

The
Islamic Review

Edited by AL-HAJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN.

Vol. XII.]

ZILHAJJA, 1342 A.H.

Annual Subscription, 1924.

JULY 1924.

Single

CONTENTS.

M. Muhammad Tewfiq Killinger	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Notes.. .. .	PAGE 227
M. Muhammad Tewfiq Killinger—Eid-ul-Azha— No Adam—No Eve—Christianity in India—The British Muslim Society.	
Woman: Her Subjection, Exploitation, and Emanci- pation. By Khwaja Nazir Ahmad	251
Gazzali on the Reality of the Soul. By K. S. Khwaja Khan	247
The Holy Prophet. By F. H. A.	254
The Secret of Superstition. By James Bayard Munro	255
Seek and Ye Shall Find	261
The Excellent Name of Allah: By Professor H. M. Léon, M:A., LL.D., P:H:D., F.S.P.	262
Correspondence	266

THE HOLY QUR-ÁN

With English Translation and Commentary, printed on high-class India paper, and bound in green flexible leather, price £2 10s. ; Pluvinsin, £2 ; cloth, £1 10s. Postage and packing for all qualities: United Kingdom, 2s. ; abroad, 4s. Prospectus and sample pages sent free on application. Apply to "Islamic Review," The Mosque, Woking, England, or to Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-i-Islam, Ahmadiyya Buildings, Lahore, or to "Islamic Review" Office, Azeez Manzil, Lahore, India.

PUBLISHED AT

www.aail.org

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
نَحْمَدُهٗ وَنُصَلِّیْ عَلٰی رَسُوْلِہِ الْکَرِیْمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

ZILHAJJA 1342 A.H.

VOL. XII.

JULY 1924.

No. 7.

NOTES

M. Muhammad Tewfiq Killinger.

M. Muhammad Tewfiq Killinger was born in Hodony, Hungary (now in Rumania), on November 14, 1875. He is a descendant of a noble and illustrious family renowned for its valour in the field for a period extending over four centuries. He was educated at the Gymnasium at Taus and later at the Military College in Mahrishch-Weisskirchen. In 1898 he joined the Dutch Colonial Army. In 1907 he returned to Europe to prosecute his studies further, and had the good fortune of being trained under the supervision of General Wille at Zurich. He then studied criminology at the respective police headquarters of Vienna, Berlin, Basel, Brussels, Paris and London. In 1909 he was appointed a General by President Castro and organized the entire Venezuelan Army. He returned to the Dutch East Indies and was head of the Dutch Military Police for some years. It was during this, his second stay among the Muslims of that land, that he was strongly impressed with the beauties and the simplicity of the Faith of Islam. He embraced Islam publicly, and thus for some time became a victim of Christian intolerance. During the Great War he fought for the Turks in the Dardanelles, Syria, Mesopotamia and the Caucasus.

Eid-ul-Azha.

The Festival of Eid-ul-Azha, which falls this year on the 13th of July, should witness an exceptionally brilliant gathering at Woking. Now that the summer has arrived at last,

ISLAMIC REVIEW

and with it a vast concourse of Muslims from the four corners of the earth, drawn by the irresistible magnet of the great Exhibition at Wembley, it is reasonable to expect that the company which will assemble in the grounds of the Memorial House will be numerous and distinguished as well as representative. These festival days at Woking have a charm which is all their own, provided only that the weather be favourable. To the eyes of the Mosque authorities, however, there is always discernible the grim spectre of a "wet day," and the ever-recurring problem of what to do with the guests should such a calamity befall. The good fortune which has consistently, by the blessing of Allah, attended these gatherings is indeed remarkable in a climate like that of England where the certainty of sunshine can never be depended on; none the less, however, do we look forward to the time when we shall be provided with all the accommodation requisite in the event of a long day's deluge. We trust that that time may not be long deferred.

No Adam—No Eve.

It is reported in a recent issue of the *Rand Daily Mail*, Johannesburg, that the Bishop of Pretoria (Dr. Talbot) "made some outspoken remarks on the story of Adam and Eve." There is nothing very desperate in this at first sight, yet on closer examination of the Bishop's remarks, some real significance may be attached to what was perhaps after all intended to be semi-jocular. "Someone—we do not know who," said the Bishop, "wrote about the Garden of Eden." This is in the best style of humorous lecturing; but the speaker went on to more definite momentous truths. "The story," he said, "is not peculiar to the Bible. It is folklore. There was never any Adam nor Eve in the world. It is Semitic folklore. Folklore is man battling with great conundrums. Primitive man had plenty of time to think, and he asked himself, 'Why are there two sexes? Why is Nature so funny?'"

There is nothing like putting the world's insoluble problems in a racy and popular form. We do not solve them any the more easily, but we become familiar with them, and so neglectfully pass them by. Hence the stagnation of intellect among what Mr. Gladstone used to call "the masses." It is a thing greatly to be avoided; but so long as we have a cheap Press that is content to write and think cheaply, so long will the trend of popular sentiment be cheap, and dignatories of the Church will perhaps be compelled to

NOTES

act accordingly if they are desirous of getting an audience. But the fact that the Bishop of Pretoria was so desirous, and that he did "make some outspoken remarks upon the story of Adam and Eve," is in itself of a certain significance. He is not the first to indulge in the pastime. It has been popular with the clergy of the Church of England for a number of years, but it does, in fact, deny the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Faith—that of the Atonement. The earnest seeker, made aware at last of this aspect of the case, asks: "If the Atonement is proved to be both unhistorical and unnecessary, something must have been discovered to take its place—something sufficiently logical, or to use the more human word, reasonable, to account for the coming of the Son of God upon the earth, and for His death upon the Cross, for Man's Redemption. What is it that has been discovered?" And the answer is, from the Christian point of view, "Nothing." This is a detail with which the jocular Prelates and lesser dignitaries—Deans or Canons—of the Established Church fail to deal. What is significant is that these "pronouncements" have been going on for many years, and that even now there are many thousands of devout Christians of the Church of England who pay no heed to them; that that Church itself is undoubtedly the most heterogeneous and ill-disciplined of all Christian bodies—the happy hunting-ground of the theological free-lance—and that the vagaries of its guerilla warriors are not to be taken too seriously by the outside world. Muslims must not regard such remarks as those of the Bishop of Pretoria as indicating a fatal schism, or disastrous fissure in the fabric of Christianity. If Christianity be a foe, do not underestimate it. But if it is not—and it ought not to be—rather let our sympathies go out whole-heartedly to the flock whose shepherds have proved themselves unfaithful.

Christianity in India.

Speaking at the Annual Meeting of the Manchester Association of the Church Missionary Society, in the Free Trade Hall in that city, the Rev. W. E. S. Holland, principal of Kottayam College in Southern India, said that after working among Indian students for twenty-two years, his experience had taught him that "our Christianity was not good enough for Indians." The speaker went on to say that "the reason was that, looking at the lives of Christians in Western Europe, the Hindus could only decide that it was better for them to retain their own faith."

ISLAMIC REVIEW

This is a sweeping statement, and one which could only have been made after mature deliberation and anxious thought. It is difficult to understand why an eminent missionary should give away his case in so frank a manner; but it is reasonable to suppose that he himself is acutely conscious of the fact that the life has gone out of the Gospel which it is his profession to preach.

Most thinking persons cannot fail to realize the necessarily wide divergence between theory and practice in things religious: it must always be so; but few zealous believers in any faith would allow themselves to take so hopeless a view; and one wonders why, if this rhetorical "hard-hitting" represents the candid opinion of missionaries concerning themselves and their efforts, the missionary spirit should still continue to flourish in all its old-time aggressiveness.

The British Muslim Society.

With the coming of warm weather, and the consequent difficulty of inducing people to bother themselves about the things Eternal in any indoor resort, be it hall or room, when the sunshine and the open air are calling, and things temporal are very much in evidence, the Society's activities are inevitably somewhat relaxed. Excellent work has been done during our exceptionally prolonged winter, and it is to be hoped that during the coming season of religious endeavour the ground so far won will not be lost. Nevertheless, one important aid towards this most desirable ambition must not be neglected. The condition of the London Prayer House at Notting Hill is not what it should be. Various reasons, and particularly the lack of funds, are responsible for a state of things which Muslim opinion, translated into deeds, should not permit to continue. The house needs renovating and redecorating from top to bottom; the thing must be done thoroughly and well, and also quickly. Islam, that is now so eloquently claiming to be the one real living religion in the British Empire, and indeed in the world, should have in the world's capital a meeting-place in all respects worthy of its aspirations. We may have to wait many weary years before a Mosque arises in London to meet this most essential need. But in the meanwhile the centre of Muslim activity is not one of which any community could be proud; it is in all respects unworthy, conveying a very bad impression to the new-comer, and a sense of utter disheartenment and dejection

WOMAN

to the Believer. The Wembley Exhibition has attracted to these shores a vast number of Muslims from every country in the world, including many Indian ruling princes of various stages of eminence. When only a few hundred pounds would suffice to put this centre of Islamic Thought in England into a seemly condition, is it too much to expect that those few hundred pounds will be readily forthcoming ?

The Society has been heavily handicapped by the unsuitable surroundings in which hitherto it has had to receive its guests, and it is not surprising that these guests should not have been so numerous as might otherwise have been expected. A sense of dignity, and the outward expression of that sense, is as important for communities as for individuals ; and we appeal to all Muslims in England and elsewhere, to aid us in removing so glaring an anomaly, with as little delay as possible.

WOMAN : HER SUBJECTION, EXPLOITATION, AND EMANCIPATION

By KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD

(Continued from p. 143, Vol. XII., Nos. 4-5.)

WOMAN UNDER CHRISTIANITY.

I HAVE said that Christianity was not a great intellectual movement. It was the outpouring of a stream of religious emotion that had been pent up by centuries of Judaic formalism. Its great task was to spiritualize religion. Of, and for, social problems it knew and cared nothing. To social injustice it was blind ; for the real social order lay beyond its sphere. Hence on secondary questions, like this of the treatment of women, it acquiesced in the feelings of its environment. People at large, in spite of the fact that the cultured Pagans had reached a higher stage, held the older ideas ; and Christianity, as a popular religion, took its colour from theirs. Hence it is that we find, from *Genesis* to *Revelation*, the subjection of woman is enforced. She commences her existence as an after-thought, and continues her career as a subordinate. Every power, every privilege, belongs

ISLAMIC REVIEW

to the man; and the whole effort of the Christian Church, for centuries, was to suppress woman and to prevent her, in the words of St. Paul¹ from *usurping power over the man*.

In dealing with the influence that Christianity exerted on woman, the Rev. Principal Donaldson says:—

The opinion has been continually expressed that woman owes her present high position to Christianity, and the influences of the Teutonic mind. But an examination of the facts seems to me to show that there was no sign of this revolution in the first three centuries of the Christian era, and that the position of women among Christians was lower, and the notions in regard to them were more degraded than they were in the first.

Principal Donaldson confines his judgment to the Christianity of the first three centuries; but it can easily be shown that it is also applicable to a much later date, also that whatever improvements occurred were due, not to Christianity, but to other influences with which Christianity was in continuous conflict. However, during these three centuries, the early Christian Fathers raised the structure of Christian teachings which was to command the absolute allegiance of Europe until the Reformation, at least.

I have already explained that amongst savages the question was not so much of superiority and inferiority between man and woman, but of difference. This difference was not ethical, but purely a superstitious one. It remained for Christianity to combine this savage superstition concerning woman with an ethical condemnation. It is a matter of no less interest than importance to trace the growth of a religious

¹ The account of the conversion of St. Paul, as explained by the Ebionites, is very illuminating. He was, as he himself averred, a native of Tarsus; and not of Jerusalem. He went to Jerusalem and during his stay there fell in love with the high priest's daughter; and, in consequence, became a proselyte. He asked her in marriage, and was refused. Thus enraged, he wrote against circumcision, the Sabbath, and the law. The bitterness against women in his writings is also explained by some such rejection (Epiph. Hæ. xxx. 16. p. 14).

WOMAN

contempt for woman through the patristic literature.

I begin with the Greek Fathers, as they were not only earlier in time, and therefore present the theory of woman's inferiority in a slight and immature form; but they were also in closer touch with the humanist, cultured Pagans. In this first stage of the theoretical interpretation of the New Testament we find the earliest traces of the reaction of the Hebrew tradition in Greek thought.

St. Clement of Alexandria exhibits the ordinary improved feeling of the educated Greeks of his time, as regards woman, when he writes as a philosopher. At first he declares that she has the "same nature" as man; but as soon as he is confronted with the familiar texts from the Epistles of St. Paul, his humanism begins to waver, and the Judaic conception of woman to prevail. Soon we begin to detect that contempt of marriage which was to become one of the greatest blunders of the Church.

It may be remarked here that the early ecclesiastical writers, in perfect conformity with the extreme coarseness of their views about the sexes, almost invariably assumed that the motive of marriage must be simply the force of the animal passions. Many absolutely condemned it;¹ but the less orthodox pronounced it lawful on account of the weakness of human nature; but, nevertheless, they viewed it with the most emphatic disapproval,² partly because they regarded it as inconsistent with their doctrine that marriage is an emblem of the union of Christ with the Church, and partly because they considered it a manifest sign of incontinence. The language of the Fathers, on this subject, appears to a modern mind most extraordinary, and, but for their conditional permission of marriage, would appear to amount to a peremptory condemnation. Thus, to give but a few

¹ Perrone, *De Matrimonio*, lib. iii. 1.

² Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.*, Sæc ii. 18.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

examples—it interests us because it ever either springs from or leads to a contempt of woman—second marriage is described by Athenagoras as “a decent adultery”;¹ and the phrase was repeated time after time until at length a Church Council had to introduce it into its decrees. According to St. Clement of Alexandria “Fornication is a lapse from one marriage into many.”² To avoid the evil, he says:—

Above all, it seems right that we turn away from the sight of woman. . . . The affection which arises from the desire which we call love leads to the fire which will never cease.³

St. Origen, the most learned of the Fathers, betrays the same contempt of marriage. “Digamists are saved,” he asserts, “in the name of Christ, but by no means are crowned by him,”⁴ and there are texts in which he utters something very like censure of even first marriage.

The other three great Greek Fathers were St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory of Nazianzum. To Basil, at first woman is “man’s equal in mental power, only less in bodily strength”; but his religious regard and blind faith in the Old Testament and the teachings of St. Paul force a confession out of him that their treatment of woman is “a mystery.” St. Gregory of Nyssa, though a married bishop, always sang in praise of virginity. St. Gregory of Nazianzum goes a step lower in his degradation of woman. He declares that her “philosophy is to obey,” her house is to be her city, and she is to refrain from ever going to weddings and christenings; and must not give even a thought to public affairs. “Blessed is the one who leads a celibate life, and soils not the Divine image within her with the filth of concupiscence.” Referring to St. Paul’s comparison of marriage to the union of Christ with the Church, he says:—

¹ *In hegat.*

³ *Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten.*

² *Strom.*, lib. iii.

⁴ *Hom.*, xvii. in *Luc.*

WOMAN

By this text, second marriages seem to me to be reprov'd. If there are two Christs, there may be two husbands or two wives. If there is but one Christ, one head of the Church, there is but one flesh—a second is repelled. But if he forbids a second, what is to be said of third marriages? The first is love, the second is pardon and indulgence, the third is iniquity; but he who exceeds this number is manifestly bestial.¹

Such sayings of this Great Father have the inevitable ending in a contempt of woman. He says:—

Fierce is the dragon, and cunning the asp;
But woman has the malice of both.

St. John Chrysostom, a great and popular preacher, who had always a crowd of women around him, is thoroughly Pauline. Foreseeing symptoms of a feeble revolt, he insists that “she shall not demand equality; for she is under the head.” And a little later he describes her as “a necessary evil, a desirable calamity, a deadly fascinator, and a painted ill.”

When, however, we turn from the Greek to the Roman Fathers, and examine their writings, this misogyny takes a more sombre form. Tertullian, the first of the Latin Fathers, a sternly ascetic figure, with his customary vehemence, in the very first sentence of his work, declaims:—

If your faith were as firm as its eternal reward, my beloved sisters, no one of you, after learning of the loving God and her own condition as a woman, would choose to seek gay apparel, but would dress in rags and remain in dirt as a sorrowful and penitent Eve.²

This is the way in which he addresses them again:—

Do you know that each one of you is an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age; the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that forbidden tree; you are the first deserter of the Divine Law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die.³

He, more than any others, praises virginity, until

¹ *Orat*, xxxi.

² *On the Adornment of Woman*.

³ *De Cultu Feminarum*, i. 1.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

at length he is moved to tell them that marriage is not far removed from fornication.

The second great African Father, St. Cyprian, is more moderate in his phrases, and contents himself with styling her "the instrument which the devil uses to gain possession of our [men's] souls."

St. Augustine, by nature one of the most humane, as he was one of the ablest, of his day, never lost an opportunity to express his disdain for woman. In his commentary on *Genesis* he asks himself the question, Why was woman created at all? and can find no better answer than the painful need of carrying on the race. Perhaps, he argues by autosuggestion, she was made to be a companion of man. No, he replies at once, for "how much better two men could live and converse together than a man and woman." Later he finds a better solution. Woman, he assures us, was created with a view to accomplish the pre-arranged drama of the Fall of Adam.

I will quote but a few more Fathers. St. Ambrose reminds woman that she "was not made in the image of God like man." St. Bernard terms her "the organ of the devil." St. Anthony alludes to her as "the foundation of the arms of the devil." St. Bonaventura refers to her as "a scorpion ever ready to sting." St. Gregory Thaumaturgus says:—

Among all men I sought for chastity proper to them, and I found it among none. And, verily, a person may find one man chaste among a thousand, but among women never.

Lastly, St. Jerome, a great Scriptural scholar, amplifies the disdainful references to women in the Bible; such as "the root of all evil," etc. He discredits marriage as only "good for those who are afraid to sleep alone at night," and affirms that the touch of a woman is as much to be dreaded as the bite of a mad dog.

It would be difficult to outdo many of the early Christian Fathers in their vituperation of woman.

WOMAN

They took every care to keep her in a state of subordination. Thus, whereas the Pagans were forming a more enlightened judgment, the Christian Church was preparing a terrible reaction. All the prestige that woman had won in Egypt, all the admissions she had wrung from the philosophers of Greece, all the high ambitions she had realized in Rome, were sunk deep in Lethe, and woman was, once again, reduced to a position of subjection. Indeed, "womanhood"—to alter Mrs. Cody Stanton's phrase slightly—"touched the lowest depth of degradation."¹

What were the causes of this sudden reaction? Various ideas are entertained in regard to this subject. The view that I take of it is that it was the outcome of the necessities of the age and the place, and Christianity failed to overcome the opposition. In the first enthusiasm of the Christian movement, women were allowed to do whatever they were fitted to do. Accordingly, we meet in the early Church with prophetesses.² They combined with men in spreading the faith; and even St. Paul was obliged to call several of them his fellow-labourers. But not many generations had elapsed when all this came to an end; and we hear only of two classes of women in connection with the administration of the Church affairs. The first is that of widows. Their work was to visit the sick, to convey assistance to the poor, and to rear orphan children. They had to be, at least, sixty years of age, and had to make up their mind not to marry again. In process of time the widows no longer are prominent, and, at length, they pass out of sight. They were replaced by deaconesses. This new order became common in all the Churches, for then widowhood had fallen in the spiritual market and virginity had risen; though for some time virgins were elected for the duties and called widows. Tertullian tells us that he knew "plainly that in a certain place virgins of less than twenty years of age had been placed in

¹ *Woman's Bible.*

² Eusebius, *Hist. Eccls.*, iii. 31.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the order of widows.”¹ The duty of these deaconesses was solely to direct worshippers to their places in churches, and to see that all behaved quietly and reverently. This was the great work of women in the Church, and in the end became nearly their only work.

The deaconesses, like widows, had no spiritual functions. They were not to teach. How jealous the Church was on this point is seen from the instructions given to them: “Let the deaconesses,” is the commandment in the *Constitutions*, “mind nothing but to pray for those that give and for the whole Church, and when she is asked anything by anyone let her not easily answer, excepting questions concerning the faith and righteousness and hope in God. . . . But of the remaining doctrines let her not answer anything, lest by saying anything unlearnedly she should make the word to be blasphemed.”² And her occupation is summed up in these words: “She is to sit at home, sing, pray, read, watch and fast, speak to God continually in songs and hymns.” And if she wishes to go anywhere she must first ask the deacon’s consent, and if she acts without first consulting him, she is to be punished for her rashness.³ They had no sacred character, and could perform no priestly office. To take one instance from Tertullian: In discussing the administration of baptism, he states that the bishop has the right of conferring it first of all, then presbyters and deacons, and then, if none of these are at hand, a layman might administer, but a woman never. He thus appeals to St. Paul:—

For how credible would it seem that he who has not permitted a woman even *to learn* with over-boldness, should give a female the power of teaching and baptizing. “Let them be silent,” he says, “and at home consult their husbands.”⁴

The entire exclusion of women from every sacred function stands in striking contrast with both pagan

¹ *De Virg. Veland*, c. ix.

² *Apost. Const.*, Book iii. 15, 5.

³ *Apost. Const.*, Book iii. 5 and 7.

⁴ Tertull., *De Baptismo*, c. xvii.

WOMAN

and "heretical practice." The contrast was present to the minds of the Early Fathers. "But if," say the *Constitutions*, "we have not permitted them [women] to teach, how will anyone allow them, contrary to nature, to perform the office of a priest? For this is one of the ignorant practices of the atheism of the Greeks [Gentiles], to appoint priestesses to the general duties."¹ Many of the so-called "heretical" Christian sects accorded the same respect to woman; and it is against these sects that Tertullian launches his thunderbolts. "The very women," he says, "of these heretics, how wanton they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures, it may be even to baptize." Epiphanius goes so far as to assert that those who exalted "Mary above humanity are none else than women; for the race of women is prone to slip, and is unstable and low in their thoughts."² He then refutes the heresy, the principal point attacked being that the heretics made women priestesses. No woman at any time was a priestess to God: Eve herself was not; none in the Old Testament, none in the New. No woman was ever made a bishop or presbyter, and a deaconess is not a priestess, but a servant of the Church appointed for special purposes. Christ made none of the women who served him priestesses—not Salome, not even his mother, nor Martha, nor Mary, etc.

Such, then, was the position which woman occupied in the Church in the course of the first three centuries of Christianity. The highest post to which she rose was to be a doorkeeper and a messenger, and even these functions were later taken away from her. Was there a reason for this?

Christianity proclaimed a gospel of love, which had no limit but that of the human race; and it applied this gospel to all classes. Thus a Christian slave-woman, though a sister in faith of her master,

¹ Book iii., c. ix.

² *Hær.*, 79, c. i.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

was also his property, her children were a source of gain to him, and he took entire control over this matter, as over the breeding of cattle. Yet we do not hear of any attempt to rescue her from the treatment to which she must have been subjected. Again, the Roman law recognized marriages only between citizen and citizen; but a very large number of early Christians had no right of citizenship. How, then, were they joined in holy matrimony? I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. One thing is certain, that the orthodox Christians were accused of the vilest crimes. During the second century the Pagans universally believed Christians to be secret conspirators combined for immoral purposes. How could such ideas have arisen? That the early Christians consisted of a strange assortment of characters and grades is evident from the writing of St. Paul to the Corinthian Church. He says:—

Be not deceived: neither fornicators nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor cheats, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor plunderers, shall inherit the kingdom of God: and these things were some of you.

Among these were the free, the rich and the poor, the high and low—especially a large preponderance of the low—the dregs of society. The Christian brethren tried to set up a plan of equality, of voluntary socialism, and wished to have all things in common; but the plan did not work, and they had recourse to a systematic relief of the poor. One feature of this relief was what were called “Love-Feasts.” These feasts were not always scenes of perfect propriety, as St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians shows, and on many occasions intoxication and riotousness prevailed.

Then there was another practice. There is a commandment five times repeated in the Apostolic Epistles: “Salute the brethren with a holy kiss,” or in another form, “Salute the brethren with a kiss of love.” For a considerable time, the Christian

WOMAN

brothers and sisters kissed each other, and there is evidence in the ecclesiastical writings that the early Christians did not always make it a holy kiss, as it should have been. St. Clement of Alexandria thus speaks of the matter :—

Love is not tested by a kiss, but by kindly feeling. But there are those that do nothing but make churches resound with a kiss. For this very thing, the shameless use of the kiss, which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports.¹

These customs prove that considerable freedom prevailed among the earliest Churches, and doubtless sometimes this freedom was abused. In consequence, a strong reaction set in, and the current of thought ran against marriage. This reaction was also of an ascetic nature, and it attached itself to the Pauline conception of flesh. But it is easy to see that the mind could not halt in this position. They did not dare condemn marriage. But they held that it was much better not to marry at all; that those who did not marry were nobler and more exalted beings. They were aided by the distinction increasingly emphasized between clerical and lay. The cleric could rise to the throne of heaven only on the wings of virginity.

Such ideas had necessarily a powerful effect on the place and position of woman, and on the conception of her nature. What was that effect? I will describe it under the cover of a great Christian authority :—

I may define man to be a male human being, and woman to be a female human being. They are both human beings, both gifted with reason and conscience, both responsible for their actions, both entitled to the freedom essential to this responsibility, and both capable of the noblest thoughts and deeds. As human beings they are in an equality as to their powers, the difference in individuals resulting from the surroundings and circumstances of spiritual growth. But man is a male and woman is a female, and this distinction exists in Nature for the

¹ *Pæd.*, iii. 81, 301 p.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

continuance of the race. Now what the early Christians did was to strike the "male" out of the definition of man, and "human being" out of the definition of woman. Man was a human being made for the highest and the noblest purpose; woman was a female made to serve only one. She was on the earth to influence the heart of man with every evil passion. She was a fire-ship continually striving to get alongside the male man-of-war to blow him up into pieces.¹

Thus woman as a sex was despised and looked down upon. The gentle St. Clement of Alexandria hits her hard when he says :—

Nothing disgraceful is proper for man, who is endowed with reason; much less for woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is.²

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs goes even further. It records that :

By means of their adornment they deceive first the minds of men, and they instil poison by the glance of their eye, and then they hate their captives by their doings, and, therefore, men should guard themselves against every woman.³

It says in another passage that :

The angel of God showed me that for ever do women bear rule over king and beggar alike; and from the king they take away his glory, and from the valiant man his strength, and from the beggar even that little which is the stay of his poverty.⁴

How, then, was this frivolous, dress-loving, lust-inspiring creature to be treated. Obviously the better way was to shut her up. This the Christian writers impressed upon her again and again. She was not to go to banquets, where her looks were sure to create evil thoughts in the minds of men who would be drinking largely of wine. She was not to go to marriage feasts, where the talk and the songs might border on licentiousness. Of course she was not to wander about the streets, in search of sights, nor to frequent the theatre, nor the public baths, nor the spectacles. Did she want exercise? Clement of Alexandria pre-

¹ Donaldson, *Woman*, pp. 181-2.

² *Pæd.*, ii. 2, 83, 186 p.

³ *Test. of Reuben*, c. 5.

⁴ *Test. of Judah*, c. 15.

WOMAN

scribed for her. She was "to exercise herself in spinning and weaving, and superintending the cooking, if necessary." He added :—

Women were with their own hands to fetch from the store what was required ; and it was no disgrace for them to apply themselves to the mill. Nor was it a reproach to a wife to occupy herself in cooking, so that it may be palatable to her husband. And if she shook up the couch, reached drink to her husband when thirsty, set food on the table as neatly as possible, and so gave herself exercise tending to sound health, the Instructor would approve of a woman like this.¹

The duties of a wife were simple. She had to obey her husband ; to fear him, reverence him, and please him alone. She had to cultivate silence ; to stay at home, to spin and take care of the house.² Then she must not adorn herself in any way. "It is not right in God," says Commodian, "that a faithful Christian woman should be adorned."³ They must bid farewell to embroidery of gold and Indian silk ; she was strictly forbidden to wear gold ornaments of any kind, and she was to avoid all dyed clothes, as the dye was unnecessary for health, afflicted greedy eyes, and, moreover, it was false ; for God would have made the sheep purple if He had wished the woollen clothes to be purple. Strong condemnation was uttered against any attempt to trick out the person. "Head-dresses," said Clement of Alexandria, "and varieties of head-dresses, and elaborate braidings, and infinite modes of dressing the hair, and costly mirrors in which they arranged their costume, were characteristic of women who had lost all shame."⁴ In regard to the hair, Cyprian addressed virgins thus :—

Are sincerity and truth preserved when what is true is changed into a lie by the deceitful dyes of medicaments. Your Lord says, "Thou canst not make one hair black or white," and you, in order to overcome the word of your Lord, will be more mighty than He, and stain your hair with a daring endeavour and with profane contempt ; with evil presage of the future, make a bringing to yourself already of flame-coloured hair.⁵

¹ *Pæd.*, iii. 10, 11.

² *Apost. Const.*, i. 8.

³ *Instruct.* 60 and Book ii. 19.

⁴ *Pæd.*, iii. 2, 11, p. 258.

⁵ *De Habitu Verg.*, 16, 17, 20, 21.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

And he used equally strong expressions in regard to tinting the eyes. "You cannot see God," he says, "since your eyes are not those which God made, but those which the devil has spoiled. You have followed him, you have imitated the red and painted eyes of the serpent. As you are adorned in the fashion of your enemy, with him also you shall burn also by-and-by." And he thus sums up the exhortations which he addresses to the virgins :—

Let your countenance remain in you incorrupt, your neck unadorned, your figure simple ; let not wounds be made in your ears, nor let the precious chain of bracelets and necklaces circle your arm or your neck ; let your feet be free from golden bands, your hair stained with no dye, your eyes worthy of beholding God.

Notwithstanding all the exhortations which were showered upon the wives and virgins, the Christian writings prove that human nature often had its own way. Both Clement and Cyprian tell dreadful stories of some of the virgins, and in the treatise of Cyprian from which I have quoted there are lamentations like this :—

For this reason, therefore, the Church frequently mourns over her virgins ; hence she groans at their scandalous and detestable behaviour ; hence the flower of her virgins is extinguished, the honour and modesty of continency are injured, and all its glory and dignity are profaned.

At the same time, to do justice, a reference should be made to the self-control and perseverance with which some pursued their high ideal—for the ideal, though almost unattained, was a high one, as the purity aimed at was not corporeal merely, but extended over the whole range of life. "For it would be ridiculous," says one of the virgins, "to preserve the lustful members pure but not the tongue, or to preserve the tongue, but neither the eyesight, the ears, nor the hands ; or lastly, to preserve these pure but not the mind, defiling it with pride and anger." ¹

¹ *Conoviv.*, xi. 1, 282.

WOMAN

Such, then, was the position of women among the early Christians. I have said nothing of Christian legislation; for I have been treating of a period when legislation was carried on entirely by Pagans. However, the greatest injustice that was done to woman was in the sphere of law, and Sir Henry Maine has shown that all the injustice inflicted on woman in later European laws was due to the overruling of the Roman and Teutonic laws by the Canon law of the Church.¹ The loss of social liberty and prestige can be clearly traced to the same root. Under the influence of the Judaic spirit, which was now incorporated in Christianity, most of the early Fathers spoke of women and marriage in terms that the duller wit and coarser feeling of the succeeding centuries only too literally received.

When the early Christian Fathers had passed away and the age of mediocrity set in, we find a bishop seriously doubting whether woman had a soul.² His colleagues, however, took a more lenient and chivalrous view, but were careful to emphasize that womanhood only belonged to this earthly existence and that on the day of resurrection all women will appear in the shape of sexless beings. The Council of Auxerre forbade women, on account of their "impurity," to touch the Eucharist with their bare hands, and in the churches they were forbidden to approach the altar during the Mass. They were also forbidden, successively, to teach, to baptize, to preach, or to take any order whatever.

From the Gospels, it is true, no support can be derived for this contemptuous attitude; but it was one of the points of the Old Testament that had not been explicitly repealed, and the harsh and dominating language of St. Paul fully supported it.

I am, however, descending too rapidly into the abyss of the Dark Ages; though, perhaps, it is advis-

¹ See *Islamic Review*, vol. xii., No. 3, p. 96.

² Council of Macon.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

able to point out at once the frightful retrogression that took place. But before examining, in greater detail, the miserable period for woman which the teachings of the early Fathers initiated, it is advisable to glance at the brighter side of the influences of Christianity.

Christianity did bring into the Roman world—though it was not the only religion to do so—ideals and principles which would have aided the progress of woman ; but the Church took away with the left hand what it gave with the right. It nullified its own action by unpractical excesses. I am not thinking so much of the elevation of Mary to the supreme position among mortals. The Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din has conclusively proved that this, far from being a novelty in the Roman world, was, on the contrary, forced on the Church itself by the inveterate customs of the Pagans.¹ The virgin god-mothers, Isis, Cybele, Frigga, Minerva and the hundred other pagan goddesses, could only be banished from the hearts of the people by a substitute of the image of Mary.

Christianity soon constituted itself the representative of a new tendency. It regarded purity as the most important of all virtues, and it strained to the utmost all the vast agencies it possessed to enforce it. In the legislation of the first Christian Emperors we find many traces of a fiery zeal. Thus, for example, a great service was done to the cause both of purity and philanthropy by a law which permitted actresses on receiving baptism, *not otherwise*, to abandon their profession, which had been made a form of slavery, and was virtually a slavery to vice.² Another law passed in A.D. 385 suppressed musical girls, who were accustomed to sing or play at the banquets of the rich, and who were regarded with extreme horror by the people. In the legislation of the Church, sins of

¹ The Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, *The Sources of Christianity*, pp. 66-75.

² Cod. *Theod.*, lib. ix. 24.

THE REALITY OF THE SOUL

chastity, probably, occupy a larger place than any others in its enactments. The cases of unnatural love, and of mothers who made their daughters courtesans, were punished by perpetual exclusion from communion, and a crowd of other offences were severely visited.

(To be continued.)

GAZZALI ON THE REALITY OF THE SOUL¹

By K. S. KHWAJA KHAN

(Continued from the last number.)

THE explanation of the reality of the soul was forbidden because ordinary people cannot understand it. There are two sets of people—the ordinary and the elect. The former cannot understand the attributes of God; how, then, can they understand the attributes of the soul? The Karamathians and the Hanbalites, who are overshadowed by materialism, have become Corporealists, have denied the attributes of God Himself, and cannot understand how God can have no body. Those who are advanced a stage further have, no doubt, denied corporeality; but could not deny the attributes dependent on corporeality. They have fixed a direction. Then come the last—the Asharites and Mutazilites, who have advanced the furthest, and believe Him to be existence, free from direction and dependence.

These explanations do not hold ground with the ordinary people, for they believe that the attributes ascribed to the soul are impossible; though not so with God. One runs the risk of being labelled heterodox, if one ascribes these attributes to the soul; and it would seem that the attributes peculiar to God are assumed not only for the soul, but for the personal self.

It is thought to be impossible that two things in space can occupy the same place at the same time.

¹ *Studies in Tasawwaf.*

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Similarly, it is considered to be impossible that two things can do so in non-space. In the first case (of two things in space), their distinction would disappear, and they would coalesce into one. In the second case, if one of the two things in non-space requires no space, their distinction would disappear. Two dimensions cannot occupy the same space. The objection is seemingly valid. It is a palpable mistake to suppose that distinction between two objects is made known on account of space. The distinction may be from three sources: from *space*—two things, in two places, are distinguishable; from *time*—two extensions, in one essence, in two different times, are distinguishable; and from *definition*. Different extensions of the same object are distinguishable at the same time by mere description or definition; as, for example, saltiness and moisture in a particular object. Time and space are one; but by mere description they are distinguishable. Knowledge and intention (Divine)—these are distinguishable by themselves by mere description or definition; otherwise the whole is only one. When the extension of objects is imagined and distinguished, different objects, though they may not be in space, can be imagined and distinguished. It would appear that to give such attributes to the soul is to bestow the attributes of God on it, and to make the two similar. This is not so; no similarity is established between man and God, even though we speak of man as living, knowing, powerful, hearing, speaking, and these attributes belong to God also. Similarly, to be non-spatial is not a peculiar attribute of God. The special attribute of God, in which no one partakes, is His being Eternal. He is, by His Essence, Everlasting—by His Essence, Everliving, and so on. The essence of all things is nothingness; their existence is borrowed from God. God's existence is His Essence, and is not borrowed; His being Eternal is His special attribute.

Why does God speak of breathing with His Spirit,

THE REALITY OF THE SOUL

and why is breathing specified? All things owe their existence to God; why this particularity in regard to the soul? In the Holy Qur-án we are told that God created man out of putrid mud, and told the angels "We are going to create man out of mud"; and, then, again, in another place: "When We properly tempered it, We breathed Our Spirit into it." What, then, is the meaning of this breathing? If it means that breath left God and joined man, then division in the nature of God becomes possible; but this cannot be. The answer to this question may be illustrated from the sun. If the sun says, "I have given light to the earth," this will be correct. The earth, although there might have been little light in it, was not like the atmosphere. Thus the soul was free from space and dimensions; to become cognizant of everything was potential in it, although it has no comparison with God; but in other bodies there was nothing of the sort, and hence the particularity.

Again, the "world of command" is simply the world in which there is no measurement, estimate or delimitation; and the world of creation is the world in which these qualities exist. It does not necessarily mean invention. The "world of command" is, therefore, the world which is above sense, thought, direction and space. There is no quantity in it, it does not come within the purview of measurement; but the world of creation is just the opposite of this. The souls of men and angels belong to the world of command.

It is sometimes wrongly believed that the soul is uncreated. The soul is not created in the sense that it is not subject to measurement or division. But it is created in the sense that it is neither original nor everlasting. When the embryo becomes fit and suitable enough, the Spirit manifests itself in it; just as in the mirror a face manifests itself immediately the mirror acquires sufficient brilliancy.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

A face may be existent previously, but it does not appear in the mirror till the latter becomes fit for it. Immediately the mirror is burnished, it reflects the face.

In virtue of connexion with bodies, souls acquire certain qualities, such as knowledge, ignorance, purity, impurity, good and bad morals and so on. On account of the acquisition of these, their separateness will remain, which is not the case before their connexion.

We are told that "God created man after His own image." The word *surat* (image or face) has different meanings in Arabic. It means shape or combination of shapes, as of bodies which we sense. Sometimes it means proposition; one might speak of the *surat* or shape of the problem in Euclid. It may mean the image of combination of circumstances. Here shape, or *surat*, is the metaphorical shape of the thing. It means the connexion between essence and attributes and actions. I have explained that the soul is an essence; it is neither a body nor an extension. It is not an essence contained in space or direction; it is neither connected with nor detached from the body; is neither within nor without the body. These things are in God also. Consider the attributes of God. The soul is living, knowing, powerful, willing, hearing, seeing, speaking. These are God's attributes also.

The source of man's actions is will or intention. It manifests itself in mind, and then with the aid of the animal soul (which is a term for ethereal vapour), it circulates through the system and rises to the brain. From there it acts on the nerves which emanate from it, and reaches the arteries, veins and muscles. When the nerve absorbs it, the finger moves, and through the finger, the pen; then there is motion in ink, and then a form appears which originally was in will or intention. This form is according to the form in the treasure-house of our thought. Whoever has dived into the actions of

THE REALITY OF THE SOUL

God, and pondered over them and considered the skies and stars and their influences, cannot but be struck with the thought that angels play the same part in the macrocosm as do our faculties in our microcosm; and that man's control over his body is very like God's control over the world.

Man has the same control over his *qalb* (mind) as God has over His *arsh*; the brain corresponding to *kursi* and the sense to the angels, who by nature are obedient to their owner and do not disobey Him, just as our senses do not disobey us. The organs and the muscles correspond to the skies; the power in the fingers corresponds to the nature with which the Creator has endowed every living creature. The paper, pen and ink (in our simile) are the elements through which combinations and dispersions manifest themselves. The mirror of our thought corresponds to the *Lawh-i-mahfuz* (the preserved Tablet).

It is not difficult to understand the meaning of the tradition: "God created man after His own image." "He who understands his *nafs* (soul) understands his God." If the relations and the correspondence, described above, are not understood, man cannot, from a knowledge of his *nafs*, understand his God. If God had not concentrated in man all the things that are in the world, and had not made him a small model (microcosm) and had not made him the *rab* (the ruler) of this microcosm, he would not have understood the great world and its *Rab* (Ruler) who controls it with Knowledge, Power and Wisdom; and would not have become cognizant of any of the attributes of God. By such a relation, *nafs* becomes one of the rungs of the ladder to the knowledge of the Maker of the *nafs*.

The Holy Prophet Muhammad has said: "God created souls two thousand years before the bodies." "I was before all the Prophets, but in mission the last of them all." "I was a Prophet when Adam was in clay and water." The first *hadees* (saying)

ISLAMIC REVIEW

clearly shows that the soul is non-eternal and is a created object. At first thought, it would appear as if the souls were created before the bodies, and they existed before them. It is, however, possible that the souls of the angels are meant, and that the bodies referred to are *arsh*, *kursi*, the heavens, the stars, mud and water. It should be remembered that the bodies of men *en masse* are insignificantly small in comparison with the body of the sun. The body of the sun is small beyond comparison with that of its heaven and with the heaven about it; and so on until finally we reach the *kursi* in which all are contained. This is so small in comparison with the *arsh* of God, that there can be no comparison between the two. When all these are considered, the bodies of men *en masse* are so insignificantly small that they cannot be thought of. Again, the souls of men *en masse* are also small in comparison with the body of the *a'lam* (from man to *arsh*). Their appearance would be manifest to one endowed with the light of illumination, as the flame of a wick, in comparison with the fire that has enshrouded the whole *a'lam*. The fire is the souls of angels. There is a gradation amongst angels. They are separate, and no two of them are in one rank, thus differing from the souls of men, which, in spite of their multiplicity, are all one in kind and rank. Each angel is *sui generis*. God has made the angels say (in the Holy Qur-án): "There is no one of us but hath his known place," and "We are those having purity." The Prophet has said that none of those who are in *ruku* perform the *sijdah*; and none of those who are in *qiyam* perform their *ruku*. Verily there is none amongst them who hath not his appointed place. Thus the souls and the bodies mentioned in the *hadees* are the angels and the bodies in the creation. As for the second *hadees*, "I am the first, in creation, of the Prophets, but the last of them all," by creation is meant the same estimate, plan, or forecast which I

THE REALITY OF THE SOUL

have mentioned above. It does not mean "the bringing into existence"; for the Prophet never existed until he was born. The excellences and perfections that manifested themselves in him were first in the forecast of God, though last in point of manifestation, among the Prophets. This is the same as the Arabic saying: "First thought, then action." An engineer thinks of constructing a building. In the plan in his mind there exists a fully constructed and finished building; but it is only then that actual construction begins. So far as he is concerned, the fully constructed house already exists in his thought; although material construction is his last act, there have been many stages from start to finish—the digging of foundations, the collection of materials, the raising of the walls, the putting up of the roof. These are mere intermediaries to bring his thought into full material existence.

The object of man's existence is to know the excellence of proximity to God. This becomes known to us from the teaching of the Prophets. The foundation-stone is first to be laid; when this is done, the construction progresses upon it from stage to stage, till the building is complete. In Adam, the foundation was laid, and the finishing touch was given by the Holy Prophet. This is the significance of his being "the seal of the Prophets"; for an addition to perfection is a defect. The perfection of our hand consists in one palm and five fingers. Just as a four-fingered man is defective, so is a six-fingered one. Perfection consists in five fingers and five alone; the sixth is an additional appendage and a defect. The Holy Prophet has compared Prophet-hood to a building, which is complete but for want of a brick. He was the last brick to give perfection to the building. There cannot be an addition to a complete building, and (if there were) such an addition would be a defect. These things were in the forecast of God first, although they came last in

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the order of existence. As for the third *hadees*, "I was a Prophet while Adam was in mud and water," the explanation of this is on the same lines.

The creation of the children of Adam could not be complete until a perfect man was born among them—one who perfected the object of creation. In him, we believe, creation reached its perfection, when it accepted the blessed soul of the Prophet. God first made an estimate, and then brought it into objective existence; just as an engineer draws up a plan on paper. The engineer draws up the plan with his pen; but it is the knowledge of the engineer that sets the pen in motion. Similarly, God draws up His plans with the pen of His Power on the tablet of His Knowledge. It should be remembered that the tablet is simply an object, which has the aptitude of being engraved upon; and a pen is the object which draws on the tablet. This pen and tablet are not a reed, nor an oblong board. Materiality is not a condition of their existence. The pen and tablet of God must be suitable to His hand; they are free from material existence. The truth is they are spiritual essences.

THE HOLY PROPHET

AHMAD the praised most truly spoke for God,
Saying that He indeed is Lord alone
And with no other being shares His throne.
That sinners shall endure His chastening rod,
But those who humbly seek Him in distress
Shall find Him full of Love and Graciousness.

"Then be resigned to His Divine Decree,
Knowing that what He doeth is the best,
Thus shall your troubled spirit be at rest;
Surely He is the Lord of Destiny.
The Qurán He revealed, doth guide the way
Through mists and shadows to the realms of day."

THE SECRET OF SUPERSTITION

Bravely the Prophet persecution bore,
But those who knew him best trusted him most.
And there arose at length a mighty host
Born of his patience and his travail sore.
All men should love him, if they God revere
Because God's truth to him was very dear.

And so, Muhammad, I, a Christian priest
Bless thee for all the good that thou didst do.
Alas! amongst us there are very few
Who of thy teaching have received the least
Knowledge, or every tongue thy praise would tell
Who served thy Lord so faithfully and well.

F. H. A.

THE SECRET OF SUPERSTITION

By JAMES BAYARD MUNRO

It's a great thing to have about us—that "Superior" feeling. It's just as easy to get—and a lot cheaper—than the other "feeling" so widely advertised at the present time. Possibly it is not so healthful.

At the bottom of most of the Big Things we pride ourselves on nowadays—"intellectualism" and "broad-mindedness" and "the Larger Vision" and the like encouraging phenomena—you will find, if you investigate carefully, and deal quite honestly by the result, nothing bigger than a sneaking desire to be thought a little better than our neighbours—a little "out of the common." If it were not for that, you could never hope to round up enough people to start a new sect—or run a new Religion. There is no scrap of cynicism, nothing but horse-sense, in the proposition that it is not—emphatically not—man's diviner instincts that set him running around after Truth, in seven cases out of ten. He does not take much stock of Truth, in the abstract. Life is too short for metaphysics. He likes to "get things done," without bothering too much about what the things that he wants to get done amount to.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

To speak the truth, or rather to get the reputation of being truthful, is a considerable social—and a big commercial—asset; and that's all there is to it. "Honesty is the best policy," but as for Truth, it belongs properly to the region of metaphysics where angels fear to tread; it has nothing to do with practical humanity.

" 'What is Truth?' said jesting Pilate "; and most of us let it go at that. No. The Proselytizer-in-Chief, the Arch-Missionary for all the mushroom crop of new religions that are springing up in the world's decay—like fungi on a rotting tree—is a very human instinct not altogether unrelated to Vanity, which is itself first cousin not even once removed to the most persistent and the most human of all the Seven Deadly Sins—which is Pride.

It is the custom for those who are blest with the "superior feeling"—one might almost say that it is the distinguishing mark by which they may be singled out infallibly—to attack, or belittle, or condemn some more or less well-established and reputable convention or belief—it may be Religious, or it may be of some other kind.

The Baconian theory as to the authenticity of Shakespeare's Plays was a godsend to the superior person. Though it originated in my country, it was comparatively innocuous and has furnished thousands of innocent folk with scope for much mild and quite harmless ingenuity. But the superior person and his fellows love to let fly at targets more august, with even greater zest. Indeed, the bigger and more Goliath-like the mark, the more like a complacent little David does the superior person feel. The mills of God grind slowly—so slowly that superior folk are, now and then, deluded into the belief that the machinery is not working; and so believing, are stimulated to prodigies of valour.

They beat their drums in the crowded spaces of Vanity Fair, amid the swings and roundabouts which

THE SECRET OF SUPERSTITION

stand for worldly pleasures, and thoughtlessness, and the "good time" which is all that man born of woman bothers himself about these days; and call the drifting multitudes together to see for themselves, and gape upon the inherent and patent absurdities of something it has long held in reverence. To do the multitude justice, it does not, as a rule, take a great deal of notice. But it makes no odds, if you want to be a superior person, whether anybody takes any notice or not. That's the beauty of the scheme. That's where it has the pull. That "superior feeling" is within the reach of everyone. There will always be, thank Heaven, enough fools in the world for that.

But in course of time it may happen—and sometimes does—that the multitude is at last convinced. By dint of persistent drum-beating and incessant reiteration (on the principle so finely enunciated by your great mathematician :—

What I tell you three times, is true),

the multitude begins at last to believe that the facts, though tough, are as stated; and as an eminent scenario-writer of my country has lately observed, "If you believe it, it is so." When the multitude, therefore, has comfortably settled down into its new belief that its old belief was all wrong, what is the superior person to do? There's nothing left for him but to turn right round and plump for the old belief again. He will prove to his own satisfaction that its absurdities (if any) are adventitious, not inherent, and proceed with zest and conviction to hail it as a New Truth.

I have no desire or ambition to be numbered among the superior ones. Their ways have always been too high for me, and, I fear, always will; but I cannot help confessing to a sneaking feeling of sympathy with them when they arrive at this stage of the proceedings; and especially am I conscious of this feeling in the case of that hardly used and

ISLAMIC REVIEW

cruelly misunderstood bogey of modern times—
Superstition.

Superstition—in itself a “not unholy thing, I hope,” as Mr. Pecksniff might have put it—has nevertheless been so buffeted and torn and scratched about, from the pious days of the Reformation to our own superior times, that you would think it ought to be ashamed to show its disreputable old face. Ask any enlightened product of one of your County Council Schools what he knows of “Superstition,” and he will—if he has ever heard of it—paint you such a picture of childish folly, moral depravity, and midsummer madness, that you will wonder how such a monstrosity was ever allowed to stalk abroad unchecked in Merrie England; and still more, how it has come about that England, with the fading of Superstition, should have gradually lost her merriment and become instead, the hard-headed paradise of efficiency and selfishness? Something must have gone wrong somewhere. Can it be that, with the decay of Superstition, man became less serious in his belief in the Eternal Righter of Wrong—in His nearness—in His reality—and so gradually the more convinced of the very urgent necessity of looking after Number One in this world—because if you don’t, nobody else will? That can hardly be. The loss of an evil thing cannot breed evil—and nobody will seriously attempt to defend the ideals of business life, whether here or in America, on moral grounds.

However that may be, there is one excellent reason why brilliant conversationalists are unanimous in their condemnation of Superstition, and that is the circumstance that every one of them means something different when he uses the word; and as to what that something is, he is himself not quite clear.

With some, to object to walking under ladders, or sitting down thirteen to table, or breaking looking-glasses, or crossing your toes, or passing each other

THE SECRET OF SUPERSTITION

on the stairs, or seeing the new moon through glass ; or to be afraid of the evil eye or of spilling salt, is superstition.

With some, to believe in ghosts and haunted houses, strange lights at midnight in chambers where no man has dwelt for centuries, clanking of chains, gibbering of unearthly voices, sheeted forms in lonely churchyards and all the eerie paraphernalia of ghostlore, is to be superstitious. The belief that a sinful soul may be condemned to find its purgatory on this earth in helpless contemplation of the misery its sin has caused—a picturesque, quite plausible, and pre-eminently moral theory—is “superstitious.”

With some—austere Protestants these, of the “Mayflower” brand—the Catholic practice of the Invocation of Saints and of the Blessed Virgin—the symbolism of Church ritual and of Church structure and adornment—the lamp burning continually before the high altar—the seven-branched candlesticks—the holy water, are superstition.

They all have a different meaning for the word, and yet each interpretation can be traced back to, and derive virtue from, that word’s original and literal significance.

Superstition properly means a standing over something—a standing still in awe of something—awe, which may be said to be compounded of amazement and reverence. I fancy that the ignorant and (which is worse) the semi-ignorant rabble with which modern democracy seeks to work out the world’s salvation, would be all the better for a little superstition—a little “standing still in awe of something.”

It is just what they never do—never dream of doing : just what every man has got to do, if he is going to make anything worth making out of his life at all.

It has always seemed to me that Muslims should stand aside from the “superior feeling.” They can afford to. It’s a cheap line, whichever way you

ISLAMIC REVIEW

look at it; and doesn't bring in any profit worth speaking of. And the selfsame observation applies with equal force to the Christians; for each claims that his religion is not a man-made contrivance. The Christian's "aüthority" may be considered to have had a thin time of it on the whole, of late. Criticism, both higher and lower, from without and within, has been at it, like mice at a Stilton cheese, until there would seem to be precious little left. The stupendous amount of learning expended by pious Christian divines and dignitaries in proving that they've got little to believe and less worth believing, might conceivably have proved of enormous practical service, had it been directed into other channels. With Muslims the case is slightly different. Their foundation has not yet been assailed seriously. Their charter remains intact. "There is no God but God, and Muhammad is the Prophet of God."

And any man who honestly believes in One God, and sets himself earnestly and faithfully to study and consider all that such belief must imply, must be superstitious—must be perpetually standing still, as it were in awe of Something.

Yet even this will not escape the censure of the superior person—the up-to-date broad-minded man of the modern world.

We all admit cheerfully, and without the slightest misgiving, or any feeling at all of apprehension, that Almighty God sees all our actions and knows all our thoughts; and yet if we act as though this alleged belief of ours was a true and living one, we shall be called superstitious as sure as Christmas comes but once a year; and, at best, people will smile at us.

When the infant Samuel heard God's voice calling him in the night, and got up and ran to the High Priest, thinking that it was he who had called him, Eli, if he had been a level-headed man of the modern world, would have patted the little fellow on the head, and have told him not to be "superstitious"

SEEK AND YE SHALL FIND

and get right off back to bed again. That's what Eli would have said.

It is too much to suppose that we shall ever agree—be we superior or otherwise—on the vexed question of Superstition, whether it be a blessing or curse; but I would appeal to those of my readers who may be disposed to concern themselves with the matter to reflect, before condemning customs and observances that may seem to them, in their wisdom, vain and foolish, that all superstition—however trite and trivial its present form, even though it take the shape of mascots and swastikas—has its root in reverence; and, as a writer in this *Review* has observed more than once, nothing which tends, however indirectly, to turn man's thoughts to a Power above him—that is, to God—must be despised. I, for my part, would prefer, in all humility, to think that such may be set as signposts and protections along life's highway, to the end that “wayfaring men, though fools, may not err therein.”

SEEK AND YE SHALL FIND

I LOOKED for God in all the likely places,
In cloistered chapel and in stately fane,
'Neath dome and spire of myriad creeds and races;
I looked for Him in vain!

I sought for God in populous rich cities,
In town and hamlet, and in hut and hall;
Lo here! Lo there! They mocked me with their
pities
Who knew Him not at all!

I searched for God in every nook and cranny,
In the deep mine, upon the utmost peak,
In thickest woods, in graveyard haunts uncanny—
Yet vainly did I seek.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

I hunted for Him, zealous to a passion,
O'er trackless oceans, through the realms of air.
Gods of a kind I found, of strange new fashion,
But God not anywhere!

Earth held Him not! I probed the dim recesses
Of farthest star-depths in the vaults of space;
Suns flocked on suns—I hazarded wild guesses—
But God still held His face.

Weary I turned, dissatisfied, still yearning
And sick at heart, so profitless my quest.
“O God!” I cried, “hast Thou no bush still burning
To light me as Thy guest?”

No voice replied. “Then God,” I said, “hath broken
His covenant, and shall no longer rule.
Look thou, my soul, within thyself for token
Thou hast possessed a fool!”

Then sad my soul, with wisdom purchased dearly,
Withdrew into that temple self-concealed;
And there (strange irony of wisdom) clearly
SHONE GOD HIMSELF—revealed!

AJAX.

THE EXCELLENT NAME OF ALLAH

BY PROFESSOR H. M. LÉON, M.A., LL.D., P.H.D., F.S.P.

THE conferring of a name upon a person was, among the Jews in early Biblical times, generally connected with some circumstance of birth. We have an instance of this recorded in Genesis xxv. 24 to 26:—

“And when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, there were twins in her womb. And the first came out red, all over like a hairy garment; and they called his name Esau. And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob.” Here the first-born son was called Esau=“the hairy one,”

THE EXCELLENT NAME OF ALLAH

and the second one was named Jacob, literally, "Heel-catcher" (Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Keil, Lange, Murphy), and hence "Supplanter" (Gen. xxxvii. 36). Several of Jacob's sons are also recorded to have received their names in this manner (Gen. xxx.).

Before the Exile, Jewish children appear never to have been named after their relatives, not even in the royal family. Not one of the twenty-one kings of Judah was named after a predecessor, or after David, the founder of the family. Instead of repeating the same name, however, it appears to have been the custom to make use of one of the elements of the family name; thus Ahitub has two sons, Ahijah and Ahimelech. As a consequence of this avoidance of repetition a single name was as a rule enough to identify an individual, and it is only in the later stages of Hebrew tradition that it was deemed requisite to give the name of the father in order to identify the son, as, for example, in the case of Jaazaniah-ben-Shaphan (Ezek. viii. 11).

Abdul-Rahman-Ibn-Sakhr, better known by his nickname Abu-Huraira, bestowed upon him on account of his fondness for cats, was one of the most constant attendants of the Holy Prophet Muhammed (upon whom be eternal blessings and peace!), and from his peculiar intimacy with him has related many traditions of the Rosul-Allah, which none of the other companions had opportunities for knowing,¹ stated that he heard the Prophet of God say: "Verily there are ninety-nine names for God; and whoever remembers, counts, and repeats them shall enter into Paradise. He is ALLA'HO, that which there is no other; AL RAH'MAN-UL-RAHIMO, the Compassionate and Merciful; AL-MALICO, the King; the dominions of both worlds are in His power and possession; AL-KUDUSO, wholly pure and utterly free from defect; AL-SAL'AM, that is, His nature is absolutely secure from any defect; AL-MOMINO, the Giver of asylum to the creation; AL-MUHAIMINO, the witness of servants' actions; AL-AZIZO, the powerful and incomparable; AL-JABBARO, the Benefactor of servants; AL-MUTACABBIRO, the mighty doer; AL-KHA'LIKO, AL-BARIO, AL-MUSAWUR'RO, the Fixer of quantity before creating, the Creator, the Giver of likeness; AL-GHAFFA'RO, the pardoner of servants' sins; AL-KAKHA'RO, the Breaker of the backs of tyrants; AL-WAHHA'BO, the Perpetual Bestower, whose gifts are without end; AL-RAZZA'KO, the sender of daily bread to the creation; AL-FATTA'HO, the Opener of the doors of mercy on His servants; AL-ALIMO, the Omniscient; AL-KA'BI'DO, the Straitener of daily bread on whom He wills, and the Taker

¹ Abu-Huraira embraced Islam in the 7th year of the Hegira (the year of the expedition to Khaiber) and passed to his eternal rest at Medinah, in the 57th year of the Hegira, being then 78 years of age.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

of souls ; AL-BA'SI'TO, the Opener of daily bread on whom He wills ; AL-KHA'FI'DO, the Sinker of the infidels to the lowest earth ; AL-RA'FI'O, the Raiser up of True-Believers to the highest paradise ; AL-MU'IZZO, the Giver of greatness in the world to whom He wills ; AL-MU'DHILLO, the Ruiner of whom He wills in the world. Now ruin is in avarice and ambition. It is related that two boys were playing together ; one had dry bread, and the other had bread and meat. The first said to the second, ' Give me something to eat with my bread.' The other said, ' Come, be my dog and I will.' The boy agreed ; and permitted the other boy to tie a string round his neck, after which he stooped down and proceeded on his hands and knees in the manner of a four-footed animal and allowed the other boy, who had placed the string around his neck, to lead him along as though he were a dog. Fatah Maus'ali saw this being done, and said, ' Behold, if this boy had been content with his dry bread, he would not have lowered himself to the position of a dog.' AL-SAMIO, the Hearer, not by the ear ; AL-BASIRO, the Seer, not with the eye ; AL-HACAMO, the Orderer amongst the creation in the expulsion of oppression ; AL-ADLO, the Just ; AL-LATIFO, the Doer of good to the creation ; AL-KHABIRO, the Knower ; AL-HALIMO, the Clement ; AL-ADHIMO, the Great ; AL-GHAFURO, the Great Pardoner ; AL-SHACURO, the Giver of rewards to the grateful ; AL-ALIO, the Most High ; AL-CABIRO, the Lord of Greatness ; AL-HAFIDHO, the Guardian of everything in the universe ; AL-MUKITO, the Giver of strength ; AL-HASIBO, the Taker of accounts of the creation on the day of resurrection ; AL-JALILO, the Glorious ; AL-KARIMO, the Munificent, whose favours precede hope, and whoever has hope in Him, does not turn away disappointed ; AL-RAKIBO, the Watcher ; AL-MUJIBO, the Approver of supplications ; AL-WASIO, the Expander ; AL-HAKIMO, the Knower of the realities of things, the Wise ; AL-WADUDO, the Friend of True-Believers ; AL-MAJID, the Lord of Glory ; AL-BA'ITHO, the Raiser up of the dead from the graves, and Awakener of the hearts from the sleep of lethargy and pride ; AL-SHAHIDO, the Witness, the Giver of evidence, on the actions of mankind on the day of resurrection ; AL-HAKKO, the Truth ; AL-WAKILO, the Taker on Himself the affairs of His servants ; AL-KHAWIYO, the Strong ; AL-MATINO, the Firm ; AL-WALIYO, the Assister of True-Believers ; AL-HAMIDO, the Praised One, the Praiser of His own Nature ; AL-MUHSI, the Counter ; AL-MUBDIO, the Creator of new things ; AL-MUIDO, the Cause of return ; AL-MUHIYO, the Causer of life ; AL-MUMITO, the Causer of death ; AL-HAIYO, the Living One, who never dies or declines ; AL-KAIYUMO, the Maker alive of the creation ; AL-WAJIDO, the Finder of all perfections ; AL-MAJIDO, the

THE EXCELLENT NAME OF ALLAH

Grand ; AL-WAHIDO, the One ;¹ AL-SAMADO, from the court of whom all desires are supplicated, and He in need of no one ; AL-KADIRO, the Powerful ; AL-MAKTADIRO, the Lord of Power ; AL-MUKADDIMO, the Bringer forward ; AL-MAWAKHIRO, the Bringer after (the Deferrer) ; AL-ANWALO, the First ; AL-ÂKHIRO, the Last ;² AL-DHA'HIRO, AL-BA'TINO, whose existence is clear, and realities hidden ; AL-WALIO, the Master of all ; AL-MUTAA'LI, the Sublime of Degree ; AL-BARRO, the Doer of Good ; AL-TAWW'ABO, the Acceptor of repentance ; AL-MUNTAKIMO, the Taker of Revenge ; AL-AFU'WO, the Eraser of sins ; AL-RAWU'FO, the Benefiter ; MALIK-UL-MULKI, the Ruler of Countries ; DHU'L-JALA'L-WA'L ICRAM, the Lord of Glory and Greatness ; AL-MUKSITO, the Giver of Justice ; AL-JAMIO, the Assembler of the creation ; AL-GHANIO, the Independent ; AL-MUGHIMO, the Maker of Independence ; AL-MUATI, AL-MANIO, the Giver to whom He wills, and the Withholder from whom He wills ; AL-DAR'RO, AL-NAFIO, the Creator of profit and loss ; AL-NURO, the Maker of Light of the regions with stars, and Giver of Light to the earth with prophets, friends of God, and sages ; AL-HADI, the Director ; AL-BADIO, the Incomparable ;³ AL-BAKI, of eternal existence ; AL-WARITHO, the Heir ; AL-RUSCHIDO, the Shower of the straight road ; AL-SABURO, the Most Patient in the punishment of sins."

Buraidah, who was of the tribe Salim, and embraced Islam before the battle of Al-Bedr, stated that the Prophet heard a man say, " O Lord ! I ask from Thee, by this means that Thou art God, the Only God, the Eternal ; all wants, all needs shall return to Thee ; Thou art neither begotten nor begetting ; nor is there any one like unto Thee." Then the Messenger of God said, " This servant has called on God by that name which is the greatest of all, that name which, being asked by, God grants ; and when supplicated by, God accepts and approves."

Anas-bin-Malik, one of the *Sahabah*, or companions of

¹ *Wahad* or *Wahid* means sole, alone, distinct, separated, unique, incomparable. From this root are derived the Arabic words, *wahdani*, pertaining to the unity of God ; *wahdaniyat*, unity, singularity: The divine quality of being one only God ; *wahdat*, being single, alone, or solitary. Unity, a solitude, etc. Compare Hebrew, *ehad*.

² Compare Rev. i. 8, " I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." See also Rev. i. 11 ; xxi. 6 ; xxii. 13. Compare also Isaiah xli. 4, " I am the Lord, the first and with the last ; I am He," and Isaiah xliii. 10, " Before Me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after Me." (The words " no God formed " might be better rendered as " nothing formed of God.")

³ The word *Bādi* in Arabic means " One who begins, brings about or causes anything," or " a cause " ; used therefore as a title or attribute of Allah, it could be rendered in English as " The Great First Cause."

ISLAMIC REVIEW

the Prophet Muhammad, and the last surviving member of that noble band of exalted men, who died at Basrah, Anno Hegira 91, at the age of 103, said, "I was sitting with the Prophet in the Musjid, when a man was performing his prayers, and said, 'O Lord! I supplicate Thee, by the means, that for Thee is all praise, there is no God but Thee, the Kind, the Bestower of benefits, the Creator of the heavens and the earth; O Lord! of Greatness and Glory, O the Living One! O the Maker of Life! I supplicate Thee.' Then the Prophet said, 'This man has called upon God by the greatest of all His names; a name which being called by, he approves, and gives when supplicated.'"

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the ISLAMIC REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—Asalam-o-Alcum.

I read with interest your Eid-ul-Fitr Sermon in the *Islamic Review*. You ask Christian friends to "come to an equitable proposition" with you. Let me say that I fully recognize the prophetic office of Muhammad and his great service to his age, and to the whole world. I have read and admired his sublime teachings in the Koran (Rodwells' translation). I say with all my heart, "On him be peace." I, however, am, and shall remain, a Christian. I enclose some lines I have written to let you see one Christian clergyman admires your Prophet.

Yours faithfully,

F. HENRY ALDHOUSE.

The Rectory, Oldtown, Ireland,

June 16, 1924.

To the Editor of the ISLAMIC REVIEW.

SIR,—I have read with great interest the Imam's sermon on "Religion and Peace." I am afraid I cannot agree with it in entirety; but the one startling fact remains that it is to Islam and the Muslims that we must look for tolerance. The present-day Christianity has failed, and until we can go back to the real teachings of Christ there can be no Peace on earth. Through your pages I ask the Muslims to put into practice the ideals of Islam; for at present, I regret to say, a great number of them try to follow the *Western* Christianity and not Islam. I enclose my card.

Yours faithfully,

A CHRISTIAN.

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House
—111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday,
at 1 p.m. **Sunday Lectures** at 5 p.m. **Qur-ân and Arabic
Classes**—every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
Service, Sermon, and Lectures every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking,
11.30 a.m.