere, many similar aspects. Al-Muḥāsibī is of importance because he captured, with a keen analytical mind and a fine literary ability, this trend of mystical thought and gave it an organized form. These writings could not have failed to exert an immense influence upon Islamic mysticism in the years to come. The teachings of al-Muḥāsibī had their immediate effect upon such associates as al-Junayd. Al-Junayd, whose influence in the devolopment of Sufism has long been recognized,[28] held al-Muḥāsibī in high regard and accepted his teachings.[29] These mystical teachings produced perhaps their greatest result in the thinking of al-Ghazzālī, whose writings were considerably influenced by al-Muḥāsibī.[30]

C. *A Summary of "Kitāb al-Ri'āya."* In this treatise[31] al-Muḥāsibī gives a detailed discussion of the use of introspection to examine with severity the workings of the mind, to ferret our falseness and hypocrisy, to cut deep into the very seat of motives, where no man is without sin. Here is the real source of sainthood; not in outward observances—asceticism, good works and the like—but in the removal of all falsehood from the inner sanctuary of the soul. In any age, with any man, this is remarkable. The human soul is filled with contumacy. Who is free from the taints of pride? Who does his good works totally free from the desire of human praise? How much there is of sham and falsehood

[28] Arberry, *Introduction to the History of Sufism,* pp. 37, 63; also, J.R.A.S., 135, pp. 499-507.
[29] al-Makkī, *Qūt al-Qulūb,* I, 158.
[30] See, Margaret Smith, "The Forerunner of al-Ghazālī", J.R.A.S., January 1936 and chap. XIV in *An Early Mystic of Baghdad.*
[31] *Kitāb al-Ri'āya li ḥuqūq Allāh,* ed. Margaret Smith, Gibb Memorial Series, London, 1940.

which needs to be cut through with the sharp sword of honest self-examination!

To observe and perform the law of God is the foremost consideration for the servant of God (p. 3).[32] But such performance requires careful self-examination, for the law of God is to be observed not only in the bodily actions (*a'māl al-jawāriḥ*) but in the actions of the heart (*a'māl al-qulūb*) (p. 13). It is in the actions of the heart—inner attitudes, thoughts, motives, etc.—that we often fall short and displease God. It is at this point that one needs to apply a strict system of self-examination in order to free the heart of these unworthy motives and gain the favor of God.

Al-Muḥāsibī prefaces his detailed exposition of the methods of introspection with a discussion of spiritual listening (*istimā'*) (p. 1). One arrives at the knowledge of right and wrong—that which pleases God or makes Him angry—by a process of meditation wherein outward disturbances are reduced to a minimum and the mind is freed to perceive the promptings of God (p. 1). Al-Muḥāsibī outlines a very sound formula for the gaining of spiritual insight (pp. 2, 27). First there must be a cessation of bodily activity. "The bodily members are put to rest (p. 2)." This should include careful restriction of sensory interference. "For the vision of the eye diverts the heart and distracts it; so does the hearing of the ear and the touch of the hand (p. 28)." The second step is that of mental discipline, directing the mind with concentrated attention toward that upon which he desires to reflect. He "cuts off the excesses of thought on inward things and keeps his heart from all save that upon which he wishes to reflect, then his attention is truly present (p. 29)."

It will be noted that al-Muḥāsibī does not hesitate to speak of the value of the mind (*'aql*) or of understanding (*fahm*). This process of spiritual listening is not a trance state but the heightening and sharpening of the mental processes. Knowledge, for which he uses both *'ilm* and *ma'rifa,* does not have a strong esoteric connotation. True

---

[32] Page numbers in this section refer to *al-Ri'āya,* ed. Margaret Smith.

knowledge is God-given (pp. 2, 3) but this is knowledge of the workings of the heart and of the meaning of the Qur'ān and the traditions. Reason (*'aql*) and knowledge are guides to the proper understanding of God's law. They are aids in overcoming passion and desire (p. 44). "There is no salvation for the servant except through obedience . . . and the guide to that obedience is knowledge. Therefore, by reason and knowledge he will discern the harmful and the beneficial among the enticements of the heart" (p. 45). In the true spirit of the mystic, warning is given against the state where one "praises his own reason and his own intelligence . . . forgetting the kindness of his Lord (so that) he will trust in himself" (p. 35). The believer is urged to "reliance upon the Lord and not upon reason" (p. 27).

The real difficulty in the observance of God's laws is in making oneself aware of their importance and in motivating the heart to the performance of them. The first essential is piety (*taqwā*). "Piety is the fear of transgression in all that God has prohibited, or of failure in doing what He has prescribed" (p. 5). "The root of piety is the fear of God (*khauf*)" (p. 5). Fear and hope are the chief sources of motivation for this process of self-examination which, by its nature, becomes burdensome to the soul. They keep the servant to the rigid self-discipline of reflection and meditation. When one fears the punishment of God or hopes for His reward, he is aroused from his heedlessness (*ghafla*) and is awakened to his duty of obedience to God.

Careful self-examination is required to avoid self-delusion. There are many seemingly pious men who simulate the outward signs of obedience but through insincerity of thought they incur the anger of God (p. 9). Self-examination is a process of "looking carefully and with deliberation to distinguish what God disapproves from what He likes" (p. 12). Every member of the body must be carefully and constantly guarded against acts displeasing to God. The servant will also make examination of his secret thoughts. He will watch for evil suggestions pertaining to the actions of the heart—self-esteem, pride, envy, hypocrisy, haughti-

ness, evil thoughts, etc. (p. 10). Self-examination has two phases, "one in the anticipation of action and the other in reflection upon the results of action" (p. 12). By self-examination one is able to weigh an action in advance and to "examine yourselves before you are examined" (p. 14). By self-examination one is also able to review past actions, both to repent of error before meeting God and to avoid further errors of a similar nature (pp. 16f.).

Repentance (*tawba*) in its true form is not easy and there are many who fail to attain to it. The soul (*nafs*) and Satan are allies in deception to prevent the servant from repentance, because repentance is a turning away from pleasure to a life of rigor. This *nafs,* or lower self, is the seat of passion and appetite. "By the passion of the *nafs* the Enemy attains that which he desires of your soul" (p. 200).

The actual process of introspection is by means of recollection (*dhikr*) and reflection (*fikra*). Much sin is due to heedlessness (*ghafla*). When one neglects recollection and reflection he becomes heedless and piles up one sin after another without awareness of his condition. "The beginning of affliction is the heart's neglect to give thought . . . or to call to mind. From that there is unmindfulness, then neglect, then heedlessness, then failure in the commands of God, and then the inheritance of evil from the blindness of passion and the hardness of the heart" (p. 18).

Hypocrisy (*riyā*) is one of these inward sins which requires self-examination for its removal. The servant's intention (*nīya*) must be acceptable to God, as well as his outward action (p. 13). Many ascetics practice abstinence and self-mortification as regards the outward members but there is greater need of an inward asceticism of the heart. This inner purification, this spiritual asceticism, is the more important and the more difficult. Only by strict self-examination is it attained.

In later chapters al-Muḥāsibī gives full discussions of other inward sins—self-esteem (*'ujb*), pride (*kibr*), jealousy (*ḥasad*)—and points out the value of self-examination for their removal from the heart. Sections are devoted to con-

trition (*nadāma*), blame (*malāma*) and humility (*tawāḍu'*).

In this entire treatise al-Muḥāsibī is dealing primarily with a method and we have little direct discussion of the mystical relationship with God. He apparently thinks of this relationship in terms of walking in the right path (p. 20), enjoying God's good pleasure and having him as a friend (p. 19) and a guide (p. 20). This seems to be more of a state of "right relationship" with God than a "mystic union." Al-Muḥāsibī mentions man's love of God (*maḥabba,* p. 19), his desire for God (*shawq,* p. 7), the nearness of God and man (p. 20) and "intimate converse" with God (p. 7). These typical mystical expressions are only scattered remarks in *al-Ri'āya* and they are never emphasized or developed. The following is the most nearly complete statement of this mystical relationship. "Accordingly He has enlightened their hearts and has strengthened their souls and has sufficed them of Himself, apart from creatures, and has made them pleased with obedience to Him. He has compelled their hearts . . . to the delight of hope in Him; and that is heightened by desire (*shawq*) for Him and for His Paradise. He has lifted them from their troubles into bliss, through obedience to Him and happiness in that obedience. He has made them content with little from this world, but He has made their life good therein and He has been a help and an aid to them . . . they are the most exalted in soul in all creation, the most enlightened in heart, the richest and the most blessed in life. They grieve in that for which men rejoice and they rejoice in that for which men grieve. . . . They find companionship where others experience loneliness because their friendship is with God alone, reaching intimate converse (*munājāt*) with Him. To Him they reveal their secrets and unto Him they draw near in their need. They find Him a refuge, a garden, a shelter. They are devoted to Him to the exclusion of all distractions which would cut them off from Him. They are in solitude when others are in company; apart from people but in company with God" (p. 7).

KERMIT SCHOONOVER

Wilbraham, Mass.

ISLAM AND THE EARLY SEMITIC WORLD

Like Judaism and Christianity, Islam was born in a Semitic environment, and like them it developed and matured in a world fashioned largely after Greek thought and established mainly by Roman power. But by virtue of the time, place and circumstances of its origin Islam adopted and has brought down with it perhaps more of the beliefs and practices of the early Semites than even Judaism. The roots of some of its ways of life and habits of thought lie far back in the ancient Semitic world; and although these ways of life and habits of thought can be understood well enough as parts of Islamic ethics and doctrine without a profound knowledge of that world, our grasp of the historical significance and implications of their survival and of the forms in which they have survived, can gain both clarity and depth by acquainting ourselves with some aspects of the life and faith of the Semites, since first they knocked at the door of history.

A discourse on primitive religions usually partakes of the nature of a dissertation on general culture; and the reason thereof is simple. Primitive man lived in a world in which the extraordinary and mysterious dogged his every footstep. He never knew when or how the weird and awful would invade his little yard and engulf him and his in disaster, or how and when any simple act of his might set fearful forces in motion to destroy everything which he held dear. His world was not a familiar sequence of linked and explicable events. He did not enjoy a broad sphere of comparative security, guaranteed by observed or recognized laws, natural, human or divine, such as enables us to forget and neglect the unknown. The unknown met him at every turn, violated even the sanctity of his family circle; and he had to reckon with it day and night in every circumstance of his life. Little or nothing in his experience was forseeable or predictable. Events had not for him as for Ecclesiastes their fit occasions even. Things had no rhythm or pattern, but an arbitrary and incalculable manner of intruding into his common, everyday affairs. And he had a desperate need for protection against the unseen perils which pervaded his environment, and of a friendly hand from out of the very unknown, from which he shrank in such dread and yet waited upon so expectantly.

But the Semites were by no means a primitive people at the dawn of history. Ages, indeed, before the use of written records, some of them at least had already achieved a fairly high level of culture and had risen in their religious life from the shadowy stage of polydemonism, in which the mysterious powers, with which man felt himself surrounded, had but vague and indefinite personalities, to

that of polytheism, in which each divinity had his or her proper name and a neatly defined personality and sphere of action. Evidences of polydemonism appear, to be sure, in historical times, which need occasion no surprise, since it is still alive in the land today under the guise of the adoration of saints; and hints of an even earlier stage crop up, when men addressed themselves, not to gods or spirits, but to an indefinite and impersonal power like the Polynesian Mana. But the Semites, as we find them in their documents and monuments, worshipped local or tribal gods. Their earlier sentiments are inferred from some of their rites and customs, which have preserved, it is maintained, traces of a more primitive way of thinking.

Robertson Smith informs us in his first lecture on *The Religion of the Semites*[1] that "the Semitic settlements in Asia were practically complete at the first dawn of history," and that "the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian conquests"—he might have added the Egyptian also—"made no considerable change in the general type of the population of the Semitic lands," such as did later the Greek and Roman conquests, when "a large, foreign element was introduced into the towns of Syria." "The populations of this whole region," he declares, "constituted a well-marked ethnic unity," and "the region of Semitic occupation was continuous and compact."

But even if we grant that the Semites formed, as Robertson Smith asserts, "a singularly well-marked and relatively speaking a very homogeneous group" by reason of a period of isolation from other groups much longer than that of their separation from each other, and that they carried with them "a strongly marked character and many common possessions of custom and idea besides their common language," it is very evident nevertheless that, when first we meet them in history, they were already part and parcel of a common civilization, which had arisen and spread over the whole of the Eastern Mediterranian area, which was participated in more or less by nations great and small, possibly even by the nomadic tribes, and which was independent moreover of political vicissitudes. The Semites, it must be said, seem to have profited by this civilization rather than to have contributed to it.

Syria and Palestine lay at the great cross-roads of early world-routes, the beaten tracks of ancient migrations and invasions, and of trade and cultural exchanges as well. Three great international highways crossed Palestine; another, the road from Tyre to Damascus, just touched its northern border. From 2900 B.C. to 1100 B.C. the destiny of both Syria and Palestine was linked inseparably with

---

[1] pp. 5-13.

that of the great empires of Babylon, Egypt and the Hittites. By the year 2000 B.C. Babylonia had imposed its sovereignity firmly upon both of them;[2] and when Babylon fell before the Hittites about 1900 B.C., and Syria and Palestine became more or less free, Egyptian influence took the place of Babylonian.[3] The Pharoahs of the 18th dynasty (1580-1350 B.C.) conquered all of Syria up to the Euphrates, but left the original princes for the most part in charge of the administration of their towns as governors, depending upon the particularism of their vassals to safeguard their own overlordship. Two dangers, however, threatened the Egyptian position at this time, the advance of the Hittites from the North and the infiltration of the "Habiru" from the South. Some scholars believe that the "Habiru" were the Hebrews. But the name means "robbers" and was probably applied to Bedouins in general.

In the reigns of Merneptah (1225-1215 B.C.) and Rameses III (c.1195-1152 B.C.) of the 19th dynasty Egypt was attacked several times by the Libyans and by various peoples from Europe, the "Peoples of the North and of the Sea," who formed part of the great migration of Aegean peoples, of which the Trojan war was also an episode. Rameses III finally defeated the "Peoples of the North and of the Sea" in 1190 B.C., but failed in preventing the settlement of several of their tribes in the region south of Carmel and in the coastal plain and ports of Canaan. From these tribes sprang the Philistine confederation, which gave Palestine its name.

Egyptian dominion over Syria and Palestine collapsed at the end of the 12th century B.C. (c.1117); the Hittite empire was destroyed by the "Peoples of the North and of the Sea" and by a flood of Aramaean migrations about the beginning of the same century; and Assyria did not intervene in Syrian and Palestinian affairs seriously until the 9th century B.C. For some three to four hundred years the small states of the Syrian coast had the liberty and opportunity to develop freely without external pressure. And it was under these exceptional circumstances that Israel established an independent state, to endure for some four centuries and to be reproduced only once in the course of history in the days of the Maccabees.

When the Israelites entered Palestine about the end of the 13th century B.C., they found in possession of the land peoples named in some texts Canaanites and Perizzites,[4] distinct tribes at first probably, and in other texts Amorites.[5] Still other peoples mentioned in the documents are the Avvites, the Hivvites and the Hor-

---

[2] Proved by the use of cuneiform writing and the Akkadian language in both lands to the 14th century at least.

[3] cf. the story of Sinouhit in the days of Sesostris I.

[4] Preferred in J and P; cf. Gen. 13:7; 34:30; Judg. 1:4-5.

[5] In the E document, Amos and Deuteronomic authors.

ites of Seir. These were all Semites except perhaps the Horites who may have been Hurrians.[6] But according to tradition they also met remnants of an ancient race of giants, the Anaqim around Hebron and in Philistia, the Emim (the Terrible) in Moab, and the Zamzummim or Rephaim in Ammon,[7] relics possibly of a still older race, builders of the Megalithic monuments, especially in Transjordan. And it is quite conceivable that some of these non-Semitic Troglodites of the third millenium still lived on in some of the more inaccessible parts of the land along with the Hittites of Jerusalem, Hebron and the plain of Jezreel.[8] Finally there were the three peoples with whom the Israelites felt themselves closely related, the Ammonites of Transjordan, the Moabites east of the Dead Sea and the Edomites south of Judah, elements of the Aramaean invasion like the Israelites, but who had left the desert for the sown centuries before the days of Moses.

But however varied in origin and divided in loyalty the peoples of Syria and Palestine may have been, the common civilization, in which they participated and to which they were to give a special form, was already well advanced before the advent of the Israelites. Bronze was in use from the middle of the third millenium, and iron was introduced towards the end of the second, probably from Asia Minor. Vines and figs were cultivated in the reign of the Pharoah Pepi I (c.2500 B.C.), and by the year 2000 B.C. wine was more plentiful than water.[9] The Canaanites were also experts in the art of fortification and the designers and makers of the famous "iron chariots," which inspired such terror in the Israelites.[10] And theirs also is the glory, according to some scholars, of having invented the alphabet, prompted by Egyptian models. In this connection too it may be worth mentioning that the Philistines, an Aegean people seem to have been "Canaanized" by the middle of the 9th century, only150 years after their establishment in the land.

The language of the land was Hebrew. But the princes of Canaan had need of scribes versed in Babylonian for the purposes of diplomacy; and these scribes composed versions of classical Babylonian texts with a view to the mastery of that language apparently, so that in the course of acquiring the art of writing diplomatic notes they also attained an acquaintance with the religious beliefs of the Babylonians and undoubtedly with their science and laws as well.

Egypt, on the other hand was dependent upon the Lebanon for

---

[6] Deut. 2:12,23; Josh. 9:7; Gen. 36:20-30.
[7] cf. Deut. 1:28; Josh. 11:21-22; Deut. 2:9-10, 20-21; Gen. 14:5.
[8] cf. Gen. 23:20; 26:34; 35:27,46; Judg. 4 and 5; Jer. 16:3,45.
[9] cf. the tale of Sinouhit and the annals of Thotmes III (c.1450 B.C.).
[10] cf. Josh. 17:16; Judg. 1:19.

large trees with which to build its sea-going boats and always attached great importance to the maintenance of good relations with the ports of Central Syria and especially with Byblos. Its commercial intercourse with Syria became notably active from the 16th century B.C. onward; and we find Canaanites established in Egypt for reasons of trade in the days of Amenophes III (1415-1380 B.C.). Egyptian objects turn up in considerable quantities in Palestinian excavations, especially at Byblos and Megiddo; and the Canaanites also imitated Egyptian wares.

But Babylon and Egypt were not the only sources of Canaanite civilization; for Aegean influence appears in Canaanite ceramics. It would be natural to suppose that the Aegean technique was introduced by the Philistines at the beginning of the 12th century B.C.; but Palestinian potters began to imitate Aegean models towards the end of the 15th century B.C. at the latest; and Mycenean pottery was very popular in Egypt from the time of Amenophes III (1415-1380 B.C.). Canaanite bronze objects also betray Aegean influence; and the pottery of Gezer shows Cyprian, which became dominant in Palestine with its subjection to Egypt during the 18th and 19th dynasties (1580-1210 B.C.).

But however indebted the Semites may have been to their neighbors in the arts and crafts and also to a considerable extent in respect of their political and legal ideas, they seem to have clung tenaciously to certain religious beliefs and social customs of their desert forbears; and these beliefs and customs have remained throughout their history the essential and formative elements in the development of their society and of their view of the world and of human destiny.

The historical documents of the Israelites picture the society of their nomadic ancestors as patriarchal;[11] and this patriarchal form of society must go back to very early times indeed, since the Arabic, Hebrew and Assyrian words for "daughter-in-law" and "father-in-law" are identical. But there is also some evidence pointing to a still earlier matriarchal stage. A mother, for example, retained for centuries the right to choose the names of her children; and a child would naturally belong to the group of the person who named it and could choose a name compounded with that of the god of the clan or family and so place the child in the circle of the god's clients. After marriage, moreover, a woman often remained with her parents and raised her children in their house enjoying only temporary visits from her husband.[12] And with the Israelites, as with the Arabs,

---

[11] cf. Ex. 21:7; Neh. 5:1-13; also II Ki. 4:1; Gen. 38:24; 42:37 with Deut. 21:18-21; Judg. 21:22.

[12] cf. Samson's Temnite wife (Judg. 15:1), Gideon's marriage to a woman in Sichem (Judg. 8:31), Moses' Midianite wife (Ex. 4:18; 18:2-7). cf. the *mut'a*

despite the fact that the official law takes count only of male parentage, there was, and still is with the Arabs, a lively sentiment of solidarity between a child and the mother's family, especially with brothers born of the same mother as the child's mother. The tent, too, remained the property of the wife; and some of the names for the clan, such as "rehem" (breast), "beten" (belly) and "ummā" (mother) also seem to bear witness to a matriarchal stage of society.

But the Israelitic clans of the Mosaic period, and also according to tradition of Abraham's day, and probably of much earlier times still, were patriarchal; and like the tribes and clans of pagan Arabia, they had a very distinctive organization. A real or assumed descent from a common ancestor formed the social bond and was the "corner-stone of morality" and the "yard-stick of worth"; not only physical, but even moral qualities were thought of as inherited; virtues and vices descended from father to son. Blood was the "symbol of nobility" and the "measure of duty"; the repute of a tribe rested upon the fame of its forefathers; the honor and security of each member depended upon the respect and regard shown to its ancestry. "Noble veins," declares a poet, "takes him back to his forefathers"; says another ". . . and whoso bears credit among men he owes it to race." The name of the eponymous hero of a tribe was often used as a kind of battle-cry and as an invocation for help apparently in the stress of battle, or in times of trouble. But it was also the symbol of the glorious memories and proud traditions of the tribe, and to answer such a call was a point of honor.[13]

Blood was the basis of tribal unity, the cement of society. The clan included all adult men in whose veins ran the blood of the group either by birth, or by a rite of alliance such as that of blood-brotherhood.[14] The child was not considered a member as by natural right. Certain acts must be accomplished to transform him into a true man capable of performing all the functions of an adult member. To these ceremonies in the beginning belonged the rite of circumcision, which was interpreted naturally as an act of affiliation

---

marriage with the Muslims. See Goldziher's *Vorlesungen über den Islam* (Heidelberg, 1910) p. 238; cf. also the implications of Gen. 2:24.

[13] See Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* (Halle, 1889) pp. 40-41, 60-61; *Mufaḍḍalīyāt* (ed. Sir C. Lyall), no. XXII, verse 24; cf. *ibid.*, no. XXIII, 22-23 and Boucher, *Divān . . . de Ferazdak*, text, p. 4, l. 3 from the bottom. For the same ideas in modern times cf. E. Braunlich, "Beiträge z. Gesellschaftsordnung d. arab. Beduinnen Stämme," *Islamica*, VI (1934), pp. 185-186, 219, 227.

[14] Still known in the Lebanon and some parts of Arabia. Herodotus (iii. 8) describes the rite as practised by Arabs on the Egyptian border. Braunlich, *op. cit.*, p. 197, remarks that the union of a branch tribe with another than its own tribe is accompanied by the rites customary at the adoption of a stranger into a family. The union as a rule is *damawī samawī*, "by blood and name." See Musil, *Ar. Petr.*, III, pp. 26ff., and Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays Moab* (Paris, 1908), pp. 25ff.

to the group. In Israel circumcision kept its character as a social rite without any religious significance, but with certain relationship to Yahwe like all national customs, down to the Exile, when it became the sign of an alliance between Yahwe and his people and necessary for participation in the Paschal meal.[15]

But in addition to those who were members of a clan by birth, or by a ceremony of initiation, the clan generally also included slaves and clients (protected persons). The slave was his master's property, but could be attached to his master's "house," or family, by a ceremony at once magical and religious; for if he was taken before the "Elohim" (domestic divinity?) and his ear pierced with an awl against the door, or door-post, he became his master's slave for ever.[16]

With the Israelites the client held a very lowly place within the clan, and sometimes, indeed, quite a miserable one. He was safe, but he had no rights. He must serve the gods of the protecting clan, which meant that he must perform all the duties of a clansman, while enjoying none of the privileges.[17]

For the Bedouins of today clientship (*ṭanab* or *jiwār*) is the simplest form of the union of one tribe to another. The relationship is regarded by both sides as a temporary arrangement, and the protected tribe is psychologically and actually subservient. It has no rights except by virtue of the protection of the Shaikh, or of some other influential person, of the protecting tribe. But it is indepedent in its external aflairs and does not give up its genealogical connection with its relatives.[18]

In classical times, however, clientship seems to have been conceived of by the pagan Arabs as an extension of the blood-relationship and to have been considered holier than a peace-treaty. A client was, as it were, naturalized in his protector's tribe. He had no further legal relations with the tribe to which his family belonged, nor was he involved in any blood-feud of his old tribe and his nearest legal avenger was his protector.[19]

"Know that my client," says Jessās, one of the principals in the *War of the Lark,* "belongs to the nearest of my kin."

"I regard my client's she-camel as the stallion of my flock."

"If my client is wronged, you wrong me in my man."[20]

The fate of the individual was bound fast to that of the tribe.

---

[15] cf. Gen. 34 and Ex. 4:26. Observe Josh. 5:2-3, 8-9; Ex. 4:4-26; 12:44,47-49 and Gen. 17:11 (P).

[16] cf. Ex. 21:6.

[17] cf. Gen. 19:9; 23:4; I Sam. 26:19; Ruth 1:16; 2:12.

[18] See Braunlich, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

[19] cf. O. Procksch, *Über die Blutrache* etc., pp. 51, 34, 38.

[20] Abū Tammām's *Hamāsa,* I, p. 222, ll. 20ff., transl., p. 421, ll. 24ff. cf. also p. 183, l. 1, transl. p. 122, ll. 5-6.

For its authority was the only guarantee of his life and goods; its name and fame were his only safeguards against robbery and violent death. Whoever walked without the tribal pale was outside the law and fair game for all comers like any wild beast. He lacked the social brand and had forfeited all human rights. And the ethos of the community did not condemn his elimination. The Banu Quraim tribe put the Banu Qain ibn Fahm to death by fire in a cave; and of this occasion and conduct one of their poets said:[21]

"Why did you not kill them [with the sword?]"

"To kill the outsider (*al-qaum*) pertains to propriety." And Duraid ibn Ṣimmal summed up the question in a line, "Have I being except for the tribe?" he asks. "If it goes astray, so do I; if it is rightly guided, so am I."[22]

To kill within the family was murder and morally condemned.[23] It was, as with Homer perhaps, a sin, but it was not a crime to be punished by the state or the tribe. A murderer was not put to death. He was banished from his tribe and declared an outlaw.

To kill an alien, on the other hand, was neither a sin, nor a crime, but just a serious affair with the kinsmen of the slain man. "Blood-guiltiness," as Doughty remarks apropos the attitude of the Bedouins of his day, "was a misfortune rather than a stain on human fellowship."[24] But the kinsmen of the murdered man were in duty bound to avenge his death. They could, and sometimes did eventually, accept blood-wit. But to do so was to sully the fair name of the tribe and to violate the one truly religious sentiment of the tribal soul. "We pay a blood-wit," says a pagan poet, "but we do not accept one at any price."[25] And another declares: "I do not like to hear men say at the watering-place, 'These beasts were the blood-wit given for Qais, or for Marthad, or for Rumh ibn Hartham.' "[26] For a clansman blood-revenge was a higher moral duty than even battle for his tribe.

Revenge was one of the obligations of tribal religion, and the Prophet Muhammad recognized its religious origin. "O believers," declares Surah II,176, "retaliation for blood-shedding is prescribed to you: a free-man for a free-man, a slave for the slave, and a woman for the woman." And the contract, which he made with the Madinans, before he fled to them for safety, affirms the same moral principle. For it states that the believers are *maulās* (allies, clients) of one

---

[21] Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, I, p. 81; *Hudhailiten*, 218.

[22] Abū Tammām's *Hamāsa*, I, pp. 377-378, transl. p. 264.

[23] cf. the affair of Numaila and Miqyas in Ibn Hishām, p. 820, l. 2.

[24] *Arabia Deserta*, iii, 1, p. 444.

[25] cf. Abū Tammām, *op. cit.*, I, 119:5; 120:2.

[26] cf. *al-Mufaḍḍalîyât* (ed. Lyall), no. XLII.15; cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen* I, p. 109 (*Hudhailiten* no. 141.5, also no. 189.7), also Boucher, *op. cit.*, no. CCXLIX, text p. 233, l. 45; transl. p. 699.

another over against the rest of mankind and stipulates that no believer must kill a believer for the sake of an unbeliever, or help an unbeliever against a believer, but that the believers are to be avengers of each other in God's war.[27] Muhammad substituted, indeed, the bond of faith for the tie of blood; but revenge remained a religious duty, a divine act, and the blood of Muslims was sacred.[28]

An avenger seems to have been under a vow, like a pilgrim; his was a consecrated state. "Now I can drink," says Ta'abbata Sharran after avenging his uncle, "althought heretofore wine was forbidden me." "Today I bid in public to pour it out for me without fear of committing a crime against Allah." "Now that my oath is accomplished, my vengeance satisfied, I can renew commerce with the Muses."[29] He who sought blood-revenge became an outlaw in his quest and forswore all profane abstractions. He neither washed himself, nor combed his hair, nor drank wine, nor had intercourse with women until his vow was fulfilled; and he cherished a firm conviction apparently that his god was in duty bound to facilitate his vengeance and heal the wound inflicted on his honor by the murder of a kinsman.[30]

With the Palestinian Israelites the obligation of blood-revenge lay upon the nearest relative of the victim, the gō'él; and vengeance fell upon the murderer alone.[31] More anciently the circle subject to the vendetta was probably wider, no distinction being drawn between near and distant relatives.[32] Some present-day Arab tribes hold that blood-revenge should not implicate any relative beyond the fourth degree; others do not recognize any such limit. The famous poet, Imru'ul-Qais, swore to slay one hundred of the Banu Asad tribe in vengeance for the murder of his father. Most probably in the beginning of things the clan as a whole was involved in the blood-feud. The whole clan at least stood solidly behind the murderer and took upon itself his responsibility. To defend any one of its members under any circumstance against strangers was a point of tribal honor. As the poet says: "They do not ask their brothers, who in straits implore their help, to prove their innocence."[33]

But this solidarity of the tribe did not prevail apparently in the

---

[27] Ibn Hishām, pp. 341-343; cf. the Prophet's farewell speech (Wāqidī, pp. 338, 431).

[28] cf. Wāqidī, pp. 54, 63, 70, 117, 181 ff.; Ibn Hishām, p. 968; Num. 6:3.

[29] Abū Tammān, *op. cit.*, I, 375,5; transl. p. 266,23.

[30] cf. *ibid.*, p. 301, Schol. V. 2; *Kitāb al-Aghānī* XIV, 67, 25 ff. (= Ṭab. 14. 1926, 1 ff.); *Hamāsa*, p. 447, l. 4 from the bottom; cf. I Sam. 21:6; II Sam. 11:10ff.; Judg. 13:16ff. See the story of Imru'l-Qais, or another poet in Ibn Hishām, p. 56 (cf. *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, VIII, 70, 23ff.); Bertram Thomas, *Arabia Felix*, p. 88.

[31] cf. II Sam. 3:27; Num. 35:9-34; Deut. 4:41-43; Josh. 20; cf. for Islam, Surah XVII, 35, also 15-16, but observe Surah II:173ff.

[32] cf. Gen. 4:14-15; 23-24; Judg. 8:18-21; II Sam. 21:1-14; 14:7.

[33] *Hamāsa*, III, 1, 4.

exercise of the duty of blood-revenge, which seems to have rested upon the family, although if the family failed to fulfil the obligation, it then became a tribal concern, since its honor was at stake. The family, not the tribe, it should also be observed, received the blood-wit, if and when it was accepted. Tribal life was sacred and would be protected at all costs in any case. But the right of vengeance and the duty of executing it lay in the first place with the family, the social unit.[34] The tribe was by nature a political quantity, and its real affair was war.

The symbol of tribal solidarity was, as has been noted, a real or a fabulous common ancestor; and undoubtedly reverence for the forefathers was one of the decisive moral motives of the ancient Arab world. According to a tradition the pilgrims to Mecca in pagan times used to make a halt in the valley of Mina, after they had performed the pilgrimage, and celebrate their ancestors in songs; and Quraysh and other Arabs used to swear by their forbears. The memory of the grave of the tribal ancestor survived for a long time; and it was an inviolable, sacred spot, as holy as the Ka'ba in Mecca. The Thaqīf of Ṭā'if offered sacrifices to its eponymous ancestor at the tomb of Abū Rijāl; and the aristocratic tribes of Quraysh brought offerings to their family gods around the Ka'ba.[35] Today, Braunlich informs us,[36] the Zullām of South Palestine still honor the grave of their ancestor, Muhannā, in Wadī-l-Ḥafīr; the En-Nuṣērāt still visit the tomb of their forbear, el-Qadēyim, at Dēr el-Balaḥ; the Palestinian Terābīn still journey yearly and bring gifts to the grave of Āṭīye, the father of their ancestor, Nejm, at 'Ain Judai in Wadī-sh-Sheikh Āṭīye, West of the Gulf of 'Aqaba; the Tiyālē still throw stones at the tomb of Sheikh 'Amrī, the ancestor of their subsection, 'Eyāl 'Amrī; and Lawrence relates in his *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*[37] that one of his men, Miflah, the chief of Zebu Zukhur, prepared himself for the dangerous expedition against the Yarmuk bridge by visiting the grave of the supposed ancestor of his clan and adding another head cord to the ragged collection around Essad's headstone.

A developed cult of ancestors existed among the Southern Arabs, and some evidence for it is found among the tribes of Middle and North Arabia.[38] Rostostzeff asserts that the cult is "well-attested" for Syria.[39] The grave of the ancestor was named a "bait," the term

---

[34] See Nöldeke's *Beiträge z. Kenntniss d. Poesie d. alten Araber,* pp. 161ff.; *Hamāsa* I, 119.5; 120.2; Zuhair's *Mu'allaqa,* 38; Josephus, *Ant.,* 16, 277.

[35] See Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* II, pp. 229-237.

[36] "Beiträge zur Gesellschaftsordnung etc.," *Islamica,* VI (1933-34) p. 224.

[37] p. 407; cf. also Condor, *Heth and Moab,* pp. 327ff.

[38] Goldziher, *op. cit.,* II, p. 231.

[39] "Mithraeum in Dura," *Mitteill. Deutsch. Arab. Instit.,* Römisch. Abteil., Bd. 49 (1934), 1-2, p. 188. But the evidence is rather late.

used for the pillar, dome, pavilion, or tent, which stood in the center of a circle of sacred stones; and such graves enjoyed the immunity of the family tent and were an asylum in blood-feuds even from the tribe of the ancestor.[40] The poet Ḥammād sought protection at the grave of his enemy's father and was not deceived in his trust; and the Shīʿī poet, al-Kumait, outlawed by the Umayyad Caliph of his day for an anti-Umayyad lampoon, and driven from pillar to post like a hunted beast, took refuge at the grave of a prince of the ruling family; and the Caliph's grand-children tied their clothes to his and cried to the Caliph: "Shame us not through him who seeks refuge with the departed one." "To shame the dead is a blot on the living."[41]

The Israelites seem to have had a sort of organized cult of ancestors. For even in historical times great importance was attached to being buried in the grave of the father; and the motive was the same probably as with the Babylonians, to which a text of Assurbanipal bears witness, saying, "To be removed from the grave of the fathers is to be deprived of sacrifices and libations." The family tomb was the sanctuary evidently at which the ancestors received the cult of their descendents; and a stēle, or pillar (*maṣṣébhā*), was erected at the tomb of an ancestor, not only to represent the defunct with the living, but also to receive the libations made to him. The Israelites rendered this cult apparently to the ancestors of the clan as well as to those of the family, for they paid religious homage even at a late date to the graves of those who were thought to be the ancestors of a clan, or even of the whole people of Israel, such as Abraham and Sarah, Joseph and Rachel.[42]

Goldziher remarks in his *Muhammedanische Studien* that Arab traditions and poetry offer more positive data for a cult of the dead than for a cult of ancestors;[43] but some of the evidence which he adduces seems to point rather to a cult of heroes. For the Arabs, he informs us, used to erect stones, or pillars, such as were set up in sacred places and the worship of which is forbidden in the Qur'ān, at the graves of especially honored warriors, and they used to slaughter a riding beast, whenever they passed by the grave of a man fa-

[40] cf. Goldziher, "Le culte des ancêtres chez les Arabes," (*Rev. de l'hist. des religions,* X, 333ff.); Quatremère, "Les Asyles chez les Arabes," (*Mém. de l'acad. d. Inscriptions et d. belles Lettres,* XV (1845); R. Boucher, *op. cit.,* CLXXXIV, p. 519 (transl.), text, p. 172, 7 from the bottom; cf. XLIII and pp. 411 ff.

[41] See *al-Aghānī* XV. pp. 117, 121.

[42] cf. Gen. 35:8 and 14 (E):19-20; Isa. 63:16. F. Macler, *Correspondence Epistulaire avec le ciel* (Paris, 1915), pp. 8-15, observes that even in quite recent times Jews wrote letters to their ancestors and inserted them in cracks in the walls of the sepulchral cave at Hebron.

[43] cf. Goldziher, *Muh. Studien,* II, p. 235. Littmann has shown that the Safaitic custom of RGM meant originally worship of the dead. (cf. H. Grimme, *"Safaitic Inscriptions,"* p. 150).

mous for generosity and nobility. When 'Amīr ibn al-Ṭufail, a rival of Muhammad, died, the Arabs raised stones, it is related, in a circle of a square mile around his grave to indicate that it was a sacred place, or temenos, a *ḥimā*; and at the grave of Ḥātim Tayyi, renouned for his lavish generosity, his grateful contemporaries set up stones which looked like mourning women; and a legend tells us that Arabs, when they passed by the grave, expected hospitality there.[44] The grave of a hero was also an asylum.

Sacrifices at the graves of ancestors and heroes are recorded; but more frequently mentioned is the sacrifice of one or several beasts immediately after the burial of the dead. In the Romance of 'Antar such sacrifices are often described. Whenever a hero dies, camels are slaughtered in hecatombs.[45] Islam has retained the rite, but explains the sacrifice as an expiation for little sins, whence its name, al-Kiffāra, the sin offering.[46] Bertram Thomas writes in his *Arabia Felix* that it was the rule in the Qara mountains to slaughter half of a man's cows as a sacrifice after his death;[47] and Burckhardt relates that the Bedouins of his day slaughtered as many camels at the 'Id al-Qurbān, as there had died grown-up members of the family of either sex during the year which had just passed away.[48] Islam has also instituted the offering of a sacrifice at this festival, but it has connected it with a biblical memory, Abraham's sacrifice, and named it "al-Fidā," the Redemption.

Hair offerings also were often brought in honor of the departed. The poet, Labīd, a contemporary of the Prophet, who accepted Islam, charged his daughters that "When the day comes, and your father dies, scratch not a face, and cut not your hair." But when the greatest warrior of the early conquests of Islam, Khālid ibn al-Walīd, died, his wives of the Banu Mughīra tribe shaved their heads and laid their hair on his tomb. It was still usage also in the earliest days of Islam to put up a tent over the grave of an honored person and to dwell therein for some time after the burial. The poet, Arṭaṭ (ob. 8th cent. A.H.), mourned his son for a whole year in a tent erected beside the grave. But 'Amr ibn al-'Ās, the conqueror of Egypt, forbade in his last testimony, or so it is related, to set up a wooden, or stone, memorial on his grave and requested that his people should remain at his grave only so long as it took to slaughter a camel and divide its flesh, so that he should enjoy their company for that length of time.[49]

---

[44] See Goldziher, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-241. [45] *ibid.*, pp. 242 ff.

[46] cf. E. W. Lane, *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages*, ed. Stanley Lane Poole, p. 261; *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (London, 1871) p. 268.

[47] p. 55.

[48] *Voyages en Arabie* I, p. 73; cf. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta* I, pp. 137, 293, 354.

[49] cf. Goldziher, *op. cit.*, II, 247-248, 255-256; cf. Robertson Smith, *Religion of*

Goldziher observes that this practice, borrowed probably from paganism, and the favorite cry of women mourners and of the writers of "Lamentations," the *marāthī* poetry, namely, *Lā tab ʿad,* "Depart not," do not bear out Fraser's thesis that mourning rites and customs express the absolute renunciation of the dead.[50] The dead, as Wellhausen remarks, are still thought of as present, witness the frequent visits to graves, the dwelling there in tents and the greeting of the dead in passing. Present day Arabs, he also points out, bring offerings to a grave until the third generation.[51] Jacob in his *Studien in altarabischen Dichtern* maintains that these customs sought through the fiction that the dead are still alive to sublimate the sorrow of living.[52] The complete renunciation did not occur, at any rate, with the Arabs in the mourning rites, but in the breaking-off of these rites. In Jewish law purification was prescribed for anyone, who had entered, or had been in, the tent in which a man had died, or had touched a dead man, or a bone of a man, or a grave, on the seventh day thereafter, to break off contact definitely, it would seem, with the spirit of the dead.[53]

Around the second century B.C., the Israelites, or Jews, seem to have felt that death was followed by almost complete annihilation; for they gave to the dead a very vague, shadowy existence in Sheol, and Ecclesiastes declared that "A living dog is better than a dead lion; for the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing."[54] But before the Exile the Israelites evidently believed in a real survival of the person after death and endowed the dead with superhuman powers and knowledge, even considering some of them divine.[55]

Israelite burial customs and beliefs, for example, can only be explained if we presume that the defunct person was thought of as still subsisting with his consciousness and sensibility. In the days of the Monarchy, and even later, the Israelites imagined apparently, like most of the peoples still in the animistic stage of culture, that there was in man, as in everything that lived, a being, or double, that caused him to live, act and think, and which could separate itself from a person even in life, in ecstacy, for instance, or through fear, or in a dream, and that his double subsisted after death and

---

the Semites (New York, 1889) pp. 305 ff., and Wellhausen, *Reste d. arab. Heidentums,* pp. 178-183.

[50] cf. Goldziher, *op. cit.,* II, p. 255.

[51] *Reste* etc., pp. 178-183.

[52] pp. 142 ff.

[53] cf. Num. 19:14-19; cf. Wellhausen, *Reste* etc., p. 178, for Arab custom of mourning lasting usually seven days.

[54] ch. 9:4-5; cf. Nöldeke *Beiträge z. Kenntniss d. Poesie d. alten Araber,* p. 106, l. 28; the defunct "has become dust covered with dust."

[55] cf. II Sam. 21:1-14; Gen. 4:11-12; also Isa. 8:19 and the dying predictions of Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses and Joshua.

preserved the traits which the person had at the moment of his decease.

When Saul grew afraid in the face of the host of the Philistines[56] and enquired of Jehovah, and "Jehovah answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by urim, nor by prophets," he sought out a woman of En-dor, who had a familiar spirit, to enquire of her. "And he said, Divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring up whomsoever I shall name unto thee." And after he had sworn that no punishment should befall her, he asked her to bring up Samuel. And when Samuel appeared to the woman, Saul said to her, "What seest thou?" And the woman said unto Saul, "I see a god coming up out of the earth." And he said unto her, "What form is he of?" And she said, "An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a robe."

Samuel has forgotten nothing and has preserved all the clairvoyance of a prophet in Sheol. For life in Sheol is a continuance of this earthly existence. Its inhabitants are weak (Rephaim), but they still have power to move and to speak and to follow with a passionate interest events in the world of the living.[57] When the King of Babylon descended among them, they greeted him with an ironic funebrial chant: "Sheol from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall answer and say to thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us?"[58]

Kings keep their thrones in Sheol. Old men are known by their white hair, the afflicted by the marks of their mourning and the murdered by their wounds.[59] Families and nations lie together there in their familiar terrestrial groupings.[60] Perhaps Sheol was originally the world of the Chthonian gods. But beliefs concerning Mother Earth suggest that man is born of the earth, and that the dead enter its breast to find new life.[61]

The supreme misfortune which could happen to man, was not to receive burial, or to be taken from the tomb. The prophets of Israel threatened the enemies of Yahwe with this fate; and Tobias risked his life to bury his compatriots, who had been executed by the Assyrian king.[62] The unburied dead were vagabonds without a home. Their souls, or doubles, hovered around the corpse and had the power to do all sorts of evil to the living; for which reason even the corpse of the crucified might not be left on the tree after sundown, and murderers have been known to attend to the burial of

---

[56] See I. Sam. 28.
[57] cf. Jer. 31:15.
[58] Isa. 14:9ff.
[59] cf. I Ki. 2:6, 9; Gen. 37:35 and 42:38.
[60] cf. Ez. 32:18.
[61] Ps. 139:13-15; Job 1:21; Sir. 40:1 and Isa. 26:19.
[62] 1:17 ff.

their victims.[63] On the other hand every indignity inflicted on a corpse was also suffered by the soul, or double, of the dead; and so it was customary to mutilate dead enemies and animals.[64] To burn a corpse was a frightful punishment.

Dirges and eulogies were sung over the dead, to be deprived of which was a dire mischance; a lock of hair, or a tuft of the beard, was cut off, or gashes cut in the body, in honor of the dead,[65] even as out of reverence for the gods; and sacrifices were offered to them apparently, either in the form of a funerary meal, of which the dead received a share,[66] or as offerings deposited in the tomb, or as libations poured over it,[67] or as blood-offerings designed to appease the irritated souls of the dead who had not yet been avenged.[68] Into the tomb also was put everything which might conceivably be found useful by the departed. Their most beautiful garments were interred with them. Warriors were buried with their swords and bucklers.[69]

Two satisfactory explanations have been offered for the burial rites of the Israelites, which are very ancient and not peculiar to them in the Semitic world.[70] Some scholars recognize in those rites truly religious, propitiatory acts, designed to dispose the dead to favor the living. Others see in them preservative gestures to shield the living from the evil which the soul of the dead could do to them.

Fraser connects such rites in his *Golden Bough* with the observances imposed upon kings and sorcerers, warriors and avengers, youths during initiation, women with child and those who enter, or approach a sanctuary. Like these observances the burial rites were, he maintains, defensive taboos, measures taken against the spiritual powers with which these classes of individuals happened to be in a special relation, in this case the souls of the dead, or some influence emanating from them. And for this reason the eyes of the dead were closed to prevent his soul from leaving the body and haunting the house; clothes were cast off and sack cloth put on to keep the influence of the dead from attaching itself to the clothes and so causing their loss; sandals were taken off, the face was veiled, or the face of the dead was covered; the hand was laid upon the head to guard it, the mustache was enwrapped to defend the mouth and nostrils against the entrance of the soul of the dead; the mourners rolled in the dust, or in cinders, or threw dirt, or cinders, on their heads, to disguise themselves, or sat, or lay, on the earth naked. A Semite entering a sacred place also doffed, it should be observed,

---

[63] cf. Deut. 21:22-23; Josh. 8:29; 19:26-27; II Ki. 9:34.
[64] cf. I Sam. 17:54; 31:9-10.
[65] cf. Deut. 14:1-2.
[66] Cf. Deut. 26:13-14.
[67] cf. Tob. 4:17; Sir. 7:33; Gen. 35:8, 14.
[68] cf. Deut. 21:1-9.
[69] cf. Ez. 32:27; cf. also Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, XIII, 8, 4ff.
[70] Most of them are found also with the Canaanites and with the Arabs.

his ordinary clothes and either donned special garments, or a garment stored at the sacred place, or went naked;[71] or he washed his clothes before, or both before and after, his visit, or tore them and made them useless.[72] And Muslims take off their shoes to enter a mosque, as Moses was commanded to do at the Burning Bush.[73]

Most, if not all, of the practices and beliefs, which have been set forth thus far, were evidently the expression of the moral sense and religious sentiments of a certain type of social organization, "based," as Robertson Smith has remarked, "on the principles of kinship and mainly held together by the tie of blood." In Arabia kinship remained "the one sacred bond of social unity" down to the time of Muhammad; "and the bond of religion was originally co-extensive with the bond of blood," the circle of worship and the circle of kinship were identical.[74] Robertson Smith maintains[75] that "this type of religion, which is founded on kinship, and in which the diety and his worshippers make up a society united by the tie of blood, was widely prevalent at an early date among the Semitic peoples," which seems to be a legitimate inference from the data at our disposal. But when he goes on to assert that "the force of the evidence goes further, and leaves no reasonable doubt that among the Semites this was the original type of religion, out of which all other types grew," he stretches the evidence beyond its scope. For the religion, which derives its sanction and significance from the sacred ties of the family circle, may have been the original type of religion with the Semites, and it may have subordinated and adapted other types to itself; but these other types did not grow out of it. Local nature gods may have become clan gods and vice-versa;[76] but the belief in them and the veneration of them did not arise out of the same set of circumstances, or of human needs, fears and hopes, even if eventually and with due opportunity the beliefs and practices associated with one kind of god were appropriated to the other kind by way of worship or interpretation.

The Israelites found the Canaanites worshipping principally local divinities with shrines "upon all the high mountains and upon the hills, and under every green tree" of the land,[77] the Baals and Astartes, Lords and Mistresses, of mountains, trees, springs and

---

[71] cf. H. J. Elherst, *Studien z. Semit. Philologie,* May 1914, p. 117; but observe p. 119 on the hair-offering.

[72] cf. Gen. 35:2; Ex. 28; 29:5-9; Lev. 8:19; Ez. 44:19; I Sam. 19:24; II Ki. 10:22; Num. 8:7; Ex. 19:10, 14; Lev. 16:26-28; Herodotus V. 5, 10 for the Phoenicians, and Bukhārī (ed. Krehl) i:409; ii:298; iii:163 for pagan Arab custom of circumambulating the Ka'ba naked.

[73] cf. Ex. 3:5.

[74] *The Religion of the Semites* (New York, 1889), pp. 33, 46, 47 and 51.

[75] *ibid.*, p. 51.

[76] *ibid.*, p. 118.

[77] cf. Deut. 12:2-3; cf. also Ez. 6:13 and Isa. 57:5.

cities, of healing and of fortune, of the dance and of the covenant, and even a Lord of Flies, Baalzebub, from whom they sought oracles.[78]

In Arabic, land fertilized by a spring and in no need of irrigation is called "that which Baal waters."[79] Baal was the genius of the spring that spread fertility in a valley, or oasis, and so the patron of the cultivators of his domain and also by extension the author of the fecundity of their flocks and of the rain indispensable for their crops. A genius of the earth could thus become a "Lord of the Heavens" and especially a Lord of storms and rain.

The Israelites, who conquered and settled Palestine, also venerated, like the earlier Canaanites, a great number of trees, springs, rivers, caves and mountains: the terebinth in the sanctuary of Yahwe at Sichem named the "terebinth of oracles," the tamarisk of Beersheba, the bush at Sinai and the "tree of tears" on the tomb of Deborah;[80] the spring of 'En-Gihon and the spring of En-Rogél, at which the Israelites of David's time anointed their kings in imitation of their precursors, the Jebusites apparently, the waters of Dan, the pools of Beersheba and the Holy Water of the Temple of Jerusalem;[81] the cave of Horeb, the grotto under the sacred rock which bore the altar in the temple, Mount Sinai or Horeb, Zion, Carmel, the Mount of Olives and the Mount of Gilead.[82] In the eyes of the Israelites, settled in Palestine, and of the Canaanites before them, these places were sacred, and cult acts were celebrated at them down at least to the reforms of Josiah in 632 B.C. But undoubtedly the Israelites of the desert also observed similar practices and venerated, for example, the tamarisk at Beersheba, the miraculous bush at Sinai, the pools of Lahai-Roi, Beersheba and Qadesh, and Sinai with its grotto.[83] And as late as 1881 W. M. Thomson reported in *The Land and the Book* that every village in the Wādīs and mountains had one or more oaks inhabited by spirits, many of them by the "Daughters of Jacob," a strange and obscene notion, for which

---

[78] The principal Canaanite gods were Hadad, the storm god, Dagon, the corn-god, Shemesh, Reshef, god of the flame, Mikal or Makal, the powerful, Shelem or Shelman, Gad, Fortune, Asher or Ashir, Fortune?, and Mout, the young god of vegetation evidently, also perhaps Yahwe.

[79] cf. Robertson Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 ff.

[80] cf. Gen. 12:6-7; 35:2-4; Josh. 24:26, 32; Judg. 9:6; Gen. 21:33; Ex. 3:2-5; Deut. 33:16; Judg. 4:5 and Gen. 35:8; cf. also on trees Gen. 13:6-9, 18; 14:13; 18:1-8; 23f.; Judg. 6:11ff.; I Sam. 10:3; II Sam. 5:22, 24; Hos. 4:13; Isa. 6:13.

[81] cf. I Ki. 1:9, 38, 45; Amos 8:14; Judg. 18:29-31; I Ki. 12:29 (cf. Enoch 13:7); Amos 5:5; 18:14 (cf. Gen. 21:28-33; 26:23-33); Judg. 15:18-19; Ex. 15:23-25; Num. 5:11-31; cf. also on springs Gen. 14:7; 16:7; Num. 21:16-18; II Ki. 2:19-22; Ex. 17:7.

[82] cf. Gen. 33:22; I Ki. 19:9, 13; II Sam. 15:32; I Ki. 18:30-38; II Sam. 15:32; Gen. 31:45-55; cf. also on hills Judg. 11:11.

[83] cf. Gen. 21:33; Ex. 3:2-5; Deut. 33:16.

he could get no explanation;[84] and in 1920 L. B. Paton recorded that "Sheep and goats are also slain beside the springs and are eaten there in a sacrificial meal.[85]

The traditional Israelite explanation of this veneration of trees and springs, caves and hills, is that these objects were just memorials of some remarkable event in their religious history, or that the tree had been planted, or the spring discovered, by a holy person. But another explanation is often offered, namely, that a god, or spirit, had come down, or came down from time to time, to sojourn there, or that a god, or spirit dwelt there continuously,[86] just as today the people of the land believe that some saint or other is buried under the roots of a holy tree, and that it is permeated with the life and extraordinary powers of the saint, and that they can transfer their maladies to him by tying rags to the branches of the tree, binding the suffering suppliants to the soul of the saint, who quite naturally is not at all discommoded by their complaints.[87]

Jacob's struggle with his mysterious adversary at Jabbok, from whom he wrested a blessing, the revelation perhaps of the rites to be observed for a safe crossing of the stream, bears witness to the belief in the spirits of the waters.[88] Compare too such names as the "Well of Judgment," the "Well of Controversy," and the "Well of the Dwelling (?)" (En-Dor),[89] a door perhaps to the habitation of the spirits of the underworld, and also the fact that in the Old Testament water is called holy and curse-bringing, purifying and expiatory,[90] and that healing power is always ascribed to it.[91] Living water was a mystery to the Semites, the work of the spirits;[92] and, as Robertson Smith observes, "The fundamental idea is that the water itself is the living organism of a demoniac life."[93] In Numbers 21:17-18, the well itself, indeed, is addressed as a living being; and originally the trees and springs themselves were probably regarded as living things, as the common phrase, "living waters" suggests. In modern times Bedouin women plunge into the hot spring of Abu Sélim chanting, "O warm spring of Abu Sélim, if I have a child, I shall sacrifice."[94]

---

[84] cf. Hos. 4:13 and Isa. 6:13; 57:5; religious prostitution.

[85] *American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem* (1920), p. 55.

[86] cf. Gen. 12:6-7; 18:1-4; Judg. 6:11-18; Ex. 3:2-5; 17:7.

[87] cf. S. J. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religions Today,* (1902), p. 91.

[88] Gen. 32:23-32.

[89] cf. Num. 20:13; Deut. 32:51; I Sam. 28:7; cf. also Josh. 19:8; II Sam. 13:73; and Neh. 2:13.

[90] cf. Num. 5:17; 5:22; 8:7; 31:23; cf. also Ex. 36:25 and II Ki. 3:11.

[91] cf. Robertson Smith, op. cit., p. 167 ff., also Benzinger, *Hebr. Archaeologie* I, p. 93.

[92] cf. Isa. 5:8.

[93] *The Religion of the Semites,* p. 128.

[94] A. Lods, "Israël des origenes au milieu du VIIIe Siècle" (*L'Evolution de l'Humanité,* H. Berr, vol. XXVII, 1930), pp. 268-269; cf. also *The Religion of the Semites,* p. 154 ff., and Curtiss as in note 87, pp. 118 ff.

Like the Arabs the Israelites probably also recognized a number of other spirits that manifested themselves in the phenomena of the desert and the sown. In the desert of Judah dwelt Azazel, to whom the Jerusalemites sent forth each year a ram burdened with the sins committed during the year.[95] Lilith, the succubus, also lived in the desert;[96] and the Se'īrīm danced there, demons in the forms of rams, to whom the Israelites offered sacrifices.[97] Man risked the ire of some spirit or other, whenever he ploughed a field, dug a well, or built a house, or a bridge; and the vengeance of the demons that haunt ruins could only be evaded by sacrificing one's own blood. When Hiël, the Bethelite, rebuilt Jericho, he "laid the foundation thereof with the loss (sacrifice) of Abiram, his first-born, and he set up the gates thereof with the loss of Segub, his youngest son."[98] Herodotus mentions the Flying Serpents of the Tih desert,[99] named in Hebrew, "Seraphim" (burning), against whose deadly bite the only defense was a statue in bronze, the brazen serpent, which worked magic on them, and sacrifices to which appeased them.[100] In Israelitic traditions the Seraphim celebrate the glory of God in the Temple; but they retained even there some evidence of their origin in their form of semi-animals with wings.[101]

The Jinn of the Arabs were not, and are not, supernatural beings, but earthy and corporeal creatures, who beget and bear children, eat and drink, can be hurt and killed. But they are not subject to the ordinary laws of nature, for they change their forms, die at the first stroke of a sword and revive at the second, and have a lion's hunger and yet cannot eat. The *jinn* and the *ins* (mankind) make up the two kinds of earthly beings, the *thaqālān* (the "two weights") of the Qur'ān (Sura 55:31). They are not reckoned to the genus of the terrible, but the tribe always stands behind the individual. Morally they are indifferent and help or hinder according as they are friend or foe.[102]

The Jinn live in half mythical, inaccessible, untrodden regions, which appear to be deserts, but are in reality bewitched paradises, the oases of the Jinn. They are the successors of vanished nations, inhabiting dead cities such as Hijr of the Thamūd, and Niṣībīn and the valley of Shadrim, where once stood Sodom and Gomorrah.

---

[95] cf. Lev. 16.
[96] cf. Isa. 34:14.
[97] cf. Isa. 13:21; 34:14; Lev. 17:7; II Ki. 23:8; and II Chron. 11:15.
[98] I Ki. 16:34; cf. also Job 15:28.
[99] III. 75; cf. also Isa 14:29; 30:6; Num. 21:4-6; Deut. 8:15.
[100] cf. II Ki. 18:4; cf. also the " 'iyyim" and "ṣiyyim" of Isa. 13:21; 34:14; Jer. 50:39.
[101] Madness, leprosy and pestilence were ascribed to evil spirits (cf. Lev. 13:14; II Sam. 24:15-17; I Sam. 16:14-23; II Ki. 19:35; Job 2:7); also the strange facts of sexual life were referred to particular invisible powers (cf. Lev. 12:1-5; I Sam. 21:5-6).
[102] cf. *Mufaḍḍalīyāt* (ed. Sir C. Lyall) LXIII, 4.

They dwell in the dark of the earth like snakes, earth-spirits, living in stench and eating dirt, going about at night and disappearing with the morning-star: church-yards are alive with them. But they also live in trees and bushes and in beasts. Or they ride on beasts, or are hairy beasts, or appear as fabulous hybrids. They seem to have been most closely associated with serpents and worms, *jān* and *ghūl* being also names for snakes, as is also *shaiṭān* in the *Dictionary of Zoology*. But they go about as men too, in which case, however, the men are just their dwelling-places, of whom they have taken possession for their own purposes, but who remain distinct from them.[103]

According to the Qur'ān the Jinn were created of pure, subtle fire.[104] They are of various sorts, some good, others evil.[105] Apostles have been sent to them by God even as to mankind;[106] and some of them have listened to the recitation of the Qur'ān and believed.[107] Some men have taken refuge with them, but only to increase their folly.[108]

The Prophet's enemies accused him of being kin to the Jinn.[109] He, on his part, charged them with worshipping the Jinn and making them associates of God.[110] Throughout the Qur'ān it is implied that Muhammad's pagan contemporaries believed the Jinn to be God's issue;[111] and the Quraysh are said to have maintained, in fact, a family relationship between Allah and the Jinn, the angels being his daughters begotten of the highest of the *jinniyyāt*.[112] Iblis himself, who refused to prostrate himself before Adam, is of the Jinn. He is their leader and father.[113] And the Satans are the tutors of the unbelievers. They teach sorcery to men and have induced many of them to slay their children.[114]

For Robertson Smith the Jinn of the older legends "are representatives of animal kinds, clothed with the supernatural attributes inseparable from the savage conception of animate nature."[115] For Wellhausen, on the other hand, and also for Robertson Smith when

---

[103] cf. Wellhausen, *Reste*, pp. 148-152; cf. Wāqidī, *al-Maghāzī* (Calcutta 1855), p. 25, ll. 1 ff., where Iblis takes the form of Sarāqa b. Ja'sham; cf. also the *Mufaḍḍalīyāt* (ed. Lyall) XL, vrs. 100, 104; R. Boucher, *op. cit.*, I Text, p. 3, l. 9, transl. p. 6 ll. 3-4, where the idea is generalized, and everybody has his or her spirit even when normal. In the Qur'ān each has his or her two spirits.

[104] 55:14; 25:26.

[105] 62:10.

[106] 6:130.

[107] 62:1ff; cf. 62:19.

[108] 62:6.

[109] 37:157.

[110] 34:40; 6:110, 127-130, 137-138.

[111] 43:14-15; 23:83; 21:26; 17:42; 16:59; 52:38-39; 37:150-154; 39:4-6.

[112] cf. Wellhausen, *Reste* etc., p. 24, note 1.

[113] 18:48; cf. 2:32; 21:30; 38:71-86; 15:30-41; 20:115; 17:61; 7:16-20. Thaġout is Satan in 6:78.

[114] 7:26; 2:96; 6:138.

[115] *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 123.

he is not arguing for the totemic origin of the Semitic religion, the Jinn are the personifications of hidden causes, subjective and objective.[116] The Semites, like most other races, peopled the earth with spirits and powers, whom the Israelites seem to have conceived of as the Canaanites did their Baals and Astartes. But the Baals and Astartes of the Canaanites were agricultural genii, dispensers of fecundity in their respective areas, whereas the "Elohim" (gods or spirits), who were the objects of worship with the nomadic Israelites, were more especially, as with the Arabs, protectors and patrons of some human group, the chiefs of clans, or tribes, the gods of "the fathers," and thus persons, not the indistinct and rather impersonal spirits of springs, or trees, or hills.

In ancient times each clan, or group, would have its own particular divinities inhabiting, or incarnated in, some sacred tree, spring, cave, or mountain, situated in the clan's territory; and many of these gods would be regarded as related to the members of the clan of which they were the protectors, or patrons; for this was a current conception in the Semitic world. The Moabites, for example, were called "Sons and daughters of Kemosh"; a pagan woman is named the "daughter of a strange god"; and Jeremiah reproaches the Judaeans of his time for saying to a stock, "Thou are my father."[117] Many Arab clans also bore the name of a divinity, whom they claimed as ancestor, the Banu Hilāl (Sons of the New Moon), the Banu Badr (Sons of the Full Moon), the Banu Shams (Sons of the Sun), the Children of al-Maqah and the People of 'Athtar; and with the Israelites and related peoples we find eponymous ancestors, who were probably once gods of old, Gad, Asher, and Edom, perhaps Dan, Ouz and Yeoush.[118] The idea of relationship was so pervasive that the terms, "father," "uncle" and "brother" were often used in proper names as synonyms for "god," as, for example, in Abiram (My father is exalted), 'Amminadab (My uncle is generous) and Hammurabi (The uncle is great); and the idea is also very ancient: for if the title, "father," applied to a god suggests the patriarchal organization of society, the titles, "uncle" and "brother" imply the matriarchal.

The relation of Israel and its king to Yahwe was undoubtedly thought of in this fashion,[119] although in this case the term "fa-

---

[116] *Reste* etc., pp. 148 ff; cf. G. Jacob, *Studien in altarab. Dichtern,* p. 121; *Mufaddalīyāt* (ed. Lyall) XCVII:9.

[117] Num. 21:29; Mal. 2:11; Jer. 2:27.

[118] See D. S. Margoliouth, *The Relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam,* pp. 13 ff; cf. also such personal names as Ben-Hadad, Barlaha, Baraté, Barqos, Bardaisan, Abi-Yahu, 'Ammi-el, 'Ammi-shaddai, Aḥi-Ya, Aḥi-Melk, etc.

[119] cf. Isa. 63:16; Ps. 89:27; II Sam. 7:14.

ther," may have been only an image for God's solicitude towards his adopted child "found in the desert." But the idea of a physical relationship between a god and his group persisted in Israel for a very long time; for the worshippers of Yahwe themselves conceded the possibility of a marriage of the "Sons of God," that is, gods, with the "daughters of man."[120] The Assyrian kings also relate, like the Pharoahs, in great detail how they were born of and fed by a goddess; and some Arab tribes claimed to be the offspring of a *jinnī* ancestor.[121] Doughty found even in his day a family in Madinah, who were the third generation of descendants of a *jinnī*;[122] and Curtiss cites the case of a man of Nebh, who was considered to be "the child of a *jinnī*."[123]

On the basis of the natural kinship established between gods, men and the lower creation, and more especially the affinity observed between Jinn and beasts and the identity in physical character obtaining between their haunts and the sanctuaries of the Semitic world, Robertson Smith seeks to answer the problem of how the local nature-god became identified with the clan-god and concludes that the belief in such gods "may not be directly evolved out of an earlier totemism," but that "there can be no reasonable doubt that it is evolved out of ideas or usages which also find their expression in totemism, and therefore must go back to the most primitive stage of savage society."[124]

In a paper published in the *Journal of Philology* (vol. ix, 1880), "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament," Robertson Smith had already developed this hypothesis, in which he pointed out in the first place, that same Arabian gods were worshipped under the name and figure of animals, that Dhu'l-kala, for example, was named "Naṣr" (Eagle) and was so represented, that Yaghuth (Helper) had for his image a lion, and Ya'ūq (Hinderer) a horse; and took note of the fact in the second place that a great number of Arab tribes had animal names, such as Lion, Wolf, Ibex, She-fox, Locusts, sons of the dove, kite, little hyena, lizard, eagle, dog, panther etc., that these names usually belonged to sub-tribes, and that the same animal name was often found with sub-tribes of different groups, which would be the case in a system of exogamy, where the totem name was transmitted through the mother; and in the third place emphasized that the

---

[120] Gen. 6:1-4.

[121] See A. S. Tritton in JRAS, Oct., 1934, p. 721; cf. Fr. Schultess, *Diwan of Ḥātim Tayyi,* Leipzig 1897, I, p. 2, ll. 12-13; also Hunnius, *Das syr. Alexanderlied,* in ZDMG 60 (1906), p. 812, l. 725.

[122] *Arabia Deserta* II, pp. 191, 193.

[123] *Primitive Semitic Religions Today,* p. 116; cf. pp. 112-124.

[124] *The Religion of the Semites,* p. 118; cf. pp. 86 and 122ff.

same facts held for the Edomites and Midianites and also for Moab and Israel.[125]

Robertson Smith believed that he had discovered with the Semites three things which are sure marks of totemism, namely, names derived from plants and animals, traces of group-marriage and a system of taboo.[126] And indubitably a number of the ancient peoples of Palestine bore the names of animals and plants. A clan at Sichem was called the "Sons of the Ass,"[127] and many Horite clans were named after animals, as, for example, the leopard clan, the hyena clan, the gazelle clan, the sheep clan and so on. The Hivvites also were perhaps the "men of the serpent," and many towns had animal, or plant names, such as Eglōn, Bēt Nimra and Bēt Lebā'ōt.[128] And just as indubitably the Canaanites and the Israelites, the Edomites and the Moabites, and the Arabs as well, all invested some animals with "gifts which we should call supernatural," and "which heathenism ascribed to the gods," such as the power to give omens and oracles, or to heal diseases.[129] Obviously too, they all believed in a tie of relationship between some of their gods and themselves. And all of these features enter as constituent elements into some form or other of Totemism somewhere or other in the world.

But neither with the Canaanites, nor with the Israelites, Edomites, Moabites, or Arabs, has any trace been found of the two essential elements of totemism, namely, the belief in the relationship of a human group with an animal, or vegetable species, and the co-existence in the same tribe of several groups each having special relations with a different totem kind. This social organization, characteristic of totemic peoples, has not actually been observed with any Semitic people; it has been shown moreover that a human group may adopt the name of an animal, because it thinks, or wishes, thereby to acquire the qualities of the animal, without imagining itself to be related to all the representatives of that animal species. Noeldeke has also remarked that most of the animal

---

[125] cf. Abraham's marriage to a non-uterine sister, and Laban's claiming his daughters' children as his own (Gen. 31:43), and David's serpent stock (cf. I Chron. 2:16; II Ki. 18:9).

[126] cf. the food interdictions as codified in Jewish law. The Canaanites also observed such restrictions.

[127] cf. Gen. 13:19; Josh. 24:32; Judg. 3:28; cf. also Gen. 34:2-26.

[128] cf. also the "City of the Serpent" (I Chron. 4:12), the "Stone of the Reptile" (1 Ki. 1:9) and the "Fountain of the Dragon" (Neh. 2:13).

[129] Atargatis is represented in a figurine with the head and bust of a female and the body and tail of a fish. Certain fish were sacred to her. Canaanite female divinities are often figured with the traits of a cow and masculine with those of a bull, types of fecundity and power (cf. I Ki. 7:25, 29; 12:4; also Ex. 29:3; 32:4, 8; Deut. 9:16; Judg. 13:15, 19; I Sam. 16:20; Hos. 8:6; 13:2ff.). Balaam's ass saw the angel of Yahwe before its master, and the serpent knew the magical powers of the tree before man did. See S. A. Cook, *Religion of Ancient Palestine,* p. 22.

names are also found as the names of individuals and is of the opinion that such tribal names were derived from individual names, from the name of some outstanding hero, for example, or from that of a ruling family. And very few of the great tribes, he adds, had animal names.[130]

The genesis of the belief of some Semites in a local nature-god, who is also a clan-god, and of the rites practised by them, does not need, in fact, to be explained by totemistic ideas and customs. The tie of blood, which is all that the Semitic nomads seem to have known and recognized, is explanation enough. For at this stage the Semite naturally and necessarily thought of his god as a member of his group and as being of the same blood and life. It is true, of course, that the ancestors of the Israelites held certain animals to be demoniac, which would suffice to make them taboo, and that it would have been only a step to take one of these species as a supernatural patron of the group, to make it an ally and consider it as related. But there is no evidence that either the Israelites, or the Arabs, did so.

Beside the holy trees and springs, and near the caves and mountains, or in or upon them, often stood a stone, or a group of stones;[131] and in many Semitic sanctuaries we find one, or several sacred stones, set up in alignment as at Gezer and Tell el-Ṣafa,[132] or in circles as in one of the sanctuaries at Gezer,[133] or as two high columns, either placed apart from the building, or used in the construction at the entrance of the sanctuary as at Byblos, Hierapolis and Petra.[134] These monoliths, or raised stones, formed generally the center of a sanctuary, although raised stones were also used as a sort of boundary mark for a sacred place, or for private property, or as votive pillars to recall to God the accomplishment of a vow, sacrifice, or pilgrimage; and pillars and cairns were often erected on graves.[135] But the pillar forming the center of a sanctuary was not simply an ex voto or memorial. Nor was it at first an altar. The sacred stone was not a transformed altar become divine. The altar was a sacred stone, to which a special function had been assigned.

"The Arabs," says Clement of Alexandria, "venerate the stone."[136] The sacred stone of the Arabs was ordinarily just a monolith,[137] elevated in the center, or on the boundary, of a sacred place, on

---

[130] See Th. Noeldeke in ZDMG, XL (1886), p. 166 and pp. 159-160, 156; cf. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta* I. ii, p. 329.

[131] cf. Ex. 17:1-7; 24:4-8; Num. 20:1-13.

[132] cf. Josh. 4:4-9 (E).

[133] Probably also in the many Palestinian holy places named "Gilgal"; cf. Josh. 4:1-3; 8:20-24; Deut. 11:30.

[134] Sometimes cairns were used instead of monoliths; cf. Gen. 31:46-48, 51-53.

[135] cf. Gen. 35:8, 14, 19-20; II Sam. 18:18; Josh. 24-26.

[136] *Patrologia Graeca,* VII, col. 183.

[137] Some stones had a vaguely human appearance, others were just cubes.

which the blood of the victims was poured.[138] The worshippers spoke to it, kissed it, caressed it, anointed it with oil, burned incense before it, and put clothes on it. The Semites called the stone "Bet-el" (House of God), whence the Greek "Baitulion" for a sacred stone, which Philo Byblios names an "animated stone."[139] The stone was conceived to be the dwelling, or body, of a god, spirit, or invisible power; and so intimate and organic was the union between the god and the object serving as his body felt to be that the Semites sometimes employed the name of the object as a truly divine name.[140] Probably they did not distinguish between the god and his dwelling.

The Semites themselves sometimes attributed phallic significance to the stones; but the stones could serve for gods and goddesses indifferently. A tradition says that they fell from heaven.[141] Some scholars suppose that the cult of stones was born of that of the mountain. Others believe that the stone was the form of the god. But the most probable suggestion is that of Robertson Smith, who maintained that the aim was simply to offer the divinity a dwelling, or a body, when once he had manifested himself in a place, in order to be able thereafter to communicate with him in a permanent manner. The stone was adopted as the most suitable for the purpose of transmitting the blood of the sacrifice.

The holy place was an inviolable domain, sometimes quite extensive, surrounding the sanctuary.[142] The idea that these parks were private property belonging to the gods is not a satisfactory explanation. The nomads did not possess the conception of private property. Rather was the divine conceived of as a sort of formidable fluid coursing through the soil of the holy place and through everything which it bore, especially through the trees and animals in it; and that the divine effluvia was transferred by contact is shown by the story of the bounds around Sinai.[143] In Arabia a man, who entered the sanctuary of Waj to cut wood, lost his axe and clothes, which had become dangerous by coming into contact with the dreaded fluid. Flocks, which strayed into a sacred park, were lost to their owner. Fugitive slaves and murderers found safety there from their pursuers. The worshippers of a god could, indeed, pasture their flocks in his sanctuary, enter into it and even dwell

---

[138] cf. Gen. 28:18; 31:13 (but cf. also Ex. 20:24-25). For early Arab practice cf. description by Nilus of a sacrifice by Arabs of the Egyptian border, *Patrologia Graeca,* 79, p. 611.

[139] *Fragm.* II:19.

[140] cf. Judg. 9:46; Gen. 31:13; also Jer. 48:13; Hos. 10:8 and Amos 3:14; 8:14.

[141] So the cube at Emessa, and at Hierapolis and Mecca.

[142] cf. Ex. 3:5; 19:12-13; 21:15; cf. those of the Walis, or saints, in Syria today.

[143] Ex. 19:10-13.

therein. But they themselves were in some measure permeated with the divine stuff.

Before coming into the presence of Yahwe the Israelite had to "purify," or "prepare" himself. The purificatory rites were performed two days before the ceremony of his appearance before Yahwe, or the evening before, or still later, and consisted of ablutions, changing, or washing of the clothes and abstention from commerce with women.[144] Sometimes special garments were worn in the performance of sacred acts; or everyday clothes were washed before and for further security even after the ceremony; or a costume, which remained at the holy place, was borrowed; or the act was celebrated naked.[145] Only the "Hums" of Mecca, the Amphiktions or Confederates, could perform the circumambulation of the Ka'ba in their own clothes. Worshippers belonging to other tribes must borrow, or hire, clothes from the "Hums," or go naked, as some Bedouin tribes did, or leave the clothes in which they circumambulated the Ka'ba, to rot there by the action of sun, wind and rain.[146] Evidently clothes were peculiarly subject to impregnation with the spiritual forces of the place, in which they were, and could either introduce hostile influences into a holy place, or bear divine virtue out into profane territory,[147] two dire possibilities.

Three of the festivals celebrated by the Israelites in Palestine go back undoubtedly to nomadic days. The "Shearing of the Sheep," to which relatives and friends were invited, and at which the firstborn of the flocks were sacrificed, was one.[148] Another was the "New Moon," which occupied a large place in the religious life of the Israelites in Palestine for a long time. It was celebrated in honor of an astral divinity. Hosea numbers it with the "Days of Baal."[149] The third was the "Passover," which is not attested to until about the seventh century, except for Exodus 34:25, the authenticity of which is disputed. Its rites were in flagrant contradiction to the characteristic tendencies of the Priestly group; and to find parallels to its ritual as described in P, it is necessary to go back to the most primitive forms of Semitic sacrifice and in especial to the picture drawn by St. Nilus of one of these ceremonies with the semi-savage Saracens of Arabia Petrea.[150]

The date of the celebration of the Passover corresponds to a very

---

[144] cf. Ex. 19:10; Josh. 3:5; 7:13; I Sam. 16:5; II Ki. 10:20.

[145] See note 72 for citations.

[146] cf. I Sam. 19:24. See Bukhārī (ed. Krehl) I, 409; II, 298 and III, 163 for Arab usage; cf. W. Gottschalk, *Das Gelübde nach älterer arab. Auffassungen,* pp. 23 ff.

[147] cf. Ex. 44:19.

[148] cf. I Sam. 25:2-13; II Sam. 13:23-27.

[149] cf. II Ki. 4:23; I Sam. 20:4-6; 26:27-29; Amos 8:5; Hos. 2:13, 15; Isa. 1:13.

[150] Nili Opera (*Patrologia Graeca,* 79) p. 613; cf. note 138.

old Semitic festival, the Spring festival, the Arabian "Rajab." The meal took place inside the house, or tent, and was in principle limited to the family, an unique feature among Semitic cult rites. Archaic also is the sprinkling of blood on the steps and lintels of the door, or on the flaps of the tent. Jewish tradition sees in it a memorial of the flight from Egypt.

The Passover was not a solar festival; it took place at night. Nor was it a fecundity rite, nor an expiatory rite, nor an attenuation of human sacrifice. It was the day probably, on which the first-born of the flock were sacrificed;[151] and the festival was addressed apparently to a domestic divinity, a genius of the house, and was not a propitiatory act, but, as in all rites concerned with first fruits, had to do with the ability to enjoy freely and without risk the new fruits, in this case the lambs and young goats, without fear of offending or driving away the spirit which is in the flock and multiplies it. The spirit was conceived of as being concentrated in the first-born animal of the season, or as being so concentrated by certain rites, and the animal was slain in order to eliminate the spirit from the rest of the new life.

The ancient Arabs seem to have had only two fixed seasons of the year for sacrifice, Rajab, the month which began the summer semester, in which was celebrated the festival of the first-fruits of the flocks in all holy places, and the Meccan pilgrimage season in the last month of the summer semester, which corresponded probably with the Israelitic Autumn festival. The pilgrimage sacrifices were, as later in Islam, individually made offerings and in consequence of a vow.[152]

The modern Bedouins also have very few sacrifices at a fixed date, just the pilgrimage sacrifices and those to a local saint once a year. But the sacrifice of the first-born of the flocks is still the occasion of a great festival with the Amur Arabs, at which, however, the first-born of each beast is not eaten, but only the first-born of each flock of sheep or goats; the blood of the victim is used to preserve the house against evil.[153] And thus today, as of yore, the sacrifice of the first-born seems, at bottom, to be an apotropaic rite to guard against the claims of the Baal, the divine proprietor of the flock, or against discharges of the divine energy manifested in the life of the beasts.

Doughty in his *Arabia Deserta*[154] describes how his host at evening "offered a young sheep for the health of his camels. . . . Some

[151] cf. Ex. 34:18, 20; Deut. 15:19-20; 16:1-8; Ex. 12 to 13.
[152] cf. Wellhausen, *Reste* etc. pp. 98-101, 115, 121-122.
[153] So with the Banu Hamîde the sacrifice of the first-born and the preservatory use of the blood are conjoined.
[154] I:499 and III:137.

of the sproutings, blood, he caught in the bowl, and putting in his fingers he bedaubed with a blood-streak the neck and flanks of every one of his couching great cattle"; and again he tells that "milignity of the soil is otherwise ascribed (than to God's judgment) by the people of Arabia to the ground demons, jan, ahl-el-ard, or earth-folk. Therefore husbandmen in these parts used to sprinkle new break-land with the blood of a peace-offering; the like when they build, they sprinkle upon the stones, lest by any evil accidents the workmen's lives should be endangered."

Islam appeared on this earth centuries after Christianity and Judaism. But its author and his followers were, and some still are, much nearer to the ancient Semitic world with its practices and beliefs and more attuned to its sentiments than the men of the Talmud, or of the New Testament. And although Islam arose and grew up in a Jewish-Christian environment, that ancient world put its mark, not only upon the rites and ceremonies of Islam, but also upon its social, ethical and religious thought. Quranic man is the creature of Genesis II:7;[155] its God often resembles the Ancient of Days, who could repent of making man (Genesis 6:6), and who answered Job, saying, (40-2 ERV) "Shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty?" The intuitions, on which Quranic revelation and Islamic theology rest, are old and tough.

William Thomson

Harvard University

[155] See my paper, "The Conception of Human Destiny in Islam," The Muslim World, October, 1945.

Turkey Old and New. By Selma Ekrem (Selma Bulayir). New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. pp. 185. $2.75.

This is an enthusiastic, friendly primer for the American who is curious about Turkey. The author seems to have in mind a "typical reader," perhaps a college girl home for the weekend. She has obviously had considerable experience answering the questions of Americans. (Isn't it hot in Turkey? What do you eat? Do you wear a veil at home?) The photographs sprinkled through the volume are well-chosen, largely from the Turkish Government publications such as *"La Turquie Kemaliste."*

Subjects covered include the Kemelist reforms, with something of their historic background, and a plea for reasonableness and peaceful intention in dealing with Russia. "We need peace for our independence and to carry on the work started in 1923. . . ."

The discussion of Islam and of the festivals and observances in Turkey is refreshingly clear, and some mention is made of the Dervish orders and of the former power of the clergy.

The writer is a granddaughter of the liberal patriot of the last century, Namik Kemal. She writes from the viewpoint of those in Turkey who have wealth, servants and education and are concerned for the welfare of those who do not. She is at present in the office of the Turkish Consul in New York.

C. ROBERT AVERY, JR.

Hartford, Conn.

The Indonesian Story. By Charles Wolf, Jr. New York, John Day Co., 1948. pp. 191. $3.00.

This story of the birth, growth and structure of the Indonesian Republic is told by one who served as American vice-consul at Batavia, Java, during the crucial period of the Republic's growth. It is no academic dissertation filled with references from books which the author has perused, but it is rather the findings of one who has seen a new nation born and was present at the birth. If "sympathy is the key to understanding" the author certainly has an understanding of the Indonesian situation. His sympathetic impartial treatment of a difficult subject in this age of propaganda is most refreshing.

On August 17, 1945, the Republic of Indonesia proclaimed its independence and this is where the book begins. The formal nationalist movement in the Indies began in Java in 1908 with the organization of the Boedi Oetomo or "High Endeavor" society under the leadership of the pacifist social reformer, Soetomo. From that time until World War II, Indonesian nationalism was characterized by division and disunity. The formation of the Poetera movement (Central People's Power) during the Japanese occupation in March 1943 was the first serious attempt to bring together the various nationalistic factions into one organization. In September 1944 under increasing pressure from both nationalists and the de-

teriorating situation in the Pacific, Premier Koiso made the first formal Japanese promise of independence to the Indonesians. The red and white independence flag and the national anthem now were recognized by the Japanese authorities. In early August 1945, Soekarno and Hatta left Batavia for Japanese Asia Headquarters in Saigon by special Japanese plane to arrange for independence discussions with Japanese leaders. Less than one week after their return to Batavia the Japanese capitulation was announced, and somewhat hastily and boldly two days later, on August 17th, Soekarno and Hatta proclaimed the Republic, not in the name of the Japanese Emperor, but in the name of the Indonesian people.

During the six weeks hiatus between the Declaration of Independence by Soekarno and Hatta and the landing of the first small British forces, the Indonesian nationalists consolidated rapidly and worked strenuously to set up a functioning government. Various statements have been made relative this delay and the failure of the United States army to come in. It is true that the American re-occupation forces had been anticipated by the Indonesians. Posters in English with quotations from Lincoln's Gettysburg address were very much in evidence. However had the American forces come in instead of the British it would have been another headache for America and the Republic would have been established anyway. The British had a thankless job and were open to criticism from both the Dutch and the Indonesians. The author is most fair in the statement: "The British were faced with a particularly difficult and explosive set of problems in the re-occupation of Indonesia, but even their best and sincerest attempts to solve these problems received neither the thanks nor the credit they were due. It is not likely that the United States would have been more successful under the circumstances."

After sixteen months of heated negotiations between Soetan Sjahrir representing the Republic and van Mook representing Holland, the Linggadjati agreement was signed on March 25, 1947. This was hailed as the final settlement of the differences between Holland and the Republic and was considered as the basis for the United States of Indonesia to be formed not later than January 1, 1949.

Unfortunately due to distrust on both sides the immediate results of this agreement seemed negative. More terrorism and bloodshed started on July 21, 1947 when the Dutch launched a program of widespread police action in Java and Sumatra. Sjahrir flew to New York to present Indonesia's case brilliantly before the United Nations Security Council. After twice calling for a cessation of hostilities, the Council sent a Committee of Good Offices to Indonesia to implement the cease-fire and to bring the disputants to parley. Under the Committee's auspices, the Reville truce agreement was signed on January 17, 1948. So far only unstable peace has come to Indonesia. The events of 1946 and 1947 signalize the birth of a nation in Indonesia. Queen Wilhelmina in her address of February 3, 1948 said: "Colonialism is dead. . . . We do not disown our past but a nation must be strong enough to make a new beginning. . . . We shall be strong enough." With this attitude on the part of Holland and with such leaders as Sjahrir, Soekarno and Hatta the design for the future can be worked out.

To one interested in religion it is interesting to note the following provision in the constitution: "The State guarantees the freedom of the people to profess their own religion and to fulfill their religious duties." In view of the strong dominant Islamic influence in the Indies this is a significant statement. The author mentions the Masjoemi Party and the great influence which that party wields among the Muslim population of Java and Sumatra. He states: "it is not unlikely that if conditions warranted, the Masjoemi Party might come forward as sponsor of an Islamic Pan Asia movement, stretching from North Africa and the Middle East through Pakistan in India, Southeast Asia and Indonesia." This seems a very remote possibility.

Anyone interested in the Indonesian situation will do well to read this book. It is the first of its kind to appear in English. We can heartily recommend it. There is a very comprehensive appendix giving the texts of the Republican constitution, the Linggadjati agreement and other primary documents.

Marmaduke Dodsworth

Singapore, Malaya

Britain and the Arab States: A Survey of Anglo-Arab Relations 1920-1948. By M. W. Seton-Williams. London, Luzac & Co., 1948. pp. 330. 21/.

We are told on the dust cover of the writer of this book that she is an Australian archeologist who has been a member of several prewar expeditions to the Middle East under colleagues distinguished in her profession and has thus had opportunities of obtaining firsthand knowledge of the Arabs and their countries. Furthermore, she was an official in the British Ministry of Information during the war. Unfortunately she has not known how best to turn her knowledge and experience to account in this volume. It is neither an original book, as it claims to be, nor a work of factual reference. Instead, it exhibits the defects of both these kinds of publication without the compensating advantages. As an original work it is ill-designed, for it is arranged into chapters dealing with the individual Arab States and this prevents the writer from even attempting to give a connected account of British policy during the period envisaged. That period, incidentally, should not have been set to open in 1920 but at least as early as the opening of hostilities with Turkey.

Then again the arrangement of the book rules out any serious effort at an interpretation of the facts presented in each chapter. Thus, to give only one example out of many, the story of Anglo-Egyptian diplomatic relations leading up to the Treaty of 1936 is told in some detail, but no reference at all is made to the Italian ambitions which transformed the psychology of the situation. Mussolini's name is never mentioned.

Not that the writer entirely eschews interpretation. Every now and then the sober chronicle breaks unexpectedly into an expression of opinion. The most marked instances of this are, as might be expected, in relation to Palestine. Thus we are given an account of the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 and then of the subsequent correspondence between the British Government and King Hussein, to which the writer appends the gentle comment that, in the circum-

stances, the second negotiation was "indeed surprising." The handling of the Zionist issue itself is equally embarrassed. We are told that "there is no doubt that, to the British Government (sic), the Balfour Declaration was a statement made during the war crisis and without sufficient consideration of its implications or the prior claims of the Arabs." Grammatically this means that the Declaration was made to the British Government, which is nonsense. Presumably what is meant is that this was how the Declaration was regarded by the British Government at that time. But so incriminating a statement should have been more clearly formulated. Confusion is also caused by the description of Zionism as having been throughout a "political movement" without any reference to the distinction clearly recognized in 1917 between a "national home" and a sovereign state.

The volume has the making of a good work of reference. Each chapter is followed by carefully compiled notes and references and there are over seventy pages of appendices as well as a useful bibliography. But there is no list given in the Contents Page of the twenty-one documents printed in the appendices which the reader has to find for himself: they are of course a small selection of the material which might have been included in a full-dress reference book covering the ground of which the present volume is a gingerly exploration. Let the writer reshape her design and then, as befits an archeologist, put her full weight on the spade, and really dig.

ALFRED ZIMMERN

Hartford, Conn.

Enkele Aspecten van het Probleem der Godsdienstvrijheid in Betreking tot de Plaats en Arbeid van de Christelijke Kerken in Azie. Proefschrift—ter Verkrijging van de Graad van Doctor in de Godgeleerdheid aan De Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Door Johannes Verkuyl. J. H. Kok, N. V. Kampen, 1948. pp. 328.

This monograph is a necessary and worthy supplement to the encyclopedic work of M. Searle Bates: *Religious Liberty, an Inquiry* (1945) since Dr. Verkuyl holds that two aspects of the problem of religious liberty were not fully dealt with, viz. the religio-historical aspect and the theological-Biblical basis of religious liberty. (Cf. THE MOSLEM WORLD, Jan. 1946, pp. 54-64 and p. 79.)

The title reads: "Some Aspects of the Problems of Religious Liberty, with a view to the place and work of the Christian churches in Asia."

After an introduction, in which the present relevance of the whole problem is underlined, a definition is given of what is meant by religious liberty.

The author writes from the viewpoint of Calvinism and as a theologian. He is not satisfied to express religious liberty merely in terms of the rights of minorities. All the freedoms of Western democracy are the result of religious freedom and that freedom rests primarily on God's Word. It was purchased in England, the Netherlands and America at a great cost. Where religious freedom is denied, tyranny inevitably follows.

This thesis for the degree of Doctor of Theology at the Free

University of Amsterdam was written after the author had been some time a pastor, then appointed missionary to Java (1939) and been war-prisoner of the Japanese 1942-45. He has recently returned to Indonesia. In addition to personal experience and study of the problem, the extensive bibliography gives evidence of scholarship and research. Five chapters (pp. 15-160) deal with the problem of religious liberty under Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Shintoism. The second part of the volume is an account of the struggle for religious liberty in Europe (chap. VI); a careful study of the Scriptural foundation for religious liberty (chap. VII); and the concluding chapter treats of Indonesia and religious liberty, especially the contrast of the attitude of the East India Company and the Netherlands government with regard to this question. Here the author deals with present-day problems of the new Indonesian Republic. And the solution is not in sight, scarcely on the horizon.

Before we turn to the first chapter on Islam, the outline of three other chapters will indicate the freshness and insight of the author's approach to his theme, *and lead to his main argument.*

Chapter IV deals with *Confucianism* and religious liberty. This article summarizes and criticizes the data of Prof. J.J.M. de Groot's book: *Sectarianism and persecution in China.*

After that the history of Confucianism in the Chinese Republic is discussed together with the present state of the problem of freedom of religion.

Chapter V. is on Shinto and religious liberty. The early Japanese religious policy is described and finally an indication is given of the present situation. Does the presence of MacArthur mean the "Götterdammerung" "twilight of the Gods" of the Japanese tribal religion? Or is Shinto the unconquered enemy and will popular Shinto in future be the stirrup through which state-Shinto may come into saddle again?

Chapter VI describes the struggle for freedom of religion in Western theology, in the following order: the first four centuries of Christianity (e.g. the conceptions of Athanasius, Ambrose and Augustine); the view of the Roman Catholic Church (from Gregory VII until modern times) in respect of religious liberty; the opinions of classic Lutheranism and Calvinism; the conceptions of Anabaptism, Spiritualism, Deism, Idealism, Romanticism, Neo-Calvinism, Barth, Brunner, etc.

It is with equal thoroughness that he writes on Islam (pp. 15-64) and it is difficult to summarize this part of his study, which is the most important section for our readers. After defining the Qur'ān in the words of Nöldeke as "the day-book of Mohammed" recording the Prophet's own reactions to current events as well as his meditations on Allah and the day of doom, he stresses the importance of distinguishing between the Mecca and Medina surahs. On this theme the whole attitude of Muhammad toward Jews and Christians changed with the change of his *qibla.* His face is no longer towards Jerusalem but towards Mecca. Islam became nationalistic and intolerant in proportion to the success of the *blitzkrieg* begun by Muhammad and continued by the early Caliphs. The question so hotly discussed between Hurgronje and Goldziher was whether Muhammad was conscious of a world mission or only of a

mission to his own people. The author sides with Goldziher that the Prophet had a vision of world conquest, a totalitarian theocracy far beyond the borders of Arabia. The roots of Pan-Islam are found in the Medina-Surahs.

His discussion of the Caliphate, its long history and final abolition by the Turks, is interesting. Its restoration seems to Dr. Verkuyl very doubtful. Stress is laid on the importance of *jihād* both in the Qur'ān and in later Muslim law and practice. The work of T. W. Arnold on the *Preaching of Islam* is shown to be unhistorical in its conclusions, although so carefully documented. As Hurgronje puts it, "those who converted the millions to Islam were not apostles but generals." "The theory of the *jihād* has had enormous influence on Islamic history. It is a sleeping avalanche that may start a catastrophe by a careless foot-fall." The question of Jewish and Christian minorities under the Islamic theocracy began A.D. 622 and continues to 1948. Surah 58:22 and the law of apostasy can always be invoked as a charter for intolerance. The *Hadith* and the laws of *Fiqh* have both interpreted the Qur'ān regulations more rigorously and Modern Nationalism is not unaware of this weapon. Will the work of Al-Afghani and Muhammad Abduh find successors of equal influence? "Will Islam succeed in throwing off the yoke of law and tradition and in concentrating upon a few religious principles as its core? Is Lord Cromer's judgment right: 'Reformed Islam is Islam no more'? Nobody can foretell." This chapter ends with a description of the reply which Islam itself gives to this question, amongst others in Pakistan, Iraq and Egypt today.

The final chapter on Indonesia discusses the archaic tribal religions and freedom of religion in Balinese-Hinduism; but the acute problem of the Indonesian Republic and its relations with the State East Indonesia (still under colonial rule) is not solved. The Christian church in the Netherlands is itself divided on the question and no one knows the future.

And now we come to the *raison d'etre* of the author's doctrinal thesis. It is found in Chapter VI. He wrote a supplement to the work of M. Searle Bates because he believes that the foundation or basis for all religious liberty is theological and Biblical, not natural or ethical or pragmatic; least of all is it humanitarian. All these reasons given as a plea for religious liberty are only relative and, therefore, inadequate. He goes beyond the thesis of W. E. Hocking (I.R.M., Oct. 1931), "the ethical basis underlying the legal right of religious liberty"; deeper than the theory of Malinowsky in *Freedom and Civilization;* or the pragmatic and utilitarian argument of John Stuart Mill's *Essay on Liberty;* and also the statements of Hocking and Bates which posit a general world-religion as ideal behind the present ethnic faiths which are comparative. Biblical revelation is absolute. Humanism and Modernism can furnish no absolute reason for freedom of the soul and its impulse to worship. The source of all our freedoms is He who said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The encounter with Christ in history and in Revelation places every man before a choice which presupposes the liberty to choose. The gospel must come to the non-Christian world without violence. Only in the Bible do we find the real ground and therefore the real passion for religious

freedom. Apart from Christ there is no freedom of the soul. All the other freedoms find their origin in this God-given freedom (pp. 229-237). "The great gift of religious freedom can not be based on indifferentism, liberalism or the relativism of modern culture-Protestantism. These proved to be only the heralds of collectivist dictatorships."

SAMUEL M. ZWEMER

New York City

A Book of Quranic Laws: An exhaustive treatise with full Quranic text, etc. Compiled by Muhammad Valibhai Merchant, Retired Assistant Secretary to the Government of Bombay. Lahore, Pakistan, Muhammad Ashraf, 1947. pp. 232. Rs. 5.

This practical compend of religious instruction deals with ten subjects: The Doctrine of the Unity of God, Prayers and Alms, Fasts, Pilgrimage, Food and Drink, Marriage, Divorce, Inheritance, Usury, Pardah. In each of the ten sections there is an explanatory description of the matter under discussion, its reasons, its advantages, and the relevant Quranic texts follow, printed usually in full.

The compiler tells of feeling, from his first reading of the Qur'ān, that a classified handbook of its requirements would be useful. He hopes that his work may help his readers, Muslims or non-Muslims, to "know some of the fundamental principles of Islam and the Quran." As an English text of the Qur'ān he uses (by permission of Dent & Sons, London) the translation by Rodwell, and he mentions appreciatively help derived from Fluegel's concordance. He cites frequently the opinions of Muslim commentators, and refers occasionally to Sale's translation and Preliminary Discourse. In an appendix he lists by number and title the surahs of the Qur'ān, but in Rodwell's order. Also in the treatment of prayers (page 9) and of alms (21) attention is called to chronological sequence.

Reading this book, a non-Muslim may observe the Muslim way of life through the eyes of an educated Muslim, a desirable experience, especially if one anticipates later intimate contacts with Muslims. By way of comparison Beaume's more extensive *Le Koran Analysé* should be mentioned. That, however, was compiled by a French official for the information of foreign administrators in circumstances where Islamic law might be involved. This compend springs from a religious motive, and is the work of a devout Muslim.

JOHN E. MERRILL

Beacon, N. Y.

Economics of Islam (A Comparative Study). By Shaykh Mahmud Ahmad. Lahore, Muhammad Ashraf, 1947. pp. viii, 188, index. Rs. 4.

The noun "intellectual" has been bandied in our generation as a term of abuse, particularly by the Marxists contemptuously referring to men who "merely think." It is time to reinstate the word, and the profession, in the place of honor that is their due. Our world sorely needs thought—relentless, profound, critical, creative.

And the more devastating and urgent the problems that a country faces, the more that country needs sincere and able intellectuals.

Pakistan is a case in point. The Muslims of that part of the old India have now achieved their hearts' craving, an independent state. The very achievement has for years absorbed their chief energies; but they are now confronted with the quite different problem of what to do with it. Their need of technicians is on everyone's mind. Yet the entire enterprise could be frustrated as effectively if their intellectuals should fail them. To survive, the state needs certainly a viable economic structure; but also a valid basic philosophy—something more positive than hatred of Hindus and Sikhs. In the most general terms, that philosophy is, of course, Islam (despite the official pretensions that Pakistan is a secular democratic state). And the concrete details, on the other hand, will be worked out by the administrators and technicians. But between these two the country's thinkers must construct a bridge, adequately conceived to bear unprecedented stresses and strains.

The book here under review is important less in itself than as representing an honest attempt to deal with some of the problems of a modern Islamic state. It is not a profound piece of writing. Several of the observations will probably be found not particularly helpful by the administrators and technicians. Further, the economic analyst would fairly readily show that the author has unconsciously in mind primarily the interests of the petty bourgeois—admittedly an important class in non-industrial Pakistan—rather than taking a comprehensive view (e.g., pp. 3, 110; and the fact that generally his concern over *ribā* is with the burden of bank-interest on the entrepreneur more than in the humanly much bigger problem of money-lender and peasant).

The two positive contributions of the book are on *zakāh* and interest. There is an exposition of the former at some length, with a rebuttal of the charge that its form is out-of-date followed, curiously, by a suggestion that for the modern world the right of *ijtihād* should be exercised so as to change its form (chiefly to a "steeply graduated income-tax"!) (p. 113). On interest, the thesis is that fixed interest could be abolished and its place in modern economics adequately taken by other devices, principally a percentage share in profits (—which an ill-disposed critic could dismiss as essentially fluctuating interest). Public works, it is proposed, should be financed by the government's floating shares rather than bonds; or, in financially non-remunerative projects, by controlled inflation (a Social Credit doctrine, by the way).

There are chapters on the social failures of capitalism, Marxian socialism, and fascism, and a rather romantic vision of brotherhood and justice under Islam; which evoke as perhaps one chief comment on the whole work that the author fails to convince not so much as to the workability or even validity of his proposals as with regard to their making so much difference after all. It is one question whether Pakistan will be either able or willing to dispense with fixed interest in the modern world; it is quite another whether even its doing so, along lines such as are here suggested, would fundamentally change much the vast social problems that face all of us, and not least Pakistan.

This kind of writing would perhaps be better suited to journal articles than to books, particularly if it could give rise to sustained discussion.

WILFRED CANTWELL SMITH

Rome

Islam and Socialism. A Critical Analysis of Capitalism, Communism, Socialism, Fascism and Nazism as Contrasted with the Quranic Conception of a New World Order. By Mirza Mohammad Hussain. Lahore, Muhammad Ashraf, 1947. pp. xii, 441, index. Rs. 10.

This is not a good book. It is large and grandiloquent; and, as the subtitle shows, ambitious. It quotes from, among others, Berdyaev and Karl Mannheim, Hermann Rauschning and the psychoanalyst Brill. But essentially it has very little to say. Unlike Mahmud Ahmad's book reviewed immediately above, it is not an attempt to answer any problem. It faces no problem at all. It talks glibly of modern, especially Western, humanity's plight, without any awareness of the depth of our distress. It talks even more glibly of Islam's splendor, its divine adequacy to remedy every ill, without any endeavor to administer the remedy or any recognition that Muslims have any problems. The author dismisses the Beveridge scheme of social insurance in Britain with contempt (p. 149). And yet his own long discussion of *zakāh* (his standard for disdaining the British plan) is devoted, not to seeing how it could be used to help real Muslims today, for instance in Pakistan, or even to advocating it, but to applauding it. This is insincerity; and it vitiates religion wherever it may be found,—in Christianity, Islam, or anywhere else.

None the less, the book has a certain importance, if only because it typifies a considerable segment of Islamic modernism which is based on a thoroughgoing romanticism and is designed to prove that Islam is a good thing. (This particular work devotes much of its energy to proving also that the modern West is bad.) This sort of thing is presumably necessary for those who are somehow losing their faith in Islam.

WILFRED CANTWELL SMITH

Rome

The Whys of the Great Indian Conflict. By M. A. Mehtar. Lahore, Muhammad Ashraf, 1947. pp. xiii, 226.

The editor of THE MUSLIM WORLD asked if this book is worth reviewing and left the present reviewer free to answer. The latter read the book and finally reacted toward it as a symptom, as a sign in the orient sky, that has a meaning. The "whys" of India do not yield to any single volume, but if the western reader would come to know his India, he must read all sorts of volumes, and today we can add daily papers and periodicals, as well. And this volume represents a scene and a state of mind which must be reckoned with, since the new India will long be in the making.

This book is Muslim and partial to Islam and Pakistan, although the book was published before Pakistan as a separate state had become a fact. It recognizes the prospect of the withdrawal of

the British, but takes occasion to declare that "a century of foreign rule has converted [India] into a land of riots, of poverty and starvation," that "the old, luxurious life of splendor and of ease, of power and plenty, have given place to a mortal struggle to live and to battle frantically for freedom." This quite rhetorical expression seems to indicate at once the author's attitude, and his somewhat scant acquaintance with India, past and present. He is equally intemperate toward the Hindus. Indeed the book is propagandist, pleading the cause of Pakistan. The "great Indian conflict" is that between the [Hindu?] Congress and the Muslim League (yes, the Congress, in the author's view, is altogether Hindu and its Muslim members are unworthy of Islam), and as the author gives the "whys," his book is a symptom of the lasting tension between the Hindus and the Muslims. Otherwise the book is a mere resumé, generally historically accurate, of India's realization of nationalistic aspirations.

But the author's immediate background is South African, not Indian, and what he writes is somewhat ignorantly partial. Although he is introduced as "a keen student of political history," he is also referred to as "a young journalist" and "a true champion of the rights of Indians in South Africa" (p. iv). We may thus—by the latter reference—account for his emotional attitude and his use of questionable analogy. Does he see in India a "race" problem which does not actually exist? But, then, he was "a casual visitor to India," returning "a total stranger after 24 years' absence." He found, he says, "the caste-Hindu majority in India bigoted, narrow-minded and fanatically intolerant toward all except its own peculiar order." He deemed "a Muslim in Hindu-dominated India" as much a "victim" as an Indian in South Africa among the whites. But, of course, the Hindus are not "whites," regardless of the ancient Indo-European strain, and the Muslims are not "colored" as are the sons of Africa. And with a bit of socialism (or communism?) in his veins, he finds a major "why" of contention "the capitalistic Hindu *bania*." He would have Pakistan, by the way, a socialistic state.

There is much truth in his observation that "India is not, and never was, one country, and the peoples known as Indians today were never at any period of history sufficiently fused into one another as to be called a nation" (p. 79). And there is similar cogency in his judgment that Hinduism and Islam represent strictly opposed orders. Such is the gist of his argument that separation is "inevitable." Incidentally, he presents Gandhi and Jinnah as typical of the contrast; Jinnah "essentially a practical politician," and Gandhi "a visionary" with "showmanship his second nature." If there is one thing more than any other which the book reflects, it is Islamic unity, the Indian Muslim's sense of solidarity in contrast with the variegated mass of Hinduism; this is the major "why." If any western reader should think little of the book, let him recall that it will have its place of influence in India, now that Pakistan becomes a separate state.

John Clark Archer

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Maze of Justice. By Tewfiq el Hakim. Translated by A. S. Eban. London, the Harvill Press, 1947.

This is a translation into English from Arabic of a book which is considered by most authorities to be the best work of its popular author. The writings of Tewfiq el Hakim, a "protagonist of curious causes," seem to reflect his long residence in Paris. In fact a French version of this story has had better sale than the Arabic. One previous English version was condemned because of the loss in translation of the "polished simplicity" of the original style.

The Arabic title of the book is *Yawmiyyāt Nā'ib fī 'l-Aryāf* which may be translated "The Journal of a Magistrate in the Country." Written in diary form the story records the happenings during eleven days in the life of an Egyptian "legal officer" in "the Provinces." It should be of interest to teachers of comparative literature and culture as a picture of rural life and legal processes in Egypt. In the preface Dr. Hafiz Afifi writes that "these sketches, humorous in the presentation, represent a biting criticism of a lamentable state of affairs which demands urgent reform." He compares the book to the works of Charles Dickens, which "drove all English politicians of all parties to place questions of social reform at the head of their political programme." "The ideas and principles developed in this story," says he, furnish "a clear diagnosis of weaknesses and defects" and "could usefully act as signposts to a serious reformer" in Egypt.

The country magistrate, whose diary, "written in hours of anguish" makes such good reading, is a conscientious young man, overworked, lonely and unhappy because of the frustration of his efforts to do a good job in administering justice by means of imported laws which he finds not at all suited to the condition of the people governed. The particular case, which serves as a framework on which to introduce numerous humorous anecdotes, poetic descriptions, philosophical soliloquies and satirical exposure of existing political conditions and judicial practices, is that of the murder of the peasant, Kamal el Doula Alwan. The principal suspect in the case is a beautiful village girl, named Rim, who, says the magistrate, "has been such a dazzling spectacle and moved us all deeply." "This sweet creature had given us some bright moments. It was as if a zephyr breeze had blown on the parched desert of our emotions in this decrepit village." But Rim's mind was "like a thicket of reeds and sugar cane whose dark foundations saw no light except in fragments like coins, flashing in the dark whenever the reeds inclined this way or that."

This is not a "murder story" in the ordinary sense of the word, for the mystery is never solved. It is a picture; and it leaves an impression of futility.

Throughout the book there is evidence of the author's sympathy for the Egyptian peasants, "whose eyes have been consumed by trachoma since childhood, whose mental facilities have been left to decay under the rule of so many governors of all races" and who live "like worms—in hovels, thatched with cotton stalks and maize twigs" and of a "dusty brown color, suggestive of mud, manure and the dung of cattle." "Human life has no value in Egypt" continues

the diary "for those who are supposed to care about it care very little."

Eleanor T. Calverley

Hartford, Conn.

Les Intellectuels Algeriens. By the late Augustin Berque, formerly Associate Administrator and Director of Muslim Affairs of Algeria, in "Revue Africaine, Tome XCI (1947), pp. 123-151 and 260-276.

In a refined, chastened and elegant style, enriched by a philosophical and historical perspective, and prompted by a genuine interest in the well-being and development of the North African Muslim population, the distinguished literator and administrator essays to trace the evolution of the Algerian intellectuals. His study embraces four categories. The first is the Muslim product of French schools. With little religious motivation, but with a spirit of social and political solidarity, the young student plunges confidently into occidental literature and philosophy and emerges quite dissatisfied with Islamic modes. The writer notes that by an interpenetration of culture there is a tendency to a fusion of occidental with oriental, diminishing the importance of "race." Secondly, there are the former students of higher Islamic institutions. Mr. Berque, after examining the limitations of the Arabic language, discusses the desire of the 'Ulama to reform Islam by eliminating heresies, especially that of the cult of saints, and by purifying the Arabic language. The third category is composed of the "Marabout" class. The writer treats in particular the former Shaikh Benalioua of Mostaganem. The fourth are those who have come under the influence of Muslim philosophers, the "neo-mu'tazilites" and Averroists who would reinterpret Islam according to Avicenna, Averroes, Al-Ghazzali or Ibn Ṭufayl. The followers of this way are of the élite.

E. H. Douglas

Constantine, Algeria

Ibn Qotaiba. Introduction au livre de la poesie et des poetes, texte arabe d'après l'edition De Goeje, avec introduction, traduction et commentaire. Par M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes. Paris, Société d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres." 1947. pp. xli, 109.

This beautifully printed volume, dedicated to the memory of the great French Orientalist Barbier de Meynard, introduces the Arabic Series to be published under the patronage of the Association Guillaume Budé, which has been famous so long for its Series of Classical texts.

The *Kitāb ash-Shi'r wa'sh-Shu'arā'* is the best known work of Ibn Qutaiba, and is probably his best work. It is thus a little remarkable that in spite of the wealth of material now available, neither the earlier Oriental prints of Constantinople and Cairo, nor the more modern elaborate edition by Aḥmad Shākir at Cairo (1364-1944), have gone beyond the textual basis established by de Goeje in his Leiden edition of 1902-04.

Ibn Qutaiba, who died c.885 A.D., is an excellent example of a Muslim "man of letters" at the lively literary and intellectual center that Baghdad was in the IXth century. After the fashion of

such "men of letters" he took an interest in the whole range of the Muslim sciences, and though primarily interested in philology and the associated study of Arab antiquities, he was no mean controversialist, and wrote on the Qur'ān, on Tradition and on theology, works which evidence not only a wide culture but a discerning mind. Most students will remember their surprise at discovering how accurately he quotes from the Bible in the early pages of his *Kitāb al-Ma'ārif,* and their even greater surprise at his liberal attitude thereto. To his *Kitāb ash-Shi'r,* the main subject of which is the Lives of the Poets, he prefixed an introduction in which he deals with what we can perhaps call Arab Literary Theory. This *Muqaddima* has attracted a good deal of interest. It was edited with a Dutch translation by Ritterhausen at Leiden in 1875, and even earlier had been translated by Nöldeke, from the defective Vienna MS., as the first essay in his *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber* (Hannover, 1864). It is this which M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes here reproduces from the Arabic text of de Goeje and translates with an elaborate literary and critical commentary, thus providing an excellent introduction to a subject which is again beginning to attract considerable attention in our generation.

As Avant propos to his translation he gives us both an account of Ibn Qutaiba and the literary world in which he moved, and an introductory essay on Arabic poetry, its forms and rules of prosody, together with a critical estimate of the actual contribution Ibn Qutaiba here makes to the science of literary criticism. It would be out of place in the Quarterly to enter into technical questions of text and translation, but it is within our province to commend to students a beautifully produced volume, that happily inaugurates a Series that has every promise of being of great usefulness in our field of Islamic studies.

ARTHUR JEFFERY
Columbia University, New York City

L'Ilahi-Name de Hwage 'Abdallah Ansari, (avec une planche). Par S. de Beaurecueil. Extrait du Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale. Tome XLVII. Le Caire, 1948. pp. 20.

The many readers of our Quarterly who are interested in Sufism will remember the little volume of English renderings of the *Invocations* of 'Abdallah Anṣārī of Herat (1005-1090 A.D.) which was published in 1939 in the "Wisdom of the East" Series as Vol. IV of the *Persian Mystics.* Such readers will give a warm welcome to this present publication in which M. Serge de Beaurecueil, who has in mind a complete edition of the writings of Pīr-i Anṣārī, edits and translates one of the tractates from the Shehit 'Ali MS. analysed by H. Ritter in *Der Islam* XXII in 1935. It is a characteristic sample of the *mushajja'āt,* and doubtless goes back to the Pīr, though in its present form it seems rather to be the work of disciples who gathered together a number of the sayings and assembled them in this somewhat haphazard way.

The Persian text has been edited from photographs of the Stambul MS., one page of which is reproduced in facsimile, but in

the notes are recorded all the variants from Kaviani's edition of the *Munājāt,* from the *Risālè Pardè-i Ḥijāb,* the *Kitāb-i Wāridāt* and the Shiraz edition of the *Risalè-i Anwār at-Taḥqīq.* There are also short notes to the translation, sometimes referring to these variants, and sometimes explanatory of the text.

There is no discernible order in the sayings in this collection. A majority of them are invocations addressed to Allah. Some are references to the sayings of famous Masters of the Way. Some are elements of teaching and lessons from practical experience addressed to those who are seeking to follow the Way. "If you know how to cut yourself off from Self, you will be able to unite yourself to Allah." "I used to search for Him, but found myself; now I search for myself and I find Him." "Oh generous One, prodigal with Thy liberality! Oh wise One, Who dost veil sin! Oh immutable One, Who art beyond the comprehension of creatures, unique One, incomparable in Thy essence and in Thy attribute! Oh Creator, Who dost show the Way, all-powerful One, to Whom belongeth divinity! Give to our souls the gift of Thy purity, to our hearts the gift of desire for Thee, to our eyes the gift of Thy clarity. Give to us that which is good, and abandon us not to any other."

The editor has not taken up seriously in this study the textual questions which immediately suggest themselves, but he indicates that a thoroughgoing textual criticism will be necessary before any complete edition of the works of Anṣārī can be attempted.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Low. Edited by Alexander Scheiber. Publications of the Kohut Memorial Foundation. Budapest, 1947. pp. xii, 361 and 195.

This stout volume which reaches us from Hungary was intended as a Jubilee Volume to be presented to Immanuel Löw on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday, but the German Occupation interrupted not only the printing of the volume, but also the quietness of the declining years of Löw, who died of exhaustion and the effects of prolonged hunger in July 1944. Even after the Liberation the volume would have remained incomplete had not the Alexander Kohut Foundation, in recognition of the long friendship between Löw and Kohut, provided the funds for its completion. It contains twenty-eight contributions in Magyar, six in German, seven in English, three in French and seven in Hebrew, together with additions to the Bibliography of the writings of Löw himself. The articles range from Exegesis to Higher Mathematics.

Of articles that are of interest to the readers of this Quarterly we may note Joseph Somogyi's article on ad-Damīrī's *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān* (pp. 123-130). Georges Vajda's paper on an unknown Hebrew version of the "Cercles imaginaires" of al-Batalyawsi (pp. 202-204), Leon Nemoy's attempt at a reappraisal of the biography of Anan ben David, the founder of the Qaraites (pp. 239-248), and Heinrich Cuttmann's paper on the Cain and Abel legends as known to Augustine (pp. 272-276).

Few of our readers will remember anything more of Immanuel

Löw than that he was the compiler of the four volumes *Die Flora der Juden,* but he was apparently a considerable figure in his community in Hungary and this volume is a notable memorial to him.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

L'Islam et nous: apercus et suggestions. Par Jean-Mohammed Abd-el-Jalil. Paris, 1947. Editions du Cerf, 1947. pp. 61.

This first number to appear of the series *L'Eglise et le monde* is small in size but great in importance. The announcement of the Series informs us that its purpose is "de faire connaître les étapes et les modalités de la propagation de l'Eglise dans le Monde; par delà son extension numérique et géographique, sa pénétration et son enracinement dans les zones culturelles, son affrontement avec des religions et des éthiques diverses."

It is to this last category that the present study belongs. Le Père 'Abd al-Jalil is distressed at the approach the West makes to the study of Islam, at times distressingly hostile, and at times sentimentally enthusiastic in a way that is equally distressing, and far too seldom with any attempt to see Islam from within. It is this he would help us do. If we would understand Islam, if we would help our Muslim friends to an appreciation of something higher in religious experience than they have ever known, or can ever know in their own religious framework, we must try to see Islam as they see it and appreciate it as it appears in their eyes.

He recognizes the paradox that though Islam seems in some ways so close to us, yet when we come close to it it seems very far away. This is because we have such very different conceptions of religion. So in a series of paragraphs he tries to let us look through a Muslim's eyes at how he understands God, how he regards the purpose of creation, the function of Prophets and revelation, what the Qur'ān means to him, how he has come to idealize the figure of Muḥammad, where for him lie the sources of authority for civil and religious life, and what his attitude is towards members of other religious groups. Having done this he discusses briefly the main currents of a modernizing Islamic world, and concludes with a suggestion for the Christian approach to the Muslim.

The essay is so good that it ought to be made required reading in all our Seminaries.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

Den arabiske Bog. Udgivet af Forening for Boghaandvaerk med tilskud fra Ny Carlsbergfondet. Johs. Pedersen. Kobenhavn, Fischers Forlag, 1946, pp. 159.

It has often been remarked that orthodox Islam, being denied the normal channels of artistic expression in painting and music, turned its artistic genius into the channel of decoration associated with architecture and the book. Yet while we have a good many manuals dealing with Islamic decorative art in connection with building, whether in structure or in furnishing, very little has been done on the rich material available for a history of the art of the book in Islam.

The present book is only a brief sketch of one area of the subject,

but it is comprehensive in its plan and thorough in its execution, so that it provides an excellent introduction to the subject. There was writing in pre-Islamic Arabia. All along the caravan routes in Northern Arabia there are to be found inscriptions on the rocks, not only in the Aramaic used by the Nabataeans or the Sabaean used by the colonies from South Arabia, but in the North Arabian dialects. There are even a few inscriptions, one as early as the fourth century, in Arabic. That Arabic was also written upon papyrus and parchment in pre-Islamic days, by pagan Arabs as well as by Jews and Christians, seems quite certain, even though no specimens of it have survived. With the Qur'ān, however, a new era opened, for now the Arabs also were a People of the Book, and the arts of calligraphy and of bookmaking became of great importance to them.

The volume before us describes the kinds of writing used in early Arabia, and the earliest Islamic writing. It tells of the various kinds of writing material that successively appeared in the Islamic world and how they were used by the Muslims, of the rise of a class of writers and a class of professional men of books, of the rise of Schools of calligraphy, of a book market, and of the assembling of books to form Libraries both private and public in the great Islamic centres. Arabic literature is particularly rich in stories of men who devoted their lives to the world of books. The art of book illustration, which had so wondrous a history in the West had only a limited development in Islam, but as religious sanctions worked strongly in most areas against the use of illustrations in the text, the scribe who did not care to offend orthodoxy spent his artistic urge on the elaboration of decorative title pieces and borders. It was the same urge that found a further expression in an extraordinary development of the art of decorative book-binding. In a final chapter the author gives us a brief introduction to the early printing of Arabic books.

This volume confines itself to the Arabic book. It would be an interesting thing to carry the study further into the world of books in Persia, Turkey, Indian Islam, and the Islamic centres of non-Arab Africa and Indonesia, for all of which areas there is an abundance of material for an account both of the development of calligraphy and of the physical make-up of the book. The present volume, however, is a model study in its field. Our complaints are but two. Firstly, it is written in Danish, which makes it a closed book to most of our readers, and but slow reading to the rest of us. Secondly, far too many of its illustrations are taken from books already available to us, and so add nothing to our knowledge, whereas it surely would have been possible from the collections at Copenhagen to provide equally good illustrations that would have presented fresh material.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

The Tulip of Sinai. Translated from the Persian of the late Sir Muhammad Iqbāl, by A. J. Arberry. London, The Royal India Society, 1947.

These one hundred sixty three quatrains translated by Professor Arberry of Cambridge constitute a section of the late Sir Muḥammad Iqbāl's *Payām-i-Mashriq* ("Message of the East") which he wrote in reply to Goethe's *West-oestlicher Divan*. The translator ap-

pends a few notes on obscure allusions; he includes no introduction to the philosophic thought of the author, for this purpose refers the reader to Professor R. A. Nicholson's translation of Iqbāl's *Asrār-i-Khudī* ("Secrets of the Self"). The present poems need to be studied with this earlier translation at hand, for the thought of this eastern author, even when mediated through the excellent renditions of Professor Arberry, is not easy to comprehend without some commentary.

Any contribution to the introduction of Iqbāl's poetry to a wider western public is welcome and important for two reasons: firstly, because this Muslim sage probably had more to do with the creation of Pakistan than any other individual, even though he died almost a decade before that state was born; and secondly, because the poetry in the original is of the best to be found in modern Persian literature, even though the author is not a native Persian. The poems give clear evidence that the mystic philosophy of the east is still very much alive, and can still find expression in poetic media of high artistic quality.

Moreover, both the content and form of these philosophic quatrains have been sympathetically and skillfully conveyed by the translator to the English reader who may be denied the pleasure of the original. As has been shown in his earlier translations of Sa'dī and Ḥāfiẓ, Professor Arberry is at his best when rendering and interpreting Persian poetry, continuing creditably the tradition of Jones, Leaf, Fitzgerald, Browne, Nicholson, Bell, to mention but a few. In these renditions Professor Arberry has succeeded in taking the middle road between literal and free translation: following the original neither so frugally as to render the English form poor and thin nor so lavishly as to lose all the taste and tone of the Persian. Almost invariably the translator has penetrated to the intention of the author and reset the jewel of his thought in a band of foreign metal not too far fashioned from the Persian gold.

Inevitably, however, the singing translator sometimes mistakes the melody and fumbles the score. One or two instances may be suggested. Instead of his rendering of Quatrain No. 14 and its difficult and obscure English, the following is suggested as more true to the original and more clear in translation:

"A Body find within this dust-made ball,
A Body stronger than a stalwart wall;
Yet beats therein a sorrow-conscious Heart,
Like to a stream beside a mountain tall."

Again, in No. 30 it is suggested that the following might do better justice to the flavor of several of the words:

"This maelstrom's Being and Not-Being flee,
O'er this world's Why and How transcendent be!
Re-fashion Selfhood in thy templed form,
And build, like Abraham, a sanctuary."

It is just possible, furthermore, that the author might be better interpreted by rendering the second line, "Transcend this world of plenty, poverty." This is the more obvious meaning of *kaif o kam*

although the meaning of "Why and How" seems to fit better the preceding line.

But these and other suggestions unrecorded for lack of space are minor matters compared to the generally excellent achievement of the translator in a very, very difficult task: as can be witnessed by anyone who has tried to translate verse from one language to another.

These poems will give to the English reader both profit and pleasure: profit by insight into some of the best of Eastern thought at a time when it is imperative that the West penetrate the mind of the East, especially the Muslim mind; and pleasure in finding the colorful oriental original suffusing the real beauty of the artistic occidental medium. Iqbāl's wine is a heady draught, but it is easier to quaff in Arberry's fine-fashioned cup.

T. Cuyler Young

Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Anthropology at the Kennedy School of Missions

In a small book entitled, "The Missionary and Anthropology," the Rev. Gordon Smith has this challenging statement, "The Anthropologist's work is done when he completes his survey of social organizations and culture, but there the missionary's work only commences." Knowing anthropologists and missionaries, I am pleased with the truth of Mr. Smith's statement. Too often missionaries do not take time, nor are they trained, to make a study as an anthropologist does. Most of them are aware of the need of such studies, but are baffled by the lack of knowledge and understanding of the technique of procedure. Most of them are able to establish a favorable rapport between themselves and their people, but are in need of special training in order that they may better study the customs and social traits of their people. It has become my task to teach missionaries this anthropological technique; that they, in gaining a better understanding of their people, will become more qualified missionaries, and also that, because of their unique situations they may make contributions to science. Believing that by teaching anthropology to missionaries, I would be teaching the discipline of anthropology with a purpose, I have given up much of my scientific research, and turned aside academic positions in colleges in order to devote my whole time to the anthropological training of missionaries.

In my four years of teaching here at Hartford, I have asked each student to write a short essay on the topic, "Why I became a missionary." Those one hundred and fifty or more essays would make interesting reading, yet I relate this to say only that in most of these essays there appears the command of Jesus, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." This text is so well known and has become such an integral part of missionary thought that many feel it necessary to quote that command as a reason for becoming a missionary.

I begin the course by teaching that every true Christian is of necessity a missionary. If the definition of a mission field holds, namely, "A mission field is any area of life in which Jesus Christ is unknown," then every Christian, no matter where he is, can begin immediately to be a missionary. It may be that the prospective missionary would have to begin first with himself, for even though he is on his way to a "foreign field," he may not really know Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He may typify what Jesus said to Pilate, "Sayest thou this of thyself or hath another told it thee of me." Too many times we use words and phrases which are the results of religious experiences of other Christians. So the missionary may well begin his mission work with himself. For, first he must work out his own salvation. If he becomes converted himself, he is then ready to go to his neighbor, for, to most of our neighbors, Jesus is unknown. Thus, all become missionaries, some as teachers, some preachers, some doctors, farmers, business men, etc.

However, to some the command is personal, "Go ye into all the world," which to them means that they must leave home for a foreign place to spread the gospel. It is good that many have given heed to this command. But it is dangerous to go to these foreign places without first becoming acquainted with the people to whom they go. Missionaries who have labored for a life-time in a given place learn to know their people, to appreciate their customs, their etiquette, food, religion and history. Studies of such topics are listed under the head of Anthropology, and can be learned by missionaries in well equipped Universities of Religion. That such knowledge is important, there is no doubt, and that countless mistakes have been made because of a lack of such knowledge, is likewise generally known. In order to emphasize their importance, let me cite a few examples.

It is customary in our society to adore babies and most of our mothers gladly accept compliments relative to their offspring. In primitive societies that just isn't done, due of course, to their association with the "evil eye." It is hard for me even yet to get over this awareness now that I have returned to our own civilization. In some parts of Africa no informed missionary will put his hand on the heads of children although among ourselves that is an attitude of affection. The native of the Belgian Congo never points with his index finger, for that has a bad connotation, nor does he hold up his hand so that his neighbor sees the palm. There are places where spitting at one another is a sign of agreement. To us it is repulsive. We are embarrassed if by accident we should belch after a meal; that, in some places of the world is a sign of enjoyment and satisfaction and is considered a compliment to the host. We have jokes about mothers-in-law, but in most places it is a real issue rather than a joke. There are people who may not even see or talk to their "in-laws." When offering gifts in some societies, it is done with both hands, never, as with us, by one hand. The entering of a house is often a ceremony among our American Indians, as it is also among some of the African tribes. Maya Indians do not approach or enter homes as we do. In our brazen method of knocking, we offend these gentle folk. Such an enumeration of social customs can be continued almost without end and it forms a definite part of the teaching of Anthropology to missionaries.

The various forms of societies differ throughout the world; in our own the father is the head of the family and, as such, the children take his name, and inherit his goods after his death. This is known as the patriarchal system. In other societies, the mother is the head, and the system is know as matriarchal. Kinship relations become most involved in some societies. We may relate who is our brother and sister, cousin, aunt, and uncle, but these terms do not mean the same to an African. Thus, it becomes essential to know their meaning. All this is Anthropology and in so far as possible, it is necessary for a missionary to study them before going to his people. Those missionaries and government officials who are best informed are best able to carry on effective work. One cannot learn the mores of a primitive people quickly. It is a process of long duration.

Perhaps the prophet Ezekiel gives us the first Biblical demon-

stration of the anthropological technique. He says in Chapter 3:15, "and I sat where they sat, and remained there astonished among them seven days." The Prophet realized that it was necessary to sit quietly among the people whom he was to teach, comfort, and preach to, so that he could absorb their problems, and understand their way of life before the actual teaching and preaching began.

Legend relates that a wise American Indian prayed, "Great Spirit, help me never to judge another until I have walked two weeks in his moccasins." We might also add that there is necessity for walking at the same rate of speed in those moccasins as the original owner does, so as not to become footsore and weary, but to develop the best speed habit for walking with the people. It necessarily follows that for perfect understanding we must see with his eyes, hear with his ears, and think with his mind.

In a little book by Julia H. Johnston entitled "Fifty Missionary Heroes Every Boy and Girl Should Know," she writes of old heroes, all of whom are now dead. Modern teachers of missionaries could substitute fifty living examples that every boy and girl should know. Some of these are teachers, doctors, farmers and business men. Our anthropology class includes men and women of various backgrounds, geographically, economically, culturally, and racially. The students have come from sixteen denominations and from varied occupations. For example, some have been, previous to their missionary activity, teachers, ministers, farmers, soil conservationists, factory owners, nurses, doctors, dentists, secretaries, etc. Most of these people were successful in their various occupations but were not satisfied until they did the same work on the mission field. They have experienced what Spurgeon meant when he wrote:

> "I should not like you, if meant by God to be a great missionary, to die a millionaire. I should not like it, were you fitted to be a missionary, that you should drivel down into a king. What are all your kings, all your nobles, all your diadems, when you put them together, compared with the dignity of winning souls to Christ, with the special honor of building for Christ, not on another man's foundation, but in preaching Christ's Gospel in regions far beyond?"

It is this type of student to whom we teach anthropology. They represent the same missionary spirit that the apostle Barnabas showed in the early Christian church, for, like him, many have given up all so that they may extend the Gospel of Christ.

Confident that I could teach my students after they left the classroom, we formed an association of former students called "An Anthropological Society for Missionaries." The Society dues are one dollar for three years, and at present, there are one hundred and fifteen paid members. To each of these members is sent a monthly letter of encouragement, reviews of scientific articles and books, and special requests for data on various scientific projects. Already data on the projects concerning the incidence of dental cares throughout the world have been received. A paper is in the making on both weights and heights of the new-born throughout the world, written chiefly from data sent by the society members. We are assembling data on various problems such as Demography, Phenology, Social Customs, Typical Days, and several more, with a

regular flow of letters to and from missionaries in all parts of the world.

This anthropological office serves also as a distributing center for missionaries to express their needs, which we try to supply from Christian laymen at home. This service likewise had an interesting beginning. For example, a carpenter in Holland, Michigan, is a missionary of the first rank, for the money he earns is working for Christ each Sunday in the hills of the Philippine Islands, where he sent the funds for a portable organ, and in Africa where fifty of his dollars serve in the capacity of a missionary's bicycle. In North Africa another sum of money is working in a day school in the form of carpenter tools sent by this Michigan carpenter. His money is helping to build a house for a missionary in Arizona, and also giving aid toward the publication of a religious book. Other gifts from laymen at home to members of our society, take the form of equipment such as cameras, etc.

There have been observers who have questioned the value of the study of anthropology by missionaries. These observers believe that if the missionary is an intelligent, consecrated Christian, one who is able to learn a language and to preach, or teach, or heal the sick, he has enough preparation, and a knowledge of the people will come, after the missionary takes up his work on the field. All this we acknowledge, yet by a study of the techniques of anthropology the missionary is able to put the experiences of trained anthropologists into practice and thereby gain years of time in appreciating fully his foreign parishioners. It is somewhat embarrassing for the professor of a subject to tell of its good points. I shall let a student talk concerning Anthropology at Hartford. The following was written by a student after spending one year in my course.

"It is difficult to define in words just what it is we derive from our anthropology course. The facts can be found in books but the true essence of this course does not come in books. We gain more than facts, something which is more an attitude, an appreciation, an understanding.

"Our first assignment was to sit in the woods for two hours and note what we saw. Its value as anthropology was obscure to us but we found it a practical introduction to the profound knowledge one Maya Indian had of nature. Before long, we also realized this sitting, listening attitude is as necessary in dealing with people as it is in nature.

"Our Cultural classes in the Kennedy School of Missions give an opportunity to learn about the past and present of our people but we study them as Africans, as Chinese, as Indians. Anthropology presents them as people with bodies and minds similar to our own. Discussion of likenesses and differences of people in various parts of the world, possible in this class with its variety of membership, sets before us the pageant of human development through the ages and leaves us breathless with the opportunities for the future.

"True, we learn techniques of anthropometric measuring, psychology and aptitude testing, and the recording and evaluating of facts. Through these technical devices come the means and the challenge for better study of our people, not as guinea pigs, but as fellow human beings with the same potentialities as ourselves. Our attitude may be called a sympathetic, scientific desire for growing understanding. Our appreciation is for the wonder of creation and the contributions to it by groups of people. Our knowledge is that due to the complexity of the human life, with its laws of heredity and environment, changes are difficult. In the comradely atmosphere of the anthropology class we all have contributed and gained an indefinable something essential to the success of our future work."

Perhaps this student has summed up the teaching of anthropology at the Hartford Seminary Foundation, better than could the Professor himself. It is true, our course does present the so called primitive races, "as people with bodies and minds similar to our own." I am delighted that it "sets before us the pageant of human development . . . and leaves us breathless with the opportunities for the future." The course emphasizes not only the obvious good that missionaries can do for their people, but also it stresses that a missionary's life in a foreign community is an anthropological book for the natives to read. In addition it presents the opportunities and obligations that missionaries have in bringing back to us the contributions their people have made to the civilization of the world.

Morris Steggerda

Hartford, Conn.

Palestinian Refugees

This letter has been authorized by a committee of representatives from different groups of the American community. The chairman is Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, President of the American University in Beirut. It is an appeal for sympathetic understanding of the desperate situation among the Arab refugees. Until now the terrible facts of this situation, pronounced by the United Nations as the greatest relief need in the world today, have not received the attention which they deserve.

The latest statistics show that there are 88,300 refugees in Transjordan, 72,700 in Syria, 61,000 in Lebanon, 9,000 in Egypt, and 237,000 in Palestine. Each new battle increases the number of homeless refugees. They have fled from the Zionist invasion of their homes and villages with only the few possessions they were able to carry. They have sought refuge with friends and relatives; they are sleeping in schools, mosques, and churches or under the seats of moving picture houses. Many thousands have no shelter at all. In the town of Bir-Zeit, for example, 7,000 refugees have descended upon the population of 1,000 residents and are eating the crops which were expected to last until the next harvest.

These people need urgently and immediately tents, blankets, warm clothing, food, medicine, and personnel for technical assistance.

The peoples and governments of the Middle East have been generous in their gifts, but the need is far beyond their capacity to meet it. Appeals for help have been made to 53 different countries and many voluntary agencies. The present rate of relief shipments and promises from every source falls far below the current needs.

Gifts should be labeled "For Palestinian Arab Relief" and sent through Church World Service, 214 E. 21st St., New York 10, N. Y.

Beirut, Lebanon;
November 1, 1948

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

I. GENERAL

BIBLIOGRAPHY. (In *Palestine Affairs,* New York. February, 1948. pp.13-19).

An annotated review of some of the more important books and articles on the Middle East appearing in 1947.

GEMIL MARDAM BEY. Carlos Chad. (In *En Terre d'Islam,* Lyons. Janvier-Février, 1948. pp. 15-25.)

Resumé of his political career, adherences and aspirations.

HISTOIRE DE L'AFRIQUE DU NORD DES ORIGINES A LA FIN DU MOYEN AGE. (In *Revue Historique,* Paris. Octobre-Decembre, 1947. pp. 228-249).

A critically annotated bibliography of significant books and articles written between 1939 and 1946.

THE NATURE OF THE ARAB LITERARY EFFORT. G. E. von Grunebaum. (In the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago. April, 1948. pp. 116-122).

Describes progress made toward a history of Arab belles lettres.

NAZI CRUSADE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. (In the *Middle East Bulletin,* New York. February 6, 1948. pp. 1-4).

Biographical data on prominent figures in the Arab-Palestinian military forces.

UN NOUVEL ALPHABET ARABE? Maurice Bouyges. (In *En Terre d'Islam,* Lyons. Janvier-Février, 1948. pp. 12-14).

Proposes solving the difficulties of the Arabic alphabet by forming a second alphabet for printing purposes.

II. ARABIA

YEMEN—STRONGHOLD OF ISLAMIC FEUDALISM. (In *The Middle East Bulletin,* New York. April 16, 1948. pp. 1-3).

Predicts isolationism will be eased under the new king but mediaeval despotism will continue.

III. HISTORY OF ISLAM

DOCUMENTS. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 339-350).

Texts of decrees reorganizing the central administration of the Protectorate of Morocco, June 21, 1947.

DEVELOPMENTS OF THE QUARTER: COMMENT AND CHRONOLOGY. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 319-338).

Covers March 1 to May 31, 1948.

"THE OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN." Charles E. Nowell. (In *Speculum,* Cambridge, Mass. October, 1947. pp. 497-519).

Tells of the dealings of the Assassins with the Christians during the Crusades.

LE PÈLERINAGE MUSULMAN. F. Pareja. (In *En Terre d'Islam,* Lyons. Janvier-Février, 1948. pp. 3-11).

Continues an article which appeared in 1946 (pp. 235-250)

and discusses rites, their pre-Islamic precedents and the experiences of pilgrims at different times in history.

IV. QUR'AN. TRADITION. THEOLOGY

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF IBN TUFAIL'S "HAIY IBN YAQZAN." 'Abdul Hamīd Khwāja. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. January, 1948. pp. 50-70).

An abridged translation of the allegory stressing the importance of intuition by an author who seems to have had deep influence on Leibniz and Spinoza.

SOME ASPECTS OF ISLAMIC POLITICAL THOUGHT. E. I. J. Rosenthal. (In *Islamic Culture,* Hyderabad. January, 1948. pp. 1-17).

Points out distinctions in the political systems of *sharī'a, siyāsa,* and the philosophers.

WHY SHOULD WE PRAY? M. A. Hamid. (In *The Islamic Review,* Woking. June, 1948. pp. 203-218).

A psychological interpretation of *Ṣalā,* or Muslim prayer.

V. RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL LIFE

THE ARAB MIDDLE CLASS. S. H. Longrigg. (In *The Arab World,* London. October, 1947).

A non-political study of present-day social trends.

BEDOUIN OF THE NEGEV. Eliahu Epstein. (In *The Jewish Frontier,* New York. March, 1948. pp. 30-34).

A valuable study of the nomads of the South Palestine desert.

THE COUP D'ÉTAT OF 1936. Majid Khadduri. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 270-293).

A study of Iraqi politics.

L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE S'ADAPTE AUX MASSES MUSULMANES EN ALGÉRIE. Pierre Mesnard. (In *Etudes,* Paris. Juin, 1948. pp. 346-363).

An historical account with special reference to l'École Normale de la Bouzaréa and the work of the White Fathers at Kabylia.

SOCIETY AND POLITICS IN MODERN EGYPTIAN LITERATURE. J. Heyworth-Dunne. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 306-318).

A bibliographical survey.

SYMPOSIUM ON SPANISH MOROCCO. Tomas Garcia Figueras. (In *Africa,* Madrid. August-October, 1947).

Deals with history, government, economic, educational and health problems and is profusely illustrated.

VI. POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS

AMERICAN AID TO THE MIDDLE EAST. Hans Heyman. (In *The Fortnightly,* London. February, 1948. pp. 96-101).

Believes a Marshall Plan for the Middle East would be bad politically and economically.

THE EXTERNAL PROBLEMS OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN IN ASIA. Sir Olaf Caroe. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1948. pp. 303-309).

The greatest need for both states is a stable North-Western frontier.

FRANCE'S FUTURE IN NORTH AFRICA. Vernon McKay. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 293-305).

French caution in striving to curb the autonomists may result in a colonial upheaval in this unstable age.

IRAQ BREAKS WITH BRITAIN. Jon Kimche. (In *The Nineteenth Century and After,* London. June, 1948. pp. 301-309).

Despite the signing of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty at Portsmouth, anti-British sentiment is rampant and Iraq is wide open to American and Russian influence.

PERSIA AND THE U.S.S.R. A. K. S. Lambton. (In the *World To-day,* London. March, 1948. pp. 97-102).

Analyses Soviet propaganda and intimidation methods operating in Iran.

PROGRESS REPORT ON INDIA AND PAKISTAN. Sir Percival Griffiths. (In *The Asiatic Review,* London. July, 1948. pp. 279-290).

Discouragement is still felt over the spread of Communism, the tension in Kashmir and weakness in administration, but affairs are really better than they were six months previously.

VII. PALESTINE

COMMUNIST TACTICS IN PALESTINE. Martin Ebon. (In *The Middle East Journal,* Washington, D. C. July, 1948. pp. 255-269).

Apparently the Soviet Union intends to turn dissatisfaction with the Western Powers to its own advantage.

THE FUTURE OF ARAB-JEWISH RELATIONS. Aubrey S. Eban. (In *Commentary,* New York. September, 1948. pp. 199-206).

"The key is cooperation of equal and separate states," so says the author, who is the representative of the Israeli government at the United Nations.

THE GREAT POWERS AND ISRAEL. (In *Commentary,* New York. June, 1948. pp. 485-497).

Comments on the American and British attitudes by Hal Lehrman and R. H. S. Crossman, M. P.

PALESTINE IN ASIA. (In *The Round Table,* London. June, 1948. pp. 643-648).

A plea for the establishment of Jewish local autonomy within a framework of Arab unity.

WHAT CHANCE FOR ARAB-JEWISH ACCORD? Robert Weltsch. (In *Commentary,* New York. July, 1948. pp. 8-17).

Anglo-American agreement is essential for any solution of the problem.

WHAT NEXT FOR THE ARAB LEAGUE? John Marlowe. (In *Commentary,* New York. October, 1948. pp. 305-312).

Responsibility for peace still rests with Great Britain and the United States.

VIII. MISSIONS TO MUSLIMS

CURTAIN UP ON IRAN. W. J. Thompson. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day,* London. September-October, 1948. pp. 269-272).

Christian medical and literature work are of supreme impor-

tance now that the field of education is practically closed to missioners, but more workers are desperately needed.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD. Noel and Doreen Hunt. (In *Egypt General Mission News,* London. May, 1948. pp. 37-68).

The Golden Jubilee annual report issue of the *News* presents an historical account of each mission showing a most inspiring accomplishment.

THE SHEIKH'S HOSPITAL. Paul W. Harrison. (In *World Dominion and The World To-day,* London. September-October, 1948. pp. 280-282).

A description of the work done at a small new hospital at Qatar, an offshoot of the Mason Memorial Hospital at Bahrain.

SOME NOTES ON EGYPTIAN CHRISTIANS. (In The *Eastern Churches Quarterly,* London. April-June, 1948. pp. 412-425).

Statistics and general information about the various churches —Coptic, Roman Catholic, Greek, Syrian, etc.,—and their leaders.