

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy

of Administration

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय

LIBRARY 102512

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No. ~~79834~~

वर्ग संख्या

Class No. 297

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No. D.8

GL 297
DOR



102512
LBSNAA

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING ISLAM

*Contemporary Apologetic of Islam
and Missionary Policy*

HARRY GAYLORD DORMAN, JR., PH.D.

TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION, NO. 940

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, 1948

COPYRIGHT, 1948, BY HARRY GAYLORD DORMAN

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO MY PARENTS

*who have always led their children forward
into paths of learning and investigation.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE PLAN for this study was originally suggested by Dr. Arthur Jeffery, to whom I am deeply grateful not only for introducing me to the field of polemic, but also for continued and helpful suggestions at the inception of the work and for encouragement by correspondence later. Since, however, most of the study and all of the final writing have been done at a great distance from him and without the benefit of his advice, he is in no way responsible for errors or weaknesses in the treatment. Dr. H. S. Elliott has been untiring in giving advice and guidance, especially in connection with the final chapter. My thanks are also due to Dr. R. B. Raup, Dr. E. E. Elder, Dr. E. G. Kraeling, and Dr. D. E. Roberts, for their criticism and encouragement. Dr. J. E. Merrill and Dr. F. E. Calverley have very kindly given help and advice at various points in the study. Finally, my deepest thanks go to one, without whose loving assistance in a hundred less technical ways, but especially in being a father as well as a mother to two small people at home, this work could never have been completed.

H. G. D., JR.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. ORIGINS OF THE POLEMIC APPROACH	3
II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLIER APOLOGETIC	10
1. First Contacts	10
2. The Early Christian Apologetic	13
3. The Early Muslim Apologetic	21
III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LATER APOLOGETIC	25
1. Later Christian Apologetic in the East	25
2. Later Muslim Apologetic	28
3. Western Apologetic	32
4. Methods and Results	39
IV. THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC: NEW CLASSICS	43
1. General Character of the Contemporary Muslim Apologetic	43
2. <i>Izhār al-haqq</i> , Rahmatallāh Al-Hindī	46
3. <i>Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khālīq</i> , ‘Abdurrahmān Bāshajizādah	57
4. <i>Lisān as-sidq</i> , ‘Alī Bahrānī	66
5. Muhammad ‘Abduh	71
V. THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC: VARIETIES	77
1. <i>Ar-radd ‘alā ad-dahriyyīn</i> , Jamāluddīn Afghānī	77
2. <i>Al-mustashriqūn wal-islām</i> , Husayn Hirrāwī	78
3. <i>Al-jawāb al-munīf</i> and <i>‘Ilm al-yaqīn</i>	81
4. <i>Khulāsāt al-kalām</i> and <i>Idrār ta ‘līm at-tawrāt wal-injīl</i>	83
5. Ahmad Malījī and Muhammad ‘Alī Malījī	86

CHAPTER	PAGE
6. Two tracts by 'Abdulqādir Iskandarānī	91
7. <i>Al-injīl was-salīb</i> , 'Abdulahad Dā'ūd	93
8. <i>The Religion of Islam</i> , A. A. Galwash	97
9. Four Concluding Examples	98
10. Ahmadiyya Polemic	102
11. Major Issues in the Polemic	109
 VI. THE BEARING OF THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC ON MIS- SIONARY POLICY	 114
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 132

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING ISLAM

*Contemporary Apologetic of Islam
and Missionary Policy*

INTRODUCTION

ISLAM and Christianity have faced each other through thirteen centuries as two great religious and cultural systems irreconcilably opposed. The two chief methods of opposition have been military force and polemic attack. In modern times the former method has been discredited at least in theory, but the latter persists. Controversy has been accepted by both sides from the earliest times as the natural way to prove that Islam is right and Christianity is wrong, or that Christianity is the true religion and Islam the false. Although the effectiveness of such controversy in a missionary approach has been seriously challenged for many years now, it is still found on both sides.

The contemporary apologetic of Islam is a considerable body of literature that has been appearing since the publication of *Izhār al-haqq*,* almost a century ago. The study of it is valuable first for the light it throws on the methods and achievements not only of the Muslim polemic but also of the Christian, which of course forms the whole background for the Muslim response. In the second place, the study of it makes possible a better understanding of the Muslim point of view and the attitudinal frames of Muslim thinking. Both these results have a bearing on the policy and practice of missionary work in Muslim countries.

The contemporary Muslim apologetic here means Muslim polemic attacks on Christianity and the apologetic replies to Christian polemic. It includes for our purposes a considerable amount of defensive apologetic material as well as the polemic attacks on the opposite position, but it does not attempt to include the whole field of Muslim systematic apologetic as such. This is by no means then a study of modern Muslim thought. It is a study of modern polemic and apologetic writing, and even here it has been limited

* The diacritical mark (.) under the roman transliterations ḥ, ṣ, ḍ, ṭ, and ẓ (ظ ط ص ح) has been omitted in this volume because of printing exigencies.

to the polemic material available in Arabic and the publications in English of the Indian Ahmadiyya movement. Polemic material in other languages, and movements of modern Islam that lie more outside the polemic field, it has not been possible to include in the scope of this work. Such are the reforming and religious movements of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Amir 'Ali, and Muhammad Iqbal in India, progressive trends in Turkey, and the new Muslim Brothers, *Al-ikhwān al-muslimūn*, in Egypt. These movements and others are of great importance for the understanding of modern Islam, but they fall outside the limits of the present study. Even within the polemic field, it has been necessary to concentrate on only a portion of the material rather than attempt a presentation of the whole of it. The principles by which the material was selected are explained below.¹

It would have been interesting to include also a review of Christian missionary thought in regard to the polemic approach to Muslims. Much has been written in recent years about it, and missionary practice has changed in many respects because of modifications of attitude toward controversy. A survey of missionary thought on the matter, however, is a study in itself. References to Christian missionary thinkers do appear in the last chapter, but there is no attempt to cover the field or to give a complete picture. The plan of the study is simple. It takes up first the origin of the polemic approach in Muhammad himself, and traces the chief strands of the developing apologetic through the centuries up to the modern period. It examines the modern apologetic of Islam in the examples selected. Finally it interprets the bearing of this apologetic on missionary policy and practice by identifying the issues that are involved and pointing to particular needs that the situation presents.

Quotations from the Qur'an are from the translation by Rodwell,² and the verse numbering is that used in his text. Quotations from the Bible are from the King James Version.

¹ Pages 44 f.

² J. M. Rodwell, transl. *The Koran*. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, 1924.

CHAPTER I

ORIGINS OF THE POLEMIC APPROACH

ISLAM has always been dealing with Christianity. There was never a time when it was independent of some sort of Christian reference. Even at its first appearance, when it must have seemed to its Byzantine and Persian contemporaries to have sprung forth suddenly fully formed and full-armed, it had been in its very formation developing in relation to Christian and Jewish elements. The roots of the controversy between Islam and Christianity go back to this earliest period, to the time when Muhammad was still constructing his religious and political system, and the Qur'an was still in process of revelation.

Arabia in the time just before Muhammad was by no means completely removed from the currents of thought and trade and political movement of the three great empires around it. "The Island of the Arabs" was surrounded by the activities of the Byzantine, the Persian, and the Abyssinian civilizations, of which the cultural pressure must have been felt quite definitely from time to time. Most of this cultural pressure was Christian, at least in name. Even the Persians, while theoretically anti-Christian, were usually very willing to further Nestorianism, the heresy exiled from the domains of the Byzantine emperor, at the expense of the orthodox Christianity of Constantinople or the Jacobite church of Syria. Some Arab tribes had become Christians,¹ but even where they were nominally so, they may not have been greatly influenced by the new religion.

Muhammad was born in Makka about A. D. 570. About 612 he began his prophetic career, and continued preaching in Makka

¹ See Richard Bell, *The Origin of Islam in Its Christian Environment*, pp. 16 and 27, 1926. Also G. W. Thatcher, "Arabia: History," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. 2, p. 178, 1943. Also Louis Cheikho, *An-nasrāniyya wa-ādābuhā bayn 'arab al-jāhiliyya*, p. 124, 1925.

without marked success until 622, the year of the *Hijra*, or "Flight," when he escaped with his band of followers to Madīna. Here, with gradually increasing success, his position became so strong not only locally but through much of Arabia that after eight years he was able to return in triumph to Makka. At his death two years later, in 632, he was the acknowledged Prophet and Lord of practically all the Arabian peninsula.

Without attempting to trace the growth of the new religious movement or the spiritual development of its Prophet, we shall merely indicate briefly some of the chief ways in which the Christian influences in Arabia at the beginning of the seventh century contributed to Muhammad's thought, but also drove him into bitter attacks on Christianity which marked the beginning of the controversy between the Christians and the Muslims. The extent of direct Christian and Jewish influence on Muhammad and the Qur'an is not certain, but it is clear that the chief source of monotheistic thought at the beginning of his career was not direct contacts with Christians or Jews but the general background of the Jewish and Christian atmosphere that had spread through Arabia. Muhammad knew of the Judaeo-Christian tradition in general but not in detail, at least at first. It is clear, too, from a study of the suras of the Qur'an when they are rearranged in the approximate chronological order of their pronouncement, that Muhammad's knowledge about Judaism and Christianity was acquired gradually throughout his life. At first he seems not to have distinguished between Jews and Christians except in a very general way, believing their religious faith to be identical, the religion of "the Book," as they are "the People of the Book." Only later does he begin to gather information about the Old Testament stories, and still later to differentiate the New Testament from the Old.

The strongest current in the religious expression of the earlier passages in the Qur'an is the interest in eschatology and the warnings about the Day of Judgment. The descriptions of the tortures of the wicked serve as a basis for the exhortation to worship God and obey his commands and accept his Prophet. This deep fear of God appears almost as Muhammad's fundamental religious experience. It is strongly reminiscent of the background of the

Christian asceticism in the East. Throughout the monastic movement, but also in popular Christianity of many types in the East, the bases of religious life are found in fear of God, fear of committing sin, fear of being held accountable at the Last Day. The descriptions of the Judgment Day that are found in the Qur'an are in many details reminiscent of the Christian apocalyptic books that were in wide circulation during Muhammad's time, though it is probable the ideas for these descriptions came to the Prophet by oral transmission, and that he did not have access to the original texts themselves.

The Qur'an's description of the delights of paradise for those who receive the reward of their faithfulness after death is given in terms which, while in later centuries regarded as typical of Islam, are nevertheless directly reminiscent of the earlier descriptions of Afrem, or Ephraim the Syrian (fl. A. D. 365), the great preacher of the East who painted in brilliant colors the delights of paradise, where the blessed, anointed with sweet unguents, banqueted beneath trees bearing all manner of delicious fruits, while flowers sprang up on every hand. Afrem was respected alike by Monophysites and Nestorians; but several other indications point to the fact that the Christian influences that played upon Muhammad were Nestorian in origin, as, for example, the statement in the Qur'an that the souls of the dead are unconscious between the time of their death and the Day of Judgment, when it will appear to the awakened souls that they have only just died. This belief was characteristically Nestorian.² It is probable that Christian influences in Makka came through the Christian Arabs of Hira, who were Nestorian, and through the Nestorians of Najran in the south of Arabia. A tradition quite possibly well founded has it that Muhammad heard a Nestorian preacher at one of the great fairs of 'Ukāz near Makka.

When Muhammad began to understand something of the content of the Old Testament, especially after he came in close contact with the three Jewish tribes in Madīna, the histories of the prophets and the patriarchs appealed to him mightily, especially those aspects of the stories that showed God's punishment upon the un-

² Tor Andrae, *Mohammed, the Man and His Faith*, transl. by Theophil Menzel, p. 123, 1936.

believing people who rejected the prophet sent especially to them. Such accounts fitted in exactly with his conception of his own prophetic function and were good material to use against those who were still refusing to accept his message. But these stories, as well as other material that obviously stems originally from the Bible, are often so strangely garbled and changed that it is difficult to imagine where he might have got his curious information. Some of the distortion is perhaps due to stories and conceptions that originated among early heretical sects of Christianity and Judaism; and yet Muhammad was probably more closely in touch with the Nestorianism of the Persian Empire and the official Christianity of the Roman Empire than with any other form. Another part of the explanation of this curious inaccuracy is the fact that Muhammad's knowledge of both Judaism and Christianity is a knowledge of a popular variety of religion, which, while not always actually heretical, tends to veer away from the orthodox norm, with emphasis on the traditions of rabbinic Judaism and on the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings that were popular in the Christian church communities of the early centuries of our era. To influences of this popular character Muhammad seems to have been very receptive, so much so that it appears that the more systematic and official aspects of Christian and Jewish doctrine were not available to him at all. In the earlier part of his Madīna period, he was constantly seeking information from Jews and Christians, and questioning them on the stories in the scriptures. His eagerness for information, some of which might turn out to be incorrect, is ridiculed by his enemies, as reported in the Qur'an itself: "And the infidels say, 'This Qur'an is a mere fraud of his own devising, and others have helped him with it. . . . Tales of the ancients that he hath put in writing; and they were dictated to him morn and even.' " ³

There are traditions that Muhammad was often in contact with a Christian monk who gave him instruction, and that he made business trips to Syria, where he would have seen churches and had the opportunity to talk with many Christians. Such traditions appear in a very doubtful light in view of Muhammad's distorted information about the Christian sacraments, the Christian serv-

³ Qur'an 25 : 5 f.

ices, and the Christian doctrine. He believed, for example, that the trinity consisted of God the Father, Mary the Mother, and Christ the Son. How this concept arose in his mind is not easy to say. The extreme forms of Mariolatry, especially among such sects as the Collyridians, and such expressions as "Mother of God," may have been one source of it. Others have seen in the fact that the Aramaic word for "spirit" is feminine, a possible explanation of how the Virgin Mary was substituted for the Holy Spirit. It is certain that Aramaic and Syriac religious vocabularies contributed greatly to the religious concepts in the Qur'an. Jeffery has shown in his study of the foreign vocabulary of the Qur'an how large the debt of Muhammad was to other languages than Arabic. Syriac, the language of those Christian groups most closely in touch with the Arabs, is the source of the largest group of the borrowed words.⁴

Muhammad must have been well advanced in the formulation of his conception of prophethood when he discovered the account of the crucifixion, for it horrified him, it being totally inconceivable that God could allow his Messenger to be thus humiliated and tortured by his enemies. The account, he says, is simply a lie, and he explains its origin in the following words of the Qur'an: "And for their saying, 'Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, an Apostle of God.' Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not, but they had only his likeness [literally, 'he was counterfeited to them']. . . . And they did not really slay him, but God took him up to Himself."⁵ This denial of the crucifixion may reflect an early heretical tradition, for although Docetism had probably disappeared from the East long before Muhammad's time, Manichaean ideas persisted, and both Mani and Basilides had taught that another person was changed to resemble Christ, took his place, and was crucified instead of him. (Basilides taught that Simon of Cyrene was the one substituted.)

Muhammad's attitude toward Christians underwent during his career a gradual change that can be traced through the suras of the Qur'an. In the early period he shows respect for the piety of anchorites and priests who are continually praising God. "In the

⁴ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, p. 19, 1938.

⁵ Qur'an 4: 156.

temples which God hath allowed to be reared, that His name may therein be remembered, do men praise Him morn and even. Men whom neither merchandise nor traffic beguile from the remembrance of God, and from the observance of prayer.”⁶ He shows regard for churches and monasteries as well as mosques in the following passage: “And if God had not repelled some men by others, cloisters, and churches, and oratories. and mosques, wherein the name of God is ever commemorated, would surely have been destroyed.”⁷

In Madīna Muhammad had perhaps more contacts with Christians than in Makka, but his knowledge of them was still limited. Early in the Madīna period Jews and Christians were equally esteemed by him, and he speaks to them as though speaking to men on a par with each other and with his own people: “Say: O people of the Book! come ye to a just judgment between us and you [literally ‘a word fair between us and you’], that we worship not aught but God and that we join no other god with Him, and that the one of us take not the other for lords, beside God.”⁸ As Muhammad came to know the Jews better, however, and realized that their teachings were not in accordance with Islam, he attacked them for corrupting the word of God sent down to them and for refusing to accept his mission. At this second stage he was still believing that Christians were more nearly related to the true religion of God and his Prophet than the Jews had shown themselves to be. “Of all men thou wilt certainly find the Jews, and those who join other gods with God, to be the most intense in hatred of those who believe; and thou shalt certainly find those to be nearest in affection to them who say, ‘We are Christians.’ This, because some of them are priests and monks, and because they are free from pride.”⁹ But as he came in closer touch with Christian communities, he came to realize that they were irreconcilably opposed to joining with him, and that agreement between their beliefs and Islam was quite impossible. He attacked them too, now, for changing their scriptures just as the Jews had done, and he warned his followers against associating with them, in a verse

⁶ *Ibid.*, 24 : 6 f.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 22 : 41.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 3 : 57.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 5 : 85.

that has had bitter consequences throughout the centuries: "O Believers! Take not the Jews or Christians as friends. They are but one another's friends. If any one of you taketh them for his friends, he surely is one of them! God will not guide the evil-doers." ¹⁰ In the end, utterly disillusioned about them all, he includes Christians and Jews together in one great curse, enjoining the faithful to fight them and subdue them by force: "Make war upon such of those to whom the Scriptures have been given as believe not in God, or in the last day, and who forbid not that which God and His Apostle have forbidden, and who profess not the profession of the truth, until they pay tribute out of hand, and they be humbled. The Jews say, 'Ezra (Ozair) is a son of God'; and the Christians say, 'The Messiah is a son of God.' Such the sayings in their mouths! They resemble the saying of the Infidels of old! God do battle with them! How they are misguided!" ¹¹ The polemic of Islam against Christian teaching has begun. War is declared, and the lines of battle are laid out in the Qur'an itself even before its compilation is complete.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 5 : 56.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 9 : 29 f.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLIER APOLOGETIC

1. *First Contacts*

THE first contacts of Christianity with Islam outside of Arabia proper were the contacts of the conquered with their conquerors. The Arab armies, sweeping into Syria in the middle of the seventh century, found an old and prosperous civilization, defended but feebly by the armies of the emperor Heraclius. The victorious occupation of the country was hardly completed before definite attitudes were being shown by the Christian inhabitants toward Islam, and the first feelings of the Christians toward their new masters are instructive. Politically, many were not sorry to see the change in rule; for the exactions of Constantinople, and especially the religious persecutions through which the emperor had hoped to reconcile to orthodox Christianity his heretical provincials by persuasion and by force, had strongly alienated the Nestorians and Jacobites and Copts who made up most of the population of the lands now overrun by the Muslim arms. Perhaps the new conquerors would prove easier masters. From the point of view of religion, they may not have seemed to the conquered very different from the Byzantine rulers, for Islam appeared not unlike a new Christian heresy, a new Arianism come to add its peculiarities to the array of Christian sects ranged against the orthodoxy of Constantinople. With its wild, untutored leaders, its utter lack of a systematic scholastic philosophy to support it, and its confessed reverence for Christ, it did not constitute at the outset a serious threat to the peace of mind of the Eastern clergy. As a matter of course there were turned upon it at once the same arguments which the orthodox church had used on heretics through the long years of controversy. To such an extent was

this done that the Christian polemic against heretics is indistinguishable both in manner and in approach from the early Christian polemic against Islam.¹

From the first, the political aspect of the situation seems to have overshadowed all else. The Christians being on the defensive against the invader, the earliest polemic seeks, not so much to convert anyone from Islam as to convince the Muslim leaders that Christianity is plausible and respectable, worthy of consideration as a recognized system of thought. It consists of arguing, not preaching. Indeed, as we approach this early Christian polemic, we should not think of it as missionary in the modern sense. The feeble and divided church was far from able either to initiate or to sustain an active missionary program toward Islam. There were no missions to Islam as we understand the term. The Christians who were living in lands under Muslim rule were weak communities whose very existence was no more than tolerated by their masters. The danger of their situation made them glad enough to preserve the status quo without stirring up trouble. The Christian communities, moreover, were expressly forbidden to proselytize, while the Muslim apostate could expect only the death penalty by law. In spite of this, there grew up a well-developed polemic largely with the purpose of apologetic, an offensive action for the sake of defense. And at the same time, along with this main purpose of defense against an encroaching enemy, there are some undoubted indications, rare though they be, of an effort toward conversion of Muslims.

In the very first recorded controversial discussion, that of the patriarch John I of Antioch and 'Amr ibn al-'Ās, the Muslim asks the questions and keeps the offensive, and this is to a great extent the case throughout later controversy. Here as elsewhere, arguments are often used just to silence the Muslim or to get rid of him; there seems to be little thought of conversion or conviction. For example, characteristic of the dialogues of John of Damascus and Abū Qurrā are such phrases as these: "I know what is in your mind," "If he asks, reply thus," and "When, under pressure, he

¹ C. H. Becker, "Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 26 : 175-95, 1912.

replies.”² These are indicative of a spirit that dominates most of the polemic, a spirit of eagerness for victory in the field of intellectual dispute and a coldness toward the spiritual needs of the opponent.

As the earliest debate is typical of others, we shall look at it in some detail. This first formal attempt of Islam to come in serious contact with the Christian church leaders gives us a suggestion of the type of relationship that existed between the two faiths throughout the medieval period. On May 8, 639, a colloquy took place between the Jacobite patriarch John and the great Arab general ‘Amr ibn al-‘Ās, who was fresh from his conquest of North Syria and about to complete the subjection of Mesopotamia.³ The patriarch, officially summoned by the victorious general, came with a great company of Christians not only of his own Jacobite flock but of all the Christian sects who were supporting him and begging him to speak for them and for all Christians, recognizing the “magnitude of the danger and the peril that threatened, if God in His mercy should not visit His Church.”⁴ Present also were representatives of three Christian Arab desert tribes, for whom there was a particular poignancy in this debate between the leader of their brethren of the desert and the protagonist of their fellow Christians of the conquered countries. ‘Amr had a straightforward purpose in this colloquy with John, a purpose characteristic of a man of military action and political aims with no interest in the intricacies of theological debate. He neither expected to change the fundamentals of the Christian faith nor, far less, “to submit Islam to the scrutiny” of men of a faith hostile to it. ‘Amr’s plan was to win over the Christians in a block. He hoped that without too much disturbance of their previous loyalties they could be induced to acknowledge that there was no God but God and that Muhammad was his Prophet. To this end he commanded the patriarch to have a translation made of the *injīl*, the gospel, into Arabic, omitting all references to Christ’s divinity, to baptism, and to the cross; but when John refused to change any jot or tittle in the translating, ‘Amr capitulated and said,

² See pages 15 f., for an example of a tract of John of Damascus.

³ F. Nau, “Un Colloque du Patriarche Jean.” *Journal Asiatique*, XI, v : 225-79, 1915.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

"Write as you please." ⁵ He at first hoped that the Arabic translation, emasculated of the three difficult points, would win over the Arab Christian tribesmen, but when he saw it would make trouble, he abandoned the plan and turned his attention to the drawing up of a pact of mutual assistance between the Muslims and the Jacobites.

On the other hand, the purpose and hope of the patriarch in this colloquy is brought out clearly in the report of it which John sent out to the various churches afterward; in this report the importance of the meeting is emphasized, the significance of those present is stressed, and then the readers are urged to "pray unceasingly for us with zeal, and beseech the Lord that in His mercy He visit His Church and His people, and that Christ give to this matter the issue that is according to His will, that He aid His Church and comfort His people." ⁶ There is no hint here of any hope that Muslims might be drawn to Christ, or even that such a thought had been in the mind of the patriarch during the discussion. Instead of an aggressive missionary purpose, the whole aim seems to have been to preserve the status quo, if that were possible.

The course of the colloquy followed a few simple questions put by the Arab general with the answers of John to them. Some Old Testament texts are presented by the patriarch as prophecies of Christ, but 'Amr passes on to inquire about the details of the Christian law. Are they found in the *injil*? John says that Christians have laws that are just and right, agreeing with the teachings of the gospel and the canons of the apostles and the laws of the church. He does not attempt to claim that the laws themselves are found in the *injil*.

2. *The Early Christian Apologetic*

During the first century of the Arab Empire, under the Umayyads, the polemic approach was developed by both Muslims and Christians. Although only a few shreds remain from this early time, the polemic at the end of the first century is already so well developed that it points to an earlier period of growth. One of

⁵ The translation was probably completed in May and June of 639.

⁶ Nau, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

the first of the well-developed apologetic works (if, as is probable, its authenticity can be established) is the letter written by the Byzantine Emperor Leo III, the Isaurian (717-741), to the Caliph 'Umar II (717-720) in answer to the caliph's polemic letter to the emperor. We know the letter chiefly through an Armenian text that may be as late as the tenth century.⁷ Already many of the points raised in the later polemic are to be found in this early letter. Leo first takes up objections brought by 'Umar against Christianity, especially the attack on the Old Testament as having been corrupted and changed at several points in the history of the Jews. He expounds some of the prophecies of Christ in the prophets and the Psalms, and denies any prophecy of Muhammad in the name "Paraclete."⁸ The divinity of Christ is defended, and Christ's words in the gospels which seem to deny it are shown to point to the other side of his nature, that is, his humanitarian side. Religious observances that the caliph had attacked are also defended—communion, the observance of Sunday as a holy day rather than the Jewish sabbath, and the veneration of holy relics, the saints, and the cross. The necessity for circumcision is denied. Leo then proceeds to a bitter attack on Muslim customs of polygamy and divorce, and especially concubinage. He explains that the prophecy of Muhammad that Muslims find in Isaiah 21 : 6 f.⁹ is a far-fetched interpretation of a passage that has a wholly different significance. It is hard to believe that this work represents the original letter of Leo without additions, for in it the Muslim exegesis of Christian scripture seems to have reached an advanced stage at an early date. Some of these points may be a reflection of later Muslim polemic investigations.

The first polemic writer on the Christian side whose original works are preserved for us without serious doubt of later change is John of Damascus, Ibn Mansūr (ca. 700-749). Compendious dogmatic writer of the Greek church and protagonist against the iconoclasts, John represents in his works the whole world of

⁷ Arthur Jeffery, "Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III." *The Harvard Theological Review*, 37 : 269-332, 1944.

⁸ On the Muslim interpretation of "Paraclete," see page 89.

⁹ "For thus hath the Lord said unto me, Go, set a watchman, let him declare what he seeth. And he saw a chariot with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of asses, and a chariot of camels; and he hearkened diligently with much heed."

thought of the oriental church of his time.¹⁰ He lived in the midst of the busy Damascene life, honored by the caliphs, especially Hishām, and only later did he retire to a lonely monastery to study and to write. He represents the late Umayyad period as his disciple Abū Qurrā represents the early Abbasid. Both of them show a better knowledge of the Qur'an and the Hadīth, or Traditions, than do their successors, and both are surprisingly accurate in attacking the weak points in Islam. John, looking upon it as "the youngest Christian heresy," discusses it in his *De Haeresibus*. The subjects he chooses for discussion, as well as his treatment of them, are characteristic of almost all the subsequent polemic, the same arguments being used again and again throughout the centuries. The chief points he takes up are: monotheism as a denial of Christ's divinity, the doctrine of the two natures, the freedom of the will, the Qur'an as revealed, the prophethood of Muhammad, paradise, and examples of Islamic law. Both he and Abū Qurrā are clearly in close touch with the Arab sources, depending directly on the Qur'an, and occasionally on the Hadīth.

A brief outline of one of John's tracts will give an example of the answers with which John advises his followers to meet the questions of Muslims and overwhelm them with confusion. The *Disputatio Saraceni et Christiani*¹¹ opens with a question put by the Saracen: What is the cause of evil and of good? Answer: God is the cause of good, the devil and we men of evil. Free will is a source of evil. But you Saracens say God is the author of evil, and so is unjust in causing men to sin. The Saracens try to prove that God is the author of evil, by asking who forms children in the womb; if God does, then he is cooperating with the fornicator. But we Christians say that God created all things in the first week, and then allowed men to reproduce themselves; thus the fornicator alone is responsible. The Saracen then asks: Did Jesus die willingly, or unwillingly? If he died willingly, the Christians should worship the Jews, not hate them, since they did God's will. But the Christian answer is that Jesus' death was not willed by God; it was only permitted and suffered, just as he suffers us

¹⁰ See Becker, *op. cit.*, pp. 175 ff., sec. 1.

¹¹ J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 96, cols. 1335-1348. Compare the longer dialogues, *ibid.*, Vol. 94, cols. 1585-1598.

to do things which are against his will. John goes on to advise his people that if they are asked, "Whom do you say Christ is?" they should answer, "The Word of God." The Saracen cannot deny this, as it is in the Qur'an. Insist too, he says, on the Saracen's telling what the Qur'an says of him, "Word" and "Spirit" from God. Ask the Saracen if the Word and the Spirit were created. If so, had God no Spirit and Word before their creation? Further questions of the Saracen are: How was God in the womb? How did Christ eat, drink, and sleep, if he was God?

The bond between John of Damascus and his disciple was formed in a cloister. At the monastery of Mar Saba, set in the face of a cliff deep in the wild rocky wastes of the wilderness of Judaea, where today one may visit the tomb of John of Damascus and the cell where he wrote and died, Theodore Abū Qurrā came under the literary influence of the great master, and perhaps even knew him personally. These two are the only ones of the earlier Byzantine polemicists who lived and worked away from Constantinople, in close contact with the Muslims. Mar Saba, a stronghold of orthodox Melkite Christianity, and a great nursery of bishops for the patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, was the natural mother of John, protagonist of Christianity against the Muslims in Umayyad Syria, and of Abū Qurrā, bishop of Harran in Abbasid Mesopotamia.¹²

Abū Qurrā (ca. 740-825) wrote not only in Greek, but in Arabic and Syriac as well. Occasionally we find in his works the very arguments and examples that John of Damascus used, and to the title of one tractate Abū Qurrā adds the words, "*ex ore Joannis Damasceni*," in acknowledgment of his debt to his teacher.¹³ Some of the Arabic works take up the subjects of free will, the trinity, prophecy, and miracles, the inspiration of scripture, and christology.¹⁴ The Greek works are on similar topics, besides attacking the mission of Muhammad, the so-called prophecies about him, the practice of polygamy, and so on. In one of these Abū Qurrā, answering the question of a Saracen, bases Christian belief squarely upon the miracles of Christ. The Saracen compares

¹² See Constantin Bacha, *Un traité des Oeuvres Arabes de Théodore Abou-Kurra*.

¹³ See page 17, fn. 15.

¹⁴ Bacha, *op. cit.*

Muhammad with Moses and Christ, saying that if Moses advanced the people from idolatry, and Christ advanced the Jews beyond Judaism, how can Muhammad be rejected, who advanced men to Islam? Abū Qurrā answers that the reason for belief in Christ and Moses was not simply that they proclaimed and taught; nor can we say that Muhammad must also be believed because he proclaimed and taught. Hear the reason for believing each of them: Moses and Christ were both believed, not because of what they taught, but because they brought signs and did miracles. By this standard, concludes Abū Qurrā, Muhammad has no place.¹⁵ This attitude toward revelation and the grounds for belief and faith, characteristic as it is of many of the Christian apologists, ancient and modern, is rarely found expressed in so absolute a form as here, where the life and teachings of Christ seem completely discounted. The apparent lack of miracles on the part of Muhammad was something the Muslims were able to remedy before many years had passed.

The most celebrated of Abū Qurrā's discussions on Islam is his colloquy with Muslim divines before the Caliph Ma'mūn, about 820 or 825.¹⁶ Though not a protagonist, the caliph shows keen interest in the debate, and a broad tolerance and nobility. The argument follows this general outline: Beginning with christology, Abū Qurrā quotes the Qur'an 3 : 40 and 4 : 169 to show that Christ is the Word of God, and a Spirit from himself. The Muslim quotes Christ's words, "My Father and your Father, my God and your God" (John 20 : 17) to show that Christ was purely man, whereupon Abū Qurrā enters into a long justification of the incarnation. Later he turns to the worship of the wood of the True Cross, and justifies it by comparison with the worship of the Black Stone of Makka. The Muslims return to christology and the doctrine of the trinity by asking whether God was deprived of his Word and Spirit while Jesus lived. Abū Qurrā replies that God is not defined locally; his presence and his movements are incomprehensible.

Finally, the freedom of the will is lightly touched upon in much

¹⁵ Migne, *op. cit.*, Vol. 94, op. 18, "*Ex eiusdem concertationibus cum Saracenis, ex ore Joannis Damasceni.*"

¹⁶ See Alfred Guillaumc, "A Debate between Christian and Moslem Doctors." *Centenary Supplement of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 233-44, 1924.

the same arguments that we have met in John of Damascus. Though man's free will is so largely denied in the Hadīth, it is admitted here (as generally in Islam) that man is responsible for his actions. There is no definite conclusion to the debate, a fact which is not surprising inasmuch as the two sides did not begin with definitions, and thus were constantly disagreeing on meanings. Neither was able to come to real grips with the other.¹⁷

We turn from these beginnings of orthodox Byzantine polemic in Greek to the polemic of the heretical churches that were also attacking Islam. In Syria and in Mesopotamia the Jacobites and the Nestorians were carrying on a polemic, partly in Syriac, but largely in Arabic, against the Muslims under whose rule they lived. Typical of the dialogue style of argument is the one which Graf, discounting as spurious earlier colloquies and discussions mentioned above, calls the earliest extant actually occurring dialogue, the *Disputatio* of the Nestorian Catholicos, Timothy I, with the Caliph Mahdī, about 781. This is in the form of a letter preserved in both Arabic and Syriac manuscripts.¹⁸

The case for Christianity is made to depend almost entirely on the Old Testament prophecies of Christ, and on the miracles of the Old and the New Testament. Timothy claims that the Old Testament contains the whole of Christian teaching, and since there is no prophecy in it of Muhammad, he must therefore be a false prophet. He goes much further when he says, "One prophecy of Muhammad in the *injil* would have made me leave it for the Qur'an," an attitude which of course within a few years brought forth claims that the Old and the New Testament did indeed contain numerous prophecies of the Prophet of Arabia. In less than a century, 'Tabarī was pointing out many such texts,¹⁹ and even in this dialogue we see the beginning of such attempts. As for the reliance on miracles, such arguments as Timothy's (and Abū Qurrā's, as we saw above) were soon to bring forth accounts

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

¹⁸ Georg Graf, "Christliche Polemik gegen den Islam." *Gelbe Hefte*, II, 2: 825 ff., sec. 1, 1926. See also A. Mingana, "The Apology of Timothy the Patriarch before the Caliph Mahdi." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 12: 137-298, 1928. Also L. E. Browne, "The Patriarch Timothy and the Caliph Al-Mahdi." *The Moslem World*, 21: 38-45, 1931.

¹⁹ See page 22.

of miracles done by Muhammad, in traditions dating chiefly from the middle of the next century.²⁰

Timothy makes no difference between the morality of the New and the Old Testament, but praises Muhammad for fighting for God not with the word only, but with the sword too, and for killing infidels as Moses slew the worshipers of the golden calf.²¹ His praise of Muhammad is strong. Mahdī asks, "What think you of Muhammad?" and Timothy says: "Muhammad deserves the praise of the Arabs, for he walked with them on the way of the prophets, and he taught them monotheism as the other prophets did, and he even taught the trinity in mentioning the Word and Spirit of God." The caliph answers naturally enough, "Then you must accept his teaching too." In his theology also Timothy appears similarly anxious to conciliate and to discover common ground.

In the very first rank of Christian attacks on Islam stands the *Apology* of 'Abd al-masīh al-Kindī,²² a work of great force and insight. Kindī, apparently a Nestorian, wrote about 820 or 830, and his direct attack on the weaknesses of Islam makes no pretense to speculative philosophy. His treatise purports to be written "in answer to" a letter addressed to him by the Muslim 'Abdallāh ibn Ismā'il al-Hāshimī, who sets forth in it the beauties of Islam, and expresses his amicable purpose to bring his friend to his own beliefs that they may be united in faith. Kindī's answer is forceful, his dialectic excellent, his criticism incisive. After a brief presentation of the doctrine of the trinity, he considers Muhammad's claim to prophethood. Muhammad's life is taken up in outline, his warlike and plundering expeditions, the assassinations he commanded, the disaster at Uhud, his wives and their jealousy of one another. Miracles and prophecy in the sense of foretelling are wanting as evidences of Muhammad's divine mission, and miracles are disclaimed in the Qur'an itself. The Qur'an is then attacked, the histories about its collection and its recensions at the hands of many showing it to be not of divine origin, and the foreign words in it proving that it is not written in a miraculously

²⁰ L. E. Browne, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*, pp. 121 f., 1933.

²¹ L. E. Browne, "The Patriarch Timothy and the Caliph Al-Mahdī." *The Moslem World*, 21 : 43, 1931.

²² Sir William Muir, transl., *Apology of Al-Kindy*.

pure, exalted language. In poetical rhythm it is far from perfect; in matter it reveals no new truth; in short, it could be thought a miracle only by rude tribesmen. Next, the ceremonial commands are considered, and compared with the Christian emphasis on inner purity. The pilgrimage and the rites in Makka are called idolatrous. Finally, Kindī gives an account of the Christian faith, beginning with the faithfulness and reliability of the Old Testament and its prophecies, and proceeding to the coming of Christ, his birth, his ministry, and his teaching, with frequent quotations from the Qur'an to show the truth of the New Testament. The account of the spread of Christianity leads up to Kindī's final appeal to believe in Christ.

Kindī covers in masterly manner almost the whole field of what came to be the traditional arguments of the Christian polemic writers against Islam. The fact that this treatise is written "in answer to" a Muslim letter suggests what appears so often elsewhere in the history of the polemic, that is, that the field and scope of the argument, as well as the tone and atmosphere of it, were usually set by Islam, and that Christianity answered in defense, arguing on Islamic grounds.

Just after Kindī there begins a philosophic handling of polemic discussion that grew out of the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The first Christian protagonist of this type is Hunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 873), a Nestorian, who has a brief but full treatise on the truth of Christianity. He gives four criteria of a revealed religion as the reasons for its acceptance: first, miracles; second, the consistency of the teaching; third, compelling proofs; fourth, the lasting ethical worth of the religion; and he shows how Christianity comes up to these requirements. After Hunayn the Christian philosophic school of apologetic continues to develop until it reaches its high point in the Jacobite Yahyā ibn 'Ādī (d. 974), a compendious writer, of whose eighty-five original works fifty are extant, thirty-nine being very polemic in character. Yahyā is typical of the school he founded in his tendency to use Islamic methods and thus base Christian apologetic, even the explanation of the trinity, on Aristotelian logic and syllogism. His dialectic weapons draw on the Aristotelian doctrine of thought and being, and to a lesser extent on Neo-Platonism, to show that Christian

dogma agrees with the principle of reason.²³ For example, Yahyā says that God is one in one respect, but various in another, and that the three Persons of the Trinity are substantial attributes, i.e., existence, wisdom, and living, as distinguished from the relative attributes of divinity, such as seeing, hearing, mercy, and righteousness. He illustrates the doctrine of the trinity by analogies showing that the Three-in-One is like the potential intellect, the active intellect, and the passive intellect, or that it is like the sun, the sunlight, and the warmth of the sun.²⁴ Yahyā's school of thought continues in his disciples Ibn Zur'ā, Yahyā ibn Jarīr, and others, and later in the three Ibn al-'Assāl brothers in Egypt in the thirteenth century. Its influence is felt in even later writers.

One later colloquy combines the popular form of the earlier dialogues with the learned and philosophic content of the school of Yahyā. This is the series of conversations "in seven sittings" between the Nestorian metropolitan Elias of Nisibis and the vizier Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Husayn, in 1026. In these discussions we note two points of interest. The first is the attack on the doctrine of the *i'jāz*, or miraculous perfection, of the Qur'an, by the attempt of Elias to show the superiority of Syriac, which is considered to be the language of Christianity, over Arabic, the language of the Qur'an. Syriac, it is claimed, is more excellent in script, in grammar, and in usage, and thus the Qur'an is far from perfect linguistically, and is no divine miracle in itself. The second point is Elias' attempt to conciliate his opponent by a vague philosophic interpretation of the trinity. He explains the dogma "one nature and three persons" to mean "self-existent possessor of life and wisdom," and in this description of the Deity the Muslim vizier concurs. It is difficult to see, however, that there remains anything characteristically Christian in Elias' formula.

3. *The Early Muslim Apologetic*

Meanwhile the polemic on the Muslim side was being handled by several able writers, of whom we shall notice the most important. 'Alī Tabarī was a Nestorian convert to Islam, who in the year 855 wrote his famous apologetic *The Book of Religion and*

²³ Graf, *op. cit.*, sec. 3.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

Empire.²⁵ It was a time of strict orthodoxy in Abbasid Baghdad, when the Caliph Mutawakkil was carrying on a persecution of non-Muslims and heretical Mu'tazilites equally; but instead of a polemic of bitterness and abuse we find Tabari's work a serious and not unfriendly approach. There is, in fact, no attack as such upon Christianity, but a positive presentation of Islam as a religion to be respected and honored. "If the proofs that we have for believing in our Prophet," he says, "are the same as those they possess for believing in theirs, they will have no excuse before God and before their own conscience for disbelieving in our Prophet, though believing in theirs."²⁶ He bases his argument on the miracles of Muhammad and of Christ, and claims that since the records of the miracles of Muhammad are more recent and more trustworthy, Christians should accept Muhammad's prophethood. He gives a long list of Muhammad's miracles, for example, making animals speak and causing trees to move their position, and another list of Old Testament passages that he says refer to the coming of Muhammad. In answering some attacks on Islam, he defends the principle of *jihād*, or holy war, by comparing it with the wars of the Old Testament, and he upholds the teaching that there are physical joys in heaven by Christ's words at the Last Supper: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."²⁷ In concluding he tries to take a completely impartial position, and claims that if a Chinese or an Indian were to come to this country seeking truth, and were to be presented with brief descriptions of the different religious sects (which he proceeds most interestingly to give), the stranger would certainly choose Islam. He closes with a plea to Christians and others to accept these arguments, and enter Islam.

Another polemic writing of about the same date is of a different sort. Jāhiz is a great name in Arabic literature, for the man was encyclopaedic in knowledge as well as versatile and able in style. Apparently devoid of principles and ideals, in a time of religious

²⁵ 'Alī ibn Rabbān Tabarī, *The Book of Religion and Empire*, transl. by A. Mingana, 1922.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁷ Luke 22 : 30.

and political tensions he was able to avoid too open a declaration of his essential skepticism, and wrote in popular vein to express other people's views better than they themselves could. "He simply drowned his sympathy in the wealth of his knowledge. This is essentially the Jāhizian idea: to write anything about everything, and be affected by nothing."²⁸ This *Risāla*, or tract, was written perhaps at the command of the Caliph Mutawakkil, and in it Jāhiz pours out to Muslims invective against Christianity not merely as a false religion, but as a social evil in the body politic. His great literary ability makes him an expert in hitting straight at the most vulnerable spots of the opposition. He attacks the pride and wealth and position of the Christians in Baghdad, their freedom of speech and their insults to Islam. The doctrine of the trinity he lampoons pitilessly. "Even if one were to exert all his zeal, and summon all his intellectual resources with a view to learn the Christian teachings about Jesus, he would still fail to comprehend the nature of Christianity, especially its doctrine concerning the Divinity. . . . Faith must be based on the unqualified submission to the authority of the book, and on following blindly the traditions of old. And, by my life, any man who would profess a faith like Christianity would of necessity have to offer blind submission as an excuse."²⁹

In the eleventh century Spain contributes an important apologist in Ibn Hazm (d. 1064). His excellent and compendious book on the history and comparison of religions treats of Christianity in two places, once among the polytheisms and once among the religions that have a revealed book. His special interest and ability lie in his attack on the Christian scriptures, which, he says, have been falsified by Christians and Jews. He points to seventy-eight places in the New Testament, especially in the gospels, where the contradictions and absurdities show that it cannot be divinely inspired revelation. His comprehensive knowledge of the Bible and his coldly critical analysis together construct a formidable case against the doctrine of the literal inspiration of the Bible. With Ibn Hazm we have come far from the

²⁸ Joshua Finkel, "A *Risāla* of al-Jāhiz." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 47: 318, 1921.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 333 f.

early polemic that attacked the Christian scriptures only in general terms. He has no patience with the Muslims who honor the Bible as inspired writing that has merely been wrongly interpreted by Christians. To him the text itself is falsified and the whole thing is thoroughly unreliable.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ On Ibn Hazm, see Erdmann Fritsch, *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*, pp. 15-17, 1930.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LATER APOLOGETIC

1. *Later Christian Apologetic in the East*

BEFORE continuing with the great Muslim polemic protagonists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, we must go back to pick up some strands of the later Christian development. The Byzantine writers in Greek who followed the early lead of John of Damascus and Abū Qurrā were for the most part writing from Constantinople, at a safe distance from Islam and in a fanatic environment that often shows in the bitterness of their attacks. Niketas, writing about 880, pours out contempt and abuse on the Arabian Prophet and all his teaching. After a philosophic presentation of the chief doctrines of Christianity, he attacks Muhammad as a false prophet, "utterly ignorant, a shameless liar, and the son of Satan," who wove "an unintelligible tissue of lies and fables" in the Qur'an. His blasphemies about Christ in denying his death on the cross, and in claiming he foretold the coming of Muhammad himself, were due to willful wickedness. The god that Islam worships is not even the true God.¹ Such bitterness as this of Niketas is characteristic of much of the polemic of Constantinople. He stands out, however, from among those who follow him in showing an acquaintance with the Qur'an unusual for one living in the Christian capital. Quoting exactly from it, he takes up the suras one by one, and criticizes them.

In the second important period of the Byzantine polemic, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the chief emphasis is not on dogmatics, as it was in the earlier period, but rather on the cult and the ethic. Bartholomaios of Edessa, in the thirteenth century,²

¹ J. T. Addison, *The Christian Approach to the Moslem*, p. 29, 1942.

² According to Wolfgang Eichner, "Die Nachrichten über den Islam bei den Byzantinern." *Der Islam*, 23 : 137, 1936. But Bartholomaios' date is uncertain; it has been placed as early as the eighth century.

the only Byzantine after John and Abū Qurrā not associated with Constantinople, gives indication of being in close touch with Islam, and criticizes especially the rite and ceremony of prayer, the legal traditions of the four law schools, cleansing, and so on. Demetrios Kydones, about 1350, gives us in his *Contra Mahometanos* an excellent and intimate picture of Islam as it existed in Baghdad in the early fourteenth century, with many examples and illustrations that show a wealth of knowledge of Islamic life and thought at that time. But the book is second hand, being a translation into Greek of a Latin work of which we shall speak later in connection with Western polemic, the *Confutatio Alcorani* of Ricoldus de Monte Crucis, Dominican missionary to Baghdad about 1291.³ John Kantakuzenos (d. 1383) has a comprehensive work, *Contra Mahometanos*, in four apologies and four addresses. In him the polemic gives way to the missionary approach, for he aims at the conversion of Muslims. He does not show any further knowledge of Islam than Kydones. Manuel Palaiologos has the longest Byzantine apology against Islam, *Dialogos* (ca. 1390), but only two of the twenty-six dialogues have been edited. This increase of polemic activity in Constantinople in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is an interesting counterpart of the second great flowering of Muslim polemic, which, as we shall see, was taking place at the same time. The contacts of Islam with Christianity during the period of the crusades seem to have provided a fresh stimulus to these controversial studies on both sides, in the East as well as in Europe.

The Qur'an itself is naturally of primary interest to these Byzantine writers. They took it for granted that the book of Muhammad held much the same place in Islam as the Bible did in Christianity, and early called it "the scripture" of Islam, ἡ γραφή. Its origin is discussed by both Bartholomaios and Kydones, but their information about its beginnings is not accurate, and they confuse various traditions. Kydones believes, as do others, that Muhammad's inaccuracies and heretical blasphemies in the Qur'an are a result of his contact with Jews and Arians and Nestorians, and he points out details of doctrine taken over from the error of Sabellius, Arius, the Manichees, and others.

³ See page 34.

Eichner shows⁴ that the chief point around which most of the Byzantine polemic centers is the fact of salvation accomplished for men through the redeeming act of God's Son. On the Muslim side, all such presentations of the incarnation are simply rejected by the formula: "There is no God but God, and Muhammad is His Prophet." The Byzantines are interested in the Muslim concept of God, but find it strangely cold and negative. They apply various characterizations to it to stress its unvarying solidity; but the favorite term, used first by Niketas, is Θεὸς ὀλόσφυρος, literally a god "of hammered metal," solid, unmovng, lifeless. This idea cannot be traced directly back to an Islamic source, but perhaps it is an interpretation of *samad*, quoted and explained in sura 112 of the Qur'an. So cold and unmovng does this God seem to some of the Byzantines that they cannot even think of it as referring to the one true God. Thus Bartholomaios speaks of "your new God," and Akominatos includes in his formula of recantation for converted Muslims a curse on Muhammad's Θεὸς ὀλόσφυρος, although Emperor Manuel Komnenos objected to this curse as being a curse against God himself. Various Byzantines present such analogies of the trinity as the early fathers used. They show that an overemphasis on oneness leads to a concept of God wholly removed from activity and completely lifeless. What Muhammad meant by calling Christ "Word of God" and "Spirit proceeding from himself" (Qur'an 4 : 169) is not critically examined, but the phrases are taken as good arguments from the Qur'an for the un-created Christ.

The determinism of Islam is attacked by the Byzantines, especially by the earlier writers. We have already seen⁵ the interest of John of Damascus and Abū Qurrā in the doctrine of the freedom of the will. The later polemist quote the Qur'an (17 : 17, 18 : 2, and 17 : 29) to show that according to Muhammad God makes men err. Kydones says there is a contradiction in saying "God leads not evil men in the right way" and then praying "that he lead you out of darkness into light and guide you in the right path." Among other points of doctrine noted by the Greeks we shall mention only the conception of paradise, which they attack as

⁴ Eichner, *op. cit.*, 133-162, 197-214.

⁵ See pages 15, 17-18.

being impressively different from the Christian concept in the emphasis on the pleasures of the sense.

Among the ethical requirements of Islam, the chief points of attack are the laws of marriage and divorce, polygamy and concubinage, and the *jihād* or holy war. Kydones says, "Muhammad has almost nothing to say about virtue; but all his teaching is about murder, plunder, and so on." The sharpest criticism is on attitudes that reflect not so much the Qur'an as the later Hadith. Among the ritual requirements, the criticisms center around circumcision, cleansing, and prayer (which is treated as a meaningless, artificial ceremony), the use of the holy day Friday, fasting and rules of eating, benevolences, the pilgrimage, and the worship of the Black Stone in Makka.

Along with the Byzantines of the later period must be mentioned an Armenian polemic writer, Grigor Tathewatsi (1340-1410), whose tractate *Contra Muhammedanos* shows good knowledge of Islam and its attacks on Christianity.⁶ In his refutation he takes up sixteen points, among which are the denial of the trinity and the divinity of Christ, the Christian scriptures, the prophethood of Muhammad, Muslim laws of eating and drinking, their ablutions, and their fastings.

2. Later Muslim Apologetic

Just at the end of the crusades there appear a number of important Muslim polemicists, of whom three center their books around the attack of a Christian whose original work is lost and whom we know only through these able Muslim opponents. He is a Greek orthodox writer, Paulus ar-Rāhib of Antioch, Bishop of Sidon, and his polemic work is in Arabic, *Risāla ilā ahad al-muslimīn*, "A Letter to One of the Muslims."⁷ Its date is unknown, but it is certainly previous to 1260. The letter claims to be the answer to a Muslim friend who asked what ideas about Muhammad Paulus had found in his travels among Christians in the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople, Amalfi, part of Frankland, and Greece. This is, however, merely a literary device to intro-

⁶ See Arthur Jeffery, "Gregory of Tathew's 'Contra Mohammedanos.' *The Moslem World*, 32: 3-19, 1942.

⁷ On Paulus, see Erdmann Fritsch, *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*, pp. 21 f. Also Louis Cheikho, *Vingt Traités*, 2nd ed., pp. 15-26.

duce an apology of Christianity. The Muhammadan standpoint is formulated hypothetically or by report. According to the situation, the Christians whom Paulus met in his travels answer him. The questions are not a living part of a dialogue, but only serve as chapter headings for a general development of the subject. The outline of the argument is as follows:

1. Muhammad was sent only for the guidance of the Arabs of the *Jāhiliyya*, "the age of ignorant paganism," as the Qur'an proves.

2. Muhammad praised the Christian religion.

3. The witness of the prophets proves that the Christian religion is true.

4. The Christian religion, and especially the doctrine of the trinity, are proved by intellectual demonstration.

5. Christians are not polytheists.

6. Christ came with such a superior revelation to that of Moses that there was no need for anything to come later to improve it.⁸

This polemic was a strong one, treating systematically and forcefully most of the significant points at issue, and it produced strong answers to it from Islam. It was used repeatedly by Christians, sometimes with additions or in a new setting.

One of the ablest books of all the Muslim polemic was called forth by this letter of Paulus. It is *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira*, "The Glorious Answers," of Qarāfi (d. 1285).⁹ Qarāfi's replies to the Christian letter, his careful and systematic organization of material with regard to the controversy, and his simplicity of presentation make the work a good source book for the study of the Muslim polemic. His first section takes up the universal mission of Muhammad, the passages of the Qur'an allegedly favorable to Christianity, the contradictions of the New Testament, and the absurdities of the trinity and the incarnation; the second contains fifteen questions about the crucifixion, the authenticity of the Old Testament, and the purity of the Qur'an; the third asks one hundred seven questions about Christian doctrine and ritual, including christology, salvation, the eucharist, fasts, and the liturgy; the

⁸ Ahmad Ibn Taymiyya, *Al-jawāb as-sahih*, Vol. I, p. 20. Cairo, 1905.

⁹ Ahmad as-Sanhāji Qarāfi, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira 'an al-as'ila al-fājira*, on the margin of 'Abdurrahmān Bāshajizādah, *Al-fāriq*, Cairo, 1322 A.H.

fourth section adduces fifty-one prophecies of Muhammad from the Old and the New Testament.¹⁰

Just after Qarāfī's time, we find the important Muslim theologian Ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328) writing also in answer to the letter of Paulus.¹¹ A reformer of tremendous activity, Ibn Taymiyya fought in Cairo for a return to the pure religion of early Islam and a freedom from the speculative philosophic trends and the new religious customs that were coming in. His attack on Christianity, *The Perfect Answer to Those Who Have Changed the Religion of Christ*, covers fourteen hundred pages in the recent Cairo edition. The arrangement of material is rather confused and illogical, but the treatment is encyclopaedic in extent and calm and critical in approach. Little of the subject matter is original. The author quotes freely from many sources. He covers the whole field of the controversy. An especial interest of his is an exhaustive presentation of a great number of miracles of Muḥammad as proof of his prophethood.¹² Contemporary with Ibn Taymiyya was Muhammad Ibn abī Tālib (d. 1327), who answered the letter of Paulus in more freely popular style, using irony in disposing of the Old Testament texts that Christians claimed were teachings about the trinity.¹³ His special interest appears in his last two sections, where we see him a *sūfī* of the type that cultivated the mysticism of philosophic speculation.

These three Muslim writers have carried to a further point the development of the Muslim attitude to the Christian scriptures. The falsification of the texts is, as always, a central problem. Ibn Hazm had been especially uncompromising in proclaiming the extensive corruption of the scriptures,¹⁴ and Muhammad Ibn abī Tālib tended to follow his lead. But Ibn Taymiyya claims that the corruption is merely in the false interpretation of texts for the most part, and that the alteration of the text itself is limited largely to the historical parts. He accordingly quotes at length from Christian scripture, adducing from it true prophecies

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 235-65.

¹¹ Ahmad Ibn Taymiyya, *Al-jawāb as-saḥīḥ liman baddala dīn al-masīḥ*. 4 vols. An-Nīl Press, Cairo, 1905.

¹² *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 62-287.

¹³ Fritsch, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁴ See pages 23-24.

of Muhammad. In any case, we have come far from the period when Muslim polemic spoke in general terms of corruption, without specifying just how or where it took place; for here we have a bold exegesis that quotes chapter and verse endlessly to show the errors that have entered the text. Ibn Hazm claims it was the evangelists who falsified the text of the revelation transmitted to them, but these last three writers have a historical perspective that finds innovations creeping in through the heretical controversies of the early centuries of the church. The Council of Nicaea and the changes forced on Christendom by Constantine's imperial edicts are to blame for much of this, they say. But Paul is generally agreed to be the worst corrupter of Christianity, drawing men away from the original purity of the revelation. In the same way that the Muslims were using Christian scripture to support their arguments, the Christians were trying to show that in the Qur'an itself Muhammad shows respect for Christianity and veneration for its beliefs and teachings. These Muslim writers attack such arguments by claiming either that these references were to the original Christians, not the moderns, or that these verses enjoining tolerance toward Christians were abrogated by later verses, such as the famous sword verse, Qur'an 9 : 74: "O Prophet! contend against the infidels and the hypocrites, and be rigorous with them: Hell shall be their dwelling place! Wretched the journey thither!" Qarāfi shows how this verse alone abrogated over twenty others that seemed to indicate lenience toward believers.¹⁵ There is, however, a conciliatory note in the works of these later writers as they try to sum up the relation of Christians to truth. Qarāfi denies that Christians are polytheists (*mushrikūn*), because he says trinity is a sort of unity "in general"; but they are unbelievers (*kāfirūn*). Muhammad Ibn abī Tālib makes a distinction between those who are unbelievers through intention and those who are so through mistaken error; among the latter, he says, are those who divide God into three godheads.¹⁶ According to him, Christians thus occupy a position superior to others outside of Islam.

These three works in answer to the letter of Paulus are repre-

¹⁵ Qarāfi, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

¹⁶ Fritsch, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

sentative of the new Muslim polemical activity that followed upon the crusades. Other similar tractates are described by Fritsch,¹⁷ especially an anonymous work from the beginning of the thirteenth century, *Adillat al-wahdāniyya fir-radd 'alā an-nasrāniyya*, "Proofs of the Unity in Reply to Christianity." The fourteenth century produced also the controversial works of Sa'id Ibn Hasan (ca. 1320), a Jew converted to Islam, and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 1350), a pupil of Ibn Taymiyya.

3. *Western Apologetic*

The church in the West, meanwhile, had been in contact with Islam in Spain, especially through the Christian scholars that went to study in the great Muslim universities. But in spite of these contacts, Europe in general seems to have remained until the time of the crusades in great ignorance about the religion of Islam, except for second-hand reports full of misinformation. Translations of the Qur'an were not at first attempted. Speaking of Western Christendom, Devic says, "Durant les cinq premiers siècles de l'hégire et jusqu'au temps de la deuxième croisade, aucun écrivain chrétien ne marque qu'il ait eu des notions certaines sur l'oeuvre de Mahomet."¹⁸ The chief reason for this hesitation to examine the holy book of Islam was not primarily the great difficulty of the Arabic and the subject matter of the Qur'an, but the fear of putting into the hands of Christians a diabolic book.¹⁹

About the middle of the twelfth century, however, when the impact of the first two crusades was making itself felt in Europe, the Venerable Peter, Pierre Maurice, abbot of Cluny, began a movement to combat Islam on the basis of a more intelligent understanding. He believed that a knowledge of the Qur'an was necessary for a successful attack on Islamic thought. Europeans of his day knew in a general way that Muslims denied the trinity and the divinity of Christ, but little else. They accused them of horrible crimes, of idolatry, of human sacrifice, almost of cannibalism. Many believed that Muhammad was worshiped as a god,

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-20, 22-25, 36-38.

¹⁸ Marcel Devic, "Une Traduction Inédite du Coran," *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 8, pt. 1, p. 365, 1883.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 366.

and a corrupted form of his name, "mammet," came to mean "idol" in the Middle Ages; his name itself was reported variously as Malphus, Baphometh, and Bafum.²⁰ Peter entrusted the translation of the Qur'an to an Englishman, Robert of Rétines, and to Hermann of Dalmatia, who with considerable difficulty prepared for him a Latin copy. It had many errors and omissions, and cannot be called a good translation, but at least it let Christians know with some degree of precision the fundamentals of Islam, and it served in the West as the only basis for attacks on Islamic doctrine from the twelfth century to the middle of the seventeenth.²¹ Peter himself wrote the earliest polemic against Islam in Latin, *Against the Loathsome Heresy of the Sect of the Saracens*,²² helped by documents he found in Spain. He wrote, he said, ". . . not so much in the hope of influencing the miserable misguided wanderers in the path of the false prophet, as for the honor of placing in the Christian arsenal (*Christianum armarium*) a worthy response to this flail of Islam, alongside of those which so many illustrious defenders of orthodoxy have already massed to fight the other heresies."²³ In this statement of Peter's purpose, two points are interesting: first, the classifying of Islam in some sense along with "the other heresies," and second, the frankly stated aim of the polemic, not as an attack on Islam for the sake of conversion or persuasion, but as an offensive action for the sake of the defense of orthodoxy. Both of these attitudes we have already met in the Christian polemic of the East.

Indeed, as the crusades developed, there was far more talk of exterminating the Muslims than of converting them. Yet there began to develop at last in some quarters a new attitude toward Islam. The great reservoirs of idealism and spiritual vitality which found their outlet early in the thirteenth century in the founding of the two mendicant orders of the Dominicans and the

²⁰ J. T. Addison, *The Christian Approach to the Moslem*, p. 36, fn. The curious ideas about Islam prevalent in Europe during both the Middle Ages and the Renaissance are studied in their relation to English literature by B. P. Smith, *Islam in English Literature*, Chap. 1; the Renaissance period is studied in detail by S. C. Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*.

²¹ Devic, *op. cit.*

²² The Venerable Peter, "Against the Loathsome Heresy of the Sect of the Saracens," *Patrologia Latina*, J.-P. Migne, ed., Vol. 189, cols. 659-720.

²³ Devic, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

Franciscans impelled the friars also toward the preaching of Christ among the Muslims. Thus there arose the first organized attempt to win Muslims to Christianity by missionary means. Francis of Assisi himself led the way. In 1219 and 1220 Francis was in Egypt and Syria, first with the crusading armies at Damietta, and later at St. Jean d'Acre. At the court of the sultan Al-Kāmil he was received with consideration and kindness at the very time that the Christian and Muslim armies were opposing each other on the field of battle.²⁴ We have little indication of what line his attempts at suasion took, and none at all of any success achieved. Later in the century we have the *Summa Contra Gentiles* of Thomas Aquinas, which includes material against Muhammad, and an extensive polemic work called *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*,²⁵ prepared by a Dominican, Raymund Martini (d. 1281).

At the end of the century another Dominican brother was living in Baghdad and preparing his notes for a remarkable and vivacious work against Islam. Ricoldus de Monte Crucis was one of many Dominicans to go to Asia in the thirteenth century. He lived in Baghdad from 1290 until about 1300, trying to convert the Nestorians, and more especially the Muslims. He began a translation of the Qur'an, but abandoned it in disgust at the subject matter. Living in Baghdad at the time of the fall of Acre in 1291, which marked the end of the crusades, he was horrified by the news of it, and by the backwash of the catastrophe in the streets and markets of Baghdad, where great numbers of the crusaders were exposed for sale in the slave markets. A touching letter tells of his attempts to ransom at least his Dominican colleagues.²⁶ His work, a treatise against Islam, variously called *Confutatio Alcorani*, *Contra Legem Sarracenorum*, or *Propugnaculum Fidei*,²⁷ was based on his own knowledge of the Qur'an at firsthand, and on his intimate comprehension of Muslim customs and society of the time. We have already met this work through

²⁴ Paul Sabatier, *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, transl. by L. S. Houghton, p. 230.

²⁵ Raymund Martini, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, ("The Dagger of the Faith against Moors and Jews.") Typis Viduae Johannis Wittigau, Lipsiae, 1687.

²⁶ See P.-F. Mandonnet, "Fra Ricoldo de Monte Croce." *Révue Biblique*, 2: 44-61, 182-202, 584-607, 1893.

²⁷ J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 154, cols. 1035-1170.

the translation of it by the Byzantine Demetrios Kydones.²⁸ One of his five rules laid down for the guidance of new missionary candidates reads as follows: "It is necessary to be well acquainted with the doctrines and arguments of the different sects, and recognize where they err on *fundamental* points. Often missionaries discuss to no purpose matters of ritual, whereas the real business is to bring heretics back to the unity of the faith, not to the unity of the ritual. The faith must be catholic, that is, the faith of all Christians, and not the faith of the Franks or of the Chaldaeans." ²⁹

The third Friar Raymund of this century was the great Raymund Lull (1235-1315).³⁰ Famous among his contemporaries as teacher, philosopher, and theologian, he sought all his life to promote the conversion of the infidels. He even wrote two treatises in Arabic. His travels took him to Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa. He preached at Tunis, was condemned to death, and managed to escape; but in his eighties he returned to Tunis to preach, and was killed. His chief "arguments against the Saracens in commending the Christian faith" are contained in his *Necessaria Demonstratio Articulorum Fidei*. He was one of the few men of his time who saw that the crusades were following evil methods to spread the Kingdom of Christ. He spoke against them openly, and for thirty years urged instead the way of love and suasion and self-sacrifice for others. Lull entered his missionary work with his eyes open, facing the special difficulties and the consequences of it squarely, and expressing his conception of the function of the missionary to Islam in these words: "The Lover saw himself taken and bound, wounded and killed for the love of his Beloved; and those who tortured him asked him: 'Where is thy Beloved?' He answered: 'See Him here in the increase of my love, and the strength which it gives me to bear my torments.' " ³¹ It must be added, however, that in his old age his failures to convert the Saracens began to undermine Lull's faith in the method of peace-

²⁸ See page 26.

²⁹ The five rules are given by Mandonnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 602 f.

³⁰ See S. M. Zwemer, *Raymund Lull*, Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1902; and E. A. Peers, *Ramon Lull*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.

³¹ C. E. Padwick, "North African Reverie," *International Review of Missions*, 27 : 352, 1938. Quoted from Allison Peers, transl., *The Book of the Lover and the Beloved*.

ful suasion, to the extent that he urged both Celestine V and Boniface VIII to proclaim and organize a new armed crusade, other methods having proved unfruitful.

After this important galaxy of Christian polemicists clustered toward the end of the thirteenth century and at the beginning of the fourteenth, there are few names of importance for polemic against Islam. Missionary activity was greatly hampered by the abysmal ignorance that prevailed in Europe about the Muslims. Many still believed Muhammad to be a god worshiped by his followers; others thought him a diabolically depraved Christian schismatic, and the Saracens still seemed more worthy of destruction than conversion. It is rare that we find such a sympathetic understanding of the true relation of Christianity to Islam as that in Gower's *Confessio Amantis* (A. D. 1384). Amans, the Lover asks:

"I prei you tell me nay or yee,
 "To passe over the grete See
 "To werre and slee the Sarazin,
 "Is that the lawe?"

and he receives the answer:

"Sone myn,
 "To preche and soffre for the faith,
 "That have I herd the gospel saith,
 "But for to slee, that hiere I noght." ³²

In the fifteenth century, three polemic writers may be mentioned. A bishop of Nevers and of Châlons, Jean Germain of Cluny (d. 1460), wrote tracts *Adversus Mahometanos et infideles*, *Adversus Alcoranum*, etc. Dionysius Carthusianus (d. 1471) took the translation of the Venerable Peter and refuted the Qur'an chapter by chapter with the usual weapons of the Christians in a celebrated book entitled, *D. Dionysii Carthusiani contra Alcoranum et sectam Machometicam libri quinque*.³³ Some years later,

³² G. C. Macaulay, ed., *The Complete Works of John Gower*, Vol. 2, Book 3, 11, 2487-2493, p. 239. Quoted by Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

³³ Printed in Cologne, 1532.

in 1487, a converted Moor of Valencia, Joannes Andreas, wrote his *Confusion de la secta Mahometana*,³⁴ which is often quoted later. In 1543 there appeared the first Protestant attack on Islam. Theodor Bibliander (or Buchmann), the successor of Zwingli as professor of theology at Zürich, revised the Venerable Peter's translation of the Qur'an, and published with it a considerable amount of material about Islam and against Islam.³⁵

In the sixteenth century the Society of Jesus developed a mission to India under Francis Xavier. In 1580 the first Jesuit missionaries went to the court of the Muslim Mughal Emperor Akbar near Agra, who encouraged them and their successors to carry on public debates at court with the Muslim scholars. The methods used in these debates, so reminiscent of the mediaeval colloquies between Eastern Christians and Muslims in the early centuries of Islam, have been preserved in a long work in Persian, *A Mirror Showing the Truth*,³⁶ by Jerome Xavier, which he completed in 1609. The book is in the form of a dialogue, the discussions taking place between a missionary and a native philosopher, with sometimes a Mulla speaking. The contents include an extremely philosophic treatment of revealed religion, and an explanation of the trinity, angels and devils, man's creation and fall, the divinity of Christ, miracles, images and relics, the authority of the uncorrupted gospels, paradise and hell, the hierarchy, the Pope and monks.

An answer to this work of Xavier's by Zayn al-'Ābidīn in 1621 was itself answered, in turn, by a treatise of the scholar Guadagnoli at Rome in 1631.³⁷ The latter is in four chapters: (1) The authority of the Old and the New Testament, as proved even by the Qur'an. (2) On the Qur'an and Muhammad's false claim to prophethood. (3) The trinity, procession from the Son, etc. (4) The divinity of Christ, admitted even by Muslims.

Later in the seventeenth century a new translation of the Qur'an at last was made by Dominic Germain, a Franciscan mis-

³⁴ Printed in Seville, 1537.

³⁵ Theodorus Bibliander, *Machumetis Saracenorum principis, eiusque successorum vitae, doctrina, ac ipse Alcoran*, n.p., 1550 (2nd ed.).

³⁶ Samuel Lee, *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*, pp. vi ff., 1824.

³⁷ Philip Guadagnoli, *Apologia pro Christiana Religione*, 1631.

sionary who worked for four years in the Orient to finish his Arabic study. It was written in Spain between 1650 and 1665, but was never published.³⁸ Thirty years later, however, there was published the great work of Marraccio, which immediately became a classic and took the place of all previous treatments of the Qur'an.³⁹ This compendious volume had taken forty years to complete. It includes a translation of the text into Latin, copious notes on the Arabic text, and a detailed *refutatio* of each few verses. There is also a long introduction on the life of Muhammad and the Qur'an, along with a general polemic, and a comparison of Islam with Christianity. In his preface Marraccio deplors the small number of works on controversy against Islam. His voluminous study displays vast erudition, and a profound knowledge of the qur'anic language, as well as of the commentaries on it and the Islamic religious literature in general.⁴⁰

In the same year that Marraccio's great work appeared, Onuphrius Mico published his *Lex Evangelica contra Alcoranum*. This large work is composed of sixty-six *Argumenta*, some of which treat of the following: Muhammad was clearly a thief; Muhammad a tyrannical legislator; answer to Muhammad's accusation of adulterated scripture; Muhammad wrote many lies about hell in the Qur'an; Muhammad denies holy images are to be worshiped; Muhammad denies Christ is God, etc.

This rapid survey brings us to the beginning of Protestant missions to Islam. After a period of comparative quiescence during the eighteenth century, the new chapter opens with the appearance of young Henry Martyn (1781-1812) in Persia. He came to Shiraz in 1811, and began writing a series of tracts in answer to an apology of Islam which had just been published in that city.⁴¹ His death the next year cut short a career begun with great energy. A few years later, in 1829, C. G. Pfander of the Basle Missionary Society came to Persia, and at Kermanshah wrote *The Balance of Truth, Mizān al-haqq*, a compendium of apologetic and polemic that set the pace for the Muslim-Christian controversy of the next

³⁸ Marcel Devic, "Une Traduction Inédite du Coran." *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 8, pt. 1, pp. 343-406, 1883.

³⁹ Ludovico Marraccio, *Alcorani Textus Universus*, 1698.

⁴⁰ Devic, *op. cit.*, p. 390.

⁴¹ Lee, *op. cit.*, p. cxv.

century. It immediately called forth several replies, of which Rahmatallāh's *Izhār al-haqq*, which we shall take up in detail in the next chapter, is the most famous. After 1835 Pfander came to India, where he continued his controversial speaking and writing.⁴² Other controversial writers in India soon appeared, carrying on a new controversy on very nearly the same lines as those laid down by the earlier polemicists. On the Christian side some of the best known names appearing toward the end of the century are: 'Imāduddīn Lahiz, E. M. Wherry, Sir William Muir, G. H. Rouse, Canon Sell, and W. St. Clair Tisdall. It is partly in reply to such apologists that the Muslim apologetic described in the next chapter has grown up.

4. *Methods and Results*

In all this mass of polemic, covering the period from the seventh century to the fifteenth and beyond, and representing a wide geographic area, from Spain and England to Baghdad and India, there is naturally a wide range of method and approach, running from the thoroughly intellectual and philosophic reasoning of Yahyā ibn 'Ādī to the popular question-and-answer colloquy of John I and 'Amr ibn al-'Ās; from the ignorant, superstitious fear toward Islam of uninformed Europe before the crusades to the scholarly and intimate discussions of Ricoldus de Monte Crucis, and from the proud utterances of the reeking crusader conquerors of Jerusalem to the humble persuasiveness of Brother Francis before the Sultan in Egypt. Generalizations with regard to such a long period of controversy can be made only with reservations; yet we may speak of two results of the polemic from the Christian point of view. Undoubtedly the Christian polemic failed to cause conversions on a large scale. In fact, Christianity in the East seemed to be fighting a losing battle with Islam from the very first, surrendering ever-increasing numbers to the enemy out of its own community. What was the reason for this failure? Why did the syllogisms of the Christians have so little effect on their opponents, and why were their arguments so little able to overthrow the arguments ranged against them by the Muslims? In the first place, the method of argumentation on both sides had a single origin, for Islamic *kalām*,

⁴² E. M. Wherry, *The Muslim Controversy*, pp. 1 f., 1905.

or dogmatic theology, was derived directly from the Christian patristic, and used its weapons from the first.⁴³ The Greek logic was developed on both sides to support opposite theses; the extreme use of the Aristotelian syllogism by Islam was so general that the Christian apologetic often imitated it, even basing proofs for the trinity on logic.⁴⁴ As far as conviction was concerned, this sort of intellectualism simply tended to bring each side up against a blank wall.

Guillaume shows that a second reason for the failure was a real inability to come to grips with essentials. He sums up the debate of Abū Qurrā before Al-Ma'mūn⁴⁵ in these words: "On the one hand, Abū Qurrā's failure to offer any explanation of the doctrine of the trinity . . . and on the other the Muslim's failure to present a reasoned statement of the Word and Spirit of God consonant with the utterances of the Qur'an on this subject, remind us that both Christianity and Islam are, so far as apologetics are concerned, where Abū Qurrā and his friends left them—fruitful sources of misunderstanding the one to the other."⁴⁶

A third significant reason for failure was that most of these Christian writers were not striving for missionary results. They were aiming at getting indulgent treatment from the authorities of Islam by influencing the Muslims to think of Christianity as a respectable religion; and in this aim they did indeed succeed.⁴⁷ A glimpse of this absence of spiritual power in the church is gained indirectly, yet very clearly, through the implications of the polemic of 'Alī Tabarī against Christianity.⁴⁸ Tabarī, as a Christian convert to Islam, writing in order to convert his former brethren to his new faith, may be considered as giving a fair picture of how Christianity in the East looked, not only to Islam, but to many of its own adherents. Tabarī seems to take it for granted that the reasons given for the truth of Islam are the same kind as those given by

⁴³ See C. H. Becker, "Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 26 : 175-195, sec. 5, 1912.

⁴⁴ Georg Graf, "Christliche Polemik gegen den Islam," *Gelbe Hefte*, II : 2 : 825-842, sec. 3, 1926.

⁴⁵ See pages 17 f.

⁴⁶ Alfred Guillaume, "A Debate between Christian and Moslem Doctors." *Centenary Supplement of the J.R.A.S.*, p. 244, 1929.

⁴⁷ Graf, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁸ See pages 21 f.

Christians for the truth of Christianity, the only difference being that the former are stronger. Speaking to Christians, he says: "Look back into the motives for which you have accepted your religion and see what they are. If it becomes evident to you that they are only possible and praiseworthy stories transmitted to you by a successor from his predecessor, and by a last from a first man, it is also through such stories that we have accepted the Prophet—peace be with him."⁴⁹ Thus the matter for him is after all a question of *isnād*, or historical transmission, and the *isnād* of the Muslims is better supported and far more recent than that of the Christians and the Jews, and so more trustworthy. Enlightenment is to come apparently through argument, for he says: "Argue for us and for yourselves, against us and against yourselves, in order that the veil may be withdrawn from you; you will then, by the assistance of God, see the truth itself."⁵⁰ There is nothing here to suggest that he had ever seen a Christian community devoted heart and soul to the unique experience of the Christian faith.

Although there was little harvest in conversions from Islam resulting from all this early polemic, its effect on Islamic dogma was far-reaching.⁵¹ Orthodox Islam was influenced negatively by it; for it was forced into an opposition that crystallized its theology in solidified dogmatic form. For example, it was driven to a stronger exposition of determinism in conscious opposition to the characteristically Christian dogma of the freedom of the will. Yet the Christian influences lived in such heterodox movements as the *qadariyya* and the *mu'tazila*, with their emphasis on man's freedom. The assertion of the freedom of the will did not enter as a result of the influences of orthodox Christianity alone, but it included a strain of Pelagianism that had persisted in Palestine and Syria since the early fifth century. Although there is some ground for the dogma of the freedom of the will in the Qur'an itself, all reference to it had been omitted from the traditions by the time that the Hadith collection of Bukhārī was compiled; here we can see how the opposition to such a typically Christian doctrine crystallized Islamic theology. John of Damascus had early declared that determinism

⁴⁹ 'Alī Tabarī, *The Book of Religion and Empire*, transl. by A. Mingana, p. 162, 1922.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁵¹ Becker, *op. cit.*

was the Islamic doctrine, and that freedom of the will was specifically Christian, and so he forced the question.⁵²

Other indirect effects of Christian teaching and Christian polemic on Islamic thought are described in Browne's chapter entitled "The Muslim Reaction to Christian Life and Teaching."⁵³ Christian morality early made a deep impression, and partly through Christian converts to Islam Christian elements became a definite part of Islamic teaching, which not only absorbed general emphases of Christian morality, but even took over certain verses and sayings directly from the New Testament. The newly accepted elements took the form of traditions going back to Muhammad, as, for example, "Deeds are judged according to intentions, and reckoning will be made to every man according to the measure of his intention." Sayings appeared in the Hadith, said to be those of Muhammad, that were strangely similar to Christ's; e.g., a pronouncement of blessings on the man that "does good and keeps it secret, so that his left hand does not know what his right hand has done." Even the Lord's Prayer is paraphrased and modified.⁵⁴ Asceticism and mysticism, similarly, came into Islam from Christian monastic origins. Later, miracles were attributed to Muhammad in answer to the Christian polemic based on the miracles of Christ. Among the common people, there seems to have been a real and deep appreciation of the figure of Christ, some mu'tazilites even giving him almost the position he held in Christian dogma, and considering him superior to Muhammad.⁵⁵ In some quarters there were indications that Islam and Christianity were drawing closer together, especially in popular local festivals and celebrations of the worship of patron saints, when followers of the two religions celebrated together.

⁵² Becker, *op. cit.*, sec. 3.

⁵³ L. E. Browne, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*, Chap. 9, 1933.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC: NEW CLASSICS

1. *General Character of the Contemporary Muslim Apologetic*

THE world of Islam has undergone many changes during the last hundred years. The rapidly increased contacts between East and West, the extension of horizons far beyond the limits of a small community, the increase of education, and the growth of knowledge in all departments of life have transformed not only the outward life of Muslims in all parts of the world, but the modes of thinking as well. The new ideas have been an invigorating stimulus that has blossomed out as a sort of renaissance in different fields of literature and science and social and religious life, a renaissance that is probably still in its initial stages. One expression of this new vigor in religious thought has been the renewal of a literary polemic against Christianity and especially against Christian missionary activity. It is a natural response to the new growth of Protestant missions in Muslim lands during the last century. Most of this Muslim polemic is a reaction to Protestant work, much of it being in direct answer to and in attempted refutation of books or tracts distributed by Protestant missionaries.

The modern polemic is based very largely upon the earlier Muslim polemical writings of the Middle Ages. In fact, several of the best mediaeval works have been printed and circulated popularly just as they stand. Three such classics are available in good modern editions, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira* of Qarāfī, the encyclopaedic *Al-jawāb as-saḥīh* of Ibn Taymiyya in four volumes, and *Hidāyat al-hayārā* of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya.¹ But a fresh vitality

¹ See pages 29 ff.

Ahmad ibn Idrīs Qarāfī, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira*, and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Hidāyat al-hayārā*, both on the margin of Bāshajizādah, 'Abdurrahmān, *Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khāliq*. Taqaddum Press, Cairo, 1322 A.H.

Taqiuddīn Ibn Taymiyya, *Al-jawāb as-saḥīh*. An-Nil Press, Cairo, 1905.

is evident in the new works. While it is true that the great majority of the material is taken directly from the mediaeval writings, and the same arguments and illustrations are used again, there is nevertheless a rearrangement of the subject matter with the modern situation in mind, and especially with reference to particular modern books or pamphlets of Christian missionary origin. Moreover, in a few of the Muslim attacks on Christianity, the element of originality is much larger, as new arguments are introduced from modern scientific writings or from European rationalistic authors, and as some of the findings of the higher criticism of the Bible are utilized to discredit the Christian scriptures. Meanwhile, there is taking place a sort of modification of some of the Muslim positions that indicates an activity of thought as the new movements in the world of Islam challenge the old standards of life and morality. There is not always agreement among the polemicists on points of this kind; for example, on whether force is justified in the spread of religion and whether Islam may and should resort to it as a proper method.

With the exception of the Ahmadiyya literature, which will be treated separately as a school of polemic thought distinct from that of the rest of Islam, most of this polemic is available only in Arabic. It has been written by Arabs for Arabs, though not always for Muslims only. Some of the tracts are definitely missionary in their purpose, designed not only to keep the Muslim faithful to his tradition, but to show the Eastern Christian the weakness of his position and the beauties of Islam. A few are intended only for Arab Christians in the hope that they will be guided to the truth of the Qur'an.

From this contemporary Muslim polemic, twenty-four books and booklets have been chosen for study here. Two criteria have been used in choosing them. In the first place, an attempt was made to include those books that are representative of the body of Muslim opinion, whether Sunnī or Shī'a, especially those that are most frequently mentioned by Muslims themselves as being the standard works in this field from the point of view of Islam. Among these would be listed such works as *Izhār al-haqq* by Rahmatallāh Al-Hindī, *Al-Fāriq* by Bāshajizādah, *Lisān as-sidq* by Al-Bahrānī, and the writings of Muhammad 'Abduh. The first three

are well recognized by Muslims as detailed and reliable expositions of the chief points in the Muslim-Christian controversy, and they are often quoted. Muhammad 'Abduh stands high in Muslim thought, especially in Egypt, as perhaps the foremost reformer of Islam in modern times. In the second place, there have been included other books that give a wider spread of types of approach to the question, either by attacking special problems of interest or by representing individual and original points of view. Among these are the translation of one of the books of the rationalistic writer Charles Watts, the exposition by Hirrāwī of the evil intentions of the European and American orientalists, the friendly approach to Christians by "Al-Ab Dā'ūd," who is supposed to be a Chaldaean priest converted to Islam, the book on spiritism in Islam, and the literary ruses used by the Malijī brothers. These give insight into particular interests and special developments in the polemic, and the study of them along with the books representative of the more widely accepted point of view will give a fair idea of the polemic that Islam is using today to defend itself against Christian missionary attack.

As we examine this polemic it is necessary to understand thoroughly the assumptions that underlie it with regard to two points, namely, inspiration and the Qur'an itself. For the Muslim, inspiration as applied to holy scripture has a very definite and limited meaning. It refers to that process whereby God's messenger reveals directly to a prophet the words of God himself, words which are "sent down on the prophet" from heaven. This prophet is always someone who has a definite mission to warn a particular people, and who proves his divine mission by miracles as well as by a revealed Book. No one who is not a thoroughly attested prophet can write revealed scripture. Nothing is revealed scripture unless it represents the actual words of God pronounced in the first person. Both Moses and Jesus, as well as other prophets, received such a Book sent down directly from God upon them. Obviously the present scriptures in the hands of the Jews and Christians do not fulfill the requirements of inspiration as outlined above, so are considered clearly corruptions of the original lost Books. No such inspired book is preserved today on earth except the Qur'an. This is indeed the only sure and reliable revelation of

the words of God among men. To the Muslim, therefore, inspiration is simply the Qur'an; the Qur'an is inspiration. All that agrees with it is truth, all that is in contradiction to it is error and deceit. The Qur'an is the touchstone of truth, the measure of all other things, the test of any other scripture or any belief or any fact. From this standpoint the Muslim looks at all religious problems.

2. "*Izhār al-haqq*," *Rahmatallāh Al-Hindī*

The first great classic of modern Muslim polemic has never been superseded. It retains today the place it has always held in the respect of Islam, and is a mine of material for all the later works in the same way that it also relies on the mediaeval controversy for its own subject matter. *Izhār al-haqq*, by Rahmatallāh Al-Hindī, was published first in India almost a century ago in direct answer to *Mizān al-haqq* by Pfander—"The Revealing of Truth" in answer to "The Balance of Truth."² *Izhār al-haqq* takes up one by one the sections of Pfander's book and answers them in detail, with references, too, to other attacks by other Christian preachers. The treatment is divided into six books. Book I examines the books of the Old and the New Testament, and traces the history of how they came to form the Christian canon. There is no uninterrupted tradition to indicate the authenticity of this canon, according to the author. A book cannot be considered inspired scripture unless it is proved to have been written by the prophet to whom it is attributed, and to have come down without alteration. But the Pentateuch appears not to have been written by Moses, who is always mentioned in the third person. Doubt is expressed also about other books. No one knows, for example, who may have written the Book of Esther. Moreover some books are considered by the Roman Catholic Church to be inspired, while Protestants consider them as apocryphal. The Gospel of Matthew was originally in Hebrew, says this author, and the present translation into Greek is quite unreliable, as even the name of the author is unknown, and the original is wholly lost.

² See page 38. P. V. Carletti, ed., *Idh-har-ul-haqq de El-Hage Rahmat-ullah Efendi de Delhi*. Leroux, Paris, 1880. 2 vols. (French translation. This spelling of the title and the author's name is used in the French edition.)

A long list of contradictions and errors in the Bible is carefully explained. Chronicles and Kings are shown to be at variance on many points, especially in their enumeration of numbers in an army, or the age of individuals, or the duration of a reign.³ The genealogies of Christ in Matthew and in Luke disagree, and there are many other contradictions in the gospel stories.⁴ Altogether one hundred twenty-four contradictions are cited as being evidence of corruption in these scriptures, in addition to one hundred ten errors. Among the latter are errors of the New Testament in quoting from the Old Testament, prophecies that have not been fulfilled, and impossible statements, such as I Corinthians 15 : 5, "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve," whereas of the twelve apostles only eleven were living, Judas already having committed suicide. These mistakes, says the author, are clearly the reason why the Roman Catholic Church forbids Christians to read the Bible. There is a discussion of the apparently different kinds of inspiration about which Christian theologians write.⁵ Certainly some things, such as Paul's individual remarks to his friends in the Epistles, cannot be inspired: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities,"⁶ and "The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments."⁷ Surely these remarks are not divinely sent down. There is thus great disagreement among Christians as to what inspiration really is. The real fact of the matter, says Al-Hindī, is that the writers of these books were subject to error, that the original gospels were lost, and that these present so-called gospels were not well-known till the end of the second century, long after the first-hand accounts had been mixed with apocryphal legends. The evidence from Clement and Ignatius and other early church fathers on the purity of the text of the New Testament during the first two centuries is examined and set aside as inconclusive and feeble.⁸ The Qur'an is thus proved to be correct in its statement

³ *Ibid.*, I : 38 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I : 46 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I : 135 ff.

⁶ I Timothy 5 : 23.

⁷ II Timothy 4 : 13.

⁸ Carletti, *op. cit.*, I : 172 ff.

that the texts of both the Old and the New Testament had been corrupted before the coming of Muhammad. We can give the writers of the New Testament the credence accorded to virtuous men, uninspired witnesses, no more. The only traditions reported in these books that can be accepted without question are those confirmed by the witness of the Qur'an. Quotations are given from Ar-Rāzī, Al-Qurtubī, Al-Maqrīzī, and Hajjī Khalfa, showing that classical Arabic scholarship has always recognized the corruption of the scriptures in the hands of the Jews and the Christians.

Book II shows that these texts have been corrupted in three ways—by alteration, by interpolation, and by omission—quite aside from the corruption by misinterpretation of the meaning of the text. That this last type of corruption takes place is admitted by Jews, Catholics, and Protestants alike, for all of them interpret passages differently, especially passages of prophecy, and accuse the others of interpreting them wrongly. The first type of corruption, that is, corruption by alteration, can be illustrated from the different readings in the Greek, Hebrew, and Samaritan texts of the Old Testament. They differ widely in their chronology, especially in giving the ages of the patriarchs; and the Septuagint and the Hebrew have several different readings elsewhere. Thirty-five examples are given of variant readings, many of the variants being preferred by Christian savants to the reading of the accepted text.⁹ Second, corruption by interpolation is illustrated where marginal notations have crept into the text, as modern textual criticism shows. For example, in what is supposed to be a book of Moses, Numbers 21 : 3 tells of the complete victory of the Israelites over the Canaanites, "And they utterly destroyed them and their cities," a series of events that took place after the death of Moses. The historical account of Moses' death also, in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, could not have been written by him.¹⁰ If the Jews were accustomed thus to make interpolations even in ancient times, what assurance can there be that the texts have reached us in pure condition? There follow twenty examples of corruption through omissions from the accepted Hebrew text of phrases found in the Septuagint, in the Samaritan text, or in the Vulgate. If

⁹ *Ibid.*, I : 194-213.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I : 220, 224.

there are so many proved suppressions, reasons the author, is it not likely that the Christians have suppressed in addition all passages that might have contained arguments in favor of Islam?

In denying the falsification of the Old and the New Testament, Christian writers claim that the Muslims are the first ones who ever accused these scriptures of being corrupt. This, however, is not the case, for in the second century Celsus claimed that Christians had changed their gospels several times. Many European freethinkers also have pointed out corruption of the texts. In the early centuries heretical sects, such as the Ebionites and the Marcionites, believed that both the Old and the New Testament as they stand are not correct, and they created different canons, omitting certain things and including others.¹¹ In the second place, Christians say that Christ recognized the authenticity of the Old Testament by quoting passages from it. But Christ's few quotations do not guarantee the whole of the text. In any case, the Jewish canon at the time of Christ was not the Old Testament as Christians know it today. Moreover, the Old Testament itself bears witness to large sections or books that have dropped out entirely and been lost. Where, for example, is the Book of the Wars of the Lord, mentioned in Numbers 21 : 14, and the Book of Jasher, mentioned in Joshua 10 : 13 and in II Samuel 1 : 18? ¹² It may be that the quotations from the revealed Torah of Moses which are given in early Muslim literature, but which are not to be found in the present scriptures of the Jews and the Christians, are quotations from those lost or suppressed books. Third, Christians say that Christians and Jews were just as religious and devoted to their holy books as the Muslims are, and so would never be willing to falsify their texts. Yet this falsification has been everywhere admitted by Christian students of the text. Fourth, they say that copies of the scriptures were in such wide circulation that it would have been impossible to corrupt all the texts in the same way. Yet in the periods of idolatry after the time of Solomon, the Torah of Moses, far from being in wide circulation, was completely lost, as we know from the account, in II Kings 21, of the finding by Hilkiah of a copy in the reign of Josiah; even that copy was probably not

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I : 269 f.

¹² *Ibid.*, I : 291.

the original Torah.¹³ In the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, in the persecutions of Antiochus, and in the sack of the city by Titus, the Old Testament books even as revised and rewritten were lost. As for the New Testament, the first three centuries of persecution gave ample opportunity for books to be rewritten, when there were so few copies in circulation.

Book III discusses the meaning of abrogation, or *naskh*. It is not true, says Al-Hindī, that the Old and the New Testament have been abrogated *in toto*. Some kinds of scriptural commands can never be so. Islam claims that certain commands and regulations from these scriptures, however, have indeed been abrogated by the Qur'an and its teaching. Abrogation never implies that God changes his mind by caprice. It simply signifies that God at one time commanded certain things, intending that they should be observed for a certain limited period, after which they were to become no longer obligatory. This occurs very naturally in history, just as a doctor changes his prescription according to the state and progress of his patient.¹⁴ The Old Testament has many examples of abrogation, when it is said, "God repented." In the New Testament, Christians claim that the new dispensation abrogated the legal requirements of the Law of Moses with regard to circumcision, sacrifice, the observance of the sabbath, etc. Abrogation therefore often appears in the development of religious law, and in fact is quite necessary because of changing conditions. It is by no means inconsistent with the divine character that the Qur'an should have abrogated portions of the earlier divine books.

The doctrine of the trinity is the subject of Book IV. The author undertakes a rational refutation of the doctrine by showing that trinity is plurality, and if it exists with unity it means the coexistence of opposites, which is impossible.¹⁵ The incarnation is a contradiction in itself, since it would mean that God is become finite and contingent instead of infinite and absolute. Another method of refuting the trinity and the divinity of Christ is by reference to those words of Jesus in which he differentiates himself from God and shows God to be One alone, apart from Christ:

¹³ Carletti, *op. cit.*, I: 306.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, I: 327.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I: 388.

“And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent”;¹⁶ “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father”;¹⁷ “Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.”¹⁸ All these indicate that God and Christ are not one and the same. The words on the cross also give dramatic support to this fact, says Al-Hindī: “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”¹⁹ and “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.”²⁰ The references of Christ to himself as “Son of God” have been greatly overemphasized and misunderstood, the author explains, inasmuch as they are not used at all in a literal sense. “Son of God” is an expression that may be used of any righteous man, and it is so used in both the Old and the New Testament. “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God,” says Jesus,²¹ and Paul says, “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.”²² Similarly, Israel is called a son of God, and David also. Other texts are used from the Gospel of John to prove the divinity of Christ, but again they are wrongly interpreted, Al-Hindī explains. For example, “I and my Father are one”²³ may seem to indicate divinity until it is compared with another verse that throws light on how it is to be understood: “That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.”²⁴ In the same way, Al-Hindī claims that other verses in John’s Gospel that seem to refer to divinity do not in fact have that purpose. The miraculous birth of Christ from the Virgin Mary does not prove divinity, since Adam too was created by God without either father or mother; nor do the raising of the dead and the other miracles of Christ prove it, inasmuch as all prophets of God have performed miracles, both Moses and Elisha having performed things far more wonderful than the miracles of Christ.

¹⁶ John 17 : 3.

¹⁷ Mark 13 : 32.

¹⁸ Matthew 19 : 17.

¹⁹ Matthew 27 : 46.

²⁰ Luke 23 : 46.

²¹ Matthew 5 : 9.

²² Romans 8 : 14.

²³ John 10 : 30.

²⁴ John 17 : 21.

Book V takes up the infallibility of the Qur'an and the reliability of the Hadith, the Traditions. The proofs that the Qur'an is the literally revealed Word of God center largely around its incomparable eloquence, the miraculous order of its arrangement, and the beauty of its language, all of which prove its divine origin.²⁵ The Qur'an is the ever-enduring miracle that lives forever to be witnessed anew in every age, whereas all other miracles of the prophets have disappeared, and can only be heard of indirectly. Other indications of the divine origin of the Qur'an are the prophecies in it of events that later took place, the warnings that God sent in it to the Prophet about the plans and ruses of his enemies, and the wonderful knowledge included in it of all kinds, both religious and non-religious.²⁶

The attacks of the Protestant preachers on the Qur'an cannot stand in the face of clear proofs. They say its eloquence does not prove its divine origin, but a careful study will substantiate all that was said above about its miraculous beauty, whereas the Old and the New Testament are extremely weak in grammar, in style, and in content. It is true that the Qur'an sometimes diverges markedly from Biblical stories and laws, and is even in complete contradiction to them; but this is due to the utter corruption of the Old and the New Testament, as has been shown above, and to the abrogation of earlier divine laws in favor of the later qur'anic laws. The preachers object to the doctrine of predestination, and to the conception that God sends faith or impiety on whomever he will. Yet the Old Testament often indicates exactly the same arbitrariness in such words as, "God hardened his heart," or "God softened his heart."²⁷ The descriptions in the Qur'an of the sensual delights of paradise are defended; for since a bodily resurrection is to take place, there must be corporeal delights provided. Yet the greatest delight and recompense of the faithful will be the grace of God.²⁸ Finally, the Qur'an never contradicts itself, as is claimed by its vilifiers, though it sometimes abrogates an earlier verse when the conditions for the commandment have changed.

The authenticity of the great body of tradition known as the Ha-

²⁵ Carletti, *op. cit.*, II : 3 ff.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, II : 26 ff.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, II : 63 f.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, II : 70 f.

dīth is defended and explained. In the same way that the Jewish Mishna was transmitted orally for many centuries, and even as the New Testament texts indicate that there was an oral tradition in the early church, and as Mark's gospel and Luke's gospel were written by men who were depending on second-hand information, so in Islam tradition has played an important part in transmitting the works and actions of Muhammad for the regulation of religious life. But in Islam it has become a well-developed science of tradition, with great care taken in its study and with definite regulations testing and attesting the authority of each "authentic" tradition.²⁹ Of primary importance is the chain of authorities through whom the tradition was orally transmitted before it came to be written down, and the reliability of each one in the chain, but especially of the one with whom the tradition originated. With these provisions safeguarded, the author says, there can be no doubt of the authenticity of this great body of material.

The preachers object that these traditions go back to the wives of the Prophet, or his companions, whose witness can have no special authority. But the Qur'an itself witnesses to the piety of these companions, in spite of the attacks of the Shī'ites on the character of the first three caliphs. Their piety admits of no questioning of the traditions attributed to them. The preachers say that an impartial examination of the Hadīth shows that the traditions are not in accord with the facts; but miracles do not have to be in accord with what we understand, and the Old and the New Testament are still more in conflict with what we understand than is the Hadīth. They say, too, that the different traditions conflict with one another; but the "authentic" traditions, as distinguished from the doubtful or spurious ones, are easily reconciled by explanation, whereas the Christian scriptures have terrible contradictions, of which fifty more examples are given.³⁰

Book VI speaks of Muhammad and his divine mission. His miracles are divided into two kinds, prophecies and wonderful acts. Of the prophecies by which Muhammad foretold events, some examples are given from the Qur'an and from the Hadīth, the former usually of a rather general nature, and the latter more

²⁹ *Ibid.*, II : 91 f.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, II : 119-141.

specific. More than a thousand prodigious works are attributed to Muhammad, among which are the springing of a fountain from his fingers, the multiplication of food, the witnessing to his prophethood by trees and animals, the healing of the blind and the sick, and the revivifying of a sheep that had been eaten.³¹ Although some of these are not among the traditions certified as the most reliable, they are all far more authentically reported, says the author, than those miracles in the Gospel of Mark and of Luke which come from a single authority. Even the Qur'an itself reports some of the miraculous acts beyond all possible question, especially the Night Journey to heaven, and the splitting of the moon. The latter has been attacked as absurd, but the Qur'an itself reports it: "The hour hath approached and the moon hath been cleft,"³² and the Hadith adds many details and explanations. The miracle is certainly no stranger than that of Joshua in causing the sun to stand still,³³ or the Deluge. The fact that it was not more generally noticed and commented upon by historians of the time in various parts of the world is explained by its having taken place at night and probably in winter when few people were out-of-doors anyway.³⁴

Other proofs of the divine mission of Muhammad are the virtues and perfections of the character of the Prophet, the loftiness of his teaching, the wonderful and immediate success of the movement of Islam, especially in overcoming great empires on the field of battle, and the fact that it was impossible that God should not have sent a prophet to the world at that particular time of dire need on the part of men for a guide to the right path. Muhammad was also announced by the preceding prophets, and the imperfect Old and New Testament still retain many of these prophecies of him in spite of their corruption. Twelve are here given from the Old Testament, and six from the New.³⁵ Old Testament announcements of a prophet to come in the future are said to fit Muhammad far more decisively than Christ. The New Testament shows that Christ was seeking for a Kingdom of God to come in the future,

³¹ *Ibid.*, II : 171 ff.

³² Qur'an 54 : 1.

³³ Joshua 10 : 12 f.

³⁴ Carletti, *op. cit.*, II : 158 ff.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, II : 204-245.

and praying that it should so come, which proves that he had not brought it in himself. He was pointing to Islam. As for Paul's epistles, they are quite valueless; for Paul, having found he could not destroy Christianity from without, counterfeited conversion, entered the Christian fold, and fought it secretly from within, breaking down its basis in the Hebrew law and corrupting it thoroughly. All references to the coming of the Paraclete are interpreted as references to the coming of Muhammad.

There is a review of the favorite theory that an error in the Greek transliteration has made Παράκλητος out of an original Περικλυτός, which would be a translation of *Ahmad* or *Muhammad*, but the author prefers to base his identification of the Paraclete with Muhammad on other proofs.³⁶ He quotes also the specific reference to Muhammad in the spurious *Gospel of Barnabas* (which apparently originated in the sixteenth century),³⁷ where Christ himself is reported to have said to Barnabas: "And though I have been innocent in this world, since men have called me 'God,' and 'Son of God,' God, in order that I be not mocked of the demons on the day of judgment, hath willed that I be mocked of men in this world by the death of Judas, making all men to believe that I died upon the cross. And this mocking shall continue until the advent of Muhammad, the messenger of God, who, when he shall come, shall reveal this deception to those who believe in God's law."³⁸ From such passages as these, says the author, Muhammad was easily recognized by the early converts to Islam from Judaism and Christianity, and they admitted widely that he was a Prophet whose coming had been announced in the Old and the New Testament.

In conclusion, the author takes up several definite accusations of the preachers against Muhammad and Islam. They attack Muhammad's character in many ways; but the author lists thirty-three examples of the sins of the patriarchs and the prophets as blasphemously recounted in the Old and the New Testament to show how comparatively insignificant are the sins the preachers falsely attribute to Muhammad.³⁹ They claim that Muhammad

³⁶ *Ibid.*, II : 246 f.

³⁷ Lonsdale and Laura Ragg, *The Gospel of Barnabas*, pp. xiii ff., 1907.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 487.

³⁹ Carletti, *op. cit.*, II . 266 ff.

and the Qur'an are barbarous in advocating the *jihād*, or holy war, as a method of propagating religion. But certainly it is true that God does punish. The Old Testament is full of accounts of terrible massacres of women and children in holy wars, which were more awful than anything Islam has instigated. The frightful persecutions of the Jews by mediaeval Christendom in Europe, and the tortures and burnings to which both Roman Catholics and Protestants have subjected one another, show Christianity to be far more ruthless in the use of force than Islam.⁴⁰ For in Islam the *jihād* is subject to important rules that cannot be set aside, such as the duty of first inviting men to be converted, and always sparing women and children from massacre.

Christians say that in the Qur'an Muhammad disclaims any power to work miracles; this misconception is due to their erroneous interpretation of passages in which he refused to work a miracle at a particular time, just as Jesus refused on some occasions to give a miraculous sign. Christians attack Muhammad for taking nine wives by special divine dispensation, while others were limited to four, and they say he did wrong in taking Zayd's wife Zaynab for his own. But prophets are indeed in a different category from others, as is shown by the free practice of polygamy among the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament; and the marriage with Zayd's wife was perfectly regular, following in all propriety upon Zayd's divorce from her.⁴¹ If such suspicions were to be entertained as the Christians bring forth, and such reasoning followed in connection with the life of Christ, it would be easy to accuse him of drunkenness at Cana, of traveling about the country in the company of a loose woman, Mary of Magdala, and even of improper relations with the disciple "whom he loved" and who "was leaning on his bosom."⁴² Such thoughts, however, are completely unworthy.

Christians say, finally, that it is useless for Muslims to expect Muhammad's intercession with God at the last day, for Muhammad was a sinner as we are, and the Qur'an says so. This belief, too, is due to a misinterpretation of the Qur'an, says the author.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, II 291 ff.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, II 311 f.

⁴² *Ibid.*, II 314.

Muhammad's prayers for forgiveness on earth are not in order that his own sins may be forgiven; they are to teach his followers how to pray, and must be considered merely as acts of devotion. Even had he been a sinner, could he not intercede after being forgiven himself by God, even as Moses interceded for his people?

This concludes Rahmatallāh's *Izhār al-haqq*. Its argument has been given in some detail because it includes those characteristic points of attack and counterattack which have served both before its time and since, as well as a great number of the examples and illustrations and references that are used again and again in the subsequent writings which we shall now consider.

3. "*Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khāliq*," 'Abdurrahmān Bāshajizādah

Another book of classic standing among Muslim controversialists, often referred to by writers of lesser pamphlets, is Bāshajizādah's *Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khāliq*, "The Differentiation of the Creature from the Creator," published in Cairo in 1904. On the wide margins are printed in entirety two of the great mediaeval works to which we have already referred, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira* of Qarāfi (d. 1285) and *Haaāyat al-hayārā* of Ibn Qayyim Al-Jawziyya (d. 1350).⁴³ The method of procedure in *Al-fāriq* is a new and interesting one, for the book is in large part simply a commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. The author takes up the text of Matthew, chapter by chapter, and almost verse by verse, commenting and criticizing.⁴⁴ All the chief points of controversy are discussed as they present themselves in the study of the text. Several times there are long digressions from the chapter under consideration in order to study in more detail the controversial subject that has arisen in connection with it. After the study of Matthew has been completed, the other three gospels are taken up more briefly,⁴⁵ they having already been studied to a considerable extent along with Matthew when their corresponding passages were quoted in connection with a passage from Mat-

⁴³ See pages 29 and 32.

⁴⁴ 'Abdurrahmān Bāshajizādah, *Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khāliq*, pp. 23 ff., 1905.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 316 ff.

thew. Indeed the study of parallel passages and the contrast of differences in readings between the four gospels in verse after verse and chapter after chapter is the chief method by which *Al-fāriq* seeks to show that these gospels cannot be the true *injīl*, or Gospel, the literally inspired Word of God. The *injīl*, according to Islam, was originally "sent down on Christ" from heaven, a complete Book of revelation. The four gospels, conflicting one with another, and all of them with the Qur'an, cannot be that Book. The differences in the various modern translations into Arabic are pointed out as additional evidences of recent corruptions that have crept into the Christian scriptures.

Throughout the exegesis there is one chief criterion by which each passage or account or saying is judged, that is, the Qur'an itself. Anything in disagreement with the Qur'an is simply an indication of extraneous or corrupted material. For example, any reference to a prophet as possibly sinful, or any statement that Christ was unwilling that his miraculous "signs" be widely reported among the people as proofs of his divine mission, is at once ruled out as spurious material, since it contradicts the Qur'anic theory of prophethood. The chief interest, aside from the corruption of the scriptures, centers naturally in the references to the "Son of God," the divinity of Christ, and the crucifixion. There is no difficulty at all with the miracles of Christ as such. Indeed they are rather taken for granted. The accounts of the crucifixion are bitterly attacked, not so much for the reason that caused Muhammad originally to recoil from such a story, namely, that it was impossible that a prophet sent by God should be so terribly humiliated and tortured. The author points out that other prophets have suffered and been rejected by their people, even as John the Baptist was beheaded; but the story of the crucifixion must be rejected, as we shall see below, simply because it is specifically denied in the Qur'an. The Qur'an is the final authority by which the New Testament verses are judged.

The introduction of this book explains that it is written in answer to many Christian books that have been attacking Islam. The Christian believer is urged to peruse this book with an open mind in order that he may do justice to its content without any bias of fanaticism. The chief reasons, says the author, why any

Christian believes as he does are: first, that his parents did before him, and second, that he is convinced of the truth of the Christian religion by the miracles of Christ as reported in the scriptures.⁴⁶ The first reason is surely not satisfactory, and the second the author attempts to overthrow by quoting from the scriptures themselves to show that the scriptures are unreliable and the accounts of the miracles are merely conjectural, while the accounts of the miracles of Muhammad are, according to the author, true beyond all doubt and form a solid basis for faith. There follows a brief review of the chief tenets of the Christian faith, and of the history of the canon of the Bible.⁴⁷ It is shown that the authorship of many of the books of scripture is in doubt, and that different sects within the church, both in ancient times and today, have formed different canons of scripture, some rejecting as uninspired books which others claim to be divine. Among these books, the four so-called "gospels" are not the Book sent down on Christ by God. They are not what John the Baptist was referring to as the gospel when he said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel."⁴⁸ The real gospel was revealed orally by Christ and was never written down by men. A few verses from it perhaps remained in the memories of the disciples, but nothing that could be truly called the *injil*, the Gospel. The great numbers of sects that arose in the early church caused vast confusion, says the author, for each group had its favorite "gospel" or canon of books. The Marcionites, the Manichees, the Pelagians, the followers of Montanus, and others, each had their own conception of what was really holy scripture, and there was no agreement until the Council of Nicaea settled everything by decree and forbade further dissidence.

Coming to the Gospel of Matthew, the author quotes several European authorities to show that this book was written originally in Hebrew, and that what we have now is a translation, or even perhaps a translation of a translation, whose author is completely unknown.⁴⁹ With no guarantee of the character of the translator,

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4 f.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 9 ff.

⁴⁸ Mark 1 : 15.

⁴⁹ Bāshajizādah, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-22.

there is no knowing what particular axe he had to grind, in including or excluding material as he "translated."

In the first chapter, the genealogy of Christ according to Matthew is compared with the genealogy according to Luke, and the differences are noted one by one.⁵⁰ When he comes to the fifth chapter, the author is much interested in Christ's words in verse 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill," and in the subsequent emphasis on the importance of every detail of the law.⁵¹ This, he says, proves that Jesus came only to call the Jews back to the Law of Moses and that he did not intend to bring a new dispensation. The Christians thus were commanded to keep the Jewish Law, and yet they have changed it completely and done away with it, changing the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday, making it lawful to eat pork, changing the feasts and the fasts, and so on.

Verse 28, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart," is made the occasion for an attack on the freedom with which Christian women display their charms and stir up passion in youth. How can young men not "commit adultery in their hearts" under such circumstances? The use of the veil by women is not a tyranny for them, but a precious treasure, a help and a protection. A Muslim can be sure of his wife when she is veiled.

The differences between Matthew's and Luke's reporting of the Sermon on the Mount are all noted, and the fact that neither Mark nor John refers to such a Sermon at all.⁵² Even the two that do report it cannot agree whether it was "on the Mount" or in a plain! Matthew says, "And seeing the multitudes he went up into a Mountain," etc., but Luke says, "And he came down with them and stood in the plain," etc.⁵³ What credence can be given to accounts such as these? Parts of the Sermon on the Mount, however, may well be from the true original *injl* that was sent down on Christ, for chapter six is full of good teaching. The only objection is that Christians do not follow it. Why do they not pay more

⁵⁰ *Ibid* , p. 23.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 43 f.

⁵³ Matthew 5 : 1 and Luke 6 : 17.

attention to these injunctions about fasting, and leave the wild abandon of their mid-Lenten masques and balls?

Both the twelfth and the thirteenth chapters provide opportunity for attack on the loose way in which Christians live today, both morally and in religious observance.⁵⁴ For instance, the account in chapter twelve of Christ's approval of his disciples' plucking the ears of wheat on the sabbath is rejected as an interpolation invented by later Christian leaders for the very purpose of allowing themselves to be free to change the religious law as they wished, relying on the license of verse 8: "For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day," and on the freedom from religious observances claimed in verse 7: "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." In the criticism of the next chapter the author refers again to this freedom from religious restraint by which the Christians claim to have thrown aside the old Law of Moses and permitted themselves things that are strictly forbidden by all true religion. He reports the remark of a prominent Christian merchant who once exclaimed to him in the course of a discussion, "Alas, alas! If only there were not in your religion the ordinances against drinking wine, and gambling, and eating pork, and the intermingling of men and women, there would be not a soul on the face of this earth who would not confess Islam!"⁵⁵

Peter's confession of Christ as the Son of God in Matthew 16 :16 is denounced as a terrible blasphemy introduced by the unscrupulous translator of Matthew.⁵⁶ Neither Mark nor Luke in reporting the same conversation of Christ with his disciples uses this expression, but they give the confession as "Son of Man" or "Christ of God." If Peter had really used the expression "Son of God," or if Christ had admitted it, the other gospels would certainly have included it here. This is another blatant example of the unscrupulous methods used by this unknown translator of Matthew to corrupt the scripture and gain credence for his own trinitarian views. There follows a discussion of the absurdity of the conception of sonship of God. Both reason and tradition, 'aql and naql, reject it. The rational proofs are detailed, and

⁵⁴ Bāshajizādah, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 ff.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 115 ff.

proofs are advanced from both the Old and the New Testament to show that Christ is in no way a special Son of God, but that the term is used loosely of many good men in a figurative sense, and that God is the Father of all the righteous.

The discussion of marriage and divorce in chapter nineteen opens the way for a lengthy attack on the immorality of Christians, especially in giving women generally great freedom, and in allowing them to be closeted secretly in the confessional with theoretically celibate priests.⁵⁷ These prohibitions of divorce which are attributed to Christ have given women equality with men in a shocking manner (quite opposed to the clear teaching of Paul). Great immorality has arisen in Europe because of the difficulty of divorce until recent times. Polygamy, as practiced in Islam, is an important method of preventing immorality, while the so-called celibacy of the clergy is an unnecessary temptation to licence.

The parable in chapter twenty of the workers hired at the eleventh hour, who receive an equal recompense with those who were hired earlier, is interpreted as a prophecy of the reward to be given to the Muslims, who, though called to enter the Kingdom of God last of all, are given a full reward.⁵⁸ A similar prophecy, with further details by which Islam is even more clearly identified, is found in Luke 13 : 28-30: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last." In the next chapter the author sees another prophecy of Islam, in the words of Christ in verse 42: "Did ye never read in the scriptures, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?'" Here "the stone which the builders rejected" is a reference to Ishmael, who seemed for a period to be set aside in favor of his brother Isaac, but whom God chose to be the foundation of the final reve-

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 139 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 146 f.

lation, for his descendants the Arabs were the final chosen people of God, and his son Muhammad was the Seal of the prophets and the proclaimer of Islam.⁵⁹ Another prophecy of Islam is found in Christ's words to the woman of Samaria in John 4 : 21: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." Here Christ is clearly foretelling the time when both Samaria and Jerusalem will have been superseded by the Islamic center of worship in Makka.

These few examples will perhaps suffice to illustrate the methods which Bāshajizādah uses in *Al-fāriq* as the commentary proceeds. Most common of all is the interminable comparing of passages from the other three gospels which correspond to the passage under consideration in Matthew, and the noting of every difference in word or in phrase.⁶⁰ Indefatigably he builds up a sort of "disharmony of the gospels." Any one of these innumerable variations would be sufficient, he says, to prove that these scriptures cannot be the original *injil* of Christ sent down on him by God, unchangeable and invariable in its literal perfection. There remains only the interesting treatment of chapters twenty-six and twenty-seven, which are of special significance because they recount the crucifixion of Christ.

In these passages, says the author, the unscrupulous translator deceives men with his invention of the crucifixion story. And yet even here the truth shines through the corrupt verses in such a way that one who reads carefully can understand that Christ was not crucified, and that he was a simple prophet, not the Son of God. For instance, in the Garden of Gethsemane he was sorrowful and apprehensive, and prayed to God that he might be delivered from the suffering that threatened him. How could he sweat in such fear if he were God, and, indeed, to whom could he pray if he were God? Can this be the Creator, the Alpha and the Omega? His fear is shown also in his attempt to escape just as the servants of the chief priests came to arrest him, for he called to his disciples, "Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray us." The account of the arrest itself is absurd, says the author, for how could it be true that they should not know Jesus,

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁶⁰ See, for example, *ibid.*, pp. 23-25, 30, 43 f., 49 f., 52-54, 56, etc., etc.

who was such a well-known figure in Jerusalem, and should need a special sign from Judas in order to recognize him? It is clear that the bewilderment and uncertainty of the multitude at this moment is an indication of the true fact underlying these lies, that is, that Christ was taken away from their sight, and that his likeness fell on Judas, so that they arrested him, the phenomenon to which the Qur'an refers in its famous words *shubbiha lahum*, "one was made to appear to them like [Jesus]." ⁶¹ "Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not, but they had only his likeness. And they who differed about him were in doubt concerning him: No sure knowledge had they about him, but followed only an opinion, and they did not really slay him, but God took him up to himself. And God is Mighty, Wise!" ⁶² Another proof that Christ was removed by God to safety comes in Christ's words in John 7 : 34 to those sent by the chief priests to arrest him on a previous occasion: "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me: and where I am, thither ye cannot come." ⁶³ Here he foretells that they will try to arrest him but will be quite unable. If there is any truth in the story that Judas repented and committed suicide, it is far more suitable to believe that he went to his death willingly as a substitute for Jesus, repenting his betrayal and giving his life in this way rather than in a useless suicide.

The variations in the different gospel accounts of the crucifixion are pointed out. The words of the crucified on the cross show, according to the author, that he could not have been Christ. He prays to God to forgive the soldiers, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," but if he had been divine he would have said, "I forgive them." "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" would be a strange cry from the lips of one who had come into the world on purpose to suffer and be crucified for the sins of the world, as the Christians say.⁶⁴ Everything points to the fact that the qur'anic account is the correct one, and that the crucified was not Christ. The incorruptible state of the Qur'an makes it sure that it is reliable on this point as on all others. Western scholarship shows that the crucifixion was rejected by

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

⁶² Qur'an 4 : 156 and fn., p. 427 (J. M. Rodwell, transl.).

⁶³ Bāshajizādah, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 266, 271.

early Christian sects, for example, the Basilidians, who believed that Simon of Cyrene was crucified in place of Christ. *The Gospel of Barnabas* also explains the substitution of Judas for Christ at the arrest and on the cross, as has been shown.⁶⁵ A further indication of the real fact is to be found in the prisoner's answer to the High Priest when he asked him if he were Christ. The answer came, "Thou hast said," which means, "That is what you are saying," whereas the speaker was really Judas.⁶⁶ Actually, says the author, the originator of the false crucifixion story may well have been Paul;⁶⁷ indeed, Paul may himself have been this translator and corrupter of the original Gospel of Matthew. Altogether, the author gives twenty proofs from the gospel texts to show that underneath the erroneous stories of the crucifixion of Christ there lingers the truth of the story that another was substituted for him.

Having gone so carefully through the whole of the Gospel of Matthew, and having considered so many passages from the other three gospels, setting them alongside the corresponding passages in Matthew, the author takes up the other three gospels much more briefly, mentioning only those passages which have not been considered previously and which he feels are significant for his purpose. 'The Gospel of Mark, he says, is not inspired, being derived from Peter indirectly. Parts of it do not even go back to Mark, but are later additions, as scholars have shown, notably the last twelve verses of the book.⁶⁸ The Gospel of Luke also is completely unreliable, as Luke was a disciple of Paul, the deceiver. Biblical scholarship shows that here too there are spurious verses, some of which are pointed out. The Gospel of John was written very late, says the author, quoting a Jesuit source in order to establish the divinity of Christ, which proves, he says, that there was much disbelief in Christ's divinity in the early days.

The appendix to this book consists of four replies to specific Christian tracts, and has special reference to Roman Catholic practice.

⁶⁵ See page 55.

⁶⁶ Bāshajizādah, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 317-325.

4. "*Lisān as-sidq*," 'Alī Bahrānī

Lisān as-sidq, by 'Alī Bahrānī, is another well-known reply to Pfander's *Mizān al-haqq*, though it is far less ably written than Rahmatallāh's *Izhār al-haqq*, which we have already studied. *Lisān as-sidq* was originally published in Bombay in 1889, but this edition is an Arabic translation revised and printed in Cairo by Muhammad 'Alī Malījī, others of whose works we shall note later.⁶⁹ While the author covers a great deal of ground in this work, and includes the principal points of controversy in his material, the arrangement is by no means as careful or the arguments as clearly and logically presented as in *Izhār al-haqq*.⁷⁰ The Shī'ite background of the writer is evident in his attitude toward 'Alī and the eleven other *imāms*, but for the most part the discussion is of an orthodox sort, such as any Sunnite might give. How much of this may be due to the revision by a Sunnite editor is not clear.

The first section takes up the arguments against the trinity in detail, some from reason and some based on texts in the New Testament. It proceeds to demonstrate the corruption of the Old and the New Testament and the ways by which corruption may take place: *tabdīl* means changing the form, while *tahrīf* is more general, and includes addition of words or phrases, suppression of words or phrases, and also *ta'wīl*, or changing the meaning by explanation and interpretation.⁷¹ The Old Testament is shown to have been corrupted in the time of the Babylonian Exile and other exiles, and the New Testament to be not at all the original *injīl* sent down on Christ by God, but a collection of books composed by disciples and others. If each of these authors was inspired and was an official recipient of divine revelation, then each should be a prophet in his own right, with a mission of his own, and a particular people to whom he was sent as a warner.⁷² But we know nothing of their fulfilling any such requirements, and thus the books are clearly not inspired. Moreover the contradictions are pointed out. Muhammad indeed gave witness that some of the

⁶⁹ See pages 86 ff.

⁷⁰ See pages 46-57.

⁷¹ 'Alī Bahrānī, *Lisān as-sidq*, p. 76. 1319 A.H.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

New Testament was true, but any variation from the Qur'an in any point is an instance of corruption.

The second section seeks to refute Pfander's arguments for the reliability of the Old Testament and the New Testament texts. The third section, by far the longest, deals with the mission of Muhammad. His life is briefly outlined, and then the author comes to the accusation that Islam was spread by the sword. His answer is that it was not so spread, although Christianity was.⁷³ It is true that when force was used against Muhammad, when his enemies plotted to murder him, it was necessary to use force. Had he not done so, the Jews and Christians would have killed him as the Jews tried to kill Christ, before Islam could get a start.⁷⁴ If he had used merely persuasive teaching and preaching, as he always did at first, and had gone no further, a mere handful of the Arabs would have followed Islam, for they were a fierce and bloody and barbarously tough race.⁷⁵ Pfander says that a prophet must love his people and lead them gently without use of force, but this author responds that a prophet must always obey God, and if he is commanded to use force, he must not question or criticize God's will. Muhammad's reason for fighting was clearer, he says, than was Moses' reason for conducting religious wars. David and others of the prophets also used the *jihād*, the religious war, to accomplish the purposes of God.

It is useless, says the author, to deny that Muhammad was foretold in both the Old and the New Testament. The Jews of his day recognized him by his description in the Old Testament, many of them being converted to Islam because of it, and telling their people that here was the promised prophet. While Muhammad was yet a boy the monk Buhayra recognized him as a prophet that had been foretold, and warned his uncle not to let the Jews harm him.

In the original *injil*, explains the author, there were clear prophecies of Muhammad, mentioning him by name, and even now there are many references to him that have not been suppressed by the Christians. The accusation made by Pfander that

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 145-143.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Muhammad probably heard from a renegade Christian that he was mentioned by name in the *injīl*, and so based his claim on nothing more than that, is an unfounded calumny. It was by divine inspiration that Muhammad knew all that was in the *tawrāt* and the *injīl*; he challenged the Jews and the Christians to bring their books and read them if they wished to disprove his statements, but they never accepted his challenge.⁷⁶ How can Pfander say that Muhammad was "forced" to announce that Christians and Jews had corrupted their texts when he found that his name did not appear in them? As the Christians blame the Jews for not recognizing the prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament, so we blame the Christians for not recognizing that Muhammad was foretold in both the Old and the New Testament.⁷⁷

There follow the classical Old Testament passages claimed by earlier Muslim writers as prophecies of Muhammad. Three will serve to illustrate this point. The first is Deuteronomy 18 : 18: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." It is expressly stated that the inspiration will be orally delivered, which was the case with Muhammad; the reference cannot be to Christ, for to him was given the *injīl* as a written book of inspiration. Moreover, "from among their brethren" means "from the children of Ishmael, the brother of Isaac," whereas it would have read "from among yourselves," if it had referred to a Jewish prophet.⁷⁸ Another important prophecy is Psalm 45 : 3 f.: "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things." Here is an exact description of Muhammad and his work. It can by no means be applied to Christ, who never girded on a sword or rode a horse as far as is known. It exactly fits the victorious Muhammad leading his armies to success in battle.⁷⁹

A longer passage referring to Muhammad is found in the forty-

⁷⁶ Ali Bahrāni, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 200 ff.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 212 f.

second chapter of Isaiah, says the author. Verses 1 to 4 are as follows: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law." This passage fits Muhammad, to whom God gave victory more completely than to any other prophet. It is known, too, that Muhammad never raised his voice in speaking, but spoke in quiet tones. "The isles shall wait for his law" proves that Muhammad is meant, for no other prophet after Moses, neither Christ nor any other, gave a new law that was to supersede the Mosaic law until Muhammad brought men the Qur'an.⁸⁰ After explaining further why Christ cannot be meant in these verses, the author goes on to quote verse 11: "Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that Kedar doth inhabit: let the inhabitants of the rock sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains." He explains that Kedar, a descendant of Ishmael (according to Genesis 25 : 13), refers to the Arabs in Makka and Madīna, and through other identifications shows that this was the very verse that caused the leaders of the Jewish tribes to recognize Muhammad as the prophet that was foretold.⁸¹

The prophecies of Muhammad in the New Testament have largely to do with the interpretation of the word "Paraclete," to which reference has already been made.

The attacks of Pfander on the miraculous eloquence of the Qur'an are answered, and the usual proofs are reiterated: that all Muhammad's enemies could not in his time produce anything like it, that even now no one can imitate it, and that in no language could there be such marvelous beauty. It is impossible that English or French, or German or Greek should have such eloquence. The content of the Qur'an is the second proof of its miraculous origin, for the things recorded are such as Muhammad

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 217 ff.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

could never have learned during his upbringing. Pfander claims that he learned some of the contents of the Old and the New Testament from Jews and Christians, and that he learned incorrectly, which resulted in differences between the Qur'an and the other texts. But Muhammad never plagiarized or copied from earlier traditions; his information was inspiration straight from God.⁸² All differences show corruption of the Jewish and the Christian books. Muhammad's early life is examined in detail, to show that it is impossible that he had contacts with Jews or Christians to any extent before the revelations came to him. Pfander accuses Muhammad of compromising with the truth, and admitting into Islam many practices just to please the Arabs and the Makkans of his time and draw them to Islam, such as the veneration of the Ka'ba, the pilgrimage to it, and the rites of circling it.⁸³ The author counters by claiming that the veneration of the Ka'ba goes back to Abraham, and that it is an example of a few rites of his early pure religion that had persisted among the Arabs, just as circumcision had continued always to be practiced. Other proofs of the miraculous nature of the Qur'an are the historical prophecies and the other miracles of Muhammad. The clear witness of these miracles in the Hadith is defended as being more reliable than the haphazard reports of the miracles of Christ.

Attacks on Muhammad's character are answered, especially the accusations that he twisted the revelations to suit his desire for more wives. It is denied that there was any tendency to epilepsy in Muhammad, and an effort is made to show that the revelations came to him, not in excitement or with abnormal manifestations, but when he was perfectly calm and balanced. Muhammad's act of giving the Quraysh an extra large share of the booty in a certain campaign in order to attract them to Islam and attach them more firmly to it, is defended by claiming that Muhammad had a right to dispose of the booty as he saw fit for the increase and advancement of God's religion.⁸⁴ The persecution of the Parsees, by massacre and exile, until they were practically eradicated from

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 284.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 433.

Persia, is upheld as the command of God.⁸⁵ Religion must have an arm of strength behind it always. Pfander says that Christianity was spread only by preaching and teaching, whereas the fact is, answers the author, that Christianity was very unsuccessful until Constantine forced it on the empire.

5. Muhammad 'Abduh

An important contribution to the field of apologetics was made by one who stands perhaps at the top of the list of modern reformers in Islam, Muhammad 'Abduh.⁸⁶ Coming from a poverty-stricken peasant family, he became before his death in 1905 one of the great influences in the life of Egypt, lecturer and writer, leader of sweeping reforms in Al-Azhar University, Grand Mufti of Egypt, and founder of movements both social and religious. His liberalizing thought, however, was rooted in a conservatism toward the qur'anic revelation; the rebirth of Islam, he felt, must come through a casting off of the accretions of tradition and authority other than the authority of the Qur'an itself, and the application of that literally inspired revelation to the problems of modern life. Greatly though he admired many aspects of western progress, his firm conviction remained that the true springs of advance of all kinds were to be found in the Qur'an, and that the salvation of the Muslim world lay in resisting the encroachments of the west and developing in accordance with the original purity of Islam. Aspects of this thesis are developed in his two best known apologetic works.

The first is a series of reprints of articles that appeared in the periodical *Al-Manār* in 1901, in answer to articles by Farah Antūn in *Al-Jāmi'a* that had attacked Islam's tendency to repress advances in learning, especially in connection with the persecution of Ibn Rushd in Spain in the twelfth century. The articles as collected are published under the title *Al-islām wan-nasrāniyya ma'al-'ilm wal-madaniyya*,⁸⁷ "Islam and Christianity in Their Attitudes to Learning and Civilization." In them his purpose is to show that

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 435 f.

⁸⁶ On him, see C. C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, 1933. Also H. A. R. Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam*, pp. 29, 31-34, 39, 47-48, etc., 1947.

⁸⁷ Muhammad 'Abduh, *Al-islām wan-nasrāniyya ma'al-'ilm wal-madaniyya*, 3rd ed., 1341 A.H.

Islam has always been far more tolerant than Christianity, and that its very nature is to encourage research and the investigation of truth. 'Abduh asks what persecution of learned men can be found in Islam today. One sees everywhere that Muslims are eagerly entering Christian schools, but Christians never are willing to enter Muslim schools. He denies that the Muslims ever massacred one another because of religious belief; the wars against the Khawārij, the Qarāmīta, and the Hāshimīyya, for example, were political. Part I of the book examines the characteristic attitude of Christianity to learning, and comes to these conclusions: (1) the first basis of Christianity is miracles, for on these the gospels depend for the proof of the truth of revelation. Any miracle may be performed by faith, the gospels say. But this is contrary to science, and if everything is possible by faith, there is no need for science for the Christian. (2) Christians have no freedom for investigation, for belief is fixed by the religious rulers and the power of the church, especially the Roman Church. (3) Christian withdrawal from the world, especially as expressed in celibacy and monasticism, expresses a lack of interest in nature and in science and is characterized by phrases such as, "Take no thought for the morrow." (4) Christianity encourages belief in the unintelligible, even in what contradicts the laws of reason.⁸⁸ Anselm, for example, instructs one to believe what is revealed to his heart, then try to understand it. On the other hand, woe to him who investigates anything, and so is led to contradict a belief! (5) The Old and the New Testament contain all that men need for living, or, as Tertullian says, "all the knowledge man is able to grasp." Thus there is no need for further study. As a result of these attitudes and others, Christians could not investigate scientific areas outside the Bible, and religious leaders opposed learning from the very beginning, when Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, destroyed a large part of the Alexandrian library, and his nephew Cyril encouraged the persecution and eventual murder of the learned Hypatia.⁸⁹ Through the centuries the history of the conflict is the same. Science and Christianity clashed after Europe's contact with learning in Muslim Spain and in the crusades. The

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 29 ff.

Inquisition brought indeed "not peace but a sword." The expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492, and of the Muslims in 1502, the opposition to Columbus by the Council of Salamanca, the burning of Bruno in 1600, and the persecution of Galileo, are paralleled in modern times by the opposition to inoculation, to the methods for easing childbirth, to freedom of belief of all kinds, and to scientific publications and societies. Protestantism is no better than Catholicism in this respect, for the Reformation still insisted that the Bible was the source of all scientific knowledge as well as of religion.⁹⁰

Part II shows how different is Islam, which believes that religion everywhere is one and is not opposed to the use of the mind, God's great gift to man. The tolerance toward learning which has in more recent times been growing stronger in Europe is due, says 'Abduh, to the influence of Islam, whose precepts and attitudes are becoming better understood in the West. For Islam depends primarily on reason for the proofs of the truth of religion. The Qur'an does not bind a man's mind within a book, but it teaches him to seek truth in nature. Islam depends on rational proofs as the primary support of belief in God's unity, and this is prior to belief in revelation and prophecy. Even here, the chief proof of the validity of the Qur'an and of Muhammad's mission does not rest on miracles done long ago which cannot be known today except through hearsay, but it rests on the ever-present miracle of the Qur'an's *I'jāz*, or superhuman perfection, which is open to examination at firsthand by anyone in any age. The attitude of Islam to science and reason may be summarized in the following points: (1) Islam is based on rational thought as a means to faith. (2) It affirms the priority of reason over traditional teaching if there is a conflict between the two; that is, the tradition may be "explained" to conform to reason.⁹¹ (3) Islam is slow to accuse of unbelief: if there is one chance in a hundred that a statement can be interpreted according to true faith rather than *kufr*, unbelief, the former must be the interpretation adopted, and there must be no accusation of *kufr*. (4) Islam demands belief in God's universal laws in nature, for the study of God's holy Book in Arabic

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 42 ff.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 54 f.

has led to linguistic, historical, cultural, and scientific investigations of all kinds. (5) Islam rejects religious authority which can dictate beliefs to individuals. As long as one is seriously attempting for himself to interpret the word of God, no one may force on him any other interpretation. (6) Islam uses force only in order to protect the true religion against its enemies. It is actually much more forbearing in the use of arms than Christianity has been.⁹² (7) Muslims are not set at odds with others, as are Christians, who must "hate their father and mother." (8) The good things of this life are the gift of God, and they are not only to be enjoyed, but examined and studied by science. "Seek knowledge though in China," says the tradition.

'Abduh proceeds to show what the results of these characteristics have been through the centuries. He reviews the patronage of learning by the Umayyads and the 'Abbasids, and the transmission of knowledge to Europe.⁹³ He then takes up the gloomy picture of Islam's situation today, when its backward condition belies the noble qualities that make up its true nature. Today ignorant *shaykhs* and rulers attack learned men, and Al-Azhar University is loath to admit into its curriculum subjects that are not closely related to religion. When Islam was Islam, religious law was broad enough to include all the world, but now it is heresy to question the decisions of the *shaykhs* on any point. There is no critical judgment of tradition in these days, simply the entire acceptance of it. Men should go back to the Prophet and his associates, and seek the original religion.⁹⁴

Muhammad 'Abduh's second well-known apologetic work is an answer to an article in the periodical *Al-Mu'ayyad* by Gabriel Hanotaux, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, in which the original intention was to bring the French people and the French government to a better understanding of the differences that separated their world from the world of Islam with which their colonial policy was dealing. He insisted on the necessity of a better knowledge of Islam on the part of those who were going into colonial service, in order that the ties might be strengthened

⁹² Muhammad 'Abduh, *op. cit.*, pp. 66 f.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

between France and Islam. He pointed out the solidarity of Islam throughout the world, and the way in which Tunis was at last being separated from that solidarity and absorbed into the French empire. These and other points were the ones that 'Abduh felt impelled to answer in his *Al-islām, risāla bi qalam M. Hanotaux wa radd 'alayhā*, "Islam, An Article by M. Hanotaux and An Answer to It." 'Abduh first blames Hanotaux for twisting the facts and misreading history entirely in his attempt to show that Aryan civilization and culture have far surpassed Semitic;⁹⁵ for, says 'Abduh, the cradle of Aryan civilization and culture is India, which is still heathen. On the contrary, Europe is indebted to the Semitic races for her culture. The barbarism of Europe was something shocking when Islam brought the light of culture to her in the Dark Ages. What we see today as civilization in Europe is by no means a Christian culture, for it is based on greed and the lust for gold, whereas a New Testament culture should be far more like the American Colony in Jerusalem, a true example of a New Testament religious group, waiting in prayer and self-denial for Christ's second coming.⁹⁶ This Aryan West has taken far more into its culture from the Semitic East than the East is taking today from the West. 'Abduh proceeds to describe God's unity and perfection, and contrasts this conception with the doctrine of the incarnation.⁹⁷ He points out that the idea of "mediators" in religion, or the worship of "divine" traits in individual men, is not far removed from idolatry. Hanotaux had claimed that Christianity, with its conception of the immanence of God, had brought man and God close together, whereas Islam's conception of the utter transcendence of God and the submission of his creatures had set a chasm between man and God. 'Abduh here says the opposite is the case, for the conception of a mediator, Christ, removes the worshiper one degree from God himself, while in Islam the worshiper comes to him directly.

At the end of the book is appended a brief article by Muhammad Farid Wajdī, one of Muhammad 'Abduh's followers, who has done some apologetic writing.⁹⁸ He attacks particularly a

⁹⁵ Muhammad 'Abduh, *Al-islām, risāla bi qalam M. Hanotaux wa radd 'alayhā*, p. 33. n.d.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38. ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 62 ff. On Wajdī, see Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 243 ff.

suggestion of Hanotaux's that Islam may well be accepted and tolerated as a bridge by which men may be led from paganism to Christianity. Islam is no "bridge," exclaims Wajdī, but the final religion revealed by the last of the prophets, the religion of the ages toward which the world is tending. Absolute monotheism is the religion of science, the ultimate in the trend of modern thinking. Islam is the religion of today, and of the future.

Before his death, Muhammad 'Abduh was working on a *Commentary* on the Qur'an, and this great work was carried on by his student Muhammad Rashīd Ridā, who had also taken a large share in the responsibility for the first part. A passage dealing with the *tawrāt* and the *injīl*⁹⁹ is of interest from the apologetic point of view. The distinction is made between the true *tawrāt* and that which is current today in the hands of the Jews and the Christians. As for the New Testament, it is made up of many books, of which not one possesses an *isnād*, that is, a definite chain of authorities guaranteeing that such a one transmitted the words to such a one until it was finally written down and received in permanent form. The real *injīl* on the contrary was given to Christ by God. The present "gospels" are four. How miraculous that the unlettered Muhammad should have been inspired to know all this, even to the plural expression "gospels" in speaking of the Christian scriptures!

⁹⁹ Muhammad 'Abduh and Muhammad Rashīd Ridā, *Tafsīr al-qur'ān al-hakīm*, III : 155 ff., 1324-1350 A.H.

CHAPTER V

THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC: VARIETIES

1. "*Ar-radd 'alā ad-dahriyyīn*," *Jamāluddīn Afghānī*

THE man from whom Muhammad 'Abduh as a youth received the great impetus of inspiration for the reform and rebirth of Islam was a colorful and impressive personality, Jamāluddīn Afghānī. Prime Minister of Afghanistan at the age of twenty-seven, Prime Minister of Persia in later life, banished in succession from Egypt, from Turkey, from Persia, he was indefatigable in preaching reform and revolution, both religious and political. Several great revolutionary movements in the Islamic countries were in their early stages due in no small measure to his inspiration—the Egyptian nationalist movement that culminated in the 'Arabī revolt of 1882, the Persian revolutionary movement of 1891–1906, and the Young Turk movement of 1908. It will be seen from these dates that his death in 1897 did not put an end to the fire of enthusiasm kindled by his teaching.¹ His only claim as a polemist, however, is a small section in his book *Ar-radd 'alā ad-dahriyyīn*,² "Refutation of the Materialists," which was translated from Persian to Arabic by Muhammad 'Abduh. A long introduction by the translator tells the story of the life and activity of Afghānī. The book itself attacks materialism and naturalism, trying to show that they undermine civilization, whereas religion creates the real supports of culture. A curious point that illustrates Afghānī's identification of religion and nationalism in Islam is his explanation of one way in which religion contributes to the progress of civilization. Religion, he says, encourages every religious man to believe "that his people are the noblest of all

¹ C. C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, Chap. 1.

² Jamāluddīn Afghānī, *Ar-radd 'alā ad-dahriyyīn*, transl. to Arabic by Muhammad 'Abduh, 1935.

peoples, and all others are in error.”³ There is no direct mention of Christianity, and the attack on it is only implied by the contrast with Islam, which is free of any conception of incarnation, or of a God suffering for the sake of his creatures. A religion which uses its religious leaders, he says, as mediums by which the worshiper may reach God, and which teaches that “what they bind on earth is bound in heaven,” does not encourage progress. Islam alone bases its claims on reason, not claiming that plurality is unity and unity plurality “above all reason.” The excellences of Islam are thus the necessary foundations of civilization.

2. “*Al-mustashriqūn wal-islām*,” Husayn Hirrāwī

Al-mustashriqūn wal-islām, “The Orientalists and Islam,” is a warning to Muslims against Western students of Arabic literature and history who are really bent on harming Islam and subjecting it to the domination of Christianity and the West. The author is a medical man who has been an inspector of health in the government. He begins by pointing out the solidarity of Islam in spite of the inroads of Western thought and political influence. Orientalism in the West has arisen, he says, in response to the desire to attack and break up the thought of Islam, which apparently cannot be overcome by the armies that have been trying by force of arms to set up colonial empires. Orientalists are professors who are instructing their own people in preparation for official posts in the colonies. Their publications have presented the East and Islam in such libelous pictures that there has grown up a far greater misunderstanding between East and West than was necessary. Some of these men attack the Qur’an, some attack Muhammad’s character, and some try to loosen the bonds that bind Islam together by persuading the Arabs that their classical language is antiquated and that the modern dialects should supplant it, each one in its own particular district.

Orientalists try to study Muhammad’s life as though it were Napoleon’s, seeking for formative influences and origins of his thought.⁴ Such attempts lead nowhere, for it is precisely the miraculous and inexplicable qualities in the Qur’an and in Mu-

³ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴ Husayn Hirrāwī, *Al-mustashriqūn wal-islām*, sec. 2, 1936.

hammad himself that created the wonderful structure of Islam. Orientalists claim that Muhammad obtained information about Christianity and Judaism from the Jews and Christians in Ma-dīna, and from his two trips to Syria, and that from this second-hand material he produced the garbled stories in the Qur'an about the two religions. The author insists that all the wisdom of the Qur'an is God-given and revealed, and that Muhammad could never have collected such learning, though all previous books of knowledge had been available to him. He deduces, by references to the methods of Freud and Jung, that psychological study of Muhammad's personality proves him to be a singularity in himself, unequaled by any other. The origins of his knowledge cannot be accounted for by ordinary means. The chief orientalists that are mentioned as attempting to belittle Muhammad's divine mission are Renan, Margoliouth, Hurgonje, Wensinck, and Dermenghen.⁵

Particular accusations against Muhammad have been of all kinds. Some orientalists have claimed that Muhammad could read, and that therefore his knowledge of so many kinds of learning was no particular miracle. Others have tried to show that his mission was dominated by a love of power. Some say that he persecuted the Jews for the sake of their wealth and the booty that could be got from them; actually he behaved with great restraint toward a people that was ruining the economy of the Arabs with usury, says the author.

The orientalists, he continues, are seeking to overthrow that independence and freedom of the mind that is one of the great characteristics of Islam—a quality of the Arabs that has been opposing the colonizing movements of the West. They run to the dictionary to prove that Islam means "submission" and "subjection" instead of freedom of thought.⁶ Renan develops a theory that the Semitic mind moves naturally toward absolute mono-

⁵ See, for example: Ernest Renan, *Der Islam und die Wissenschaft*. M. Bernheim, Basel, 1883.

D. S. Margoliouth, *Mohammedanism*. Williams and Norgate, London, 1911.

C. Snouck Hurgonje, *Mahomedanism*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1916.

A. J. Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed*. University Press, Cambridge, 1932.

Emile Dermenghen, *The Life of Mahomet*, transl. by Arabella Yorke. Lincoln MacVeagh, New York, 1930.

⁶ Hirrāwī, *op. cit.*, sec. 6.

theism and simplicity in art, in religion, in civilization, and in thought, while the Aryan mind is characterized by a diversity and plurality that leads to invention and progress. But the author finds the theory quite baseless, and asks how it is that the Arabs were so long polytheists. Margoliouth's attacks on the person of Muhammad include the calumnious suggestion that, since among the Arabs the name 'Abdallāh, "Servant of God," often meant someone whose name was not known, and since the name of Muhammad's father is given as 'Abdallāh, we may well wonder if Muhammad had no known father. Such a suggestion of evil about the Prophet's mother is characteristic of them. If his father was not known, how were his paternal uncle, and his paternal grandfather, and his paternal cousins known, all of whom are specified as such?

A special section deals with articles which the author once published protesting against the appointment of Wensinck as a delegate to the Royal Linguistic Conference in Egypt, in view of statements of his in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* and elsewhere to the detriment of the true religion of Islam. The fact is, says the author, that orientalists are an international society encouraged by the governments of the West. Any book of theirs appears in three languages at the same time, French, English, and German, and the introduction always acknowledges the help of men in other countries. Missionaries then get their material for polemical tracts from these findings of the orientalists, who are thus their chief helpers.

The last part of the book, section 10, deals with marriage and divorce, and the use of the veil. Freud's psychology, according to the author, teaches that the sex instinct is the basis of all other instincts and of the drive to living. Muhammad recognized this. Not only do his regulations fit man's particular need in this sphere, but we must admit that here is an added miracle of the Qur'an, a miracle of psychology, in that the spirit of man is treated suitably and understandingly, far above what any mere human understanding could accomplish without divine aid. Islam for the first time conserved woman's rights in marriage, says the author, after centuries during which man looked down on her as the satanic means by which he had been deprived of para-

dise. The necessity for freedom in divorce is explained, and the advantages of polygamy. In general, Islam's arrangement for marriage is ideal, says the author, for it makes marriage easy and regulates the financial commitments of it, and in all things treats the sexual instinct sympathetically and suitably. Orientalists and missionaries libel Muhammad in the matter of his marriages. As a matter of fact, the author says, Muhammad was an ascetic in mortifying his desires and needs. His marriages were not for the sake of gratifying desires, but in order to do honor to the widows of certain faithful martyrs, or to obtain a benefit for the people of God through desirable alliances. The proof of this is that among them all only one was a virgin, while several were older widows.

3. "*Al-jawāb al-munīf*" and "*ʿIlm al-yaqīn*"

Two smaller books in answer to publications from India are *Al-jawāb al-munīf fir-radd ʿalā muddaʿī at-tahrīf fil-kitāb ash-sharīf*, "The Glorious Reply to Him Who Claimed There Is Corruption in the Holy Book," and *ʿIlm al-yaqīn fir-radd ʿalā al-mutanassar ʿimāduddīn*, "True Knowledge in Reply to the Convert 'Imāduddīn."⁷ The former is written in answer to a missionary tract in Arabic, *Hal min tahrīf fil-kitāb ash-sharīf?*, "Is There Corruption in the Holy Book?", which was a translation of W. Goldsack's *The Qur'an in Islam*, published in India in 1912. The author of this reply was a blind *shaykh*, teacher of theology at Al-Azhar University, and for a time chairman of a committee that was formed to combat missionary activity against Islam.⁸ The *shaykh* in this reply to Goldsack remarks on the fanaticism of missionaries and the absurdities of Christian beliefs, and then proceeds to establish the incorruptible perfection of the Qur'an. The points taken up are ones that have already been rehearsed, such as the impossibility of the text's having been tampered with and the great care in its preservation. Tolstoi and especially Carlyle⁹ are quoted in praise of Muhammad. The miraculous

⁷ Yūsuf Dijwī, *Al-jawāb al-munīf*, 1913. Ahmad Sharif, *ʿIlm al-yaqīn*, 1311 A.H.

⁸ Arthur Jeffery, "A Collection of Anti-Christian Books and Pamphlets Found in Actual Use among the Mohammedans of Cairo." *The Moslem World*, XV: 29 f., 1925.

⁹ Dijwī, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-75.

qualities of the Qur'an are reviewed, and the praise of its beauty by Sir William Muir, Washington Irving, Gibbon, Macaulay, Marcus Dods, and others.¹⁰ On the other hand, the corruption of the Old and the New Testament is claimed by the *shaykh*, who gives examples of contradictions to prove his point. Twenty-four questions are suggested as suitable to ask Christians if you are arguing with them, questions which they will have great difficulty in answering. The first is this: Are we to believe that God is God alone and that he sent Christ (as it is taught in John 17 : 3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent"); or are we to believe that Christ is "very God of very God" as the creed says? ¹¹ Another question asks: If Christ was God, why did he say to the ruler, reported in Luke 18 : 19 : "Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, that is God"? Was it perhaps that he was God but didn't know it? At the end of the book there are listed in opposite columns the corresponding beliefs of their respective followers about Christ and Buddha, and Christ and Krishna. Parallels are shown in the stories of miracles attending the birth of each, and a similarity is pointed out between the Hindu and the Christian doctrines of the trinity, where Krishna and Christ are in each case made the Second Person of a triune God. The characteristic Christian doctrines and many of the stories of the New Testament, says the author, are thus clearly derived from earlier Indian sources.

ʿIlm al-yaqīn is a refutation of the writings of ʿImāduddīn Lahiz, a well-known Indian convert from Islam to Christianity, who was baptized in 1866 and died in 1899.¹² ʿImāduddīn's spiritual autobiography is analyzed in the opening sections, where the author criticizes his method of trying to seek truth while he was yet a Muslim. Islam does not point a man to asceticism, he says, which is the way ʿImāduddīn took, but it sends a religious inquirer to some wise and learned teacher who may direct him according to his needs. This man's solitary and introverted search was madness. Even the great Ghazālī needed a guide to

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 202 ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

¹² See page 39. For ʿImāduddīn's books, see E. M. Wherry, *The Muslim Controversy*, pp. 15-66, 1905.

help him to the truth. Too much fasting and prayer can easily be dangerous.¹³ The man could not expect to find God while he was wandering about as a filthy mendicant. In a passage rich with the mystical imagery of the *sūfīs*, the author claims that the body must be healthy and pure in order that the spiritual heart may reflect the truths that come from the divine source of all light. "We know that man is created only that he may know God and worship him, and the service of God through acts of obedience is not easy unless the body is purified; for the health of the body has always preceded a healthy religion. . . . The faithful, who have tested the matter, have likened the heart to a mirror in which are imprinted pictures perceived by the reflection of light rays, and they have said that a mirror cannot have imprinted in it any pictures if layers of rust have formed over it; even so in the mirror of the heart nothing can be printed, or nothing can appear clearly, if it is corrupted by sin and guilt and especially by the veil of unbelief and rebellion against God."¹⁴ Thus only to the pure and the devoted is God's truth revealed. The causes for 'Imāduddīn's conversion are found to be quite insufficient. The Qur'an is shown to be all-sufficient, so that even Matthew's account of the Sermon on the Mount, including the seventh chapter, which 'Imāduddīn says was the cause of his conversion, is all contained in the Qur'an and much better expressed there.¹⁵ The book concludes with an appeal for the founding of a society to protect true religion from attack and to answer the publications that are appearing against it.

4. "*Khulāsat al-kalām*" and "*Idrār ta'lim at-tawrāt wal-injīl*"

Two little books having an avowedly missionary purpose in being written for non-Muslims as well as Muslims are *Khulāsat al-kalām* and *Idrār ta'lim at-tawrāt wal-injīl*.¹⁶ The former is written by Shaykh Yūsuf Nabhānī of the Beirut law courts, its full name being translated "A Synopsis of the Argument for the Superiority of Islam." Except for an appendix by the same au-

¹³ Sharīf, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 39 and 41.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁶ Yūsuf Nabhānī, *Khulāsat al-kālam fī tarjīh dīn al-islām*, 1322 A.H. 'Abdul-wahhāb Tannir, ed., *Idrār ta'lim at-tawrāt wal-injīl*, 1319 A.H.

thor about the necessity for Muslim parents to send their sons to Muslim schools and not to Christian schools, which is very unsuitably added at the end of this work by the editor, Muhammad 'Alī Malījī, the whole of the booklet is missionary in its aim, seeking to persuade Christians to try Islam and not to fear the difficulties of breaking with their home and their family traditions. It is true, says the author, that everyone loves what he is accustomed to, but that same love of what one is accustomed to is not sufficient to bring salvation from eternal punishment if the religion is wrong. Examine your religion, and if Islam seems better, fear not to change.¹⁷ The transmission of Islam's revelation has been far surer than the uncertain way in which Christianity and Judaism have been handed down through the periods of darkness that preceded Muhammad. "For between the mission of our Lord 'Īsā [Jesus], on whom be peace, and the mission of our Lord Muhammad, the prayers and peace of God be on him, there were about six hundred years. . . . During this long period an age of ignorance had become general through all the earth, so that it was not easy during it to transmit factual accounts in such a manner that they could reach later times in their original true form without change or corruption, especially inasmuch as our Lord 'Īsā, on whom be peace, did not continue long on earth, for God raised him up to heaven at the age of thirty-three. Moreover he was in a weakened condition in the midst of unbelievers, overcome by them so that he could not accomplish the mission of his God in safety and tranquillity because of the opposition of the Jews and their government to him."¹⁸ Islam, on the other hand, brought in an age of enlightenment that never allowed error to creep into recorded revelation. It is a religion wholly uncorrupted. The book ends with a dramatic appeal to the non-Muslim. The time is short, believe before death comes on you. What will you say on the Last Day when you stand before the judgment of God? You can only reply to God with the excuse that you were fanatic and obstinate. Think of the eternal punishment.

Idrār ta'lim at-tawrāt wal-injil, "The Danger of Teaching the

¹⁷ Nabhānī, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 19 f.

Old and the New Testament," is largely a translation of a publication of the Rationalist Press in London, by Charles Watts. In the introduction the translator complains of the slanders of the missionary publications that are attacking the Qur'an and Muhammad. "But those people don't realize that we are a nation (we thank God for it) who pass generously over foolish talk, and 'when the ignorant address us we reply, "Peace be with you,"' acting in accordance with the commands of the glorious Qur'an and modeling our character upon the character of the merciful and compassionate Prophet. And so we have brought them arguments from men of their own community and ilk, so that if their own selves are speaking we shall be innocent of all blame or fault. " ¹⁹ The book, says the translator, is especially for non-Muslims, in order that they may be enlightened to see the falsities in the books written by enemies of the truth. True Muslims of course are in no danger of being led astray by such foolish propaganda.

The chief argument of Charles Watts's book is that although there are some good things in the Bible, they are discounted by the great mass of immoral teaching and immoral stories, so that the Bible is unfit for study by old or young. There are contradictions in commandments, changes and abrogations of earlier commands, insistence on "faith, not works," persecution of unbelievers, and so on. In a conclusion the translator tells of other European books also that show how the Bible leads to evil actions and to agnosticism. He regrets that the author was not acquainted with the Qur'an, for if he had been he would surely have pointed his readers to it, after rejecting the Bible. The Bible is no doubt to blame for the social evils and the immorality that are so widespread in Europe.²⁰ On the other hand the translator lauds the beauty and perfection of the Qur'an, and the nobility of the character of Muhammad. He throws ridicule on those who accuse Muhammad of having been cruel in his slaughter of the men of Banū Qurayza, for they "are blind to the Old Testament, that commanded the slaughter of all the inhabitants of the cities, and the rooting out of its enemies, men, women, children,

¹⁹ Tannir, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

and even beasts; and blind to the words of Christ in the gospel of Matthew: 'But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.'²¹ But the author's remark is enough for us, when he said, 'Is there anything further needed beyond this as proof that this book teaches hatred and such things? It is shameful for Christ to say such words.' As for us, we say, God forbid that Christ should have said them; rather have they lied about him, and about every prophet!"²²

5. Ahmad Malījī and Muhammad 'Alī Malījī

A rather different atmosphere of trickery and bitterness is felt in the writings of the two Malījī brothers, Ahmad and Muhammad 'Alī. They are an example of the more virulent type of attack, and their material is sometimes developed by literary ruses which cannot be taken at face value. *I'lām al-ba'id wal-qarīb*²³ is a series of poems mostly by Ahmad Malījī. The first is called *As-su'āl al-'ajīb*, "The Strange Question," a poem which has sometimes been published alone, and sometimes, in whole or in part, appended to other tracts of polemic. It is introduced by a short account of how Malījī once entered a missionary evangelistic meeting, and how, by asking questions of the speaker, he completely confused him and won a great victory for the faith. Now he wishes to propound some questions in poetry which, he has no doubt, cannot be answered satisfactorily by any Christian. The poem itself develops a series of catch questions around the following points: the divinity of Christ with the apparent denials of it in both the Old and the New Testament, the suffering of a god, the descent of Christ, according to the genealogies, from the adulterous union of Jacob and Tamar,²⁴ the words of Christ indicating that he was a man, and so on. The second poem is one which Malījī says is advanced as a refutation of his *As-su'āl al-'ajīb*, but which he rightly scorns as of no significance. It is brief, and does not attempt to answer all the points that

²¹ The reference is not to Matthew, but to Luke 19:27, where these words are spoken in the Parable of the Pounds by the nobleman whom the citizens hated.

²² Tannir, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

²³ Ahmad Malījī, *I'lām al-ba'id wal-qarīb*, 1323 A.H.

²⁴ Matthew 1:3 and Genesis 38.

have been raised, but after some verses on the qur'anic witness to Christ as the "Word" of God and a "Spirit" from him, and some further lines on the doctrine of the atonement, it attacks Muhammad as a liar and a trickster and an adulterer with Zaynab and others. Islam, he says, ought to have died out before this. The answer of Malijī to this "filthy, stinking" poem is the poem that gives its name to the whole booklet, *I'lām al-ba'id wal-qarīb bi-'ajz man zann annahu radd 'alā as-su'āl al-ajīb*, "Informing the Far and the Near about the Failure of Him Who Thought He Had Replied to 'The Strange Question.'" Malijī says the slander of the foregoing poem is simply the result of the poet's having no arguments at all that he could bring out. Their own prophets they accuse of terrible sins; no wonder, then, that they accuse Muhammad also in such terms. Another brief poem by Malijī on the weakness of Christian beliefs concludes the series.

We may pause to consider a curious tale thrown up in the "Christian" poem as an accusation against Muhammad, a story that occurs several times in Christian polemic, with no foundation of any sort in fact. The accusation is that Muhammad before his death told his followers that they should not bury his body after his death, as he would be resurrected within three days, like Christ. His followers accordingly watched by his body until the stench became unbearable, upon which they departed, and dogs came and attacked the unguarded body. This unsavory tale is of the same apocryphal sort as another which has also no foundation whatever, and which has appeared, curiously enough, on both sides of the polemical fence. The Christian version is that Muhammad's metal coffin is suspended aloft in the air under the dome of the mosque tomb in Madīna, with no visible means of support, while powerful magnetic lodestones, embedded in the dome, are the real explanation of what is supposed to be a continuous miracle. With a very slight shift, the same story serves the Muslim polemicists, who charge the priests in a certain church with pointing to a great iron cross suspended in midair in the chancel, as a miraculous proof of the true religion, the cross meanwhile being supported by lodestones buried in the

ceiling.²⁵ This story apparently took its rise in the congenial atmosphere of mediaeval superstition, but which group of pole-mists were the inventive originators would be hard to say.

Ahmad's younger brother, Muhammad, has written *Al-fāsil bayn al-haqq wal-bātil*,²⁶ "The Distinguisher between Truth and Falsity," which is in a rather interesting historical setting. In the introduction Malijī says that he had met with a copy of *The Apology of Al-Kindī*,²⁷ printed in Europe, a book which its editor claimed had been found in an ancient mosque. Soon after, says Malijī, he stumbled on a book of the same type, with the conditions reversed; that is, as there was in Al-Kindī's *Apology* a brief Muslim letter and a long Christian reply, so in this newly discovered book there was an introductory Christian challenge, and a longer Muslim reply. The rest of Malijī's book purports to be this "old book": the Muslim protagonist says that he met a Christian with whom he began to debate on religious matters, but the latter couldn't answer, and finally said he would get some arguments from Ibn 'Assāl²⁸ and return another time to continue the debate. Instead of returning he wrote his Muslim friend this letter, to which the Muslim replied. The two letters form the book. The whole setting is clearly a fabrication to fit in with the way *The Apology of Al-Kindī* was discovered. Almost a full page of the above explanation is copied word for word from *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira* of Qarāfī (d. 1285),²⁹ where Qarāfī himself tells how he met a Christian who later wanted to get some suggestions for arguments from Ibn 'Assāl before continuing the debate. The internal evidence of the "Christian's" letter is also clearly in favor of an artificial literary device, for it is a most curious statement of Christian belief and argument. The writer uses the expressions "our God Christ" and "Jesus Christ, our God" in a strange way, and shows far closer acquaintance with the Qur'an, of which many verses are quoted,

²⁵ See page 89. Also Ahmad Qarāfī, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira*, margins of 'Abdurrah-mān Bāshajirādah, *Al-fāriq*, p. 7, 1322 A.H.

²⁶ Muhammad 'Alī Malijī, *Al-fāsil bayn al-haqq wal-bātil*, 1331 A. H.

²⁷ 'Abdulmasih Ibn Ishāq Al-Kindī, *Apology*, transl. and abridged by Sir William Muir, 1911. See also pages 19 f.

²⁸ The three Ibn 'Assāl brothers were Christian apologists in Egypt in the thirteenth century. See above, page 21.

²⁹ Malijī, *op. cit.*, pp. 3 f.; and Qarāfī, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f. (margin).

than with the Old Testament or the New, to which the references are of the vaguest kind.

The answering letter of the Muslim includes very little that we have not already noticed in connection with other books. The fable of the iron cross "miraculously" suspended in a church by charlatanry is repeated here,³⁰ and it is affirmed to have taken place in Constantinople. Another interesting fable drawn from the thirteenth century polemic is given here in two different forms, explaining how the deceiver Paul destroyed Christianity by leading the early Christians astray. His deep-laid plot developed after he realized that his persecution of Christianity from outside was proving unsuccessful. His pretended conversion was believed by the Christians when he claimed to have had a vision of Christ. Later, when after many years his position among the Christians was strengthened beyond all doubt, and when he had become so highly respected that all the kings used to come to visit him once a year, he made an announcement that he must on the next day commit suicide for the glory of Christ. Each of three kings came in alone to say a last farewell, and Paul gave to each one a different "revelation" as a final secret, to the first that Jesus was the Son of God, to the second that Mary was God's wife, and to the third that God was Three. His suicide immediately after caused these "revelations" to be jealously guarded, each king thinking he had the only truth, and war soon broke out among the three sects.³¹ The other form of the tale is reported also: After his pretended conversion Paul persuaded the Christians to eat pork, to pray toward the East rather than toward Jerusalem, and to break the laws of God in other ways; and before his suicide he revealed a new truth about Christ's being the Son of God to four leaders, Jacob, Nestor, Malkon, and the Believer. The first three interpreted it each in a different way, and so the Jacobites and the Nestorians and the "Malkonites" all began to fight each other, at the same time showing a common hatred for the followers of the true Believer, who continued to believe that Christ was purely human. These believers escaped to Arabia, where they lived on, continuing to believe in Christ

³⁰ See above, page 87.

³¹ Maliji, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 f.

as a prophet, until eventually some became Muslims.³² After Paul's suicide, his plan continued to operate as he had foreseen, and the sects continued in strife until Constantine forced the Christians to conform to the dogmas that he arbitrarily found suitable. This fable about Paul's activity, though it is not always found in such extreme form, does give the prevailing Muslim conception of him as the great enemy of religion and the perverter of original true Christianity.

Malījī's book ends with the *Poem in L* of Abū 'Abdallāh Al-Būsirī, a well-known poet of the thirteenth century. The poem runs through the criticisms of the conception of an incarnate and suffering God, and the bad arithmetic of the doctrine of the trinity, and concludes with a paean of praise for Muhammad, the Beloved.

A small tract of thirty-two pages called *Al-qawl as-sahih li-ta'yid mahabbat al-masih*, "The True Saying to Strengthen the Love of Christ," is probably by Muhammad 'Alī Malījī, though only the initials of the author, M. A., are given. The omission of author's name and place of printing is in accordance with the plan of this work, for here we have a more serious literary ruse than any we have met thus far. The pamphlet purports to be written by a Christian, who wants his brethren to listen to the very words of Christ himself, and to set them against the teaching of the "honorable fathers," "our holy church fathers." Later, in quoting from the Qur'an, the author keeps up the fiction by referring to "our Muslim brothers and their Prophet." The pamphlet thus depends entirely upon quotations from the New Testament, and their exegesis, in attempting to prove that Christ himself taught the opposite of the trinity and the opposite of his own divinity, and that he did not voluntarily accept death on the cross. The author begins by saying that "our love for Christ" is worthless if we do not act upon his sayings, as he commanded us. We must therefore compare what he actually said with what the "honorable church fathers" have been teaching us. And after bringing forward all these texts as proof, he concludes by repeating that Christians must carefully note these words of Christ and follow them, for in that day, "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 56-59.

enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.”³³ It is interesting that in quoting the words of Christ in the attempt to deny his divinity, the author does not hesitate to quote freely from the Gospel of John, even such words as these: “I and the Father are one” (10 : 30), “The Father is in me, and I in him” (10 : 38), and “Before Abraham was, I am” (8 : 58). All these words are boldly explained by free exegesis, in order that no one will continue to think they give any support to the historical doctrines of the church. The pamphlet is equally bold in its plan and execution.

Another little anonymous pamphlet is probably by one of the Malījī brothers, as it includes what seems to be another literary ruse and also concludes with an abbreviated form of Ahmad Malījī's *As-su'āl al-'ajīb*, the poem we have discussed above. The pamphlet is *Al-khulāsa al-burhāniyya 'alā sihhat ad-dīniyya al-islāmiyya*, “A Synopsis of Proof of the Authenticity of Islam” (1317 A. H.). The first part takes up certain points of the controversy. The second part of the book is a curious story about a Muslim who was once taken captive by the Byzantines, and who entered into a series of arguments with Christian religious leaders, convincing them one after another of the absurdity of the Christian beliefs until he appeared before the “King” to argue with the Patriarch. Here too he had the best of the argument, as the Patriarch could not answer such catch questions as: Why is it more holy for a bishop not to marry and have sons, when you say that God himself entered a womb? If you worship Christ because he had no father, why don't you worship Adam? If you worship him because he raised men from the dead, what about Ezekiel? In the end, the Muslim triumphed by giving the Muslim call to prayer within the cathedral itself. The entire lack of circumstantial evidence in this story, the completely one-sided victory for the Muslim captive in the midst of an enemy court, and other items indicate that the account has no basis in fact, but is another literary fiction of the sort we have already discussed.

6. *Two tracts by 'Abdulqādir Iskandarānī*

Two more pamphlets of the bitter type are the tracts of 'Abdul-

³³ Matthew 7 : 21.

qādir Iskandarānī, *Iqāz al-wasnān* (1342 A. H.) and *Tanbīh al-yaqzān* (1342 A. H.), "Awakening the Slumbering," and "Cautioning the Wakeful," in reply to a missionary tract from Egypt by Naṣīruddīn Zāfir in which he attacked the miraculous *i'jāz*, or superhuman perfection, of the Qur'an. The first of the two pamphlets complains that missionaries are still spreading their poisonous, lying writings; and yet they blame Muslim divines for calling those who do not follow the Islamic law dogs and donkeys, for which there is qur'anic basis. The chief point of controversy under consideration is the *i'jāz* of the Qur'an. After putting forward the usual arguments that we have already noted, the author says that another proof of its miraculous nature is the fact that it refers to things discovered by modern political and natural sciences, that is, it prophesies what has come to pass, for example, trains, airplanes, submarines, and so on. Where is all this in the New Testament? The Christian writer complained that he found no miraculous beauties in the Qur'an, but by this he only blackens himself, for all who have any feeling of any kind, or any true taste, recognize its excellence. In criticism, the greatest missionary cannot compare in wisdom or in knowledge with the dirt of the feet of the Muslim scholars. Individual verses are miracles in themselves; for example, a single verse contains all the teachings of Christ, and another sums up all the learning of Galen in medical science. Such things, revealed by an illiterate man like Muhammad, are proofs of its divine origin.

The second pamphlet is not different from the first in its virulent attacks on the author and on all missionaries, and in its central interest, the establishment of the miracle of the Qur'an. It explains especially the reasons for the repetitions which are found in the Qur'an, repetitions given as revelations to the Arabs on different occasions as they had need of them. It takes up the criticism of the *Fātiha*, the prayer with which the Qur'an opens, and explains its special beauties and its noble themes. It closes with renewed vituperation of the missionaries, and ridicule of the many mistakes and contradictions to be found, as the author says, in the Bible.

7. "*Al-injil was-salib*," 'Abdulahad Dā'ūd

Very different in tone from the foregoing is the remaining group of books that we shall consider. *Al-injil was-salib*,³⁴ "The Gospel and the Cross," is far more conciliatory and friendly in most respects than the books last reviewed. It is supposed to be a translation "from Turkish to Arabic, by an 'Irāqī Muslim" of a treatise whose author was a Christian priest, a Chaldaean, who became a Muslim. Some circumstantial details are given in connection with the outline of the author's life in Mesopotamia and later in Istanbul, and although certain things might seem to cast doubt on the authenticity of the identity of "Father 'Abdulahad Dā'ūd, the Assyrian, the 'Irāqī," on the whole most of the evidence points to his being more than a literary fiction. The wide knowledge of the Bible that is shown in the book, the sympathy on the whole for Christians, the acquaintance with a smattering of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and the broader base of Syriac, the references to Istanbul, and the religious and political situation in the Balkans, all these make it quite likely that someone of Chaldaean priestly background resident in Istanbul is really behind the treatise. Throughout, there are liberal sprinklings of quotations in Greek and Hebrew, as an exegesis of Bible texts is attempted, the misprints in both languages being almost the rule rather than the exception. Usually the transliteration into Arabic script is also given; sometimes the transliteration represents the correct original, showing that the error in the Greek or the Hebrew is only typographical, but sometimes the error occurs in the Arabic transliteration as well.

The author's thesis in a word is that the *injil*, the Gospel, is not a book but a concept, that is, the good word of the Kingdom of God that is to come; and this Kingdom of God, announced by Christ, is the community of Islam. The announcement began just at the birth of Christ, with the song of the angels over the fields of Bethlehem (Luke 2 : 14), translated by Christian scholars as: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." This verse, illuminated by a sudden discovery which the author made, was the real cause of his conversion to Islam, he

³⁴ Al-Ab 'Abdulahad Dā'ūd, *Al-injil was-salib*, 1351 A.H.

tells us. The discovery was based on the realization that the angels were not singing to the shepherds in Greek, for they would never have understood that, but in Syriac or Aramaic, *siriānī*.³⁵ The question therefore arises: What were the original words the angels used which in Greek appear as εἰρήνη, "peace," and εὐδοκίας, "good will"? Obviously the word for εἰρήνη must have been the Syriac word of the same three-letter root as the Arabic *salām* and *islām*; and since these two are sometimes used almost interchangeably, it was just a misunderstanding on the part of an early Greek author that set down εἰρήνη as the translation of the original *siriānī* word, and caused the angels' song to read "And on earth peace . . ." instead of "And on earth Islam!" Similarly, an examination into the original word for which the translator put down εὐδοκίας will reveal the fact, says the author, that both δοκέις and δόξα imply the meaning of "praise" or "desire," and that the original word of the angels must accordingly have been either *mahmad* or *ahmad*, either of which would be a clear statement of Muhammad's name (which is often used in the form "Ahmad"). Actually, then, says the author, we are confronted with the amazing revelation that what the angels really sang was this: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Islam, and among men Ahmad!"

From here the author goes on to develop his theory that the Kingdom of God which Christ preached was Islam. He was an announcer, a preparer of the way for the Kingdom, for which he prays as though it were in the future. He did not set up an organization to assure the success of a new religion of his own founding, nor did he give his followers any book or code of laws. He preached simply an idea, and told men to wait for one who would come after him, the Paraclete, Muhammad. This pointing of the way to Islam was not understood by his disciples. The author shows how the Kingdom is the fulfillment of Judaism, but that it cannot be Christianity or the Christian church, which do not at all correspond to the description of the characteristics of the Kingdom as we have them in Jesus' words. The Kingdom of God is Islam. At the end a section is devoted to quoting parallel verses

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 38 ff.

from the Bible and from the Qur'an that speak in the same vein about the Kingdom, the unity of God, and so on.³⁶ The author expresses his hope that his book will encourage Christians to read the Qur'an.

The book is characterized by a fresh approach, quite in contrast with much of the other polemic, which is so uniform in its treatment of the controversy. The author criticizes his fellow Muslims for attempting to discredit Christianity by translating Western rationalistic attacks on Christianity. This sort of procedure is dangerous, he says, because such men as Voltaire, Renan, and Carlyle attack Islam too, inasmuch as rationalists are against anything that savors of a religious miracle. They believe in no religious inspiration of any kind. Such Christian and Muslim polemic as *The Sources of Islam* on the one hand and *Heathen Beliefs in Christianity* on the other are attacks and counterattacks that only help the naturalistic rationalists, and do not forward any really religious cause. "And what I see to be the truth is this, that God is one, and that it is He who sent all the prophets. His revelation to them was one revelation, and that is the reason for the agreement of religions in many matters, especially such as are connected with beliefs."³⁷

A footnote that is clearly by the translator outlines the history of what Christian missionaries to Islam have tried to do. "The missionaries have not come to the east of themselves, for the love of guiding its people to happiness. They were sent by Western politics, to work for its benefit. Their call when they began their work was a simple call to Christianity; then they began to dispute, and bring forth arguments and proofs. But when they encountered from the Muslims peremptory proofs that pointed out the error of their claims and refuted their equivocations, they became annoyed and angry, and so published books and pamphlets containing abuse and vilification of the religion of the Muslims and of their Prophet. And inasmuch as Christ, on whom be peace, was a prophet respected by the Muslims, they were not able to meet this attack in kind. Rather did they turn to the translation of some Western atheistic publications, for example, *The Danger of*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 216-218.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 56 and 57 fn.

*Teaching the Old and the New Testaments.*³⁸ It is clear what danger there lies in that, even for the Muslim religion, as the author of this book has reminded us repeatedly. Then the missionaries went back to spreading abroad publications that they pretended came from certain individual Muslims they claimed had turned Christian, this being simply a lie. Next they progressed in this deceit to the point of charging some of the great Muslim divines with being Christian, or half-Christian, as they said in *Al-ghawwās wal-lā'ālī fī tarjamat al-ghazālī*, 'The Pearl Diver and the Pearls, in the Interpretation of Ghazālī,' by Zwemer. And now that all these methods and machinations have brought them no success you see them today content with trying to strip the Muslims of their beliefs and their good character and of any religion, so as to make them atheists and radicals. I find they are to some extent successful in this, and it is exactly the goal that Western politics is aiming at, that is, the dissolution of the bonds of Muslim unity."³⁹ The passage is an interesting outline of how a Muslim says the missionary enterprise appears to him.

Another footnote (the long footnotes contain some of the most interesting material in this book) points out that the Protestant Reformation in Europe was simply a movement that carried out the injunctions of the Qur'an to the Christians one after the other. "They have taken their rabbis and priests as Lords aside from God," says the Qur'an; but the Reformers threw off the yoke of popery. "Let the People of the Gospel give judgment according to what God sent down in the Gospel," says the holy Book, and the Protestants translated the Bible into the common languages and spread it abroad. God's words in the Qur'an are: "Jesus, Son of Mary, didst thou say to the people, 'Take me and my mother as two gods aside from God?'" but the Protestants did away with the worship of the Virgin. God's word again is: "As for monasticism, they invented it; I did not lay it on them," and the Protestants abolished monasticism and required the clergy to marry. All this, and many other points too, says the author, go to show how the West is drawing very much nearer to Islam and the Muslim law, even though unintentionally. Meanwhile Islam is degenerating,

³⁸ See pages 84 f.

³⁹ Dā'ūd, *op. cit.*, p. 67 fn.

falling away from its true principles and introducing new and superstitious practices. It may even be that a day will come when the West will arise and call the East back to true Islam! ⁴⁰

8. "*The Religion of Islam*," A. A. Galwash

*The Religion of Islam*⁴¹ is an ambitious attempt to present in English a compendium of the life of Muhammad and the teachings of Islam, together with a discussion of the chief points in the controversy with Christianity, introduced as they touch on material in the general plan of the book. The first section of the book deals briefly with the history of the Arabs before Islam, the second with the life of Muhammad and the social organization of Islam, and the third with the beliefs of Islam. The whole is conciliatory in tone, approaching the controversial issues with a broad rationalism that deprecates "the attacks of the Christian divines" on Islam, and seeks to explain Muslim beliefs and practices as being thoroughly in accord with modern life and thought. The institution of polygamy is vigorously supported as being necessary in certain conditions of society, as when the male population is depleted by a disastrous war. "Propagation of one's species is the most important of all the purposes of marriage," he explains,⁴² and therefore if a first wife cannot produce a child, it is much better to take a second wife along with the first than to divorce the first, a procedure which might cause "heart-burnings" to the man, "if he is strongly attached to his first wife." The section on marriage and divorce is very long, and seeks to show that the rights of the woman are carefully protected in Islam. "The object of marriage was defined by the Prophet in clear, unambiguous words. . . . It was instituted, in the first place, as a safeguard against lewdness and incontinence, and, in the second place, as a means of procreation." ⁴³ The restrictions upon women in Islam are explained as being necessary for the preservation of morality, although complete veiling at all times is held to be neither desirable nor qur'anic.

In a section on the divinity of Christ, American Unitarians are

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 168 fn.

⁴¹ A. A. Galwash, *The Religion of Islam*, 1940.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

quoted to support the contention that Protestantism is turning away very largely from a trinitarian belief, and Christ's own words are cited to show how he differentiated himself from God.

Not all the Bible is corrupted, says the author, and he gives many of the usual "prophecies of Muhammad" from the Old and the New Testament, "extracts of the safe contents of the Bible," which are to be distinguished from the corrupt sections. These prophecies are considered in great detail; they are the same ones that have appeared before. As a last point of interest in this treatment mention is made of the author's absolute denial of Islam's sanctioning of force or compulsion for the spread of Islam. Occasionally, he admits, there have been cases in the history of Islam when it fell short of its true nature, but he claims that usually Islam's involvement in war has been a matter of defensive resistance to an attack from outside. Verses in the Qur'an that refer to killing infidels with a general slaughter are to be taken as referring only to defensive warfare. "Peace is the Muslim's watchword, whatever circumstances he has to pass through. . . . The religion of Islam is essentially for peace, and even in fighting the aim was nothing but peace." ⁴⁴ It is rare that we find in Islam so complete a renunciation of the use of force.

9. *Four Concluding Examples*

Four last examples represent very differing types of apologetic, though all are alike in that they for the most part breathe a conciliatory spirit similar to that which we have observed in the last two books considered. *Al-madhhab ar-rūhānī*,⁴⁵ "Spiritualism," is a curious presentation of modern spiritistic beliefs in an Islamic setting. The greater part of the book is concerned with an exposition of spiritualism, or spiritism, that is, of how we may commune with the spirits of the dead and modify our living according to the revelations received from them. There is a historical review of the beginnings of the manifestations in Europe and America, and a detailed account of the procedure ofappings and conversations through a medium. Then follows a description of the material quality of the spirit body, its clothes, its habits, its functions, and

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 85 f.

⁴⁵ 'Abdallāh Abāhī, *Al-madhhab ar-rūhānī*. n.d.

so on. A glance at the history of the various religions reveals to this author that all ancient and modern religions have known a good deal about this communion with the dead, and especially that Christ himself and all his disciples were ardent practitioners of spiritism. Only later did the priests usurp the place of the mediums and suppress the truth. As for the crucifixion of Christ, not only does the author affirm it, but he gives a dramatic description of it, the word-for-word account of a spirit who was a contemporary of Christ, and was an eyewitness of the event.⁴⁶ The spirit points out a few differences from the gospel story, notably the fact that there was no resurrection of the body, this being a fable that arose after Christ had appeared to his disciples in a spirit body. Muhammad too was a follower of the truth of spiritism, and "the spirits" revealed to him the Qur'an. The Qur'an, says the author, denies eternal punishment, and also affirms the transmigration of souls, both of which show that it is in line with the important beliefs of spiritism. To prove transmigration he quotes Qur'an 2 : 26, "How can ye withhold faith from God? Ye were dead and He gave you life; next He will cause you to die; next He will restore you to life; next shall ye return to Him!"

In the last two sections Christianity is attacked in much the usual way, but on a fairly high level of historical approach, with a point of view more or less detached, and free of rancor. Here for the first time in the polemic, we see an objection to the miraculous element in the Bible narratives. The author says that God does not show His power by the breaking of His own natural law, but rather by preserving it, and he claims that scientific spiritists have done miracles of curing, raising of the apparently dead, and so on, just as "magnetic" personalities are recorded in the biblical accounts as having done.⁴⁷

The final section is an attack on the Christian "mysteries," which are opposed, says the author, to the scientific belief that the mind is man's best guide. One by one, the chief doctrines of the church are discussed from this point of view: the trinity, original sin, the incarnation, and the divinity of Christ, the grace of God, the virgin birth, the resurrection of the body, the last judgment,

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 372 ff.

hell, purgatory and pardons, the confessional, the eucharist, and papal infallibility. The closing word is an appeal to men to follow spiritism as the answer to the world's need. In it is to be found a unity of life in the body and in the spirit, and in it new horizons are opening up to science and to religion alike. Let us leave blind faith, says the writer, and work together through the guidance of the spirits of the dead that are all about us.⁴⁸

A new type of controversial approach is that shown in the three booklets published by Pastor Alfred Nielsen of Jerusalem, in which there is reported a symposium of letters between him and certain Muslim *shaykhs*. We may take as an example one that is published jointly by Pastor Nielsen and Shaykh 'Abdallāh Qīshāwī of Gaza, in which each presents the reasons for his own faith.⁴⁹ Qīshāwī defends Islam as a religion of reason, a helper of science, a natural religion, and an absolute monotheism with no trace of an idolatrous association of a human being with God. Islam is the religion of democracy and equality, the universal religion that always was acceptable to God and always will be. The miraculous character of the Qur'an shows it to be the greatest of the heavenly books, supplying all the needs of the soul, and including all that makes for knowledge and happiness and progress. Nielsen introduces his apologetic with a plea for mutual understanding between Muslim and Christian, and he quotes from Rashīd Ridā to the effect that there is no objection to Muslim and Christian trying to convert each other if they do it in the right manner. At the end also he pleads that Christians and Muslims should learn from one another, and join together to repel the dangers of increasing atheism. This is indeed a new type of apologetic, where both sides are fairly and boldly represented by their own proponents, and where there is at the same time an openness and readiness to learn from one another. If there is a "higher controversy," this is it.

Another example of apologetic that is sympathetic toward Christianity, appreciates the difficulties between it and Islam, and shows eagerness to find the basis of a better understanding between Muslims and Christians is a little collection of sayings of

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 471.

⁴⁹ 'Abdallāh Qīshāwī, *Afkār mu'minin fī haqā'iq ad-dīn*, "Thoughts of Believers on the Truths of Religion," Vol. 1, *Limādhā atba' dīnī dūn ghayrihi*, "Why I follow my own religion rather than another." (Joint editor, Alfred Nielsen.) 1938.

Tolstoi about Muhammad and Islam, *Hikam an-nabī muhammad*, "The Wise Sayings of the Prophet Muhammad,"⁵⁰ in which the Russian philosopher's appreciation of the Prophet of Arabia is given in a series of brief selections. The author, or compiler, was a Syrian teaching in Cairo, and a writer in the political press. The name of the collection is derived from Tolstoi's list of quotations from various sayings of the Prophet from the Hadīth. Two selections from Tolstoi on women, and on love and marriage, are included. The former insists that women's place is in the home. The latter claims that great reverence is given to marriage in Muslim, Hindu, and Chinese communities, whereas in Europe it is becoming a joke. The increasing immorality among women in the upper classes, and the harmful effects of the balls of high society are deplored, without any reference to Islam; but the article is quoted in order that it may stand as an indictment of the freedom accorded to women in Christian society. A letter addressed to Tolstoi by Muhammad 'Abduh, in which the Arab praises the Russian as a great monotheist and a religious leader, is followed by two elegies on Tolstoi at his death. Three articles at the end of the book are translations from Turkish or Russian, regarding the state of Islam in Russia. Another is an article from Istanbul in which the writer tells of the unfounded beliefs of mediaeval Europe in regard to Islam, its picturing of Muhammad as a devil with horns, or as a jealous cardinal whose ambition to be made pope had been disappointed, and he praises the modern scientific trends toward an accurate study of religion, without ulterior purposes. The article concludes in a remarkable passage that points out how much Islam and Christianity have in common. It deplores the fact that many Westerners are still in a mediaeval state of mind toward Islam. It admits that Islam has had much evil in it during its weaker periods, even as Christianity, "though built on a firm foundation," had in it much evil during the Middle Ages.⁵¹ The last article is a description of a ceremony in Japan in which three Japanese were received into Islam.

The last of these polemical writings is a pamphlet which quotes similarly from Tolstoi, Washington Irving, Gibbon, Carlyle, and

⁵⁰ Salīm Qub'īn, *Hikam an-nabī muhammad*, n.d.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

others, to show how Christian writers pay honor to the nobility of Muhammad and of the Qur'an. *Unmūdhij al-fadā'il al-islāmiyya*, "The Pattern of Islamic Virtues,"⁵² is an expanded form of an address that the author gave when he was invited to speak at the Jerusalem Y.M.C.A. on the excellences of Islam. The Qur'an, says the author, was what guided the Arabs to power and glory, and it created the foundation of all modern civilization. Western writers admit its contribution. Twelve points are given as the chief virtues of Islam, among which are freedom, justice, kindness to animals, charity, diligence and industry, cleanliness and purity, and the general emphasis on character. The reasonableness of Islam is stressed. The pamphlet is a good example of that irenic and sympathetic approach that has been characteristic of all this last group of booklets.

10. *Ahmadiyya Polemic*

Outside of the body of orthodox Muslim polemic are the attacks of the Indian Ahmadiyya movement upon Christianity. Although this movement is not very large in numbers of adherents, it is important in the Muslim polemical field, for its great missionary purpose makes it prolific in controversial writing. The movement was founded by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad,⁵³ who lived most of his life in Qadian in the Punjab. Born in 1839, he gave himself (about 1860) to a life of religious devotion. He began to publish his teachings in 1880, but not until 1891 did he reveal that he was the Promised Messiah and Mahdi, the prophet who was to bring in the new age of religious truth for all men. He claimed to be the fulfillment of the revelation of Islam. All Muslims who did not accept him were following a corrupt form of their religion and were doomed for refusing to obey the new revelation of God. Ahmad was fiercely attacked by Orthodox Muslims and his claims and teachings were completely rejected. But despite persecution, he gathered about him a considerable number of followers. After his death in 1908 the movement continued to grow, and in 1914 there occurred a schism which developed into two parties, one

⁵² Muhammad Nadīm Mallāh, *Unmūdhij al-fadā'il al-islāmiyya*, 1340 A.H.

⁵³ On the Ahmadiyya movement see H. A. Walter, *The Ahmadiyya Movement*, 1918. Also J. T. Addison, "The Ahmadiyya Movement and Its Western Propaganda." *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXII: 1-32, 1929.

with its center at Lahore, characterized by a more liberal and rationalistic Muslim outlook and less concerned with the particular revelations of Ahmad, and the other at Qadian, with a continued emphasis upon Ahmad's function as Messiah and Mahdi. Both groups are strongly missionary in outlook; there are missions in Europe, Africa, Australia, and America, as well as in Asia. The Lahore group is more important in England, where its center at the mosque in Woking is more active than the Qadian mission. In the United States, however, the Qadian group is the only one that has a mission. Its center is in Chicago. The Lahore group publishes a paper called *The Light*, and in Woking a monthly, *The Islamic Review*; the Qadian group publishes also at Lahore a fortnightly, *The Sunrise*, and in Chicago a quarterly, *The Moslem Sunrise*, in addition to a monthly, *The Review of Religions*, at Qadian.

Although both groups are rejected by orthodox Islam, each feels itself to be the only true representative of Islam. The Lahore group, by its liberalizing and rationalistic syncretism, is drawing further and further away from any strong commitment to the life and teachings of the founder, and is becoming almost indistinguishable from other comparatively broad and liberalizing tendencies in Islam. The Qadian group, however, is in most matters of doctrine and practice adhering more closely to original Islam than are its Lahore brethren, while at the same time it holds firmly to the new teaching that the fulfillment of Islam has come in the person of Ahmad. In its missionary work neither party emphasizes any differences between itself and the rest of Islam, but rather portrays itself as representing true and universal Islam.

In its manner of approach and in the points it takes up the polemic itself differs little from the material we have already examined. One difference is that an attempt is made to adapt to Western psychology and to the background of thinking in Europe and America. Especially the Lahore group has toned down Muslim teaching, and taken over ideals and even phraseology from Christian sources in order to appeal to the West. Two definite teachings of Ahmad appear sometimes in other Muslim polemic, but they are especially developed by both the Qadian and the

Lahore party. The first is the teaching that the *jihād* as a religious war in the literal sense is no longer permitted by God, but that in modern times it refers only to the spiritual warfare of true belief with unbelief. Ahmadis are at one in denying the right of anyone to declare a religious war, and in India they have been consistently loyal to the British government. The other special teaching in the polemic is the detailed exposition of the "swoon theory" of the crucifixion. The early attacks of Ahmad on Christian teaching included this account of how the disciples took down the body of Jesus from the cross and anointed it with a wonderful ointment, and how Jesus survived and wandered off to India, where he preached as the Messiah until his death at the age of one hundred and twenty. His tomb is supposed still to be seen in Srinagar. This theory is constantly expounded in current Ahmadiyya literature.⁵⁴

The *jihād* is disclaimed as a method of propagating religion today, but it was also abhorrent in the early days to Muhammad, say the Ahmadis, except when he was forced to war. "Muhammad (the Peace of God be upon him and on all the prophets of the world) came when filled with the Holy Spirit, and gave the only practical illustrations of 'Love thine enemy.' But for Muhammad, the text would have remained a dead dream. . . . He had his enemies—enemies of the most implacable description." Then after an explanation that Muhammad's wars were defensive, and that he forgave his enemies when they were defeated, the following conclusion is reached: "'Love thine enemy' was thus put into practice once for all, and the world can refer to no such event in its history."⁵⁵

The easy adoption of Christian and Western elements into the Ahmadiyya description of Islam is shown in the above passage and others from the same chapter. The claim by Christians that their religion is the "Religion of Love" is attacked, and the term is taken over for Islam: "The Religion of Love is too big a subject to receive full justice here. It deserves independent handling and a

⁵⁴ See, for example, A. Q. Niaz, "The Death-knell of Christianity." *The Review of Religions*, 45 : 103-106, 1946; M. K., "Jesus in India," *The Review of Religions*, 45 : 94-96, 1946; and Sufi M. R. Bengalee, "Jesus' Journey to India according to Buddhist Records." *The Moslem Sunrise*, 18 : 8-14, 1946.

⁵⁵ Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, *The Sources of Christianity*, pp. 158-160, 1924.

separate book: it is worth the task. Moreover, it has now become a duty, incumbent on Muslims today, to speak their word on the subject, in refutation of the reflections made, in the Oxford Conference, on Islam. The Conference could not see its way to admit the claim of Islam to be a Religion of Love. . . . It has been insinuated that Islam lacks all those altruistic feelings and humanitarian principles so necessary to constitute a religion of love.”⁵⁶ Some of the Ahmadiyya literature includes Christian hymns that are capable of a broad interpretation, for example, Maltbie Babcock’s *Be Strong*,⁵⁷ and, from James Russell Lowell’s *Once to Every Man and Nation*, the lines beginning “Truth forever on the scaffold,” which are used to illustrate the sufferings of the prophets through the ages, and especially the ordeals of the Holy Founder of the Ahmadiyya movement.⁵⁸ Another adaptation from the West is the description of Islam in terms of a democracy. “Democracy, the popular system of government of modern times, is described thus: ‘a government of the people, for the people, by the people.’ . . . No nation, provided it be degraded, has ever in the history of the world reached democracy without the proper channel of dictatorship. But there is one exception. Muhammad the Holy Prophet (peace and the blessings of God be upon him) was the singular general who raised up the degraded nation of Arabs and led them directly to democracy without following the way of dictators. This is an unique instance in the whole of the world history and thus a peculiar miracle of the Holy Prophet (peace on him). The Holy Prophet (peace on him) rid humanity from the clutches of oppression, tyranny, and injustice direct through democracy.” The passage continues by pointing out certain differences between “Islam’s democracy,” with a caliph at its head, and other conceptions of democracy: “The Western democracy, although the best of the lot, is no match with this Islamic democracy.”⁵⁹

Ahmadiyya writings make much of what is called the “practical” nature of Islam, or the “natural” Islamic way of life. “What is religion, after all; a practical code of life conducive to our util-

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 150 f.

⁵⁷ *The Moslem Sunrise*, 18 : 29, 1946.

⁵⁸ Sufi M. R. Bengalee, *The Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam*. n.d. (Pamphlet).

⁵⁹ Nasir Ahmad, “Islamic Democracy.” *The Sunrise*, 15 : 3 f., 1944.

ity, to our civilization, and to the development of our faculties.”⁶⁰ Islam is submission to law, and if Nature is our best guide to religion, then Nature too shows absolute submission to law, and leads us naturally to Islam. Man, as a part of Nature, is Muslim, that is, subjected to the laws of Nature and faithful to them. In the same way it is constantly reiterated that great numbers of people in the West, who follow a rationalistic naturalism, are already Muslims, though they do not know it. Converts discover that they have “always been Muslims” all their lives. “Competent observers have affirmed that there are thousands of people in England who are Muslims, though they do not know that they are Muslims. This is nothing more than what the famous German thinker and writer, Goethe, said after reading the Holy Qur’an, more than a hundred years ago: ‘If this be Islam, do we not all live in Islam?’ Yes, Islam is the religion of every emancipated soul, that has sought the Eternal Soul behind all this transient and ephemeral phenomena, and decided to submit to It.”⁶¹ Not only Goethe, but Browning and Shelley and others were on the road to Islam. “What Shelley was yearning after was also nothing short of Islam. If only Islam had been presented to him, his restless, troubled soul would have found its much-needed peace and happiness.”⁶² The practical nature of Islam is explained in the following way. “Muhammad was the most practical of prophets; he did not remain content with preaching principles and precepts. He laid down rules for giving practical shape to all his teachings. He would probe the whole case, he would go to the root of the matter, and find out all the practical difficulties in the way of the precepts he had enunciated, and then he would suggest a proper course by which they might be met.”⁶³ One practical aspect of Ahmadiyya teaching is shown in the willingness, especially of the Lahore group, to make concessions on ritual requirements in the West. *The Islamic Review* quotes a request for official ruling sent by the Moslem community in Helsinki, Finland, to Al-Azhar Mosque in Cairo, to inquire whether during Ramadan, which now falls in summer, it would be necessary to

⁶⁰ Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, *Four Lectures on Islam*, p. 34. n.d.

⁶¹ M. A. Samad, “Shelley and Islam.” *The Review of Religions*, 45 : 110, 1946.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, *The Sources of Christianity*, p. 161, 1924.

fast from sunup to sundown, since in that latitude the sun is on the horizon twenty-two of the twenty-four hours of the day. The Ahmadiyya editor, without ascertaining the Al-Azhar response, pronounces a decision to the effect that Muslims in Helsinki should follow, as the required hours of fasting, "the medium time as found in Arabia."⁶⁴ An example of broad statements made without much reference to fact in order to create an impression of cosmopolitan tolerance is the claim that the Ahmadiyya movement disapproves of any attack on other religions. "In order to bring about religious peace Hazrat Ahmad made certain concrete propositions, which are noted below: (1) The founders and leaders of the different religions must not be referred to in a manner calculated to wound the feelings of their followers. (2) In the propagation of their faiths, the missionaries of each religion must confine themselves to the expounding of the merits, beauties, and excellences of their religions without making any attack upon other religions. Because to find fault with other religions does by no means prove the truth or superiority of one's own."⁶⁵ Of course the actual practice of Ahmadiyya writers has been very different.

The attacks on Christian theology follow the lines we have already observed in other polemic. One approach is that Christian thought all hinges on the doctrine of original sin and atonement, which it is claimed are Pauline elements, and not really from Christ's teaching at all.⁶⁶ The similarity of Christian customs, for example, the celebration of Christ's birth on December 25, and of the teachings about Jesus' life and miracles and death, to customs and teachings of pagan religions, especially those of sun worship in the first century A. D., is emphasized in an attempt to show that Christian theology is largely pagan.⁶⁷ Ridicule of the doctrines of the trinity and the atonement in the earlier propaganda, where the Holy Spirit is referred to as "only a pigeon" and the atonement a "blood bath," has given way to

⁶⁴ "Correspondence," *The Islamic Review*, 34 : 421 ff.

⁶⁵ Bengalee, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁶⁶ Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, "Islam and Its Principles Compared with Christianity," Chap. 3 in *Four Lectures on Islam*, n.d.

⁶⁷ Khwaja Kamal ud-din, "The Church Mysteries and the Ancient Legends," Chap. 3 in *The Sources of Christianity*, n.d.

more cautious attempts at logical refutation in the later publications. In much the same way as in earlier polemic the corruption and consequent unreliability of the Bible are claimed. For instance, miscalculations are found in the report in Genesis 46 of the numbers of Jacob's family that emigrated to Egypt,⁶⁸ and in such ways, and many others, the Bible is said to have "suffered from human interference." The character of Jesus was bitterly attacked by Ahmad himself, though as a Muslim he was obliged to respect the qur'anic picture of Christ. He does not always distinguish between the two pictures, however, and attacks Christ as cowardly, disrespectful to his mother, friendly with low women, blasphemous, and so on.⁶⁹ It is interesting that Ahmadiyya teaching opposes the doctrine of the virgin birth,⁷⁰ while orthodox Islam and the Qur'an itself affirm it. Muhammad, on the other hand, is claimed to be absolutely without sin, and passages from the Qur'an are interpreted to give support to this understanding of him.⁷¹ The Lahore group interprets Muhammad as "the Father of modern nationalism" as well as the prophet of a world religion, a conception in line with its interest in politics, from which the Qadian group stands aloof. "No wonder, perhaps," says a Lahore writer, "that the old and very beautiful spirit of nationalistic Islam should find reincarnation in what is known today as Pakistan," the ideal of the modern Muslim nationalistic movement of India.⁷² The position of woman in Islam is defended not very satisfactorily. "One of the accusations of the opponents of Islam, which always surprises me," says one writer, "is the assertion that Islam keeps the position of woman low. As yet I have not succeeded in finding out on what ground this assertion is based. . . . Man is physically and intellectually superior to the weaker vessel, and that is why he occupies a higher position in the physical world. . . . Notwithstanding the apparent inferiority of woman in body and mind, their lives are interdependent. . . . How wisely the kind Heaven has provided for

⁶⁸ Peer Salah-ud-din, "A Study in Bible—I." *The Review of Religions*, 42: 193-195, 1943.

⁶⁹ Walter, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 ff.

⁷⁰ Muhammad 'Ali, *Muhammad and Christ*, pp. 76 ff., 1921.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 67 ff.

⁷² G. S. Arundale, "Prophet Muhamed, Father of Modern Nationalism." *The Light*, 20: 5, 1941.

the disabilities of the female. . . . Home is her little world, the prattle of the children is to her a music, a thousand times sweeter than the turmoil and hurry-scurry of the world. The home is her right place, without doubt.”⁷³ In answer to a question on the *huris* of paradise, the lovely virgins who wait upon the faithful in the future life, Kamal-ud-din explains that female company always helps in the formation and molding of a man’s character, and that this is needed in the next world, where our faculties will continue to grow and develop. Besides, the effect of the female company is intensified if the ladies have charming faces and fascinating airs.⁷⁴

11. Major Issues in the Polemic

In all this polemic material certain issues stand out as the chief ones around which revolves most of the discussion. Let us recapitulate these chief points. In the attacks on Christianity, either scripture or christology naturally heads the list. The attack on scripture is an attack on revelation, especially since to the Muslim God reveals himself primarily in a holy Book. If even a single passage of the Christian scriptures can be proved to be incorrect in some detail, the scriptures cannot be literally inspired; and literal inspiration is the only kind of inspiration the Muslim understands. The Qur’an teaches that the Old and the New Testament have been corrupted, and the polemic proceeds to show how this is true. One proof is to be found, it claims, in the history of the scriptures. The Old Testament cannot contain the original *tawrāt* delivered by God to Moses, for it was already lost, as we know, before the time of Hilkieh, again at the Babylonian Captivity before the time of Ezra, and again at the final destruction of Jerusalem in the first century A. D. The present Old Testament is thus a conjectural reconstruction at best. As for the New Testament, it is not a single Gospel of Christ, or *injil* sent down from God, but is a series of books, written by disciples and even by unknown authors, including four “gospels” that reconstruct the life of Christ more or less at second-hand. The internal

⁷³ Amir Hamza, “Position of Woman in Islam.” *The Review of Religions*, 42 : 202 f., 1943.

⁷⁴ Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, *Four Lectures on Islam*, pp. 52 f., n.d.

evidence, says the polemic, bears out these historical facts. Both Old and New Testaments are full of errors and contradictions—in numbers, in ages, in genealogies, and in differently reported facts. Variant accounts in the four gospels are one example. Aside from these corruptions throughout the text, Christians have misinterpreted even what remained of the original authoritative Torah and Gospel. Prophecies that refer to Muhammad in the Old Testament have been applied to Christ, and references to him in the New Testament, such as have not been entirely deleted, are made to apply to the Holy Spirit, especially the references to the Paraclete. And yet, after all, even if the original revealed text were here in perfect form, and even if the interpretation were correct, the Christian scriptures would still have no relevancy, since they have been completely abrogated or, more correctly, superseded, by the final revelation of God in the Qur'an.

Christology is the second great issue between Islam and Christianity in the polemic. The Muslim claims that in the doctrines of the trinity and the divinity of Christ there is to be found simply the deification of a man to form a second god. Unity in trinity is not merely a paradox, he says, but an absurdity contrary to reason. To speak of God as incarnate in the flesh is blasphemy, for it denies His infinite attributes and elevates a man to share the worship due to the One God. The "Sonship" of Christ is especially repugnant as a term of his relationship to God, as it is in conflict with the express words of the Qur'an. The trinity and the divinity of Christ are to be refuted, not only with rational arguments, but also by the very words of Christ in the New Testament, in those passages where his humanity stands out clearly. In the account of his life, the crucifixion is an important point of controversy, though not always Christ's suffering. The crucifixion is denied in the Qur'an, and besides outside evidence, the polemic adduces internal evidence from the gospel stories in an attempt to show that someone else was crucified in place of Christ. Christ's character is not usually attacked, since the Qur'an praises him as a prophet of God; but under the guise of "the Christ of the Christian gospels" he is sometimes accused of drunkenness, consorting with loose women, anger, disrespect to his mother, and so on.

Other Christian doctrines are attacked as mythological absurdi-

ties, especially the doctrines of original sin, atonement (in its Anselmic form), and salvation by faith. The last is seen as a means of getting around God in order to avoid deserved punishment, a method of destroying God's law that was invented by Paul. Paul is an arch enemy of true religion, who either purposely or unconsciously perverted the pure teaching of Christ and opened Christianity to absurd dogmas and to licentious living. In this way Christians have claimed they are free of the Jewish Law to which Christ himself was obedient. They eat pork, they become drunken, they follow curiously lax customs of fasting, they have changed their *qibla*, or direction of praying, from prayer toward Jerusalem to prayer toward the East, they have given up circumcision, they observe Sunday instead of the Saturday sabbath, and so on. All this freedom to do as they like in religious matters is an innovation since the time of Christ. Christian social life and morality are also attacked. Christians do not live up to the rules laid down in the Sermon on the Mount. On the contrary, their wars among themselves and their persecutions of one another and of Islam show hatred of their enemies and not love. The freedom they accord their women in society is a source of immorality.

In the defense of Islam the Qur'an's position is primary. It is the literal revelation of God, dictated to Muhammad by Gabriel, perfect in every letter. It is an ever-present miracle, witnessing to itself and to Muhammad, the Prophet of God. Its miraculous quality resides partly in its style, so perfect and lofty that neither men nor *jinn* could ever produce a single chapter to compare with its briefest chapter, and partly in its content of teachings, prophecies about the future, and amazingly accurate information such as the illiterate Muhammad could never have gathered of his own accord. Those parts of the Qur'an that are attacked as being in contradiction to other parts, especially those that enjoin something that is forbidden elsewhere, are explained by abrogation. That is, in a given situation God revealed a command to his people which was to serve for a time at that stage of their development, but later a new command abrogated the former one and replaced it for all time. The Hadith, or Traditions, on which is based much of Islamic teaching, are defended as wholly trustworthy, according to the reliable *isnād*, or chain of witnesses, required for

the support of each tradition and prefixed to each one. The study of the reliability of the Traditions is a carefully preserved science admitting of no error.

Another important issue, the prophethood of Muhammad, is closely connected with the foregoing one, since the Qur'an witnesses to Muhammad's prophethood, and its miracle is in a sense his miracle. Besides the Qur'an which he revealed from God, his miracles are at least a thousand according to the Hadith. Even the Qur'an itself indicates one or two, which is a complete refutation of the attacks that say Muhammad in the Qur'an expressly denied that he could perform miracles. Some of the polemic claims that the Old and the New Testament originally had many more prophecies of Muhammad but that they have been suppressed by unscrupulous Jews and Christians. In any case, all agree that the present Christian scriptures still retain clear prophecies of the coming of Muhammad and Islam. In the Old Testament these are drawn largely from the prophets, and in the New chiefly from references to the coming of the Kingdom and the presence of the Paraclete. Muhammad's sinlessness is upheld against attack. His prayers for "forgiveness" in the Qur'an are to be understood as referring to forgiveness for his people. His unusual number of wives is explained as being due to lofty purposes for his people's benefit, and not to any personal desires.

Attacks on Islam's morality have centered around woman's seclusion, polygamy, and divorce. These, says the polemic, show how much woman is respected in Islam, not the contrary. The veil is necessary for the preservation of morality. Polygamy serves the same purpose, and so does divorce. Woman has her rights within the prescribed limitations, and has the benefit of her husband's protection and care. The condition of immorality in the West is contrasted, and the freedom of Christian women in social intercourse is denounced. Attacks on the immorality of the *jihād*, the religious war, are answered in different ways. Some point out that this is only a war of defense, others that force must always be used to keep down lawless elements, others that the principle is built on the same attitude that announces God's wars of vengeance in the Old Testament.

Finally, Islam is presented as a religion of reasonableness, op-

posed to difficult mysteries of faith, and founded on scientific attitudes of mind. The West is seen to be coming more and more to an enlightened attitude which is further from fanatical Christianity and nearer to Islam. The attacks of missionaries and orientalists upon Islam are said in some of the polemic to be an expression of Western imperialistic politics, which seeks to disrupt the unity of Muslim civilization.

Through most of this material there moves a strain of suspicion and resentment. In only a few of the books is there an open friendliness in the approach. For the most part the polemicists are fighting hard to win a declared battle and to overthrow the enemy. There is surprisingly little difference from the classical polemic methods of the earlier centuries. But increasingly greater use is made of Western historical criticism and Western philosophic thought in order to defend Islam and attack Christianity. Sometimes this is just an adaptation of tools to fit a particular purpose; less often it gives indication of a real growth and broadening of outlook that is fraught with possibilities for the development of Islam.

CHAPTER VI

THE BEARING OF THE CONTEMPORARY APOLOGETIC ON MISSIONARY POLICY

WE HAVE already observed the weight and importance of the contemporary polemic of Islam. Let us recapitulate briefly what it is actually doing. In the first place it is successfully using the traditional frontal attack in developing logical bases for the refutation of Christian theological arguments. With its roots firmly planted in the ancient tradition of Aristotelian systematic thought, it is thoroughly at home as it painstakingly considers the endless chain of points brought up by Christian apologists and turns their own weapons against them with the same enthusiasm and efficiency that they exhibit. Especially devastating are the attacks on the weakness of a conception of revelation based on literal inspiration of the Bible. Understanding revelation to mean the literal dictation of a Book, every word of which is pronounced by God himself, the Muslim polemic relies for its chief refutation of the divine quality of the Bible on the contradictions and the inaccuracies to be found in it, but also makes much of a low stage of religious development in parts of the Old Testament, where the characters of the patriarchs and the prophets are sometimes shown to be far from moral, and where the character of God himself sometimes is colored with caprice and vengefulness. It makes telling use of the findings of historical criticism in pointing out human elements of authorship and authority in both the Old and the New Testament. In its attacks on systems of Christian theology, its arguments against the doctrines of the trinity, the incarnation, redemption, and salvation by faith are the traditional rationalistic arguments which have been used both in the West and in the East, and which can never be finally silenced by logical argumentation, however prolonged. Finally, the Muslim polemic usually exhibits an atmosphere of hostility and hatred occasioned in large measure

by the Christian polemic that it is answering. The manner of discussion is often far from academic and impersonal, and sometimes descends to expressions of strong feeling. In certain instances we have seen derision and ridicule used as the chief weapon. In almost every instance, emotions of resentment and defense lie close to the surface.

While most recent writers on methods of approach to Islam have insisted on abandoning polemic as a chief tool, it cannot be lightly cast aside as irrelevant to the problem. A systematic explanation of the logical bases for belief will always have a function in removing obstacles to intellectual understanding. Apologetic is useful in clearing the ground. Homrighausen points out that reason may not create faith, but may "lead to its necessity," and that it cannot be completely abandoned.¹ Kraemer says that a higher form of controversy is possible which avoids intellectualism and psychological weaknesses, but that to carry it on needs real grace, a thorough steeping in biblical atmosphere, especially with Jesus' method of dealing with people, "good knowledge of the religious situation, and clear insight, springing from sympathy and love, into the psychology of the people."² But whatever place is assigned to controversy, a study of the destructive elements that appear in the so-called "Muhammadan Controversy," and especially in the polemical material we have been examining, gives great weight to the warnings about the dangers of the polemic method.

Several issues are raised by this study of the polemic. The first is an educational issue on the method of approach, and asks whether the controversial method is effective. The Christian frontal attacks have aroused emotions of resentment and hostility and have called forth counterattacks in such a way that on both sides the chief objective has become victory for the right and confusion for the enemy. The stage is set and the ideal conditions are provided for a perfect example of the closed mind, unable to consider new propositions because of an emotional predisposition against them. The activating impulse here is not a desire to search for truth, but a desire to fight an opponent and overcome opposi-

¹ E. G. Homrighausen, "Communicating the Christian Faith." *Theology Today*, 1: 498, 1945.

² Hendrik Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, p. 305, 1938.

tion. Conditions are created in which any attempt to understand the opposite point of view and any willingness to modify one's own opinions are equally unlikely. On the contrary, the frontal attack serves to solidify and even to petrify the opposite point of view. The history of contacts between Christianity and Islam has amply illustrated this melancholy fact. Early Islam was at the beginning apparently not greatly impressed with the differences between itself and Christianity, as we saw in the case of that first colloquy of the Patriarch John with the Arab general 'Amr ibn al-'As.³ It is probable that the apologetic of the Christians, immediately on the defensive against a new heresy, widened the breach by the attacks upon Islam of John of Damascus and others, crystallized the opposition, and prevented such liberal movements as the Mu'tazila from effectively softening the rigidity of orthodox Islam and introducing an appreciative understanding of the figure of Christ. The bitter battle of words had already gone far in dividing Islam and Christianity into hostile camps, with mental areas mutually closed to each other, when the crusades completed the estrangement in a not very different method of force by weight of armament instead of force by weight of argument. Bell points out that the same thing had happened in the early national Christian churches of the East, which, being repressed by Constantinople, became only the more obstinate in opposition, while their personal sympathies and indignations played at least as great a part in the schism as did the merely intellectual disputes.⁴ Today the great danger is that in a period of intellectual and cultural interchange the full possibilities of fresh and active contacts between Islam and Christianity will be hindered if there is again a crystallization of rival orthodoxies through acrimonious and belligerent polemics.⁵

For any fruitful interchange of Islam with any differing system of thought, it is an indispensable prerequisite that there should be created an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence. Only by such removal of suspicion and resentment is there a possibility that prejudgments may be released, rather than embraced with an increasingly passionate fervor. The atmosphere of polemic is not a

³ See pages 12 ff.

⁴ Richard Bell, *The Origin of Islam in Its Christian Environment*, p. 12, 1926.

⁵ See Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, *Re-thinking Missions*, p. 89, 1932.

climate in which new points of view can be considered; it is an atmosphere of coercion under such conditions that there is little likelihood of any readiness for learning and little opportunity for growth.

It must not be overlooked, moreover, that an attack on Islam is an attack not simply upon a religious system, but upon deep-seated national and community loyalties. It is a challenge taken up with enthusiasm, sometimes by men of no particular religious interest or spiritual experience, because it is an attack upon many beloved elements in Muslim culture that are respected as the source of all that is good and noble in national life. Islam is not a theocracy in theory only; it is a cultural organization in which religion, social life, and national life have been closely bound together for thirteen centuries. It is asking almost more than is psychologically possible to expect that Islam as a religious concept be separated in the minds of the Arabs from all the great achievements of Muslims and their advance in learning and culture through the centuries. We have seen that the Muslim polemic interprets the attacks of missionaries upon Islam as a campaign that has aims and effects not only religious, but of many kinds. It is a campaign against the solidarity of the Easterners, against the unity of the Islamic nation, against the purity and classic perfection of the Arabic language, and against the character and person of the great hero of the East, Muhammad. The translator of *Al-injil was-salib* claims that when Western political forces have failed to overthrow the unity of Islam by means of force and imperial colonization, they have tried the other method of attack through the missionaries, a method which he says has been more successful than the first in accomplishing the dissolution of bonds of unity in Islam by undermining true religion and making men radicals and atheists.⁶ Others have said that the attempt of the missionaries to print books in the local Arabic dialects of the unlearned is an attack on the unifying influence of the classical Arabic, which, being the same in all Arab lands and following the standard of the Qur'an, is an important unifying influence in the culture that Western imperialism would gladly see weakened. The Muslim polemic therefore shows that the polemic of Christianity is making direct attack on basic loyalties

⁶ See page 96.

that are extremely rigid. There are involved not one, but many, controlling patterns of thought and living that cannot be easily altered, especially by this method. Watson and Hartmann have pointed out⁷ the extreme rigidity of these basic attitudes and frames of thought. In spite of the fact, they say, that we believe in logic and in the scientific method and in the power of weight of evidence after the essential facts are assembled, it still remains true in controversial matters "that either most great issues are like ambiguous perceptual figures which permit more than one pattern of apprehension to emerge, or the grand frames which encompass our mental life are reconstructed only when the organism experiences some powerful trauma."⁸ The polemic method, far from avoiding these deep-seated loyalties and dissociating religious life from them, tends to overemphasize their connection with the religious attitude, at the same time stiffening the religious framework itself.

It follows from what has been said that even if such polemic attacks were to some extent successful, the success would be accompanied by undesirable effects. Muslims convinced after this fashion are likely to be involved in a renunciation of their former community and nation, cutting themselves completely off from the group with which they have been identified. This is so partly because of the peculiar setup of Islam, which officially rejects an apostate, and even approves his murder by any self-appointed avenger of the faith. But even more it is due to the subtle and deep-rooted attitudes that link Islam with all that is best in the cultural tradition of the Arab lands, and make a rejection of her become for the individual himself almost unconsciously a rejection of all those spheres of his life that Islam has always dominated. But the Christian life aims at a broadening and an abundant enrichment of the life not merely of the individual, but of the individual in his social relationships and in his environment. A Christian experience that removes the individual from his environment and cuts him off from the community in which he has lived is to that extent self-defeating.

Another issue raised by the polemic is the question of how men

⁷ W. S. Watson, and G. W. Hartmann, "The Rigidity of a Basic Attitudinal Frame." *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 34 : 314-335, 1939.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

arrive at truth. Controversy relies upon the logic of argument for its demonstrations, and discounts the far more effective logic of experience, by which man actually finds the truth in his own living. Liberal Protestant thought therefore insists upon the primacy of experience and rejects controversy as a chief method of missionary approach because it distorts theology itself. Theology is the interpretation or explanation of Christian religious experience. But controversy makes the verbalizing about the experience prior to the experience itself, rather than explanatory of it. It attempts to present to an individual a theory about a new, untried experience that is completely meaningless if it is theoretical. Duchesne decries this unpractical and theorizing tendency as it was found in the early church even before the rise of Islam, when in the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries "the unwisdom of the theologians kept upon the dissecting table the sweet Saviour who offered Himself for our love and our imitation far more than for our philosophical investigations."⁹ An analogy to the learning of a new religious life may be found in the learning of a new language. While the parallel is not entirely complete, it serves in this, that the best way to learn a language is the way small children learn it, growing up into the "feel" of it through constant use of its idiom. Those who learn English by rules of grammar in the classroom come to a systematic and academic understanding of the language, but they would rarely be encouraged in this way to desert their own language for the new one. It is only as they learn the "feel" of the language through use that they may come to grow away from their own language into English.

Similarly, polemic attacks contradict the Protestant conception of Christian religious life, which encourages each individual to approach God autonomously through his own religious experience. This freedom is not isolated from authorities that serve as resources of experience outside the individual, that is, the authority of scripture, of the *communio sanctorum*, and of God's revelation by the Holy Spirit in nature and in the heart. But Christian theology explains such revelation as having always something of freshness because each case is a new expression of the revelation and speaks

⁹ Louis Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, transl. by Claude Jenkins, p. 226. John Murray, London, 1924.

to the individual in his particular needs and through his particular experience. This autonomy tends to be overthrown, or at least belittled, by a polemic that brings pressure to bear and exerts force to attain its own ends. As long as one religion claims that it is drawn up against another which it intends to replace *in toto*, there is implied an infringement of the autonomy of religious experience, in an attempt to prove truth by the logic of argument rather than to find it while dealing with the pertinent and current problems of contemporary living. Much of the Muslim polemic material that we have studied, for example, gives the impression that the issues considered are far removed from the everyday experiences of living, and that the lines of battle have been drawn in places where it did not much matter what result came of it all, because the questions were so highly speculative and theoretical. In a missionary approach, any theoretical material is of value only if it has direct bearing on a practical problem or aspect of life that confronts the individual directly. Certainly no theological doctrine is useful except when it is felt to be active in the particular experience of individuals. Any interpretation of theology, to be significant, must have some bearing on a contemporary situation that needs explanation. Education takes place where "historic culture and contemporary living meet."¹⁰

Polemic attack, moreover, tends to obscure the actively creative quality in Christian life. It is negative and stultifying, and does not release springs of creative energy. Christianity is not a patent medicine, "good for what ails you." It is a revelation ever fresh to each individual, requiring newness of expression and of form. Those who live by it must be free "to explore the depths and heights of Christian truth which belongs to the centuries and which cannot be fully stated within the limited framework of any given historic period" or cultural tradition.¹¹ Any religious life that becomes static is dead. A constant change and development in thinking and living is the true expression of the Christian spirit. "Continuous reconstruction is of the essence of the divine work in and through the human."¹² Kraemer, stating that polemics as a

¹⁰ H. S. Elliott, *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* p. 65, 1941.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 68.

method "must be abandoned on religious and psychological grounds," shows how its intellectualism is one of the cardinal objections to it, for it tends to an irreligious intellectualism that is neither active nor effective.¹³ Its stultifying effect is seen in the repeated use of terms completely misunderstood by Muslims and in the attempt to explain them logically, without consideration for their complete unsuitability to the Muslim mind with its qur'anic background. The doubtful and even harmful religious value of such symbols as "Son of God," "Spirit," and "the Christ," when used among Muslims, will be discussed below; meanwhile we may merely notice that if any value for the application of these symbols in human life is to be discovered at all among Muslims, it is surely not by the method of argument and controversy.

A third issue has been the question of revelation. Has God revealed truth once for all at a single point in history, or does he reveal it progressively through history? Islam claims that God's word was given in the Qur'an, complete, forever. The revelation stands there, a miraculous Book today and always. One trouble with so much of the missionary approach is that it has similarly tried to hand over a body of revelation delivered once for all. It has been atomistically concerned with all sorts of details of a great picture or systematic framework of thought, to such an extent that it has often been enthusiastically dealing with points about Christian theology or about the Bible which are not the prime revelation and which have not entered the experience of those to whom these things are explained. Such an approach is merely confusing. It is enough that one central fact or point of view be allowed to have its full impact on Islam, and that it be interpreted by her pertinently to her own experience and her own needs. That is the fact that a man lived who caused his friends about him to believe—to be firmly assured, and to pass on their conviction in a way that effectively renewed the same faith of their group in each succeeding generation—that here in him the essential nature of God overcame the limitations of human existence in such a manner that on earth there was a continuous maintenance of union with God which acted and continues to act as the great healing quality of the world. To put it differently, "the character and works of

¹³ Kraemer, *op. cit.*, pp. 301, 305.

Christ are the character and works of the heavenly Father, and the indwelling Spirit inspires and enables men to do the same sort of works.”¹⁴ This is the heart of the problem between Islam and Christianity, and it is a difference that has an importance for daily experience: for Islam defines revelation as a single dictated Book, largely made up of warnings and commands for daily living, while Christianity claims that the revelation of God is supremely found in a Person who overcame and continues to overcome the limitations and separations and frustrations of daily human experience.

A fourth issue concerns the relation of Islam and Christianity to each other on the mission field. Are these two religions required to meet in head-on collision, as being two systems of completely revealed facts that are quite irreconcilable? It would seem from what has preceded that this is not a true analysis of the situation. For if Christian religious life develops by the working out of the relation of the individual to God through the overcoming of frustrations in daily living, the missionary approach must be experimental. This does not mean that the Christian revelation is set aside, and experiment begins without any facts on which to experiment. But it does mean that the approach is experimental in encouraging the twin attitudes of receptivity to truth and obedience to it in both Muslim and Christian. It means that in both Muslim and Christian changes may take place in the structure of beliefs, as interpretations are challenged and tested and used experimentally in living. It is a method of testimony on both sides and a testing of the other's testimony.

Religion is an attitude of the whole personality, it is not merely a matter of ideas. Here is common ground for Islam and Christianity to meet. Here is mutually autonomous ground that tolerates no tyranny of overriding authority on either side, but opens the way for experimental creative living. Receptivity to truth and obedience to truth are the keys to a variety of experiences as broad as human life. The polemic material that we have studied shows that in the past the opposite attitudes have been encouraged by the method of attack on both sides. The closed mind, self-satisfaction, scorn—these we have seen, and these are the arid and unproductive opposites of receptivity. Self-interest, reluctance to admit faults,

¹⁴ L. E. Browne, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*, p. 123, 1933.

vilification of opponents because they are opponents—these are the barren opposites of obedience to truth. Not only must Christian missionary work avoid these more obvious sins, but it must be sure that its methods always provide for the free play of experiment with truth and always protect contemporary experience from the tyranny of a dogma that should be its servant. For it is not likely that “an education which is entirely Christian in its processes can at the same time be dogmatically Christian in its content.”¹⁵ Kraemer refers to the same danger that Christian teaching should become irrelevant to current experience, and he stresses the need for “a genuine deepening of religious life, a creative rediscovery of the relation of God’s world with the spheres of human life to make this connection [of life and Christianity] a reality. A huge task of religious pedagogy is awaiting the Christian Church in this field.”¹⁶

In this experimental approach, freedom must be given for the formulation of the description of experience. Not only a theological terminology, but the working out of devotional and ecclesiastical systems, may be left largely to those who pass through the experience of the regenerating power of Christ and who live under the new conditions of union with God through him, for they alone are thoroughly fit to give free and natural expression to these experiences in their own forms of speech and activity and organization. Here will be produced a new and invaluable contribution to the understanding of the Christian life and the Christian faith, a contribution which is enriched by Muslim strains of culture and thought hitherto not known in the Christian heritage. This is not merely a desirable concomitant of the transmission of a message. It is an indispensable condition both of giving and of receiving Christian teaching, for Christian teaching “cannot be handed on as a finished doctrine, without renewal of insight by those who undertake to transmit it”¹⁷ and those who receive it. There has been too much talk of the “superiority” of Christianity to other religions, as though we had a higher system of morality, or ethic, or philosophy, and as though we wished to absorb into our own superior group the Muslims who are outsiders. It is this that the Muslim polemic has

¹⁵ *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council*, 2: 39, 1928.

¹⁶ Kraemer, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

¹⁷ Laymen’s Foreign Missions Inquiry, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

bitterly resented, seeing in it a kind of imperialistic pressure that men were not slow to attribute even to Western political instigation. The Christian contribution is not a system superior to other systems, nor does it aim primarily at the acceptance of superior ideas. It points men to one central picture, the picture of God revealed in Jesus as the Christ, and it aims at creating a change in every man, whether Muslim or Christian so-called, a transformation whereby a new type of released personality is formed.¹⁸

It follows, then, that the missionary approach must be receptive to backgrounds of thinking and experience in the historical cultures of Islam and Christianity as well as to any others that are pertinent or effective or useful. This statement does not imply that the method should be one of syncretistic collecting of "all that's best in other cultures." What is best in other cultures cannot be collected. It can only interpret and interact functionally with other forces, as, for example, the powerful, transforming force which the Christian missionary seeks to introduce. A syncretism which is merely a summation of collected details is a sterile conglomerate with no unifying drive; but once the Christian dynamic is the central driving force in a man or in a community, then its spirit is always seeking on all sides fresh types of living experience through which it may continue to express itself in ever-new fashion.

Besides these issues that have been raised, the polemic reveals some special challenges to the restudy of particular areas of missionary method in dealing with Islam. The first is the warning of the great harm that may be caused by a negative or destructive approach. We have already seen that the Muslims have found many destructive elements in the attacks of Christian missionary propaganda. It is undoubtedly true that much of the contact with the West serves, especially among young people, to undermine the old loyalties without providing new ones, and results in a negativism that destroys all interest in morality or social responsibility. It is much easier to attack weak points in orthodox Islam than to present a positive and acceptable alternative. There is little to be gained, and much harm to be done, for example, by an attack

¹⁸ Compare Lootfy Levonian, *Studies in the Relationship of Islam and Christianity*, p. 144, 1940. Also Kraemer, *op. cit.*, pp. 286, 292, 294.

on the character of Muhammad. Aside from the deep national and religious loyalties that are offended, at the very core of a man's spiritual life, by an attack on this great racial hero, *An-nabī al-'arabī*, "The Arabian Prophet," there is a plaintive appeal in these Muslim writings for fair play toward their leader, inasmuch as they are by their traditional respect for Christ prevented from attacking him as Muhammad is attacked by the Christians. It may not always be possible to avoid some negative criticism entirely, but it is possible to avoid it more often than has been done in the past.

Another need indicated by this study is that missionary policy must include the purpose of building on attitudes of reverence and humility wherever they are already found. Christianity is a matter of attitudes, not merely of ideas, and the attitudes of reverence for, and humility before truth and before God are fundamental. They are to be found in Islam as they are to be found to some extent everywhere, but the education and nurture of them need enlightened training. These attitudes are not means to the end of securing assent to Christian doctrine, but they are themselves ends about which Christian doctrine speaks. In words that give a close parallel to the situation on the mission field, Ruckmick shows how little the importance of educating the emotions has been recognized in American education: "Drives, incentives to motivation, aims, and ideals, all have had a recognized place in the school and college program, but, outside of a few institutions that direct their efforts toward the education for 'ethical culture' and the like, these emotional processes have been used as a means to an end, and not as ends in themselves. The culture of the intellect was the end."¹⁹ In no educational venture, and especially not in Christian missionary education, can the education of the whole man give place to an emphasis on the training of the intellect.

If the missionary is to be sensitive to the attitudes of reverence and humility wherever they are already found, he must be no less sensitive to the various reform movements in Islam and be ready to cooperate with them whenever it is possible and suitable to do so. Reform movements are earnest attempts to reinterpret religious teaching in the light of present experience, or to interpret new experience in the light of religious teaching, and they are

¹⁹ C. A. Ruckmick, *The Psychology of Feeling and Emotion*, p. 493, 1936.

therefore of primary importance for the missionary. This does not mean, of course, that every novel movement embraced by a few eccentrics is worthy of careful study; it means that wherever there arises a truly religious expression of contemporary living that is trying to give spiritual interpretation to everyday experience, there growth is taking place, and there spiritual forces are grappling with facts.

It is possible that one of these reform movements will have more significance for an eventual Muslim understanding of Christ than can now be imagined. It may even be that in the next few years the chief contribution of the missionary in Muslim lands will be not so much to the regeneration of individual Muslims as to the regeneration of Islam itself. Here at least is a field of opportunity that cannot be neglected. That it is open, is clear from those last examples of apologetic that seemed to welcome a working together of Muslims and Christians—Dā'ūd's deprecation of the bitter and destructive Muslim-Christian polemic, Nielsen's symposium of contributions from both sides, and Qub'īn's appreciation of the growing understanding between Muslims and Christians.²⁰

An interesting line of investigation would be to study whether it is necessary for a Christian to love the Muslims and to hate Islam, or whether it is possible to love Islam too and seek its regeneration. Gibb, for example, gives a vivid picture of some of the currents of thought at work in Islam, and points out the great leavening influence that will transform religious and secular attitudes if "an inexorable devotion to truth" can lead Islam to the habit of historical thinking in regard to her own past and present.²¹ Here is an expression of reverence for truth that will have far-reaching results for a great community.

Finally, one of the most important facts to which this polemic material points is the confused situation that obtains between Muslims and Christians in the use of symbols. Nowhere is it more obvious that words mean one thing to one group and quite a different thing to another group. When such words are an attempted description of experience, complete confusion prevails and careful revision is imperative. The symbols of Christian

²⁰ See pages 95, 96, 100, 101 f.

²¹ H. A. R. Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam*, pp. 124 ff., 1947.

theology and Christian worship are in no sense absolute; they exist to clarify and explain Christian experience, and if they are found to be obscuring it, they are becoming self-defeating. For the Muslim, there are several such obscure and harmful symbols in use among Christians. The most obvious one is "Son of God," an expression actually offensive religiously to Muslims because of the wealth of unfortunate connotation it contains. From the time of Muhammad onward, the Qur'an firmly bears witness again and again that God has no sons or daughters, that he begets not nor is begotten,²² and that to call Christ the Son of God is blasphemy and idolatry. It therefore becomes extremely doubtful whether the symbol can ever be truly of use to Muslims in expressing the paradox of the godhood and manhood in the person of Jesus as the Christ. It is certainly harmful unless a long and difficult period of training is undertaken to explain the background and historic use of the symbol in the Christian scriptures and the Christian church. The search for a more useful symbol than "Son of God" does not mean an easy wafting aside of the true difference that stands between Muslim and Christian thinking about Christ. Can God's limitless perfection be revealed in a limited human form? And was it so revealed? Islam says no. The Christian Church has said yes, and has used the symbol "Son of God" in expressing its affirmation. The missionary to Islam says yes, but seeks a way to express that truth which will be more full of meaning for Islam.

Another symbol with less annoying but just as confusing connotations for Islam, is the word "spirit." Levonian has pointed out in *Studies in the Relationship of Islam and Christianity* that the Muslim conception of spirit is material and corporeal.²³ A man's spirit is a light and highly refined substance that spreads through his body. God therefore cannot be a spirit, for he is not corporeal. The Holy Spirit as an expression of God's being thus becomes meaningless. Similar confusion is found in the symbol "Word of God," and other symbols used differently by Islam and Christianity.

A special confusion, introducing a difficulty of a little different character, is found in the use of the symbol "Christ." As it is used

²² Qur'an 2 : 110, 6 : 100 *et passim*.

²³ Levonian, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-80.

in the Qur'an and in Islam generally, the word has nothing of its biblical connotation whatever. It seems to occur simply as a proper name, "Jesus the Christ," as one might say "Jesus the Nazarene." It is the form his full name takes when the angel first announces to the Virgin Mary that she is to bear a son, Qur'an 3 : 40: *ismuhu al-masih 'isā ibn maryam*, "his name shall be Christ Jesus Son of Mary." The word Christ has been freely used between Christians and Muslims, and seems in some ways a very suitable word to use, since it is acceptable to both and has an aura of dignity about it. But the danger in its use lies exactly in this, that the symbol in Christian thought is not intended to convey the idea of dignity, nor does it mean a proper name. If it is emptied of its significance as the unique revelation of Godhood in manhood, the term is probably much better not used at all. At least it should be made clear that it is being used in a completely non-Christian sense. In speaking to Muslims there is no value in using terms that have acquired a halo of sanctity in the West, but that have no significance in the day-by-day experiences of Muslims.

Similarly, the Near East Christian Council has reported on the connotation of the words "Christian" and "baptism" for Muslims. Both mean for them the identification of a man with a particular community, a special political and social, and even racial, group.²⁴ These terms for the Muslim refer to a new social and political affiliation; they do not refer to a new inner orientation of the personality or a spiritual rebirth.

This situation means that there is a critical need for the discovery and use of terms and symbols that are pregnant with meaning for Muslims and that are not foreign to their life. To discover such terms and make them available is not an easy task. It is one that must be attacked experimentally with great sympathy and appreciation, with keen theological understanding and with insight into experience, either by Christian missionary workers with good training in Islamics, or better by Muslim Christians, or best of all by a cooperative experiment that includes both missionaries and Muslim Christians in the interplay of all their insights. Where this experiment may lead is beyond the range of this study. It is a

²⁴ Near East Christian Council, *Report of the Inquiry on the Evangelization of Moslems* (H. H. Riggs, ed.), pp. 7 f., 1938.

large and important field for investigation, a field almost untouched up until now.

Without attempting to define the limits of it, we may at least indicate some lines along which the investigation might go. First of all, it would seek to find what symbol could replace "Son of God," and perhaps even the empty proper name "Christ." Is there in the *sūfī* devotional literature any hint of a symbol or symbols that might express the Christian conception in more living form? It should be a symbol that could convey the picture of one who makes effective the immediate and unbroken unity of humanity with God, or of one who heals the separations and frustrations of existence. This task of investigation would not be the work of a moment. It would be an attempt to replace a symbol drawn from the centuries of Hebrew religious experience before the appearance of Christ and used through the twenty centuries since that time to express the daily experience of the Christian church. The boldness of such an enterprise is justified only by the imperative demand of the Christian life that experience be always expressed in meaningful terms, and that dead symbols or misunderstood symbols, however hallowed by time and tradition, are worse than useless as vehicles of living experience.

Such an investigation would seek also for other useful symbols in *sūfī* thought. Browne's chapter "When Sufis Looked to Jesus" ²⁵ shows that Muslims have not always been cold to the power of the figure of Jesus Christ. He quotes the words of the mystic Jalālud-dīn Rūmī (d. A. D. 1273) in regard to self-abasement, "Make thyself dead in supplication and poverty (of spirit), that the breath of Jesus may revive thee and make thee fair and blessed as itself." ²⁶ Such words as these are examples of the way in which Christian thought was affecting *sūfī* mysticism and popular Islam. It may be that in the warmth of spiritual expression that is to be found in Sufism symbols may be found which can be filled with Christian meaning to far more purpose and with far more effect than the traditional Christian symbols, weighed down with the misunderstandings of centuries.

There are other possible sources of significant symbols, areas of

²⁵ L. E. Browne, *The Prospects of Islam*, Chap. 6. S. C. M. Press, London, 1944.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

life where thought and growth are most actively taking place, areas where the issues of life are sharply drawn and keenly realized. There is the whole area of nationalism, in which the loyalties of the Near East are so vitally involved. Is there in this field some symbol for "freedom from bondage," or "self-dedication," or "new responsibility in the new life," that can be filled with fresh Christian meaning? There is the area of overwhelming family loyalty and other group loyalties which make an important background for living in the Muslim lands. "The community" is a word to conjure with, full of beloved connotation; perhaps "the new community" or "the universal community" might become a useful symbol for the Christian life. There is a word in the Arab Near East that stands as a counterpart to the word "face" in the Far East, though its meaning is not exactly identical: *'izzat an-nafs* means "self-respect" and "honor" and "dignity" and "knowing what is one's due." The concept and the word itself are dear to the Arabs, but the word has not been truly christianized. It could be turned outward from self, and filled with connotations of the value of the individual and the divine possibilities residing in other personalities than oneself. Its emphasis could be shifted from "what is mine by right" to what is possible in others as sons of God.

In worship and religious observances also the use of symbols is crucial. Here the field for investigation is wide. One example is the use of the church bell to summon people to worship. The age-old objection of Muslims to the bell as a strange and foreign introduction has been fed by jealous resentment every time a new church building has introduced the clamor of a bell into a district that was formerly silent. Meanwhile, Islam has its own unsurpassed method of summoning to prayer, the human voice. This is a type of devotional symbol that could be used by Muslim Christians. Its need is secondary, however, for the primary need is for such theological symbols as are suggested above.

Browne tells of the special contribution to Christian life made by Muslim converts to Christianity, who have brought into the church three characteristic elements that are recognizable as coming from the Muslim background: a sense of deep awe in worship, a practical expression of the brotherhood of each worshiper with all the other members of the church, and a remarkable enthusiasm or

zeal that appears in the celebration of religious feasts and in an eagerness for missionary activity.²⁷

If there are such contributions to be made by Muslims who bring into the Christian church some expressions of their own previous cultural and religious life, may there not also be terms and symbols used by Islam and congenial to it that can be enriched with Christian meaning, and come at last to enrich in turn the life of the church with a new interpretation of the ever fresh revelation of God in Christ? The symbols suggested here merely point the way to the much wider study and experimentation that are needed to open the path to a more effective missionary approach to Islam.

What is, after all, this age-long controversy between Islam and Christianity? In the polemic examined the Muslims do not oppose Christ as they understand him, nor "original Christianity" as they think they know what it was. They oppose what they believe to be a Western misinterpretation of his life and death. They oppose the customs of life and the forms of worship so foreign to their own. They oppose forces that they believe will destroy from without the culture and civilization of the Arabs and of the beloved Arabic tongue. We must not belittle the fundamental religious differences that lie between Islam and Christianity. But we must make clear the fact that Islam should not be put to the necessity of opposing something "foreign." It should be allowed to claim for itself that truth which belongs to Muslims as to all men, the good news of God's revelation to man in Christ, and to develop from within its understanding of the real Christ, through the upsurging of loyalties to him as their own Eastern Christ and through the revelation of the Holy Spirit in their own daily experience. It may be that in this way Muslims will discover that Christ is not a menacing figure who threatens to destroy the customs and ideals and ways of life that they hold most dear, but one who makes possible their unending growth and expansion through an abundantly fresh flowering of individual life and national culture.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Chap. 9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

- ADAMS, C. C. *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*. Oxford University Press, London, 1933.
- ADDISON, J. T. "The Ahmadiyya Movement and Its Western Propaganda." *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 1-32, January, 1929.
- ADDISON, J. T. *The Christian Approach to the Moslem*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1942.
- ALAM, MUHAMMAD AMIR. *Islam and Christianity*. Oriental Printers and Publishers, Calcutta, 1923.
- 'ALI, MUHAMMAD. *Muhammad and Christ*. Ahmadiyah Amjumar i-Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore, 1921.
- BENGALIEF, SUFI M. R. *The Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam*. (Pamphlet) The Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, n.d.
- BOGOSLOVSKY, B. B. *The Technique of Controversy*. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1928.
- BOWER, W. C. *Christ and Christian Education*. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York, 1943.
- BROWNE, L. E. *The Prospects of Islam*. S. C. M. Press, London, 1944.
- CARLETTI, P. V., transl. *Idh-har-ul-Haqq*, by Rahmat Ullah ibn Khalil al-Rahman (al-Hindi). Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1880. (Original written in 1860.)
- COE, G. A. *What Is Christian Education?* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1929.
- DAR-UL-KUTUB ISLAMIA (The Islamic Book Depot). *A Complete List of Books and Periodicals*. Lahore, 1939.
- ELLIOTT, H. S. *Can Religious Education Be Christian?* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1941.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Ed. M. T. Houtsma, et al. E. J. Brill Ltd., Leyden, 1913-1938. 8 vols.
- FLEMING, D. J. *Helping People Grow*. Association Press, New York, 1931.
- FOLLETT, M. P. *Creative Experience*. Longmans, Green, and Company, New York, 1924.
- GIBB, H. A. R. *Modern Trends in Islam*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1947.
- HEADLEY, LORD. *The Affinity between the Original Church of Jesus Christ and Islam*. Trust for the Encouragement and Circulation of Muslim Religious Literature, Woking, 1927.

- HOMRIGHAUSEN, E. G. "Communicating the Christian Faith." *Theology Today*, Vol. 1, January, 1945.
- INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL. "*The Madras Series*," Vols. 1 and 3. The Council, New York, 1939.
- INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL. *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council*, Vol. 2. The Council, New York, 1928.
- The Islamic Review*. The Woking Mission and Literary Trust, Woking. Monthly. (Lahore Ahmadiyya.)
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. "A Collection of Anti-Christian Books and Pamphlets Found in Actual Use among Mohammedans of Cairo." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 15, pp. 26-37, January, 1925.
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. "New Trends in Moslem Apologetic," Chapter 20 in *The Moslem World of Today*, J. R. Mott, ed. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1925.
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. "Present Day Movements in Islam." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 33, pp. 165-186, July, 1943.
- JONES, L. BEVAN. "How Not to Use the Koran." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 30, pp. 280-291, July, 1940.
- JONES, L. BEVAN. *Christianity Explained to Muslims: A Manual for Christian Workers*. Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, Calcutta, 1938.
- KAMAL-UD-DIN, KHWAJA. *The Sources of Christianity*. The Basheer Muslim Library, Woking, 1924.
- KAMAL-UD-DIN, KHWAJA. "Islam and Its Principles Compared with Christianity." Chap. 3 in *Four Lectures on Islam*. The Muslim Book Society, Lahore, n.d.
- KRAEMER, HENDRIK. *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1938.
- Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry. *Re-thinking Missions*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1932.
- LEE, A. M. and LEE, E. B., ed. *The Fine Art of Propaganda*. Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1939.
- LEVONIAN, LOOTFY. *Moslem Mentality*. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1928.
- LEVONIAN, LOOTFY. *Studies in the Relationship of Islam and Christianity*. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1940.
- The Light*. Lahore. Approximately weekly. (Lahore Ahmadiyya.)
- MORRISON, S. A. "Modern Types of Moslem Thought." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 15, pp. 374-384, October, 1925.
- The Moslem Sunrise*. Chicago. Quarterly. (Qadiani.)
- Near East Christian Council. *Report of the Inquiry on the Evangelization of Moslems* (H. H. Riggs, ed.). American Mission Building, Beirut, 1938.
- The Review of Religions*. Qadian. Monthly.
- RICE, W. A. *Crusaders of the Twentieth Century*. Church Missionary Society, London, 1910.

- RUCKMICK, C. A. *The Psychology of Feeling and Emotion*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1936.
- SMITH, WILFRED CANTWELL. *Modern Islam in India*. Minerva Book Shop, Lahore, 1943.
- The Sunrise*. Lahore. Weekly. (Qadiani.)
- TEMPLE, WILLIAM. *Basic Convictions*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1936.
- WALTER, H. A. *The Ahmadiyya Movement*. Oxford University Press, London, 1918.
- WATSON, W. S. and HARTMANN, G. W. "The Rigidity of a Basic Attitudinal Frame." *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 34, pp. 314-335, July, 1939.
- YOUNG, KIMBALL. *Social Psychology*. E. S. Crofts and Company, New York, 1931 (1st ed.).

Historical Development of the Apologetic

- ANDRAE, TOR. *Mohammed, the Man and His Faith*. Transl. by Theophil Menzel. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1936.
- ASSEMANI, J. S. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, Rome. Vol. I, 1719; Vol. II, 1721; Vol. III, pt. 1, 1725; Vol. III, pt. 2, 1728.
- BACHA, CONSTANTIN. *Un Traité des Oeuvres Arabes de Théodore Abou-Kurra*. Tripoli de Syrie, Evêché grec-catholique, 1905.
- BECKER, C. H. "Christliche Polemik und Islamische Dogmenbildung." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. 26, pp. 175-195. Strassburg, 1912.
- BELL, RICHARD. *The Origin of Islam in Its Christian Environment*. Macmillan and Company, London, 1926.
- BROCKELMANN, KARL. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2 vols. Felber, Weimar, 1898-1902.
- BROWNE, L. E. *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia*. University Press, Cambridge, 1933.
- BROWNE, L. E. "The Patriarch Timothy and the Caliph Al-Mahdi." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 21, pp. 38-45, January, 1931.
- CHEIKHO, LOUIS. *An-nasrāniyya wa ādābuhā bayn 'arab al-jāhiliyya* (Christianity and Christian Literature in Arabia before Islam). Jesuit Press, Beirut, 1923.
- CHEIKHO, LOUIS. *Trois Traités anciens de polémique et de théologie chrétiennes*. Beyrouth, 1923. (In Arabic.)
- CHEIKHO, LOUIS. *Vingt Traités théologiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens*. Beyrouth, 1920. (In Arabic.)
- DEVIC, MARCEL. "Une Traduction inédite du Coran." *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 8, part 1, pp. 343-406, April-May-June, 1883.
- EICHNER, WOLFGANG. "Die Nachrichten über den Islam bei den Byzan-

- tinern." *Der Islam*, Vol. 23, pts. 3 and 4, pp. 133-162 and 197-244, April and October, 1936.
- FRITSCH, ERDMANN. *Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter*. Müller und Seiffert, Breslau, 1930.
- GOLDZIHNER, IGNATZ. "Über muhammedanische Polemik gegen Ahl al-Kitab." *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. 32, pp. 341-387. Leipzig, 1878.
- GRAF, GEORG. "Christliche Polemik gegen den Islam." *Gelbe Hefte*, Vol. II, pt. 2, pp. 825-842. Munich, 1926.
- GUADAGNOLI, PHILIP. *Apologia pro Christiana Religione*. Typis Sac. Congreg. de Prop. Fide. Rome, 1631.
- GUILLAUME, ALFRED. "A Debate between Christian and Moslem Doctors." *Centenary Supplement of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 233-244, 1924.
- GUILLAUME, ALFRED. "Some Remarks on Free Will and Predestination." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 43-63, January, 1924.
- GÜTERBOCK, CARL. *Der Islam im Lichte der byzantinischen Polemik*. J. Gutentag, Berlin, 1912.
- HUGHES, T. P. *A Dictionary of Islam*. W. H. Allen and Co., London, 1895.
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*. Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1938.
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. "Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III." *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 37, pp. 269-332, October, 1944.
- JEFFERY, ARTHUR. "Gregory of Tathew's 'Contra Mohammedanos'." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 32, pp. 3-19, July, 1942.
- KELLER, ADOLF. *Der Geisteskampf des Christentums gegen den Islam, bis zur Zeit des Kreuzzüge*. W. Faber, Leipzig, 1896.
- Al-Kindī, 'Abd-al-Masīh Ibn Ishāq. *Apology*, transl. and abridged by Sir William Muir. Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, London, 1911.
- KOELLE, S. W. *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*. Rivington's, London, 1889.
- LATOURETTE, K. S. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*. 7 vols. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937-1945.
- LEE, SAMUEL. *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*. J. Smith, Cambridge, 1824.
- MANDONNET, P.-F. "Fra Ricoldo de Monte Croce." *Révue Biblique*, Vol. 2, pp. 44-61, 182-202, 584-607, January, April, October, 1893.
- MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. *Mahommed and the Rise of Islam*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1905.
- MARRACCIO, LUDOVICO. *Alcorani Textus Universus*. Ex Typographia Seminarii, Patavii, 1698.
- MARTINI, RAYMUND. *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*. Typis Viduae Juhannis Wittigau, Lipsiae, 1687.

- MICO, ONUPHRIUS. *Lex Evangelica contra Alcoranum*. Thypis Regalis Coenobii, Valentia, 1698.
- MIGNE, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*, Vols. 1-161. *Series Latina*, Vols. 1-221. J.-P. Migne, Paris, 1879-1891.
- NAU, F. "Un Colloque du Patriarche Jean avec l'Émir des Agaréens et faits divers des années 712 à 716, etc." *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 11, sec. 5, pp. 225-279, March-April, 1915.
- PALMIERI, AURELIO. *Die Polemik des Islam*, transl. into German by Valentin Holzer. Anton Pustet, Salzburg, 1902.
- PFANDER, C. G. *The Mizanul-Haqq*, revised and enlarged by W. St. Clair Tisdall. The Religious Tract Society, London, 1910.
- PFANNMÜLLER, GUSTAV. *Handbuch der Islam-Literatur*. W. de Gruyter and Co., Berlin, 1923.
- RAGG, LONSDALE and RAGG, LAURA, ed. and transl. *The Gospel of Barnabas*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1907.
- RODWELL, J. M., transl. *The Koran*. J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1924.
- SBATH, PAUL. *Vingt Traités philosophiques et apologétiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens du IX^e au XIV^e siècle*. Friedrich, Cairo, 1929. (In Arabic.)
- STEINSCHNEIDER, M. *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vol. 6, pt. 3, 1877, n.p.
- Tabarī, 'Alī ibn Rabbān. *The Book of Religion and Empire*, transl. by A. Mingana. Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1922.
- WHERRY, E. M. *The Muslim Controversy*. The Christian Literature Society, London, 1905.
- WRIGHT, THOMAS. *Early Christianity in Arabia*. Bernard Quaritch, London, 1885.
- ZWEMER, S. M. *The Moslem Christ*. American Tract Society, New York (preface, 1912).

Books and Pamphlets Studied in Chapters IV and V

- Abāhī, 'Abdallāh. *Al-madhhab ar-rūhānī*. (Place and date cut off.) 471 pp.
- 'Abduh, Muhammad. *Al-islām; risāla bi-qalam hānūtū wa-radd 'alayhā*. n.p., n.d. 80 pp.
- 'Abduh, Muhammad. *Al-islām wan-nasrāniyya ma'al-'ilm wal-madaniyya*. Manār Press, Cairo, 1341 A. H. 200 pp.
- 'Abduh, Muhammad. *Tafsīr al-qur'ān al-hakīm*, ed. by Muhammad Rashīd Ridā. Manār Press, Cairo, 1324-1346 A. H. 8 vols.
- Afghānī, Jamāluddīn. *Ar-radd 'alā ad-dahriyyīn*. Mahmūdiyya Press, Cairo, 1935. 80 pp.
- Anonymous. *Al-khulāsa al-burhāniyya*. n.p., n.d. 32 pp.
- Bahrānī, 'Alī. *Lisān as-sidq*. Mawsū'āt Press, Cairo, 1319 A. H. 480 pp.
- Bāshajizādah, 'Abdurrahmān. *Al-fāriq bayn al-makhlūq wal-khāliq*. Taq-addum Press, Cairo, 1322 A. H. 408 and 120 pp.

- Dā'ūd, Al-Ab 'Abdulahad. *Al-injīl was-salīb*, "transl. into Arabic from Turkish by an 'Irāqī Muslim." Cairo, 1351 A. H. 222 pp.
- Dijwī, Yūsuf Ahmad Nasr. *Al-jawāb al-munīf*. An-Nahda al-Adabiyya Press, 1913. n.p. (Cairo). 277 pp.
- Galwash, Ahmad A. *The Religion of Islam*. Al-Azhar Magazine (preface, Cairo, 1940). 216 pp.
- Hirrāwī, Husayn. *Al-mustashriqūn wal-islām*. Manār Press, Cairo, 1936. 107 pp.
- Iskandarānī, 'Abdulqādir. *Ar-risāla al-ūla, iqāz al-wasnān*. Fai'hā' Press, Damascus, 1342 A. H.
- Iskandarānī, 'Abdulqādir. *Ar-risāla ath-thānia, tanbīh al-yaqzān*. Fai'hā' Press, Damascus, 1342 A. H. 32 pp.
- Malījī, Ahmad. *I'lām al-ba'īd wal-qarīb*. An-Nīl Press, Cairo, 1323 A. H. 67 pp.
- Malījī, Muhammad 'Alī. *Al-fāsil bayn al-haqq wal-bātil*. Mawsū'āt Press, Cairo, 1331 A. H. 129 and 13 pp.
- (Malījī), M (uhammad) 'A (lī). *Al-qawl as-sahīh li-ta'yīd mahabbat al-masīh*, by M. 'A, n.p., n.d. 32 pp.
- Mallāh, Muhammad Nadīm. *Unmūdhij al-fadā'il al-islāmiyya*. Bayt al-Muqaddas Press, Jerusalem, 1340 A.H.
- Nabhānī, Yūsuf. *Khulāsat al-kalām fī tarjīh dīn al-islām*. Mawsū'āt Press, Cairo, 1322 A. H. 32 pp.
- Qīshāwī. 'Abdallāh. *Afkār mu'minīn fī haqā'iq ad-dīn*, Vol. 1. American Press, Beirut, 1938. 58 pp.
- Qub'īn, Salīm. *Hikam an-nabī muhammad*. Mahmūdiyya Press, Cairo, n.d. 55 pp.
- Rahmatullāh b. Khalīl al-Rahmān (al-Hindī). P. V. Carletti transl., *Idh-har-ul-Haqq*. Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1880. Vol. 1, 423 pp.; Vol. 2, 472 pp.
- Sharīf, Ahmad. *Ilm al-yaqīn fir-radd 'alā al-mutanassar 'imāduddīn*. Sharīfiyya Press, Cairo, 1311 A. H. 76 pp.
- Tannīr, 'Abdulwahhāb Salīm. *Idrār ta'līm at-tawrāt wal-injīl*, transl. from the English of Charles Watts. Mawsū'āt Press, Cairo, 1319 A. H. 66 pp.

मसुरी

102512

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

[illegible]

102512

अवाप्ति सं०
ACC. No. ~~19834~~

वर्ग सं. पुस्तक सं.
Class No. 297 Book No.
लेखक Do१
Author.... Doorman, Harry.... G.
शीर्षक
Title.... Toward Understanding... ~~Do~~

297

Do१

LIBRARY

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration

MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 102512

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.