CHAPTER VI

BONDAGE (SLAVERY)

"And as to your slaves, see that ye feed them as ye feed yourselves
and clothe them as ye clothe yourselves"—The Prophet.

SLAVERY in some of its features has been aptly compared with polygamy. Like polygamy, it has existed among all nations, and has died away with the progress of human thought and the growth of a sense of justice among mankind. Like polygamy it was the natural product of passion and pride so strongly marked in certain phases of the communal and individual development. But unlike polygamy it bears from its outset the curse of inherent injustice.

In the early stages, when humanity has not risen to the full appreciation of the reciprocal rights and duties of man; when laws are the mandates of one, or of the few, for the many; when the will of the strong is the rule of life and the guide of conduct—then the necessary inequality, social, physical, or mental, engendered by nature among the human race, invariably takes the form of slavery, and a system springs into existence which allows absolute power to the superior over the inferior.\(^1\) This complete subserviency of the weak to the strong has helped the latter to escape from the legendary curse laid on man—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the ground," and allowed them to employ the leisure thus acquired in congenial pursuits. "The simple wish," says the author of Ancient Law, "to use the bodily powers of another person as the means of ministering to one's

---

own ease or pleasure, is doubtless the foundation of slavery, and as old as human nature."

The practice of slavery is co-eval with human existence. Historically, its traces are visible in every age and in every nation. Its germs were developed in a savage state of society, and it continued to flourish even when the progress of material civilisation had done away with its necessity.

The Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, and the ancient Germans,² —people whose legal and social institutions have most affected modern manners and customs,—recognised and practised both kinds of slavery, prudial servitude as well as household slavery.

Among the Hebrews, from the commencement of their existence as a nation, two forms of slavery were practised. The Israelite slave, given into bondage as a punishment for crime or for the payment of a debt, occupied a higher position than a slave of alien birth. The law allowed the former his liberty after six years of servitude, unless he refused to avail himself of his right. But the foreign slaves, whether belonging to the people whom the Israelites had reduced into absolute helotage by a merciless system of warfare, or whether acquired in treacherous forays or by purchase, were entirely excluded from the benefits of this arrangement, an arrangement made in a spirit of national partiality and characteristic isolation.³ The lot of these bondsmen and bondswomen was one of unmitigated hardship. Helots of the soil or slaves of the house, hated and despised at the same time, they lived a life of perpetual drudgery in the service of pitiless masters.

Christianity, as a system and a creed, raised no protest against slavery, enforced no rule, inculcated no principle for the mitigation of the evil. Excepting a few remarks on the disobedience of slaves,¹ and a general advice to masters to give servants their due, the teachings of Jesus, as portrayed in the Christian traditions, contained nothing expressive of disapprobation of bondage. On the contrary, Christianity enjoined

¹ Maine, Ancient Law, p 104
² Caesar (De Bell Gall lib vi), Tacitus (De Mortibus German, cap 21, 22), and Pothier (De Stat Servor apud Germ, lib 1) all testify to the extreme severity of German servitude.
³ Lev. xxv. 44, 45.
⁴ 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.
on the slave absolute submission to the will of his or her proprie-
tor. It found slavery a recognised institution of the empire; it adopted the system without any endeavour to mitigate its baneful character, or to promote its gradual abolition, or to improve the status of slaves. Under the civil law, slaves were mere chattels. They remained so under the Christian domination. Slavery had flourished among the Romans from the earliest times. The slaves, whether of native or of foreign birth, whether acquired by war or purchase, were regarded simply as chattels. Their masters possessed the power of life and death over them. But that gradual improvement which had raised the archaic laws of the Twelve Tables to the comprehensive code of Hadrian, did not fail to introduce some amelioration in the condition of the slaves. In spite, however, of the changes which the humanity or the wisdom of the emperors had effected in the old laws, the person of the slave was absolutely subject to the will of the master. Each magnate of the empire possessed thousands of slaves, who were tortured and subjected to lashings for the most trivial of faults.

The introduction of the religion of Jesus into Europe affected human chattelhood only in its relation to the priesthood. A slave could become free by adopting monachism, if not claimed within three years. But in other respects, slavery flourished as much and in as varied shapes as under the pagan domination. The Digest, compiled under a Christian emperor, pronounced slavery a constitution of the law of nature, and the Code fixed the maximum price of slaves according to the professions for which they were intended. Marriages between slaves were not legal, and between the slave and the free were prohibited under severe penalties. The natural result was unrestrained concubinage, which even the clergy recognised and practised.

Such was slavery under the most advanced system of laws known to the ancient world. These laws reflected the wisdom of thirteen centuries, and towards the close of their develop-

1 Comp Milman, Latin Christianity, vol 1 p 358
2 One of the punishments was, if a free woman married a slave, she was to be put to death and the slave burnt alive. Comp the splendid though apologetic chapter of Milman on the subject, Latin Christianity, vol ii.
3 Comp Milman, Latin Christianity, vol ii p. 309, and also Du Cange, Concubina
ment had engrafted upon themselves some faint offshoots of the teachings of one of the greatest moral preceptors of the world.

With the establishment of the Western and Northern barbarians on the ruins of the Roman empire, besides personal slavery, territorial servitude scarcely known to the Romans, became general in all the newly settled countries. The various rights possessed by the lords over their vassals and serfs exhibited a revolting picture of moral depravity and degradation.¹ The barbaric codes, like the Roman, regarded slavery as an ordinary condition of mankind; and if any protection was afforded to the slave, it was chiefly as the property of his master, who alone, besides the State, had the power of life and death over him.

Christianity had failed utterly in abolishing slavery or alleviating its evils. The Church itself held slaves, and recognised in explicit terms the lawfulness of this baneful institution. Under its influence the greatest civilisers of Europe had upheld slavery, and have insisted upon its usefulness as preventing the increase of pauperism and theft.² And it was under the same influences that the highly cultured Christians of the Southern States of North America practised the cruelest inhumanities upon the unfortunate beings whom they held as slaves, —many of their own kith, —and shed torrents of blood for the maintenance of the curse of slavery in their midst. The least trace of the blood of an inferior race, however imperceptible, subjected the unfortunate being to all the penalties of slavery. The white Christian could never legitimise the issue of his illicit connection with his negro slave-women. With her he could never contract a legal union. The mother of his illegitimate children and her descendants, however remote,

¹ Comp. De Choiseul, and also consult on this subject the comprehensive chapter of Stephen's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, bk ii pt i chap n. One of the miserable and disgusting privileges possessed by the lord was designated in Britain the custom of *cottage*, which was afterwards commuted into a fine. This custom, as has been correctly supposed, gave rise to the law of inheritance, prevalent in some English counties, and known by the name of Borough English.

could be sold by his legitimate white issue at any time. Christianity failed to grasp the spirit of its Master’s teachings in regard to the equality of man in the sight of God.

İslâm recognises no distinction of race or colour; black or white, citizens or soldiers, rulers or subjects, they are perfectly equal, not in theory only, but in practice. In the field or in the guest-chamber, in the tent or in the palace, in the mosque or in the market, they mix without reserve and without contempt. The first Muezzin of Ĵâlân, a devoted adherent and an esteemed disciple, was a negro slave. To the white Christian, his black fellow-religionist may be his equal in the kingdom of heaven, but certainly not in the kingdom of this world; in the reign of Christ, perhaps, but not in the reign of Christianity. The law may compel him, a larger humanity with torrents of blood may force him to give his black brother civic rights, but the pride of race and colour acknowledges no equality, and even in the house of God a strict separation is observed.

The İslâmic teachings dealt a blow at the institution of slavery which, had it not been for the deep root it had taken among the surrounding nations and the natural obliquity of the human mind, would have been completely extinguished as soon as the generation which then practised it had passed away.

It has been justly contended that, as the promulgation of the laws, precepts, and teachings of İslâm extended over twenty years, it is naturally to be expected many of the pre-Islâmic institutions, which were eventually abolished, were, at first, either tacitly permitted or expressly recognised.¹ In one of these categories stood the usage of slavery. The evil was intertwined with the immost relations of the people among whom Mohammed flourished. Its extinction was only to be achieved by the continued agency of wise and humane laws, and not by the sudden and entire emancipation of the existing slaves, which was morally and economically impossible. Numberless provisions, negative as well as positive, were accordingly introduced in order to promote and accomplish a gradual enfranchisement. A contrary policy would have produced an utter collapse of the infant commonwealth.

The Prophet exhorted his followers repeatedly in the name

¹ Tahzíb al-Akhkák (15th Rajab, 1288), p 118.
of God to enfranchise slaves, "than which there was not an act more acceptable to God." He ruled that for certain sins of omission the penalty should be the manumission of slaves. He ordered that slaves should be allowed to purchase their liberty by the wages of their service; and that in case the unfortunate beings had no present means of gain, and wanted to earn in some other employment enough for that purpose, they should be allowed to leave their masters on an agreement to that effect. He also provided that sums should be advanced to the slaves from the public treasury to purchase their liberty. In certain contingencies, it was provided that the slave should become enfranchised without the interference and even against the will of his master. The contract or agreement in which the least doubt was discovered, was construed most favourably in the interests of the slave, and the slightest promise on the part of the master was made obligatory for the purposes of enfranchisement. He placed the duty of kindness towards the slave on the same footing with the claims of "kindred and neighbours, and fellow-travellers, and wayfarers", encouraged manumission to the freest extent, and therewith the gift of "a portion of that wealth which God hath given you"; and prohibited sensual uses of a master's power over the slave, with the promise of divine mercy to the wronged. To free a slave is the expiation for ignorantly slaying a believer, and for certain forms of untruth. The whole tenor of Mohammed's teaching made "permanent chattelhood" or caste impossible, and it is simply "an abuse of words" to apply the word slavery, in the English sense, to any status known to the legislation of Islam.

The Lawgiver ordained, that a fugitive fleeing to the territories of Islam should at once become enfranchised; that the child of a slave woman should follow the condition of the father, while the mother should become free at his death; that the slave should be able to contract with his master for his emancipation; and that a part of the poor-tax should be devoted to the ransom of those held in bondage. The masters were forbidden to exact more work than was just and proper. They were ordered never to address their male or female slaves by that degrading appellation, but by the more affectionate

1 Koran xxiv. 33, etc
name of "my young man," or "my young maid"; it was enjoined that all slaves should be dressed, clothed, and fed exactly as their masters and mistresses. Above all, it was ordered that in no case should the mother be separated from her child, nor brother from brother, nor father from son, nor husband from wife, nor one relative from another.¹

In the moral rules laid down for the treatment of those then in bondage, the Arabian Teacher did not prescribe the reciprocal duties of master and slave in the one-sided manner so often visible in other creeds.² With a deeper and truer knowledge of human nature, he saw that it was not so needful to lay down the duties the weak owe to the strong, as those the strong owe to the weak. In Islam no discredit is attached to the status of slavery. It is an accident, and not, as in the civil law and patristic Christianity, "a constitution of nature." Zaid, the freedman of the Prophet, was often entrusted with the command of troops, and the noblest captains served under him without demur; and his son ‘Osâma was honoured with the leadership of the expedition sent by Abû Bakr against the Greeks. Kutb ud-din, the first king of Delhi, and the true founder, therefore, of the Muslim empire in India, was a slave. The slavery which was allowed in Islam had, in fact, nothing in common with that which was in vogue in Christendom until recent times, or with American slavery until the holy war of 1865 put an end to that curse.

In Islam the slave of to-day is the grand vizier of to-morrow. He may marry, without discredit, his master’s daughter, and become the head of the family. Slaves have ruled kingdoms and founded dynasties. The father of Mahmûd of Ghazni was a slave. Can Christianity point to such records as these? Can Christianity show, in the pages of history, as clear, as humane an account of her treatment of slaves as this?

From all that we have said it is abundantly clear that the Legislature himself looked upon the custom as temporary in its

¹ I see no need of quoting authorities on these points, as they are admitted facts. But I may refer the curious reader to the traditions collected in the Mishkat, the Sahih of Bukhârî, and the Bihâr ul-Anwâr. The latter contains the noblest monument of generosity and charity practised by the Prophet's immediate descendants.
² See Col. iii. 22, 1 Tim. vi. 1.
nature, and held that its extinction was sure to be achieved by the progress of ideas and change of circumstances. The Koran always speaks of slaves as "those whom your right hands have acquired," indicating thus the only means of acquisition of bondsmen or bondswomen. It recognised, in fact, only one kind of slavery—the servitude of men made captives in bona fide lawful warfare, Jihād-i-Sharā‘ī. Among all barbarous nations the captives are spared from a motive of selfishness alone,¹ in order to add to the wealth of the individual captor, or of the collective nation, by their sale-money or by their labour.² Like other nations of antiquity, the Arab of the pre-Islāmic period spared the lives of his captives for the sake of profiting by them. Mohammed found this custom existing among his people. Instead of theorising, or dealing in vague platitudes, he laid down strict rules for their guidance, enjoining that those only may be held in bond who were taken in bona fide legal war until they were ransomed, or the captive bought his or her own liberty by the wages of service. But even when these means failed, an appeal to the pious feelings of the Moslem, combined with the onerous responsibilities attached to the possession of a slave, was often enough to secure the eventual enfranchisement of the latter. Slave-lifting and slave-dealing, patronised by dominant Christianity,³ and sanctified by Judaism, were utterly reproved and condemned. The man who dealt in slaves was declared the outcast of humanity. Enfranchisement⁴ of slaves was pronounced to be a noble act of virtue. It was forbidden in absolute terms to reduce Moslems to slavery. To the lasting disgrace of a large number of professed Moslems it must

¹ Comp Milman, Latin Christ, vol ii p 387. The ancient jurists based the right of enslaving the captive on the prior right of killing him. In this they are followed by Alberacus Gentilis (De Jure Gentilis cap de Servitude), Grotius, and Pufendorf. Montesquieu, indeed, was the first to deny this mythical right of killing a captive, unless in case of absolute necessity, or for self-preservation. And thus the author of the Spirit of Laws denied, because of his freedom from the thraldom of the Church.

² Comp Milman, Hist of the Jews, vol iii p 48

³ After the massacre of Drogheda by Cromwell, and the suppression of the insurrection in Ireland, the English Protestants sold the Irish, men and women, wholesale to the colonists in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and other places. The same was done after Monmouth’s rebellion.

⁴ According to an authentic and well-known tradition from Imām Ja‘far as-Sādik (Bihār ul-Anwār)
be said, however, that, whilst observing, or trying to observe the letter, they have utterly ignored the spirit of the Teacher’s precepts, and allowed slavery to flourish (in direct contravention of the injunctions of the Prophet) by purchase and other means. The possession of a slave, by the Koranic laws, was conditional on a bonâ fide struggle, in self-defence, against unbelieving and idolatrous aggressors, and its permission was a guarantee for the safety and preservation of the captives. The cessation of the state of war in which the Moslem community was at first involved, from the ammosity of the surrounding tribes and nations, would have brought about the extinction of slavery by a natural process—the stoppage of future acquisition and the enfranchisement of those in bondage. However, whether from contact with the demoralised nations of the East and the West, and the wild races of the North, or from the fact that the baneful institution was deeply rooted among all classes of society, many Moslems, like the Christians and the Jews, recognised slavery, and to some extent do so even now. But the wild Turkoman, or the African Arab, who glories in slave-lifting, is no more a representative of Islâm than is the barbarous Guacho, who revels on the savage prairies of South America, of Christianity.1 Like polygamy, the institution of slavery, prevalent universally among mankind at some stage or other of their growth, has, at least among the nations which claim to be civilised, outlived the necessities which induced its practice, and must sooner or later become extinct. It will be seen, therefore, that Islâm, did not “consecrate” slavery, as has been maliciously affirmed, but provided in every

1 In order not to break the letter of his Prophet’s Commandments, the Turkoman (himself a violent Sunni) forced his captive (whether a Sunni or a Shia) to acknowledge himself a heretic. And the African Arab calls his murderous razzias, on the pagan negroes, jihads. Mr Joseph Thompson, the well known African traveller, in a letter to the London Times of the 14th of November, 1887, thus writes on the subject of slavery in East Africa: "I unhesitatingly affirm, and I speak from a wider experience of Eastern Central Africa than any of your correspondents possess, that if the slave trade thrives it is because Islâm has not been introduced in these regions, and for the strongest of all reasons, that the spread of Mahommedanism would have meant the concomitant suppression of the slave trade." His account of "the peaceful and unassuming agencies" by which Islâm has been spread in Western Africa and Central Soudan deserves the attention of every reader. "Here," he says, "we have Islâm as a living, active force, full of the fire and energy of its early days, proselytizing too with much of the marvellous success which characterized its early days."
way for its abolition and extinction by circumscribing the means of possession within the narrowest limits. Islam did not deal capriciously with this important question. Whilst proclaiming in the most emphatic terms the natural equality of human beings, it did not, regardless of consequences, enfranchise the men and women already in bondage, which would have only been productive of evil in a world not then ripe for that consummation of human liberty, moral and intellectual.

The mutilation of the human body was also explicitly forbidden by Mohammed, and the institution which flourished both in the Persian and the Byzantine empires was denounced in severe terms. Slavery by purchase was unknown during the reigns of the first four Caliphs. There is at least no authentic record of any slave having been acquired by purchase during their tenure of the office. But with the accession of the usurping house of Ommeyya a change came over the spirit of Islam. Muawiyah was the first Muslim sovereign who introduced into the Moslem world the practice of acquiring slaves by purchase. He was also the first to adopt the Byzantine custom of guarding his women by eunuchs. During the reigns of the early Abbassides, the Shiah Imám Ja'far as-Sādik preached against slavery.

The time is now arrived when humanity at large should raise its voice against the practice of servitude, in whatever shape or under whatever denomination it may be disguised. The Moslems especially, for the honour of their great Prophet, should try to efface that dark page from their history—a page which would never have been written but for their contravention of the spirit of his laws, however bright it may appear by the side of the ghastly scrolls on which the deeds of the professors of the rival creeds are recorded. The day is come when the voice which proclaimed liberty, equality, and universal brotherhood among all mankind should be heard with the fresh vigour acquired from the spiritual existence and spiritual pervasion of fourteen centuries. It remains for the Moslems to show the falseness of the aspersions cast on the memory of the great and noble Prophet, by proclaiming in explicit terms that slavery is repudiated by their faith and discountenanced by their code.
CHAPTER VII

THE POLITICAL SPIRIT OF ISLÂM

"The blood of the Zimmâ is like the blood of the Moslem."—Ali.

HITHERTO, we have considered the teachings of the Arabian Prophet solely from one point of view—as furnishing the rule of human conduct, and supplying the guide of man’s duty to his Creator and to his fellow-creatures. We now propose to examine the influence of Islâm on collective humanity—on nations, and not merely on the individual, in short, on the destiny of mankind in the aggregate.

Seven centuries had passed since the Master of Nazareth had come with his message of the Kingdom of Heaven to the poor and the lowly. A beautiful life was ended before the ministry had barely commenced. And now unutterable desolation brooded over the empires and kingdoms of the earth, and God’s children, sunk in misery, were anxiously waiting for the promised deliverance which was so long in coming.

In the West, as in the East, the condition of the masses was so miserable as to defy description. They possessed no civil rights or political privileges. These were the monopoly of the rich and the powerful, or of the sacerdotal classes. The law was not the same for the weak and the strong, the rich and the poor, the great and the lowly. In Sasamde Persia, the priests and the landed proprietors, the Dehkâns, enjoyed all power and influence, and the wealth of the country was centred in their hands. The peasantry and the poorer classes generally were ground to the earth under a lawless despotism. In the Byzantine Empire, the clergy and the great magnates, courtzans,
and other nameless ministrants to the vices of Caesar and proconsul, were the happy possessors of wealth, influence and power. The people grovelled in the most abject misery. In the barbaric kingdoms—in fact, wherever feudalism had established itself—by far the largest proportion of the population were either serfs or slaves.

Village or serfdom was the ordinary status of the peasantry. At first there was little distinction between prædial and domestic slavery. Both classes of slaves, with their families, and their goods and chattels, belonged to the lord of the soil, who could deal with them at his own free will and pleasure. In later times the serfs or villeins were either annexed to the manor, and were bought and sold with the land to which they belonged, or were annexed to the person of the lord, and were transferable from one owner to another. They could not leave their lord without his permission; and if they ran away, or were purloined from him, might be claimed and recovered by action, like beasts or other chattels. They held, indeed, small portions of land by way of sustaining themselves and their families, but it was at the mere will of the lord, who might dispossess them whenever he pleased. A villein could acquire no property, either in land or goods; but if he purchased either, the lord might enter upon them, oust the villein, and seize them to his own use.

An iron collar round the neck was the badge of both prædial servitude and domestic slavery. The slaves were driven from place to place in gangs, fed like swine, and housed worse than swine, with fettered feet and manacled hands, linked together in a single chain which led from collar to collar. The trader in human flesh rode with a heavy knotted lash in his hands, with which he 'encouraged' the weary and flagging. This whip when it struck, and that was frequently, cut the flesh out of the body. Men, women, and children were thus dragged about the country with rags on their body, their ankles ulcerated, their naked feet torn. If any of the wretches flagged and fell, they were laid on the ground and lashed until the skin was flayed and they were nearly dead. The horrors of the Middle Passage,

---

1 The Church retained its slaves longest. Sir Thomas Smith in his Commonwealth speaks bitterly of the hypocrisy of the clergy.
the sufferings of the poor negroes in the Southern States of North America before the War of Emancipation, the cruelties practised by the Soudanese slave-lifters, give us some conception of the terrible sufferings of the slaves under Christian domination at the time when Islâm was first promulgated, and until the close of the fifteenth century. And even after the lapse of almost two thousand years of Christ’s reign, we still find Christians lashing to death helpless women, imprisoned for real or imaginary political offences by one of the most powerful empires of the civilised world.

The condition of the so-called freemen was nowise better than that of the ordinary serfs. If they wanted to part with their lands, they must pay a fine to the lord of the manor. If they wanted to buy any, they must likewise pay a fine. They could not take by succession any property until they had paid a heavy duty. They could not grind their corn or make their bread without paying a share to the lord. They could not harvest their crops before the Church had first appropriated its tenth, the king his twentieth, the courtiers their smaller shares. They could not leave their homes without the leave of the lord, and they were bound, at all times, to render him gratuitous services. If the lord’s son or daughter married, they must cheerfully pay their contributions. But when the freeman’s daughter married, she must first submit to an infamous outrage—and not even the bishop, the servant of Christ, when he happened to be the lord of the manor, would waive the atrocious privilege of barbarism. Death even had no solace for these poor victims of barbarism. Living, they were subject to the inhumanities of man; dead, they were doomed to eternal perdition; for a felo-de-se was the unholiest of criminals, there was no room for his poor body in consecrated ground; he could only be smuggled away in the dead of night and buried in some unhallowed spot with a stake through his body as a warning to others.

1 In the Parliamentary War both sides sold their opponents as slaves to the colonists. After the suppression of the Duke of Monmouth’s rebellion all his followers were sold into slavery. The treatment of the slaves in the colonies at the hands of “the Pilgrim Fathers” and their descendants will not bear description.

2 This was written before the fall of the Romanoffs.
Such was the terrible misery which hung over the people! But the baron in his hall, the bishop in his palace, the priest in his cloister, little recked they of the sufferings of the masses. The clouds of night had gathered over the fairest portion of Europe and Africa. Everywhere the will of the strongest was the measure of law and right. The Church afforded no help to the downtrodden and oppressed. Its teachings were opposed to the enfranchisement of the human race from the rule of brute force. "The early Fathers" had condemned resistance to the constituted authorities as a deadly sin. No tyranny, no oppression, no outrages upon humanity were held to justify subjects in forcibly protecting themselves against the injustice of their rulers. The servants of Jesus had made common cause with those whom he had denounced,—the rich and powerful tyrant. They had associated themselves with feudalism, and enjoyed all its privileges as lords of the soil, barons and princes.

The non-Christians—Jews, heretics, or pagans—enjoyed, under Christian domination, a fitful existence. It was a matter of chance whether they would be massacred or reduced to slavery. Rights they had none, enough if they were suffered to exist. If a Christian contracted an illicit union with a non-Christian,—a lawful union was out of the question,—he was burnt to death. The Jews might not eat or drink or sit at the same table with the Christians, nor dress like them. Their children were liable to be torn from their arms, their goods plundered, at the will of the baron or bishop, or a frenzied populace. And this state of things lasted until the close of the seventeenth century.

Not until the Rechise of Hira sounded the note of freedom,—not until he proclaimed the practical equality of mankind, not until he abolished every privilege of caste, and emancipated labour,—did the chains which had held in bond the nations of the earth fall to pieces. He came with the same message which had been brought by his precursors and he fulfilled it.

The essence of the political character of Islam is to be found in the charter, which was granted to the Jews by the Prophet after his arrival in Medina, and the notable message sent to the Christians of Najran and the neighbouring territories after
Islâm had fully established itself in the Peninsula. This latter document has, for the most part, furnished the guiding principle to all Moslem rulers in their mode of dealing with their non-Moslem subjects, and if they have departed from it in any instance the cause is to be found in the character of the particular sovereign. If we separate the political necessity which has often spoken and acted in the name of religion, no faith is more tolerant than Islâm to the followers of other creeds.¹ "Reasons of State" have led a sovereign here and there to display a certain degree of intolerance, or to insist upon a certain uniformity of faith; but the system itself has ever maintained the most complete tolerance. Christians and Jews, as a rule, have never been molested in the exercise of their religion, or constrained to change their faith. If they are required to pay a special tax, it is in lieu of military service, and it is but right that those who enjoy the protection of the State should contribute in some shape to the public burdens. Towards the idolaters there was greater strictness in theory, but in practice the law was equally liberal. If at any time they were treated with harshness, the cause is to be found in the passions of the ruler or the population. The religious element was used only as a pretext.

In support of the time-worn thesis that the non-Moslem subjects² of Islâmic States labour under severe disabilities reference is made not only to the narrow views of the late canonists and lawyers of Islâm, but also to certain verses of the Koran, in order to show that the Prophet did not view non-Moslems with favour, and did not encourage friendly relations between them and his followers.³ In dealing with this subject, we must not forget the stress and strain of the life-and-death struggle in which Islâm was involved when those verses were promulgated, and the treacherous means that were often employed by the heathens, as well as the Jews and the Christians, to corrupt and seduce the Moslems from the new Faith. At such a time, it was incumbent upon the Teacher

¹ Comp. Gobineau, Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale.
² In the Islâmic system the non-Moslem subjects of Moslem States are called Akl-ul-zinmah or Zimmis, i.e. "people living under guarantees."
³ See Sell's Essays on Islâm.
to warn his followers against the wiles and insidious designs of hostile creeds. And no student of comparative history can blame him for trying to safeguard his little commonwealth against the treachery of enemies and aliens. But when we come to look at his general treatment of non-Muslim subjects, we find it marked by a large-hearted tolerance and sympathy.

Has any conquering race or Faith given to its subject nationalities a better guarantee than is to be found in the following words of the Prophet: "To [the Christians of] Najrān and the neighbouring territories, the security of God and the pledge of His Prophet are extended for their lives, their religion, and their property—to the present as well as the absent and others besides, there shall be no interference with [the practice of] their faith or their observances, nor any change in their rights or privileges; no bishop shall be removed from his bishopric, nor any monk from his monastery, nor any priest from his priesthood, and they shall continue to enjoy every thing great and small as heretofore; no image or cross shall be destroyed, they shall not oppress or be oppressed, they shall not practise the rights of blood-vengeance as in the Days of Ignorance; no tithes shall be levied from them nor shall they be required to furnish provisions for the troops." 1

After the subjugation of Hira, and as soon as the people had taken the oath of allegiance, Khālid bin-Walid issued a proclamation by which he guaranteed the lives, liberty and property of the Christians, and declared that "they shall not be prevented from beating their nāḥīyā' 2 and taking out their crosses on occasions of festivals." "And this declaration," says Imām Abū-Yusuf, "was approved of and sanctioned by the Caliph 4 and his council." 5

---


2 A piece of wood used in Eastern Christian churches in place of a bell.

3 The Chief Kāzi of Hārūn ar-Rashīd.

4 Abū Bakr.

5 Consisting of Omar, Osmān and Ab and the other leading Companions of the Prophet, see the *Kitāb-ul-Khadr*, p. 84.
The non-Moslem subjects were not precluded from building new churches or temples. Only in places exclusively inhabited by Moslems a rule of this kind existed in theory. "No new Church or temple," said Abdullah bin Abbās, "can be erected in a town solely inhabited by Moslems; but in other places where there are already Zimmis inhabiting from before, we must abide by our contract with them." In practice, however, the prohibition was totally disregarded. In the reign of Mâmûn, we hear of eleven thousand Christian churches, besides hundreds of synagogues and fire-temples within the empire. This enlightened monarch, who has been represented as "a bitter enemy" of the Christians, included in his Council the representatives of all the communities under his sway,—Moslems, Jews, Christians, Sabæans and Zoroastrians; whilst the rights and privileges of the Christian hierarchy were carefully regulated and guaranteed.

It is a notable fact, with few parallels even in modern history, that after the conquest of Egypt the Caliph Omar scrupulously preserved intact the property dedicated to the Christian churches and continued the allowances made by the former government for the support of the priests.

The best testimony to the toleration of the early Moslem government is furnished by the Christians themselves. In the reign of Osmân (the third Caliph), the Christian Patriarch of Merv addressed the Bishop of Fars, named Simeon, in the following terms: "The Arabs who have been given by God the kingdom (of the earth) do not attack the Christian faith; on the contrary they help us in our religion, they respect our God and our Saints, and bestow gifts on our churches and monasteries."

In order to avoid the least semblance of high-handedness, no Moslem was allowed to acquire the land of a zimmī even by purchase. "Neither the Imām nor the Sultan could dispossess a zimmī of his property."

The Moslems and the zimmīs were absolutely equal in the eye of the law. "Their blood," said Ali the Caliph, "was like our blood." Many modern governments, not excepting

---

1 A cousin of the Prophet and a jurist of recognised authority.
2 Kitāb al Kharāj, p 88.
3 Maktûz, pp 492, 499
some of the most civilised, may take the Moslem administration for their model. In the punishment of crimes there was no difference between the rulers and the ruled. Islam's law is that if a zimmī is killed by a Moslem, the latter is liable to the same penalty as in the reverse case.¹

In their anxiety for the welfare of the non-Moslem subjects, the Caliphs of Bagdad, like their rivals of Cordova, created a special department charged with the protection of the zimmīs and the safeguarding of their interests. The head of this department was called, in Bagdad, Kālib-ul-Jihbāzh; in Spain, Kālib-ul-Zimām.²

Mutawakkil, who raised to the ground the mausoleum of the martyr Husain and forbade pilgrimages to the consecrated spot, excluded non-Moslems, as he excluded the Moslem Rationalists, from the employment of the State and subjected them to many disabilities. In the later works of law, written whilst the great struggle was proceeding between Islam and Christendom, on one side for life, on the other for brute mastery, there occur no doubt passages which give colour to the allegation that in Islam zimmīs are subject to humiliation. But no warrant for this statement will be found in the rules inculcated by the Teacher, or his immediate disciples or successors. It must be added, however, that the bigoted views of the later canonists were never carried into practice; and the toleration and generosity with which the non-Moslems were treated are evidenced by the fact that zimmīs could be nominated as executors to the wills of Moslems, that they often filled the office of rectors of Moslem universities and educational institutions, and of curators of Moslem endowments so long as they did not perform any religious functions. And when a non Moslem of worth and merit died, the Moslems attended his funeral in a body.

In the beginning military commands, for obvious reasons,

¹ Zaḥr in his Tuhkīm-ul-Ḥidayā mentions a case which occurred in the Caliphate of Omar. A Moslem of the name of Fālik bin Wālī killed a Christian named Hārīṭ. The Caliph ordered that “the killer should be surrendered to the heirs of the killed.” The culprit was made over to Honor, Hārīṭ’s heir, who put him to death, p. 338, Delhi edition. A similar case is reported in the reign of Omar bin Abdul Azīz.

² With a Zāl, see The Short History of the Saracens, p. 573.
were not entrusted to non-Moslems, but all other posts of
collocation and trust were open to them equally with Moslems.

This equality was not merely theoretical, for from the first
century of the Hegira we find important offices of state held
by Christians, Jews and Magians. The Abbasides, with rare
exceptions, recognised no distinction among their subjects on
the score of religion. And the dynasties that succeeded them
in power scrupulously followed their example.

If the treatment of non-Moslems in Islamic countries is
compared with that of non-Christians under European Govern-
ments, it would be found that the balance of humanity and
generosity, generally speaking, inclines in favour of Islam.
Under the Mogul Emperors of Delhi, Hindus commanded
armies, administered provinces and sat in the councils of the
sovereign. Even at the present time can it be said that in no
European empire, ruling over mixed nationalities and faiths
is any distinction made of creed, colour or race?

That which Islam had almost exclusively in view was to
inculcate among mankind the principle of divine unity and
human equality preached by the Prophet. So long as the
central doctrine of the unity of God and the message of the
Prophet is recognised and accepted, Islam allows the widest
latitude to the human conscience. Consequently, wherever the
Moslem missionary-soldier made his appearance, he was hailed
by the down-trodden masses and the persecuted heretics as
the harbinger of freedom and emancipation from a galling
bondage. Islam brought to them practical equality in the
eye of the law, and fixity of taxation.

The battle of Kadesa, which threw Persia into the hands
of the Moslems, was the signal of deliverance to the bulk of
the Persians, as the battles of Yozanuk and Ajnâdâm were to the
Syrians, the Greeks, and the Egyptians. The Jews, whom the
Zoroastrians had massacred from time to time, the Christians,
whom they hunted from place to place, breathed freely under
the authority of the Prophet, the watchword of whose faith
was the brotherhood of man. The people everywhere received
the Moslems as their liberators. Wherever any resistance
was offered, it was by the priesthood and the aristocracy.
The masses and the working classes in general, who were
under the ban of Zoroastrianism, ranged themselves with the conquerors. A simple confession of an everlasting truth placed them on the same footing as their Moslem emancipators.

The feudal chiefs of the tribes and villages retained all their privileges, honours, and local influence,—"more than we believe," says Gobineau, "for the oppressions and persecutions of the Muslims have been greatly exaggerated."

The conquest of Africa and Spain was attended with the same result. The Arians, the Pelagians, and other heretics hitherto the victims of orthodox fury and hatred, the people at large, who had been terribly oppressed by a lawless soldiery and a still more lawless priesthood,—found peace and security under Islâm. By an irony of fate, which almost induces a belief in the Nemesis of the ancients, the Jews, whose animosity towards the Prophet very nearly wrought the destruction of the Islâmic commonwealth, found in the Moslems their best protectors. "Insulted, plundered, hated and despised by all Christian nations," they found that refuge in Islâm, that protection from inhumanity, which was ruthlessly denied to them in Christendom.

Islâm gave to the people a code which, however archaic in its simplicity, was capable of the greatest development in accordance with the progress of material civilisation. It conferred on the State a flexible constitution, based on a just appreciation of human rights and human duty. It limited taxation, it made men equal in the eye of the law, it consecrated the principles of self-government. It established a control over the sovereign power by rendering the executive authority subordinate to the law, a law based upon religious sanction and moral obligations. "The excellence and effectiveness of each of these principles," says Urquhart, "(each capable of immortalising its founder), gave value to the rest, and all combined, endowed the system which they formed with a force and energy exceeding those of any other political system. Within the lifetime of a man, though in the hands of a population, wild, ignorant, and insignificant, it spread over a greater extent than the dominions of Rome. While it retained its primitive character, it was irresistible." ¹

¹ Urquhart, Spirit of the East, vol 1, Introd. p xxviii
The short government of Abú Bakr was too fully occupied with the labour of pacifying the desert tribes to afford time for any systematic regulation of the provinces. But with the reign of Omar—a truly great man—commenced that sleepless care for the welfare of the subject nations which characterised the early Moslem governments.

An examination of the political condition of the Moslems under the early Caliphs brings into view a popular government administered by an elective chief with limited powers. The prerogatives of the head of the State were confined to administrative and executive matters, such as the regulation of the police, control of the army, transaction of foreign affairs, disbursement of the finances, etc. But he could never act in contravention of the recognised law.

The tribunals were not dependent on the government. Their decisions were supreme, and the early Caliphs could not assume the power of pardoning those whom the regular tribunals had condemned. The law was the same for the rich, for the man in power, as for the labourer in the field.

As time advances the stringency of the system is relaxed but the form is always maintained. Even the usurpers, who, without right, by treachery and murder seized the reins of government, and who in their persons represented the pagan oligarchy which had been displaced by the teachings of Islâm, observed more or less the outward semblance of law-abiding executive heads of a representative government. And the rulers of the later dynasties, when they overstepped the bounds, often unlimited, of arbitrary power, were restrained by the sentence of the general body of jurisconsults, which in all Moslem States serves as a constitutional check on the sovereign. In the early times, however, the "Companions" of the Master formed as it were an effective Council of State. The consideration attached to the title of "Companion of the Prophet" was as great in the camp as in the city. The powerful influence which they possessed increased with the conquests of the Moslems. The quality of askāb carried with it a character of sanctity and nobleness. When a person bearing this title was in an action, the crowd flocked to his side and
followed his lead. In the first degree were those who had accompanied the Prophet from Mecca—the Exiles, and the Ansâr who had received him with devotion, and who had battled in defence of the Faith at Badr and Ohod; those who were charged with any work by him and those who had talked with him, seen him, or heard him. In the last rank came those who had served under any of the sâhâbas, and thus came indirectly within the magic influence of the Master.

An incident which occurred during the Caliphate of Omar shows the absolute equality of all men in Islam. Jabala, king of the Ghassamides, having embraced the Faith, had proceeded to Medina to pay his homage to the Commander of the Faithful. He had entered the city with great pomp and ceremony, and been received with much consideration. Whilst performing the tawâf, or circumambulation of the Kaaba, a humble pilgrim engaged in the same sacred duties accidentally dropped a piece of his pilgrim’s dress over the royal shoulders. Jabala turned round furiously and struck him a blow which knocked out the poor man’s teeth. The rest of this episode must be told in the memorable words of Omar himself to Abû Obaidah, commanding the Moslem troops in Syria. “The poor man came to me,” writes the Caliph, “and prayed for redress; I sent for Jabala, and when he came before me I asked him why he had so ill-treated a brother-Moslem. He answered that the man had insulted him, and that were it not for the sanctity of the place he would have killed him on the spot. I answered that his words added to the gravity of his offence, and that unless he obtained the pardon of the injured man he would have to submit to the usual penalty of the law. Jabala replied, ‘I am a king, and the other is only a common man.’ ‘King or no king, both of you are Musalmans and both of you are equal in the eye of the law.’ He asked that the penalty might be delayed until the next day; and, on the consent of the injured, I accorded the delay. In the night Jabala escaped, and has now joined the Christian dog. But God will grant thee victory over him and the like of them.”

This letter was read by Abû Obaidah at the head of his

1 Such was the designation usually given to the Byzantine emperors by the early Moslems.
troops. These communications appear to have been frequent under the early Caliphate. No person in the camp or in the city was a stranger to public affairs. Every Friday after divine service, the Commander of the Faithful mentioned to the assembly the important nominations and events of the day. The prefects in their provinces followed the example. No one was excluded from these general assemblies of the public. It was the reign of democracy in its best form. The Pontiff of Islâm, the Commander of the Faithful, was not hedged round by any divinity. He was responsible for the administration of the State to his subjects. The stern devotion of the early Caliphs to the well-being of the people, and the austerely sempitaneity of their lives, were in strict accordance with the example of the Master. They preached and prayed in the mosque like the Prophet; received in their homes the poor and oppressed, and failed not to give a hearing to the meanest. Without cortège, without pomp or ceremony, they ruled the hearts of men by the force of their character. Omar travelled to Syria to receive the capitulation of Jerusalem, accompanied by a single slave. Abû Bakr on his death-bed left only a suit of clothes, a camel, and a slave to his heir. Every Friday, Ali distributed his own allowance from the public treasury among the distressed and suffering, and set an example to the people by his respect for the ordinary tribunals. Whilst the Republic lasted none of the Caliphs could alter, or act contrary to, the judgment of the constituted courts of justice.¹

Naturally, it is difficult for a new government, introduced by force of arms, to conciliate the affection of the people at once. But the early Saracens offered to the conquered nations motives for the greatest confidence and attachment. Headed by chiefs of the moderation and gentleness of Abû Obaidah, who tempered and held in check the ferocity of soldiers like Khalid, they maintained intact the civil rights of their subjects. They accorded to all the conquered nations the completest religious toleration. Their conduct might furnish to many of the civilised governments of modern times the noblest example of

¹ The first sentence of a court of justice which was not carried into execution was under Mūhammad, who pardoned a man found guilty by the judge upon the criminal reciting a poem in praise of the usurper.
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civil and religious liberty. They did not lash women to death. They did not condemn innocent females to Siberian mines and the outrages of their guards. They had the sagacity not to interfere with any beneficent civil institution, existing in the conquered countries, which did not militate with their religion.

The measures taken by Omar to secure the agricultural prosperity of the people evince an ever-present solicitude to promote their well-being and interests. Taxation on land was fixed upon an equitable and moderate basis; aqueducts and canals were ordered to be made in every part of the empire. The feudal burdens, which had afflicted the cultivators of the soil, were absolutely withdrawn, and the peasantry were emancipated from the bondage of centuries. The death of this remarkable man at the hands of an assassin was an undoubted loss to the government. His character, stern and yet just, his practical commonsense and knowledge of men, had eminently fitted him to repress and hold in check the ambitious designs of the children of Ommeyya. On his death-bed Omar entrusted to six electors the task of nominating a successor to the office. The Caliphate was offered to the son of Abū Taḥīb, but Ommeyyade intrigue had annexed to the proposal a condition which they knew Ali would not accept. He was required to govern, not only in accordance with the laws and precedents of the Prophet, but also with those established by his two predecessors. With characteristic independence Ali refused to allow his judgment to be so fettered. The Caliphate was then offered, as it was expected by the Ommeyyades, to their kinsman Osmān. The accession of this venerable chief to the vicegerency of the Prophet proved in the sequel an unqualified disaster to the commonwealth of Islām. He was a member of that family which had always borne a deep-rooted animosity towards the children of Ḥāshim. They had persecuted the Teacher with rancorous hatred, and had driven him from his home. They had struggled hard to crush the Faith in its infancy, and had battled against it to the last. Strongly united among themselves, and exercising great influence among all the tribes of Mozar,¹ of which they were

¹ With a Zād.
the prominent members, the Ommeyyades had watched with ill-concealed jealousy the old power and prestige slip away from their hands. After the fall of Mecca they had accepted the inevitable, but never forgave the house of Hāshim or Islâm for the ruin which the son of Abdullah had wrought to them. Whilst the Prophet lived, his commanding personality overawed all these traitors. Many of them had made a nominal profession of the Faith from self-interest and a greed to secure a part of the worldly goods which the success of the Moslems brought to the Islâmic commonwealth. But they never ceased to hate the democracy proclaimed by Mohammed. Libertines and profligates, unscrupulous and cruel, pagans at heart, they chafed at a religion of equal rights, a religion which exacted strict observance of moral duties and personal chastity. They set themselves, from the commencement, to undermine the government to which they had sworn allegiance, and to destroy the men upon whom the Republic depended. The first two successors of the Prophet had kept their ambition within bounds, and repressed their intrigues and treacherous designs. With the election of Osmān, they flocked to Medina like vultures scenting the prey. His accession was the signal for that outburst of hatred, that pent-up profligacy on the part of the Ommeyyades, which convulsed the Islâmic world to its innermost core, and destroyed its noblest and most precious lives.

Under Osmān there was a complete reversal of the policy and administration of his two predecessors, whose decisions he had engaged to follow. All the old governors and commanders taken from among the immediate disciples of the Prophet and his Companions were displaced. Merit and faithful service were wholly disregarded. All offices of trust and emolument were seized by the Ommeyyades. The governorships of the provinces were bestowed on men who had proved themselves most inimical to Islâm, and the treasury was emptied in their favour. We shall have to describe the subsequent events in some detail when dealing with the divisions in the Church of Mohammed; suffice it for us to say, that the corruptness of the administration, the total disregard of all precedent, the gross

1 They were, therefore, called the Muallafat ul-kulūb.
favouritism displayed by the old Caliph towards his kinsmen, and his refusal to listen to any complaint, gave rise to serious disaffection among the old companions of the Prophet and the general body of the Moslems, ending in revolt in which Osmán lost his life. On Osmán’s tragical death, Ali was elected to the vacant Caliphate by the consensus of the people. The rebellions which followed are matters of history. “Had Ali been allowed to reign in peace,” says Oelsner, “his virtues, his firmness, and his ascendancy of character would have perpetuated the old republic and its simple manners.”¹ The dagger of an assassin destroyed the hope of Islâm. “With him,” says Major Osborn, “perished the truest-hearted and best Moslem of whom Mohammedan history has preserved the remembrance.” Seven centuries before, this wonderful man would have been apotheosised; thirteen centuries later his genius and talents, his virtues and his valour, would have extorted the admiration of the civilised world. As a ruler, he came before his time. He was almost unfitted by his uncompromising love of truth, his gentleness, and his merciful nature, to cope with the Ommeyyades’ treachery and falsehood.

With the establishment of an autocracy under Muʿāwiyah the political spirit of Islâm underwent a great change. The sovereigns were no more the heads of a commonwealth, elected by the suffrage of the people, and governing solely for the welfare of their subjects and the glory of the Faith. From the time of Muʿāwiyah the reigning Caliph nominated his successor; and the oath of fealty taken by the people in his presence, or in that of his proxy, confirmed his nomination. This system combined the vices of democracy and despotism without the advantages of either. Under the Republic not only were the Caliphs assisted by a council of the Companions of the Prophet, but the provincial governors had similar advisory bodies. During the Ommeyyade rule the government was a pure autocracy tempered by the freedom of speech possessed by the desert Arabs and the learned or holy, which enabled them, often by a phrase or verse from the Koran or from the poets, to change the mood of the sovereign. Under the first five Caliphs of the Abbaside dynasty also the government

¹ Oelsner, Des Effets de la religion de Mohammed.
continued to be more or less autocratic, although the departmental ministers and prominent members of the family formed a body of unauthorised councillors. A regular Council composed of the leading representatives of communities owning allegiance to the Caliph was for the first time established in the reign of Mâmûn the Great. The Buyides, the Sâmânîdes, the Seljukides, and the Ayyûbides all had their councils in which the people were more or less represented.

But absolutism in the hands of the early Abbasides helped in the intellectual development and material prosperity of the Islâmic nations. In the vigour of their rule and the firmness with which they held the reins of government they may be compared with the Tudors of England. The political and administrative machinery of the Abbaside Caliphate, which was afterwards adopted by the succeeding dynasties, owes its origin to the genius of Mansûr, the founder of Bagdad. In its effective distribution of work and its control of details it ranks with the most perfectly organised systems of modern times.

At the very commencement of their rule, which lasted for several centuries, they established a Chamber of Finance and a Chancellery of State, the first being charged with the duty of receiving the taxes and disbursing the expenses of the empire, the second with the duty of impressing a character of authenticity on the mandates of the sovereigns. Later, for the better subdivision of work, other departments of state (called diwâns) were created, of which the following are the principal:—the Diwân-ul-Kharâj (Central Office of Taxes) or Department of Finance; the Diwân-ud-Dînâ (Office of the Crown Property); the Diwân-uz-zîmân (Audit or Accounts Office); the Diwân-ul-Jînd (War Office); the Diwân-ul-Mawâlh wa’l Ghîlmân (Office for the Protection of Chents and Slaves), where a register was kept of the freedmen and slaves of the Caliph, and arrangements made for their maintenance, the Diwân-ul Barât (the Post Office); Diwân-uz-Zîmân an-Nafakât (Household Expense Office); the Diwân-ar-Rasâ’il (Board of Correspondence or Chancery Office), the Diwân-ud-Toukia (Board of Requests), the Diwân un nazz fi’l Mazáhir (Board for the Inspection of Grievances); the Diwân-ul-Ahdâs w’ash-Shurtâ
(Militia and Police Office); and the Diwân-ul-ʻAlâ (Donation Office), analogous to the paymaster-general’s department, charged with the payment of the regular troops. The protection of the interests of non-Moslems was entrusted to a special office, the head of which was called the Kâthib-ul-jihbâzâh.

Each Government office was presided over by a director who was designated the Raîs, or Sadr, and the practical work of control and supervision was carried on by inspectors, called Mushrîfs, or Nâzîrs.¹

To this organisation the Abbaside Caliphs added the appointment of an officer with the designation of Hâjîb, who introduced the foreign ambassadors, and also formed a Court of Appeal from the decrees of the Kâzîs. They instituted the office of Vizier, or Prime Minister, whose duty it was to submit for the consideration of the sovereign the various matters requiring his decision. They gave regularity to the provincial administration, and fixed definitely the contributions due from the provinces. They constructed caravanserais, built cisterns and aqueducts along the road from Bagdad to Mecca, planted trees along the route, and everywhere founded wayside resting-places for the travellers and pilgrims. They made a route between Mecca and Medina, and laid relays of horses and camels between Hîjâz and Yemen to facilitate communication between these two provinces. They established couriers in every city for the despatch of the post. They formed a central office in the metropolis for the custody and preservation of the archives of the empire, and created an efficient police in every part of their dominions. They formed a syndicate of merchants, charged with the supervision of commercial transactions, the decision of disputes between mercantile men, and the duty of suppressing fraud. Not only did each centre of commerce possess its corporation of merchants but most cities of importance had their town councils. They created the office of Mukhtâsîb, or intendant of the market, who went round daily to examine the weights and measures of the tradespeople. They fostered self-government and protected and encouraged municipal institutions. Agriculture was promoted by advances

¹ For a full account of the political and administrative machinery of the Abbasides, see The Short History of the Saracens, pp 492-443.
to the peasantry, and periodical reports were required from the provincial officers respecting the prosperity of the people and the state of the country. Many of them, in the midst of their pomp and circumstance, tried to maintain a semblance of republican virtue. Books written by them, baskets woven by them, used to be sold in the market, and the proceeds were supposed to supply the personal expenses of the Caliphs. Their zeal to promote the well-being of their subjects may perhaps be taken into the great Account against their cruelties towards the Alids. Under Mâmûn and his two immediate successors the Abbaside empire attained the zenith of prosperity.

Spain furnishes one of the most instructive examples of the political character of Islâm and its adaptability to all forms and conditions of society. This country had suffered frightfully under the barbarian hordes which had swept over the land, destroying and levelling every institution they found existing. The kingdoms they had formed over the ruins of the Roman administration had effaced the germs of political development. Their subjects were weighted down with feudal burdens, and all the terrible consequences flowing therefrom. Vast areas were completely denuded of population. The introduction of the Islâmic Code enfranchised the people as well as the land from feudal bondage. The desert became fruitful, thriving cities sprang into existence on all sides, and order took the place of anarchy. Immediately on their arrival on the soil of Spain, the Saracens published an edict assuring to the subject races, without any difference of race or creed, the most ample liberty, Suevi, Goth, Vandal, Roman, and Jew were all placed on an equal footing with the Moslem. They guaranteed to both Christian and Jew the full exercise of their religions, the free use of their places of worship, and perfect security of person and property. They even allowed them to be governed, within prescribed limits, by their own laws, to fill all civil offices and serve in the army. Their women were invited to intermarry with the conquerors. Does not the conduct of the Arabs in Spain offer an astonishing contrast to that of many European nations, even in modern times, in their treatment of conquered nationalities? Whilst to compare the Arab
rule with that of the Normans in England, or of the Christians in Syria during the Crusades, would be an insult to common-sense and humanity. The fidelity of the Arabs in maintaining their promises, the equal-handed justice which they administered to all classes, without distinction of any kind, secured them the confidence of the people. And not only in these particulars, but also in generosity of mind and in amenity of manner, and in the hospitality of their customs, the Arabians were distinguished above all other people of those times. The Jews had, owing to the influence of the Christian priesthood, suffered bitterly under the barbarians, and they profited most by the change of government. Spanish ladies of the highest rank, among them the sister of Pelagius and the daughter of Roderick, contracted marriages with "the Infidels," as the orthodox Jean Mariana calls the Moslems. They enjoyed all the rights and privileges which their rank gave them with full liberty of conscience. The Moslems invited all the landed proprietors, whom the violence of Roderick had driven into the mountains, to abandon their retreats. Unhappily the depopulation was so great that this measure had no effect in supplying inhabitants to the soil. They, accordingly, held forth the most generous advantages to foreign cultivators who wished to establish themselves in the Peninsula. These offers brought large and industrious colonies from Africa and Asia. Fifty thousand Jews at one time, accompanied by their women and children, settled in Andalusia.

For seven centuries the Moslems held Spain, and the beneficence of their rule, in spite of intestine quarrels and dynastic disputes, is testified to and acknowledged even by their enemies. The high culture attained by the Spanish Arabs has been sometimes considered as due principally to frequent marriages between Moslems and Christians. This circumstance undoubtedly exercised a great influence on the development of the Spanish Moslems and the growth of that wonderful civilisation to which modern Europe owes so much of its advance in the arts of peace. What happened in Spain happened also in other places. Wherever the Moslems entered a change came

1 Conde's History of the Spanish Moors.
2 Renan, Averroes et Averroisme.
over the countries; order took the place of lawlessness, and peace and plenty smiled on the land. As war was not the privileged profession of one caste, so labour was not the mark of degradation to another. The pursuit of agriculture was as popular with all classes as the pursuit of arms.¹

The importance which Islam attaches to the duties of sovereigns towards their subjects, and the manner in which it promotes the freedom and equality of the people and protects them against the oppression of their rulers, is shown in a remarkable work ² on the reciprocal rights of sovereigns and subjects, by Safi-ud-din Mohammed bin Ali bin Tabbara Taba, commonly known as Ibn ut-Tiktaka.³ The book was composed in 701 A.H. (1301-2), and is dedicated to Fakhr ud-din 'Isa bin Ibrahim, Ameer of Mosul.

The first part deals with the duties of sovereigns to their subjects, and the rules for the administration of public affairs and political economy. The author describes the qualities essential for a sovereign, -- wisdom, justice, knowledge of the wants and wishes of his people, and the fear of God; and adds emphatically that this latter quality is the root of all good, and the key to all blessings, "for when the king is conscious of the presence of God, His servants will enjoy the blessings of peace and security."

sovereign must also possess the quality of mercy, and "this is the greatest of all good qualities." He must have an ever-present desire to benefit his subjects, and consult with them on their wants; for the Prophet consulted always with his Companions, and God hath said,⁴ "Consult with them ⁵ or every affair." In the administration of public affairs, it is the

¹ Oelsner.
² This work is generally known as the Kitab-i Tarikh-ud-Dawal Hist. c Dynasties; but its proper title is Kitab-ul Dakhri al-adab-ul-Sultaniyal wa' duwal ul Islamia, "the book of Fakhri, concerning the conduct of sovereigns and the Islamic dynasties." Debenbourg's Edition, see Appendix.
³ With a hard kaf
⁴ In the Koran
⁵ I.e. The people.
sovereign’s duty to superintend the public income, guard the lives and property of his subjects, maintain peace, check the evil-doer, prevent injuries. He must always keep his word, and then, adds the author significantly, “the duty of the subject is obedience, but no subject is bound to obey a tyrant.” Ibn Rushd (the great Averroes) says, “the tyrant is he who governs for himself, and not for his people.”

The laws of the Moslems, based on equitable principles, and remarkable for their simplicity and precision, did not demand an obedience either difficult to render or incompatible with the intelligence of mankind. The countries where the Moslems established themselves remained exempt from the disastrous consequences of the feudal system and the feudal code.¹ “Admitting no privilege, no caste, their legislation produced two grand results,—that of freeing the soil from factitious burdens imposed by barbarian laws, and of assuring to individuals perfect equality of rights.”²

¹ In Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and Lower Italy, the feudal system was introduced after the expulsion of the Arabs.
² Oelsner
CHAPTER VIII

THE POLITICAL DIVISIONS AND SCHISMS OF ISLĀM

To every philosophical student of the history of religion the heading of this chapter must cause surprise, if not pain: to every Islāmist devoted to the Founder of his Faith it must cause sorrow and shame. Alas! that the religion of humanity and universal brotherhood should not have escaped the curse of internecine strife and discord; that the Faith which was to bring peace and rest to the distracted world should itself be torn to pieces by angry passions and the lust of power. The evils, which we deplored in Christianity arose from the incompleteness of the system, and its incompatibility with human needs, in Islām, the evils that we shall have to describe arose from the greed of earthly advancement, and the revolutionary instincts of individuals and classes impatient of moral law and order.

Nothing evinces so clearly the extraordinary genius of the Arabian Teacher, his wonderful personality, and the impressiveness of his call to religious unity and universal citizenship, as the world-movement of which he was the cause, and which, in spite of internal dynastic wars, carried his people on a tidal wave of conquest from one end of the globe to the other. Arabia, hitherto the home of warring tribes and clans, each with its blood-feud of centuries, was suddenly animated with a common purpose. Until now the wars of the Arabs and their alliances, their virtues and their vices, their love of independence and
Their clannish feeling, had alike prevented community of action. Suddenly a nation of shepherds is turned into a nation of kings, a race of semi-nomades transformed into masters of "a world-faith and law." With unexampled energy and self-mastering devotion the congeries of wandering clans planted between three continents take up the banner of the Faith and bear it aloft to every quarter of the earth. "You have been elected to carry to all mankind the message of mercy, the announcement of divine unity," is the call addressed to them, and they respond to it with a determination which acknowledges no obstacle. The intensity of conviction, which alone could carry them through the barriers of hostile creeds and races, explains the mystery of the revolution!

Truth is eternal. Mohammed's message was not new. It had been delivered before, but had not reached the heart of man. His voice quickened the dead into life, revived the dying, and made the pulse of humanity beat with the accumulated force of ages. The exodus of the Saracens under this mighty impulse, its magnitude and its far-reaching effects, form the most marvellous phenomenon of modern times. They issued from their desert-fastnesses as the preceptors of humanity. Within thirty years—the term prophesied for the true Caliphate—they were knocking at the gate of every nation, from the Hindu Kush to the shores of the Atlantic, to deliver their message. In the short space of time which elapsed from the death of the Prophet to the subversion of the Republic, they built up an empire, which, in its vastness, exceeded that achieved by the Romans after thirteen centuries of continuous expansion. Turn over the pages of Ibn ul-Athir, Tabari, or Abulfedâ, you will find a continuous record of the wave rolling onward, fertilising every soil over which it passes, assimilating in its way all that is good.

The same causes, however, which, until the advent of the Prophet, had prevented the growth of the Arabs into a nation,—the same tribal jealousies, the same division of clan and clan, the marks of which are still visible throughout the Moslem world,—led eventually, not only to the ruin of the Republic, but also to the downfall of the Saracenic empire. "Had the followers of Mohammed marched on the lines of the Master
and adopted the character of the early Caliphs,” says d’Ohsson, “their empire would have been still more vast and more durable than that of the Romans.” But the greed of the Ommeyyade, the unruliness of the Arab, and his spirit of individualism, which showed itself even when arrayed against a common foe, caused the overthrow of the stupendous fabric which the heroism and devotion of the early Moslems had raised. Owing to this, they lost Tours, even whilst victory was within their grasp; they were driven out of Spam because they could not forget the old jealousies of the desert, and make common cause against the enemy.

But though the Republic fell, and the imperial sceptre passed from the hands of the Saracens, the Faith lived. It was the outcome of ages of evolution. It represented the latest phase in the religious development of man; it did not depend for its existence or its growth on the life of empires or men. And as it spread and fructified, each race and each age profited by its teachings according to their own spiritual necessities and intellectual comprehension.

The Church of Mohammed, like the Church of Christ, has been rent by intestine divisions and strifes. Difference of opinion on abstract subjects, about which there cannot be any certitude in a finite existence, has always given rise to greater bitterness and a fiercer hostility than ordinary differences on matters within the range of human cognition. The disputes respecting the nature of Christ deluged the earth with the blood of millions; the question of Free-will in man caused, if not the same amount of bloodshed, equal trouble in Islâm. The claim to infallibility on the part of the Pontiffs of Rome convulsed Christendom to its core; the infallibility of the people and of the Fathers became in Islâm the instrument for the destruction of precious lives.

Most of the divisions in the Church of Mohammed owe their origin primarily to political and dynastic causes,—to the old tribal quarrels, and the strong feeling of jealousy which animated the other Koraishites against the family of Hâshim. It is generally supposed that the Prophet had not expressly designated any one as his successor in the spiritual and temporal Government of Islâm, but this notion is founded on a
mistaken apprehension of facts, for there is abundant evidence that many a time the Prophet had indicated Ali for the vice-
gerency. Notably on the occasion of the return journey from the performance of "the Farewell Pilgrimage," during a halt at a place called Khumm, he had convoked an assembly of the people accompanying him, and used words which could leave little doubt as to his intention regarding a successor. "Ali," said he, "is to me what Aaron was to Moses — Almighty God! be a friend to his friends and a foe to his foes, help those who help him, and frustrate the hopes of those who betray him!"¹ On the other hand, the nomination of Abū Bakr to lead prayers during the Prophet's illness might point to a different choice. The question came up for discussion and settlement on his decease, when it became necessary to elect a leader for Islam. The Hāshimites maintained that the office had devolved by appointment as well as by succession upon Ali. The other Koreishites insisted upon proceeding by election. Whilst the kinsmen of Mohammed were engaged in his obsequies, Abū Bakr was elected to the Caliphate by the votes of the Koreish and some of the Medinite Ansār. The urgency of an immediate selection for the headship of the State might explain the haste. With his usual magnanimity and devotion to the Faith, scrupulously anxious to avoid the least discord among the disciples of the Master, Ali at once gave in his adhesion to Abū Bakr. Three times was he set aside, and on every occasion he accepted the choice of the electors without demur. He himself had never stood forth as a candidate for the suffrages of the electors, and whatever might have been the feeling of his partisans, he had never refrained from giving to the first two Caliphs his help and advice in the governance of the Commonwealth and they on their side had always deferred to his counsel and his exposition of the Master's teachings. We have already referred to the circumstances connected with the elevation of Osmān to the Caliphate. We will here trace

¹ Ibn Khalikān, vol. i. p. 383. "According to Al Hāfiz," says Ibn-Khalikān, "Khum is the name of a valley lying between Mecca and Medina, and in the neighbourhood of at Tulā. It contains a pond (ghadir) near which the Prophet pronounced his invocation." This took place on the 18th of Zul-Hijja, for Ibn Khalikān says, the 18th of that month "is the anniversary of the Feast of Ghadir (Id-ul-Ghadir), which is the same as that of Ghadir-i-Khum."
the events which followed upon his accession to elucidate the
history of the deplorable schism which has for so long divided
the Moslem world into two sects. Osmân possessed neither
the shrewdness of Abû Bakr nor the intellectual vigour or the
moral fibre of Omar. His amiability and easy good nature
made him a pliable tool in the hands of his kinsfolk. The
venerable Caliph surrounded by his hungry kinsmen, the
provinces crying for redress, and the general body of Moslems
sullenly watching the proceedings of the head of the State;
form an instructive though sad picture of the times. The
character of the deluded Pontiff has been graphically portrayed
by Dozy: "The personality of Osmân did not justify his
election to the Caliphate. It is true he was rich and generous,
had assisted Mohammed and the religion by pecuniary sacrifices,
and that he prayed and fasted often, and was a man of amiable
and soft manners. He was, however, not a man of spirit, and
was greatly enfeebled by old age. His timidity was such that
when placed on the pulpit he knew not how to commence his
sermon. Unhappily for this old man, he possessed an inordinate
fondness for his kinsmen, who formed the Meccan aristocracy,
and who, for twenty years, had insulted, persecuted, and fought
against Mohammed. Soon they dominated over him
completely. His uncle, Hishâm, and especially Hishâm's son,
Merwân, in reality governed the country, only allowing the
title of Caliph to Osmân, and the responsibility of the most
compromising measures, of which he was often wholly ignorant.
The orthodoxy of these two men, especially of the father, was
strongly suspected. Hishâm had been converted only when
Mecca was taken. Having betrayed state-secrets, he had been
disgraced and exiled. Abû Bakr and Omar had maintained
the order passed (by the Prophet). Osmân, on the contrary,
not only recalled him from his exile, but gave him on his arrival
a hundred thousand pieces of silver from the public treasury,
and a piece of land belonging to the State. He made Merwân
his secretary and vizier, and married him to one of his daughters,
and enriched him with the spoils of Africa." 1 . . . He con-
formed Mu'awiyah, the son of Abû Sûtân and Hind, who had
fought against Mohammed with such ferocity at Ohod, in the

1 Dory, Hist. des Musulmans dans l'Espagne, vol. 1, p 44.
governorship of Syria; and his foster-brother, Abdullah ibn Sa'd ibn Surrah, to the satrapy of Egypt. This Abdullah was at one time a secretary to the Prophet, and when the Master dictated his revelations, he used to change the words and "denaturalise" their meaning. His sacrilege being discovered, he had fled, and had relapsed into idolatry. Walid, an uterine brother of the old Caliph, was made governor of Kufa. His father had often ill-treated Mohammed, and once nearly strangled him. An abandoned debauchee, a profligate drunkard, his life was a scandal to the Moslems. He appeared in the mosque at the time of morning-prayers helpless from intoxication, falling prostrate on the ground as he attempted to perform the duties of an Imam, or leader of prayer; and when the by-standers hurried up to assist him to his feet, shocked them by demanding more wine, in a husky and stammering voice. These were the men whom the Caliph favoured. They fastened upon the provinces like famished leeches, heaping up wealth by means of futile extortion. Complaints poured into Medina from all parts of the empire. But the complaints were invariably dismissed with abuses and hard words. A deputation, consisting of twelve thousand men, headed by Mohammed, the son of the Caliph Abü Bakr, came to the capital to lay before Osmân the grievances of the people, and to seek redress. Sore pressed at their demands for justice, he had recourse to the intervention of the son-in-law of the Prophet whose advice he had hitherto persistently refused to heed. Ali persuaded the deputation to depart to their homes, by giving them a pledge that their complaints should be redressed. On their way back, and hardly at a day's journey from Medina, they intercepted a letter written by Osmân's secretary, which bore the Caliph's own seal, containing a mandate to the unscrupulous Murâwiyyah to massacre them in a body. Enraged at this treachery, they returned to Medina, entered the old Caliph's house, and killed him. His death furnished to the Ommeyyades what they were long thirsting for, a plea for a revolt against Islâm,—against its democracy, its equal rights, and its stern rules of morality. It furnished to the Meccans and their allies an excuse for organising a conspiracy against

Medinite dominance, which they hated so bitterly. Ali had tried hard to save Osmân, at first by wise counsels not to abandon himself absolutely into the hands of his unprincipled kinsmen, and at the last crisis by placing himself before the infuriated soldiery, and asking for consideration for the venerable though misguided pontiff. He had nearly sacrificed his own sons in his endeavours to protect Osmân. On Osmân’s death he was raised to the Caliphate by the unanimous voice of the people. Since the death of the Prophet, Ali, though he had never failed to attend the councils of State, had always maintained a dignified reserve and a noble independence of character. In his retirement he had chiefly devoted himself to study and the peaceful occupations of domestic life. Called to the helm of the State, he received the oath of fealty with his usual simplicity, declaring his readiness to resign the office to any one more worthy.

"Had," says Sédillot, "the principle of hereditary succession (in favour of Ali) been recognised at the outset, it would have prevented the rise of those disastrous pretensions which engulfed Islam in the blood of Moslems..." The husband of Fâṭima united in his person the right of succession as the lawful heir of the Prophet, as well as the right by election. It might have been thought that all would submit themselves before his glory; so pure and so grand. But it was not to be. Zubair and Talha, who had hoped that the choice of the people might fall on either of them for the Caliphate, baulked in their ambitious designs, and smarting under the refusal of the new Caliph to bestow on them the governorships of Basra and Kûfa, were the first to raise the standard of revolt. They were assisted by ‘Ayesha, the daughter of Abû Bakr, who had taken a decisive part in the former elections. This lady had always borne an inveterate dislike towards the son-in-law of Khadija, and now this feeling had grown into positive hatred. She was the life and soul of the insurrection, and herself accompanied the insurgent troops to the field, riding a camel. The Caliph, with his characteristic aversion to bloodshed, sent his cousin Abdullah bin Abbâs to adjure the insurgents by every obligation of the Faith to abandon the arbitrament of war. But to no avail. Zubair and Talha gave battle at a place called
Kharaiba, and were defeated and killed. 1 'Ayesha was taken prisoner. She was treated with courtesy and consideration, and escorted with every mark of respect to Medina. Hardly had this rebellion been suppressed, when Ali learnt of the insurrection of Mu'awiyah in Syria. The son of Abū Sufiān, like most of his kinsmen whom Osmān had appointed to the governorships of the provinces, had, with the gold lavished upon him by the late Pontiff and the wealth of Syria, collected round him a large band of mercenaries. Ali had been advised by several of his councillors to defer the dismissal of the corrupt governors appointed by the late Caliph until he himself was secure against all enemies. "The Bayard of Islām, the hero, without fear and without reproach," 2 refused to be guilty of any duplicity or compromise with injustice. The flat went forth removing from their offices all the men whom Osmān had placed in power, and who had so grossly betrayed the public trust. Mu'awiyah at once raised the standard of revolt. Defeated in several consecutive battles on the plains of Siffin, on the last day when his troops were flying like chaff before the irresistible charge of Mālek al-Ashtar, he betook himself of a ruse to save his men from impending destruction. He made some of his soldiers tie copies of the Koran to their spears, and advance towards the Moslems shouting, "Let the blood of the Faithful cease to flow; if the Syrian army be destroyed, who will defend the frontier against the Greeks? If the army of Irāk be destroyed, who will defend the frontier against the Turks and Persians? Let the Book of God decide between us." The Caliph, who knew well the character of the arch-rebel and his fellow-conspirator, Amr(u) the son of al-‘Ās, saw through the artifice, and tried to open the eyes of his people to the treachery, but a large body of his troops refused to fight further, and demanded that the dispute should be referred to arbitration. In answer to the Caliph’s assurances that the son of Abū Sufiān was only using the Koran as a device for delivering himself from the jaws of death, these refractory

1 The battle is called the "Battle of the Camel," from ‘Ayesha’s presence in a litter on a camel. The place where the fight actually took place and where these men were killed, is called ṭidī us-Saba‘, "Valley of the Lion."

2 These are the designations given to Ali by Major Osborn
spirits threatened open defection.¹ Mâlek al-Ashtar was recalled; the battle was stopped, and the fruits of a victory already won were irretrievably lost.² An arbitration was arranged. The bigots, who had compelled Ali to sheathe the sword at the moment of victory, forced upon him, against his own judgment and wishes, Abû Mûsa al-Ashtarī as the representative of the House of Mohammed. This man, who was also secretly hostile to Ali, was altogether unfitted by his vanity and religious conceit and a somewhat simple nature to cope with the astute and unscrupulous Amr the son of al-‘Ās, who acted as the representative of Mu‘āwiyah, and he soon fell into the trap laid for him by the latter. Amr led Abû Mûsa to believe that the removal of both Ali and Mu‘āwiyah (of the one from the Caliphate and of the other from the governorship of Syria), and the nomination of another person to the Headship of Islâm, was necessary to the well-being of the Moslems. The trick succeeded; Abû Mûsa ascended the pulpit and solemnly announced the deposition of Ali. After making this announcement he descended aglow with the sensation of having performed a virtuous deed. And then Amr smilingly ascended the pulpit vacated by Abû Mûsa the representative of Ali, and pronounced that he accepted the deposition of Ali, and appointed Mu‘āwiyah in his place. Poor Abû Mûsa was thunder-struck; but the treachery was too patent, and the Fâtimides refused to accept the decision as valid.³ This happened at Dûmat ul-Jandal. The treachery of the Ommeyyades exasperated the Fâtimides, and both parties separated vowing undying hatred towards each other. Ali was shortly after assassinated whilst engaged in prayer in a mosque at Kûfa.⁴ His assassination enabled the son of Abû Sufiân to consolidate his power both in Syria and Hijâz. On the death of Ali, Hasan, his

¹ Shahristâni, pt 1 p 85
² Ibid
³ Those very men who had forced upon the Caliph the arbitration afterwards repudiated it, and rose in rebellion against him for consenting to their demand for arbitration. They were the original Khâbârîyins (insurgents), who became afterwards an enormous source of evil to Islâm, see post
⁴ With the chivalrous generosity which distinguished him, the Caliph Ali, even in his war against his treacherous foe, always ordered his troops to await the enemy’s attack, to spare the fugitive, and respect the captive, and never to insult the women. With his dying breath he commanded his sons to see that the murderer was killed with one stroke of the sword, and that no unnecessary pain might be inflicted on him.
eidest son, was raised to the Caliphate. Fond of ease and quiet, he hastened to make peace with the enemy of his House, and retired into private life. But the Ommeyyade’s animosity pursued him even there, and before many months were over he was poisoned to death. The star of Hind’s son was now in the ascendant, and Abū Sufiān’s ambition to become the king of Mecca was fulfilled on a grander scale by Mu‘āwiyah. Thus was the son of the two most implacable foes of the Prophet, by the strangest freak of fortune recorded in history, seated on the throne of the Caliphs. Lest it be considered our estimate of Mu‘āwiyah’s character is actuated by prejudice, we give the words of a historian who cannot be accused of bias in favour of either side “Astute, unscrupulous, and pitiless,” says Osborn, “the first Khalif of the Ommayad shrank from no crime necessary to secure his position. Murder was his accustomed mode of removing a formidable opponent. The grandson of the Prophet he caused to be poisoned; Mālek-al-Ashtar, the heroic lieutenant of Ali, was destroyed in a like way. To secure the succession of his son Yazid, Mu‘āwiyah hesitated not to break the word he had pledged to Husam, the surviving son of Ali. And yet this cool, calculating, thoroughly atheistic Arab ruled over the regions of Islam, and the sceptre remained among his descendants for the space of nearly one hundred and twenty years. The explanation of this anomaly is to be found in two circumstances, to which I have more than once adverted. The one is, that the truly devout and earnest Muhammadan conceived that he manifested his religion most effectually by withdrawing himself from the affairs of the world. The other is the tribal spirit of the Arabs. Conquerors of Asia, of Northern Africa, of Spain, the Arabs never rose to the level of their position. Greatness had been thrust upon them, but in the midst of their grandeur they retained, in all their previous force and intensity, the passions, the rivalries, the petty jealousies of the desert. They merely fought again on a wider field ‘the battles of the Arabs before Islam.’”

With the rise of Mu‘āwiyah the oligarchical rule of the heathen times displaced the democratic rule of Islam. Paganism, with all its attendant depravity, revived, and vice and immorality followed everywhere in the wake of
Ommeyyade governors and the Syrian soldiery. Hijâz and Irâk groaned under the usurper's rule; but his hold on the throat of Islâm was too strong to be shaken off with impunity. The wealth which he pitilessly extracted from his subjects, he lavished on his mercenaries, who in return helped him to repress all murmurings. Before his death, he convened the chief officers of his army and made them take the oath of fealty to his son Yezid, whom he had designated as his successor to the throne. This was Yezid's title to the Caliphate! On Mu'âwiyah's death, the Domitian of the house of Ommeyya ascended the throne founded by his father on fraud and treachery. As cruel and treacherous as Mu'âwiyah, he did not, like his father, possess the capacity to clothe his cruelties in the guise of policy. His depraved nature knew no pity or justice. He killed and tortured for the pleasure he derived from human suffering. Addicted to the grossest of vices, his boon companions were the most abandoned of both sexes.- Such was the Caliph—the Commander of the Faithful! Husain, the second son of Ali, had inherited his father's chivalric nature and virtues. He had served with honour against the Christians in the siege of Constantinople. He united in his person the right of descent from Ali, with the holy character of grandson of the Apostle. In the terms of peace signed between Mu'âwiyah and Hasan, his right to the Caliphate had been expressly reserved. Husain had never demeaned to acknowledge the title of the tyrant of Damascus, whose vices he despised, and whose character he regarded with abhorrence; and when the Moslems of Kūfa besought his help to release them from the curse of the Ommeyyade's rule, he felt it his duty to respond to the Irâkians' appeal for deliverance. The assurances he received, that all Irâk was ready to spring to its feet to hurl the despot from his throne the moment he appeared on the scene, decided him to start for Kūfa with his family. He traversed the desert of Arabia unmolested, accompanied by his brother Abbâs, a few devoted followers, and a timorous retinue of women and children; but as he approached the confines of Irâk he was alarmed by the solitary and hostile face of the country, and suspecting treachery, the Ommeyyade's weapon, he encamped his small band at a place called
Kerbela near the western bank of the Euphrates. No event in history surpasses in pathos the scenes enacted on this spot. Husain's apprehensions of betrayal proved to be only too true. He was overtaken by an Ommeyyade army under the brutal and ferocious Obaidullah ibn-Ziyād. For days their tents were surrounded; and as the cowardly hounds dared not come within the reach of the sword of Ali's son they cut the victims off from the waters of the Tigris. The sufferings of the poor band of martyrs were terrible. In a conference with the chief of the enemy, Husain proposed the option of three honourable conditions: that he should be allowed to return to Medina, or be stationed in a frontier garrison against the Turks, or safely conducted to the presence of Yezid. But the commands of the Ommeyyade tyrant were stern and inexorable—that no mercy should be shown to Husain or his party, and that they must be brought as criminals before the "Caliph" to be dealt with according to the Ommeyyade sense of justice. As a last resource, Husain besought these monsters not to war upon the helpless women and children, but to kill him and be done with it. But they knew no pity. He pressed his friends to consult their safety by a timely flight; they unanimously refused to desert or survive their beloved master. One of the enemy's chiefs, struck with horror at the sacrilege of warring against the grandson of the Prophet, deserted with thirty followers "to claim the partnership of inevitable death." In every single combat and close fight the valour of the Fātimides was invincible. But the enemy's archers picked them off from a safe distance. One by one the defenders fell, until at last there remained but the grandson of the Prophet. Wounded and dying he dragged himself to the river-side for a last drink; they turned him off with arrows from there. And as he re-entered his tent he took his infant child in his arms; him they transfixed with a dart. The stricken father bowed his head to heaven. Able no more to stand up against his pitiless foes,
alone and weary, he seated himself at the door of his tent. One of the women handed him a cup of water to assuage his burning thirst; as he raised it to his lips he was pierced in the mouth with a dart, and his son and nephew were killed in his arms. He lifted his hands to heaven,—they were full of blood—and he uttered a funeral prayer for the living and the dead. Raising himself for one desperate charge, he threw himself among the Ommeyyades, who fell back on every side. But faint with loss of blood he soon sank to the ground, and then the murderous crew rushed upon the dying hero. They cut off his head, trampled on his body, and subjected it to every ignominy in the old spirit of Hind. They carried the martyr's head to the castle of Kufa, and the inhuman Obaidullah struck it on the mouth with a cane: "Alas!" exclaimed an aged Musulman, "on these lips have I seen the lips of the Apostle of God." "In a distant age and climate," says Gibbon, "the tragic scene of the death of Husain will awaken the sympathy of the coldest reader." It will now be easy to understand, if not to sympathise with, the frenzy of sorrow and indignation to which the adherents of Ali and his children gave vent on the recurrence of the anniversary of Husain's martyrdom.

Thus fell one of the noblest spirits of the age, and with him perished all the male members of his family, old and young,—with the solitary exception of a sickly child, whom Husain's sister, Zainab (Zenobia), saved from the general massacre. He, too, bore the name of Ali, and in after-life received the noble designation of Zain ul-Abidin, "the Ornament of the Pious." He was the son of Husain by the daughter of Yezdjard, the last Sasanide king of Persia, and in him was perpetuated the house of Mohammed. He represented also, in his mother's right, the claims of the Sassanians to the throne of Iran.

The tragical fate of Husain and his children sent a thrill of horror through Islam; and the revulsion of feeling which it caused proved eventually the salvation of the Faith. It arrested the current of depravity which flowed from the Ommeyyade court of Damascus. It made the bulk of Moslems think of what the Master had done, and of the injuries which the children of his enemies were inflicting on Islam. For a hundred years, however, the Ommeyyades ruled with the free
help of the sword and poison. They sacked Medina, and drove the children of the Helpers into exile in far-away lands. The city which had sheltered the Prophet from the persecution of the idolaters, and which he loved so dearly, the hallowed ground he had trod in life, and every inch of which was sanctified by his holy work and ministry, was foully desecrated; and the people who had stood by him in the hour of his need, and helped him to build up the arch of the Faith, were subjected to the most terrible and revolting atrocities, which find a parallel only in those committed by the soldiers of the Constable of France and the equally ferocious Lutherans of George Frundsberg at the sack of Rome. The men were massacred, the women outraged, the children reduced into slavery. The public mosque was turned into a stable, the shrines demolished for the sake of their ornaments. During the whole period of Ommeyyade domination the holy city remained a haunt of wild beasts. The paganism of Mecca was once more triumphant. And "its reaction," says Dozy, "against Islam was cruel, terrible, and revolting." The Meccans and the Ommeyyades thus repaid the clemency and forbearance shown to them in the hour of Islam's triumph. The Ommeyyades produced many notable men eminent for piety and virtue, chief amongst them Omar bin-'Abdul Aziz, the Marcus Aurelius of the Arabs, a virtuous sovereign, a good ruler, and a God-fearing Moslem, who modelled his life after his great namesake the second Caliph. For the rest they were unabashed pagans and revelled in the disregard of the rules and discipline of the religion they professed.

But for the Ommeyyades, the difference between the followers of the *Ahl-ul-Bait,* the upholders of Ali's right to the apostolical succession, and those who maintained the right of the people to elect their own *spiritual* as well as temporal chiefs, would never have grown into a schism, it would have ended in a compromise or coalition after the accession of Ali to the Caliphate. The violence and treachery of the children of Ommeyya rendered this impossible. They had waded to the throne.

---

1 Abdul Malik ibn-Merwan went so far as to issue an edict forbidding pilgrims to visit the sepulchre of the Prophet at Medina.

2 For the meaning of this word see note 2, page 313.
with the greatest affection and consideration by Muhammad. The Prophet's example was imitated by Abū Bakr, Omar, and Osmân. They dismounted if they met him walking; and not unfrequently would accompany him to his residence.¹ He died in A.H. 32,—according to some, two years later,—leaving four sons, Abdullah (Abu'l Abbās Abdullah ibn Abbās), Fazl, Obaid-ullah, and Kaithân. Abdullah, better known in history and tradition as Ibn Abbās, was born at Mecca in A.C. 619, three years before the Hegira. He was instructed in the Koran and jurisprudence by Ali himself. His reputation as a scholar and expounder of the Koran and of the decisions of the Caliphs stood so high that crowds flocked from all parts to hear his lectures. He gave public lessons one day in the week on the interpretation of the Koran; another day, on law; the third, on grammar; the fourth, on the history of the Arabs, and the fifth on poetry. He gave an impulse to the study and preservation of pre-Islamic Arab literature and history by frequently quoting verses from the ancient poets to explain and illustrate the difficult and obscure passages of the Koran. He was wont to say, "When you meet with a difficulty in the Koran, look for its solution in the poems of the Arabs, for these are the registers of the Arab nation."² The steady and unvarying devotion of Ibn Abbās and his brothers to Ali was proverbial. All four brothers were present at "the Battle of the Camel," and at Siffin, Ibn Abbās, who was no less an accomplished soldier than a scholar, commanded the cavalry of Ali. He acted frequently as the envoy of the Caliph, and it was he whom Ali desired to nominate as the representative of the House of Mohammed when forced by the refractory troops to refer the dispute between himself and Marāwiyyah to arbitration.³ Ibn Abbās died at Tāyef of a broken heart, after the murder of Husain, in A.H. 67, in the seventieth year of his age. His son, who was named Ali after the great Caliph, walked in the footsteps of his father in his zealous attachment to the children of Fātimah. He died in A.H. 117.

¹ Abbās may be called the John of Gaunt of Moslem history
² Once he was asked how he had acquired his extensive knowledge: his reply was, "By means of an inquiring tongue and an intelligent heart."
³ Shahristani, pt 1 p 80
and was succeeded in the headship of his family by his son Mohammed.

At this time, Persia, Irâk, and Hijaz, which had suffered most from the atrocities of the Bani-Ommeyyâ, were honey-combed by secret organisations for the overthrow of the hated family. The Bani-Abbâs were the most active in the movement to subvert the Ommeyyâde rule, at first, perhaps, from a sincere desire to restore to the Fâtimides their just rights, but afterwards in their own interests. Mohammed, the son of Ali ibn Abdullah, was the first to conceive the project of seizing the Caliphate for himself. He was a man of great ability and unbounded ambition. Whilst working ostensibly for the Fâtîmides, he contrived gradually to establish the pretensions of his own family. He started a new doctrine to justify the claims of his house to the Imâmâte: that on the murder of Husain at Kerbela, the spiritual headship of Islâm was not transmitted to his surviving son Ah (Zaun ul-Âbudîn), but to Mohammed ibn al-Hanahya, a son of the Caliph Ali by a different mother, whom he had married after the death of Fâtimah, belonging to the tribe of Hamîfa, that upon his death the office descended upon his son Hîshêm, who had assigned it formally to the Abbasîde Mohammed. This story received credence in some quarters; but for the bulk of the people, who clung to the descendants of the Prophet, the dâ'îs of the Abbasîdes affirmed that they were working for the Ahl-ul-bait. Hitherto, the Abbasîdes had professed great devotion to the House of Fâtima, and had ascribed to all their movements and plans the object of securing justice for the descendants of Mohammed. The representatives and adherents of the Ahl-ul-bait, little suspecting the treachery which lay behind their professions, extended to Mohammed bin Ah and to his party the favour and protection which was needed to impress upon his action the sanction of a recognised authority. The attachment of the Persians to the Fâtîmide cause was due to historical and national associations. The Fâtîmides represented in their persons, through the daughter of Yezdîjard, the right to the throne of Irân. From the first commencement of the Islamic preachings, Ali had extended the utmost consideration and

1 Missionaries or political agents.
friendship to the Persian converts. Salmân the Persian, one of the most notable disciples of the Prophet, was long the associate and friend of the Caliph. After the battle of Kâdesia, Ali used to devote his share of the prize-money to the redemption of the captives, and repeatedly by his counsel induced Omar to lighten the burden of the subjects. The devotion of the Persians to his descendants was intelligible. Mohammed bin Ali beguiled the Persians by preaching to them their approaching deliverance from the hated rule of their Arab oppressors. To the Yemenites settled in Khorâsân, Fars, and other provinces of Irân, who were equally attached to the Ahl-ul-bait, and whose animosity against their old enemies, the descendants of Mozar, was inflamed by many recent injuries, he proclaimed he was acting solely on behalf of the Imâms of the House of Mohammed. He succeeded in winning over to his side Abû Muslim, the ablest general of his time, and hitherto a devoted partisan of the children of Abû. Before his death, which took place in 125 AH, he named his sons Ibrâhîm, Abdullah Abû’l Abbâs (surnamed Saffâh), Abdullah Abû Ja’far (surnamed al-Mansûb) as his successors, one after the other.

The furious struggle which broke out about the middle of the eighth century between the Yemenites and Mozarites in Khorâsân served as a signal to apply the torch to the well-laid mine. Abû Muslim sent word to his partisans in every city and village of the Province to raise at once the standard of revolt. The cause proclaimed was “the rights of the Ahl-ul-bait” against the usurping Bani-Ommeyya. A short time previously, Yahya, a grandson of the Imâm Ah Zam-ul-‘Abidîn, had revolted and been killed, and his body was exposed, by the order of Merwân, upon a gibbet. Abû Muslim ordered the remains of the young chief to be taken down and buried with every mark of respect: and his followers clothed themselves in black in token of their sorrow, and their determination to avenge the death of Yahya. From that day black became the distinguishing symbol of the Abbaside cause. And when the order went forth summoning the people to arms against the usurpers, the crowd, clothed in black, which flocked to the trysting-places showed the widespread character and strength of the revolt. The gathering was to take place on the night
of the 25th of Ramazān A.H. 127, and the people were to be summoned by large bonfires lighted on the tops of the hills. Vast multitudes poured from every quarter into Merv, where Abū Muslim was dwelling at the time. Ibrāhīm, who had succeeded Mohammed bin Ali as the head of the Abbasides, was seized by Merwan and killed, but before his death he contrived to pass to his second brother, Abū'l Abbās, a document assigning him the authority in accordance with the testament of their father. Abū Muslim soon made himself master of the whole of Khorāsān, and marched his victorious troops towards Irāk. Nothing as yet was divulged as to the ultimate purpose of the movement. The Ahl-ul-bait was the watchword which rallied all classes of people round the black standard. Kūfa surrendered at once. Hasan ibn Kahtaba, the lieutenant of Abū Muslim, entered the city at the head of his troops, and was joined at once by Abū Salma Ja'far ibn Sulaimān al-Khallal, "who," says the author of the Rouzat-us-Safā, "was designated the vizer of the descendants of Mohammed." Apparently this man acted as the agent of the head of the family. He was received with the greatest consideration by the Abbaside general, "who kissed his hand, and seated him in the place of honour," and told him that it was Abū Muslim's orders that he should be obeyed in all things. Abū Salma's vanity was flattered, but as yet he was wholly unaware of the Abbaside design. A proclamation was issued in the joint names of Abū Salma and Hasan ibn Kahtaba, inviting the inhabitants of Kūfa to assemble the next day at the Masjid-al-Jāmi' (the public mosque). The people flocked to the mosque expecting some announcement, but the plot had not yet thickened, and Hasan and the other Abbaside partisans considered the moment inopportune for the proclamation of their design. In the meantime, Abū Abbās, with his brother Abū Ja'far, had successfully evaded the Ommeyyade guards, and had arrived at Kūfa, where they kept themselves concealed, waiting for the next event of the drama. Abū Salma, who was still faithful to the masters he purported to serve, sent a message secretly to the Imām (Ja'far as-Sādik) to come and take up his right. The Imām, knowing well the nature of

1 Rouzat-us-Safā, Ibn ul-Athir, vol. v p 312 et seq
Irākian communications, burnt the missive unopened. But before any answer could reach Abū Salma, he had already accepted Abūl Abbās as the Caliph. He then issued a proclamation, still acting ostensibly in the name of the Aḥl-ul-bait, inviting the inhabitants, one and all, to assemble on the following day, which was a Friday, to elect a Caliph. On that day Kūfa presented a strange aspect. Large crowds of people, clothed in the sable garments of the Bani-Abbās, were hastening from every quarter to the Masjid-al-jāmi', to hear the long-deferred announcement. In due time Abū Salma appeared on the scene, and, strangely, dressed in the same sombre black. Few, excepting the partisans of Abūl Abbās, knew how he had come to sell himself to the Abbaside cause. He preferred his head to the interests of his masters. After leading the prayers he explained to the assemblage the object of the meeting. Abū Muslim, he said, the defender of the Faith and the upholder of the right of the House, had hurled the Ommeyyades from the height of their impiety; it was now necessary to elect an Imām and Caliph; there was none so eminent for pietry, ability, and all the virtues requisite for the office as Abūl Abbās, and him he offered to the Faithful for election. Up to this Abū Salma and the Abbasides were dubious of the impression on the people. They were afraid that even the Kūfians might not view their treachery to the house of Ali with approbation. But the proverbial fickleness of the Irākians was now proved. They had again and again risen in arms in support of the Fātimide cause, and as often betrayed those whom they had pledged themselves to help or whose help they had invoked. Swayed by the passing whim of the moment, they had as often shown themselves to be traitors, as the defenders of truth. After the massacre of Kerbela they had been so struck with remorse that twenty thousand of them, after spending a night over the tomb of Husain praying for forgiveness, had hurled themselves against the serried legions of Yezid. But the remorse did not last long; fickle and turbulent, faithless and unrepeatable, Hajjāj ibn-Yusuf, the veritable "Scourge of God," had alone kept them in order. And now, no sooner had the words passed from the lips of Abū Salma, proposing Abūl Abbās as the Caliph, than they
burst forth with loud acclamations of the takbir\(^1\) signifying their approval. A messenger was sent in haste to fetch Abūl Abbās from his concealment, and when he arrived at the mosque there was a frantic rush on the part of the multitude to take his hand and swear fealty. The election was complete. He ascended the pulpit, recited the khutba, and was henceforth the Imām and Caliph of the Moslems.\(^2\) Thus rose the Abbasides to power on the popularity of the children of Fāṭima, whom they repaid afterwards in a different coin. The greed of earthly power is the worst form of ambition. It has caused greater disasters to humanity than any other manifestation of human passion. It never hesitates as to the choice of means to attain its object, it uses indiscriminately both crime and virtue, the one to disguise its design, the other to achieve its ends. It has even pressed religion into its service. Ambition disguised in the cloak of religion has been productive of fearful calamities to mankind. The popes of Rome, in their incessant endeavour to maintain unimpaired their temporal power, deluged the civilised world with human blood. The pontiffs of Islām, Abbaside, Egyptian Fāṭimude, and Ommeyyade, seized with avidity upon the claim prepared by willing munions to supreme spiritual and temporal rule, and in their desire to maintain the undivided allegiance of their subjects, caused equal bloodshed and strife in the bosom of Islām.

The early Abbaside Caliráhs were men of great ability, and possessed of vast foresight and statesmanship. From the moment they were raised to the Caliphate by the acclamation of the people of Kūfa, they directed their whole energy towards consolidating the spiritual and temporal power in their hands, and to give shape and consistency to the doctrine of divine sanction to popular election. Henceforth it became a point of vital importance to disavow the principle of apostolical succession by descent, and to make the election by the people almost sacramental.

During Saffāh’s\(^3\) reign, Abū Muslim enjoyed some considera-

\(^1\) I.e. Allāhu Akbar, God is great.
\(^2\) For a full account, see *The Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan).
\(^3\) Abū’l Abbās Abdullah received the title of Saffāh, “blood spiller,” or “sanguinary,” on account of his unsparing use of the sword against his
tion, but the king-maker was hated and suspected for his ill-concealed Fâtîmide proclivities. Under Saffâh’s successor he was accused of heresy—stigmatised with the opprobrious epithet of Zendik — and killed. The pure and unsullied lives of the leading representatives of the House of Mohammed, the extreme veneration in which they were held by the people, frequently evoked the jealousy of the Abbasides, and exposed the children of Fâtîma to periodic outbursts of persecution. Hârûn destroyed the Barmekides, who were the bulwarks of his empire and had made for him the fame which he so largely appropriated, solely on suspicion of conspiracy with the Fâtîmides. This state of affairs lasted until the reign of Abdullah al-Mâmûn, the noblest Caliph of the house of Abbâs, who, on his accession to the Caliphate, resolved to restore to the children of Fâtîma their just rights. He accordingly named Ali ibn Mûsa, surnamed Rizâ (“the acceptable or agreeable”), the eighth Imâm of the Fâtîmides, as his successor, and gave his sister Umm ul-Fazl in marriage to this prince. He also abandoned the black, the Abbaside colour, in favour of the green, which was the recognised standard of the Fâtîmides. Ali ibn Mûsa ar-Rizâ was poisoned by the infuriated Abbasides, and Mâmûn was forced to resume the black as the colour of his house. The tolerance shown by him to the Fâtîmides was continued by his two immediate successors (Mû’tasim and Wâsik). The accession of Mutawakkil was the signal for a new and fierce persecution, which lasted during the whole fifteen years of a reign signalised by gross cruelty and debauchery. He was succeeded by his son Muntasir, whose first care was to restore the tombs of Ali and Husain, destroyed by Mutawakkil, and to re-establish the sacredness of their memory so wantonly outraged by his father. The sagacity of this Caliph was imitated by his successors, and some degree of toleration was thenceforward extended to the Shiahls. In the year 334 A.H. (A.C. 945) Muizz ud-dowla (the Deilemite), of the House of Buwaih, became the

enemies, one of his successors (Mû’tazul b’illâh) received the title of Saffâh as-Sâm (Saffâh II.), and the Ottoman, Selmi I., bore the same designation.

1 I.e. a Magian, Gujar, from Zend

2 The Fâtîmides had adopted green, the colour of the Prophet, as the symbol of their cause, the Banî-Ommeyya, the white, and the Banî-Abbâs, black.

3 Mû’tasim b’illâh (Mohammed) and Wâsik b’illâh (Hârûn).
Mayor of the Palace at Bagdad. An enthusiastic partisan of the Fâtimides, he entertained at one time the design of deposing the Abbaside Caliph Muti'ullah, and placing in his stead some scion of the house of Ali, but was restrained by motives of policy from carrying this project into effect. Muizz ud-dowla also instituted the Yaum-ul-`ashıra, the day of mourning, in commemoration of the martyrdom of Husain and his family on the plains of Kerbela. In the year A.H. 645 (A.D. 1247), under Musta'sim b'ilâh, another fierce persecution of the Shiâhs broke out, the consequences of which proved in the end disastrous to Saracenic civilisation, engulfing in one common ruin the Western Asians. Impelled by the pernicious counsels of the fanatics who surrounded him, this inebriate pontiff of the Sunni Church doomed the entire male population of the Shiâhs to massacre. By a terrible edict, which reminds us of the fate of the Albigenases and the Huguenots, he permitted the orthodox to plunder the goods, demolish the houses, ravage the fields, and reduce to slavery the women and children of the Shiâhs. This atrocious conduct brought upon the ill-fated city of Bagdad the arms of the avenging Hulâkâ, the grandson of Chengiz. For three days the Tartar chief gave up the town to rapine and slaughter. On the third day the thirty-seventh Caliph of the house of Abbâs was put to death with every circumstance of ignominy, and so ended the Abbaside dynasty! 1

Until the time of Mu'âwiyyah the adherents of the Aahl-ul-bait 2 had not assumed or adopted any distinctive appellation. They

1 A scion of the house of Abbâs escaped into Egypt, and the titular Caliphate flourished there until the Ottoman Selm obtained a renunciation in his favour from the last of the Abbasides, see ante, p. 130.

2 The Aahl-ul-bait, “People of the House” (of Mohammed), is the designation usually given to Fâtimâ and Ali and their children and descendants. This is the name by which Ibn-Khaldûn invariably designates them, and their followers and disciples, the Shiâhs or adherens of the “People of the House” Sanâî represents the general feeling with which the descendants of Mohammed were regarded in the following verse —

جر کتاب الله و عہدرت راجحہ مرسال مہدر
با کاری کو توان ہی روز محشر دانشان

“Excepting the Book of God and his family (descendants) nothing has been left by Ahmed the Prophet, memorials such as these can never be obtained till the Day of Judgment.”
were known simply as the Bani-Hāshim. There was no difference between the Bani-Fatima and the Bani-Abbās; they were all connected with each other by the closest ties of blood. After Mu‘āwiya’s seizure of the sovereign power the followers of the House of Mohammed began to call themselves Shi‘ahs (adherents) and their enemies either Nawāsid (rebels) or Khawārij (insurgents or deserters). The Ommeyyades called themselves Ama‘wās (children of Ommeyya). As yet the name of Ahl-us-Sunnat wa’l Jam‘at was wholly unknown. Under Mansūr and Hārūn this designation first came into existence. In the tenth century, a member of the house of Ali wrested Egypt from the Abbasides, and established a dynasty which ruled over that country and Syria until the rise of Saladin. The anathemas which the Caliphs of Bagdad and Cairo hurled at each other, the multitudinous traditions which were unearthed to demolish the claims of the one and the other, and the fatwas emanating from the doctors of the two Caliphates, accentuated the strife and bitterness of partisans. Saladin overthrew the Fātimide dynasty in Egypt, and restored the predominance of the Sunni Church in Eastern Africa. Various other branches of the Bani-Fatima, however, succeeded in establishing the supremacy of their family in different parts of the two continents. The Isnā-asharā‘us alone, the followers of the saintly Imāms, who reprehended the use of force, and who claimed and exercised only a spiritual dominion, maintained an attitude of complete withdrawal from temporal interests, until Shah Ismail the great Safawi monarch made Isnā-‘ashari‘ism the State religion of Persia. Himself a philosopher and a Sūfī, he perceived in the sympathy and devotion of the people to the House of Mohammed, whose descendant he was, a means of national awakening and consolidation. Since then Isnā-‘ashari‘ism is the national church of Persia.

1 The name of Khāwarīj was especially given to the troops who deserted Ah at Dūmat ul-Jandāl and formed a confederacy hostile to Islām, and was afterwards applied to those who adopted their pernicious doctrines; see post.

2 Besides the Bani-Fatima of Egypt, other branches of Fātimides have ruled under the different denominations of Ameer, Imām, Sharif, and Caliph in different parts of the Muslim world, such as the Bani-Ukhaydur, the Bani-Missī, the Bani Kāfīdah at Mecca, the Bani-Taba-Taba in Northern Yemen, the Bani-Ziyād in Southern Yemen, and the Bani-Idris in Morocco.

3 Isnā with a َ, see post.
The Bahmani and Ādil Shāhī dynasties of Southern India which Aurungzeb overthrew, thus paving the way for the rise of the Mahratta marauders whom the Bahmani sovereigns had kept in check with an iron hand, were attached to the doctrines of the Imāms. Such has been the political fate of the Fātimides, which has left its impress on their doctrines.

The title of the Bani-Abbās to the spiritual and temporal headship of Islām was founded on ba‘dal or nominal election. Since Saffāh’s accession, the Abbaside Caliphs had taken the precaution of obtaining during their lifetime the fealty of the chiefs for their intended successors. And it became necessary to impress on the doctrine of election a sanctity derived from precedent and ancient practice. The rise of the Fātimides in Egypt, their persistent endeavour to wrest the dominion of the East from the Caliphs of Bagdad, made it doubly necessary to controvert the pretensions of the children of Fāṭima, and to give form and consistency to the orthodox doctrines recognising the Abbaside Pontiffs as the spiritual chiefs of Islām.

Every corner of Irāk and Hijāz was ransacked for traditions in support of the right of the house of Abbās. The doctors of law were required to formulate the principles of orthodoxy in explicit terms and gradually the grand superstructure of the Sunni church was raised on the narrow foundations of Abbaside self-interest. Much of the success of the doctors and legists who assisted in the growth and development of Sunni-ism was due to the Manicheism of the Egyptian Fātimides. The nature of their doctrines, which were at variance with the teachings

---

1 Arslān al-Bāṣīrī, a general in the service of the Abbasides, but an adherent of the Egyptian Fātimides, drove al-Kām b. amr sīlah, the then Caliph of Bagdad, from the city, and compelled him to take refuge with the phylarch of the Arabs (the Ameel-ul-Arab, a title analogous to the Il-Khānī of Persia), until restored by Tughrīl, the father of Alp Arslān and the founder of the Seljukide dynasty. During the whole of this period the Khutba was read in Bagdad itself in the name of the Fātimide Caliph. The Khutba is the name given to the sermon pronounced on Fridays from the pulpits of the great mosques in all Moslem countries; it begins by a declaration of God’s attributes and unity, and an invocation of His blessings upon the Prophet, his family, and successors, then follows a prayer for the reigning Caliph and for the prince who exercises civil power in the State. The right of being named in the Khutba and that of coming money are two of the principal privileges possessed by the temporal sovereign, and the special marks of his legitimacy.
of both the Shahâb and the Sunni doctors; the assassinations of the best men committed at the instance of Hasan Sabbâḥ ("the Old Man of the Mountain"); the disintegrating character of the heresies, which under the influence of the ancient Chaldæo-Magism had sprung up in various quarters, and which were subversive of all order and morality,—added greatly to the strength of a system which formed, in the opinion of the masses, a bulwark against the enemies of Islam. The Shahâb strongly condemned the impious or communistic doctrines of the antitypes of Mâni and Mazdak, but they lacked the power, even if willing to use it, to suppress heresy or enforce uniformity. Sunniism, associated with the temporal power of the Abbaside Caliphs, possessed the means and used it, and thereby won the sympathy and acceptance of all who cared little about the disputes on the abstract question of apostolical descent.

Until the rise of the House of Abbâs there was little or no difference between the assertors of the right of the Ahl-ul-bait to the pontificate and the upholders of the right of the people to elect their own spiritual and temporal chiefs. The people of Hijâz and the Medinite Ansâr especially, who were so ruthlessly destroyed by the Ommeyyades, whilst they insisted on the principle of election, abhorred the injustice done to the children of Fâṭima. After the murder of Husain, a cry of horror had gone forth from the heart of Islam, and the people of the holy cities had risen in arms against the tyrant, and suffered bitterly for it. The adherents of the Ahl-ul-bait and the followers of the first three Caliphs together underwent fearful cruelties in the cause of the common Faith. But when it became necessary for dynastic reasons to create a gulf between the two parties the elements of divergence came ready to hand on both sides. Their doctrinal and legal differences began from this time to assume the type and proportions they retain at the present moment.

During the enlightened rule of Mâmûn and of his two immediate successors, when humanitarian science and philosophy influenced the conceptions of all classes of society, there was a break in the development of the Sunni Church. With the exception of this period the entire duration of the Abbaside
Caliphate\(^1\) was occupied in the consolidation of its dogmas. The Church and State were linked together; the Caliph was the Imâm—temporal chief as well as spiritual head. The doctors of law and religion were his servants. He presided at the convocations, and guided their decisions. Hence the solidarity of the Sunni church. Many of the sects\(^2\) into which it was originally split up have gradually disappeared, but it is still divided into four principal denominations, differing from each other on many questions of dogma and ritual. Their differences may perhaps be likened to those existing between the Roman Catholic and the Greek, Armenian, and Syrian orthodox churches.

Shiaism, on the other hand, shows how the Church and the State have become dissociated from each other, and how the "Expounders of the Law" have assumed, at least among a section, the authority and position of the clergy in Christendom. The freedom of judgment, which in Protestantism has given birth to one hundred and eighty sects, has produced an almost parallel result in Shiaism, and the immense diversity of opinion within the church itself is due to the absence of a controlling temporal power, compelling uniformity at the point of the sword.

The question of the Imâmate,\(^3\) or the spiritual headship of

---

\(^1\) From 750 A.D. to 1252 A.D.

\(^2\) According to Imâm Ja'far Isâ'î (quoted in the Dabātûn), the Sunnis were originally divided into sixty-five sects.

\(^3\) A very good definition of the word "Imâm" is given by Dr. Percy Badger. "The word 'Imâm' comes from an Arabic root signifying to anoint, to follow after, most of the derivatives of which partake, more or less, of that idea. Thus 'Imâm' means, primarily, an exemplar, or one whose example ought to be imitated. It is applied in that sense, e.g., 'Abd Allah, to Mohammed, as being the leader and head of the Muslims in civil and religious matters, and also to the Khalîfahs, or legitimate Successors, as his representatives in both capacities. It is also given in its religious import only to the heads of the four orthodox sects, namely, the El'Hanafî, El'Shâfi'i, El'Mâlikî, and El'Hanbâli, and, in a more restricted sense still, to the ordinary functionaries of a mosque who leads in the daily prayers of the congregation, an office usually conferred on individuals of reputed piety, who are removable by the Nâzîr or wardens, and who, with their employment and salary, lose the title also.

"The term is used in the Koran to indicate the Book, or Scriptures, or record of a people, also, to designate a teacher of religion. Hence, most probably, its adoption by the Muslims in the latter sense. 'When the Lord tried Abraham with certain words, which he fulfilled, He said, I have made thee an Imâm to the people' Again, referring to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, 'We have made them Imânis, that they may direct others at our
the Muselman commonwealth, is henceforth the chief battle-ground of the two sects. The Shi'as hold that the spiritual heritage bequeathed by Mohammed devolved on Ali and his descendants. They naturally repudiate the authority of the Jam'at (the people) to elect a spiritual head who should supersede the rightful claims of the Prophet's family. According to the Shi'as, therefore, the Imamate descends by divine appointment in the apostolical line. The Imam, besides being a descendant of the Prophet, must possess certain qualities,—he must be Mas'um or sinless, bear the purest and most unsullied character, and must be distinguished above all other men for truth and purity. It is not proper, nor could it be the intention of the Almighty, they argue, that a man whose character is not unimpeachable should have the direction of the human conscience. Human choice is fallible, as is proved by the history of mankind; and the people have often accepted the worst men for their leaders. God could never have left the religious needs of man to his unaided faculty. If an Imam be needed, he must be one whom the conscience must accept. Accordingly they declare that if the choice of an Imam be left to the community, it would be subversive of all morality; and

command.' And again, 'We delivered to Moses the Book, therefore be not in doubt of his reception thereof, and we ordained it to be a guide unto the children of Israel. And we appointed some of them to be Imams, to direct the people according to our command.' — Badger's Imams and Seyyids of Oman, App. A

1 The question of the Imamate forms a subject of controversy, ˹says Mas'u'di, ˹between the followers of different sects, particularly between those who adhere to the doctrine of appointment, َإِفْكَانُوُّنِ مَبْنِي وَأَنَصَ إِسْحَاقُ إِبْنِ الْإِحْدَآر٦ The defenders of the doctrine of appointment are the Imamas, َإِنْ لِإِلَهَةً مَأْمَلٌ مَعْلَمَة٦ who form a section of the Adherents, Shi'as of Ali ibn Abu Tâlib and his holy children (by Fâtima) َإِلَّا أَنْفُسَهُمُ مِنْ وَآدَم٦ They believe that God does not leave mankind at any time without a man who maintains the religion of God (and acts as their Imam). Such men are either prophets or their legates. The doctrine of appointment is defended by a section of the Khawârij, َإِلَّا مُحَرَّمٗ, the Marjías َإِلَّا مَرْجَعَة٦, by many of these who hold the traditions and the generally received opinions (Akhî-as Sunna), by some of the Murtazâlas, and by a section of the Zaharis, َإِلَّا مَرْجَعَة٦ They believe that it is the will of God and His Prophet that the nation should choose a man amongst themselves, and make him their Imam, for there are times when God does not send a legate. The Shi'as consider such Imams as usurpers of the dignity. — Murujuz-zahab.
consequently the spiritual guidance of mankind has been entrusted to divinely-appointed persons.¹

According to the Sunnis, the Imamate is not restricted to the family of Mohammed. The Imam need not be just, virtuous, or irreproachable (Maṣūm) in his life, nor need he be the most excellent or eminent being of his time; so long as he is free, adult, sane, and possessed of the capacity to attend to the ordinary affairs of State, he is qualified for election. Another doctrine in which they agree with the Church of Rome was full of momentous consequences to Islam. They hold that neither the vices nor the tyranny of the Imam would justify his deposition,² nor can the perversity or evil conduct of the Imam or those who preside at the public divine service invalidate the prayers of the Faithful.³ They also hold that the Imamate is indivisible, and that it is not lawful to have two Imams at one and the same time. As Christianity could yield obedience to but one Pope, so the Moslem world could yield obedience to but one lawful Caliph. But as three Popes have often pretended to the triple crown, so have three

¹ "It is neither the beauty of the sovereign," says Ibn-Khaldûn, "nor his great learning, perspicacity, or any other personal accomplishment which is useful to his subject. The sovereign exists for the good of his people." "The necessity of a ruler," continues this remarkable writer, "whose keenness of observation was equalled by his versatility," arises from the fact that human beings have to live together, and unless there is some one to maintain order, society would break to pieces. A temporal sovereign only enforces such orders as are promulgated by man, but the laws framed by a divinely-inspired legislator have two objects in view: the moral as well as social well-being of mankind. The Caliph is the Vicar and Lieutenant of the Prophet. He is more than a temporal ruler, he is a spiritual chief as well. The Caliph is thus designated the Imam, his position being similar to that of the leader of the congregation at the public prayers."  

² This establishment of an Imam," continues Ibn Khaldûn, "is a matter of obligation. The law which declares its necessity is founded on the general accord of the Companions of the Prophet. The Imam is the spiritual head, whilst the Caliph or Sultan represents the temporal power."  

³ In spite of this doctrine, promulgated at the order of tyrants anxious to avoid the penalty of their oppression, the people have never approved of it entirely. Under the Qarmatāye Wahhābī, nicknamed for his vices the Fārīk (the Wicked), they rose in revolt and deposed him. Similarly, when the unities of Mutawakki (the Abbaside) became intolerable, he was deposed by his own son, Muntaser the Good. The history of the Ottoman Turks contains many examples of the people being in revolt against a various or incapable sovereign, the last being under the unhappy Abdul Aziz.  

⁴ Against this doctrine there is now a widespread revolt in the Sunni Church, the Ghârî-Mukhallidīn, whom we shall describe later, holding that if the Imam is not chaste in his life, the prayers of the congregation are invalid.
Ameer ul-Muslimin laid claim to supreme rule. After the downfall of the Ommeyyades in Asia a member of that house succeeded in setting up an independent state in Spain, whilst the family of Abbâs exercised power on the banks of the Tigris, and that of Fâtima on the Nile. The fact that at various times two or three sovereigns have assumed simultaneously the Headship of Islâm has given rise to an opinion that the rule of indivisibility applies only to one and the same country, or to two countries contiguous to each other; but when the countries are so far apart that the power of one Imâm cannot extend to the other, it is lawful to elect a second Imâm. The Imâm is the patron and syndic of all Musulmans, and the guardian of their interests during their lives as well as after their death. He is vested with the power to nominate his successors, subject to the approval of the Moslems. As the office is for the temporal and spiritual benefit of the community, the nomination is dependent on the choice of the people.¹

It might have been expected that persecution would keep the Shiahs united among themselves; but although all were agreed on the question that the supreme pontificate of Islâm is confined to the line of the Prophet, many of them fell away from the recognised heads of the family, and attached themselves from design or predilection to other members of the House. Whilst the acknowledged Imâms and their disciples lived in holy retirement, the others found leisure amidst their foreign hostilities for domestic quarrels. They preached, they disputed, they suffered.

Shahristâni divides the Shiahs into five sects, viz. the Zaidia, the Isma'îla, the Ismâ'-hashâria or Imâma, the Kefâ'îna, and the Ghâlîha or Ghullât. As a matter of fact, however, as we shall show hereafter, some of these sects, and especially the branches into which they bifurcated, had, excepting in a more or less exaggerated attachment to Ah, nothing in common with Shiainism proper. On the contrary, they derived their origin from sources other than Islâmic.

The Zaidias, says Shahristâni, are the followers of Zaid, son of Ali II (Zam-ul-'Abidîn), son of Husam. They affirm that the Imâmate descended from Ali to Hasan, then to Husain;

¹ Ibn Khaldûn, see ante, part i, chapter x.
from Husain it devolved upon Ali II. (Zain-ul-ʿAbidin); and from him it passed to Zaid, and not, as is held by the ʿIsnā-
Asharīas, and, in fact, by most Moslems, to Mohammed al-Bākīr. In their doctrines they closely approach the ʿAhl us-Sunnat. They hold that the people have the right of choosing their spiritual head from among the descendants of the Prophet, combining thus the principle of election with the principle which restricts the Imāmate to the family of Mohammed. They also affirm that it is lawful to elect the nafzūl (the less eminent) whilst the afzd (the most eminent) is present. As a consequence of this principle, they accept the imāmate of the first three Caliphs, whose pontificate is generally disclaimed by the other Shiāhs. They hold that though Ali was the most eminent of all the Companions of the Prophet, and by right of descent as well as by his qualities entitled to the Imāmate, yet for reasons of policy, and to allay the disorders which had broken out upon the death of the Prophet, to settle the minds of the people and to compose the differences among the tribes, a man of a maturer age was required to fill the office. Besides, owing to the struggle in which Ali had been engaged in defence of the Faith, the feeling of retaliation was strong in the bosom of those who had fought against Islām, and who had been only recently reduced to subjection; and these people would not willingly have bowed before the grandeur of Ali. They hold that the same reason applies to the election of Omar.\(^1\) Their acceptance of the Imāmate of the first two Caliphs brought upon the Zaidas the name of Rawāhz, or Dissenters, by the other Shiāhs. Another doctrine held by them is too important to escape notice. They maintain that in addition to piety, truth, knowledge, and innocence or sinlessness, qualities required by the Shiāhs proper for the pontifical office, the Imām should possess bravery, and the capacity to assert by force of arms his right to the Imāmate. The Imām Mohammed al-Bākīr, who had succeeded his father Ali II, maintained that the use of force was reprehensible. Zaid differed from his brother in this opinion. He rose in arms against the tyrants in the reign of ʿIshāh ibn Abdul Malik (the Ommeyyade), and was killed in the neighbourhood of

\(^1\)  Shāh distrust, pt 1 p 115.
Kūfa. He was succeeded by Yahya, his son, who followed the example of his father, and, against the advice of Imām Ja‘far as-Sādik, proceeded to assert his right by force of arms. He collected a large following in Khorāsān, but was defeated and killed by one of the generals of Hishām.

On the death of Yahya, the Imāmate, say the Zaidīs, passed to another member of the family, Mohammed ibn Abdullah, surnamed an-Nafs-uz-Zakiya ("the Pure Soul"). Mohammed assumed the title of Mahdi, and rose in arms in Hijāz against the Abbaside Mansūr. He was defeated and killed at Medina by ‘Isā, Mansūr’s nephew. He was succeeded by his brother Ibrāhīm, who lost his life similarly in a vain struggle against the Abbasides. Isā, another brother, who also endeavoured to assert his claims by force, was seized by Mansūr, and imprisoned for life. After mentioning these facts, Shahristānī adds that “whatever befell them was prognosticated by Ja‘far as-Sādik, who said that temporal dominion was not for their family, but that the Imāmate was to be a toy in the hands of the Abbasides.”

According to a branch of the Zaidīs, the Imāmate passed from Ibrāhīm to Idrīs, the founder of the Idrisiide dynasty in Mauritania (مغرة الأقصى), and of the city of Fez. After the fall of the Idrisides, the Zaidīs became disorganised, but members of this sect are still to be found in different parts of Asia and Africa. A branch of the Zaidīs ruled in Tabaristan for a long time, and there is a Zaidī Imām still in Northern Yemen. The Zaidīs, according to Shahristānī, were divided into four subsections, viz. the Jārudīs, Sulaimānīs, Tabarīs, and Sālehabīs. They differ from each other about the devotion of the Imāmate from Zaid’s grandson. The Jārudīs, who upheld the claims of Mohammed Nafs-uz-Zakiya in supersession of Isā, suffered bitterly under Mansūr. The Sulaimānīs were named after their founder, Sulaimān ibn Jarīs, who declared that the Imāmate depended upon the consensus of the people; . . . “that the Imāmate is not intended for regulating religion or for the acquisition of a knowledge of the Deity, or His unity or the laws which He has made for the government of the world, for these are acquired through Reason. The Imāmate is intended for the government of the earth, inflicting punishments
on wrong-doers, dealing out justice, and defending the State. It is not necessary for the Imam to be aefal. . . .” "A section of the Ahl-us-Sunnat hold similar opinions, for they say that it is not required for the Imam to be learned or a Mujtahid, so long as he is wise and has some one with him capable of expounding the law."¹ The Sulaimānas and the Sādechias agree in accepting the Imamate of the first two Caliphs; the latter hold that Ali, having himself abandoned his preferential claim in favour of Abū Bakr and Omar, the people have no right to question their Imamate but as regards Osmân they are in doubt, for they say “when we see how he travailed for the support of the Banû Ummeyya, we find his character different from the other Sahâba.”

The Ismai'ías, also sometimes called Sabrīyân (Seveners),² derive their names from Isma'il, a son of Imam Ja'far as-Sâdik, who predeceased his father. They hold that upon the death of Imam Ja'far as-Sâdik, the Imamate devolved on Isma'il’s son, Mohammed (surnamed al-Maktûm,³ the hidden or unrevealed), and not on Ja'far’s son, Mūsâ al-Kâzim, as believed by the Isnâd-`Ashurâ and generally by the other Moslems. Mohammed al-Maktûm was succeeded, according to the Isma’íliyas, by Ja'far al-Musaddik, whose son Mohammed al-Habîb was the last of the unrevealed Imâms.

His son, Abû Mohammed Abdullah, was the founder of the Fâtimide dynasty which ruled Northern Africa for three centuries. He had been thrown into prison by the Abbaside Caliph, Mu'tazzid-b'ullâh Saffâh II, but, escaping from his dungeon at Segelmessa, he appeared in Barbary, where he assumed the title of Obaidullah and Mahdi (the promised Guide). Followers gathered round him from all sides, and, assisted by

¹ Shahristânî, pt 1 pp 119, 120
² Because they acknowledge only seven Imâms—(1) Ali, (2) Hasan, (3) Husain, (4) Ali II, (5) Mohammed al Bâ'ārî, (6) Ja'far as-Sâdîk (the True), and (7) Isma'il
³ So called, says Makrizi, because his followers kept him "concealed" to escape the persecution of the Abbasides. Isma'il was the eldest son of Imam Ja'far as-Sâdik, and a man of sweet disposition and engaging manners, and according to Makrizi, had a considerable following in Yemen, in Kétâma, and the African provinces. During the lifetime of Isma'il’s mother, says Shahristânî, the Imam Ja'far never had any other wife, "like the Prophet with Khadija, and Ali with Fâtima."
a Sūfī, he soon overthrew the Aghlabites, who were ruling the African provinces in the name of the Caliphs of Bagdad, and founded an empire which extended from Mauritania to the confines of Egypt. One of his successors (Maʿdd Abū Temim), al-Muizz-li-dīn-illāh (Exalter of the Faith of God), wrested Egypt and a portion of Syria from the Abbasides. Muizz, to mark his victory over the enemies of his House, founded Cairo (Kāhira, the Victorious City), and removed his capital from Mahdièh, near Kairwân, established by Obaidullah al-Mahdi, to the new city. At this time his dominions included, besides the whole of Northern Africa, the islands of Sardinia and Sicily. He founded in Cairo the mosque of al-Azhar (Jāmiʿ- al-azhar, the Brilliant Mosque), a vast public library, and several colleges, and endowed them richly. At these colleges, students received instruction in grammar, literature, the interpretation of the Koran, jurisprudence, medicine, mathematics, and history. "The distinctive character of his reign," says the historian, "was justice and moderation." 1

Almost all the accounts we possess of the Egyptian Fātimides have come down to us from hostile sources. Since Jouhar, the general of Muizz, conquered Egypt and Syria from the Caliphs of Bagdad, there was an incessant struggle between the two Caliphates as to the legitimacy of their respective titles. The hold, which the claim of the Fātimides to be descended from Mohammed enabled them to acquire over the people, gave rise to an unceasing desire on the part of the Abbasides to annihilate the genuineness of their rivals' genealogy, and to impress on the world the anti-Islamic character of the doctrines adopted by them. In the reign of Kādir-bʿillāh, a secret assemblage of the doctors of the law was held at Bagdad at the instance of

1 Marcel The orthodox Jamāl ud-dīn bin Taghribardī (in his Maured ul-Lutāfīl, لعمر الدقاقة, says, "though Muizz was a schismatic, he was wise, learned, generous, and just to his subjects."

For a full account of the Fātimide dynasty, see Short History of the Saracens (Macmillan).
the frightened Caliph, to fulminate against the Fātimides an anathema declaring that they were not the genuine descendants of Fātimā. The Fātimides, on their side, replied by a counter-anathema, signed by the leading doctors of Cairo, among them many belonging to the Māhikī and Shāfe‘ī persuasions. In spite, however, of the doubts thrown on their legitimacy by the Abbaside doctors, great historians like Makrizī, Ibn Khaldūn, and Abulfedā have accepted the genuineness of the claims of the Fātimides.

Makrizī is extremely outspoken on the subject, and plainly charges the partisans of the Bānī-Abbās with misrepresentation and forgery. Dealing with the Abbaside statement that Obaidullah al-Mahdi was not a descendant of Mūḥammad, he goes on to say, "a little examination of facts will show that this is a fabrication. The descendants of Aḥ, the son of Abū Talib, at that time were numerous, and the Shahis regarded them with great veneration. What was it then that could have induced their partisans to forsake them, the descendants of Mūḥammad, and to recognise in their stead as Imām an offspring of the Magi, a man of Jewish origin? No man, unless absolutely devoid of commonsense, would act thus. The report that Obaidullah al-Mahdi was by descent a Jew or a Magian owes its origin to the artifices of the feeble Abbaside princes, who did not know how to rid themselves of the Fātimides, for their power lasted without interruption for 270 years, and they despoiled the Abbasides of the countries of Africa, Egypt, Syria, the Diārbakr, the two sacred cities (Mecca and Medina), and of Yemen. The Khutba was even read in their names at Bagdad during forty weeks. The Abbaside armies could not make head against them; and, therefore, to inspire the people with aversion against the Fātimides, they spread calumnies about their origin. The Abbaside officers and Amirs who could not contend successfully with the Fātimides gladly adopted these slanders as a means of revenge. The Kāzīs, who attested the act of convocation under Kādir b‘illāh, acted under the orders of the Caliph, and only upon hearsay; and since then historians have heedlessly and without reflection given currency to a calumny which was invented by the Abbasides." Nothing can be more explicit than this statement by a critical historian
and a distinguished jurisconsult whose reputation stands high among all Orientals.¹

Probably the doctrines professed by the Egyptian Fātimides were subjected to the same process of misrepresentation. Still there can be little doubt that they adopted largely the esoteric doctrines of Abdullah ibn Maimūn, surnamed the Kaddāh (the Oculist), and made use of his degrees of initiation for the purposes of a political propaganda.

The protracted struggle between pope and emperor for the suzerainty of Christendom; the Thirty Years' War, with its concomitant miseries; the persecution of the Huguenots, in which dynastic ambitions played as important a part as religious bigotry,—give us some conception of the evils that have flowed from the greed of earthly power. In Islam it has been the same. The Abbasides battling with the Ommeyyades, and then with the Egyptian Fātimides, produced the same disastrous results.

The eastern provinces of the ancient Persian empire were at this time the home of a variety of congenial spirits. Here had gathered not only the Mago-Zoroastrians, fleeing before the Islamic wave, but also the representatives of various Indian sects, with their ideas of metempsychosis, the incarnation of Vishnu, the descent of Krishna from heaven, and his free and easy intercourse with the gopīs. The revolutionary opinions and heresies which under the later Sassanides had shaken the temple and palace alike, and which Kēsrā Anūshīrvān had endeavoured to exterminate with fire and sword, had survived all persecutions. At least they retained sufficient vitality to reappear in Islam in various shapes and forms.

¹ Makrizī died in 845 A.H. Jamal ud-dīn Abūl Mahāsin Yusuf ibn Taghrībīrdī, in his Jihām al-zahrārī fī umul Mululu, speaks of Makrizī thus:

٨٥٢

نُوْفَى الشَّیْخُ إِبْرَاهِیْمُ عِلَمِ الدُّنْیَا المُعْلَمَتِ المَقْتَلَ عَمَّةُ الرَّحْمَانِ نَورُ الْمَهْدِ نَقِیَ الْدِّینِ اِلْهَمِّدُ بِنْ عُلَیّ بْنِ عَـبْدُ الْقَادر

بَنِ مَحْمُودِ بْنِ الْهَمِّدِ بْنِ مَحْمُودِ بْنِ تَمْیِمِ بْنِ عَـبْدُ الرَّحْمَانِ الْبُلْطَمِیْکَ

الَّا وَلَدُ النَّبِیْۃِ الْمُؤَمَّدَیۡـیّ

"In this year died the learned sheikh and Imam, jurisconsult, and that eminent historian and traditionalist, Tākū ud-dīn Ahmad, son of Ah," etc. etc.
The Rawendi, an Indo-Magian sect who maintained the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and the Safidjamagan,\(^1\) founded by Hâkim bin Hâshim, the infamous Mokanna,\(^2\) revolted in Khorâsân, and were suppressed by the Caliph Al-Mahdi. Mokanna taught that God had assumed the human form, since He had commanded the angels to adore the first man; and that, since that period, the divine nature had passed from prophet to prophet until it had descended to himself.\(^3\)

About the same time Mazdakism, which two centuries and a half before had involved the empire of the Chosroes in a general conflagration, and was ruthlessly trampled under foot by the great Anûshirvân, raised its head again under the Caliphs. The snake had only been half killed Bâbek, surnamed Khurrami (from Khurram, his place of birth), preached, like his prototype Mazdak, the same minimalist doctrines,--the community of women and goods, and the indifference of all human actions. For a space of twenty years he filled the whole circuit of the Caliphate with carnage and ruin, until at length, in the reign of Mu'tasim b'ilâh, he was overthrown, taken prisoner, and put to death in the Caliph's presence. It was a repetition of the old story. Islam had to pass through the same throes as Christianity. From the beginning of the second to the end of the ninth century there was an unceasing struggle in Christianity with the ancient cults, which were appearing in diversified characters throughout the wide area in which the religion of Jesus was professed. After this struggle was over, a deadly pall settled over Christendom; orthodoxy had succeeded in crushing not only the revolutionary Monophysites, the Manichaean Paulicians, but also the rationalistic Arians. Ecclesiasticism and orthodoxy, convertible terms, held in bondage the mind of man until the Reformation. Islam had

---

1 So called because they dressed themselves in white, like the Tabonides of Europe
2 This is the impostor whom Moore has made famous as "the Veiled Prophet of Khorasan." He was called Mokanna because, either to conceal his ugliness, or to impress his followers with a sense of inaccessibility, he always wore a veil. He was also called the Sâzendeh-i-Mah (Moon-maker), because on one occasion he had, by a piece of jugglery, caused an illumination, like that of the moon, at Nakhshab
to pass through the same ordeal, but its Reformation is only just commencing.

Islam required from its votaries a simple confession of an eternal truth, and the practice of a few moral duties. In other respects it allowed them the widest latitude of judgment. In the name of divine unity it held forth to all creeds and sects the promise of a democratic equality. Naturally the persecuted heretics of every faith rallied round the standard of the Prophet who had emancipated human judgment from the bondage of priesthood; and "Avestan scripturalists" and Zoroastrian free-thinkers, Manichæans, Christians, Jews, and Magi all hailed the advent of a new dispensation which realised the dream of religious unity. The swarms of gnostic sects which had distracted the Church of Jesus from the second to the sixth century had either merged in the Church of Mohammed, or lived in peace, unmolested by the orthodox Greeks or Catholics, under the large tolerance of the Caliphs. The former, whilst they adopted the faith of Mohammed, retained their primitive conceptions, and gave birth to the docetic sects of Islam, which we shall describe later on.

The national characteristics of a people, the climatic conditions under which they exist, the natural features of the country in which they dwell, the influence of older cults, all give a colour and a complexion to their faiths and doctrines. It is the same in Christendom and in Islam. Iran gave birth to agnosticism; from there emanated the docetic conceptions which permeated the Roman world and impressed upon the primitive belief of the judaical Christians the conception of a divinity who discouraged familiarly with mankind on earth. Manichaæism, that wonderful mixture of fancy and philosophy, to which Christianity owes so much and acknowledges so little, was, in spite of the persecution of Zoroastrian and Christian, alive, not dead. Will it ever die, that child of a bizarre genius, the outcome of a nation's character? Theologians may try, but will never kill it. The morbidism of the Fathers of the Sunni Church gave place in Iran to imaginative philosophy. Ali's personality fired the imagination of Manichaæism. It took the place of the docetic Christ among the people. The process of deification was not confined to Ali. His successors were deified with him.
Shiaism, like Sunnism, presents therefore two aspects. One is the pure, simple Shiaism of Mohammed's immediate descendants, which we shall describe shortly. The other is docetic Shiaism, fantastic and transmogrified according to the primitive beliefs of the people among whom it spread. Ultra-Shiaism is again as different from docetic Shiaism as ultra-Sunnism or Nawasibism is from docetic Sunnism. Narrow-minded exclusiveness is not the peculiar characteristic of any one faith or creed; nor are the thunders of the Athanasian Creed confined to Christianity. In Islam also (be it said with certain exceptions) each sect condemns the others to perdition, not eternal (as the orthodox Christian charitably hopes it will be), but sufficiently prolonged to make them feel the evils of a different doxy from its own. Still, notwithstanding the anathemas of hell-fire and brimstone which have been hurled by contending parties and sects against each other, the philosophical student will not fail to observe the universality of Islam.

About the middle of the seventh century Constantine Sylvanus founded the Manichaean sect of Paulicians, who derived their name from St. Paul, whose disciples they professed themselves to be. The Paulicians disclaimed the designation of Manichaean; but their doctrines bear the closest analogy to those taught by Mâni, and all the Christian writers, with the exception of Milner, ascribe their origin to Manichaeism. The Paulicians were the real progenitors of the Reformed Churches of Europe. Their abhorrence of images and relics was probably a reflex of Islamic influences. In their aversion towards Mariolatry and saint-worship, and in the repudiation of all visible objects of adoration, they closely approached the Moslems. They believed, however, with Mâni, that Christ was a pure spirit which bore on earth only the semblance of a body, and that the crucifixion was a mere delusion. They maintained the eternity of matter; the origin of a second principle, of an active being, who has created this visible world, and exercises his temporal reign till the final consummation of sin and death. In the interpretation of the Christian Gospels they indulge in allegories and figures, and claimed, like Mâni, an esoteric insight into the meaning of words. An outward and expedient profession of another faith, a doctrine which in modern Persia has
become famous as *ketmân* or *takiyyê*,¹ was held to be commendable.

The Paulicians were persecuted by the Greek Church and the Byzantine Court with terrible fury, and for nearly two hundred years they waged a not unequal contest in North Armenia and Cappadocia with the fanatics and despots of Byzantium, in which both sides perpetrated the most fearful atrocities.² At last they succumbed to superior force; but though their fortresses were razed and their cities ruined, the sect lived. It passed its doctrines to the Bulgarians, who have always been regarded with disfavour by the Orthodox Churches. The Paulicians after their destruction in Asia appeared in South Provence and Savoy in the thirteenth century. Their fate in those countries is known to every reader of European history. They were annihilated with fire and sword,—not even women and children were spared; such of the latter as escaped were reduced to slavery. But Paulicianism did not die; it showed itself in England, where its followers, under the name of Lollards, suffered like their predecessors in Asia, in Savoy, and in Provence; it reappeared in Bohemia under Huss, and finally it triumphed under Luther and Calvin over its orthodox persecutors. We have traced so far the fate of this peculiar sect, as in its original home it exercised no inconsiderable influence over the religio-political movements which were proceeding about the same time in Islâm.

*During the tempestuous epoch, when Chyroseir the Paulician was devastating the eastern portion of the Byzantine dominions, and had filled the cities of Asia Minor with carnage and ruin, there lived at Alhwâz, in Fars, a man who rivalled Mâni in the versatility of his genius, the variety of his information, and the profundity of his knowledge, and who was destined to play an almost equal part in the history of religion.* Abdullah ibn Maimûn al-Kaddâh has been represented by his enemies as a Magian by birth: whilst his disciples have declared him

¹ See post. p. 335.

² A hundred thousand Paulicians are said to have been destroyed under the orders of the second Theodora, the mother of Manuel, by the sword, the gibbet, or the flames.
to be a descendant of Ali. However that may be, it is clear that he was a devoted adherent of the House of Mohammed. Considering the disastrous consequences which directly or indirectly have flowed from his teachings, it was impossible for even historians like Ibn Khaldûn to avoid viewing the man and his doctrines with an unfavourable bias. They think Abdullah ibn Maimûn was animsted by a desire to subvert the dominion of Islam by the same insidious means which were adopted by his great prototype against Christianity. Aware of the risk attendant upon an open war against constituted authority so long as the conscience of the people and temporal power were at its back, he determined (they say) to work in secret like Mâni. He accordingly enveloped his system in a veil of mystery, and, in order to annihilate all positive religion and authority, he resolved to divide his followers into seven degrees, like the Pythagoreans. The last degree inculcated the vanity of all religion, the indifference of actions, which, according to him, are neither visited with recompense nor chastisement, either now or hereafter. He appointed emissaries whom he despatched to enlist disciples, and to initiate them according to their capacity in some or all of the degrees. The pretensions of the son of Isma'il served them as a political mask; whilst working ostensibly for him, they were secretly, but in reality, the apostles of impiety.

Shahristâni's account, however, of the tenets of the sect is in a more philosophical spirit; whilst Mohsen Fâni's description in the Dâbistân, derived from members of the fraternity, is coloured with a slightly roseate hue. But, studied carefully, they render it more than probable that Abdullah ibn Maimûn was a materialistic theist; that like Mâni, he was fired with the ambition of creating an eclectic naturalism, which would reconcile philosophy with positive religion; and that his degrees of initiation were analogous to the mystical degrees of the Sûfis. It is evident from what Mirkhond states that the

1 Abdullah ibn Maimûn is stated to have been at one time in the service of Imam Ja'far as Sâdik
2 Pronounced in Arabic Ibn (n) Khaldûn, in Persian, Ibn (n) Khaldûn.
3 Nuwari, Journal Asiatique, vol IV p 298
4 Shahristâni, part I p 147
Egyptian Fātimides adopted most of their mystical doctrines from Abdullah ibn Maimūn.\(^1\)

Abdullah proceeded from Ahwāz to Basra, and thence to Syria, where he settled at Salemiyè. In the course of his travels he came in contact with the Paulicians, and imbibed many of their doctrines. The long-continued struggle of the Paulicians with the Byzantines, and the success of their proselytising endeavours, undoubtedly influenced him in his project of religion. He moulded his doctrines partly upon those actually taught by Māni and partly upon those of the Moslem mystics. Manichæism itself was essentially pantheistic, founded upon a substratum of Pythagorean philosophy, Zervanism, and Christianity. Abdullah's followers have received the designation of Bātinas or Esotericians, on account of their claim to an esoteric insight into the precepts of positive religion—a claim similar to that advanced by the Manichæans and Paulicians.

Abdullah ibn Maimūn seems to have affirmed the eternity of matter. He declared further “that God is not separate from His manifestations, that it cannot be predicated of him independently that He is existent or non-existent, omniscient or non-omniscient, for to affirm regarding Him any of these things is to assume that there is some resemblance between Him and His creatures, that the First Cause evolved by a simple command (amr-ta-vāhid), or a mere act of volition, a Principle which was embosomed in Eternity, and is called Akl or Reason, and this Principle evolved a subordinate Principle called the Nafs or soul, whose relation to the other is that of a child to the parent; that the essential attribute of this Principle is Life, as that of Reason is Knowledge, that this second Principle gave shape to pre-existent Matter, the essential attribute of which is passivity, and afterwards created Time and Space, the elements, the planets, and the astral bodies, and all other objects in creation; that in consequence of an incessant desire on the part of the Second Principle (the Demiurgus) to raise

\(^1\) The Egyptian Fātimides differed from the general body of the Isma'iliyas in one essential feature. Whilst the latter held that Isma'il, their last Imam, had only disappeared, and would reappear in the fulness of time when “the kingdom of heaven” would be revealed, the Egyptians taught that he had reappeared in the person of Obadullah al-Mahdi and his successors.
The political divisions and schisms. Itself to the level of the First Created Principle, it manifested itself in matter in the shape of human beings; that the aim of all human souls is to struggle upwards to the Creative Principle or Wisdom; that the Prophets are embodiments or manifestations of that Principle to help the human soul to struggle with matter; the Prophets are therefore called Nāยกَینُ، 'speaking apostles'; that they are seven in number like the planets; that the progress of the world is in cycles, and at the last stage will occur the Resurrection (تَأَمَّتَ كُرَبِی), when the sanctions of positive religion and law will be withdrawn, for the motion of the heavens and the adoption of the precepts of religion are for the purpose that the Soul may attain Perfection, and its perfection consists in attaining to the degrees of Reason and its junction or assimilation with it in fact; and this is the great Resurrection (تَأَمَّتَ كُرَبِی), when all things, the heavens, the elements, and organic substances, will be dissolved, and the earth will be changed, and the heavens will be closed like a written book, and the good will be differentiated from the bad, and the obedient from the disobedient, and the good will be merged in the Universal Soul, and the bad will join with the Principle of Evil; thus from the commencement of motion to its cessation (according to Abdullah ibn Maimūn) is the initial stage (جِدَاب), and from the cessation of motion or activity to amalgamation with infinity is the stage of perfection, 1 that

1 دما تَحْرِکَتِ الْاَلَّاکَ تَحْرِکَتِ الْقَوْسِ وَ الْشَّرَائِعِ بِالْشَّرَائِعِ تَحْرِکَتِ النَّفْسِ وَ الْعَقْلِ وَ الطَّاعَ

1 ذاك تَحْرِکَتِ الْقَوْسِ وَ الْشَّرَائِعِ بِالْشَّرَائِعِ تَحْرِکَتِ النَّفْسِ وَ الْعَقْلِ وَ الطَّاعَ
all the precepts of religion and law have their measures... and that each letter and word have two meanings, for every revelation (tanzil) has an interpretation (tâvîl), and everything visible has its counterpart in the invisible world; that knowledge of truth cannot be acquired by reason but by instruction.” Abdullah ibn Maimûn’s disciples developed his doctrines still further by declaring that Resurrection means the Advent or Revelation of the Imâm and of a Heavenly Kingdom in which all the burdens of positive religion and traditions would be removed; that deception in religion is allowable; that all the precepts of the Koran have an esoteric sense; that religion does not consist in external observances, but in an inner sense and feeling; that every thing or act which is not injurious is lawful; that fasting is nothing but keeping the secret of the Imâm; that the prohibition against fornication implies that the disciple must not disclose the mysteries of the faith; and that zakât means the giving of the tithes to the Imâm ma’sûm—a peculiar and fantastical medley of many cults and philosophies, and in its tendency subversive of law and morality.

Abdullah ibn Maimûn settled in Syria, the home of Christian Gnosticism, where he still further developed his doctrines. Here he converted Hamadân, also called Karmath, whose name has become infamous in the annals of Islâm.

The method of proselytising adopted by the followers of Abdullah ibn Maimûn was the old Manichean one of throwing the acolyte into a sea of doubt with insidious questions and equivocal replies, “not,” says Mobsin Fâni’s informant, “with any evil object, but simply to bring the seeker after truth and wisdom to the goal of perfection”¹ The process varied with the religious standpoint of the person whom they desired to

---Shahristân, pt 1 pp. 148, 149.

¹ Dabistân, p 356
convert. The Dā‘i (the missionary) would at first give a tacit recognition of the faith of the intended proselyte, and then by an insinuation of doubt and difficulties, gradually un settle his mind, and end by suggesting as the only possible solution the peculiar tenets of the Bātim system. For example, if the Dā‘i had to proselytise a Shiāh, he would represent himself as a devoted partisan of the House of Mohammed. He would expatiate on the cruelty and injustice with which they were treated—on the martyrdom of Husain and the butchery of Kerbela; having thus prepared the way, he would instil into the now receptive mind the esoteric doctrines of the Bātimus. If he had a Jew to deal with, he spoke disparagingly of the Christians and the Musulmans, and while agreeing with his intended convert in still looking forward to a promised Messiah, by degrees persuaded the neophyte that this promised Messiah can be none other than the Isma‘īlī Imām. If it was a Christian whom he hoped to win over, he enlarged on the obstinacy of the Jews and the ignorance of the Musulmans, he conformed to all the chief articles of the Christian creed, at the same time hinting that they were all symbolic, and pointed to a deeper meaning which the Bātim system alone could solve. And after the mind of the neophyte had been so far moulded he would suggest that the Christians had misinterpreted the doctrine of the Paraclete, and that the Isma‘īlī Imām was the real Paraclete. Abdullah ibn Maimūn also formulated in precise terms the doctrine of takeyyā—outward conformity with an alien religious belief or practice. It had been in vogue among all the Manichaean sects, not excepting the Paulicians. It was re-introduced by Abdullah ibn Maimūn, partly to escape persecution, partly to facilitate the work of proselytism. Takeyyā is the natural defence of the weak and suffering against the strong. All people have not the fibre of a martyr; and the majority of them have to submit where they cannot oppose. The primitive Christians had to practise takeyyā. The Isma‘īlīs had special reasons for concealing their religious views in all countries within the sway of the Abbaside Caliphs, and this long-enforced habit became at last a second nature with them. From them the Shiāhs proper borrowed the practice of takeyyā.

\[1\text{ Dā‘i, one who invites.} \quad 2\text{ Mām, in fact, claimed to be the Paraclete.}\]
Before Persia and Turkey had entered upon terms of amity, a Shah was unable to perform the Hajj unless he conformed to the Sunni rites, and takeyyê in such cases was almost a necessity with the devout Shah wishing to visit the holy shrines. But takeyyê, “the natural offspring of persecution and fear,” has become so habitual with the Persians that they conform to it even in circumstances when there is no necessity. They practise it to avoid giving offence or wounding susceptibilities, just as the modern Protestant shows a certain deference to Roman rites in Catholic countries.

Hamadan, otherwise called Karmath, had broken away from his master and formed a sect of his own. Abdullah ibn Maimun had disavowed the use of force in his proselytism; Karmath advocated it as the cornerstone of his sect. Possibly, like Chyroseir, he was driven to it by the persecution of the orthodox. He raised an insurrection in al-Ahsa and al-Bahrain. The weakness of the Caliph’s troops gave him the victory. Collecting a large following he issued from al-Bahrain, and, like the Paulicians Chyroseir, marked his progress by slaughter and ruin. The Karmathites, from their fastnesses in al-Bahrain and al-Ahsa, waged for nearly a hundred years a sanguinary contest with the Pontiffs of Bagdad. They pillaged even Mecca, and carried away the sacred stone, the symbol of Abrahamic antiquity, like the Wahabís 900 years later. In this sacrilege they imitated the example of their congeners, the Paulicians, who had pillaged Ephesus, destroyed the sepulchre of St. John, and turned his cathedral into a stable for mules and horses. They were destroyed ultimately by the Caliph Mutazzid Billah.

After the destruction of the Karmathites, Isma’ilism was proscribed, its votaries were placed under the ban, and hunted like venom. Isma’ilism had to hide itself on all sides until Obaidullah al-Mahdi wrested Africa from the Abbasides.

The Fatimides of Egypt were grand supporters of learning and science. Yet in their desire to promote the diffusion of knowledge among their subjects, they did not ignore the political advantages of the propaganda established by Abdullah ibn Maimun, whose esoteric and Manichaean doctrines they partially adopted for their own purposes. They established
colleges, public libraries, and scientific institutes (Dār ul-hikmat), richly furnished with books, mathematical instruments, to which were attached numerous professors and attendants. Access to, and the use of, these literary treasures were free to all, and writing materials were afforded gratis. The Caliphs frequently held learned disputations, at which the professors at these academies appeared, divided according to the different faculties,—logicians, mathematicians, jurists, and physicians, dressed in their Khala’, or doctoral mantles. The gowns of the English universities still retain the original form of the Arabic Khala’ or Kafian.

Two hundred and fifty-seven thousand ducats, raised by a carefully regulated taxation, was the amount of the annual revenue of the institutes, for the salaries of the professors and officials, for the provision of the requisites for teaching, and other objects of public scientific instruction. In these institutes they taught every branch of human knowledge. To the central Dār ul-hikmat was attached a grand Lodge, where the candidates for initiation into the esoteric doctrines of Isma’ilism were instructed in the articles of the faith. Twice a week, every Monday and Wednesday, the Dār ad-du’āt, the Grand Prior of the Lodge, convened meetings, which were frequented by both men and women, dressed in white, occupying separate seats. These assemblages were named Majālis ul-hikmat, or Conferences of Wisdom. Before the initiation the Dār ad-du’āt waited on the Caliph, who was the Grand Master, and read to him the discourse he proposed to deliver to the neophytes, and received his sign-manual on the cover of the manuscript. After the lecture the pupils kissed the hands of the Grand Prior, and touched the signature of the Master reverently with their foreheads. Makrizi’s account of the different degrees of initiation adopted in this Lodge forms an invaluable record of freemasonry. In fact, the Lodge at Cairo became the model of all the Lodges created afterwards in Christendom. Abdullah ibn Mamün had established seven degrees of initiation. Seven was the sacred number; there were seven planets, seven days in the week, and seven Imāms. At Cairo, where Egyptian hierophantism met the old mystic

1 Makrizi, Christomathie Arabe (De Sacy), vol. 1 p. 158
2 Makkari, S.I.
ceremonies became superimposed on the Manichæan foundation, the number was increased to nine. The first degree was the most difficult of all, and required the longest time to mould the mind of the neophyte, and incline him to take that most solemn oath by which he bound himself to the secret doctrine with blind faith and unconditional obedience. After this the process was simple enough; the acolyte was led gradually to recognise all the doctrines, and to become the instrument of insatiable ambition.

The Grand Lodges of Mahdièh and afterwards of Cairo became thus the centres of a vast and far-reaching political propaganda. But the knowledge of the doctrines upon which they worked was confined to a few. Like the mysteries of

1 A very good description of the different stages of initiation is given by De Sacy in the Journal Asiatique, vol. iv p. 298. In order to induce the neophyte to take the oath of the first degree, his mind was perplexed by the Da'ir with doubts. The contradictions of positive religion and reason were dwelt upon, but it was pointed out that behind the apparent literal signification there lay a deeper meaning, which was the kernel, as the words were mere husks. The curiosity of the novice was, however, not satisfied until he had taken an unrestricted oath, on this he was admitted to the second degree. Thisculminated the recognition of divinely-appointed Imâms, who were the source of all knowledge. As soon as the faith in them was well established, the third degree taught their number, which could not exceed the holy seven; for, as God had created seven heavens, seven earths, seven seas, seven planets, seven colours, seven musical sounds, and seven metals, so had He appointed seven of the most excellent of His creatures, as revealed Imâms. These were Ali, Hasan, Husan, Ali II (Zam-ul-Abî), Mohammed al-Bâkir, Ja'far as-Sâdîk, and Isma'il his son, as the last and seventh. In the fourth degree they taught that since the beginning of the world there have been seven speaking apostles (قُسَم) embodiments of the Logos, each of whom had always, by the command of Heaven, altered the doctrine of the predecessor; each of these had seven coadjutors, who succeeded each other in the epoch from one Nâtik to another, but who, as they did not manifest themselves, were called Sâmit (صامت) or Silent. The seven Nâtiks were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, and Isma'il (the son of Ja'far as-Sâdîk) or Imâm-i-zamân (Lord or Imám of all times). Their seven colleagues were Seth, Shem, Ishmael son of Abraham, Aaron, Simeon, Ah, and Mohammed son of Isma'il. The object of having a Sâmit attached to a Nâtik was to allow a free hand to the teachers and emissaries to put forward any one they liked as the Sâmit apostle of the time. The fifth degree inculcated that each of the seven Sâmits had twelve Nâkîhs or delegates for the extension of the true faith, for the number twelve is the most excellent after seven, hence the twelve signs of the Zodiac, the twelve months, the twelve tribes of Israel, etc. In the sixth degree, the principles of Manichæan philosophy were instilled into the heart of the neophyte, and only when he was fully impressed with the wisdom of those doctrines was he admitted to the seventh, where he passed from philosophy to mysticism. He then became one of the knoovers (drîfîn). In the eighth he shook off the trammels of positive religion. The "veil" was lifted, and henceforth "everything was pure to the pure." The tendency of these doctrines can be better imagined than described.
Eleusis, or the secret principles of the Templars, the Illuminati, and the Revolutionists of France, they were imparted only to the adepts—in whole or in part; wholly to those alone who were intended to be used for the purpose of undermining the power of their enemies. For the masses and the uninitiated, the State-religion was Islam, and its moral precepts and religious observances were enforced in all its austerity. Most of the Caliphs, especially al-Muizz, were in their lives and practice strict religious and observers of the duties enjoined by the moral law. The doctors of law and the officers of State were pious Moslems. Nevertheless the fact of the existence of a secret body working on mysterious lines loosened the bonds of society. The organisation of secret emissaries weakened the control of the Abbasides without permanently strengthening the hold of the Fatimides or extending their temporal power.

The Fatimides of Egypt have been called the Western Isma'iliyas, in contradistinction to the followers of Hasan ibn Mohammed Sabbâh Himyar, commonly known as Hasan Sabbâh, infamous in the history of the West as the founder of the order of the Assassins, but known to his followers as "Syedna," "our lord." His disciples are sometimes designated

1 Mohsin Fāmī says --

Hākim bi-amr-illāh, the sixth Fatimide Caliph of Cairo, who is regarded even at the present day by the Druses (a branch of the Isma'iliyas) as an incarnation of the Divinity, has been represented as "a monster of iniquity." His was a strangely contradictory character, and, as Makiżī rightly thinks, his mind was probably affected. He was, at times, atrociously cruel, at other times, a wise and humane sovereign. He abolished all distinction of race and creed in his dominions, he introduced the system of lighting up the streets of Cairo for the protection of wayfarers, he organised a system of police, he repressed violence. For an account of Hākim bi-amr-illāh, see Short History of the Saracens, p. 602. It may be noticed, as a remarkable coincidence, that Ivan the Terrible, who has been termed just such another monster, was regarded by the average Russian of his day as a monarch of singular force of character and ability. The fact is that the cruelties practised by Galeazzo Maria Sforza, by the Norman chief of Sicily who was in the habit of disembowelling his victims, by the Popes Paul and Alexander VI, by the Kings of England, Richard and John, and others, show only too clearly how little difference creed or country is apt to make in the misdeeds of irresponsible power joined to an innately cruel nature.

2 Sylvestre de Sacy derives the name from the word hashish (the Indian bhang) with which Hasan Sabbâh's followers drugged themselves, and this derivation is now generally accepted. See Professor Browne's Literary Hist. of Persia, vol. ii, pp. 204-5. Mohsin Fāmī describes this man's life and
as the Eastern Isma'iliyas or Alamútias, or the Maláhida of Kuhistán ("the impious atheists" of Kuhistán).

Hasan was the son of a learned Shi'ah doctor, an Arab by descent, as his name betokens, residing in the city of Khoi in Persia. He had been carefully trained in all the learning of his time. It is said that at one time he was a fellow-student of Nizám ul-Mulk (afterwards the renowned minister of Alp Arslán and of Malik Shah, the two great Seljukian sovereigns of the East) and of the famous mystical poet Omar Khayyám. But the story appears now to be discredited.¹ Baulked in his ambition at the court of Malik Shah, he proceeded to the pontifical court at Cairo, and was there initiated into the mysteries of the Cairene Lodge. Persia at that time was in the most rigid bonds of Sunni orthodoxy, the Seljukian Sultans having always been among the most devoted upholders of the straitest traditions of Asha'rism. Hasan returned from Egypt to Asia, and partly by force and partly by fraud possessed himself of an almost impregnable fortress called in the archaic Persian or Pahlavi Alamút, or the Eagles' Nest,² seated on one of the most inaccessible mountain fastnesses of Upper Persia,³ and during the thirty-five years that he held the dominion of that place, he organised from there a system of terror throughout Asia and Africa⁴ and Eastern Europe, fighting the sword with the dagger, and avenging persecution with assassination. He himself was a strict observer of all the precepts of religion, and would not allow drunkenness or dancing or music within the circuit of his rule. His esotericism appears to have been different from that of the doctrines according to the Isma'iliyas themselves, "as hitherto his life had been written with the pen of prejudice."

چون احوال او در تواریخ بالا قلم نقصب کارش یافته لا جرم
بر تعییر آن چنانچه نزن اسماعیلیه اسمت مبادرت می نماید

¹ Professor E. T. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. ii pp. 190-193
² Vassát.
³ قلعة الوعود يعني آن استاده عقاسیت
⁴ Near Kâz̄w̄in
⁵ Was it says...

و از فلک رهنهک و بهبک رهنهک ملاذده این راهان اور میان

⁶ مسلمانان مرفوع شد
Western Isma'ilias, and is explained in detail by Shahristāni and Moshin Fāni, both of whom speak of him with some awe, which induces the conviction that they were not quite unapprehensive of the dagger of his fidāis. Leaving the mystical portion of his doctrines aside, it may be said that he admitted only four degrees of initiation. Those who had obtained the first three degrees were named respectively Fidāi, Rafīk, and Dā'i,—fellows, companions, and knights,—to use the terms of a system to which Hasan’s institution bears the closest resemblance, viz. that of the Templars. Hasan was the first Grand Master of this institution, though he always paid a formal homage to the Egyptian Caliphs. The fourth Grand Master, Hasan bin Mohammed, of the Alamūtia Lodge, who, in order to further his ends, did not hesitate to claim descent from the Caliph Mustansir bi'llāh of Cairo through his son Nizār, abolished all the ordinances of religion. The Resurrection had arrived; the revelation of the Imām had taken place in his person, and the Kingdom of Heaven was ushered in with freedom and licence from the ordinary trammels of the moral law. This

1 That their apprehensions were not unjustified will be apparent from the following anecdote concerning Imām Fakhr ud din Rāzī. This learned Imām used to lecture on jurisprudence in his native city of Rāz (Rhages). Once he had occasion to denounce the Isma’ilias from his professional chair. The news of this audacious conduct was carried to the Eagles’ Nest, and a Fidāi was promptly deputed to bring the careless professor to reason. The Fidāi on his arrival at Rāz entered himself as a student in the Imām’s college. For seven months he waited for an opportunity to carry his design into effect. At last one day he found the Imām alone in his chamber; he locked the door, and throwing the Imām on the ground pointed the dagger at his throat: “Why kill me?” asked the frightened professor. “Because you have cursed the Isma’ilias,” answered the Fidāi. The Imām offered to bind himself solemnly never again to disparage the brotherhood. The Fidāi refused to accept the Imām’s word unless he agreed to receive a pension from the Grand Master, thus binding himself by the debt of ‘bread and salt’.

2 Hasan died in 508 A.H. Wassāf, following Juvaini, the vizier of Hūlāku and the author of the Jahān Kuchā, gives an extremely bitter but not unjust account of these Isma’ilias.

جِنَّ إِعْمَامٍ فَوْسَمٍ دَرَأُمِّدَ وَ جِنَّ مُرْجِعٍ شُوْمَ بِرَ دَرْخَت

رَقُومَ نَسَمَتْ وَ ازْتَحْمَيْدَيُ فِرَا خُورٍ ضَرَّعَ مَذْمُومٍ فَانْهُ شَدَّدَهُ مَزْدَا

دَنُّ كَ الْإِعْمَامٍ بُلْحَتَ مَفَاقَةٍ هُدَايَتُ كَشَدَدَهُ عَسْتَ وَ قَيَامَتُ

مُرْجِعٌ مَذْمُومٍ شَدَّهُ بِقَبْسِ عَلْيَ مَذْمُومٍ عَلْيَ حَسَنِ اْسْمُ مَعَمَدٌ
mad revolutionist is known in the history of the Alamūtías as 'ala-Zikrīḥi-as-Salām, “may his name be blessed”—corrupted into Zikr-as-Salām. From this time, until the destruction of Alamūt, the disciples of the two Hasans maintained a remorseless fight with civil society, in which no quarter was shown on either side. They were, in fact, the Nihilists of Islām. Under their stilettoes fell both Christians and Moslems. They were attacked by Hulāku, and after the destruction of their fortresses in the mountains, they were hunted and killed like vermin.¹

From the Isma’īlīs the Crusaders borrowed the conception which led to the formation of all the secret societies, religious and secular, of Europe. The institutions of Templars and Hospitallers; the Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola, composed of a body of men whose spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to their cause can hardly be surpassed in our times, the ferocious Dominicans, the milder Franciscans,—may all be traced either to Cairo or to Alamūt. The Knights Templars especially, with their system of grand masters, grand priors and religious devotees, and their degrees of initiation, bear the strongest analogy to the Eastern Isma’īlīs. Small sections of the Western Isma’īlīs are still to be found in Yemen, in Egypt, and Barbary, where they cannot be distinguished from the general body of Moslems. On the western coast of India there exists, however, a large community called Khojahs, who are the direct representatives of the original Eastern

¹ For a full account of the Alamūtías and their crimes against humanity, see Von Hammer’s History of the Assassins, translated into English by Wood. Even the Christian sovereigns frequently availed themselves of the services of the Alamūtía assassins to get rid of their enemies. Richard of England had Conrad of Montferrat assassinated by a Fidār of Alamūt, and one of the Popes employed another, though unsuccessfully, to remove Frederick Barba-rossa. After the destruction of Alamūt, Kudbār, and the other castles of the Assassins, the Alamūtías were massacred without compunction by the Tartars.
Isma'iliás. Hindus by origin, they were converted to Isma'ilism, in the eleventh or twelfth century of the Christian era, by one Pir Sadr ud-din, an Isma'ili Dā'ī. His teachings fitted in with their own religious conceptions, for part of the old cult was incorporated with the Isma'ili doctrines.  

The Kaisântas and Hāshmaís, both of them exclusively political in their character, but tinted by Manichæism, are now completely extinct, and hardly require any mention.

The Ghâllîas or the Ghulât (Extravagantists), supposed by Ibn Khaldûn and Shahrastâni to be a sect of the Shiabs, are, in reality, the descendants of the old Gnostics, whose Islam consisted merely in the substitution of Mohammed or Ali, chiefly the latter, for Christ. They are, in fact, the Docetâs of Islam. The Nusairîs, who believe in the divinity of Ah, the Ishâkiyas, the Numânîas, the Khatâbiyas, and others, anthropomorphists, believers in incarnations and metempsychosis, represent the notions which were prevalent among the Marcionites, the Valentinians, and the other docetic Christians. Some of these have replaced the Christian triad by a pentad. These believe that Mohammed, Ah, Fâtimâ, Hasan, and Husain jointly represent the Divinity. A form of Docetism is in vogue also in Sunnism. In the mountains of Kurd-stân a Sunni Saint occupies almost a similar place in the popular faith to Jesus among the Gnostics.

The Roushenias, as their name implies, were the exact counterparts of the Illuminati of Christendom. This sect had its origin in Afghânistân in that dark, turbulent, and sanguinary period which preceded the accession of Akbar to the throne of India. Their founder, Bâyezîd, by birth an Afghan, but of Arab extraction, appears to have been a man of great natural abilities and extreme subtlety of genius. In his early youth he acquired a taint of Manichæism from the Isma'iliás.

1 Numbers of Isma'iliás are also to be found in the mountains of Gilgit and Hunza.

2 Sheikh Abdul Kâdir Ghulâm. There are Sunnis who pay an extravagant veneration, verging on adoration, to this Saint. He has received the title among them of Ghaus-i-dzam, Māhâbîr Subhâni, Kubrâ Kâbir. The great Saint, the beloved of God, the Pole-star of holiness' (see the Guldastas-Kerâmât). Sheikh Abdul Kâdir was a mystic, and a Fâtümû by descent. He takes a high position in the hierarchy of the mystics and the dervishes, see chapter xi.

3 Afterwards called Miân Roushan Bâyezîd.
who still flourished in considerable numbers in some of the
mountainous districts of Khorâsân. The doctrines which he
first propagated seem not to have differed essentially from those
of the Sûfîs; but as he proceeded he diverged wider and
wider from the pale of dogmatic Islâm. As his sect increased
in numbers and power, it assumed a political as well as a
religious aspect, and soon made such formidable progress
that, at last, it embraced nearly the whole of Afghânistân.

The doctrines taught by Bâyezîd, when examined critically,
show a superstructure of mysticism and pantheism upon a basis
of Isma’â’îsm. The observant reader, however, will not fail to
perceive a strange and fantastic analogy between his teachings
and the practices and theories of the brotherhood of Fakîrs.
He taught that God is all-pervading, and that all existing
objects are only forms of the Deity; that the Fârs or religious
teachers were the great manifestations of the Divinity; that
the sole test of right and wrong was to follow the path pointed
out by the Fîr, who is the representative of the Divinity; that
the ordinances of the law have therefore a mystical meaning,
and are ordained only as the means of acquiring religious perfe-
tion, and that the mystic sense of the law is only attainable by
religious exercises and through the instructions of a Fîr; it
is the source of religious perfection, and this perfection being
attained, the exterior ordinances of the law cease to be binding,
and are virtually annulled.

The Bâ’tîms, the Isma’â’îhas, and all the cognate sects differ
from the general body of Moslems in making faith the keystone
of their doctrines. In this they closely approach most of the
Reformed Churches of Christendom. They “believe,” like
Luther, in “justification by faith.” Luther has strenuously
inculcated that “faith in Christ” would save all sinners. The
Bâ’tîms and the Isma’â’îhas with their offshoots made “faith”
or “imân,” which included a firm reliance on the divine Imâm,
an essential factor in their creed. So long as an individual was
blessed with imân, his outward acts were immaterial.

We now come to the Shiah’s proper, the followers of the Imâms
of the house of Mohammed, generally known as the Isnâ-
‘Ashârias (the Duo decemians), so named because they accept
the leadership of twelve Imâms. The Isnâ’-‘Ashârias hold
that the Īmāmate descended by express appointment in the following order:—

1. Ali, the Caliph, usually styled Murtaza Asad-ullah al-
Ghālib, the Chosen, the Lion of God, the Victorious (d. A.H. 40,
A.C. 661).


3. Husain, Shaḥīd-i-Kerbela, the Martyr of Kerbela (A.H. 60,
A.C. 679).

4. Ali II., surnamed for his piety Zain ul-Ābādīn, the Orna-
ment of the Pious (died A.H. 94, A.C. 713)

5. Mohammed al-Bākir, the Explainer of Mysteries, or the
Profound, a man of great learning and ascetic austerity (born
A.H. 57, A.C. 676; died A.H. 113, A.C. 731).

6. Jaʿfar as-Sādik, the True, was the eldest son of Mohammed
al-Bākir. Jaʿfar was born in Medīna, in the year of the Hegira
A.H. 80 (A.C. 699). As a scholar, a littérateur, and a juris-
consult, his reputation stands high among all sects of Moslems.
His learning and his virtues, the transcendental purity and
truth of his character, won him the veneration even of the
enemies of his family. He died at an advanced age in his native
town, in the reign of Abū Jaʿfar al-Mansūr, the second
Abbaside Caliph, in the year of the Hegira 148 (A.C. 765).

7. Abūl Hasan Mūsa al-Kāzīm, the son of Jaʿfar as-Sādik,
was also surnamed al-Abd us-Sālekh, the Holy Servant, on account
of his piety and "his efforts to please God." He was born at
Medīna in the year 129 A.H. (A.C. 746-747). He died at Bagdad
on the 25th of Rajab 183 (1st September, 799 A.C.) in a prison
where he was confined for a number of years by Hārūn, who
was extremely jealous of the veneration in which the Imām was
held in Hijāz. De Sacy says Mūsa was put to death secretly in
his confinement by order of Hārūn. His sufferings and his pure
and exalted character endeared him greatly to all classes of
people, and gained for him the title of Kāzīm, "the Patient."

8. Ali III., Abūl Hasan Ali, surnamed ar-Rīza, the Accept-
able, for the purity of his character. He was a scholar, a poet,
and a philosopher of the first rank. He was born in Medīna in
the year 153 A.H. (A.C. 770), and died at Tūs in Khorāsān in
A.H. 202 (A.C. 817). He married a sister of Māmūn, named
Umm ul-Fazl.
9. Abû Jafar Mohammed, surnamed al-Jawwâd for his munificence and generosity, and Taki for his piety. He was a nephew of Mâmûn, and was also married to his daughter, named Umm ul-Habib. He was held in the highest estimation by that Caliph and his successor Mu’tasim (born A.H. 195, A.C. 811; and died in A.H. 220, A.C. 835).

10. Ali IV, surnamed Naki, the Pure, died A.H. 260, A.C. 878.

11. Abû Mohammed al-Hasan ibn Ali al-‘Askari, surnamed al-Hâdi, the Director, and called ‘Askarî from his long residence under the surveillance of Mutawakkil at Surran-man-Râ, which also went by the name of al-‘Askar, “their Encampment.” He was a man of eminent piety and great nobility of character, a distinguished poet and littérature. He was born at Medina A.H. 231 (A.C. 845-6), and died at al-‘Askar in A.H. 260 (A.C. 874). He is said to have been poisoned by Mutawakkil.

12. Mohammed al-Mahdi (A.H. 265, A.C. 878-9). This last Imam disappeared, according to the Shâhid belief, in a grotto at Surran-man-Râ in the fifth year of his age. He is believed to be still alive, and they look forward with earnest anticipation to his reappearance to re-establish the universal Caliphate, and to restore the purity of the human race. He is styled the Imam Ghâib (the absent Imam), the Muntazar, “the Expected,” and the Kâim, “the Living.”

The Isnâ-‘Asharâs, now called Shuâhs or Imamias par excellence, are divided into two subsects—Usûlis and Akhbâris (i.e. the followers of principles and the followers of traditions). There is no difference between them on the question of the Imamate or its descent to the last Imam. But they differ on the amount of authority to be attached to the exposition of the Mu’tahâds, who call themselves the representatives of the Imam. The Usûlı repudiates entirely the authority of the expounders of the law to fetter its judgment. He contends that the law is clear, and that it is his duty to construe it for himself with the light of reason and progress of human thought, and not to be

---

1 A place several days’ journey to the north-west of Bagdad
2 For an account of this pathetic incident, see ante, p. 123, and Short History of the Saracens (Macmillan), p 295
3 Compare especially the belief of the Christadelphians, according to whom Christ will reappear to bring about an earthly kingdom
THE POLITICAL DIVISIONS AND SCHISMS

guided in his judgment by the dictates of men as fallible as himself, and interested in maintaining the world in ignorance. He holds that God's revelations had not the object of hiding the Divine meaning in words difficult to apprehend. They were addressed through his Prophet to humanity to apprehend and to obey. Thus God's teachings delivered through His Messenger do not require the interpretation of priest or lawyer. The Akhbâri, on the other hand, obeys slavishly the expositions of the Mujtahids.

According to the Usûl doctrines, the oral precepts of the Prophet are in their nature supplementary to the Koranic ordinances, and their binding effect depends on the degree of harmony existing between them and the teachings of the Koran. Thus, those traditions which seem to be in conflict with the spirit of the Koranic precepts are considered apocryphal. The process of elimination is conducted upon recognized principles, founded upon logical rules and definite data. These rules have acquired a distinctive type among the Mu'tazilas, who have eliminated from the Hadîs Kudsi (the holy traditions) such alleged sayings of the Prophet as appeared incompatible and out of harmony with his developed teachings as explained and illustrated by the philosophers and jurists of his family.

The Usûlis divide the traditions under four heads, viz.:—
(a) Sahîh, "authentic"; (b) Hasan, "good"; (c) Mûsak, "strong"; and (d) Za'if, "weak." A hadîs sahîh, or an authentic tradition, is one the authority of which can be conclusively traced to the Jamma-i-Ma'sûm (the nine Imâms), according to the narration of an Imâm 'âdil, "a just or trustworthy Imâm," about whose integrity there is a consensus among the "masters of traditions" (arbâh i-hadîs). The narration must be through a succession of such 'âdils. A hadîs-hasan, or a good tradition, is one the authority of which goes back, like that of the hadîs sahîh, to the Ma'sûm; but, according to the narrative of a venerable Imâm, in this way, that although, in regard to the narrator of it, the words sikah 'âdil, "trustworthy and just," have not been used by the historians, yet they have praised him in other words. A hadîs-mûsak, or a strong tradition, is one handed down by people who are acknowledged to be sikah and 'âdil, "virtuous and just," by the
historians, though some or all of the narrators might not be Imámias, "followers of Ali." A hadís-za'if, or a weak tradition, is one which complies with neither of these conditions. It is only the first three kinds of hadís that are accepted or relied upon by the Usúlis.

Again, a tradition before it can be accepted must have been handed down in regular succession. A tradition is in regular succession when a large number of people in the regular course of time make the same narration until it is traced to the Ma'súm, subject to the condition that the number of narrators, in each particular age, is so great as to exclude the idea of their having combined in telling a falsehood. A tradition is without a regular succession, when the number of narrators does not, in all or several stages, reach to such a body of witnesses; and this kind of tradition is called, "in the peculiar idiom of the masters of traditions, the information of one."

The Usúli exercises his own judgment in the construction of the law, and the reception, application, and interpretation of the traditions. He does not consider himself bound to follow the exposition of a Mujtahid, if his judgment and conscience tell him that that exposition is against the revealed or natural law, or justice, or reason. They protest against the immoderate number of traditions accepted by the Akhábāris without any criticism, or any application of the rules of exegesis. The Usúlis represent the Broad Church, if not of Islám, at least of Shiaism.

According to the Dabistán, the Akhábāris derive their title from the fact that they rely entirely upon akhábár, or traditions, and repudiate ijtihdád (the exercise of private judgment), as they consider it contrary to the practice of the Imámás. They accept as authentic whatever tradition happens to be current, if only it is labelled with the name of an Imám or of the Prophet. It is enough that it is called a hadís; it becomes ipso facto authentic in their eyes,¹ and further inquiry is not required to test the source from which it emanates. It need not be said that under colour of this easy principle a vast number of traditions and maxims have become incorporated with the Islámic

¹ Adilla-f Kauf, conclusive evidence, which admits of no questioning, and requires no exercise of judgment.
teachings, which have little in common with them. The ancient faith had never completely died out of the hearts of the masses, and it was impossible that with the growth of a national Church many of the old thoughts should not find expression in new and more approved garbs. Gobineau has, somewhat harshly, but not quite without reason, charged ultra-Akhbārisim with having converted the great hero of Islām into an Ormuzd, and his descendants into Amshaspands.

Akhbārisim is the favourite creed of the uneducated, who require a leading string for their guidance, or of the half-educated Mullas. Usūlisim finds acceptance among the most intellectual classes of the people and the most learned of the clergy. One of the most notable advocates of the Usūli doctrines within recent times was Mulla Sadra (Mohammed bin Ibrāhim), a native of Shurāz, and probably the ablest scholar and dialectician of his time. He was the reviver of philosophy and humanitarian science among the Persians. From the fall of the Buwahis to the rise of the Safawis, Irān had remained under a cloud. Patristic orthodoxy had proscribed philosophy and science, the very name of Avicenna had become hateful, and his works were publicly burnt. During these centuries many Mazdeistic traditions dressed in Islāmic garb naturally had found acceptance among the uneducated classes. The true Fātimid scholars had retired into seclusion, and a body of ecclesiastics strongly imbued with national predilections and prejudices had sprung up to maintain the people in ignorance. Mulla Sadra had thus to contend against a clergy as tenacious of their rights as those of Christendom, and as ready to take offence at the slightest approach to an attack on their preserve of orthodoxy. But Mulla Sadra was gifted with great perseverance and tact, and succeeded after considerable difficulty in reviving the study of philosophy and science. Usūlisim came to the front once more. Its philosophical counterpart, Mu'tazilism, is unquestionably the most rationalistic and liberal phase of Islām. In its liberalism, in its sympathy with all phases of human thought, its grand hopefulness and expansiveness, it represents the ideas of the philosophers of the House of Mohammed who reflected the thoughts of the Master.

1 Mulla Sadra flourished in the reign of Shah Abbās II.
The political factions which have hitherto kept the Shiáhs divided among themselves are disappearing, and the rest of the sects are fast merging into the Isná-‘Asharias. The Shiáhs of Persia, Arabia, West Africa, and India belong for the most part to this sect *Isná-‘Ashariaism* has thus become synonymous with Shahism.

Like the Akhbarís, the Sunnis base their doctrines on the entirety of the traditions. But they differ from them in accepting such only of the traditions as can stand the test of certain rules of criticism peculiar to their school. In this they approach the Usúlis. They regard the concordant decisions of the successive Caliphs and of the general assemblies (Ijmá‘-ul-Ummati) as supplementing the Koranic rules and regulations, and as almost equal in authority to them.

The Sunnis are divided into several sub-sects, each differing from the other on various points of dogma and doctrine. These minor sectarian differences have often given rise to great bitterness and persecutions. In the main, however, they are agreed on the fundamental bases of their doctrines and laws, deriving them from four unvarying sources, viz. — (1) The Koran, (2) The Hadis or Sunnat (traditions handed down from the Prophet), (3) The Ijmá‘-ul-Ummati (concordance among the followers), and (4) The Kiyáā (private judgment). The Hadis (pl. Hadís) embraces (a) all the words, counsels, and oral precepts of the Prophet (Kuál); (b) his actions, his works, and daily practice (Fá’il); (c) and his silence (Takrîr), implying a tacit approbation on his part of any individual act committed by his disciples. The rules deduced from these subsidiary sources vary considerably in respect of the degree of authority which is attached to them. If the rules, or traditional precepts, are of public and universal notoriety (*Ahádis-I-Mutawadírīch*), they are regarded as absolutely authentic and decisive. If the traditions, though known publicly by a great majority of people, do not possess the character of universal notoriety, they are designated *Ahádis-I-Mashhíra*, and stand next in rank to the *Ahádis-I-Mutawadírīch*, whilst the Akhbar-I-wáhid, which depend for their authenticity upon the authority of isolated individuals, have little or no value attached to them. Thus every tradition purporting to be handed down by the con-
temporaries and companions of the Prophet, regardless of their actual relationship to him, is considered to be authentic and genuine, provided certain arbitrary conditions framed with the view of testing the value of personal testimony are complied with. The expression *Ijmā'-al-ʿUmmat* implies general concordance. Under this collective name are included all the apostolic laws, the explanations, glosses, and decisions of the leading disciples of the Prophet, especially of the first four Caliphs (the *Khulafāʾ Râshîdîn*), on theological, civil, and criminal matters.

Since the eighth century of the Christian era, however, all these sources of law and doctrine have been relegated to the domain of oblivion. And each sect has followed blindly its own doctors in the interpretation of the law and the exposition of doctrines. This is called *Tâkhlîl*. No man is considered “orthodox” unless he conforms to the doctrines of one or the other of the principal doctors.

The four most important persuasions or sects¹ among the Sunnis are designated Hanafî, Shâfeʿî, Mâhki, and Hanbali, after their respective founders.

Abû Hanîfa,² who gave his name to the first school, was born in the year 80 of the Hegira, during the reign of Abdul Malik ibn Merwân. He was educated in the Shiah school of law, and received his first instructions in jurisprudence from Imâm Jaʿfar as-Sâdîk, and heard traditions from Abû Abdullâh ibn al-Mubarak and Hâmid ibn Sulamân. Abû Hanîfa often quotes the great Shiah Imâm as his authority. On his return to his native city of Kûfa, though he continued to remain a zealous and consistent partisan of the house of Ah, he seceded from the Shiah school of law and founded a system of his own, diverging completely in many important points from the doctrines of the Shiahs; and yet, so close is the resemblance between his exposition of the law and their views, that there is no reason for doubt as to the source from which he derived his original inspiration. The latitude which he allows to private judgment in the interpretation of the law seems to be unquestionably a reflex of the opinions of the Fâtimide doctors.

¹ Called the *Mazâhir arbaʿa*.

² Abû Hanîfa al-Noʿman ibn Thâbit (A.C. 699-769).
is called by his followers the *Imâm-ul-Na'zam* (the great Imâm). He died in the year A.H. 150. The doctrines taught by him are in force among the major portion of the Indian Musulmans, among the Afghans, Turkomans, almost all Central Asian Moslems, the Turks, and the Egyptians. His school owns by far the largest number of followers.

The founder of the second school was (Abû Abdullah) Mâlik ibn Anas, who died in the year A.H. 179, in the Caliphate of Hârûn ar-Rashîd. Shâfe‘î was the originator of the third school. He was born at Ghazza in Syria, in the same year in which Abû Hanîfa died. He died in Egypt in the year A.H. 204 (A.C. 819), during the Caliphate of Mâmûn. He was a contemporary of the Fâtimide Imâm Ali ibn Mûsa ar-Rîzâ. Shâfe‘î’s doctrines are generally followed in Northern Africa, partially in Egypt, in Southern Arabia, and the Malayan Peninsula, and among the Musulmans of Ceylon. His followers are also to be found among the Borahs 1 of the Bombay Presidency. The fourth school was originated by Ibn-Hanbal. He flourished during the reigns of Mâmûn and his successor Mu'tasim b'illâh. These two Caliphs were Mu'tazilas. Ibn-Hanbal's extreme fanaticism, and the persistency with which he tried to inflame the bigotry of the masses against the sovereigns, brought him into trouble with the rulers. He died in the odour of great sanctity in the year A.H. 241. Ibn-Hanbal and his patristicism are responsible for the ill-success of Mâmûn in introducing the Mu'tazila doctrines throughout the empire, and for the frequent outbursts of persecution which deluged the Mohammedan world with the blood of Moslems.

I have in another place 2 described the legal differences of the various Sunni schools; their doctrinal divergences run into the minutiae of the ceremonials of worship, unnecessary to detail in a work intended for the general student. It may be said, however, that the Hanbalites were the most pronounced anthropomorphists. To them God was a being in the similitude of man enthroned in heaven. Among the other sects the conceptions varied considerably according
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1 These Borahs are partly Shâfe‘îs and partly Isma'îlas of the Egyptian type.
2 "Mohammedan Law."
to the age and the people. Anthropomorphism was, however, the predominating element. There is no doubt that Hanafism was originally the most liberal of these sects, whilst Shâfe’ism and Mâlikism were both exclusive and harsh in their sympathies and ideas. With the advance of time, and as despotism fixed itself upon the habits and customs of the people, and the Caliph or sovereign became the arbiter of their fate without check or hindrance from jurisconsult or legist, patristicism took hold of the mind of all classes of society. The enunciations of the Fathers of the Church became law. The Hanafis, who styled themselves, and were styled by their brethren of the rival schools, ahl-ur-rai w'al kiyâs, "people of judgment and analogy," in contradistinction to the others, who were called ahl-ul-hadîs, traditionists par excellence, have long ceased to exercise their judgment in the domains of law or doctrine. What has been laid down by the Fathers is unchangeable, and beyond the range of discussion. The Faith may be carried to the land of the Esquimaux, but it must go with rules framed for the guidance of Irâkians.  

Patristicism has thus destroyed all hope of development in the Sunni fold. But its endeavours to ensure uniformity of faith and practice have led within the last hundred years to two notable revolts within the bosom of the Sunni Church. Wahâbîsm, which made its appearance at the beginning of the nineteenth century, derived its breath from the Desert. Ghair-mukallidism springs from the innermost recesses of the human heart, seeking an escape from the strait-laced pharisasm of the established Church. The Ghair-mukallid is a non-conformist, though he has been wrongly and unjustly confounded with the Wahâbis. He is undoubtedly more philosophical and rationalistic than the followers of the other denominations of Sunnism. Narrow, no doubt, admittedly limited and unsympathetic in its scope, Ghair-Mukallidism is nevertheless the one movement in the Sunni Church which contains great promise for the future.

The dispute which ushered in the Reformation in Europe has already commenced among the Hanafis, and is sure before long to make itself felt among all sects and schools of Moslems.
Does the translation of the Koran stand on the same footing as the Arabic Koran; are prayers offered in the vulgar tongue, in the tongue of the worshipper ignorant of Arabic, as meritorious as those offered in the language of Hijâz—such are the questions which are now agitating the Moslem world in India. The controversy has already caused much bitterness and given rise to a few anathemas on the side of the orthodox, and the reformers may well be congratulated that the movement which they have set on foot is conducted under a neutral Government. To the old plea, which vested interests have always urged against every innovation, the leaders of the reform answer by asking, Is Arabic the sole language which God understands? If not, what is the purpose of the prayer instituted by the Prophet? If it is to bring the worshipper nearer to God, and to purify and ennoble his heart, then how can he feel the elevating effect of prayer if he only mumbles what he cannot understand? From reason they appeal to the example of the Prophet, who allowed his Persian converts to offer their prayers in their own tongue. This movement, still unknown to Europeans, contains the germ of great development. It is the beginning of the Reformation. Hitherto the theologians of Islâm, like the Christian clergy in the Middle Ages, have exercised, through the knowledge of a language not known to the masses or the sovereigns, a dominating influence. Once the principle for which the reformers are working is accepted, the prescriptions framed in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Christian era, for people utterly apart from the culture and civilisation of the present day, will have to be understood and explained with the light of a thousand years.

Khawârijism has been often regarded as a branch of Sunnism, though in reality it came into existence long before the foundations of the Sunni Church were laid. The refractory troops, who had forced the Caliph Ali to abandon the fruits of the well-earned victory at Siffin, and who afterwards rose in arms against him at Nahrawân, were the first to receive the name of Khawârij (deserters or rebels). Shahristânî has given a very lucid account of this insurrection. These were the men who were most eager in referring to arbitration the dispute of the

1 See ante, p 186
arch-rebel Mu‘āwiyah with the Caliph. They had forced upon their chief, against his own judgment, Abū Mūsa as the representative of the House of Mohammed; but no sooner had the terms been settled than these soldier-theologians, these Covenanters of Islām, fell into a hot controversy amongst themselves about the sinfulness of submitting any cause to human judgment. In order to prevent the spectacle of Moslems slaughtering each other in the presence of the enemy, Ali retired to Kūfa with the greater part of his army, leaving a small detachment at Dumat ul-Jandal to await the result of the arbitration. The rebels to the number of twelve thousand deserted the Caliph at Kūfa, and, retiring to Nahrawān, took up a formidable position from which they threatened the Caliphate. With the repugnance to shed blood which was ever the distinguishing trait in Ali’s character, he besought them repeatedly to return to their allegiance. In reply they threatened him with death. Human patience could not bear this contumacy longer. They were attacked and defeated in two successive battles. A few of the rebels escaped, says Shahristāni, and betaking themselves to al-Bahraīn, that harbour of refuge for all the free lancees of Islām, spread their noxious doctrines among the wild inhabitants of that tract. They reappeared in the time of Abdul Malik, who drove them back into their fastnesses in al-Abīsa and al-Bahraīn. They issued again under Merwan II, and spread themselves in Yemen, Hijāz, and the Irāk. They were attacked and defeated, and forced to take refuge in Oman, where they have remained settled ever since. Under the Abbasides they spread their doctrines among the Berbers of Africa, whom they raised repeatedly against the Pontiffs of Bagdad. The Khawārij are the Calvinists of Islām. Their doctrines are gloomy and morose, hard and fanatical. They are strict predestinarians. They do not accept the Imāamate of any of the Caliphs after Omar, their own chiefs being, according to them, the lawful Imāms. They differ from the other Sunnis, in maintaining that it is not requisite for a person to be either a Koreishite or a free man for election as Imām of the Moslems. Slaves and non-Koreishites were eligible for the Imāmate equally with Koreishites and free men. According to Shahristāni, the Khawārij
are divided into six groups, the most important of whom are
the Azârika (the followers of Abû Râshid Nafè ibn Azrâk); the
Ibâdhiya (the followers of Abdullah ibn Ibâdî, who appeared
in the reign of Merwân II., the last of the Ommeyyades); the
Negidat Azâreen (the followers of Negidat ibn 'Amir); the
Azârûla (of Abdul Karîm bin 'Aprod); and the Sufârûz
Ziadia

Of these, the Azârika are the most fanatical, exclusive, and
narrow. According to them, every sect besides their own is
doomed to perdition, and ought to be forcibly converted or
ruthlessly destroyed. No mercy ought to be shown to any
infidel or Mushrik (an expansive term, including Moslems,
Christians, and Jews). To them every sin is of the same
degree. Murder, fornication, intoxication, smoking, all are
damning offences against religion. Whilst the other Moslems,
Shiâ as well as Sunnî, hold that every child is born into the
world in the faith of Islâm, and remains so until perverted by
education, the Azrâke declares that the child of an infidel is
an infidel. The orthodox Christian maintains that every child
who is not baptized is doomed to perdition; the Khâriji, like
the Christian, declares that every child who has not pronounced
the formula of the Faith is beyond the pale of salvation. The
Azârika were destroyed by Hajjâj ibn Yusuf; but their
sanguinary, fierce, and merciless doctrines found expression
nine centuries later in Wahâbsm.

The Ibâdhiya were decidedly less fanatical. They were, for
the most part, settled in Oman, and are still to be found in the
principalities of Muscat. The Azârika, and afterwards the
Wahâbis, were at deadly feud with the Ibâdhiyas.

According to them, the general body of Moslems are
beliebers, but not Mushrik (polytheists), and that consequently
they can intermarry with them. They differ from the Azârika
in this and in other respects. They accept the evidence of
Moslems against their people; hold that the taking of the goods
of the Moslems except in time of war, is unlawful, and " pro-
nounce no opinion," says Shahristâni, "on the infidelity of the
children of infidels"; but they agree with their brethren, the

كل مولود يولد على فطرة الإسلام!
Azārika, in denouncing and anathematising the chief companions of the Prophet (the Ashāb-ṣa-Kabār).

The Ibāḍīs have held Oman until now. Sore pressed by the Wahābis, they have succeeded in maintaining their power on the coast of Eastern Arabia, but they seem to be fast merging into the general body of Sunnis.

The Wahābis have been depicted in rather favourable colours by Mr. Palgrave, in his Travels in Central Arabia, but, in fact, they are the direct descendants of the Azārika, who, after their defeat by Hajjāj ibn Yusuf, had taken refuge in the recesses of Central Arabia. Abdul Wahāb’s doctrines bear the closest resemblance to those held so fiercely by the followers of Nāfe ibn al-Azrak. Like them, the Wahābis designate all other Moslems as unbelievers, and permit their despotism and enslavement. However commendable their revolt against the anthropopatrous usages in vogue among the modern Moslems, their views of religion and divine government, like those of the Ikhwān of the present day in Nejd, are intensely morose and Calvinistic, and in absolute conflict with progress and development.

Bābism, which made its appearance in Persia in the early part of the nineteenth century, has been represented in widely divergent colours. According to the Moslem authorities, it is nothing but a new form of Mazdakism, an Eastern socialist communism. Its mixed gatherings of men and women are regarded in the same light as the ancient Ἀγαθος of the primitive Christians were considered by the followers of the older faiths. On the other hand, a European scholar of great research and learning, who has studied the religious literature of the Bābis, and mixed familiarly with them, represents Bābism as the latest expression of an eclectic evolution growing out of the innate pantheism of the Iranian mind.

During the reign of Mohammed Shah, the hypocrisy and vices of the national clergy, says this writer, had reached such a pitch that a change was inevitable. The political and social condition of the people was deplorable. In this

1 Gobineau

2 The third Kajar King of Persia, who ascended the throne on the death of his grandfather, Fath Ali Shah.
state of affairs a young Mullah of Shirāz, Mirza Ali Mohammed, supposed to be a Fātimide by descent, who had studied much, had travelled a great deal and made the pilgrimage to the holy cities, and had for many years resided in Arabia and Syria, began to preach a social and moral reform. He denounced the hypocrisy of the ordinary mullahs, and their reception of the most doubtful traditions to justify practices condemned by Islām. His words struck a sympathetic chord in minds already prepared for the reception of his views, and evoked extraordinary enthusiasm. He obtained numerous disciples, among them a young lady of Kazwīn, whose learning and eloquence supplied a powerful support to his cause. She is venerated now as Kurrat-ul-āyn, “Light of the Eyes” Mirza Ali Mohammed, either carried away by the enthusiasm of his followers, or unhinged by his own exaltation, in a fit of pantheistical insanity, assumed the title of Bāb Hazrat-ādāla, and styled himself a part of the Divinity. His followers rose in arms against the constituted authorities and failed. The fanaticism of the clergy and political expediency gave rise to a persecution, for which even Gobineau thinks the Bābirs were primarily responsible. The Bāb was killed with most of his prominent disciples. But his teachings have survived. His social precepts are said by Gobineau to be much in advance of the received doctrines. He attached great importance to the marriage-relations, and during the continuance of the first marriage he allowed the taking of a second wife only under certain conditions. He absolutely interdicted concubinage, forbade divorce, and allowed the appearance of women in public. The custom of seclusion, as Gobineau justly observes, creates infinite disorders, and exercises a pernicious influence on the early education of children. The usage itself does not depend on any religious prescription, it is simply a convenience. The ancient kings of Persia observed it as a sign of grandeur, and the Moslem sovereigns and chiefs imitated their example, and adopted the custom. Among the Arabs the women of the tribes are perfectly free to move about as they wish. The ladies of the Prophet’s family conversed with the disciples, received their visits, and often shared in the repasts of the men. Mirza Ali Mohammed therefore, says
Gobineau made no innovation in endeavouring to free women from the bondage of a mischievous custom. His religious doctrines are essentially pantheistic, and his code of morals, far from being lax, is strict and rigid.¹

Some Moslem writers have divided the religious sects into two comprehensive groups, viz., the *Ahl-ul-bātin*, the *Intuitionists*, and the *Ahl-ul-zāhir*, those who look into the meaning of precepts, and those who look only to the literal sense. The *Ahl-ul-bātin*, however, must not be confounded with the *Bātinis*. The *Ahl-ul-bātin* include the mystical Sufis, the philosophical *mutakallimīn*, and the Idealists in general, "all those," to use the words of Zamakhshari’s comment, "who strive to implant in their hearts the roots of divine perfection," who strive and struggle to attain the highest standard of human excellence, and who, whilst conforming to the prescriptions of the law, perceive in them the divine intent to promote concord and harmony among the races of the earth, peace and goodwill among mankind.²

¹ The most recent account of this remarkable religious movement, from the Bābi point of view, is to be found in Professor E. G. Browne’s *New History of the Báb*, which purports to be a translation of a Bābi work called *Tārikh-i-fadīd*. Professor Browne’s Introduction is extremely interesting. From the *Tārikh* one can picture the fascinating personality of *Kurratul-Ayn*, see Appendix III. This great scholar has given to the world in his new work, called *Materials for the Study of the Báb Religion*, considerable additional information regarding its development and diffusion. Bahá’ism, its latest phase, which flourishes chiefly in the United States of America, appears to have largely assimilated the doctrines of Christian Science.

² See *post*, chap XI.
CHAPTER IX

THE LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT OF ISLÂM

We have already referred to the Arabian Prophet’s devotion to knowledge and science as distinguishing him from all other Teachers, and bringing him into the closest affinity with the modern world of thought. Medina, the seat of the theocratic commonwealth of Islâm, had, after the fall of Mecca, become the centre of attraction, not to the hosts of Arabia only, but also to inquirers from abroad. Here flocked the Persian, the Greek, the Syrian, the Irâkian, and African of diverse hues and nationalities from the north and the west. Some, no doubt, came from curiosity, but most came to seek knowledge and to listen to the words of the Prophet of Islâm. He preached of the value of knowledge. “Acquire knowledge, because he who acquires it in the way of the Lord performs an act of piety, who speaks of it, praises the Lord; who seeks it, adores God; who dispenses instruction in it, bestows alms; and who imparts it to its fitting objects, performs an act of devotion to God. Knowledge enables its possessor to distinguish what is forbidden from what is not; it lights the way to Heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when bereft of friends; it guides us to happiness; it sustains us in misery; it is our ornament in the company of friends, it serves as an armour

1 The translation of this Hadîs is given in the text. "Acquire knowledge, etc."
against our enemies. With knowledge, the servant of God rises to the heights of goodness and to a noble position, associates with sovereigns in this world, and attains to the perfection of happiness in the next.”

He would often say, “the ink of the scholar is more holy than the blood of the martyr”; and repeatedly impress on his disciples the necessity of seeking for knowledge “even unto China.” “He who leaves his home in search of knowledge, walks in the path of God.” “He who travels in search of knowledge, to him God shows the way to paradise.”

The Koran itself bears testimony to the supreme value of learning and science. Commenting on the Sūrat-ul-’alâk, Zamakhshari thus explains the meaning of the Koranic words: “God taught human beings that which they did not know, and this testified to the greatness of His beneficence, for He has given to His servants knowledge of that which they did not know. And He has brought them out of the darkness of ignorance to the light of knowledge, and made them aware of the inestimable blessings of the knowledge of writing, for great benefits accrue therefrom which God alone compasseth; and without the knowledge of writing no other knowledge (’ulâm) could be comprehended, nor the sciences placed within bounds, nor the history of the ancients be acquired and their sayings be recorded, nor the revealed books be written; and if that knowledge did not exist, the affairs of religion and the world, امور الدنيا والدأب, could not be regulated.”

Up to the time of the Islamic Dispensation, the Arab world, properly so called, restricted within the Peninsula of Arabia and some outlying tracts to the north-west and the north-east, had shown no signs of intellectual growth. Poetry, oratory, and judicial astrology formed the favourite objects of pursuit among the pre-Islamic Arabs. Science and literature possessed no votaries. But the words of the Prophet gave a new impulse to the awakened energies of the race. Even within

1 Tradition from the Bihâr-ul Anwâr of Mulla Bâkî ibn Mohammed Tâhib al-mujâhid, vol. 1 chap on Knowledge, handed down by the Imam Ja’far as-Sâîdî, also quoted from Mu’âz ibn Jabal in the Mustâraf, chap 1V, also in the Kashf us-Sunnât of Hâji Khalîfa, Fluegel’s ed. p. 44
2 Mssbâh ush-Shari‘at
3 Jami‘ ul-Akhâbûr
4 Koran, sura xcvii, see also other suras.
his lifetime was formed the nucleus of an educational institution; which in after years grew into universities at Bagdad and Salerno, at Cairo and Cordova. Here preached the Master himself on the cultivation of a holy spirit: "One hour's meditation on the work of the Creator [in a devout spirit] is better than seventy years of prayer." 1 "To listen to the instructions of science and learning for one hour is more meritorious than attending the funerals of a thousand martyrs,—more meritorious than standing up in prayer for a thousand nights;" "To the student who goes forth in quest of knowledge, God will allot a high place in the mansions of bliss; every step he takes is blessed, and every lesson he receives has its reward;" "The seeker of knowledge will be greeted in Heaven with a welcome from the angels;" "to listen to the words of the learned, and to instil into the heart the lessons of science, is better than religious exercises, . . . better than emancipating a hundred slaves;" "Him who favours learning and the learned, God will favour in the next world," "He who honours the learned honours me." Ali lectured on branches of learning most suited to the wants of the infant commonwealth. Among his recorded sayings are the following: "Emminence in science is the highest of honours;" "He dies not who gives life to learning;" "The greatest ornament of a man is erudition."

Naturally such sentiments on the part of the Master and the chief of the Disciples gave rise to a liberal policy, and animated all classes with a desire for learning. The art of Kûfic writing which had just been acquired by a disciple at Hira, furthered the primitive development of the Moslems. It was, however, pre-eminently an age of earnestness and faith, marked by the uprise of the soul against the domination of aimless, lifeless philosophy. The practice of religion, the conservation of a devotional spirit, and the special cultivation of those branches of learning which were of practical value in the battle of everyday life, were the primary objects of the Moslem's attention.

The age of speculation was soon to commence, its germs were contained in the positive precepts of the Master, and even whilst he was working, the scholarly Disciple was thinking. The Master had himself declared that whosoever desired to

1 Jâmi' ul-Akhbâr.
realise the spirit of his teachings must listen to the words of the Scholar. Who more able to grasp the meaning of the Master's words than Ali, the beloved friend, the trusted Disciple, the devoted cousin and son? The gentle, calm teachings instilled in early life into the young mind bore their fruit.

In spite of the upheaval of the Arab race under the early Caliphs, literature and arts were by no means neglected in the metropolis of primitive Islām. Ali and Ibn Abbās, his cousin, gave public lectures on poetry, grammar, history, and mathematics; others taught the art of recitation or elocution; whilst some gave lessons in caligraphy—in ancient times an invaluable branch of knowledge.

On Osmān's tragical death the Scholar was called by the voice of the people to the helm of the State. During his retirement Ali had devoted himself to the study of the Master's precepts by the light of reason. "But for his assassination," to quote the language of a French historian, "the Moslem world might have witnessed the realisation of the Prophet's teachings, in the actual amalgamation of Reason with Law, and in the impersonation of the first principles of true philosophy in positive action."

The same passionate devotion to knowledge and learning which distinguished Mohammed, breathed in every word of his Disciple. With a liberality of mind—far beyond that of the age in which he lived—was joined a sincere devoutness of spirit and earnestness of faith. His sermons, faithfully preserved by one of his descendants, and his litanies or psalms, portray a devout uplooking toward the Source of All Good, and an unbounded faith in humanity. The accession of the Ommeyyades to the rulership of Islām was a blow to the progress of knowledge and liberalism in the Moslem world. Their stormy reigns left the nation little leisure to devote to the gentler pursuits of science; and to this, among the sovereigns, was joined a characteristic idolatry of the past. Their thoughts were engrossed by war and politics. During the comparatively long rule of a century, the House of

ءيلة العلم علي ناها

"I am the city of learning, Ali is its gate."
Ommeyya produced only one man devoted to the cultivation of letters; and this man was Abū Hāshim Khālid ibn Yezīd, "the philosopher of the Merwānīan family," 1 as he has been called, who was set aside from the succession on account of his learning.

The jealous suspicion and the untiring animosity of the children of Abū Suffān and Hind had obliged the descendants of the Prophet to live a life of humble retirement. "In the night of misery and unhappiness" they followed truly and faithfully the precepts of their ancestor, and found consolation in intellectual pursuits. Their ardent love of knowledge, their passionate devotion to the cause of humanity,—their spirit looking upwards far above the literalness of common interpretations of the law,—show the spirituality and expansiveness of Islam. 2 The definition by the Imām Ja'far as-Sādik of sciences or knowledge gives some idea of their faith in the progress of man. "The enlightenment of the heart is its essence; Truth its principal object, Inspiration, its guide; Reason, its accepter; God, its inspirer; and the words of man its utterer." 3

Surrounded by men whom love, devotion, and sympathy with their patience had gathered around them, the early descendants of the Prophet were naturally more or less influenced by the varied ideas of their followers. Yet their philosophy never sinks to that war of words without life and without earnestness which characterised the schools of Athens or Alexandria under the Ptolemies.

But though literature and philosophy were at a discount among the rulers, the example of the Imāms naturally exercised no small influence on the intellectual activity of the Arabs and the subject races. Whilst the Ommeyyades discouraged the peaceful pursuits of the mind, the children of Fāṭima, with remarkable liberalism, favoured learning. They were not

1 Mākhzar-ʿulūm of Moulla Syed Kerāmat Ali. This learned scholar was nearly forty years curator of the Imambara at Houghly
2 See the Ḥadīs i Ḥilāl, from the Imam Ali bin-Mūsa ar-Raza, reported by Mufaral bin Omar Juh, Bihār ul Anwār
3 Tārīkh ul-Hukmā, by Jamāl ud din al-Kittī, founded upon another work bearing the same name, by Shihāb ud din Suhrwardī. Shihāb ud-dīn was a Platonist, an Ishārái an idealist, and was condemned and put to death by the orthodox synod in the reign of Saladin's son. Compare the first Khutba of the Nahj ul-Balāghat, and the traditions on knowledge in the Bihār ul-Anwār.
devoted to the past,—the salaf was not their guide. With the Master's precepts to light their path, they kept in view the development of humanity, and devoted themselves to the cultivation of science and learning in all its branches. Like the Master and the early Caliphs, the "Philosophers of the House of Mohammed" received with distinction the learned men whom the fanatical persecution of Justinian's successors drove for refuge into foreign lands. The academies of philosophy and medicine, founded by the Nestorians at Edessa and Nisibis, had been broken up; its professors and students were refugees in Persia and Arabia. Many betook themselves—as their predecessors had done before, in the time of the Prophet and the Caliph Abû Bakr—to Medina, which, after its sack by the Ommeyyades, had again gathered round Ja'far as-Sâdik a galaxy of talented scholars. The concourse of many and varied minds in the City of the Prophet gave an impetus to the cultivation of science and literature among the Moslems. From Medina a stream of unusual intellectual activity flowed towards Damascus. Situated on the northern confines of the Arabian Desert, along the trade-route from Mecca and Medina to Syria, Damascus had been associated from ancient times with the Ommeyyades; and the Syrian Arabs were closely allied by interest and kinship to the family whom they had assisted to elevate to the rulership of Islam. The Ommeyyades had naturally fixed upon this city as the seat of their empire; and though shunned with horror by the devout Moslems, it formed the gathering place for the representatives of the many races who had come under the sway of Islam. The controversies of Greek and Saracen furnished a strong incentive to the study of dialectics and Greek philosophy; and the invention of the diacritical and vowel points furthered the cultivation of grammar and philology. At this time flourished two Christian writers of note, who, fleeing before their orthodox persecutors, had taken shelter in Damascus. These were Johannes Damascenus and Theodorus Abucaera. Their polemical writings against the Moslems, their rationalistic and philosophical disputes with their own orthodox brethren, joined to the influence of the Medinite school, which flourished under

1 Mâkhzûr-‘Ulûm.
Mohammed al-Bākir and Ja'far as-Sādik, soon led to the growth of philosophical tendencies among the Saracens. For centuries Greek philosophy had been known to the Persians and the Arabs; the Nestorians had spread themselves in the dominions of the Chosroes since the beginning of Justinian’s reign, but it was not until all the varied elements had been fused into an organic whole by Islām that Greek science and culture exercised any real effect on the intellectual development of Western Asia. It was towards the close of the Ommeyyade rule that several Moslem thinkers came into prominence, whose lectures on subjects then uppermost in the minds of the people attracted great attention. And their ideas and conceptions materially moulded the thoughts of succeeding generations.

It was in the second century, however, that the literary and scientific activity of the Moslems commenced in earnest, and the chief impulse to this was given by the settlement of the Arabs in towns. Hitherto they had lived in camps isolated from the races they had subjugated. Osmān had laid a prohibition on their acquiring lands in the conquered countries, or contracting marriages with the subject nations. The object of this policy was apparent; it has its parallel in the history of all nations, ancient and modern. In British India and in French Algeria it is still in force. During the whole period of the Ommeyyade rule the Arabs had constituted the dominant element, the aristocratic military caste amongst their subjects. The majority of them were occupied in warlike pursuits. The gentler avocations of learning and science were left to the suspected Hāshumīs and the children of the Ansār,—to the descendants of Ah, Abū Bakr, and Omar. The Arabs had carried with them into distant regions the system of clientage which had existed in Arabia, as it had existed among the Romans, from ancient times. Clientage afforded to the subjects protection and consideration; to the conquerors, the additional strength gained by numbers. Thus, both in the East and in the West, the leading families allied themselves with members of the prominent desert clans, and became the maulas or clients, not freedmen, as has been incorrectly supposed, of their conquerors. To these clients, besides the Hāshimites and the children of the Ansār and Muhājirīn, such as had
survived; the sack of Medina, was left scholarship and the
cultivation of arts and sciences during the Ommeyyade rule.
With the rise of the Abbasides commenced a new era. They
rose to power with the assistance of the Persians; and they
relied for the maintenance of their rule more upon the attach-
ment of the general body of their subjects, than the fickle
affection of the military colonists of Arabia. Abu’l Abbâs
Saffâh held the reins of government for but two years. His
brother and successor, al-Mansûr, though cruel in his treatment
of the Fâtimides, was a statesman of the first rank. He
organised the State, established a standing army and a corps
of police, and gave firmness and consistency to the system of
administration. The Arabs had hitherto devoted themselves
almost exclusively to the profession of arms, the method of
government adopted by al-Mansûr gave a new bent to their
genius. They settled in cities, acquired landed properties, and
devoted themselves to the cultivation of letters with the same
ardour which they had displayed in the pursuit of war.

The rich and fertile valley of the Euphrates, watered by the
two great rivers of Western Asia, has, from the most ancient
times, been the seat of empire and the centre of civilisation.
It was in this region that Babylon, Ctesiphon, and Seleucia
had risen successively. Here existed at this epoch Basra and
Kûfa, with their unruly and volatile inhabitants. Basra
and Kûfa had, from the first conquest of the Moslems,
been important centres of commercial activity. The latter
was at one time the seat of government. To Basra
Kûfa had come all the active spirits of the East, who
ner could not or would not go to the depraved capital
of the Ommeyyades. For the Abbasides, Damascus had not
only no attraction, but was a place of peril, and the uncertain
and fickle temperament of the people of Basra and Kûfa
made those cities undesirable as the seat of government. Al-
Mansûr cast about for a site for his capital, and at last fixed
upon the locality where Bagdad now stands—a six days’ journey
by river from Basra.

Bagdad is said to have been a summer retreat of Keskâ
Apûshîrvân, the famous monarch of Persia, and derived from
his reputation as a just ruler the name it bears,—the “Garden
of Justice.” With the disappearance of the Persian monarchy had disappeared the famous Garden where the Lord of Asia dispensed justice to his multitudinous subjects; tradition, however, had preserved the name. The beautiful site, central and salubrious, attracted the eyes of Mansûr, and the glorious city of the Caliphs arose, like the sea-goddess issuing from the waves, under the magic wand of the foremost architects of the day.

The Bagdad of Mansûr was founded in the year 145 of the Hegira on the western bank of the Tigris. Soon, however, another city—a new Bagdad—sprang up on the eastern bank under the auspices of the heir-apparent, the Prince Imperial of the Caliphate, who afterwards assumed the title of al-Mahdi. This new city vied in the splendour of its structures with the beauty and magnificence of the Man-suriêh. In the days of its glory, before the destroying hordes of Chengiz sweeping over Western Asia had engulfed in ruin every vestige of Saracen civilisation, Bagdad presented a beautiful and imposing appearance—a fit capital for the Pontiffs of Islâm.1

The beauty and splendour of the city, before its sack by the Mongols, have been immortalised in glowing lines by Anwarî—most brilliant of panegyrists:

“Blessed be the site of Bagdad, seat of learning and art—
None can point in the world to a city equal to it,
Her suburbs vie in beauty with the blue vault of heaven,
Her climate in quality equals the life-giving breezes of heaven,
Her stones in their brightness rival gems and rubies.”

1 For a description of Bagdad under the Abbasides, see Short History of the Saracens (Macmillan), p. 444

* This English rendering gives an inadequate idea of the beauty of the original.
Her soil in beneficence has the fragrance of the amber,  
The morning breeze has imparted to the earth the freshness  
of *Tūba* (the tree of Paradise),  
And the winds have concealed in her water the sweetness  
of *Kausar* (the spring of Eden),  
The banks of the Tigris with their beautiful damsels surpass  
(the city of) *Khullakh,*\(^1\)  
The gardens filled with lovely nymphs equal Cashmere,  
And thousands of gondolas on the water,  
Dance and sparkle like sunbeams in the sky."

Its designation of the *City of Peace, Dar as-Salām,* was  
derived from a prophecy made by the astronomer-royal Noubakht, that none of the Caliphs would die within the walls of the  
city, and the strange fulfilment of this prognostication in the  
case of thirty-seven Pontiffs. The great number of holy men  
who have found their last resting-place within or about its  
walls, and whose tombs are objects of veneration to all Moslems,  
gave to Bagdad the title of *Bulwark of the Holy.* Here are the  
mausoleums of the greatest Imāms and the most pious Sheikhs.  
Here reposes the Imām Mūsā al-Kazīm, and here he buried  
Abū Hanifa, the Sheikhs Junaid Shībī, and Abdul Kādir  
Ghilānī, the chiefs of the Sūfis.

In the midst of the monuments of the Imāms and Sheikhs stood those of the Caliphs and their consorts. Of the numerous  
academies, colleges, and schools which filled the city, two  
institutions surpassed all others in importance by their wealth

\(^1\) A city in Cathay famous for the beauty of its women.
and the number of their students. These were the Nizamiéèh and Mustansariéèh; the first established in the first half of the fifth century of the Hegira by Nizàm ul-Mulk, the great Vizier of Malik Shah, Sultan of the Seljuks; and the second, built two centuries later, by the Caliph Al-Mustansir b’illâh.

"It is a remarkable fact," says the historian of Culture under the Caliphs, "that the sovereign who makes us forget some of the darker sides of his nature by his moral and mental qualities, also gave the impetus to the great intellectual movement which now commenced in the Islâmic world." 1 It was by Mansûr’s command that literary and scientific works in foreign languages were first translated into Arabic. Himself no mean scholar and mathematician he had the famous collections of Indian fables (the Hitopadesa), the Indian treatise on astronomy called the Sûdhânta, several works of Aristotle, the Ambagest of Claudius Ptolemy, the books of Euclid, as well as other ancient Greek, Byzantine, Persian, and Syrian productions, translated into the language of the Arabs. Mansûr mentions that no sooner were these translations published than they were studied with much avidity. Mansûr’s successors were not only warm patrons of the learned, who flocked to the metropolis from all quarters, but were themselves assiduous cultivators of every branch of knowledge. Under them the intellectual development of the Saracens, in other words of the conglomerate races of the vast empire which constituted the Caliphate, proceeded with wonderful rapidity.

Each great nation of the world has had its golden age. Athens had her Periclean era, Rome, her Augustan age; so, too, had the Islâmic world its epoch of glory, and we may with justice look upon the period which elapsed from the accession of Mansûr to the death of Murtazid-b’illâh, with only a brief intermission during the reign of Mutawakkil, as an epoch of equal, if not of superior greatness and magnificence. Under the first six Abbasidé Caliphs, but especially under Mâmûn, the Moslems formed the vanguard of civilization. The Saracen race by its elastic genius as well as by its central position, with the priceless treasures of dying Greece and Rome on one side, and of Persia on the other, and India and

China far away sleeping the sleep of ages,—was pre-eminently fitted to become the teacher of mankind. Under the inspiring influences of the great Prophet, who gave them a code and a nationality, and assisted by their sovereigns, the Saracens caught up the lessons of wisdom from the East and the West, combined them with the teachings of the Master, and "started from soldiers into scholars." "The Arabs," says Humboldt, "were admirably situated to act the part of mediators, and to influence the nations from the Euphrates to the Guadalquivir and Mid-Africa. Their unexampled intellectual activity marks a distinct epoch in the history of the world."

Under the Ommeyyades we see the Moslems passing through a period of probation, preparing themselves for the great task they were called upon to undertake. Under the Abbasides we find them the repositories of the knowledge of the world. Every part of the globe is ransacked by the agents of the Caliphs for the hoarded wealth of antiquity; these are brought to the capital, and laid before an admiring and appreciating public. Schools and academies spring up in every direction; public libraries are established in every city free to every comer; the great philosophers of the ancient world are studied side by side with the Koran. Galen, Dioscorides, Themistius, Aristotle, Plato, Euclid, Ptolemy, and Apollonius receive their due need of appreciation. The sovereigns themselves assist at literary meetings and philosophical disquisitions. For the first time in the history of humanity a religious and autocratic government is observed to ally itself with philosophy, preparing and participating in its triumphs.

Every city in the empire sought to outshine the other in the cultivation of the arts and sciences. And governors and provincial chiefs tried to emulate the sovereign. Travelling in search of knowledge was, according to the precept of the Master, a pious duty. From every part of the globe students and scholars flocked to Cordova, to Bagdad, and to Cairo to listen to the words of the Saracenic sages. Even Christians from remote corners of Europe attended Moslem colleges. Men who became in after-life the heads of the Christian Church, acquired their scholarship from Islamic teachers. The rise of Cairo

1 Such as Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II, who studied in Cordova.
under al-Muizz li-dīn-illāh added a spirit of rivalry to the patronage of learning on the part of the Caliphs of the Houses of Abbās and Fāṭima. Al-Muizz was the Māmūn of the West—the Mæcenas of Moslem Africa, which then embraced the whole of the continent from the eastern confines of Egypt to the shores of the Atlantic and the borders of the Sahara. During the reign of al-Muizz and his first three successors, the arts and sciences flourished under the especial and loving protection of the sovereigns... The free university of Cairo, the Dār-ul-Hikmat Scientific Institute established by al-Muizz, "anticipated Bacon's ideal with a fact." The Idrisides at Fez, and the Moorish sovereigns in Spain, outvied each other in the cultivation of arts and letters. From the shores of the Atlantic eastward to the Indian Ocean, far away even to the Pacific, resounded the voice of philosophy and learning, under Moslem guidance and Moslem inspiration. And when the House of Abbās lost its grasp on the empire of the East, the chiefs who held the reins of government in the tracts which at one time were under the undivided temporal sway of the Caliphs, extended the same protection to science and literature as the Pontiffs from whom they still derived their title to sovereignty. This glorious period lasted, in spite of the triumph of patriotism and its unconcealed jealousy towards scientific and philosophical pursuits, until the fall of Bagdad before the Tartar hordes. But the wild savages who overturned the Caliphate and destroyed civilisation, as soon as they adopted Islam, became ardent protectors of learning.1

What was the condition of learning and science in Christendom at this epoch? Under Constantine and his orthodox successors the AEscepiions were closed for ever, the public libraries established by the liberality of the pagan emperors were dispersed or destroyed, learning was "branded as magic or punished as treason"; and philosophy and science were exterminated. The ecclesiastical hatred against human learning had found expression in the patristic maxim, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion", and Pope Gregory the Great, the founder of ecclesiastical supremacy, gave effect to this obscurantist dogma by expelling from Rome all scientific studies, and burning the Palatine Library founded by Augustus
Cæsar. He forbade the study of the ancient writers of Greece and Rome. He introduced and sanctified the mythologic Christianity which continued for centuries the predomina- ting creed of Europe, with its worship of relics and the remains of saints. Science and literature were placed under the ban by orthodox Christianity, and they succeeded in emancipating themselves only when Free Thought had broken down the barriers raised by orthodoxy against the progress of the human mind.

Abdullah al-Mâmûn has been deservedly styled the Augustus of the Arabs. "He was not ignorant that they are the elect of God, his best and most useful servants, whose lives are devoted to the improvement of their rational faculties... that the teachers of wisdom are the true luminaries and legislators of the world." ¹

Mâmûn was followed by a brilliant succession of princes who continued his work. Under him and his successors, the principal distinguishing feature of the school of Bagdad was a true and strongly marked scientific spirit, which dominated over all its achievements. The deductive method, hitherto proudly regarded as the invention and sole monopoly of modern Europe, was perfectly understood by the Moslems. "Marching from the known to the unknown, the school of Bagdad rendered to itself an exact account of the phenomena for the purpose of rising from the effect to the cause, accepting only what had been demonstrated by experience, such were the principles taught by the (Moslem) masters." "The Arabs of the ninth century," continues the author we are quoting, "were in the possession of that fecund method which was to become long afterwards, in the hands of the moderns, the instrument of their most beautiful discoveries."

Volumes would be required to enumerate the host of scientific and learned men who flourished about this epoch, all of whom have, in some way or other, left their mark on the history of progress. Mâshallâh and Ahmed ibn Mohammed al-Nâhâvendi, the most ancient of the Arab astronomers, lived in the reign of Mansûr. The former, who has been called the Phœnix of his time by Abu’l Faraj, wrote several valuable treatises on

¹ Abu’l Faraj
the astrolabe and the armillary sphere, and the nature and movements of celestial bodies—works which still evoke the admiration of scientists. Ahmed al-Nehâvendi wrote from his own observations an astronomical table, *al-Mustamal*, which formed a decided advance upon the notions of both the Greeks and the Hindus. Under Mâmûn, the *Almagest* of Ptolemy was re-translated, and the *Verified Tables* prepared by famous astronomers like Send ibn Ali, Yahya ibn Abî-Mansûr, and Khâlid ibn Abdul Malik. Their observations connected with the equinoxes, the eclipses, the apparitions of the comets, and other celestial phenomena, were valuable in the extreme, and added greatly to human knowledge.

Mohammed ibn Mûsa al-Khwârizami made a new translation, under the orders of Mâmûn, of the *Siddhanta*, or the Indian Tables, with notes and observations. Al-Kindi wrote two hundred works on various subjects—arithmetic, geometry, philosophy, meteorology, optics and medicine. Thoroughly versed in the language of the Greeks, he derived from the schools of Athens and Alexandria part of the information which he embodied in his invaluable treatises. "His works," says Séchillot, "are full of curious and interesting facts." Abû-Ma'shar (corrupted by the Europe of the Middle Ages into Albumazar) made the celestial phenomena his special study; and the *Zij-abî-Ma'âshar*, or the Table of Abû-Ma'âshar, has always remained one of the chief sources of astronomical knowledge. The discoveries of the sons of Mûsa ibn Shâkir,¹ who flourished under Mâmûn and his two immediate successors, especially with respect to the evaluations of the mean movement of the sun and other astral bodies, are almost as exact as the latest discoveries of Europe. They ascertained with wonderful precision, considering the appliances they possessed, the obliquity of the ecliptic, and marked for the first time the variations in the lunar altitudes. They also observed and determined with remarkable accuracy the precession of the equinoxes, and the movements of the solar apogee (which were utterly unknown to the Greeks). They calculated the size of the earth from the measurement of a degree on the shore of the Red Sea—thus at a time when Christian Europe was

¹ Mohammed, Ahmed, and Hasan.
asserting the flatness of the globe. Abu'l Hasan invented the telescope, of which he speaks as "a tube to the extremities of which were attached dipters." These "tubes" were improved and used afterwards in the observatories of Marâgha and Cairo with great success. Al-Nairûzî and Mohammed ibn Isa Abû Abdullah continued the great work of Mûsa ibn Shâkir's sons. By the time al-Batâni appeared, the Moslems had evolved from the crude astronomy of the ancients a regular and harmonious science. Al-Batâni, though surpassed by his successors, occupies a high position among astronomers, and a competent judge pronounces his rôle to be the same among the Saracens as that of Ptolemy among the Greeks. His Astronomical Tables, translated into Latin, furnished the groundwork of astronomy in Europe for many centuries. He is, however, best known in the history of mathematics as the introducer of the sine and co-sine instead of the chord in astronomical and trigonometrical calculations.

Among the numerous astronomers who lived and worked in Bagdad at the close of the tenth century, the names of two men, Ali ibn Amajûr and Abu'l Hasan Ali ibn Amajûr, generally known as Banû-Amajûr, stand prominently forward. They are noted for their calculation of the lunar movements.

Owing to the weakness of the central power, and an increasing inability to maintain the sway of the Caliphate in outlying and distant parts, there arose on the confines of the empire, towards the end of the tenth century, several quasi-independent chiefs. Spain had been lost to the Abbasides at the commencement of their rule, about this period the Bani-Idris established themselves at Fez, the Bani-Rustam at Tahârt, and the Bani-Aghlab at Kairouân in Africa. Soon, however, the whole of the northern part of that continent was brought under the domination of the Bani-Fâtima, and then another era of glory for arts and literature commenced. Fez, Mîknâsa, Segelmessa, Tahârt, Tlemcen, Kairouân, but above all, Cairo, became centres of culture and learning. In Khorâsân the Tâherides,

1 For their names, see ante, p 374. Mohammed ibn Musa ibn Shâkir died in A.H. 259 (A.D. 873).

2 Abû Abdullah Mohammed ibn Jâbir ibn Sinân al-Batâni was a native of Harran, died A.H. 317 (A.D. 929-30).
in Transoxiana the Sâmânides, the Buyides in Tabaristan and afterwards in Persia and Bagdad, as mayors of the palace, extended a lavish patronage to scientists and scholars. Abdur Rahman Sûfi, one of the most brilliant physicists of the age, was an intimate friend of the Buyide Ameer 'Azud ud-Dowla, deservedly called the second Augustus of the Arabs. Abdur Rahman improved the photometry of the stars. 'Azud ud-Dowla, himself a scholar and a mathematician, welcomed to his palace as honoured guests the learned men who flocked to Bagdad from every part of the globe, and took part in their scientific controversies. Ja'far, the son of the Caliph Muktafi b'illâh, made important observations regarding the erratic movements of comets, and wrote a treatise on them; and other princes cultivated the sciences side by side with their subjects.

Under the Buyides flourished a host of astronomers, physicists, and mathematicians, of whom only two need be mentioned here, Al-Kohî and Abu'l-Wafâ. Al-Kohî studied and wrote on the movements of the planets. His discoveries concerning the summer solstice and the autumnal equinox added materially to the store of human knowledge. Abu'l-Wafâ was born in 939 A.C. at Buzjân in Khorâsân; he established himself in Irâk in 959, where he applied himself chiefly to mathematics and astronomy. His Ziyâr-Esh-Shâmîl (the Consolidated or General Table) is a monument of industry and keen and accurate observation. He introduced the use of the secant and the tangent in trigonometry and astronomical observations. "But this was not all," says M. Sédillot; "struck by the imperfection of the lunar theory of Ptolemy, he verified the ancient observations, and discovered, independently of the equation of the centre and the ejection, a third inequality, which is no other than the variation determined six centuries later by Tycho Brahe." 2

Under the Fâtimides of Egypt, Cairo had become a new intellectual and scientific centre. Here flourished, in the reigns

1 To 'Azud ud Dowla (Malik Fanâkhus û) Bagdad owed several hospitals for the sick and refuges for orphans. He built magnificent mausoleums over the tombs of Ah and Husain at Najaf and Kerbela. He rendered navigable the river which flows by Shuráz by erecting the famous dyke called Bend-emir.

2 Abu’l Wafâ died in A.H. 387 (A.C. 997)
of Azīz bʿillāh and Hākim bi-amr-illāh, one of the master-spirits of the age, Ibn Yunus, the inventor of the pendulum and the measurement of time by its oscillations. He is, however, famous for his great work named after his patron and sovereign, Zīj-ul-Akbar-al-Hākim, which soon displaced the work of Claudius Ptolemy. It was reproduced among the Persians by the astronomer-poet Omar Khayyām (1079); among the Greeks, in the Syntax of Chrysococca; among the Mongols by Nasīr ud-dīn Tūsī, in the Zīj-il-Khāni; and among the Chinese, in the astronomy of Co-Cheou-king in 1280; and thus what is attributed to the ancient civilisation of China is only a borrowed light from the Moslems.

Ibn Yunus died in 1009, and his discoveries were continued by Ibn un-Nabdi, who lived in Cairo in 1040, and Hasan ibn Haitham, commonly called in Europe Alhazen, and famous for the discovery of atmospheric refraction. He flourished about the end of the eleventh century, and was a distinguished astronomer and optician. He was born in Spain, but resided chiefly in Egypt. He is best known in Europe by his works on optics, one of which has been translated into Latin by Risner. He corrected the Greek misconception as to the nature of vision, and demonstrated for the first time that the rays of light come from external objects to the eye, and do not issue forth from the eye, and impinge on external things. He determined the retina as the seat of vision, and proved that the impressions made upon it were conveyed along the optic nerves to the brain. He explained the phenomena of a single vision by the formation of visual images on symmetrical portions of the two retinas. He discovered that the refraction of light varies with the density of the atmosphere, and that atmospheric density again varies with the height. He explained accurately and clearly how in consequence of this refraction, astral bodies are seen before they have actually risen and after they have set, and demonstrated that the beautiful phenomenon of

1 Azīz bʿillāh was one of the greatest sovereigns Egypt ever had. "He loved his people as they loved him." He was married to a Christian lady, whose brothers, Jeremiah and Arvenus, held the posts of patriarchs, one of Jerusalem and the other of Alexandria. Both of them belonged to the orthodox or melkhite sect.

2 See Appendix III.

3 Séduillot.
twilight was due to the effect of atmospheric refraction combined with the reflecting action of the air upon the course of the rays of light. In his book called the *Balance of Wisdom* he discusses dynamical principles, generally supposed to be the monopoly of modern science. He describes minutely the connection between the weight of the atmosphere and its density, and how material objects vary in weight in a rare and in a dense atmosphere. He discusses the submergence of floating bodies, and the force with which they rise to the surface when immersed in light or heavy media; he fully understands the principle of gravitation, and recognises gravity as a force. He knows correctly the relation between the velocities, spaces, and times of falling bodies, and has very distinct ideas of capillary attraction.

In Spain the same activity of mind was at work from the Pyrenees to the Straits. Seville, Cordova, Granada, Murcia, Toledo, and other places possessed their public libraries and colleges, where they gave free instruction in science and letters. Of Cordova, an English writer speaks thus: "Beautiful as were the palaces and gardens of Cordova, her claims to admiration in higher matters were no less strong. The mind was as lovely as the body. Her professors and teachers made her the centre of European culture; students would come from all parts of Europe to study under her famous doctors, and even the nun Hroswitha far away in her Saxon conven of Gaudersheim, when she told of the martyrdom of Eulogius, could not refrain from singing the praises of Cordova, 'the brightest splendour of the world.' Every branch of science was seriously studied there, and medicine received more and greater additions by the discoveries of the doctors and surgeons of Andalusia than it had gained during all the centuries that had elapsed since the days of Galen. . . . Astronomy, geography, chemistry, natural history, all were studied with ardour at Cordova; and as for the graces of literature there never was a time in Europe when poetry became so much the speech of everybody—when people

---

1 The annalist Aym says that at this period the public library of Cairo contained over two million books, of which six thousand treated exclusively of mathematics and astronomy. I have only mentioned a few of the names among the thousands of mathematicians and physicists who flourished during this epoch, when the scientific spirit of Islam was at its zenith.
of all ranks composed those Arabic verses which perhaps suggested models for the ballads and canzonettes of the Spanish minstrels and the troubadours of Provence and Italy. No speech or address was complete without some scrap of verse, 'improvised on the spur of the moment, by the speaker or quoted by memory from some famous poet.'

To these we may add the words of Renan: "The taste for science and literature had, by the tenth century, established, in this privileged corner of the world, a toleration of which modern times hardly offer us an example. Christians, Jews, and Musulmans spoke the same tongue, sang the same songs, participated in the same literary and scientific studies. All the barriers which separated the various peoples were effaced; all worked with one accord in the work of a common civilisation. The mosques of Cordova, where the students could be counted by thousands, became the active centres of philosophical and scientific studies."

The first observatory in Europe was built by the Arabs. The Giralda, or tower of Seville, was erected under the superintendence of the great mathematician Jâbir ibn Afâh in 1090 A.C. for the observation of the heavens. Its fate was not a little characteristic. After the expulsion of the Moors, it was turned into a belfry, the Spaniards not knowing what else to do with it!

Omar ibn Khaldûn, Ya'kûb ibn Târik, Mûshmah al-Maghrîbi, and the famous Averroes (Abu'l Walîd Mohammed ibn Rushd) are some of the physicists whom we may mention here. Nor was Western Africa inactive during this period. Ceuta and Tangier, Fez, and Morocco, rivalled Cordova, Seville, and Granada; their colleges sent out able professors, and numerous learned works testified to the indefatigable ardour of the Moslem mind in all departments of learning.

The beginning of the eleventh century saw a great change in the political condition of Central Asia. The rise of

---

1 Stanley Lane-Poole, *The Moors in Spain*, p 144. For a full account of Cordova, see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan), p 515.

2 Renan, *Averroes et Averroism*, p 4. The golden age of literature and science in Spain was under Hakam al-Mustansir Billah who died in 976 A.C. The catalogue of his library consists of forty-four quartos. He employed agents in every quarter of the globe to procure for him, at any price, scientific works, ancient and modern. He paid to Abu'l Faraj al-Ispahâni 1000 dinars of gold for the first copy of his celebrated Anthology (*Kitâb ul-Aghâni*).
Mahmūd, the great Ghaznavide conqueror, *Yemin ud-Dowla* and *Amin ul-Millat*, "right hand of the empire" and "custodian of the Faith," brought Transoxiana, Afghānīstān, and Persia under the sovereignty of Ghazni. He collected round him a body of scholars and litterateurs who shed a glorious lustre on his brilliant reign. Attached to the renovated "orthodoxy" of al-Asha’ī, and consequently piously inimical to the rationalistic school of thinkers, chary in his munificence to the poets who made his name famous in the annals of the world, he yet had the genius to perceive the merits of men like *Abū Raihān Mūḥammad ibn Ṭhān al-Beirūnī, philosopher, mathematician, and geographer.* Fīrūz, the prince of poets, Dākī, and Ursūrī. Al-Beirūnī’s mind was encyclopædic. His work on astronomy, entitled after his patron Sultan Masūd, *al-Kānūn-al-Masūdī, Canon Masudicus,* is a monument of learning and research. He travelled into India, and studied the language of the Hindus, their sciences, their philosophy and literature, and embodied his observations in a work which has recently been furnished to us in an English garb. The philosophical and scientific, not to say sympathetic, spirit which animates al-Beirūnī in the treatment of his subject is in marked contrast to the mode still in vogue among Western nations, and serves as an index to the intellectual character of Islām. The *Ivādiya* of al-Beirūnī shows the extent to which the Moslems had utilised the treasures of Greek learning, and turned them to fruitful purposes. Besides these two great works, he wrote on mathematics, chronology, mathematical geography, physics, and chemistry.

Al-Beirūnī communicated to the Hindus the knowledge of the Bagdadian school in return for their notions and traditions. He found among them the remains of Greek science, which had been transported to India in the early centuries of the Christian era, or perhaps earlier, during the existence of the Graeco-Bactrian dynasties. The Hindus do not seem to have possessed any advanced astronomical science of their own; for, had it

---

1. A.C. 990-1030
2. The son and successor of the Conqueror.
3. *Fi’t Fuhkhī mā iš’l Hind,* see *Short History of the Saracens* (Macmillan), p. 493 Another remarkable work of his is the *Āsār al-Bākīb* or the *Vestiges of the Past,* translated into English by Dr. Sachau
been otherwise, we doubtless would have heard about it, as Sédillot rightly observes, from the Greek writers of the times of Alexander and the Seleucidæ. They, like the Chinese, borrowed most of their scientific ideas from foreign sources, and modified them according to their national characteristics.

Under the successors of Mahmuḍ learning and arts flourished abundantly. The rise of the Seljukides and their grand munificence towards scholarship and science rivalled that of the golden days of the Abbaside rule. Tughril, Alp Arslân, Malik Shah, and Sanjar were not only remarkable for the greatness of their power, the clear comprehension of what constituted the welfare of their subjects, but were equally distinguished for their intellectual gifts and ardent enthusiasm in the cause of learning. Jalâl ud-din Malik Shah ¹ and his vizier, Khwâja Hasan Nizâm ul-Mulk,² collected round them a galaxy of astronomers, poets, scholars, and historians. The astronomical observations conducted in his reign by a body of savants, with Omar Khayyâm and Abdur Rahman al-Hâzmi at their head, led to the reform of the Calendar which preceded the Gregorian by six hundred years and is said by a competent authority to be even more exact ³ The era which was introduced upon these observations was named after Malik Shah, the Jalāliān.

The destructive inroads of the Christian marauders who called themselves Crusaders was disastrous to the cause of learning and science in Western Asia and Northern Africa. Barbarous savages, hounded to rapine and slaughter by crazy priests, they knew neither mercy for the weakness of sex or age, nor the value of letters or arts. They destroyed the splendid library of Tripoli without compunction; they reduced to ashes many of the glorious centres of Saracenic culture and arts. Christian Europe has held up to obloquy the apocryphal destruction of the Alexandrian library, which had already been burned in the time of Julius Cæsar, but it has no word of blame for the crimes of her Crusaders five centuries later. The calamities inflicted by the Crusaders were lasting in their effect; and in spite of the endeavours of Saladin and his sons to restore the intellectual life of Syria, it has remained dead from that day to this.

¹ 1073-1092 A.C. ² i.e. the Administrator of the Empire. ³ Sédillot.
In the interval which elapsed between the rise of Mahmūd and the fall of Bagdad, there flourished a number of philosophers and scientists, among whom shine the great Avicenna (Abū Ali Husain Ibn-Sina),¹ Fath ibn Nâbeghah Khâkâni,² Mubashshar ibn Ahmed,³ and his son Mqhammed.⁴

The eruption of the Mongols upon the Saracenic world was not like the invasion of the Roman empire by the northern barbarians. These had proceeded slowly; and in their comparatively gradual progress towards the heart of the empire they had become partially softened, and had to some extent cast off their pristine ferocity. The case was otherwise with the hordes of the devastator Chengiz. They swept like overwhelming torrents over Western Asia. Wherever they went they left misery and desolation.⁵ Their barbarous campaigns and their savage slaughters put an end for a time to the intellectual development of Asia. But the moment the wild savages adopted the religion of the Prophet of Arabia a change came over them. From the destroyers of the seats of learning and arts they became the founders of academies and the protectors of the learned. Sultan Khoda-Bendah (Uljaïtâ-Khan), sixth in descent from Chengiz, was distinguished for his attainments and his patronage of the sciences. But the fearful massacres which the barbarians had committed among the settled and cultured population of the towns destroyed most of the gifted classes, with the result that, though the great cities like Bokhâra and Samarcand rose again into splendour, they became, nevertheless, the seats of a narrower culture, more casuistical and theological than before. And yet the Mongols protected philosophers like Nasîr ud-din Tûsî, Muwayyad ud-din al-Orezi of Damascus, Fâkhr ud-din al-Marâghi, Mohi ud-din al-Maghribi, Ali Shah al-Bokhâri, and many others. The successors of Hulâku tried thus to restore to Islâm what their ancestor had destroyed. Whilst the Mongols in Persia were employed in making some amends to civilisation, Kublai Khan transported to China the learning of the Arabs.

¹ Died in 1037 A.C.
² Died in 1082 A.C.
³ Died in 1135 A.C.
⁴ Died in 1193 A.C.
⁵ For a full account of the havoc and ruin caused by the Tartars, see Shor History of the Saracens, pp. 391-400
Cheou-king received in 1280 from Jamál ud-din the tables of Ibn-Yunus, and appropriated them for Chinese purposes.

Ibn-Shâthir, who lived in the reign of Mohammed ibn Kalâun, the Mameluke sovereign of Egypt, developed still further the mathematical and astronomical sciences. And now arose on the eastern horizon the comet-like personality of Timür.

"From his throne in Samarcand this Titan of the fourteenth century called into being the greatest empire ever seen in Asia, and seemed to extinguish in his one resistless will the immemorial antagonism of Irān and Tūran." He was a patron of science and poetry, himself fond of the society of the scholars and artists of his day, an author, as well as a legislator of no mean order. ¹ Magnificent colleges, splendid mosques, vast libraries, testified to the taste for letters of this remarkable man. His vast system of colonisation filled the great cities of Eastern Asia, especially Samarcand, with the splendour of all the arts and sciences known to the West. Timūr established "the most brilliant empire known to the history of Islām, except that of the Ommeyyads in Spain, and that of the first Abbasides in Arabistan" Jānī, master of sciences; Suhaūlī, translator of Pilpay; Ali Shēr Ameer, were some of the men who shed lustre on the reigns of his successors. The college founded by his consort, Bibi Khānām, and known by her name, still strikes the observer as one of the most imposing and most beautiful products of Saracenic architecture. Timūr's son, Shah Rukh Mirza, imitated his father in the cultivation and patronage of arts and letters. His peaceful reign of nearly half a century was remarkable for high intellectual culture and scientific study. When he transported his government from Samarcand to Herat, the former city lost none of its splendour. Ulugh Beg, his son, charged with the government of Transoxiana, maintained the literary and scientific glories of Samarcand. Himself an astronomer of a high rank, he presided at the observations which have immortalised his name. The tables in which those observations were embodied complete the cycle of Arabian thought. Ulugh Beg is separated by only a century and a half from Kepler, the founder of modern astronomy.

¹ The Mafżūzat-i-Timūr ("The Institutes of Timūr") are couched in the style of the old Assyrian and Kyāman monarhs.
It was, however, not astronomy only which the Moslems cultivated and improved. Every branch of higher mathematics bears traces of their genius. The Greeks are said to have invented algebra, but among them, as Oelsner has justly remarked, it was confined to furnishing amusement "or the plays of the goblet." The Moslems applied it to higher purposes, and thus gave it a value hitherto unknown. Under Mâmun they had discovered the equations of the second degree, and very soon after they developed the theory of quadratic equations and the binomial theorem. Not only algebra, geometry, and arithmetic, but optics and mechanics made remarkable progress in the hands of the Moslems. They invented spherical trigonometry, they were the first to apply algebra to geometry, to introduce the tangent, and substitute the sine for the arc in trigonometrical calculations. Their progress in mathematical geography was no less remarkable. The works of Ibn-Haukal, of Makrizi, a Tâhirî, Mas'ûdi, al-Beirûnî, al-Kumi and al-Idrîsi, Kazwinî, Ibn ul-Wardi, and Abu'l Fedâ, show what the Saracens attained in this department of science, called by them the ra's-m-ul-arz. At a time when Europe firmly believed in the flatness of the earth, and was ready to burn any foolhardy person who thought otherwise, the Arabs taught geography by globes.

The physical sciences were as diligently cultivated. The method of experimentation was substituted for theorising; and the crude ideas of the ancients were developed into positive sciences. Chemistry, botany, geology, natural history, among others occupied the attention and exercised the energies of the ablest men.

Chemistry, as a science, is unquestionably the invention of the Moslems. Abû Mûsa Jâbir (the Geber of Châmers' writers) is the true father of modern chemistry. His name is memorable in chemistry, since it marks the transition of bland bliss the blan

1 Humboldt calls the Arabs "the real founders of the physical sciences".
2 Abû Mûsa Jâbir ibn Hayyân was a native of Tarsus. Ibn al-Mukhâkas says: "Jâbir compiled a work of two thousand pages in which he asserted the problems of his master (the Imâm) Ja'far as-Sâdîk which formed five hundred treatises"; see also the Târikh al-Hukama.
Lavoisier.” He was followed by others, whose originality and industry, profundity of knowledge, and keenness of observation, evoke the astonishment of students, and make them look with regret upon the inertness of the latter-day Moslem.

The science of medicine and the art of surgery, the best index to a nation’s genius and a severe test to the intellectual spirit of a faith, were developed to the highest degree. Medicine had undoubtedly attained a high degree of excellence among the Greeks, but the Arabs carried it far beyond the stage in which their predecessors in the work of civilization had left it, and brought it close to the modern standard. We can give here but a small conception of the work done by the Saracens for several centuries in this department of human study, and in the development of the natural sciences.

The study of medical substances, the idea of which struck Dioscorides in the Alexandrian school, is, in its scientific form, a creation of the Arabs. They invented chemical pharmacy, and were the first founders of those institutions which are now called “dispensaries.” They established in every city public hospitals, called Dar ush-Shifa, “the house of cure,” or Marisidn (an abbreviation of binmaristan, “the patient’s house”) and maintained them at the expense of the State.

The names of the Arab physicians in the biographical dictionary of Abû Usâbi’a fill a volume. Abû Bakr Mohammed ibn Zakaria ar-Râzi (known to mediaeval Europe as Rhazes), who flourished in the beginning of the tenth century,2 Ali ibn-Abbâs,3 Avicenna (Abû Ali Husain ibn-Šinâ), Albuscasis (Abû'l

---

1 The persons in charge of the dispensaries were under the control of Government. The price and quality of medicine were strictly regulated. Many dispensaries were maintained by the State. There were regular examinations for physicians and pharmacists, at which licences were given to passed candidates. The licence-holders were alone entitled to practise. Compare Kremer and Sédillot.

2 This great physician, surnamed Râzi, from the place of his birth, Rai (ancient Rhages), filled successively the office of principal of the public hospitals at Rai, Jund Shapur, and Bagdad. He wrote the Hâwi, which Sédillot calls “un corpus medical fort estimé.” His treatises on smallpox and measles have been consulted by the physicians of all nations. He introduced the use of minorautes, invented the scotol, and discovered the nerve of the larynx. He wrote two hundred medical works, some of which were published in Venice in 1510. Ar-Râzi died in A H 311 (A.C. 923-4).

3 Ali ibn-Abbâs flourished fifty years later than Rhazes. He published a medical work, consisting of twenty volumes, on the theory and practice of
Kāsim Khalaf ibn Abbās), Aven-Zoar 1 (Abū Merwān ibn Abdul Malik ibn Zuhr), Averroes (Abu’l Walid Mohamad ibn Rushd), 2 and Aben-Bethar (Abdullah ibn Ahmed ibn Ali al-Beithār, the veterinary), 3 are some of the most brilliant and most distinguished physicians who have left an enduring impression on the world of thought. Albuscasis was not only a physician but a surgeon of the first rank. He performed the most difficult surgical operations in his own and the obstetrical department. In operations on women, we are informed by him, in which considerations of delicacy intervened, the services of properly instructed women were secured. The ample description he has left of the surgical instruments employed in his time gives an idea of the development of surgery among the Arabs. 4 Avicenna was unquestionably the most gifted man of his age; a universalist in genius, and encyclopaedic in his writings. A philosopher, mathematician, astronomer, poet, and physician, he has left his influence impressed on two continents, and well deserves the title of Aristotle of the East. In spite of patristic jealousy, his philosophic ideas exercised an undisputed sway for several centuries in the schools of the East as well as of Europe. Avicenna is commonly known in Asia as the Sheikh par excellence.

medicine, which he dedicated to the Buyide Ameer Azud ud-dowla. This work was translated into Latin in 1227, and printed at Lyons in 1523 by Michel Capella. Abu ibn Abūs corrected many of the errors of Hippocrates and Galen.

1 Ibn Zuhr or Aven Zoar was one of the most distinguished physicians of his age. Born at Penafort, he entered, after finishing his medical and scientific studies, the service of Yusuf ibn Tāshīfn, the great Almoravide monarch of Africa, who covered the rising physician with honours and riches. Ibn Zuhr joined, like Albuscasis, the practice of medicine with surgery. He was the first to conceive the idea of bronchotomy, with exact indications of the luxations and fractures, and discovered several important maladies with their treatment. His son followed in his father’s steps and was the chief surgeon and physician of Yusuf ibn Tāshīfn’s army.

2 Averroes was the Avicenna of the West. His life and writings have been given to the world by Renan. He was a contemporary of Ibn Zuhr, Ibn Bāja, and Ibn Tufal. Of Averroes and his contemporaries we shall have to speak in the next chapter.

Besides these may be mentioned Abu’l Hasan ibn Tiḥnit, author of Almaḵsh, Abū Ḥaǧfar Ahmed ibn Mohammed at-Tālib, who wrote on pleurisy, etc., and Ḥrabūlla

3 Al Beithār travelled all over the East to find medicinal herbs, on which he wrote an exhaustive treatise. The Arab physicians introduced the use of the rhubarb, cassia, senna, camphor, the pulp of the tamarind (lāmr—

kund—or Indian date), etc.

4 In lithotomy he was equal to the foremost surgeons of modern times.
He was born in the year 980 A.C. at a village called Afshanah, in Transoxiana, of which place his father was the governor. He finished his medical studies in Bokhara at the age of eighteen, when commenced an extraordinary political and philosophical career. His tenacity in refusing the liberal offers of Mahmud the Conqueror to join his service led to his expulsion from the Ghaznavide dominions. He soon became the vizier of Shams ud-dowla, Ameer of Hamadan, and afterwards of 'Ala ud-dowla, Ameer of Ispahan, where he pursued his scientific and philosophical studies, and wrote his great works, the Kânûn and the Arjûza, afterwards the foundation of all medical knowledge.

The Greeks possessed crude notions of anatomy, and their knowledge of pharmacy was restricted within a very narrow compass. The Moslems developed both anatomy and pharmacy into positive sciences. The wide extent of the empire enabled researches and investigations in every quarter of the globe, with the result that they enriched the existing pharmacopeia by innumerable and invaluable additions. Botany they advanced far beyond the state in which it had been left by Dioscorides, and augmented the herbalogy of the Greeks by the addition of two thousand plants. Regular gardens existed both in Cordova and Bagdad, at Cairo and Fez for the education of pupils, where discourses were delivered by the most learned in the sciences.

Ad-Damiri (Aldemri) is famous in the Moslem world for his history of animals—a work which forestalled Buffon by seven hundred years.

Geology was cultivated under the name of 'Ilm-i-Tashrth-ul-Arz, "the science of the anatomy of the earth."

The superiority of the Moslems in architecture requires no comment, for the glorious remains of Saracenic art in the East and in the West still evoke the admiration of the modern world. Their religion has been charged with their backwardness in painting and sculpture, but it must be borne in mind that the prohibition contained in the Koran is similar to the Levitical commandment. It was but a continuation of the Mosaic Law, which had so effectually suppressed the making of "graven images" among the Jews, and its signification rests upon the
inveterate idolatry of the pre-Islâmite Arabs. To the early Moslems, therefore, painting and statuary were odious and unlawful, as emblematic of heathenism, and this deeply implanted iconoclasm undoubtedly saved them from relapsing, as other nations had done, into idolatry. But with the gradual development of the primitive commonwealth into a civilised and cultured empire, and with the ascendency of learning and science, the Moslems grasped the spirit of the prohibition, and cast off the fetters of a narrow literalism. No doubt the spirit of rationalism, which so deeply influenced the early Abbaside and Spanish Caliphs, was the actual cause of the impetus given by them to art. Hence throughout the Moslem world a taste for painting and sculpture arose simultaneously with the progress of literature and science. The palaces of the Caliphs, the mansions of the sovereigns who followed in their footsteps, and the houses of the grandees were decorated with pictures and sculptures.

To the Prophet’s prohibition of graven images or painting in mosques the world is indebted for the art of arabesque—which possesses such peculiar charm in the decoration of Oriental buildings, and which has been widely adopted by Western art. With the gradual enlightenment of the Moslems by contact with the arts of other nations, animals and flowers, birds and fruits were introduced into arabesque; but the figures of animated beings were throughout absolutely interdicted in the decoration of places of worship. In purity of form and simplicity of outline, in the gracefulness of design and perfection of symmetry, in the harmony of every detail, in the exquisiteness of finish and sublimity of conception, Moslem architecture is equal to any in the world, and the chaste and graceful ornamentation with which so many of the grandest monuments are adorned, indicates a refinement of taste and culture surpassing any of the great monumental relics of ancient Greece or modern Europe. Another branch of Moslem decorative art is that of ornamental writing, which is so often utilised with remarkable effect in the adornment of mosques, mausolea, and palaces, where whole chapters of the Koran are carved or inlaid round domes and minarets, doors and arches, testifying to the same religious earnestness, yet in
a purely monotheistic spirit, as the pictures of saints and martyrs which decorate Christian churches.

Before the promulgation of Islām the profession of music among the Arabs was confined to the slaves of both sexes imported from Syria and Persia, or to the class of hetairai called Kyān. The Prophet had discountenanced, for obvious moral reasons, the songs and dances of these degraded women. But under the Abbasides and the Spanish Arab kings, when music was elevated to the rank of a science, and its cultivation was recognised as an art, a love for music spread among all classes of society. A large literature grew up on the subject; songs were collected and classified according to their melodies and keys, and the musical instruments of the ancients were improved and new ones invented. The sharp conflict between Rationalism and Patristicism, between Idealism and Literalism, which marked the middle of the twelfth century, drove this sweetest of arts back into the arms of the servile classes or forced it to seek a refuge in the chapels of the dervishes.

A large general literature existed on the subject of commerce, agriculture, handicraft and manufacture, the latter including every conceivable subject, from porcelain to weapons of war.

In historical research the Moslems have not been behind any other nation, ancient or modern. At first attention was devoted chiefly to the history of the Prophet, but soon the primitive idea widened into a broad conception. Archaeology, geography, and ethnology were included in history, and the greatest minds applied themselves to the pursuit of this captivating branch of study. Between the simple work of Ibn-Ishāk and the universal history of Ibn-Khaldūn there is a great difference, but the intervening space is occupied by a host of writers, the product of whose labours supplies some index to the intellectual activity of the Saracenic nations under the inspiration of Islām.

Balāzuri, who died in 279 A.H. (A.D. 892), was born at Bagdad, where he lived and worked. His "Conquest of the Countries" (Fatāh ul-Buldān) is written in admirable style, and marks a distinct advance of the historical spirit.

Hamadāni, who flourished towards the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century of the Hegira, gave to the
world a comprehensive history of Southern Arabia, with an account of its tribes, its numerous remains of interest, with explanations of their inscriptions, as well as the ethnography and geography of Yemen. It is, however, in the monumental works of Mas'ūdi, of al-Beirūnī, of Ibn ul-Athir, of Tabarî, of Ibn-Khaldūn, called by Mohl the Montesquieu of Islâm, of Makrizi, Makkari, Abu'l'Fedâ, Nuwairi, and Mirkhond that the mental vigour of the Moslem races in this department of knowledge is found in full play. These men were not specialists only; they were encyclopædists—philosophers, mathematicians, geographers, as well as historians. Mas'ūdi was a native of Bagdad, but by descent a Northern Arab, who in his early youth travelled and saw the greater part of the Mohammedan world. He first went to India, visited Multan and Mansūra, then travelled over Persia and Kerman, again went to India, remained for some time at Cambay (Kambāja) and the Deccan, went to Ceylon, sailed from there to Kambalu (Madagascar), and went from there to Oman, and perhaps even reached the Indo-Chinese Peninsula and China. He had travelled far in Central Asia, and reached the Caspian Sea. After finishing his travels, he lived for some time in Tiberias and Antioch, and afterwards took up his abode in Basrah, where he first published his great work, called the Murūj-uz-Zahab (مروج الذهب). Afterwards he removed to Fostat (old Cairo), where he published the Kitāb ut-Tanbih, and later the Mirāt-uz-Zamān, or the Mirror of the Times, a voluminous work, which is only partially preserved. In the Murūj-uz-Zahab (the "Golden Meadows") he tells the rich experiences of his life in the amiable and cheerful manner of a man who had seen various lands, experienced life in all its phases, and who takes pleasure, not only in instructing, but in amusing his reader. Without burdening us with the names of the authorities, without losing himself in long explanations, he delights in giving prominence to that which strikes him as wonderful, rare, and interesting, and to portray people and manners with conciseness and anecdotic skill.”

1 I am told that the Library in Vienna contains a historical work by the same author consisting of some thirty volumes which bears the name of the Akhbār-uz-Zamān. Perhaps this is the same work as Mirāt-uz-Zamān.
Tabari (Abū Ja‘far Mohammed ibn Jarīr), surnamed the Livy of the Arabs, who died in Bagdad in 922 A.C., brought his work down to the year 302 of the Hegira (914 A.C.) It was continued to the end of the twelfth century by al-Makīn or Elmacin.

Ibn ul-Athīr (ابن الاستير), surnamed Izz ud-dīn, “glory of religion,” was a native of Jazīrāt-bāni-Omar, in Irāk, but resided chiefly at Mosul, where his house was the resort of the most distinguished scholars and savants of the time. His universal history, known as the al-Kāmil, which ends with the year 1231 A.C., may be compared with the best works of modern Europe.

Makrīzī ¹ (Taki ud-dīn Ahmed) was a contemporary of Ibn-Khaldūn. His works on Egypt furnish a vivid picture of the political, religious, social, commercial, archaeological, and administrative condition of the country.

Abū’l-Fedā, whom we have already mentioned as a geographer, was the Prince of Hamah at the commencement of the fourteenth century. Distinguished alike in the pursuit of arms as in letters, gifted with eminent qualities, he occupies a prominent place among the scholars and scientists of the East. The portion of his great work which deals with the political and literary history of Islām, and its relations to the Byzantines from the eighth to the twelfth century, is extremely valuable.

Ibn Khaldūn flourished in the fourteenth century of the Christian era. Born in Tunis in 1332, he was in the midst of all the revolutions of which Africa was the theatre in the fourteenth century. His magnificent history is preceded by a Prolegomena, in itself a store-house of information and philosophical dissertation. In the Prolegomena he traces the origin of society, the development of civilisation, the causes which led to the rise and fall of kingdoms and dynasties; and discusses, among other questions, the influence of climate on the formation of a nation’s character. He died in the year 1406 A.C.

The Arabs invented the mariner’s compass, and voyaged to all parts of the world in quest of knowledge or in the pursuit of commerce. They established colonies in Africa, far to the south in the Indian Archipelago, on the coasts of India, and on the Malayan Peninsula. Even China opened her barred gates

¹ Died in 1442 A.C.
to Moslem colonists and mercenaries. They discovered the Azores, and, it is even surmised, penetrated as far as America. Within the confines of the ancient continents they gave an unprecedented and almost unparalleled impulse in every direction to human industry. The Prophet had inculcated labour as a duty, he had given the impress of piety to industrial pursuits; he had recommended commerce and agriculture as meritorious in the sight of the Lord. These precepts had their natural result; the merchants, the traders, the industrial classes in general, were treated with respect; and governors, generals, and savants disdained not to call themselves by the title of their professions. The peace and security with which caravans travelled the empire; the perfect safety of the roads; the cisterns, and tanks, and reservoirs, and rest-houses which existed everywhere along the routes—all aided in the rapid development of commerce and trade, and arts and manufactures.

The Arabs covered the countries where they settled with networks of canals. To Spain they gave the system of irrigation by flood-gates, wheels, and pumps. Whole tracts of land that now he waste and barren were covered with olive groves, and the environs of Seville alone, under Moslem rule, contained several thousand oil-factories. They introduced the staple products, rice, sugar, cotton, and nearly all the fine garden and orchard fruits, together with many less important plants, such as ginger, saffron, myrrh, etc. They opened up the mines of copper, sulphur, mercury, and iron. They established the culture of silk, the manufacture of paper and other textile fabrics; of porcelain, earthenware, iron, steel, and leather. The tapestries of Cordova, the woollen stuffs of Murcia, the silks of Granada, Almeria, and Seville, the steel and gold work of Toledo, the paper of Salibah were sought all over the world. The ports of Malaga, Carthagena, Barcelona, and Cadiz were vast commercial emporiums for export and import. In the days of their prosperity the Spanish Arabs maintained a merchant navy of more than a thousand ships. They had factories and representatives on the Danube. With Constantinople they possessed a great trade, which ramified from the Black Sea and the eastern shores of the Mediterranean into the interior of Asia, and reached the ports of India and China.
and extended along the African coast as far as Madagascar.

"In the midst of the tenth century, when Europe was about in the same condition that Caffraria is now, enlightened Moors, like Abul Cassem, were writing treatises on the principles of trade and commerce." In order to supply an incentive to commercial enterprise, and to further the impulse to travel, geographical registers, gazetteers, and itineraries were published under the authority of Government, containing minute descriptions of the places to which they related, with particulars of the routes and other necessary matters. Travellers like Ibn-i-Batūta visited foreign lands in quest of information, and wrote voluminous works on the people of those countries, on their fauna and flora, their mineral products, their climatic and physical features, with astonishing perspicacity and keenness of observation.

The love of learning and arts was by no means confined to one sex. The culture and education of the women proceeded on parallel lines with that of the men, and women were as keen in the pursuit of literature and as devoted to science as men. They had their own colleges;¹ they studied medicine and jurisprudence, lectured on rhetoric, ethics, and belles-lettres, and participated with the stronger sex in the glories of a splendid civilisation. The wives and daughters of magnates and sovereigns spent their substance in founding colleges and endowing universities, in establishing hospitals for the sick, refuges for the homeless, the orphan, and the widow.²

The division and jealousy of the Arab tribes, which had prevented the assimilation and fusion of their several dialects, had nevertheless conduced to the enrichment of the national language as spoken in Ḥijāz, and the annual conflux of people

¹ One well-known institution of this kind was established in Cairo in 684 A.H. by the daughter of the Mameluke Sultan Malik Tāher

² Zubaida, the wife of Ḥārūn, founded several such refuges, and the hospital built by the wife of ‘Azud ud-dowla rivalled her husband’s. The daughter of Malik Āshraf, known as the Khâtūn, erected a splendid college at Damascus. Another college was founded by Zamurud Khâtūn, wife of Násir ud-dowla of Hems.

Many Moslem ladies were distinguished in poetry Ṣâtima, the Prophet’s daughter, holds a high rank among poets So does the daughter of Aurangzeb, Zêb un-nisâ, surnamed Ṣakkif. When Urquhart travelled in Turkey, three of the most celebrated living poets were ladies, and one of them, Pershek Khânam, acted as private secretary to Sultan Mustafa
at Okâz, with the periodical contest of the poets, had imparted
to it a regularity and polish. But it was the Koran—“a book
by the aid of which the Arabs conquered a world greater than
that of Alexander the Great, greater than that of Rome, and
in as many tens of years as the latter had wanted hundreds to
accomplish her conquests; by the aid of which they alone of
all the Semites came to Europe as kings, whither the Phœni-
cians had come as tradesmen, and the Jews as fugitives or
captives; came to Europe to hold up, together with these
fugitives, the light to humanity;—they alone, while darkness
lay around, to raise up the wisdom and knowledge of Hellas
from the dead, to teach philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and
the golden art of song to the West as to the East, to stand at
the cradle of modern science, and to cause us late epigoni for
ever to weep over the day when Granada fell,” 1—it was this
book which fixed and preserved for ever the Arabic tongue in
all its purity. The simple grandeur of its diction, the chaste
elegance of its style, the variety of its imageries, the rapid
transitions, like flashes of lightning, which show the moralist
teaching, the philosopher theosophising, the injured patriot
denouncing in fervent expressions the immorality and degrada-
tion of his people, and withal the heavenly Father calling back
through His servant His erring children,—all mark its unique
character among religious records. And the awe and venera-
tion with which the greatest poets of the day listened to its
teachings, show how deeply it must have moved the people.
Delivered at different times,—in moments of persecution and
anguish, or of energetic action, or enunciated for purposes of
practical guidance,—there is yet a vitality, an earnestness and
energy in every word, which differentiates it from all other
Scriptures. Lest it be thought we are biased in our opinion,
we give the words of the great orientalist whom we have already
quoted: “Those grand accents of joy and sorrow, of love, and
valour, and passion, of which but faint echoes strike on our
ears now, were full-toned at the time of Mohammed; and he
had not merely to rival the illustrious of the illustrious, but
excel them; to appeal to the superiority of what he said and
sang as a very sign and proof of his mission. . . . The poets

1 Deutsch.
before him had sung of love... Antara, himself the hero of the most famous novel, sings of the ruin, around which ever hover lovers' thoughts, of the dwelling of Abla, who is gone, and her dwelling-place knows her not. Mohammed sang none of these. No love-minstrelsy his, not the joys of this world, nor sword nor camel, not jealousy or human vengeance, not the glories of tribe or ancestors, nor the unmeaning, swiftly and forever-extinguished existence of man, were his themes. He preached Islām. And he preached it by rending the skies above and tearing open the ground below, by adjuring heaven and hell, the living and the dead.”

Another great writer speaks of the Koran in the following terms: "If it is not poetry,—and it is hard to say whether it be or not,—it is more than poetry. It is not history, nor biography. It is not anthology, like the Sermon on the Mount; nor metaphysical dialectics, like the Buddhist Sūtras; nor sublime homiletics like Plato's conferences of the wise and foolish teachers. It is a prophet's cry, Semitic to the core; yet of a meaning so universal and so timely that all the voices of the age take it up, willing or unwilling, and it echoes over palaces and deserts, over cities and empires, first kindling its chosen hearts to world-conquest, then gathering itself up into a reconstructive force that all the creative light of Greece and Asia might penetrate the heavy gloom of Christian Europe, when Christianity was but the Queen of Night."¹

In general literature, embracing every phase of the human intellect, ethics, metaphysics, logic, rhetoric, the Moslem writers may be counted by hundreds. In poetry, the fertility of the Moslem mind has not been yet surpassed. From Mutanabbi the Arab (not to go back to the poets who flourished in the time of the Prophet) to Hāli the Indian, there is an endless succession of poets. Mutanabbi flourished in the ninth century, and enjoyed the patronage of Ameer Saif ud-dowla (Abu’l Hasan Ali bin Hamdàn). He was followed by Ibn-Duraid,² Abū-Ula,³ Ibn Fāridh,⁴ Tantarānī,⁵ and others. The Spanish Arabs were nature's poets; they invented the different kinds of poetry, which afterwards were adopted as models by the

¹ Johnson ² Died in A.C. 933 ³ Died in A.C. 1057.
⁴ Died in A.C. 1255. ⁵ Died in A.C. 1092.
Christian nations of southern Europe. Among the great poets who flourished in Spain the name of Ahmed ibn Mohammed (Abû-Omar)\(^1\) is the most famous. We have already mentioned the poets who lived under Mahmûd; Firdousi, who brought back to life the dead heroes of Irân, rivals the fame of the sovereign whom first he praised and afterwards satirised. Under the later Ghaznavides and the Seljukides flourished the lyric poets Suzeni,\(^2\) the creator of the Persian metrical system, and Watwât; the panegyrists Anwarî,\(^3\) Khâkânî,\(^4\) and Zahîr Fâryâbî;\(^5\) the great mystics, Sanâî,\(^6\) whose Hadîka is valued wherever the Persian language is known and appreciated, and Farîd ud-dîn 'Attâr;\(^7\) and the romancist Nizâmî, the immortal bard of Khusrû and Shirîn and of Alexander. Under the Atâbegs, who rose to power on the decline of the Seljukides, flourished the moralist Sa'dî and the mystic Jalâl ud-dîn Rûmî. Under Timûr lived the sweet singer Hâfiz (Shams ud-dîn), called the Anacreon of Persia. These are but a very few of the names famous in the realm of poetry. The pages of Ibn-Khallikân, and of Lutf Ali Azar\(^8\) speak more eloquently of the poetical genius of the Moslems.

Such were the glorious achievements of the Moslems in the field of intellect; and all was due to the teachings of one man. Called by his voice from the abyss of barbarism and ignorance in which they had lutherto dwelt, with little hope of the present, with none of the future, the Arab went into the world, to elevate and civilise. Afflicted humanity awoke into new life. Whilst the barbarians of Europe, who had overturned an effete empire, were groping in the darkness of ignorance and brutality, the Moslems were building up a great civilisation. During centuries of moral and intellectual desolation in Europe, Islâm led the vanguard of progress. Christianity had established

\(^{1}\) A.C. 1175, A.H. 569
\(^{2}\) A.C. 1177, A.H. 573

\(^{3}\) Anwarî’s panegyric on Sultan Sanjar is one of the finest poems in the Persian language. The Hindustân poet Sauda in the Kasîda in honour of Asaf ud-Dowla of Oudh has imitated Anwarî with great success.

\(^{4}\) A.C. 1180, A.H. 582
\(^{5}\) A.C. 1201, A.H. 598.

\(^{6}\) A.C. 1180, A.H. 576
\(^{7}\) A.C. 1190, A.H. 586

\(^{8}\) The Atesh-Kadîkh ("Fire Temple") of Lutf Ali Azar is the lives of the Persian poets from the earliest times, with specimens of their poetry.
IX. THE LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC SPIRIT

itself on the throne of the Cæsars, but it had failed to regenerate the nations of the earth. From the fourth century of the Christian era to the twelfth, the gloom that overshadowed Europe grew deeper and deeper. During these ages of ferocious bigotry Ecclesiasticism barred every access through which the light of knowledge, humanity, or civilisation could enter. But though jealously shut out from this land of fanaticism, the benignant influences of Islâmic culture in time made themselves felt in every part of Christendom. From the schools of Salerno, of Bagdad, of Damascus, of Cordova, of Granada, of Malaga, the Moslems taught the world the gentle lessons of philosophy and the practical teachings of stern science.¹

The first manifestation of Rationalism in the West occurred in the province most amenable to the power of Moslem civilisation. Ecclesiasticism crushed this fair flower with fire and with sword, and threw back the progress of the world for centuries. But the principles of Free Thought, so strongly impressed on Islâm, had communicated their vitality to Christian Europe. Abelard had felt the power of Averroes’ genius, which was shedding its light over the whole of the Western world. Abelard struck a blow for Free Thought which led to the eventual emancipation of Christendom from the bondage of Ecclesiasticism. Avenpace and Averroes were the precursors of Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke.

The influence of Abelard and of his school soon penetrated into England. Wycliffe’s originality of thought and freedom of spirit took their rise from the bold conceptions of the former thinkers. The later German reformers, deriving their notions on one side from the iconoclasts of Constantinople, and on the other from the movements of the Albigenses and the Wycliffites, completed the work which had been commenced by others under foreign rationalistic influence.

While Christian Europe had placed learning under the ban of persecution; while the Vicar of Christ set the example of stifling the infant lisplings of Free Thought; while the priests

¹ The impetus which Islâm gave to the intellectual development of mankind is evidenced by the fact that the Arabs were joined in the race for progress by members of nationalities which had hitherto lain absolutely dormant. Islâm quickened the pulse of humanity and awakened new life in communities which were either dead or dying; see Appendix III.
led the way in consigning to the flames thousands of inoffensive beings for mere aberration of reason; while Christian Europe was exorcising demons and worshipping rags and bones—learning flourished under the Moslem sovereigns, and was held in honour and veneration as never before. The Vicegerents of Mohammed allied themselves to the cause of civilisation, and assisted in the growth of Free Thought and Free Inquiry, originated and consecrated by the Prophet himself. Persecution for the sake of the faith was unknown; and whatever the political conduct of the sovereigns, the world has never had superior examples in their impartiality and absolute toleration of all creeds and religions. The cultivation of the physical sciences—that great index to the intellectual liberty of a nation—formed a popular pursuit among the Moslems.

The two failures of the Arabs, the one before Constantinople and the other in France, retarded the progress of the world for ages, and put back the hour-hand of time for centuries. Had the Arabs been less keen for the safety of their spoils, less divided among themselves, had they succeeded in driving before them the barbarian hosts of Charles Martel, the history of the darkest period in the annals of the world would never have been written. The Renaissance, civilisation, the growth of intellectual liberty, would have been accelerated by seven hundred years. We should not have had to shudder over the massacre of the Albigenses or of the Huguenots, or the ghastly slaughters of the Irish Catholics by the English Protestants under the Tudors and the Protectorate. We should not have had to mourn over the fate of a Bruno or a Servetus, murdered by the hands of those who had revolted from their mother-church. The history of the auto-da-fe, of the murders of the Inquisition, of the massacres of the Aztecs and the Incas; the tale of the Thirty Years' War, with its manifold miseries,—all this would have remained untold. Above all, Spain, at one time the favoured haunt of learning and the arts, would not have become the intellectual desert it now is, bereft of the glories of centuries. Who has not mourned over the fate of that noble race, exiled by the mad bigotry of a Christian sovereign from the country of its adoption, which it had made famous among nations? Justly has it been said, "In an ill-omened hour the Cross
supplanted the Crescent on the towers of Granada." The shades of the glorious dead, of Averroes and Avenpace, of Wâlâdèh and Âyesha, sit weeping by the ruined haunts of their people—haunts silent now to the voice of minstrelsy, of chivalry, of learning, and of art,—only echoing at times the mad outcries of religious combatants, at times the fierce sounds of political animosities. Christianity drove the descendents of these Moslem Andalusians into the desert, sucked out every element of vitality from beautiful Spain, and made the land a synonym for intellectual and moral desolation.\(^1\)

If Maslamah had succeeded in capturing Constantinople,—the capital of Irene, the warm advocate of orthodoxy and cruel murderess of her own son,—the dark deeds which sully the annals of the Isaurians, the Comneni, the Palæologi, the terrible results which attended the seizure of Byzantium by the Latins, above all, the frightful outburst of the unholy wars, in which Christian Europe tried to strangle the nations of Asia, would probably never have come to pass. One thing at all events is certain, that if Constantinople had fallen into the hands of the Moslems, the iconoclastic movement would not have proved altogether abortive, and the reformation of the Christian Church would have been accomplished centuries earlier. Providence willed otherwise. The wave of Free Thought, which had reached the Isaurian emperors from the Islâmic regions, broke upon the rocks of ignorance, superstition, and bigotry; its power was not felt until the combined action of the schools of Salerno and Cordova—the influence of Averroes, and perhaps of some Greeks who had imbibed learning at the Saracen fountain—had battered down the rampart of Ecclesiasticism.

Islâm inaugurated the reign of intellectual liberty. It has been truly remarked, that so long as Islâm retained its pristine character, it proved itself the warm protector and promoter of knowledge and civilisation,—the zealous ally of intellectual freedom. The moment extraneous elements attached themselves to it, it lagged behind in the race of progress.

But, to explain the stagnation of the Moslems in the present

---

\(^1\) For the economic condition of Spain and the state of arts and learning under the Arabs, see *Short History of the Saracens*, pp 474-580
day, it is necessary to glance back for a moment at the events that transpired in Spain, in Africa, and in Asia between the twelfth and the seventeenth centuries. In the former country, Christianity destroyed the intellectual life of the people. The Moslems had turned Spain into a garden; the Christians converted it into a desert. The Moslems had covered the land with colleges and schools; the Christians transformed them into churches for the worship of saints and images. The literary and scientific treasures amassed by the Moslem sovereigns were consigned to the flames. The Moslem men, women, and children were ruthlessly butchered or burnt at the stake; the few who were spared were reduced to slavery. Those who fled were thrown on the shores of Africa helpless beggars. It would take the combined charity of Jesus and Mohammed to make Islâm forget or forgive the terrible wrongs inflicted by the Christians of Spain upon the Andalusian Moslems. But the punishment was not long in coming. Before the world was a century old, Spain's fire had sunk into a heap of ashes!

In Western Africa, the triumph of Patristicism under the third Almohade sovereign,¹ and the uprise of Berber fanaticism turned back the tide of progress, arrested the civilisation of centuries, and converted the seats of learning and arts into centres of bigotry and ignorance. The settlement of the Corsairs on the Barbary coast and the anarchy which prevailed in Egypt under the later Mamelukes, discouraged the cultivation of peaceful knowledge. In Asia the decadence of the Timûrid dynasty, the eruption of the wild and fanatical Uzbegs, and the establishment of their power in the capital of Timûr, destroyed the intellectual vitality of the people. In Persia, under the Safawis, literature and science had begun

¹ On the decadence of the Fâtimude power in Western Africa there arose a dynasty descended from a Marâbî or saint of the country, hence called Almoravide or al-Murâbita (المرابطين). To this family belonged Yusuf ibn Tâshfin, the patron of Ibn-Zahr. His son and successor was defeated and killed by Abdûl Momin, the founder of the dynasty of Almohades (al-Muwahhidîn, الموحدين, the Unitarians), who sacked and destroyed Morocco and Fez. They were akin to the Wahâbîs and the Ikhwân of Central Arabia, and probably not very different from the Mahdis of Lybia. The first two sovereigns of this dynasty, Abdûl Momin and Yusuf, encouraged learning and arts. In the reign of Ya’kûb al-Mansûr, the third Almohade king, fanaticism became rampant.
to breathe once more; but this renaissance was only temporary, and with the irruption of the barbarous Ghihzais the renovated life of Irân came to an end. A deathlike gloom settled upon Central Asia, which still hangs heavy over these unhappy countries, and is slowly lifting in Afghanistan.

Under Selim I, Solyman and the Murads, learning received support in the Ottoman dominions; but the Osmanlis were on the whole a military race. At first from ambition, afterwards from sheer necessity and for self-preservation, they had been at war with a relentless foe, whose designs knew no slackening, whose purpose was inscrutable. That enemy has disappeared, but the nation has still to fight for its existence. Letters and arts, under such conditions, can make but little progress. Dealing with the charge of obscurantism, often levelled against İslâm, M. Gobineau makes the following pregnant observation: "Imagine in any European country the absolute predominance of military and administrative despotism during a period of two hundred and fifty years, as is the case in Turkey, conceive something approaching the warlike anarchy of Egypt under the domination of foreign slaves—Circassians, Georgians, Turks, and Albanians; picture to yourself an Afghan invasion, as in Persia after 1739, the tyranny of Nâdir Shah, the cruelties and ravages that have marked the accession of the dynasty of the Kajars,—unite all these circumstances with their naturally concomitant causes, you will then understand what would have become of any European country although European, and it will not be necessary to look further for any explanation of the ruin of Oriental countries, nor to charge İslâm with any unjust responsibility."

From the time of its birth in the seventh century up to the end of the seventeenth, not to descend later, İslâm was animated by a scientific and literary spirit equal in force and energy to that which animates Europe of our own day. It carried the Moslems forward on a wave of progress, and enabled them to achieve a high degree of material and mental development. Since the eruption of the Goths and the Vandals, the progress of Europe has been on a continuous scale. No such calamity as has afflicted Asia, in the persons of the Tartars or the Uzbegs, has befallen Christendom since Attila's retreat
reconciled with each other? It seems inconsistent at first sight that man should be judged by his works, a doctrine which forms the foundation of Islāmic morality, if all his actions are ruled by an all-powerful Will. The earnest faith of Mohammed in an active ever-living Principle, joined to his trust in the progress of man, supplies a key to this mystery. I propose to illustrate my meaning by a reference to a few of the passages which give expression to the absolutism of the Divine Will and those which assert the liberty of human volition: "And God's ordering is in accordance with a determined decree; ... and the sun proceeding to its place of rest—that is an ordinance of the Almighty, the All-wise; \(^{1}\) ... and among His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and of the animals which He hath distributed therein, which He has sovereign power to gather when He will; \(^{2}\) ... and do they not see that God who created the heavens and the earth, and faltered not in creating these, has power to vivify the dead—nay, He has sovereign control over all things; \(^{3}\) and other things which are not at your command, but which are truly within His grasp, as much as God is sovereign disposer of all things; \(^{4}\) nor is there anything not provided beforehand by Us, or which We send down otherwise than according to a fore-known decree; \(^{5}\) ... the secrets of the heavens and the earth are God's; ... God has all things at command, \(^{6}\) ... and propounded to them a similitude of this present life, which is like water sent down by Us from heaven, so that the plants of the earth are fattened by it, and on the morrow become stubble, scattered by the winds,—God disposes of all things; \(^{7}\) ... and it pertains to God's sovereignty to defend them; \(^{8}\) ... God creates what He will, \(^{9}\) ... and who created all things, and determined respecting the same with absolute determination; \(^{10}\) ... and thy Lord is a supreme sovereign; \(^{11}\) ... behold then the imprints of the mercy of God—how He vivifies the earth, after it has died—in very deed, a restorer of life to the dead is there, and all things are at His budding; \(^{12}\) ... to God belongs whatsoever is in the

---

\(^{1}\) xxvi. 48  \(^{2}\) xiii. 28  \(^{3}\) xli. 29.  \(^{4}\) xlviii. 21.  \(^{5}\) xv. 21.

\(^{6}\) xvi. 77  \(^{7}\) xlviii. 45  \(^{8}\) xxi. 40.  \(^{9}\) xli. 44.  \(^{10}\) xxv. 2.

\(^{11}\) xxv. 54  \(^{12}\) وَهُمْ عَلَى كُلٍّ شَيْءٍ تَفْدِيرٌ , xxi. 50
heavens and whatsoever is on the earth; and whether ye disclose that which is within you or conceal it, God will reckon with you for it; and He pardons whom He will, and punishes whom He will—inasmuch as God is a Supreme Sovereign;

say thou: O God, Sovereign Disposer of dominion, Thou givest rule to whom Thou wilt, and takest away power from whom Thou wilt, Thou exaltest whom Thou wilt, and humblest whom Thou wilt— all good is at Thy disposal— verily, Thou art a Supreme Sovereign;

God punishes whom He will, and pardons whom He will;

to God belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and whatsoever they contain is His, and He is Sovereign over all things.

Verily, God accomplishes what He ordains—He hath established for everything a fixed decree; but God has the measuring out (بَدْنُر) of the night and the day; extol the name of Thy Lord, the Most High, who made the world, and fashioned it to completeness, who fore-ordained, and guides accordingly; as for the unbelievers it matters nothing to them whether thou warnest them or dost not warn them; they will not believe; God hath sealed up their hearts and their ears; and the darkness of night is over their eyes, and God guides into the right path whomsoever He will.

God is pleased to make your burden light, inasmuch as man is by nature infirm.

God changes not as to what concerns any people until they change in respect to what depends upon themselves;

say thou: Verily, Gods leads astray whomsoever He will, and directs to Himself those who are penitent.

It will be noticed that, in many of these passages by "the decree of God" is clearly meant the law of nature. The stars and planets have each their appointed course, so has every other object in creation. The movements of the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of nature, life and death, are all governed by law. Other passages unquestionably indicate the idea of Divine agency upon human will; but they are again explained by others, in which that agency is "conditioned" upon human will. It is to the seeker for Divine help that God
reconciled with each other? It seems inconsistent at first sight that man should be judged by his works, a doctrine which forms the foundation of Islāmic morality, if all his actions are ruled by an all-powerful Will. The earnest faith of Mohammed in an active ever-living Principle, joined to his trust in the progress of man, supplies a key to this mystery. I propose to illustrate my meaning by a reference to a few of the passages which give expression to the absolutism of the Divine Will and those which assert the liberty of human volition: "And God's ordering is in accordance with a determined decree; ... and the sun proceeding to its place of rest—that is, an ordinance (بِنِصْرِ) of the Almighty, the All-wise;¹... and among His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and of the animals which He hath distributed therein, which He has sovereign power to gather when He will;²... and do they not see that God who created the heavens and the earth, and faltered not in creating these, has power to vivify the dead—nay, He has sovereign control over all things;³ and other things which are not at your command, but which are truly within His grasp,asmuch as God is sovereign disposer of all things (على كل شيء قدير);⁴ nor is there anything not provided beforehand by Us, or which We send down otherwise than according to a fore-known decree;⁵ the secrets of the heavens and the earth are God's; ... God has all things at command;⁶... and propound to them a similitude of this present life, which is like water sent down by Us from heaven, so that the plants of the earth are fattened by it, and on the morrow become stubble, scattered by the winds,—God disposes of all things;⁷... and it pertains to God's sovereignty to defend them;⁸ God creates what He will;⁹... and who created all things, and determined respecting the same with absolute determination,¹⁰... and thy Lord is a supreme sovereign;¹¹... behold thou the imprints of the mercy of God how He vivifies the earth, after it has died—in very deed, a restorer of life to the dead is there, and all things are at His bidding;¹²... to God belongs whatsoever is in the

¹ xcvii 38
² xlix 28.
³ xlv 29.
⁴ xlviii 21.
⁵ xlv. 21.
⁶ xvi 77.
⁷ xlv 45.
⁸ xxiv 45.
⁹ xxv 54.
¹⁰ xxv. 2.
¹¹ xvi 54.
¹² xvi 54.
heavens and whatsoever is on the earth; and whether ye disclose that which is within you or conceal it, God will reckon with you for it; and He pardons whom He will, and punishes whom He will—inasmuch as God is a Supreme Sovereign;¹ . . . say thou: O God, Sovereign Disposer of dominion, Thou givest rule to whom Thou wilt, and takest away power from whom Thou wilt, Thou exaltest whom Thou wilt, and humblest whom Thou wilt: all good is at Thy disposal—verily, Thou art a Supreme Sovereign;² . . . God punishes whom He will, and pardons whom He will;³ . . . to God belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and whatsoever they contain is His, and He is Sovereign over all things.⁴ . . . Verily, God accomplishes what He ordains—He hath established for everything a fixed decree;⁵ . . . but God has the measuring out (مُقَدَّر) of the night and the day;⁶ . . . extol the name of Thy Lord, the Most High, who made the world, and fashioned it to completeness, who fore-ordained, and guides accordingly;⁷ . . . as for the unbelievers it matters nothing to them whether thou warkest them or dost not war them; they will not believe; God hath sealed up their hearts and their ears;⁸ . . . and the darkness of night is over their eyes,⁹ . . . and God guides into the right path whomsoever He will,¹⁰ . . . God is pleased to make your burthens light, inasmuch as man is by nature infirm. . . . God changes not as to what concerns any people until they change in respect to what depends upon themselves;¹¹ . . . say thou: Verily, God leads astray whomsoever He will, and directs to Himself those who are penitent.”¹²

It will be noticed that, in many of these passages by “the decree of God” is clearly meant the law of nature. The stars and planets have each their appointed course, so has every other object in creation. The movements of the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of nature, life and death, are all governed by law. Other passages unquestionably indicate the idea of Divine agency upon human will; but they are again explained by others, in which that agency is “conditioned” upon human will. It is to the seeker for Divine help that God

¹ ii. 284. ² iii 25 ³ v. 18 ⁴ v. 120 ⁵ lxv 3 ⁶ lxix. 20. ⁷ lxviii 1-3 ⁸ ii. 5-6 ⁹ ii. 7. ¹⁰ xiii. 31. ¹¹ “الله لا يغيّر ما نقوم حتى يغيّروا ما نفّسوا.” ¹² xiii. 27.
renders His help; it is on the searcher of his own heart, who purifies his soul from impure longings, that God bestows grace. To the Arabian Teacher, as to his predecessors, the existence of an Almighty Power, the Fashioner of the Universe, the Ruler of His creatures, was an intense and vivid reality. The feeling of "an assured trust" in an all-pervading, ever-conscious Personality has been the motive power in the world of every age. To the weary mariner, "sailing on life's solemn main," there is nothing more assuring, nothing that more satisfies the intense longing for a better and purer world, than the consciousness of a Power above humanity to redress wrongs, to fulfil hopes, to help the forlorn. Our belief in God springs from the very essence of Divine ordinances. They are as much laws, in the strictest sense of the word, as the laws which regulate the movements of the celestial bodies. But the will of God is not an arbitrary will: it is an educating will, to be obeyed by the scholar in his walks of learning as by the devotee in his cell.

The passages, however, in which human responsibility and the freedom of human will are laid down in emphatic terms define and limit the conception of absolutism. "And whosoever gets to himself a sin, gets it solely on his own responsibility; and let alone those who make a sport and a mockery of their religion, and whom this present world has deluded, and thereby bring to remembrance that any soul perishes for what it has got to itself; and when they commit a deed of shame they say, We have found that our fathers did so, and God obliges us to do it, say thou, Surely, God requireth not shameful doing. they did injustice to themselves, yonder will every soul experience that which it hath bargained for; so then, whosoever goes astray, he himself bears the whole responsibility of wandering."

---

1. من يكسب إما فإما يكسبه على نفسه
2. إن دلل نفس بما كسب
3. إما على إما لا بإم لا بإم
4. ولكن كاروا النعم والنور
5. بذلك تلوا كل نفس ما اسلفت
6. فن اهتم في إما إما بنغد في نفس ونفس صل فنام نسلم عليها
Man, within the limited sphere of his existence, is absolute master of his conduct. He is responsible for his actions, and for the use or misuse of the powers with which he has been endowed. He may fall or rise, according to his own "inclination." There was supreme assistance for him who sought Divine help and guidance. Is not the soul purer and better in calling to its Lord for that help which He has promised? Are not the weak strengthened, the stricken comforted--by their own appeal to the Heavenly Father for solace and strength? Such were the ideas of the Teacher of Islam with regard to Divine sovereignty and the liberty of human volition. His recorded sayings handed down from sources which may be regarded as unquestionably authentic, help in explaining the conception he entertained about freewill and predestination (جبر و اختيار و قضاء و قدر).

Not only his own words, but those of his son-in-law, "the legitimate heir to his inspiration," and his immediate descendants, who derived their ideas from him, may well furnish us with a key to the true Islamic notion on the question of the free agency of man—a subject which has for ages, both in Islam and in Christianity, been the battleground of sectarian disputes. In discussing this subject, we must not, however, lose sight of the fact that most of the traditions which have supplied to Patristicism its armoury of weapons against the sovereignty of reason, bear evident traces of being 'made to order.' They tell their own story of how, and the circumstances under which, they came into existence. Some of the traditions which purport to be handed down by men who came casually in contact with the Teacher, show palpable signs of changes and transformations in the minds and in the memories of the mediaries. The authentic sayings, however, are many, and I shall refer only to a few to explain what I have already indicated, that in Mohammed’s mind an earnest belief in the liberty of human will was joined to a vivid trust in the personality of the heavenly Father. Hereditary depravity and natural sinfulness were emphatically denied. Every child of man was born pure and true, every departure in after-life from the path of truth and rectitude is due to education. "Every man is born religiously constituted; it is his parents who make him afterwards a Jew, Christian, or a
Sabæan, like as ye take up the beast at its birth—do ye intend upon it any mutilation, until ye yourselves mutilate it?" 1

Infants have no positive moral character: for about those who die in early life, "God best knows what would have been their conduct" [had they lived to maturity]. "Every human being has two inclinations,—one prompting him to good and impelling him thereto, and the other prompting him to evil and thereto impelling him; 2 but the godly assistance is nigh, and he who asks the help of God in contending with the evil promptings of his own heart obtains it." "It is your own conduct which will lead you to paradise or hell, as if you had been destined therefore." No man's conduct is the outcome of fatality, nor is he borne along by an irresistible decree to heaven or hell; on the contrary, the ultimate result is the creation of his own actions, for each individual is primarily answerable for his future destiny. "Every moral agent is furthered to his own conduct," or, as it is put in another tradition: "Every one is divinely furthered in accordance with his character." 3

Human conduct is by no means fortuitous; one act is the result of another; and life, destiny and character mean the connected series of incidents and actions which are related to each other, as cause and effect, by an ordained law, "the assignment" of God. In the sermons of the Disciple we find the doctrine more fully developed. "Weigh your own soul before the time for the weighing of your actions arrives; take count with yourself before you are called upon to account for your conduct in this existence; apply yourself to good and pure actions, adhere to the path of truth and rectitude before the soul is pressed to leave its earthly abode: verily, if you will not guide and warn yourself, none other can direct you." 4 "I adjure you to

1 "Qal رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ماه من مولود إلا بولد على القفرة قابوته بهوداه و بنصراه و بحمساه كما قنعت الديهجة دوما سبب النصر و البجد." Bukhari's Collections, chapter on the Hadis, "He is secured whom God helps", reported by Abu Sa'id al-Khuzari.

2 "أعملوا فكل ميستر لما حافي له" Nahj al-Balaghah, p. 33 (a collection of the Khutbas of the Caliph Ali by one of his descendants, named Sharif Riza, mentioned by Ibn-Khallikân), printed at Tabriz in 1299 A.H.
worship the Lord in purity and holiness. He has pointed out to you the path of salvation and the temptations of this world. Abstain from foulness, though it may be fair-seeming to your sight; avoid evil, however pleasant... For ye knoweth how far it takes you away from Him... Listen, and take warning by the words of the Merciful Guardian."¹... And again, "O ye servants of my Lord, fulfil the duties that are imposed on you, for in their neglect is abasement: your good works alone will render easy the road to death. Remember, each sin increases the debt, and makes the chain [which binds you] heavier. The message of mercy has come; the path of truth is clear; obey the command that has been laid on you; live in purity, and work in piety, and ask God to help you in your endeavours, and to forgive your past transgressions."²

"Cultivate humility and forbearance: comport yourself with piety and truth. Take count of your actions with your own conscience (نفس), for he who takes such count reaps a great reward, and he who neglects incurs great loss. He who acts with piety gives rest to his soul; he who takes warning understands the truth; he who understands it attains the perfect knowledge." These utterances convey no impression of predestinarianism; on the contrary, they portray a soul animated with a living faith in God, and yet full of trust in human development founded upon individual exertion springing from human volition. Mohammed's definition of reason and knowledge, of the cognition of the finite and infinite, reminds us of Aristotelian phraseology and thought, and Ali's address to his son may be read with advantage by the admirer of Aristotelian ethics.

The Ihtijāj ut-Tabrasi ³ supplies further materials to form a correct opinion on the question of predestinarianism in Islām. The Caliph Ali was one day asked the meaning of Kazâ (كز) and Kadar (كرد) he replied, "The first means obedience to the commandments of God and avoidance of sin; the latter, the ability to live a holy life, and to do that which brings one nearer to God and to shun that which throws him away from

---

¹ Ibid. p. 136
² Nahj ul-Balâghat, p 170
³ Evidences of Tabrasi, a collection of traditions by the Shaikh ut-Tabrasi.
His perfection. . . Say not that man is compelled, for that is attribution of tyranny to God; nor say that man has absolute discretion,1—rather that we are furthered by His help and grace in our endeavours to act righteously, and we transgress because of our neglect (of His commands)." One of his interlocutors, 'Utba ibn Rabi'a Asadi, asked him once as to the meaning of the words "there is no power nor help but from God," لا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله. "It means," said the Caliph, "that I am not afraid of God's anger, but I am afraid of his purity; nor have I the power to observe His commandment, but my strength is in His assistance." 2 . . . God has placed us on earth to try each according to his endowments. Referring to the following and other passages of the Koran, the Caliph went on to say, "God says, 'We will try you to see who are the strivers (مُجاهِدُون) [after truth and purity], and who are the forbearing and patient, and We will test your actions.' . . . and 'We will help you by degrees to attain what ye know not.' 3 . . . These verses prove the liberty of human volition." 4 Explaining the verse of the Koran, "God directs him whom He chooses, and leads astray him whom He chooses," the Caliph said that this does not mean that He compels men to evil or good, that He either gives direction or refuses it according to His caprice, for this would do away with all responsibility for human action; it means, on the contrary, that God points out the road to truth, and lets men choose as they will. 5

Arabian philosophy, nurtured afterwards in other cradles, drew its first breath in the school of Medina. The freedom of human will, based on the doctrine that man would be judged by the use he had made of his reason, was inculcated in the teachings of the Master, along with an earnest belief in a Supreme Power ruling the universe. The idea assumed a more definite shape in the words of the Disciple, and grew into a philosophy. From Medina it was carried to Damascus, Kūfa, Basra, and

---

1 I.e. to decide what is right and what is wrong.
2 Jihād ut-Tabrasi, p. 236
5 Ibid.
Baghdad, where it gave birth to the eclectic schools, which shed such lustre on the reigns of the early Abbasides.

The butchery of Kerbela and the sack of Medina had led to the closing of the lecture-room of the Imâms. With the appearance of Jaafar as-Sâdîk as the head of Mohammed’s descendants, it acquired a new life. Extremely liberal and rationalistic in his views,—a scholar, a poet, and a philosopher, apparently well read in some of the foreign languages,—in constant contact with cultured Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians, with whom metaphysical disputations were frequent,—he impressed a distinct philosophical character on the Medânite school. Some of his views respecting predestination deserve to be mentioned. Speaking of the doctrine of Jabr (compulsion or predestinationism), which had about this period made its appearance in Damascus, he expressed the following opinion: “Those who uphold Jabr make out God to be a participator in every sin they commit, and a tyrant for punishing those sins which they are impelled to commit by the compulsion of their being; this is infidelity.” Then (giving the analogy of a servant sent by his master to the market to purchase something which he, the master, knows well that he cannot bring, not possessing the wherewithal to buy it, and, nevertheless, the master punishes him) the Imâm adds, “the doctrine of Jabr converts God into an unjust Master.”

As regards the opposite doctrine of absolute liberty (Tafwîz, delegation of authority) — meaning not the freedom of human will, but unqualified discretion in the choice of wrong and right, he declared that to affirm such a principle would destroy all the foundations of morality, and give to all human beings absolute licence in the indulgence of their amoral propensities; for if each individual is vested with a discretion to choose what is right or wrong, no sanction, no law can have any force.  

1 Ihtijâj ut-Tabrâsî, p 236.  
2 Ibid. p. 235
the eighth Imám, Ali ar-Rızá, who denounced \textit{Jabr} (predestinarianism) and \textit{Tashbîh} (anthropomorphism) as absolute infidelity,¹ and declared the upholders of those doctrines to be "the enemies of the Faith." He openly charged the advocates of \textit{Jabr} and \textit{Tashbîh} with the fabrication of traditions. At the same time he warned his followers against the doctrine of \textit{discretion} or \textit{Tafwîz}. He laid down in broad terms, "God has pointed out to you the two paths, one of which leads you to Him, the other takes you far away from His perfection; you are at liberty to take the one or the other; pain or joy, reward or punishment, depend upon your own conduct. But man has not the capacity of turning evil into good, or sin into virtue."

The Ommeyyades, many of whom remained pagans at heart even after the profession of Islâm, were, like their forefathers, fatalists. Under them arose a school which purported to derive its doctrines from the "ancients," the \textit{Salaf}, a body of primitive Moslems. All of them were dead; it was consequently easy to fabricate any tradition and pass it as handed down by one or other of them. Jahm bin Saťwān was the founder of this school, which was called \textit{Jabria}. The \textit{Jabriases} ² rivalled Calvin in the absolute denial of free-will to man. They maintained "that man is not responsible for any of his actions which proceed entirely from God; ³ that he has no determining power to do any act, nor does he possess the capacity of free volition; that he is the subject of absolute Divine sovereignty in his actions, without ability on his part, or will or power of choice; and that God absolutely creates actions within him just as He produces activity in all inanimate things;... and that reward and punishment are subject to absolute Divine sovereignty in human actions." The \textit{Jabriases} maintained certain views regarding Divine attributes which have no

¹ He who believes in \textit{Jabr} is a \textit{Kāfîr}; \textit{Ihtijāj ut-Tabrāsi}, p. 214.
² Shahristānī divides the \textit{Jabriases} into two branches, one being \textit{Jabriases} pure and simple, and the other more moderate. The first maintained that neither action nor the ability to act belongs in any sense to man (بَعْضٌ لِلْعَدْدِ قُوَّةٌ غَيْرَ قُوَّةٌ عَلَى الْقَوْلِ إِصَالًا) the latter held that man has an ability which is not at all efficacious.
³ إِجَارِيَّ دُمَمُ الْقَوْلِ حَدِيثَهُ عِنْ الْعَدْدِ وَإِصَالَهُ إِلَى الرَّبِّ نَعَمَالٍ
particular significance.\textsuperscript{1} According to Shahrastānī, the \textit{Jabriya}s were divided into three sects, viz.: the \textit{Jahmiya}, the \textit{Najjāria}, and the \textit{Zirāria}, differing from each other on minor points; but, so far as the doctrine of predestination was concerned, all of them were agreed in denying free agency. The \textit{Najjāria}s, who, after undergoing several transformations, developed two centuries later into the \textit{Ashʿarīa}s, maintained that God creates the conduct of His creatures, good and bad, virtuous and vicious, while man appropriates the same. The \textit{Jabriya} doctrines found favour with the Ommeyyade rulers, and soon spread among the people.

The uncompromising fatalism of the \textit{Jabriya}s occasioned among the thinking classes a revolt, which was headed by Maʿbad al-Juhani, Yūnis al-Aswāri, and Ghailān Dimishki (\textit{i.e.} of Damascus), who had evidently derived many of their ideas from the Fātimides. They boldly asserted in the capital of the Ommeyyades, in the very stronghold of predestinarianism, the free agency of man\textsuperscript{2}. But in the assertion of human liberty they sometimes verged on the doctrine of \textit{Taswīr}. From Damascus the dispute was carried to Basra, and there the differences of the two parties waxed high. The \textit{Jabriya}s merged into a new sect, called the \textit{Sīfāliya}s,\textsuperscript{3} who, with predestinarianism, combined the affirmation of certain attributes in the Deity as distinct from His Essence, which the \textit{Jabriya}s denied. The \textit{Sīfāliya}s claimed to be the direct representatives of the \textit{Salaf}. According to Shahrastānī, these followers of the \textit{Salaf} "maintained that certain eternal attributes pertain to God, namely, knowledge, power, life, will, hearing, sight, speech, majesty, magnanimity, bounty, beneficence, glory, and greatness,—making no distinction between attributes of essence and attributes of action.... They also assert certain descriptive attributes (\textit{مفاتيح خبرة}), as, for example, hands and face, without any other explanation than to say that these attributes enter into the \textit{revealed} representation of the Deity, and that, accordingly, they had given them the name of descriptive attributes." Like the \textit{Jabriya}s, they adhered to the doctrine of predestination in all its gloominess and intensity.

\textsuperscript{1} Shahrastānī, part 1, p. 59
\textsuperscript{2} Shahrastānī, part 1, pp. 59-63.
\textsuperscript{3} Lit. Attributists
From the Sifātias sprang the Mushabbihas, "who likened the Divine attributes to the attributes of created things," and turned God into a similitude of their own selves. At this period one of the most noted professors belonging to the anti-predestinarian party was Imām Hasan, surnamed al-Basrī (from his place of residence). He was a Medinité by birth, and had actually sat at the feet of the Philosophers of the family of Mohammed." He had imbibed their liberal and rationalistic ideas, and, on settling at Basra, had started a lecture-room, which was soon thronged by the students of Irāk. Here he discoursed on the metaphysical questions of the day in the spirit of his masters.

One of his most prominent pupils was Abū Huzaina Wâsil bin ʿAtâ al-Ghazzâl, a man of great mental powers, thoroughly versed in the sciences and traditions, who had also studied in the lecture-room of Medina. He differed from the Imām on a question of religious dogma, and was made to withdraw from the lecture-room. He thereupon founded a school of his own. His followers have, from this fact, been called Muʿtazilas, or Ahl-ul-Iʿtīzāl, Dissenters. He soon rivalled the fame of his master, whose school before long practically merged in that of the pupil. In his antagonism against intellectual tyranny he often overstepped the bounds of moderation, and gave utterance to views, especially on the controversy raised by Muʿāwiyah, which were in conflict with those entertained at Medina. Yet the general rationalism of his school rallied the strongest and most liberal minds round his standard. Proceeding upon the lines of the Fatimite philosophers, and appropriating

fair partial readings of the preceding

Shahristānī draws a distinction between the Sifātīs anthropomorphists and those who came into existence later. "At a later period certain persons went beyond what had been professed by any who held to the primitive faith, and said that undoubtedly those expressions (denoting the attributes) are used in the literal sense, and are to be interpreted just as they stand, without resort to figurative interpretation; and at the same time, without insisting upon the literal sense alone, whereby they fell into pure anthropomorphism in violation of the primitive Moslem faith."

He lived in the days of Abd ul-Malik, Walîd and Hishâm. He was born in 83 AH (699-700 CE) and died in 131 AH. (748-9 CE)

Shahristānī, p. 31. Gouhar-i Murād (vide post) Muʿtazala spelt with a jatha (a) in the third syllable in the Ghyās-ul-lughat and the Farhang (Lucknow, 1889). See Appendix III.
the principles which they had laid down and the ideas to which they had often given forcible expression, he formulated into theses the doctrines which constitute the basis of his difference from the predestinarian schools and from Patristicism generally. For several centuries his school dominated over the intellects of men, and with the support of the enlightened rulers who during this period held the reins of government, it gave an impetus to the development of national and intellectual life among the Saracens such as had never been witnessed before. Distinguished scholars, prominent physicists, mathematicians, historians—all the world of intellect in fact, including the Caliphs, belonged to the Mu'tazilite school.¹

Men like Abu'l Huzail Hamdân,² Ibrâhim ibn Sayyâr an-Nazzâm,³ Ahmed ibn Hâitt, Fazl al-Hadâisi, and Abû Ali Mohammed al-Jubbâī,⁴ well read in Greek philosophy and logic, amalgamated many ideas borrowed from those sources with the Medînîte conceptions, and impressed a new feature on the philosophical notions of the Moslems. The study of Aristotle, Porphyry, and other Greek and Alexandrian writers gave birth to a new science among the Mu'tazilas, which was called Ilm-ul-Kalâm, "the science of reason" (Kalâm, logos),⁵ with which they fought both against the external as well as the internal enemies of the Faith,—the non-Moslems who assailed the teachings of Islâm from outside, and the patristic Moslems who aimed at its degradation from within. The extreme views of Wâsil on the political questions which had agitated the Caliphate of Ali were before long abandoned, with the result that moderate Mu'tazilism became substantially amalgamated with the rationalism of the Fâtimide school, whence it had sprung. It is a well-known fact that the chief doctors of the Mu'tazilite school were educated under the Fâtimides, and there can hardly be any doubt that moderate Mu'tazilism

¹ We may mention here two or three prominent Mu'tazilas whose names are still famous, e.g. Imâm Zamakhshâri, the author of the Kashshâf, admittedly the best and most erudite commentary on the Korân. Masûdî, "Imâm, historian, and philosopher," the famous Al-Hazen, Abû'l Wafâ, and Mirkhond.
³ A nephew of Abu'l Huzail.
⁴ Born in 861, died in 933.
⁵ Shahristânî, p. 18; Ibn-Khaldûn in loco.
represented the views of the Caliph Ali and the most liberal of his early descendants, and probably of Mohammed himself. A careful comparison of the Mu'tazilite doctrines will show that they were either word for word the same as were taught by the early Fātimides, or were modifications of those doctrines induced by the requirements of a progressive society, and partly, perhaps, by the study of Greek and Alexandrian philosophy.

The Caliph Ali had condemned in emphatic language all anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conceptions of the Deity. "God was not like any object that the human mind can conceive; no attribute can be ascribed to Him which bore the least resemblance to any quality of which human beings have perception from their knowledge of material objects. The perfection of piety consists in knowing God; the perfection of knowledge is the affirmation of His verity; and the perfection of verity is to acknowledge His unity in all sincerity; and the perfection of sincerity is to deny all attributes to the Deity...."

He who refers an attribute to God believes the attribute to be God, and he who so believes an attribute to be God, regards God as two or part of one. He who asks where God is, assimilates Him with some object. God is the Creator, not because He Himself is created; God is existent, not because He was non-existent. He is with every object, not from resemblance or nearness, He is outside of everything not from separation. He is the Primary Cause, not in the meaning of motion or action; He is the Seer, but no sight can see Him. He has no relation to place, time, or measure. God is Omniscient, because knowledge is His Essence; Mighty, because Power is His Essence; Loving, because Love is His Essence. The conditions of time or space were wholly inapplicable to Him. "Takdir," constructed by the followers of the Salaf to mean predestination, meant "weighing," "probation," "trial."

Let us see now what Mu'tazilaism is. On many minor and subsidiary points the prominent Mu'tazilite doctors differed

1 Nahj ul-Balaghah; see the comment of Ibn-i-Abi'l Hadid, the Mu'tazilite.
2 From the Imam Ja'far as-Sadik, ibid.
among themselves; but I shall give here a sketch of the doctrines on which they were in accord. According to Shahristâni, the Mu'tazilas declare that "eternity is the distinguishing attribute of the Divine Being; that God is Eternal, for Eternity is the peculiar property of His Essence; they unanimously deny the existence of eternal (Divine) qualities [as distinct from His being], and maintain that He is Omniscient as to His being; Living as to His being; Almighty as to His being; but not through any knowledge, power, or life existing in Him as eternal attributes; for knowledge, power, and life are part of His Essence. Otherwise, if they are to be looked upon as eternal attributes of the Deity (separate from His Essence), it would tend to the affirmation of a multiplicity of eternal entities. They also maintain that the Word of God is created, and when created, is expressed in letters and sounds. In like manner they unanimously denied that willing, hearing, and seeing are ideas subsistent in the Divine Being, though differing as to the modes of their existence and their metaphysical grounds." They deny unanimously that God can be beheld in the Dâr-ul-Karâr (in the Abode of Rest) with the corporeal sight. They forbid the describing of God by any quality belonging to material objects, either by way of direction, or location, or appearance, or body, or change, or cessation of action, or dissolution; and they have explained the passages of the Koran in which expressions implying these qualities have been used, by asserting that the expressions are used figuratively and not literally. And this doctrine they call Ta'ihid,' assertion of Divine unity.'

1 "The Mu'tazilas called themselves," says Shahristâni, "Ashrib ul 'adi wa't-lauhid, 'people of justice and unity,' and sometimes Kadariya." As a matter of fact, however, the designation of Kadaria was never applied by the Mu'tazilas to themselves, it was applied by their enemies to the extreme Mu'tazilas who maintained the doctrine of Ijâhib, and which was condemned by the Fatimade Imams. They always repudiated that designation, and applied it to the predestinarians, who asserted that God is the Creator of every human action. Shahristâni admits this, and says -

"Ijâhib" the word 'Ijâhib'" on p. 30.

2 But he tries to refute the applicability of the word Kadaria to the predestinarians. "How can it apply to those who trust in God?", Shahristâni, p. 30.

31.

2 D
They also agree in believing that man is the creative efficient of his actions, good and bad, and gets reward and punishment in the future world by merit for what he does; and that no moral evil, or iniquity of action, or unbelief, or disobedience, can be referred to God, because, if He had caused unrighteousness to be, He would be Himself unrighteous. They also unanimously maintain that the All-wise does only that which is beneficial and good, and that a regard in the light of wisdom for the good of humanity is incumbent upon Him, though they differed as to His being obligated to secure the highest good, and to bestow grace. And this doctrine they call the doctrine of ‘adl, or justice.”

They further hold that there is no eternal law as regards human actions; that the Divine ordinances which regulate the conduct of men are the result of growth and development; that God has commanded and forbidden by a law which grew gradually. At the same time, they say that he who works righteousness merits rewards, and he who works evil deserves punishment; and this, they say, is consonant with reason. The Mu‘tazilas also say that all knowledge is attained through reason, and must necessarily be so obtained. They hold that the cognition of good and evil is also within the province of reason; that nothing is known to be wrong or right until reason has enlightened us as to the distinction; and that thankfulness for the blessings of the Benefactor is made obligatory by reason, even before the promulgation of any law on the subject. They maintain that the knowledge of God is within the province of reason; and, with the exception of Himself, everything else is liable to change or to suffer extinction. “They also maintain that the Almighty has sent His Prophets to explain to mankind His commandments... They differ among themselves as to the question of the Imâmâte; some maintaining that it descended by appointment, others holding to the right of the people to elect.” The Mu‘tazilas are, therefore, the direct antitheses of the Sifâtas, for “these and all other Ahl-us-Sunnat hold that God does whatever He pleases, for He is the
Sovereign Lord of His dominions, and whatever He wishes He orders... and this is 'adl (justice) according to them. According to the Ahl-ul-I'tizāl, what accords with Reason and Wisdom only is justice ('adl), and the doing of acts for (or according to) the good and well-being [of mankind]. The Ahl-ul-'adl say that God has commanded and forbidden by created words. According to the Ahl-us-Sunnat (the Sifâtias), all that is obligatory is known from hearsay (سمع); (secular) knowledge only is attained by reason; Reason cannot tell us what is good, or what is bad, or what is obligatory. The Ahl-ul-'adl say (on the contrary) that all knowledge comes through reason. They referred that term of tradition 'pre-destination' to trial and deliverance, adversity and prosperity, sickness and health, death and life, and other doings of God, exclusive of moral good and evil, virtue and vice, regarding men as responsible for the latter.

(دُون الخير و الشر و الحسن و الحزن إن أدَّرَبُوا في أكاسِب العبد)

and it is in the same sense that the whole community of the Mu'tazila employ that term.'

Thus far we have given the views of the school as a body; but there were certain opinions held by the prominent doctors individually, which, though not accepted beyond the immediate circle of their particular disciples, are yet deserving of notice. For example Abû-Huzail Hamdân maintained that the Creator is knowing by virtue of knowledge, but that His knowledge is His Essence; powerful by virtue of power, but that His power is His Essence; living by virtue of life, but that His life is His Essence. "A view," says Shahristānī, "adopted from the Philosophers," but really taken from the Medînite school. He also affirmed that free will (الإرادة) is an accident (عرص), additional to perfection of development and soundness (الصحة). Ibrâhîm ibn Sayyâr an-Nazzâm, "a diligent student of the books of the Philosophers," maintained "that without a revelation, man is capable, by reflection, of recognising the Creator, and of distinguishing between virtue and vice... and that the Doer of Righteousness possessed not the capacity to do wrong." Mu'ammâr ibn Abbâd as-Sulami advanced

1 Shahristānī, p 31
the Platonic theory of "archetypes." He maintained that accidents are permanent in the several species of things to which they belong (لا تنادي في كل نوع), and that every accident subsists in a subject, though its subsistence therein is only by virtue of some idea (in the human mind). Mu'ammar and his followers were in consequence of this doctrine called Idealists (الإسطاعية). Abū Ali Mohammed ibn Abdul Wahhāb, known as Abū Ali al-Jubbāi, maintained that action pertains to man in the way of origination and first production; and ascribed to man moral good and evil, obedience and disobedience, in the way of sovereignty and prerogative; and that free-will (الإسطاعة) is a pre-requisite to action, and a power additional to bodily completeness and soundness of the members. Abū'l Ma'āli al-Juwaini, 1 Imam-ul-Haramain (i.e. of the two sacred cities), who, however, did not call himself a Mu'tazila, and is generally claimed by the upholders of the opposite doctrine as belonging to their body, held that the denial of ability and free-will is something which reason and consciousness disavow, that to affirm an ability without any sort of efficacy is equivalent to denying ability altogether, and that to affirm some unintelligible influence (of ability), which constitutes a motive cause, amounts to the denial of any special influence, and that, as much as conditions and states, on the principle of those who maintain them, are not to be characterised as existing or non-existing (but must be explained by reference to their origin), action on the part of man (regarded as an existing state) is to be attributed really to his own ability, —though not in the way of origination and creation, for by creation is meant the causing of something to come into being by supreme power which was not previously in existence; and that action depends for its existence upon ability (in man), which itself depends for its existence upon some other cause, its relation to that cause being the same as the relation of (human) action to (man's) ability, and so one cause depends upon another until the causa causans (صبيب الإسباب), the Creator of causes and of their operations, the Absolute Self-

1 Died 1085.
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sufficing, is reached. "This view," adds Shahristānī, "was borrowed by Abu’l Ma’ālī from the Philosophers of the theistic school, but he presented it in the garb of the Kalām (scholastic theology)." ¹

This is the general outline of the philosophical notions of the Mu’tazilas respecting some of the most burning questions which have agitated the mind of man in every age and country, and have so frequently led to sangunary strifes and fratricidal wars both in the East and in the West.

As the assertors of divine Unity, shorn of all anthropomorphic conceptions, and the advocates of moral responsibility, they naturally called themselves ʿashāb-ul-ʿadl waʾl-tauḥīd, "upholders of the unity and justice of God," and designated their opponents Mushabbṭhas ("assimulators" or anthropomorphists). They reasoned thus: If sin emanated from, or was created by God, and man was pre-ordained to commit it, the imposition of any penalty for its commission would make the Creator an Unrighteous God, which is infidelity; thus reason and revelation both tell us that piety and sin, virtue and vice, evil and good, are the product of human volition; man has absolute control over his actions, though he has been told what is right and what is wrong. Evil and good depend upon what is just; for God’s creation is ruled by justice. Reason and justice are the guiding principles of human actions; and general usefulness and the promotion of the happiness of mankind at large, the chief criterion of right and wrong. Has not God Himself declared that "the two Paths were shown to mankind for their own good? Has He not Himself called upon them to exercise their understanding?" Rationalists and Utilitarians, they based the foundations of the moral law on the concordance of Reason with positive revelation. They walked in the footsteps of the Master and his immediate descendants. They upheld the doctrine of Evolution in regarding every law that regulates the mutual relations of man to man as the result and outcome of a process of continuous development. In their ideas of the long

¹ Comp. Juwaini’s views with those of Ibn Rushd (Averroes). Shahristānī evidently had not made himself acquainted with the views of the Fātimide Imāms; Shahristānī, part i, pp. 70, 71. The views of Abu’l Ma’ālī do not commend themselves to the "orthodox" Shahristānī.
antiquity of man on earth, they occupy a vantage ground in relation to the natural philosophers of the modern world.

Mu’tazilaism spread rapidly among all the thinking and cultured classes in every part of the Empire, and finding its way into Spain took possession of the Andalusian colleges and academies. Mansûr and his immediate successors encouraged Rationalism, but made no open profession of the Mu’tazilite doctrines. Mâmûn, who deserves more justly than any other Asiatic sovereign the title of “Great,” acknowledged his adhesion to the Mu’tazilite school; and he and his brother Mu’tasim and nephew Wâsîk, endeavoured to infuse the rationalistic spirit into the whole Moslem world. Under them Rationalism acquired a predominance such as it has not gained perhaps even in modern times in European countries. The Rationalists preached in the mosques and lectured in the colleges; they had the moulding of the character of the nation’s youth in their hands; they were the chief counsellors of the Caliphs, and it cannot be gainsaid that they used their influence wisely. As professors, preachers, scientists, physicians, viziers, or provincial governors, they helped in the growth and development of the Saracenic nation. The rise of the Bani-Idrîs in Western Africa, and the establishment of the Fâtîmisc power imparted a new life to Mu’tazilism after its glory had come to an end in Asia.

The question now naturally occurs to the mind, how is it that predestinarianism and the subjection of Reason to blind authority, though discredited by the Prophet and the Philosophers of his family, became finally predominant in the speculations and practice of the Moslem world? Before we furnish an answer to this inquiry, let us trace the development of another phase of the Moslem intellect. Mu’tazilaism has been, with considerable plausibility, compared to the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages in Europe. Scholasticism is said to have been the “movement of the intellect to justify by reason several of the dogmas of the Faith.” Mu’tazilaism also directed its endeavours to establish a concordance between

1 They derived this notion from a Hadîs reported from Abî, Bshâr-ul-Anwâr, chapter on Creation.
Reason and positive revelation. But there the parallel ends. In the Christian Church, the dogmas requiring explanation and justification were many. The doctrine of the trinity in unity, of the three "Natures" in one, of original sin, of transubstantiation, all gave rise to a certain intellectual tension. The dogmas of the Church accordingly required some such "solvent" as scholasticism before science and free thought could find their way into Christendom. In Islām the case was otherwise; with the exception of the unity of God—the doctrine of Tāuhid, which was the foundation of Mohammed's Church—there was no dogma upon which insistence was placed in any such form as to compel Reason to hold back its acceptance. The doctrine of "origin and return"—mabīlā (مبيل) and māād (ماد), "coming (from God) and returning (to Him)"—and of the moral responsibility of man, was founded on the conception of a Primal Cause the Originator of all things. That the Ego will not be entirely lost after it has been set apart from its earthy habiliments, that it will exist as a self-conscious entity after the dissolution of the body, is a notion which has been shared alike by the wise and the ignorant. Some few have denied a future existence, but the generality have believed in it, though all have differed as to the nature of that existence. So also as regards moral responsibility, there is great divergence of opinion on the mode in which man shall discharge the obligation; but there is little difference on the question that he is responsible for the use or misuse of his powers. On both these questions the words of the Teacher allow the greatest latitude of judgment; so long as the original conceptions were retained and accepted, Mohammed's Church permitted the broadest and most rationalistic view. Hence it was that Islām passed at once from the Age of Receptivity into the Age of Activity, from the Age of Faith into the Age of Reason, without any such intermediate stage as was required in Christianity.

In the Prophet's time, as well as under the Rāshidūn Caliphs, no doubt, free independent inquiry was naturally, and perhaps rightly, discouraged. But no questioning was avoided, no doubt was silenced by the terror of authority, and if the teacher was unable to answer the question, the inability was avowed in
all humility.\textsuperscript{1} Mu‘tazilaism holds therefore a distinctive place in the development of the human intellect. It bears an analogy to European scholasticism, but in reality it is akin in genius to modern rationalism. Scholasticism worked under the shadow of the Church. Mu‘tazilaism worked in conjunction with the heads of the Church. The real scholasticism of Islâm came later.

The cultivation of the physical sciences gave a new direction to Saracenic genius. A body of thinkers sprang up, who received the generic name of Hukamā\textsuperscript{2} (pl. of hakīm, a scientist or philosopher), whose method of reasoning was analogous to that of modern science. They were mostly Mu‘tazilas, but the conceptions of a few were tinged by the philosophical notions of Aristotle and the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria. Though bigotry and ignorance stigmatised them with the opprobrious epithets of infidel and heretic, historical verity must admit that they did not exclude themselves from Islâm, nor advance any theory for which they were unable to find a warrant in the sayings of the Founder of the Faith or his immediate descendants.

The doctrine of evolution and progressive development to which these philosophers adhered most strongly has been propounded in clear terms by one of their prominent representatives, the famous Al-Hazen. The philosophical notions on this subject may be summarised thus: "In the region of existing matter, the mineral kingdom comes lowest, then comes the vegetable kingdom, then the animal, and finally the human being. By his body he belongs to the material world, but by his soul he appertains to the spiritual or immaterial. Above him are only the purely spiritual beings,—the angels,—above whom only is God; thus the lowest is combined by a chain of progress to the highest. But the human soul perpetually strives to cast off the bonds of matter, and, becoming free, it soars upwards again to God, from whom it emanated." And these notions found expression later in the Masnavi of

\textsuperscript{1} The answer was, "God knows best".

\textsuperscript{2} The author of the \textit{Godhar-i-Murad}, to which I shall refer later in some detail, explains that what are called in the language of theology "angels," are the forces of nature in the language of Hikmat.
Moulâna Jalâl ud-dîn, whose "orthodoxy" can hardly be questioned,—

الجیدی مردم و زېمې شدېن،
وز نما مردم بختیاران سوژېدېن،
مردم ان خپلې و اچا شېيدېن
پېس جه نرسېږي رې مردن دې شوم
دېباړه دېکه دېږي رام ار سر
نام او نه مېنځ دال و پر
دېښه دېکه مېلک پېرې شوم
آنېه ادیيهم دايد او شوم
پېس خدېږي وېږېدومن دېم خون پرېزېږو
کېږ دم کا امې راهېږم

"Dying from the vegetable we developed into the vegetable kingdom. Dying from the vegetable we rose to the animal. And leaving the animal we became men. Then what fear that death will lower us? The next transition will make us angels. From angels we shall rise and become what no mind can conceive. we shall merge in Infinity as in the beginning. Have we not been told, 'All of us will return unto Him'?

The greatest of the philosophers were al-Kindi, al-Fârâbi, Ibn-Sîna, Ibn-Bâja, Ibn-Tufail, and Ibn-Rushd.¹

Al-Kindi ² (Abû Yusuf Ya'kûb ibn Ishâk), surnamed the Philosopher par excellence, was a descendant of the illustrious family of Kinda, and counted among his ancestors several of the princes of Arabia. His father, Ishâk bin as-Sabbâh, was the governor of Kûfa under al-Mahdi, al-Hâdi, and Hârûn. Al-Kindi, who prosecuted his studies at Basra and Bagdad, rendered himself famous under the Caliphs Mâmun and Mu'tasim by the versatility of his genius and the profoundness of his knowledge. He wrote on philosophy, mathematics,


² 813 to 842 A.C.; see Appendix II.
astronomy, medicine, politics, music, etc. Versed in the languages of the Greeks, the Persians, and the Indians, thoroughly acquainted with their sciences and philosophy, he was selected by Māmūn for the work of translating Aristotle and other Greek writers into Arabic. "Cardan," says Munk, "places him among the twelve geniuses of the first order who had appeared in the world up to the sixteenth century."

Abū Nasr Fārābī (Abū Nasr Mohammed bin Mohammed Turkhān al-Fārābī), so called from his native city of Fārāb in Transoxiana, was a distinguished physician, mathematician, and philosopher. He is regarded as the most learned and subtle of the commentators of Aristotle. He enjoyed the patronage of Saif ud-dowlāh Ali bin Hamdān, Prince of Aleppo, and died at Damascus in the month of Rajab 339 A.H. December (950 A.C.). Among his various works some may be mentioned here to show the tendency of the Arab mind in that prolific age. In the *Encyclopædia of Science* (*Iḥsā ul-ulām*) he gives a general review of all the sciences. A Latin epitome of this work gives an idea of the range over which it extends, being divided into five parts dealing with the different branches of science, viz. language, logic, mathematics, natural sciences, and political and social economy. Another celebrated work of Fārābī, largely utilised by Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus, was his commentary on Aristotle's *Organon*. His *Tendency of the Philosophies of Plato and Aristotle*, his treatise on ethics, entitled *as-Sīrat ul-Fazīlāh*, and another on politics, called *as-Siyāsāt ul-Medīncyya*, which forms part of a larger and more comprehensive work bearing the name of *Mabādī ul-Moujūdāt*, show the versatile character of his intellect. Besides philosophy and medicine, Fārābī cultivated music, which he elevated into a science. He wrote several treatises both on the theory and the art of music, as well as the manufacture of musical instruments. In one he compared the systems of music among the ancients with that in vogue in his own time. Abu'l Kāsim Kinderski, no mean judge, places Fārābī on a level with his great successor, Ibn-Sīnā.1

---
1 See also the *Uyūn-ul-Masā'il* (Dietenici's ed p 52), where he establishes by deductive reasoning that Creation is the work of a Supreme Intelligence, and that nothing in the universe is fortuitous or accidental.
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Of Ibn-Sīna I have already spoken as a physician. As a philosopher he occupies a position hardly inferior to that of the great Stagyrite. He was unquestionably the master-spirit of his age, and in spite of the opposition raised against him by fanaticism and self-interest, he left his impress in undying characters on the thoughts of succeeding ages. His voluminous works testify to the extraordinary activity of his mind. He systematised Aristotelian philosophy, and filled "the void between God and man" in Aristotle's fragmentary psychology by the doctrine of the intelligence of the spheres conceived after a scientific method. The great object of the Arabian philosophers was to furnish the world with a complete theory of the unity of the Cosmos which would satisfy, not the mind only, but also the religious sense. And accordingly they endeavoured to reconcile the ethical and spiritual with the philosophical side of science. Hence the development of the theory of the two intellects—the passive Reason, or Abstract Soul, in contact with material forms, and subject through them to change and death; and the Active Reason (Akhī-l-fā'dl), conversant with the immutable, and so remaining unchanged in itself. By patient discipline of the heart and soul man can elevate himself to conjunction with this Higher Reason. But the discipline needed was as much moral and spiritual as intellectual. Ibn-Sīna represented these ideas in the highest degree. He was the truest and most faithful exponent of the philosophical aspirations of his time. "For ethical earnestness it would be hard to find anything more impressive than the teaching of Avicenna." A severely logical treatment of his subjects is the distinctive character of his writings. His main endeavour was directed towards the demonstration of the theory that there existed an intimate connexion between the human Soul and the Primary Absolute Cause—a conception which is traced in every line of Jalâl ud-din Rûmî.

Shahristâni gives a brief but exhaustive sketch of Ibn-Sīna's views, culled, as he says, from his various books. After describing Ibn-Sīna's treatment of the sciences, logic, and other

1 His two greatest works on philosophy and science, the Shi'fā and the Najāt, still exist intact.
cognate subjects, Shahristâni states that the Philosopher discussed metaphysics under ten theses; under the first five, he deals with the origin of knowledge, experimentation, induction, and deduction; matter and force; the relation of cause and effect; the primary and accidental, universals and particulars. Under the sixth and seventh he demonstrates that the Primal Cause—the being whose existence is necessary by virtue of his Essence—is one and Absolute. Under the eighth and ninth he deals with the unity of the Cosmos, the relation of human souls to the Primal Cause and the Active Intellect, the first created. And lastly, he discusses the conception of future existence, the doctrine of "Return" (مُعاد). He proclaims the individual permanence of the human soul, and argues that it will retain its individuality after its separation from the corporeal body; but that the pleasure and pain of the future existence will be purely spiritual, depending on the use or misuse by man of his mental, moral and physical powers to attain the Perfection. He argues under the last head the necessity for mankind of prophetism. The Prophet expounds to men the Divine laws, explains to them the ethical demands of God and Humanity in parables comprehensible to common folk, which appeal to and settle their hearts. The Prophet dissuades from jealousy, rancour, and misdeeds; lays the foundations of social and moral development, and is God's veritable messenger on earth.

Abû Bakr Mohammed ibn Yahya, surnamed Ibn-ul-Sâyeh, popularly called Ibn-Bâja, corrupted by the European scholiasts into Avenpace, is one of the most celebrated philosophers among the Arabs of Spain. He was not only a distinguished physician, mathematician, and astronomer, but also a musician of the first rank. He was born at Saragossa towards the end of the eleventh century of the Christian era, and in 1118 A.C. we find him mentioned as residing in Seville. He afterwards proceeded to Africa, where he occupied a high position under the Almoravides. He died at Fez in 1138 A.C. Several of his works have come down to us in their entirety and show the free range of the Moslem intellect in those days.

Ibn-Tufail (Abû Bakr Mohammed ibn Abdul Malik ibn-
Tufail al-Kaisi) was born in the beginning of the twelfth century at Gaudix (Wâdi-ash), a small city of Andalusia, in the province of Granada. He was celebrated as a physician, mathematician, philosopher, and poet, and was held in great esteem at the court of the first two sovereigns of the Almohade dynasty. From 1163 to 1184 he filled the office of vizier and physician to Abû Ya'kûb Yusuf, the second Almohade king. Ibn-Tufail died in Morocco in 1185 A.C. He belonged to the contemplative school of Arab philosophy which was designated Ishrâki, an offshoot of ancient Neo-Platonism, and akin in its aspirations to modern mysticism. His contemplative philosophy is not founded on mystical exaltation, but on a method in which intuition is combined with reasoning. His famous work, called Hayy ibn Yakzân, represents the gradual and successive development of intelligence and the power of perception in a person wholly unassisted by outside instruction.1

Ibn-Rushd or Averroes (Abû'l Walid Mohammed ibn Ahmed) was born in 520 A.H. (1126 A.C.) at Cordova, where his family had for a long time occupied a prominent position. His grandfather was the Kâzi al-Kuzât of all Andalusia under the Almoravides. Ibn-Rushd was a jurisconsult of the first rank, but he applied himself mainly to medicine, mathematics, and philosophy. Introduced to Abû Ya'kûb Yusuf by Ibn-Tufail, he was received with great favour by that sovereign. In 1169-1170 we find him holding the office of Kâzi of Seville, and in 1182 of Cordova. For a few years after the accession of Ya'kûb al-Mansûr to the throne of the Almohades, Ibn-Rushd enjoyed the consideration and esteem of that monarch, but when the pent-up Berber fanaticism burst forth he was the first to fall a victim to the fury of the lawyers and Mullahs whom he had offended by his philosophical writings, and who were jealous of his genius and his learning. Ibn-Rushd was without question one of the greatest scholars and philosophers the Arab world has produced, and "one of the profoundest commentators," says Munk, "of Aristotle's works." Ibn-Rushd held that the highest effort of man ought to be directed towards the attainment of perfection, that is, a complete

1 See Appendix III.
identification with the Active Universal Intellect; that this perfection can only be attained by study and speculation, and abandoning all the desires which belong to the inferior faculties of the soul, and especially to the senses,—but not by mere sterile meditation. He also held that prophetic revelations were necessary for spreading among mankind the eternal verities proclaimed equally by religion and philosophy; that religion itself directs their search by means of science; that it teaches truths in a popular manner comprehensible to all people: that philosophy alone is capable of seizing the true religious doctrines by means of interpretation; but the ignorant apprehend only the literal meaning. On the question of predestination he held that man was neither the absolute master of his actions nor bound by fixed immutable decrees. But the truth, says Ibn-Rushd, lies in the middle, words used by the Fātimide Imāms, and explained by them somewhat similarly. Our actions depend partly on our own free will and partly on causes outside us. We are free to wish and to act in a particular manner; but our will is always restrained and determined by exterior causes. These causes spring from the general laws of nature; God alone knows their sequence. It is this which, in the language of theology, is called Kazā and Kadar. Ibn-Rushd's political theories were directed against human tyranny in every shape. He regarded the Arab republic under the Rāshidin Caliphs as the model government in which was realised the dream of Plato. Mu‘āwiyah, he says, in establishing the Ommeyyade autocracy, overthrew this ideal, and opened the door to all disasters. Ibn-Rushd considered women to be equal in every respect to men, and claimed for them equal capacity—in war, in philosophy, in science. He cites the example of the female warriors of Arabia, Africa, and Greece; and refers to their superiority in music in support of his contention, that, if women were placed in the same position as men, and received the same education, they would become the equals of their husbands and brothers in all the sciences and arts; and he ascribes their inferiority to the narrow lives they lead.

In Ibn-Rushd Arabian philosophy reached its apogee. Six centuries divide him from the Prophet. Within these centuries
the Arab intellect had broadened in every direction. Men like Ibn-Sīnā and Ibn-Rushd thought with the accumulated wealth of ages on all the most important questions which occupy human attention in modern times, and formulated their ideas, little different from those held by the most advanced scientists of the present day, with logical precision. All these thinkers claimed to be Moslems, and were recognised as such by the best minds of their times. Ibn-Sīnā repudiated with indignation and contempt the charge of infidelity levelled against him by fanatics or enemies jealous of his fame, and one of the greatest mystical poets of Islām, Sanā‘ī, whose orthodoxy, though doubted by his personal foes, is no longer questioned, has embodied his veneration for “Bū Ali Sīnā” in an immortal poem.\textsuperscript{1}

Ibn-Rushd wrote on the concord of religion with philosophy; and one of his intimate friends, Abd ul-Kabir, a highly religious person, described him as one anxious to establish a harmony between religion and philosophy.\textsuperscript{2} Al-Ansā‘ī and Abd ul-Walīd speak of Ibn-Rushd as sincerely attached to Islām; and his latest biographer says: “There is nothing to prevent our supposing that Ibn-Rushd was a sincere believer in Islāmism, especially when we consider how little irrational the supernatural element in the essential dogmas of this religion is, and how closely this religion approaches the purest Deism.”\textsuperscript{3}

The close of the tenth century was full of the darkest omens for rationalism and science. The star of the son of Sīnā had not yet risen on the horizon; but masters like Kindī and Fārābī had appeared and departed after shedding an abiding lustre on the Saracenic race. Patristicism was triumphant in every quarter which owned the temporal or spiritual sway of the Abbasides: the college of jurists had placed under the ban of heresy the rationalists and philosophers who had made the name of Moslems glorious in the annals of the world; a heartless, illiberal, and persecuting formalism dominated the

\textsuperscript{1} See Appendix III
\textsuperscript{2} In the Fast-ul-Mahāl (Muller’s ed. published in Munich, 1859), which is said to have been written in A.H. 575 for the Almohade sovereign Yusuf ibn Tāshfin, he establishes this concordance.
\textsuperscript{3} Renan, Averroes et Averroïsme, p. 163.
spirit of the theologians; a pharisical epicureanism had taken possession of the rich, and an ignorant fanaticism of the poor; the gloom of night was fast thickening, and Islam was drifting into the condition into which ecclesiasticism had led Christianity. It was at this epoch of travail and sorrow for all lovers of truth that a small body of thinkers formed themselves into a Brotherhood to keep alive the lamp of knowledge among the Moslems, to introduce a more healthy tone among the people, to arrest the downward course of the Moslems towards ignorance and fanaticism, in fact, to save the social fabric from utter ruin. They called themselves the "Brothers of Purity," Ikhwan-us-Safâ. The society of the "Pure Brethren" was established in Basra, which still held rank in the fast-dwindling Caliphate as the second city of the empire, the home of rationalism and intellectual activity. To this "Brotherhood" none but men of unsullied character and the purest morals were admitted; the passport for admission in the select circle was devotion to the cause of knowledge and humanity. There was nothing exclusive or esoteric in their spirit; though, from the necessities of their situation, and working under a rigid theological and political despotism, their movements were enshrined in some degree of mystery. They met together quietly and unobtrusively in the residence of the head of the society, who bore the name of Zaid the son of Rifâ'a, and discussed philosophical and ethical subjects with a catholicity of spirit and breadth of views difficult to rival even in modern times. They formed branches in every city of the Caliphate, wherever, in fact, they could find a body of thoughtful men, willing and qualified to work according to their scientific method. This philanthropic and scientific movement was led by five men, who, with Zaid, were the life and soul of the "Brotherhood." Their system was eclectic in the highest and truest sense of the word. They contemned no field of thought; they "culled flowers from every meadow." In spite of the mysticism which slightly tinged their philosophical conceptions, their views on social and political problems were highly practical and intensely humane. As the result of their labours, they gave to the world a general résumé of the knowledge of the time in separate treatises, which were collectively
known as the Rasāil 1-i-Ikhwān-us-Safā wa-Khullān-ul-Wafā, "Tracts of the Brothers of Purity and Friends of Sincerity"; or, shortly, Rasāil-i-Ikhwān-us-Safā.2 These risālas range over every subject of human study—mathematics, including astronomy, physical geography, music, and mechanics; physics, including chemistry, meteorology, and geology; biology, physiology, zoology, botany, logic, grammar, metaphysics, ethics, the doctrine of a future life. They form, in fact, a popular encyclopædia of all the sciences and philosophy then extant. The theory of these evolutionists of the tenth century as to the development of animal organism may be compared with advantage with that entertained in present times. But I am not concerned so much with the scientific and intellectual side of their writings as with the ethical and moral. The ethics of the "Pure Brethren" are founded on self-study and the purification or abstraction of human thought from all impurity. Moral endowments are prized above intellectual gifts, and the strength of soul founded upon patient self-discipline and self-control is regarded as the highest of virtues.3 "Faith without work, knowing without doing, were vain." Patience and forbearance, mildness and loving gentleness, justice, mercy, and truth, the sublimity of virtue, the sacrifice of self for others, are taught in every line—cant, hypocrisy, and deceit, envy and pride, tyranny and falsehood, are reproved in every page; and the whole is pervaded by a purity of sentiment, a fervent love of humanity, an earnest faith in the progress of man, a universal charity, embracing even the brute creation in its fold.4 What can be more beautiful, more truly humane, than the disputation between the "animals and mankind"?5 Their ethics form the foundation of all later works.6 Then religious idea was identical with that of Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā; the universe was an emanation from God, but not directly; the Primal Absolute Cause created Reason, or the Active Intel-

1 Plural of Risāla, a tract, a chapter, a monograph
2 Published in 4 vols., at Bombay, in 1305 A.H., by Ḥajī Nāṣir ud-dīn
3 See the third Risāla, vol iv
4 See the fourth Risāla, vol iv
5 Such as the Akhlāq-e-Nāsir of Naṣir ud-dīn Tūsī, the Akhlāq-i-Jālān, and the Akhlāq-i-Mukāmāt of Husain Waiz Kāshmir
ligence: and from this proceeded the Nafs-i-nafsûs, the Abstract Soul, from which sprang primary matter, the protoplasm of all material entities; the Active Intelligence moulded this primary matter, and made it capable of taking shapes and forms, and set it in motion, whence were formed the spheres and the planets. Their morality is founded on this very conception of the Primal Absolute Cause being connected by an unbroken chain with the lowest of His creation; for the Abstract Soul individualised in humanity is always struggling to attain by purity of life, self-discipline, intellectual study, the goal of Perfection,—to get back to the source from which it emanated. This is Ma'âd; this is the "Return" which the Prophet taught; this is the rest and peace inculcated in the Scripture. It was thus that the "Pure Brethren" taught. Whatever we may think of their psychology there is no denying that their morality was of the purest, their ethics of the highest that can be conceived, standing on a different plane from those of the theologians who induced the bigot Mustanjid to burn their encyclopædia in Bagdad, before Bagdad itself was burnt by the Mongols.

Aristotelian philosophy, which was founded on "observation and experience," was, however, more akin to the Saracenic genius and the positive bent of the Arab mind. Aristotelian logic and metaphysics naturally exercised a great influence on the conceptions of Arab scientists and scholars. Neo-Platonism based on intuition and a certain vague and mystical contemplation, did not take root among the Arabs until it was made popular by the writings of the unfortunate Shihâb ud-din Sulhrwardi. The Aristotelian conception of the First Cause pervades accordingly many of the philosophical and metaphysical writings of this period. And it was in consequence of the influence exercised by the Stagyrite that a section of Arab thinkers tended towards a belief in the eternity of matter. These men received the name of Dahrîs (from dahr, or nature). "The fundamental idea of these philosophers," says Kremer, "was the same as has gained ground, in modern times, owing to the extension of natural science." But they were not, as their enemies called them, atheists. Atheism is the negation of a power or Cause beyond and outside the visible and material
world. These philosophers affirmed no such thing; they only held that it was impossible to predicate of the Causa Causans any attribute whatsoever, or to explain the mode in which He works on the universe. They were, in fact, the exponents of the doctrine of ta’lil or agnosticism.

It appears clear, therefore, that the Islám of Mohammed contains nothing which in itself bars progress or the intellectual development of humanity. How is it, then, that, since the twelfth century of the Christian era, philosophy has almost died out among the followers of Islám and an anti-rationalistic patristicism has taken possession of the bulk of the people? How is it that predestinarianism, though only one phase of the Koranic teachings, has become the predominant creed of a large number of Moslems? As regards the supposed extinction among them of philosophy, I should like to call attention to the revival of twicennism under the Safawi sovereigns of Persia to show that rationalism and free-thought are not yet dead in Islám. But the questions which I have formulated apply to the general body of Moslems, and I propose to explain the causes which have led to this result.

Before the Abbaside Mutawakkil’s accession to the throne, Islám presented a spectacle similar to that of Christendom in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was divided into two camps, one of Authority, the other of Reason; the one advocated the guidance of humanity in matters, natural as well as supernatural, by precedent, pure and simple, the other, by human judgment tempered so far as practicable by precedent. Between these two parties the difference was irreconcilable. The first was composed chiefly of the lawyers—a class of people who have been regarded in every age and country, and not always without reason, as narrow-minded, self-opinionated, and extremely jealous of their interests as a body. To them were joined the ignorant populace. “The creed of the bishop is the creed of the grocer. But the philosophy of that grocer is in no sense the philosophy of a professor. Therefore it is that the bishop will be revered where the professor will be stoned. Intellect is that which man claims as specially his own; it is the one limiting distinction, and thus the multitude, so tolerant of the claims of an aristocracy of birth,
or of wealth, is uneasy under the claims of an aristocracy of intelligence.”

As I have had occasion to mention in a previous chapter, most of the legal decisions pronounced by the Prophet were called forth by the passing necessities of a primitive and archaic society. After him the Caliph Ali was the expeditor of the new Faith. In the Koran these legal doctrines were extremely few, and adaptable to any circumstance or time, and, during the reigns of the Râshidîn Caliphs, were expounded chiefly by Ali and his disciple Ibn Abbâs.

Upon their death, the men who had attended their lectures or listened to their judgments opened classes of jurisprudence on their own account. Fâkîhs or lawyers multiplied; they discussed religio-legal questions, gave opinions on points of casuistry, the rites of religion, as well as on the ordinary relations of life. Gradually they became the keepers of the conscience of the people. Naturally there was a keen desire to discover how the Prophet had acted in any particular case; traditions multiplied. The supply was in proportion to the demand. But, excepting in the school of Medina, there was no uniformity of system or method. The immediate descendants of Mohammed followed one definite rule; if they found any precedent of the time of the Prophet or of the Caliph Ali, authenticated by their own ancestors, which was applicable to the circumstances of the case, they based their decision upon it; if not, they relied on their own judgment. Law was with them inductive and experimental; and they decided according to the exigencies and requirements of each particular case. Under the early Ommeyyades there was no fixed rule; the governors ruled sharply by the sword, according to their own judgment, leaving matters of conscience to the Fâkîhs. Under the later Ommeyyades, however, the lawyers assumed great preponderance, chiefly on account of their influence with the fickle populace. When the Abbâsides rose to power the lecture-room of Imâm Ja'far as Sâdîk was attended by two men who afterwards became the bulwarks of the Sunni Church,—one was Abû Hanîfa,² and the other Mâlik son of Anas.³

¹ Lewes's History of Philosophy, vol. ii p. 59
² See ante, p 351.
³ See ante, p 352.
Abū Hanifa was a native of Irāk; Ṣāliḥ, of Medina. Both were men of severe morals and great kindliness of nature, and anxious to broaden the foundations of the Church. They were devoted to the family of the Prophet, and suffered in consequence of their attachment. Abū Hanifa on his return to Kūfa opened a class which became the nucleus of the now famous Hanafi school. He rejected most of the traditions as untrue, and relied solely on the Koran; and by “analogical deductions” endeavoured to make the simple Koranic utterances applicable to every variety of circumstance. Abū Hanifa knew nothing of human kind; nor had he ever been to any city except Medina and Bagdad. He was a speculative legislist, and his two disciples, Abū Yusuf, who became Chief Kāzi of Bagdad under Hārūn, and Mohammed ash-Shaibānī, fixed Abū Hanifa’s conceptions on a regular basis. Malik proceeded on different lines. He excluded from his system all inferences and “deductions.” He applied himself to discover in Medina, so full of the Prophet’s memories, every real or supposititious incident in the Master’s life and based his doctrines thereupon. His was “the Beaten Path,” and to the simple Arabs and the cognate races of Africa Malik’s enunciations were more acceptable, being suited to their archaic forms of society, than the rationalised views of the Fātimide Imāms, or the speculative theories of Abū Hanifa. Soon after came Shāfe’i, a man of strong and vigorous mind, better acquainted with the world than Abū Hanifa and Malik, and less casuistical than Abū Yusuf and Mohammed ash-Shaibānī. He formed, from the materials furnished by Ja’far as-Sādik, Malik, and Abū Hanifa, an eclectic school, which found acceptance chiefly among the middle classes. Less adaptable than original Hanafism to the varying necessities of a growing and mixed population, it contained sufficient germs of improvement which, had they not been killed by the rigid formalism of later times, would have been productive of substantial good. Four different systems of law and doctrine, more or less distinct from

1 Ibn Khallikān

2 The Muwatta, i.e. “The Beaten Path,” is the name of his work on jurisprudence

3 Shāfe’ism is spreading rapidly among the educated Hanafis of India.
each other, thus established themselves in the Islâmic world. The Fâtimidâ system was chiefly in force among the Shiâhs, who were dispersed all over the empire; Mâlikism among a large part of the Arabs in the Peninsula, among the Berbers, and most of the Spanish Moslems; Shâfe'îsm among the fairly well-to-do classes; and Hanafism among the more respectable sections of society in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt. The position of Hanafism in the Caliphate was similar to that of Pharisaism among the Jews. It received the countenance of the Court as the only school with sufficient expansiveness to meet the requirements of a mixed population. To have acknowledged the Fâtimide system would have been to give too great a preponderance to the descendants of the Prophet; to have adopted Mâlikism and Shâfe'îsm for the administration of a liberal State would have jeopardised the interests of the empire. Hence, whilst rationalism ruled in the colleges and Madrasas, 1 Hanafism held possession of the pulpits and Mâhmûmas. 2 In its theological views, Hanafism inclined towards Sîfâtism, but it varied its opinions according to those of the rulers. At this period Hanafism was remarkable for its flexibility. Ahmed ibn Hanbal, commonly known as Imâm Hanbal, made his appearance at this juncture,—a red hot puritan, breathing eternal perdition to all who differed from him, he was shocked with the pharisaical liberalism of Hanafism, and disgusted both with the narrowness of Mâlikism and the common-place character of Shâfe'îsm, he applied himself to frame a new system, based on traditions, for the whole empire. Abû Hanifa had rejected the majority of the current traditions; Ibn Hanbal's system included a mass of incongruous, irrational, and bewildering stories, the bulk of which were wholly inconsistent with each other, and bearing upon their face the marks of fabrication. And now commenced a serious struggle between the parties of progress and retrogression. Ibn Hanbal adopted the extreme Sîfâtîa views; he inculcated that the Deity was visible to the human sight; that His attributes were separate from His essence; that the statements about His being seated on the throne were to be accepted in their literal sense; that

1 Madrasa is a place where lectures are given, hence a college, school, etc.

2 Courts of justice.
man was in no sense a free agent; that every human action was the direct act of the Deity, and so forth. He denounced learning and science, and proclaimed a holy war against Rationalism. The populace, carried away by his eloquence or his vehemence, took up the cry; the Hanafi jurists, whose power materially depended on their influence over the ignorant masses, and who were jealous of the prominence of the scientists and philosophers in the Court of Hârûn and Mâmûn, made common cause with the new reformer. The pulpits began to fulminate brimstone and fire against the upholders of reason and the advocates of philosophy and science. The streets of Bagdad became the scenes of frequent rioting and bloodshed. Mu'tasim and Wâsîk repressed the fanatical violence of the fiery puritans with some severity. The prime mover of the disturbances was put in prison, where he died in the odour of great sanctity; his bier was followed to the grave by a crowd consisting of a hundred and forty thousand men and women.\(^1\) His system never took root among any large body of people; but, mixing with Hanafism, it gave a new character to the doctrines of Abû Hanîfa. Henceforth Hanafism represents a mixture of the teachings of Abû Hanîfa and of Ibn Hanbal.

When Mutawakkîl was raised to the throne the position of the various parties stood thus:—the Rationalists were the directing power of the State; they held the chief offices of trust; they were professors in colleges, superintendents of hospitals, directors of observatories; they were merchants; in fact, they represented the wisdom and the wealth of the empire; Rationalism was the dominating creed among the educated, the intellectual, and influential classes of the community. Sî'dîm was in force among the lower strata of society, and most of the Kâzîs, the preachers, the lawyers of various degree were attached to it. A cruel drunken sot, almost crazy at times, Mutawakkîl had the wit to perceive the advantage of an alliance with the latter party. It would make him at once the idol of the populace, and the model Caliph of the bigots. The fiat accordingly went forth for the expulsion of the party of progress from their offices under government.

---
\(^1\) See Appendix II.
The colleges and universities were closed; literature, science, and philosophy were interdicted; and the Rationalists were hunted from Bagdad. Mutawakkil at the same time demolished the mausoleum of the Caliph Ali and his sons. The fanatical lawyers, who were now the priests and rabbis of Islâm, became the ruling power of the State. Mutawakkil's death and Mustansir's accession gave the victory once more to the Progressists. But their success was short-lived. Under the pitiless and sanguinary Mu'tazid b'ilâh the triumph of Patristicism was complete. He mercilessly persecuted the Rationalists. They inculcated that "justice" was the animating principle of human actions; that God Himself governed the universe by "justice," which was His Essence; that the test of right and wrong was not any individual will, but the good of humanity. These doctrines were terribly revolutionary; they were aimed at the divine right of the Caliph to do wrong. Tom Paine could scarcely preach worse. On the other hand, the clerical party taught very properly "God is the Sovereign; as the sovereign does no wrong, so God can do no wrong." There could be no question which of these two doctrines was true. The days of Rationalism were now over under the Abbasides. Expelled from Bagdad, it took refuge in Cairo, which was worse, for if there was one place which the Abbaside Caliphs hated with the hatred of death, that was Cairo. The very name of Rationalism became one of dire import to the Pontiffs of Bagdad. A College of Jurists was established to ferret out "heresy" in the writings of the philosophers and scientists, whose misfortune was still to live within the reach of the patristic influences. The works in which the smallest taint was observed were committed to the flames; their authors were subjected to tortures and to death. Islâm now presented the spectacle of orthodox Christendom. There was a time when, in spite of the fact that the temporal power was arrayed against it, Rationalism would have regained its hold on the masses. In their constant disputation the clerical party always found themselves worsted; and though, on these occasions, they not infrequently invoked the more forcible reasoning of the sword and backs and stones, their defeats in argument perceptibly told on the ranks of their followers.
x. RATIONALISTIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL SPIRIT

It was at this period that the retrogressive party received the assistance of an unexpected ally. Hitherto they had fought against Reason with their usual repertory of traditions. Abu'l Hasan al-Asha'ri, a descendant of the famous Abû Mûsa al-Asha'ri, who had been tricked by 'Amr ibn al-'Âs into abandoning the rights of the Caliph Ali, was educated among the Mu'tazilas. He had learnt their logic, their philosophy, their science of reasoning. Actuated by vanity, and partly perhaps by ambition, he one day in the Jâmi' mosque of Basra, in the presence of a large congregation, made a public disavowal of the Mu'tazilite doctrines, and declared his adherence to Sifâtism. His theatrical manner and his eloquent words impressed the people, and the waverers at once went over to him. Asha'irî was now the greatest man in the Caliphate; he was petted by the legists, idolised by the populace, respected by the Caliph. He gave to the clerical party what they had long been wanting - a logical system, or what may be called by that name, for the defence of patristic theology against the rationalistic conceptions of the Mu'tazilas, the philosophers, and the Fâtimide Imâms. Abu'l Hasan maintained the Sifâtâ doctrine, with very slight modifications.

A short summary of his views, taken from Shahristânî, will explain the present mental lethargy of so many Moslems. "He maintained," says our author, "that the attributes of the Deity are eternal and subsistent in His Essence, but they are not simply His Essence, rather they are additional to His Essence; . . . that God speaks by an eternal word, and wills by an eternal will, for it is evident that God is a Sovereign, and, as a Sovereign, is One to whom it belongs to command and prohibit, so God commands and prohibits; . . . that His ordering is eternal, subsistent in Him, a quality pertaining to Him; that the will of God is indivisible, eternal, embracing all things subject to volition, whether determinate actions of His own or actions of His creatures - the latter, so far as created

1 Al-Ashâ'irî was born at Basra in 260 A.H. (874 A.D.), but passed the greatest part of his life in Bagdad. Up to the fortieth year of his age he was a devoted adherent of the Mu'tazilas. He ascribed his theatrical abjuration of his old beliefs to an admonition he received from the Prophet in a dream during the fasting month of Ramazân.
by Him, not as they are their own actions by *appropriation*;¹... that God wills all things morally, good and evil, beneficial and injurious; and, as He both knows and wills, that He wills on the part of His creatures what He knows, and has caused to be registered in the memorial-book—which fore-knowledge constitutes His decree, His decisions, and His determination, therem there is no varying or change; that an *appropriated* action means an action which is pre-destined to be done by created ability, and which takes place under the condition of created ability." In plainer language, he taught that every human action emanates from God, or is pre-destined by His decree, to be performed by a particular person, and this person, having the capacity of *appropriation* or *acquisitiveness*, does the act; the act is primarily God's act, secondarily the man's. For example, if a man applies himself to write a letter, his desire to write is the outcome of an eternal decree that he should write; then he takes up the pen, it is the will of God that He should do so; and so on. When the writing is finished, it is due to his *acquisitiveness*. Shahristâni very appropriately observes that, according to Abu'l Hasan, no influence in respect to origination (of action) pertains to created ability. This worthy divine further maintained that "God rules as a Sovereign over His creatures, doing what He wills and determining as He pleases; so that were He to cause all men to enter Paradise, there would be no injustice, and if He were to send them all to hell, there would be no wrong-doing, because injustice is the ordering in respect to things which do not come within the sphere of control of the Orderer, or the inversion of established relations of things, and God is the Absolute Sovereign, on whose part no injustice is imaginable, and to whom no wrong can be attributed... and that nothing whatever is obligatory upon God by virtue of reason—neither that which is beneficial, nor that which is most advantageous, nor gracious assistance... and that the ground of (human) obligation is nothing which constitutes a necessity binding upon God."..."... After mentioning the doctrines of Abu'l Hasan, Shahristâni proceeds to state the views of Abu'l Hasan's principal disciple,
whose teachings were adopted by a large body of people—Abû Abdullah Mohammed bin Karrām, "whom we count as one of the Sifātians." This man maintained that the Divine attributes were distinct from His Essence, that God can be perceived by eyesight, and that He creates human actions from time to time as He wills.

No account of al-Asha'ri's teachings would be complete without a reference to Ibn 'Asâkir's work. Shahristâni in his résumé of the Asha'rite doctrines maintains a philosophical and judicial attitude. Ibn 'Asâkir, on the other hand, makes no pretence of holding an even balance between contending schools. To him, as to Asha'ri, the doctrines of the Rationalists are rank heresy; and he denounces their teachings with uncompromising violence. His exposition, however, of al-Asha'ri's emphatic rule that the dogmas of the Faith must be accepted by the orthodox, without questioning, helps us to understand the tendencies which were set in motion at an early stage of Moslem development, and which eventually succeeded in arresting the progress of Moslem nations and paralysing, in the course of centuries, their intellectual energy. All questioning was declared to be an impiety and an unforgivable sin, whilst the spirit of inquiry was held to be a manifestation of the devil. "God," says the Koran, "sees all things"; therefore, it was assumed, He must have eyes, and the believer must accept it bi'ta kaifâ, without "why or wherefore";—thus reasoned al-Asha'ri, and thus has reasoned his school through all ages.

Two hundred and fifty years separate al-Asha'ri from his distinguished exponent and apologist. Within this period of time, Islâm had undergone a great change. Until al-Asha'ri started his new school of dogmatic theology, the struggle for ascendancy was confined between Rationalism on one side and Patristicism on the other. Al-Asha'ri supplied the latter with a weapon it had never possessed before. As Ibn 'Asâkir

---

1 Abî Kasîm Abî bîn al-Hasan Albî bîn Abî 'Abdullâh bîn Abî-Hasan Albî Shafî`î, surnamed Ibn 'Asâkir, famous for his monumental work on the history of Damascus, was born in 499 H., died 571 H. He was a rigid Shafî`ite and a violent partisan of al-Asha'ri, whom he regarded as a renovator and foremost champion of Islâm. Ibn 'Asâkir's work is called The Exposure by al-Imâm Hasan Al-Asha'ri of Mischiefous Untruths.
remarks, "al-Asha'ri was the first orthodox dialectician, who reasoned with the Rationalists and other heretics according to their own principles of logic." As an attempted compromise between Rationalism and Patristicism, between "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy," his doctrines found a ready acceptance among the extreme theologians and divines, who saw in his system the means for overthrowing Rationalism from the pinnacle of power and influence which it had attained in the enlightened reigns of al-Mamûn and his two immediate successors. Rationalism was also favoured by the earlier Buyides, and, under their auspices and encouragement, its influence had become paramount in Mid-Asia. "The power of the Mu'tazila," says Ibn 'Asâkir, "was very great in Irâk until the time of Fânâkhusrî" ('Azud-ud-Dowla). In his reign Asha'rizm first found favour at Court and gradually spread among all classes. Up to the middle of the fifth century of the Hegira it was often confounded with Mu'tazilaism, which al-Asha'ri had professed until his dramatic secession. His disciples appear even to have been subjected to some persecution at the hands of the sects who claimed the special privilege of orthodoxy.

Under Sultan Tughril, the founder of the Seljukide dynasty, the followers of al-Asha'ri were suspected of unorthodoxy, and had to undergo proscription and exile. The Sultan himself was a follower of Imâm Abu Hanîfa and professed Hanafite orthodoxy. He had given orders for public imprecation on heretics from the pulpits of the mosques. According to Ibn 'Asâkir, his vizier, who was a Mu'tazili, included the Asha'rites in the imprecation, and started a persecution of the

1 Mulakallim b'Isan

1 Al-Malik Fânâkhusrî reigned as the Mayor of the Palace from 367-372 A.H. Ibn 'Asâkir tells the story of how Fânâkhusrî, after attending one of the "Assemblies of the learned" which were held in the house of the Chief Kazi, who was a Mu'tazili, found that there was not a single Asha'rite in their midst. On being told that there was no learned Asha'rite in Bagdad, he pressed the Judge to invite some from outside. It was at his instance, it is stated, that Ibn al-Bakillàni, one of the principal disciples of al-Asha'ri, was summoned to Bagdad. To him Fânâkhusrî confided the education of his sons. Whether this story be true or not, the period of 'Azud-ud-Dowla's reign fixes the date of the rise of the Star of Asha'rizm

2 Abû Nasr Mansur Kundurî, surnamed 'Amid al-Mulk.
most prominent Imâms and doctors among the disciples of al-Asha'ri.

The cloud under which Asha'rism laboured in the reign of Tughril Beg lifted on his death, and with the accession of Alp Arslân and the rise of Nizâm ul-Mulk, "who favoured the adherents of the Sunnat," Asha'rism became the dominant sect. "He recalled the exiles, covered them with honours, opened colleges and schools in their names." Thus one of the most generous patrons of learning among the Moslems unconsciously allied himself to a tendency to which, more largely than any other cause, the sterilisation of the intellectual energies of the Moslems is due.

Ibn 'Asâkir's account of the progress of Asha'rism is enthusiastic. From Irâk it spread into Syria and Egypt under the Ayyubides ¹ and Mamelukes; from Irâk also it was carried into Western Africa by Ibn Tumart,² and it took firm root in the Maghrib (Morocco). "There remained no other sect in Islâm, excepting some followers of Ibn Hanbal and some partisans of Abû Hanifa, to compete with the adherents of al-Asha'ri." "Ahmed b. Hanbal and al-Asha'ri were in perfect harmony," says Ibn 'Asâkir, "in their religious opinions and did not differ in any particular, in the fundamental doctrines and in the acceptance of the authority of the Traditions." "This is the reason," he continues, "why the Hambalites relied from always and at all times on the Asha'rites against the heterodox, as they were the only dialecticians among the orthodox."

To throw into relief the cardinal principles of al-Asha'ri's teachings, Ibn 'Asâkir places in juxtaposition the opinions held by different sects.

After mentioning various other sects, he gives an account, in the words of al-Asha'ri, of the Mu'tazilite doctrines ("in which they have strayed from the right path"). He tells us that the Mu'tazilas repudiate the notion that God can be seen by the corporeal sight, or that the Almighty has any similitude to human beings; or that there will be a corporeal resurrection on the Day of Account. "They repudiate also," he says,

¹ Saladin and his successors.
² The founder of the Almohade dynasty in north-west Africa.
"the doctrine of pains and penalties ('Azâb) ¹ in the grave," nor do they believe in the intercession (Shafâ'at) of the Prophet; they hold that human sins can only be forgiven or remitted by Divine Mercy, and that neither His mercy nor justice can be influenced or deflected by human intercession; they believe that the Koran is created and revealed to the Prophet and that the "law has been announced according to human needs."

After stating the Mu'tazilite doctrines Ibn 'Asâkir proceeds to give in detail the creed of al-Asha'ri. They are twenty-four in number, but to show the theological attitude of al-Asha'ri and his sharp difference with rationalistic Islam it is sufficient to refer only to a few. After the confession of Faith, regarding the unity of God and the messengership of the Prophet in which all Islam is agreed, the Ashâ'rite creed proceeds thus:—

"We declare that Paradise and Hell are true, that the arrival of the Hour of Judgment is certain, and that without doubt God will raise the dead from their graves; that God will appear to human sight on the Day of Judgment.² We declare that the word of God (i.e. the Koran), and every part thereof, is uncreated: that there is nothing on earth, neither good nor bad, which does not come into existence but by the will of God: that nothing, in fact, comes into being unless He wishes. We believe that God the Almighty knows the acts of His servants and their ends and consequences, as well as those which do not come to pass. We believe that human actions owe their origin to His will and are determined in advance by Him; that man has no power to originate or create anything by himself (i.e. without God's help). That man is incapable of obtaining by himself that which is good for his soul, or avoiding that which is harmful, except by the will of God."

The Ashâ'rite creed then goes on thus:—"We believe in the intercession of the Prophet, and that God will redeem from

¹ The meaning of 'A. ab will become clearer later on.

² It is believed that on the third day after burial the grave is visited by two angels named Munkar and Nakir, who raise the dead to life by blows from their batons, and interrogate him as to his or her past life and record the answers in a register. They act as a sort of Juge d'instruction. This belief, evidently an off-shoot from the Egyptian conceptions, was imbedded in the folk-lore of the country before the promulgation of Islam.
the punishment of fire believers who have sinned.” “We believe in the Day of Resurrection, we believe in the appearance of the anti-Christ, in the interrogation of the dead by the two angels (Munkir and Nakir). We believe in the Ascension of the Prophet; we believe that all evil thoughts are inspired by Satan; we believe that it is sinful to rise in arms against the lawful Imam.”

This summary shows more clearly than Shahrastâni’s philosophical analysis the attitude of al-Asha’ri towards Moslem development.

In order to meet the Mu’tazilas on their own ground, Abu’l Hasan invented a rival science of reason—the real scholastic theology of the Moslems, which, though supposed to be an offshoot of the ‘Ilm-ul-kalâm founded by the Mu’tazilas, is in many essential features different from it. For example, most of the Mu’tazilas were conceptuallists, whilst the Asha’ri Mutakallimûn were either realists or modified nominalists. The Asha’ris maintained that a negative quality like ignorance is an actual entity, whilst the Mu’tazilas declared that it was the mere negation of a quality, for example, ignorance was the absence of knowledge. The Asha’ri Mutakallim maintained that the Koran was uncreated and eternal; the Mu’tazilite declared that it represented the words of God revealed to the Prophet from time to time as occasion arose, otherwise there would be no meaning in násîkh and mansûkh, for admittedly some of the later verses repealed others which had been uttered before.

Asha’rism thus became the dominant school in the East. When the enlightened Buyides became the mayors of the palace Rationalism again raised its head in Bagdad; but Asha’rism never lost its hold over the conscience of the masses.

1 The belief in the Ascension of the Prophet is general in Islam. Whilst the Asha’ri and the patriotic sects believe that the Prophet was bodily carried up from earth to heaven, the Rationalists hold that it was a spiritual exaltation, that it represented the uplifting of the soul by stages until it was brought into absolute communion with the Universal Soul.

1 The orthodox Sunni belief, that once the sacramental oath of allegiance is sworn to the Caliph any rising against him is a religious crime, led all Moslem sovereigns to beg for investiture from the Caliph, however impotent, as it made insurrection against them or their authority on the part of their subjects unlawful.
nor did Mu'tazilaism ever regain its old position of preponderance. The Buyides were Rationalists; but the Seljukides, in spite of their patronage of learning and science, belonged to the Asha'ri school. Renan has observed that Islâmism, having become, by the accident of history, the property of races given over to fanaticism, such as the Spaniards, the Berbers, the Persians, the Turks, acquired in their hands the garb of a rigid and exclusive dogmatism. "What has happened to Catholicism in Spain has happened to Islâm, what would have happened in all Europe if the religious revival which took place (in Christendom) at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century had stopped all national development." This observation is absolutely true. The Persian always associated an idea of divinity with the person of his sovereign; the Turk, the Mongol, the Berber looked upon their chiefs as the direct descendants of God; conversion to Islâm did not detract from their veneration of their kings or princes. For centuries the Arabs had tried to exorcise the demon of fanaticism which had been introduced into the hearts of the Spaniards by the Christian clergy; they failed, and the moment the Chancellor al-Munsâr, in order to enlist popular support in furtherance of his ambitious designs, raised in Spain a cry against Rationalism, the same crowd which afterwards assisted with willing hands and gleeful faces at the auto-da-fé of heretics, helped in the burning of philosophical works in the market-place of Cordova. The victorious arms of Saladin carried Asha'rism into Egypt. Whilst Rationalism was thus fighting a losing battle with its old enemy, the writings of Imâm al-Ghazzâli, which were directed chiefly against the study of philosophy, strengthened the hands of Patristicism. Abu Hâmid Mohammed ibn Mohammed al Ghazzâli was a man of undoubted talents and purity of character. He had studied philosophy and dived into the mysteries of the sciences; he had even

1 *Avernoes et Averroism*, p 30
2 Was born at Tûs in Khurasân (the birthplace of Firdowsi) in the year 1058 A.C (450 A.H), died in 1111 A.C (505 of the Hegra). His most celebrated works are the *Ihya ul-üdûm* ("the Revival of the Sciences of Religion"); the *Muntz min az-zaldî* ("Deliverance from Errors"); *Makhâsid-ul-falâsîfa* (the "Tendencies of Philosophers"); and *Tahafsul ul-falâsîfa* ("Destruction of Philosophers"), to which Ibn-Rushd wrote a refutation called the *Tahafsul-ul-Tahafsul ul-falâsîfa* ("the Destruction of Destruction," etc.); see chap. xi.
indulged in free-thought. Suddenly the spirit of earnest longing for a solid rock on which to rest the weary soul, the spirit that has worked similarly upon other minds in later ages, spoke to his heart, and from a philosopher he turned into a mystic. In the Munkiz, which appears to have been a discourse delivered either verbally or written to his religious brethren, he describes with some naïveté how he hankered for knowledge, and in its search went everywhere, dipped into everything, acquainted himself with every subject; and how he abandoned the doctrines which had been instilled into him in early life. He says he knew the saying of the Prophet, which declared that every child was born with a knowledge of the truth in nature, and therefore wanted to know what that truth was. Then he describes how he was seized with scepticism, and how he escaped from its consequences bybetaking himself into the higher regions of faith, viz. a mystical exaltation. The discourse contains a violent attack on the philosophers, whom he groups under three heads. (1) The Duhris, who believe in the eternity of matter, and deny the existence of a Creator. (2) The Physicists or naturalists, who believe in the existence of a Creator, but think that the human soul once separated from the body ceases to exist, and that therefore there is no accountability for human actions; both of them were infidels. (3) The Theists (Plato and Aristotle), “these have completely refuted the doctrines of the first two, and God has saved thereby the true believer from the battle.” “But they must be pronounced infidels; and so also the Moslem philosophers who have followed them, especially Fârâbî and Ibn-Sina, for their philosophy is so confused that you cannot separate the truth from the false, so as to refute the latter!” From what we can discover of the writings of these two men, knowledge may be divided under three heads; one group we are bound to pronounce as infidel, another as heresy, and about the third we need say nothing!” And yet with all this simplicity there is considerable practical sense displayed in Ghazzâli’s writings. He praises wisdom as far higher than mere belief, and opposes the fanatical dogmatism which rejects all rational inquiry and all knowledge because it is cultivated by his bêtes noires the philosophers. He calls this dogmatism the unwise friend of
Islam. At the same time his precepts on personal independence, on moral discipline, on self-purification, on practical kindness, and on the education of the young, and his denunciation of the immoral and useless lives of the Mullahs of his time, reflect great credit on the goodness of his nature.

From this period there was an unceasing struggle between Rationalism and Patristicism. In the year 1150, under the orders of the Caliph Mustanjid, all the philosophical works of Ibn-Sina and the copies of the Rasâ'îl-i-Ikhwân us-Safâ found in the public and private libraries were consigned to the flames. In 1192 the physician Ar-Rukn Abdus-Salâm was accused of atheism, and the populace and priests proceeded to make a bonfire of his books. The Mullah who presided at this ceremony stood on a chair and delivered a sermon against philosophy. As the books were brought out they were delivered to him, and with a few remarks on their impiety, he threw them into the fire. A disciple of Maimonides was a witness to this strange scene, and has left an account of it. "I saw," says he, "in the hands of this doctor the work of Ibn-ul-Haithem (Al-Hazen) on astronomy. Showing to the people the circle by which the author represented the celestial sphere, the doctor burst forth, 'Misery of miseries, inexpressible disaster!' and with these words he threw the book into the flames." But even the influence of Imam al-Ghazzâli and the temporal power of the sovereigns, some of whom were at heart rationalists, would not have prevented the eventual victory of reason over the dead-weight of authority, had not the Mongol's sword turned the scale. "One Khan, one God: as the Khan's ordinance is immutable, so is God's decree." Could any doctrine be more logical or more irresistible, backed as it was by a million swords? Rationalism, philosophy, the sciences and arts went down before that avalanche of savagery—never to rise again. The gleams of light which we have seen shining on Western Asia under the successors of Hulâku were the fitful rays of the setting sun. Policy worked with an inborn fanaticism in crushing any endeavour to introduce rationalism and philosophy in the Moslem world. The lawyers were not

1 See chapter xi, post.
only strong, but also the main support of despotism. The result was, as we have already seen, Patristicism took possession of the hearts of large sections of Moslems, and has in course of time become a second nature with them. They can perceive nothing except through the medium of the patristic glasses. The Prophet inculcated the use of reason; his followers have made its exercise a sin. He preached against anthropolatry and extravagant veneration for human beings; the Sunnis have canonised the salaf and the four jurists; the Akhbâri Shiâhs, their Mujtahids,—and have called any deviation from the course laid down by them—however much that deviation might accord with the Master's own teachings and with reason—a crime. He had said that "ghosts, apparitions, and the like have nothing to do with Islâm." They now believe firmly in them. He impressed on them to go in quest of knowledge to the land of the heathens. They do not take it even when it is offered to them in their own homes.

Under the Safawis, rationalism and philosophy came to life once more—though not in that vigorous shape in which they had flourished under the earlier Abbasides. From the twelfth to the fifteenth century Irân had suffered terribly; and in the darkness which enshrouded the land during this long period of disaster and trouble, the Shahi Mullahs had assumed the position of the clergy in Christendom to a larger degree than even the Sunni lawyers. They claimed the sole and absolute power of expounding the laws on the ground that they were the representatives of the Fâtimide Imâms. Mulla Sadra, whom I have already mentioned as the reviver of the Usûli doctrines,—the religion of Mohammed as it was understood and accepted by his immediate descendants,—applied himself to revive the study of philosophy and science among his countrymen. It was by no means an easy task, but he worked with tact and judgment. Avicennism came to life again, and, in spite of the political vicissitudes of Irân, the destruction of lives during the Afghan domination, and the establishment of the Kajârs on the throne of Persia, has persistently maintained its hold over many of the cultivated class. One of the best epitomes of Avicennistic philosophy was published in the reign of Shah
Abbas II., by Abdur Razzâk bin Ali bin al-Hassan al-Lâhiji, under the name of Gouhar-i-Murâd, "The Pearl of Desire." It contains a summary of Ibn-Sînâ’s views, explained and illustrated by references to the opinions of the Caliph Ali and his descendants, and philosophers and physicists like Imâm Fâkhr ud-din Râzi, Nasîr ud-din Tûsî, Imâm Taftazâni, and others.

Some of Abdur Razzâk’s views are extremely interesting. For example, dealing with Mu’tazilaism and Asha’rîsm, he states that "the Mu’tazilas invented the science of Kalâm with the object of establishing a harmony between the precepts of religion and the requirements of society, and of explaining by principles of Reason the [Koranic] verses and the traditions which at first sight seem unreasonable (الى ائه ” العلماء"), whilst their opponents (الف ىي ् رة ُ Então) upheld the literal acceptance [of the verses of the Koran and of the traditions] partly from motives of bigotry and partly from policy; prohibited all interpretations, and pronounced the interpretations of the Mu’tazilas and all their opinions as heresy (بدمت), and designated the Mu’tazilas heretics (سيء ع), and considered themselves in opposition to them [the Mu’tazilas] as ahl-i-Sunnat wa-Jamâ’al . . . So much so, that many of them have fallen into the sin of thinking God to be a material being, all of them are immersed in that of anthropomorphism.—And this has happened of their shutting the door upon all interpretations; they have construed in their literal acceptation, the verse that ‘He is seated on the Throne,’ and such like, and the traditions as to (the sight of God) until they derived tajsim (corporeality) from one, and tashbih (similarity, or anthropomorphism) from the other. These people had at first no method of reasoning or putting forward of logical arguments; they relied only on the literal words of the Koran and traditions until the appearance of Abu’l Hasan Asha’rî, who was a prominent disciple of Abû Ali Jubbâî, one of the learned Imâms of the Mu’tazilas. Abu’l Hasan had acquired great knowledge.

1 Of this sovereign it is said that he was as tolerant to all religions as his great ancestor Abbas I. He often declared the principle by which his conduct on this point was regulated "It is for God, not for me, to judge of men’s consciences, and I will never interfere with what belongs to the tribunal of the great Creator and Lord of the Universe."
of logic and argumentation. He abandoned the Mazhab-i-
'itizâl, and adopted that of the Ahl-i-Sunnat wa-Jamâ'at and
made great endeavours to advance the cause of this sect, which up
to his time had no influence whatsoever. Henceforth it began
to be called after him. He invented principles and rules according
to the Mu'tazilite models. . . . And as the tyrannical sovereigns
found that the doctrines of this Mazhab suited their policy,
they supported this sect; and so Asha'irism spread widely
among the Ahl-i-Islâm. But, as the doctrines of the Mu'tazilas
(وزرائے عقل) were founded on the principles of reason
(صبر عقل), they found acceptance among a large number
of the true-hearted people. And as the Mu'tazilas had studied deeply the philosophical and scientific
works, they introduced arguments borrowed from them
in the discussion of metaphysical and theological subjects.
And when the Asha'iris became aware of this, as they considered
everything which was not contained in the bosom of Islâm a
heresy—شریعہ در صدر سلام ۴۰۰۰ ل ، they at once
pronounced the study of philosophy (علمۂ کم حکم) to be
unlawful and dangerous. It was owing to the endeavours of
this sect that philosophy became so unpopular among the Ahl-i-
Islâm as to affect even the learned of the Mu'tazilas. But the
Asha'iria were the originators of this antagonism to philosophy,
for, otherwise, it is in truth in no way inconsistent with religion
or the mysteries (مروارید) of the Koran and traditions. . . .
The prophets and their representatives (در) have ex-
plained the truths of philosophy which are Divine by tamsil,
similitudes." . . . "With regard to the freedom of human
actions, there are three Mazhabs: the first is the doctrine of
Jabr, and that is the Mazhab of the Asha'irias; they hold that
the actions of man are immediately created by God without
any exercise of will on the part of human beings—so much so,
that if a person lights a fire, the lighting is said to be an act of
God." Then after exposing the immorality of this doctrine,
the author proceeds to say, "the second Mazhab, that of tafwez,
was adopted by a few Mu'tazilas, who held that man has
absolute power to choose what is right and what is wrong, and
do accordingly. The third is the *Mazhab* of the Fâtimide Imâms, and the majority of the philosophers and rationalists who maintain that human actions are the immediate creations of man, but evil and good are pointed out by God."

We cannot help contrasting the present condition of the Church which claims to be orthodox in Christendom with that of the one which advances a similar claim in Islâm. From the fourth century, ever since its foundation, until the revolt of Luther, Catholicism proved itself the mortal enemy of science, philosophy, and learning. It consigned to the flames myriads of beings for heresy; it trampled out the lisplings of free-thought in Southern France and closed with violence the schools of rational theology. But Catholicism, after the great break of Luther and Calvin, discovered that neither the cultivation of science nor the pursuit of philosophy renders the faithful an unbeliever. It broadened its base and now includes men of the largest minds, scientists, litterateurs, etc. To an outsider it presents a more liberal aspect than even the Reformed Christian Churches. For five centuries Islâm assisted in the free intellectual development of humanity, but a reactionary movement then set in, and all at once the whole stream of human thought was altered. The cultivators of science and philosophy were pronounced to be beyond the pale of Islâm. Is it impossible for the Sunni Church to take a lesson from the Church of Rome? Is it impossible for her to expand similarly---to become many-sided? There is nothing in Mohammed’s teachings which prevents this. Islâmic Protestantism, in one of its phases, Mu’tazilism, has already paved the way. Why should not the great Sunni Church shake off the old trammels and rise to a new life?
CHAPTER XI

THE MYSTICAL AND IDEALISTIC SPIRIT IN ISLĀM

The mystical philosophy which forms the life and soul of modern Persian literature owes its distinct origin to the esoteric significance attached by an important section of Moslems to the words of the Koran. The elevated feeling of Divine pervasion with which the Prophet often spoke, the depth of fervent and ecstatic rapture which characterised his devotions, constitute the chief basis on which Moslem mysticism is founded. During his lifetime, when the performance of duties was placed before religious speculation, there was little scope for the full development of the contemplative and mystical element in Islâm. This mystical and contemplative element exists in all religions and among every people. And yet it varies with the peculiarities of the individual and the race, and according to their tendency to confound the abstract with the concrete. The Hindu looks on absorption of the finite into the Infinite as the culmination of happiness; and to attain that end he remains immovable in one spot, and resigns himself to complete apathy. The sense of infinity makes it difficult for him to distinguish objectively between the priest and the God, or himself and the God; and eventually between the Deity and the different forms of nature in which He is supposed to be manifested. Gradually this train of contemplation leads to the formal conclusion, as appears from the Bhagavad Gīṭa, that Creator and creation are identical. We see thus how curiously pantheism, in its extreme manifestation, approaches to fetishism,
which preceded every other idea of the Divinity. In its infancy the human mind knows no spiritual sentiment but one of unmixed terror. The primeval forests, which the hand of man has not yet touched, the stupendous mountains looming in the distance, the darkness of the night, with the grim, weird shapes which hover about it, the howling of the wind through the forest tops, all inspire fear and awe in the infant mind of man. He worships every material object he finds more powerful or more awe-striking than himself or his immediate surroundings. Gradually he comes to attach an ideality to all these objects of nature, and thinks these idealities worthy of adoration. In process of time all these separate idealities merge in one universal all-embracing Ideality. Materialistic pantheism is the first step in the rise from fetishism.

Neo-Platonism, itself the child of Eastern thought, had impressed its character on Christianity, and probably given rise to the eucharistic idea. With the exception of Johannes Scotus and Eckhart,¹ the mystics of Europe during the Middle Ages fought only on this ground. Mysticism, properly so called, with its higher yearning after the Infinite, was ushered in by the Moslem doctrine of "inward light."

The idea among the nobler minds in the world of Islâm, that there is a deeper and more inward sense in the words of the Koran, arose not from the wish to escape from the rigour of "texts and dogmas," but from a profound conviction that those words mean more, not less, than the popular expounders supposed them to convey. This conviction, combined with a deep feeling of Divine pervasion,—a feeling originating from and in perfect accordance with the teachings of the Koran and the instructions of the Prophet, led to the development among the Moslems of that contemplative or idealistic philosophy which has received the name of Sûfism, and the spread of which, among the Mohammedans, was probably assisted by the prevalence of Neo-Platonic ideas. Imâm al-Ghazzâlî in the East, and Ibn-Tufail in the West, were the two great representatives of mysticism among the Moslems. The former, as we have already seen, dissatisfied with every philosophical system, which based knowledge on experience

¹ 1260-1328 A.C.
or reason, had taken refuge in Sūfism. * Al-Ghazzālī’s influence served greatly to promote the diffusion of Sūfism among the Eastern Moslems, and idealistic philosophy was embraced by the greatest intellects of the Mohammedan East. Moulâna Jalâl ud-dîn of Rûm (Turkey), whose Masnavî 1 is venerated by the Sûfî; Sanâī, whom Jalâl ud-dîn himself has called his superior; 2 Farîd ud-dîn Attâr, Shams ud-dîn Hâfiz, Khâkânî, the moralist Sa’dî, the romancer Nizâmî,—all belonged to this school.

It must not be supposed that al-Ghazzâlî was the first preacher of “inward light” in Islâm. Intuitive knowledge of God (ta’arruf) is inherent in the Faith. The intent (niyyet) of “approach” (kurbat) to and communion with Him is the essential preliminary to true devotion; the “Ascension” (the mi’râj) of the Prophet meant the absolute communion of the finite with the Infinite. Not only does God speak to the hearts of men and women who in earnest sincerity seek divine help and guidance, but all knowledge is from the Supreme Intelligence; it comes to the Prophets by direct revelation (Qâdi’) and often “The sacrament of the heart” is conveyed by Him to His chosen few, “fi-sirrat-kalbi, بِسِیرَاۃُ گُزَّذِی،” without an intermediary. This in Islâm is called ‘Ilmi-laduuni. 3 It is referred to in the Koran, where it says, “We taught him [His chosen servant] knowledge from Ourselves.” 4 The same conception of intimate communion with God occurs in the well-known hadîs, where the Almighty says, “My earth and My heaven contain Me not, but the heart of My faithful servant containeth Me.” 5 And the Divine promise finds a responsive note in the human heart when it is uplifted

1 One of the apologues of the Masnavî on true devotion being the service of man, has been beautifully rendered into English by Leigh Hunt in the lines beginning—

“Abou ben Adhem (may his tribe increase)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,” etc.

2 See Appendix III.

3 Koran, Sura xviii. v. 65. 

4 See Appendix II. Also quoted by Dr Reynolds Nicholson of Cambridge in his Mystics of Islam. This work, by a scholar whose knowledge of Sûn literature is unrivalled in Europe, gives in a small compass a lucid summary of Persian mysticism.
in prayer: "The Almighty God hears whatever prayers (lit. praises) I offer Him. O my Lord, I thank Thee."¹

The same transcendentalism is to be found in other traditions; and Ali discourses on the inward light in his sermons;² Fāṭima'-t az-Zahra, "our Lady of Light," dwells on it in her preachings;³ and it finds ecstatic expression in the prayers of the grandson of Ali, the son of Husain the Martyr.⁴ But nowhere in these earliest records of the conception of "Inward Light" is there any ground for the suggestion that either the Prophet or the direct inheritors of his spiritual heritage ever preached the abandonment of the affairs of the world in the pursuit of Truth, or the observance of asceticism which he so strongly reprobed.⁵ And that is exactly what has happened in the evolution of Moslem esotericism. In the endeavour to obtain spiritual perfection⁶ numbers of Moslems have forgotten the precept that human existence depends on constant exertion. How this has taken place is not without interest.

The mystic cult neither in Christianity nor in Islâm is a new

¹ The Nahj-ul-Balâghat. There are two commentaries on the Nahj-ul-Balâghat, one by Ibn Abîl Hadid, the other in Persian by Lutf' Ullah Kâshânî. The full name of Ibn Abîl Hadid is given in the editorial note to the Sharh as "Abu Hâmid Abdul Hamîd bin Hibatullâh bin Mohammed bin Mohammed bin Hûsân bin Abîl Hadid." He was born at Madâin in the month of Zu'l Hija 586 A.H. (December 1190 A.D.) He was a Mu'tazili, and a Shahî, and those designations are applied to him in the note. He was a jurisconsult of the first rank, profoundly versed (mu'tabakkhr) in science and learning, a mutakallim (dialectician) and a poet; and was attached to the Chancellery (the Diwân) under the Caliphs Nasir and Zahir. Ibn Khalilikân (De Slane, vol. iii p. 543, in the biography of Zia-ud-din Ibn ul-Athir) speaks of him as "the jurisconsult Izz-ud-din and a man of letters," but does not mention Ibn Abîl Hadid's great work, the Commentary on the Nahj-ul-Balâghat; nor the fact that he was a Mu'tazili and a Shahî. Ibn Abîl Hadid refutes at the beginning of his work, where he propounds the human duty of thankfulness and worship to the Almighty, the Aš'ârî doctrine of the corporeal vision of God on the day of Judgment (r'uyat ul-Bânî fi'l Akhârät).

² The Prophet and the early disciples spent "the greater part of the night in devotion; and their days in transacting the affairs of the people." So did Omar ibn Abdul Azîz, the fifth Ommeyyade Caliph, who deserved the title of saint more than many others.

³ To become what in Sûfi phraseology is called a "perfect man," "insâni kâmil."
development. It existed in the Roman world and was not unknown to the Jews. In Aryan India, it practically ran riot and was cultivated in every form. From India it was transported into Western and Central Asia, where it assumed from time to time most fantastic shapes. Wherever it was planted it implied the abandonment of all commerce with the outside world, the renunciation of family ties and obligations, and the concentration of the human mind on one object to the exclusion of all others. This, in fact, represents the essence of the mystic cult. The call of Jesus was an echo of the world-old teaching of the Mystic. The Prophet of Islām, on the other hand, emphasised the faithful performance of the less impressive duty, the service of man, as the most acceptable worship to God. His call was the direct antithesis of the older conceptions.

Unfortunately, the convulsions that followed on the break-up of the original and true Caliphate with the assassination of Ali,¹ the sack of Medina with all its attendant horrors, and the pagan licence which came into vogue in social life under the more dissolute Ommeyyade sovereigns of Damascus, drove many earnest-minded Moslems to take refuge in retirement and religion. From piety there is only a step to Quietism. Thenceforward the evolution of the mystical cult runs a natural course. The adoption of the distinctive woollen garment (the khirka) as a mark of penitence and renunciation of the world dates from early times.² The Sūfi theory of spiritual development is based on complete self-abnegation and absolute absorption in the contemplation of God. The Sūfi believes that by this absorption and mental concentration ³ he can attain a far

---

¹ See ante, p. 296, also Short History of the Saracens, pp. 52 and 70
² In Christianity garments made of sackcloth or hair served the same purpose. The Khirka is a sort of gaberdine like a long pillow-case. The Sūfī derives his name from the woollen garment he wears, the word sūf meaning wool. The term sūfī has no connection either with the ahl-us-Suffa, the religious men who were wont to sit and sleep outside the Prophet’s mosque and receive daily their food from him, nor with the Ikhwān-us-Sūfā, “The Brethren of Purity.”
³ It is stated that Abū Sa‘īd bin Abīl Khair who also holds a high place in Sūfī hagiology, kept his mind, like the Hindu yogis, centred on his navel. An excellent biography of Abū Sa‘īd bin Abīl Khair is given in Dr. Nicholson’s Studies in Islamic Mysticism, published by the Cambridge University Press; see also Professor E. G. Browne’s Literary History of Persia. He is said to have been a contemporary of Avicenna. He died in 1049.
closer communion with the Divinity and a truer cognition of the Truth. This belief, whilst it no doubt led many pious and devout men and women to consecrate their lives to religion, produced at the same time a rank growth of fantastic ideas.

Ali the Caliph and the Imâms of his House are regarded as having possessed in a superlative degree the "Inward Knowledge." Abû Nasr as-Sarrâj, in his work al-Luma' on the philosophy of Sûfism, quoting Junaid ² says, that had Ali not been occupied in so many wars, he would have imparted to the world the vast measure of the 'Ilm-ul-ladunni ³ with which he was endowed.⁴ And in the Tazkirat-ul-Awlia⁵ of Farîd-ud-din 'Attâr⁶ the first place in the list of mystic saints is given to Ja'far as-Sâdik, the sixth apostolical Imâm. It is worthy of note that in the case of almost every Sûfi saint the line of spiritual descent is traced back to Ali and through him to the Prophet.⁷ A few only trace it to Abû Bakr.

The holy men and women who flourished in the first two centuries were more Quietists than Sûfis. They had abandoned the world and devoted themselves exclusively to devotion and piety (zuhd and takwa). Such were Imâm Hasan al-Basri,⁸

---

¹ *Al-Luma' fi-tasawwuf; tasawwuf* is the philosophy of Sûfism. The *Luma' of* as-Sarrâj has been recently edited with great care and erudition by the learned author of *Studies in Islâmic Mysticism* According to Nûr-ud-din Abdul Rahmân Jâmî (*Nafahât-ul-Ums*, Calcutta ed p. 319) as-Sarrâj occupies an eminent position among the Sûfi saints. He appears also from Jâmî's account to have been a proficient mathematician, versed in the abstract sciences. As-Sarrâj died in 378 A.H. (988 A.C.), nearly 100 years before al-Ghazzâlî.

² *Al-Luma', p 129* Junaid was one of the earliest mystics of Islâm; he died A.H. 297 (A.C 910). He is stated to have declared that "the Sûfi system of doctrine is firmly bound with the dogmas of the Faith and the Korân" (Ibn Khallikân).

³ The Indian poet Dabîr calls Ali the "Knower of the mysteries of God," *ramûzdân-i-Khuda*.

⁴ Biography of the Saints.

⁵ See ante, p 306; 'Attâr was born in 545 A.H. (1150 A.C.), and is believed to have been killed by the Mongols in 627 A.H. (1229-30 A.C.).

⁶ See post.

⁸ Wâsîl bin 'Ata, the founder of Mu'tazilaism, was a pupil of Hasan Basri. Imâm Hasan Basri died in A.H. 110 (A.C. 728).
Ibrāhīm ibn Adham, Ma'rūf Karkhi, Junaid, Rābi'a, the pious lady whose name has become famous in the annals of Islām, Bāyezid Bistāmī and a host of others. In the third century when Junaid flourished, Sūfism had become a recognised offshoot of Islāmic philosophy, but owing to the scope it afforded to indulgence in undisciplined thought, Sūfism began to assume in different minds distinctly non-Islāmic shapes. Ābu Nasr as-Sarrāj denounces the erratic tendencies which now emerged from the welter of old ideas and conceptions. Some of the professors of the mystic cult anticipated Johannes Agricola in declaring that perfect knowledge absolved the "knower" from all trammels of the moral law.

As-Sarrāj was the predecessor of al-Ghazzālī in his endeavour to systematise Sūfistic philosophy. In spite of his efforts to shape Sūfism into a disciplined channel, it still continued to run in the old gnostic and often antinomian currents. And yet throughout the five centuries which elapsed between the death of the Prophet and the rise of Al-Ghazzālī there flourished numbers of men and women revered for their learning, piety and nobleness of character. One of these was the famous Imām-ul-Haramain, the master of al-Ghazzālī.

To Imām al-Ghazzālī eastern Sūfism owes in a large measure its systematisation and most of the colour and beauty in which it is clothed. His appearance on the stage of the world was well-timed; for the Sunni Church, owing to causes which I propose to review briefly, needed vitalisation.

1 Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Adham ibn Mansūr is spoken of in the Tazkira-ul-Awta as the son of a prince of Balkh. His father appears to have been a rich magnate. He abandoned the world, gave all his riches to the poor and lived a life of piety and devotion. He is said to have been a disciple of Ābu Hanifa. He died in 161 A.H.

2 Ma'rūf Karkhi was the son of a Christian. He was converted to Islām by the eighth Apostolical Imām Alī ar-Rizā the son of Imām Muṣā. He was Imām Riza's disciple. The Imām was greatly attached to him and treated him as a son, from which comes the saying "Āl Mūsā Riza as-waś-ruza bād." Ma'rūf was killed in a riot at the gate of the Imām's residence in Meshed.

3 In Junaid's time already convents and congregational lodges had come into existence.

4 Rābi'a died in the year 160 A.H., and her name is emblazoned in the annals of mysticism as one of the holiest of saints. She had a long line of successors, the last of them, Bibi Pākdāman, died in Lahore about the middle or towards the end of the last century.

5 These Sūfis or dervishes in India are called Be Shara"—"without law"
Al-Asha'ri died in 320 of the Hegira; al-Ghazzâlî was born exactly 130 years later, towards the close of the fifth century of the Moslem era, and began his work of revivification when he was forty years of age. The sixth century was the most critical in the history of Islâm. Whilst the faith of Mohammed was involved in a deadly struggle with Christendom which threatened its very existence, an insidious enemy within its own bosom was poisoning its life. Hasan Sabbâh’s tenets inculcated implicit and unquestioning obedience to him as the vicerecter of the Fatimide Caliph Nizâr, commonly regarded by the sect as the incarnate Imâm; he taught that the “path” to Truth led to and through him. His disciples, drugged by hashish, obtained on awakening a foretaste of the delights he promised them in after-life as the reward for their obedience and unaltering execution of his orders. Beautiful maidens gathered from every quarter helped in fastening his chains on the neck of his votaries. His emissaries, actuated by varied motives, but all subject to an irresistible driving force, abounded in every city, township and village of Central and Western Asia. Every household contained a concealed member of the dread fraternity. Neither heroic service to the Faith, nor learning, devoutness or nobility of character was a protection against these nihilists of Islâm.¹ The best and noblest of Moslems were struck down by these enemies of society. Their propaganda was not confined among Moslems alone. Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and Hindus alike became the victims of their insidious methods of proselytism. Both men and women, and even children, were seduced from their faith by alluring hopes of immediate reward from Heaven. To contend against these enemies of Islâm it had become essential to galvanise the conservative forces into fresh vitality. Whilst Asha'irism had hardened into a rigid formalism, among the populace the cult of the mystic had run wild. Every man or woman who found the discipline of the Faith irksome turned

¹ Compare the destructive tendencies of Hasan Sabbâh’s cult with those of the Illuminati in the eighteenth century. Professor E. G. Browne in his Literary History of Persia gives a list of some of the eminent men who fell victims to the daggers of the Isma’îlîs. See also the opening chapter in M. Guyard’s Un Grand Maître des Assassins au Temps de Saladin; and the life of Hasan Sabbâh by Moulvi Abdul Halîm in Urdu, published in Lucknow.
to Sufism, to a life independent of rules. Philosophical reasoning brought no immediate relief or consolation to minds in terror from enemies within and without. There was a general relaxation in ethical conceptions and an amazing deterioration in ideals. It was just at this critical period in the life of Islam that al-Ghazzali’s call to a mystical life in God, and to the attainment of truth by the individual soul in direct communion with the Almighty, struck a responsive chord in many distracted hearts. It relaxed the tension and gave orthodoxy a new weapon with which to fight the disruptive teachings of Hasan Sabbah’s emissaries.¹

It is a dispensation of Providence that wherever a religion becomes reduced to formalism cross-currents set in to restore spiritual vitality. The author of The Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity enumerates the men, each of whom, according to his light, tried to vitalise the old creed of Palestine. But it was the Prophet of Nazareth who, by his mystical summons to the worship of the Spirit in place of the national God of Israel, infused new life into Judaism.

Al-Ghazzali was preceded by other intuitionalists besides the Apostolical Imams. Immediately before him came as-Sarrâj and al-Kushairi.² But al-Ghazzali set the coping stone upon their work, and freed the Sunni church from Asha’rite dogmatism.

The story of al-Ghazzali’s life told by himself, of his trials and tribulations, of his doubts and his hopes, of his final emergence from “darkness into light,” is an interesting record of spiritual growth finally ending in Quietism, a form of spiritual relief which brings solace and comfort to many a heart tossed on the ocean of doubt.

Al-Ghazzali ³ was born in 450 of the Hegira (1058 A.C.) at

---

¹ In Professor Goldziher’s learned chapter on “Ascticism et Sufism” in Le Dogme et la loi de l’Islam, which I read only after I had sent this chapter to the press, I find that my estimate of the causes which brought forward al-Ghazzali is in general accord with the views of that eminent scholar; compare also the masterly essay of Professor D B Macdonald in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol xx

² Al-Kushairi (Abu’l Kâsim) died in 465 A.H (A.C 1074).

Tûs,¹ a township in the neighbourhood of Meshed in Khorâsan. He must have been gifted with a peculiarly virile and independent mind, for, as he tells us in the Munkiz, he had abandoned in early youth that test of orthodoxy in all creeds called taklid or conformity. To abandon taklid and strike out a path for the exercise of individual judgment in the domain of religious thought has been in all ages and in all creeds regarded by dogmatic theologians as a sin of the first degree. Orthodoxy in the Sunni Church meant conformity with the principles of one or other of the founders of the four schools of law. Ghazzâli, with an audacity which demands admiration, refused to adhere to any particular dogma without independent examination.² But as he always called himself ash-Shâfe‘i, he must have conformed more or less to the doctrines of that school. Ibn Khallikân, in fact, says al-Ghazzâli was a doctor of the Shâfe‘i sect. “Towards the close of his life the Shâfe‘is had not a doctor to be compared to him.” In the twentieth year of his age al-Ghazzâli proceeded from Tûs to Naishapur, a great centre of learning until its destruction by the Mongols in 1256 A.C. Here he enrolled himself in the Nizâmiéh College, which had been founded only a few years before, as a pupil of the Imâm ul-Haramain al-Juwaini. Al-Ghazzâli studied with this saintly Imâm until his death in 478 A.H. (1084 A.C.). Al-Ghazzâli was then in his twenty-eighth year; ambitious, energetic, well-versed in all the learning of the Islâmic world, he betook himself to the court of Nizâm-ul-Mulk,³ the great Vizier of the Seljukide sovereign Malik Shah. Nizâm-ul-Mulk by his munificent patronage of scholarship, science and arts, had gathered round him a brilliant galaxy of savants and learned men. He recognised the worth of the new aspirant for his help and support, and after a short probation in his own

¹ Tûs is also the birthplace of Firdousî, the greatest of Persian poets. Meshed, properly Mashhad (mausoleum), is venerated by the Shiâhs as the eighth Apostolical Imâm Ali bin Musa al-Rizâ is buried there.

² It is only in recent times that a new sect has grown up among the Moslems of India, which bears the proud name of ’Ghair Mukalîda‘ (‘Non-conformists’), see ante, p. 353.

³ Abû Ali al-Hasan, also a native of Tûs. He is the author of the Šidâsat-Nâmîh, a book on the administration of the commonwealth—“the art of government.” The text of this work in the original Persian with a French translation has been published by the late M. Ch. Schefer.
entourage conferred on al-Ghazzâli a professorial seat in one of the colleges in Bagdad. Nothing shows so clearly the extraordinary solidarity of the intellectual world of Islâm nor the link throughout the vast extent of the territories over which the Seljukide sovereigns in the plenitude of their power held sway as the manner in which officials of every rank, including professors and lecturers, were transferred from one centre to another.

In Bagdad al-Ghazzâli performed his professorial duties for six years. His lectures attracted pupils of all classes from every part of the Empire to hear his discourses on scholastic theology and logic. Towards the end of 488 A.H. (1095 A.C.) he was compelled to leave Bagdad in consequence of a severe nervous breakdown. The very subjects on which he lectured strengthened his doubts in the teachings of the schoolmen and divines of his Church. Asha'ri had emerged from his retreat after a fortnight's contemplation of the comparative virtues of Rationalism and Patristicism. It took ten years for al-Ghazzâli to find the resting-place for his soul. That rest he found, as he tells us himself, in the Master's words read in the light of the revelation which the Fashioner of the Universe vouchsafes to all hearts that seek Him. During his prolonged wanderings he visited every centre of learning and every scholastic or religious institution, where he found scholars or holy men engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, secular or divine. Al-Ghazzâli was in Jerusalem just before the crusading storm burst on that devoted city (Sha'bân 492) ¹ He seems to have tarried longest at Damascus, where he lectured in a corner of the cathedral mosque situated on the west bank of the river. The cloister he occupied in the mosque is still called the Zâvia of Imâm al-Ghazzâli. When he returned to Naishapur after his long wandering, he was forty-eight years of age, still in the prime of life, worn and scarred, though he had found what he sought—the knowledge of God and peace of soul. His great and generous patron, Nizâm-ul-Mulk, had been assassinated by an Isma'îli Fidâi, one of Hasan Sabbâh's emissaries, in 485 A.H. (1092 A.C.), whilst al-Ghazzâli was still lecturing in Bagdad. Malik Shah had died six months after

¹ He is said to have visited in his wanderings even Alexandria.
the assassination of his faithful servant, the bulwark of his empire. Sultan Sanjar, one of Malik Shah's sons, now reigned over the shrunken patrimony of Tughril and Alp Arslân, and Fakhr-ul-Mulk, a son of Nizâm-ul-Mulk, held at this time the office of Vizier under Sanjar. As great a patron of learning as his distinguished father, Fakhr-ul-Mulk at once requisitioned the services of Ghazzâlí and appointed him to a high professorial post in the Maimunièh-Nizâmièh College at Naishapur. Here commenced that marvellous activity of a prolific mind which has left its impress on the emotional and mystical side of Islâm.

The Munkiz-min-az-Zalâl ("The deliverer from darkness") was evidently written about this time. In this book, which is not more than a discourse, he divides the "seekers of truth" (at-tâlibin) into three classes or groups (sinf). The first group consists of the dogmatic theologians (the Ashar'ite Mutakallimín). These people base their conceptions on "deductions" (rât) and speculation (nazar). Their unsatisfactory dogmatism is ruled out in rather a measured criticism. In the second group are included the Bâtinis or Isma'íllas, those who profess to derive their knowledge from a "living Imâm." After an examination of the views of the philosophers, among whom are included the authors of the Ikhwân-us-Safâ, "which is no more than a compilation of philosophy," al-Ghazzâlí subjects the teachings of the Ta'limis, that is the Isma'íllas, to a merciless criticism and exposes their anti-Islâmic character. To their assertion that they follow a living Imâm, he replies, "There is the Prophet, why should we follow any other leader" And he adds that these misbelieving heretics would not have met with so much success among the people, had their opponents (implying the dogmatists) not been so remiss and feeble in their arguments. In the fourth group

1 The old Nizâmíeh College appears to have been extended and enlarged by Fakhr-ul-Mulk, and received the new designation.

2 مَنْكِز مِنْ عَذَاب یُتَّلِب

3 Printed with Schmölder's Essai sur les Écoles Philo-
   sophiques chez les Arabes; India Office copy.

4 See ante, note, p. 326

4 This is identical in spirit to the famous couplet of Sanáí already quoted, ante p. 47.
come the Sûfis, the intuitionalists, people of "vision and manifestation." In other words, they see Truth where others find the Divine Essence from reason. According to the historian Ibn-ul-Athîr, who compiled his great work in Mosul not long after al-Ghazzâlî’s death, the *Ihya-ul-’Ulum*¹ ("the Revivification of Knowledge") was written before the Imâm returned to Naishapur. There is some difference of opinion on this point; although by consensus it is by far the most important of his productions. The *Ihya-ul-’Ulum* is an encyclopædic work dealing comprehensively with the philosophy and ethics of Sûfism.

Al-Asha’ri had condemned all enquiry into the mysteries of existence. Although equally dogmatic in his denunciation of philosophers and philosophy, of rationalism and its ideals, al-Ghazzâlî gives them a hearing; appraises their work and finds it wanting, wanting in the capacity to attain the goal to which, according to him, humanity should strive. And what is more, as people of the same *kiblêh*² he includes them within the pale of Islâm. It is extraordinary that the greatest mystics of the succeeding ages make little reference to him. Jalâl-ud-din sings of Attâr and Sanâî but expresses no obligation to al-Ghazzâlî for his transcendentalism. Is

¹ *Ishaq al-Bašâmil, al-‘Ilm* (Cairo Ed. India Office copy).

A short reference to some of the subjects with which it deals will show its extraordinary range and the industry and intellectual power of the writer. The book (in vol. i) opens with a disquisition on the excellence of learning (knowledge)—*fazl-ul-’ilm*; and it is established by proofs furnished by reason and authority (*ash-shawâhid ul’ akhîh wa’l nakhîh*); there is a disquisition on the "excellence of Reason" (*Sharaf ul-’akl*) and the difference between soul (*nafs*) and Reason (*’akl*), and Islâm and Imân (faith). Toleration is extended to all who bow to the same *kiblêh* (i.e. are followers of Islâm). In vol. ii he deals with the duties of man to man, of the reciprocal duties of children and parents. He defines here the meaning of *nafs* (the soul) and *râh* (the spirit), of *kalb* (the heart), and *’akl* (Reason), he points out the distinction between intuition (*ilhâm*) and instruction (*’a’lâm*). And in this volume he deals with the whole philosophy of Sûfism (*fath-ul-Sufîyeh fi-istikshâf il-Hath wa-tarik un-nazâr*).

The other two volumes are mainly concerned with the ethics of Islâm: he condemns pride, anger and vindictiveness, avarice and miserliness, and commends condescension and humility (*hilm*), forgiveness and mercy, generosity (*sakha*) and kindness. The *Ihya-ul-’Ulum* is held in high esteem also among the Shiah; in the *Buhr-ul-Anwar*, in the thesis on Reason and Knowledge it is mentioned as one of the *Isnâds* or "supports".

² *Kiblêh* is the point to which the Moslem turns his face when offering his orisons, i.e. Mecca, or rather the Kaaba.
it because the impetus he gave to emotional Islâm lost its force in the life and death struggle with the crusading hordes which lasted for nearly two centuries? To the Christian onslaught in Western Asia, followed by the Mongol avalanche which swept over mid-Asia, destroying in its course every vestige of civilisation and culture, is entirely due the long night that followed the sack of Bagdad. It is not improbable that the force of his example and precept became barren in the cataclysm that overwhelmed Islâm not long after his death. And yet the faith in communion with the Almighty, with its aspirations and inwardness, survived in the hearts of the truly earnest and devout disciples, and the ‘âriff claimed to have visions where the philosopher and the rationalist obtained cognition by reason. The emotional part of al-Ghazzâlî’s mystical philosophy found refuge in the monasteries of the dervishes; zâvias, rabâts¹ and khânkâhs² sprang up on all sides. Wherever the holy men who claimed a transcendental insight, an insight beyond the ken of reason, took up their abode, disciples clustered round them; they founded orders, and imparted mystical knowledge to their followers. Many were sincere and honest, others were impostors. The influence and teachings of the first, whilst they lasted, were undoubtedly beneficent; the influence of the others, with their sundering tendencies from Islâm, were demoralising.

Al-Ghazzâlî himself did not place his trust in dogmatic theology (Kalâm) and denounced it as opposed to reason, but the exact sciences, arithmetic, geometry and the connected branches, are considered by him as absolutely unassailable and not open to doubt or controversy. At Naishapur he wrote, among other works, the Makâsid-ul-Falâsifa (“The Aims of Philosophy”), and the Tahâfut-ul-Falâsifa (“the Destruction of the Philosophers”), both directed against philosophy and those who cultivated it, and in both he tries to prove the

¹ From the word rabât is derived the word “marabout.” In the eleventh century the Murâbita established a powerful empire in Morocco and Spain; see History of the Saracens, p 532.

² Meninski defines a khânkâh thus: domus propter Deus extracta in usum sacerdorum aut religiosorum; conoburn. Richardson calls it a monastery or religious structure built for Eastern Sâfs and dervishes. There is a startling analogy between those Moslem institutions and the Hindu Muths in southern India, where also disciples gather for religious instruction.
futility of philosophic reasoning and the unsatisfying character of the teachings of philosophy.

On the assassination of his patron and friend Fakhr-ul-Mulk Ali by an emissary of that arch-enemy of ordered society “the Old Man of the Mountain,” Hasan Sabbah, in the Muharram of 500 A.H. al-Ghazzâli retired sorrow-stricken to his native city of Tûs, where he had built a madrasa for students and a khânakâh (monastery) for his disciples. Here he lectured, and here he laboured on his works which have made him a personality in the world of Islâm. The great Sûfî died on Monday the 14th of Jumâdi 11. 505 A.H. (18th December, 1116).

With him passed away one who, in spite of his mysticism, was endowed with a particularly virile character, the influence of which lasted long after his death. Imâm al-Ghazzâli as a follower of Shâfe’î, was bitterly hostile to Imâm Abû Hanifa, whose encouragement of analogical reasoning and of the exercise of ratiocination he seems to have strongly disapproved. Whilst on the one hand the mystic Imâm by his Quietism chilled the blood in the veins of the Moslem races and arrested their energies for progress and development, on the other he imparted to Ash’arism an idealism it did not previously possess.

The desire to enforce conformity and repress “heresy” has been the curse of every religious system where ecclesiastics and legists have usurped authority in the church. Islâm has not escaped from it, though it has been less harsh to “unbelievers” than to its own “innovators,” whom orthodoxy designated as ahl-ul-bida’. Men suffering from spiritual exaltation, or whose minds had become unhinged by excessive self-mortification, along with rationalists and reformers, became the victims of persecution. The story of Mansûr al-Hallâj

Fakhr-ul-Mulk was held in such love and esteem by the people, for his wise and beneficent administration of Sanjar’s kingdom, that history has named him Jamâl-ush-Shuhada, “The Glory of the Martyrs.” Husain, the grandson of the Prophet massacred at Kerbela, is called the Syed ush Shuhada, “The Chief of the Martyrs.”

The followers of Abû Hanifa were accordingly called ahl-ur-ras-wa‘l-Kyâs, “people of reasoning and analogy.”

Dr. Sachau, the eminent translator of al-Beiruni’s Indika, says that “were it not for al-Asha’ri and al-Ghazzâli the Arabs would have been a nation of Galileos and Newtons.”
is one of the most pitiful in the annals of mysticism.\footnote{1} Farīd-ud-dīn-'Attar was, like Firdousī, an adherent of the House of Mohammed; he was also a Sūfī of the first degree. In the Mazhar-ūl-ʻAjāīb\footnote{2} 'Attar gives an account of his sufferings; of his expulsion from the place of his birth (Ṭūs); of the confiscation of his property and goods, and of his subsequent wanderings. Many of them suffered the penalty of death; in the case of others the punishment was posthumous; their works were consigned to the flames. Even al-Ghazzālī's Iḥyā-ṣ-ʻUlūm met with that fate in Cordova, at one time the home of Saracenic culture.\footnote{3} But these repressive methods did not succeed in stopping the spread of the mystical cult. Every holy man round whom gathered disciples became a saint or wālī. The saints were credited with supernatural powers; and although the most noted Sūfīs of early times who rank now as wālis of the first rank, like Junaid and Bāyezīd Bistāmi, strongly discountenanced thaumaturgic practices, the Tazkīrat-ūl-Awliya, and the Ṣafāḥ-ūl-Uns recount remarkable acts by the saints outside ordinary human experience. These wonders are called karāmāt, performed as they are by virtue of the powers gifted to them by God. In these days they would probably be attributed to what is called ‘psychic influence.’ Hypnotism and mesmerism, under the name of tāsīr ʿul-anzūr, and telepathy have long been known in the East. Some of the acts might be due to unconscious hypnotism.

Sufism travelled speedily from Irāk and Persia into India, where it found a congenial soil. A large number of Sūfī saints, both men and women, flourished in Hindustan and the Deccan and acquired great fame in their lifetime for sanctity and good work. Their tombs are up to the present day the objects of pilgrimage to Moslems and, remarkable to note, to Hindus as well.\footnote{4} These saints taught their disciples who congregated in the colleges or monasteries they established Islāmic theosophy

\footnote{1}{Tazkīrat-ūl-Awliya, \textit{Pt} ii \textit{p} 135.}
\footnote{2}{Mazhar ʻul-ʻAjāib is a title of the Caliph \textit{Ameer ʻul-Mominīn} \textit{Ahī}.}
\footnote{3}{This happened in the reign of \textit{ʻAlī} bin Yusuf Tāshīfīn, who died in 1143 A.C.}
\footnote{4}{Luṭfullāh in his \textit{Qānūn Islām}, translated by Herklot, gives an account of most of these wālis, with the practices and superstitions common among the \textit{Inādīa} Sūfīs}
and Sufi rules of life. They, like their successors, were called sajjādanāshin. They are, in fact, spiritual preceptors. In the West the preceptor is called the sheikh; in India, ṭir or murshid; the disciple the murid. On the death of the ṭir his successor assumes the privilege of initiating the disciples into the mysteries of dervishism or Sufism. This privilege of initiation, of making murids, of imparting to them spiritual knowledge, is one of the functions which the sajjādanāshin performs or is supposed to perform. He is the curator of the mausoleum where his ancestor is buried, and in him is supposed to continue the spiritual line (silṣila). The shrines (dargahs), which are to be found all over India, are the tombs of celebrated dervishes who in their lifetime were regarded as saints. Some of these men had established khānkāhs where they lived and where they taught their Sufi doctrines. Many did not possess khānkāhs and when they died their tombs became shrines. They were mostly Sufis; but some were undoubtedly the disciples of Miān Roushan Bāyezid, who lived about the time of Akbar, and who had founded an independent esoteric brotherhood, in which the chief occupied a peculiarly distinctive position. They called themselves dervishes or fakirs, on the hypothesis that they had abjured the world, and were humble servitors of God; by their followers they were honoured with the title of shah or king. Although the Persian word "dervish" is significantly Moslem in its origin and meaning, "dervishes" have always existed in Western Asia. The minor Prophets of the Hebrews, designated nabīn, were only the prototypes of the modern "dervish." John the Baptist, who lost his life for his temerity before Herod's wife, acted exactly as hundreds of dervishes have done in later ages, challenging kings and princes in their palaces. One of the most celebrated of these Indian walis is Shah Nizām uddin Awlia, who came from Ghazni and is buried in the neighbourhood of Delhi, where he lived for many years. He is said to have died in 1325. Khwāja Mu'in ud-din Chishti

1 *Sajjāda* is a prayer mat, and *nashin* is the person seated on it

2 See ante, p. 345. This man should not be confounded with the celebrated Bāyezid Bistāmi, who died in A.H. 261 (A.D. 874-5). In the Surah Bistāmi is spelt as Bistāmī.

3 In the reign of Ala-ud-din Khilji, who was his murid.
appears to have preceded Nizâm uddin Awlia into India. He
died at Ajmere at the age of 97 in 663 A.H. (1265 A.C.). His
mausoleum at Ajmere is the resort of pilgrims, both Moslem
and Hindu, from all parts of India.\(^1\)

Another wali, Burhân ud-din, is buried in Burhanpur (named
after him) in Central India. Shah Kabir Dervish flourished
in the reign of Farrukh Siyar in the eighteenth century. He
is buried in Sasseram in Behar. One of his descendants is
still in charge of his monastery. Ameer Khusru, poet laureate
of Ala-ud-din Khilji, the Pathan King of Delhi, is also claimed
as a Sûfi saint.\(^2\)

In the West, orders of dervishes sprang up on all sides. One
of the most famous and probably the most influential is the
Kâdiria founded by the celebrated Sunni saint Sheikh Muhi-
ud-din Abd ul-Kâdir Ghilani.\(^3\) Another was founded by
Moulâna Jalâl ud-din, which is called after his title the Moulaviya
and has a great reputation for the holy life of its members.
The Nakshbandia is another powerful order, which has many
adherents in India.

But it is given to few to be saints and to still fewer to combine
a holy life of concentrated devotion with the discharge of the
daily duties of life. To the bulk of humanity the call to
abjure the world and to betake ourselves to complete absorp-
tion in the contemplation of the Divinity is an inducement to
mental lethargy. The responsibility for the present decadence
of the Moslem nations must be shared by the formalism of the

\(^1\) Mu‘in ud-din (usually styled among Indian Sûfis Moulâna Hazrat Sultan
ul-Mashâkh) traced his sîsîla through Ibrâhîm Adham, and through Ibrâhîm
Adham to Hasan Basri, and through him to the Caliph Ali, and through him
to the Prophet, Sarwar-î-Kânât, “Chief of the Creation.” Mu‘in ud-din
Christi is the founder of the Chishti order in India. Three hundred years later
Sheikh Selim Chishti became the spiritual preceptor of the great Akbar, who
named his son and successor Jehangir after his murshid
Moulâna Jalâl ud-din Rûmî traced his sîsîla similarly through Junaid to
the 8th Apostolical Imâm Ali son of Musa (ar-Riza), and through him to the
Caliph Ali and the Prophet.

\(^2\) See Appendix III.

\(^3\) Abdul Kâdir was a descendant of Ali and is credited with the performance
of many miracles. He is the patron saint of the Kurds and is held in great
veneration among the Sûfis of the Sunni sect in India. He is usually called
“Ghous Azam.” According to the authors of Les Confréries Religieuses
Musulmanes (MM Depont et Cappolani, vol 1, p. 303) the Kâdiria order has
a wide influence in the East, which extends to Java and China, and its lodges
Zavas are established in Mecca and Medina. “Abnegation of self,” say
Asha'ri and the quietism of the Sufi. Mystical teachings like the following:

The man who looks on the beggar's bowl as a kingly crown
And the present world a fleeting bubble,
He alone traverseth the ocean of Truth
Who looks upon life as a fairy tale. 1

can have but one result—intellectual paralysis.

I must now return to al-Ghazzâlî's conceptions of Sufi theosophy and theosophical life. He certainly did not claim any exclusive knowledge of the mysteries of Creation nor were his doctrines so esoteric as those professed by latter-day Sufis. Like as-Sarrâj he propounded a scheme of life which he considered formed the true Path (tarikat) to the ultimate goal "the attainment of nearness to God," and final peace in the Beatific Vision. But as his insistence on the Path depends on the larger theory of the Cosmos it is necessary to say something about its essential features. His enunciation about all nature and all existence being the direct Creation of God the Almighty is but an echo of what is told in the Koran. His theory assumes a broader aspect when he begins to state his conception of the universe as a whole. He divides Creation into two categories, viz. the Visible and the Invisible. The Visible world ('ālam-ul-Mulk) is the world of matter; and is subject to the law of evolution, to change and growth. Here he is in accord with the Rationalists (the Mu'tazilas).

The invisible world, imperceptible to human sense, he divides into two sub-categories; first, the 'ālam-ul-jabarût, 2 which stands between pure matter and pure spirit; it is not wholly matter nor wholly spirit but partakes of the character of both. The forces of nature belong to this category. Had al-Ghazzâlî lived in these days he would probably have assigned some of the discoveries of modern science like the properties of radium

the authors of the Confessions, "to the service of God; ecstatic mysticism bordering on hysteria; philanthropic principles developed to the highest degree, without distinction of race or creed, intense charity; vigorous piety, humility, pervading all actions, and a gentleness of spirit, have made him (Abdul Kâdir) the most popular and most revered saint of Islam" 1

1 See Appendix III.

2 "Jabarût, in the language of the sâlihân [those who strive to attain Truth]," says the Fârhang, "is the sublime realm, the abode of angels and Divine Attributes" (sifât Ilâhi)
to the ‘ālam-ul-jabārīt. His idea of the purely spiritual world, al-‘ālam-ul-malakūt, forms the most interesting part of his theory. The ‘ālam-ul-malakūt is the realm of “Ideas.” The human soul belongs to this world. It comes as a spark from its original home and on separation from the earthly body, it flies back to the region whence it came.

These divisions are merely al-Ghazzālī’s deductions from the Koran. His abhorrence of analogical reasoning does not prevent him from arriving at the conclusion by the usual process of ratiocination. Neither the theory nor the division was altogether new, for they had been anticipated by al-Fārábī in his ‘Uyun-ul-Masāil. According to the Mu‘tazilas, the references in the Koran to the “Balance” (Mizān) in which human actions are weighed, to the “Pen” (Kalam) and Tablet (Lauh) with which and on which the decrees of Providence are inscribed, are allegorical. As already mentioned, al-Asha‘rī affirms them to be actual, corporeal objects. Imām al-Ghazzālī takes another course; he relegates them to the ‘ālam ul-malakūt, the realm of “abstract ideas.” It was thus he endeavoured to reconcile Patrioticism with his doctrine of “inward light” and its longings for the upward flight of the human soul.

Some of the extreme Sūfis believe that when the final nearness is attained the human soul becomes absorbed in the Divinity. This is called hulūl (absorption) and sometimes ittiḥād (union). But this pantheistic conception is strongly repudiated both by as-Sarrāj and al-Ghazzālī; though often the words wisāl and waslat are used to signify the closeness of the approach to the Divine Essence. Even when the Sūfi talks of ḥanāfīl Allāh (annihilation in God) he does not mean to imply that the human soul becomes merged in the Universal Soul. Al-Ghazzālī’s notion, like that of his great predecessor, is that the individual soul (rūḥ) at the Almighty’s bidding emanates from a realm, the ‘ālam ul-Malakūt, nearest to the Divine Essence, and on its separation from the corporeal body reverts to its original home; and that this is the meaning of the Koranic

1 In the Farhang, Malakūt is defined thus: ”in the language of the Sūfis, it means the Realm of Ideas” (‘ālam ma‘nī).

2 See ante, p. 426.
THE MYSTICAL AND IDEALISTIC SPIRIT

declaration "We come from God and unto Him we return." ¹

The Mu'tazili, the Asha'ri and the follower of al-Ghazzâlî do not differ in the essentials; their difference is due more to the angle from which they look at the dogmas of the Faith. The rationalist holds that a knowledge of God is attainable by Reason. He appeals to Reason because the call of the Koran to the worship of one God is based on Reason. The Asha'ri believes because he is so taught; the Sûfi believes because, as he says, of "the inward light." According to the Sûfi, the seeker for Truth by intensive "inwardness" and communion with God can rise by successive stages of exaltation to a state when he can actually have a vision of the Divine Essence. The first step for the novitiate is to form the niyyat (the resolve or intention); then comes tauba (penitence and renunciation). He is now on the forward path, this stage is called mujâhâda (probation or striving). After a prolonged probation the ecstatic soul appears in the Presence still veiled. Hâfiz, in a mood of exaltation, refers to this stage, technically called Muhâzara, as huzûrî, when the soul presents itself in absolute surrender to God and "abandonment of the world and all its vanities." ² The next is "the uplifting of the veil" (mukâshâfa), when the veil which curtailed off the Unseen is lifted and the God becomes revealed to the worshipper's heart; the last stage is the Vision (mushâhada), when the entranced Soul stands in the presence of Truth itself, and the light falls distinctly on "the human heart."

Even in the primary stage, the psychological effort to concentrate all thought on one object causes the disciple (the murid) to see visions, hear the voices of angels and prophets, and gain from them guidance. Exactly parallel forms of psychological exaltation have appeared in Christianity in all ages. In the phraseology of the Sûfi the effort by which each stage is gained is called (hâl) a "state." It is a condition of joy or longing. And when this condition seizes on the

¹ The pious Moslem pronounces these words whenever he passes a beer or a cemetery.

² Huzûrî gar hamî khabî, as-o ghâib mashâhu Hâfiz
Matâ mà-talik, man-tahwâ da'a'd-dunyâ wa amhîla.
"seeker," he falls into ecstasy (wajd). The dervishes in their monasteries may be seen working themselves up into a condition of "ecstasy." ¹

The Sûfi holds that the knowledge of God is vouchsafed to him by inward light; the Rationalist affirms that the cognition comes to him from Reason, a gift of the Creator. Does not the Koran constantly appeal to human reason and human intelligence "to reflect, to consider, to speculate" about God's Creation and the mysteries of nature? Had the Koran condemned the exercise of reason, would it have exhorted the people to whom it spoke to look at the marvels of nature and draw their own conclusions whether this wonderful world was a creation of accident, or was brought into existence by an all-pervading Intelligence. Religion and Rationalism are correlated and bound together. If we find anything in the Koran which seems superficially to be in conflict with the results of philosophy, we may be sure there is an underlying meaning, which it should be the work of reason to unravel. Ibn Rushd places this proposition with extreme lucidity in his Faṣl-ul-Makāl.² He affirms that there is no disagreement between religion and philosophy; religion is revelation from God; philosophy is the product of the human mind. He was thus not far removed from al-Ghazzâli's plane. For al-Ghazzâli did not believe like Asha'ri that the earth was flat because it was said in the Koran "God had spread it out as a carpet." He accepts all the revelations of science and the conclusions of mathematicians and astronomers. The stars and planets revolve round the world according to pre-ordained laws. Nature itself contains its own proof of the Power, Benevolence and Intelligence that brought it into existence. He is thus in complete accord with Ibn Sîna, Ibn Rushd and the rationalists in general. Examined closely it will be seen that the mind of al-Ghazzâli, who saved Asha'rism from becoming a hard-crusted formalism, and by joining it to an exalted form of

¹ Zikr is the name of the function in which the dervishes usually congregate for obtaining the ecstatic condition. There is an excellent description of a Zikr in an Egyptian Zawwa by Dr D B Macdonald in his Aspects of Islam. In India Zikrs are usually held at the celebration of the 'Urs (anniversary ceremony of the death of the original spiritual preceptor).

² See anie, p. 427.
emotionalism infused into it fresh vitality, ran really in the same groove as the minds of those masters.

The Senussi confraternity ¹ is not a religious order like the Kâderia, but unquestionably, in the civilising and uplifting work it is doing in Northern and Central Africa, it imparts a mystical meaning into the teachings of its Ikhwân. They convey to their converts and disciples some of the lessons of "inward knowledge" without detaching them from the world of struggle and advance.

The exalted idealism which breathes in the Prophet's words, in the preachings of the Imâms and in the teachings of the expounders of "inward light," rationalists, philosophers and Sûfis alike, has modelled the lives and inspired the actions of the noblest men in Islâm. Heroes like 'Imâd-ud-dîn Zangi, rulers like Salâh-ud-dîn bin Ayyub (the Saladin of European history) have found in it their guiding star. And poets like Sanâî, 'Attâr and Jalâl ud-dîn have given fervent expression to that universal Divine love, which pervades nature from the lowest type of creation to the highest, and whose idylls are regarded by many Moslems with a respect only less than that entertained for the Koran.

But Sûfism in the Moslem world, like its counterpart in Christendom, has, in its practical effect, been productive of many mischievous results. In perfectly well-attuned minds mysticism takes the form of a noble type of idealistic philosophy; but the generality of mankind are more likely to unhinge their brains by busying themselves with the mysteries of the Divine Essence and our relations thereto. Every ignorant and idle specimen of humanity, who, despising real knowledge, abandoned the fields of true philosophy and betook himself to the domains of mysticism, would thus set himself up as one of the Ahl-i-Ma'rifat. And that this actually occurred in the time of Ghazzâlî we see by his bitter complaint that things had come to such a pass that husbandmen were leaving their tillage and claiming the privileges of "the advanced." In fact the greatest objection to vulgar mysticism, whether in Islâm or in Christendom, is that, being in itself no religion, wherever it prevails it unsettles the mind and weakens the

¹ See Appendix III.
foundations of society and paralyses human energy; it naturally drifts into anthropolatry and naturalistic pantheism.

Yet the benefits conferred by the nobler type of idealistic philosophy are too great to be ignored; and the Idealism of Averroes developed in Europe the conception of Universal Divinity. Christian Europe owes its outburst of subjective pantheism—and its consequent emancipation from the intense materialism of a mythological creed—to the engraving of Moslem idealism on the Western mind. It was the influence of Averroistic writings that attracted the attention of reflecting people to the great problem of the connection between the worlds of matter and of mind, and revived the conception of an all-pervading spirit, "which sleeps in the stone, dreams in the animal, and wakes in the man," "the belief that the hidden vital principle which produces the varied forms of organisation is but the thrill of 'the Divine Essence' that is present in them all."

"I would have said He was the Soul of the Universe if I had known the relation of the human soul to the body, for He is present and hidden in the heart of every atom."

THE END.