The Call of the Minaret By Kenneth Cragg

ISLAM SINCE 1945

NINETEEN FORTY-FIVE may seem altogether too near a date from which to assess the contemporary situation in the Muslim world. Perspective is usually a prerequisite of sound judgment and a decade is nothing in the evolving story of so vast and massive a reality as Islam. But when the date is not too strictly enforced, there is merit in its closeness, if only because it serves to measure the speed and inclusiveness of contemporary change. Since the year of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the year in which World War II ended and the uncertain "atomic" peace began, manifest changes have occurred within Islam, gradual no doubt in their genesis, but dramatic in their issue. If historians must wait longer to set them into focus, servants and lovers of men must act within them by what light they can discern in advance of history's sober exposition. For the living present passes beyond the range of our opportunity before it is fully known. Our action must be within the perspectives open to us now as men of Christian purpose. This does not absolve us, however, from evaluating as best we may, in the immediate flux of events, those facts which history will identify as the gist of this century.

In the last decade almost the entire world of Islam has come into political self-responsibility. It may be ironical that this independence has been reached at a time when circumstances created by science have made it an anachronism, bringing as they do the new compulsion to interdependence. None the less independence, in so far as it can continue feasible, has arrived almost everywhere, to gratify and consummate the hopes and efforts of more than half a century. How far is 'Abdal-Nasir's Egypt from Lord Cromer's! Through successive installments it has passed from tutelage to independence, and from independence to final foreign evacuation-1922, 1936, 1946, 1954. Round the corner of the eastern Mediterranean, Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq have several dates that celebrate their independent status, occasions marking the stages of the retreating West, from the outset of the Mandates to their final termination. But the consummation falls within the last decade-the fruition of hopes often deferred and passions long thwarted.

The concurrent emergence of Israel compromises and embitters the Arab sense of achievement and remains a territorial and spiritual frustration to Arab ambition. The entail of the fact of Israel in every realm is the supreme test of Arab nationhood in this century. But the immediate point is that, for all its provocative quality, Israel has not impeded the arrival of Arab Muslim nationalism. Indeed the depth of Arab resentment over Israel is the measure of how far the Arab world of the Versailles Mandates has come since it languished under the heel of Sultan 'Abdul-Hamid H. It has grown to independence in interaction with its bitterest problem. But it has grown: and the evolution finds Baghdad and Damascus, old seats of empire, capitals, with Amman, of new Muslim national expressions. Northward Turkey has transformed herself from an overgrown and unwieldy empire into a vigorous, modern, secular state, with a virile nationhood and a new perspective.

Even more arresting changes await the observer when he moves eastward and southward to Karachi and beyond, where over 60 per cent of world Islam is located. Here the two most populous Islamic nations, Pakistan and Indonesia, have come into existence since 1947. Partition on the basis of religious predominance proved to be the solution of the dilemma created by the recession of British power. The finally determinant factor in that solution, it is clear, was the insistence of Muslims that it should be so. Pakistan, therefore, is the most eloquent and compelling ISLAM SINCE 1945 witness to the Muslim sense of separate identity and of the validity of Islamic nationalism as the contemporary form of its expression. The seventy million Muslims who followed Muhammad 'Ali Jinnah in the enterprise of
Pakistan had travelled far from the days of Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his Anglophile attitudes of the eighteen-seventies. They were also a far cry from the Jinnah of the nineteen-twenties with his insistence on a united India. When the evacuation of the British Raj was no longer a distant aspiration but an impending reality, Islam in India took urgent counsel of its own genius and elected for Pakistan, despite the necessity of excluding from itself what remains the largest "minority" in the world—the thirty-five million Muslims of Nehru's India.

In the even more populous Dutch East Indies the same decade has seen the same phenomenon—emergence to nationhood of a new and growing Muslim expression. Divergencies in it—Muslim parts continue to harass its orderly development, as they do also in Pakistan, where a constitution was long unagreed. But these are the growing pains of new life. They are the travail of the present that intends a future. No one mistakes the finality of the Dutch departure. Governmentally, educationally, linguistically, the new self-responsible status is absorbing or shedding the Dutch past.

Elsewhere throughout the household of Islam the same pattern is apparent. Libya became an independent power at the end of 1951, likewise the Gold Coast, arguing further recessions of colonialism in West Africa. Nigeria anticipates self-government in 1956 and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan awaits the climax of a transition period leading into complete responsibility. If we except a few scattered and relatively small territories like Aden, and the large half-known segment of Islam in Soviet Russia, almost the entire community of Islam in the world has arrived at independence. Of the three territories of French North Africa, Tunisia and Morocco are moving to varying degrees of political self-expression. It can hardly be that Algeria will remain permanently exempt from a pattern of change which everywhere else is discernible.

ISLAM SINCE 1945 reason of its seeming impracticability in today's world. Yet for thirteen centuries, the Caliphate was considered indispensable to the existence and continuity of a valid Islam.

Some observers, like Muhammad Iqbal, the Pakistani poet-philosopher, have loosely compared the changes implicit in the termination of the Caliphate to the Western European Reformation on its political side. The comparison is a tempting one though it needs all the caution due to such generalizations. It is, however, clear that Islam has been moving in the last decade through further stages of a twentieth-century experience which does resemble some of the features of European history four centuries earlier, except that the pace of change is vastly more bewildering. To estimate these changes against their longer background may be our best path into an understanding of the world of today's muezzins. Their total significance involves a variety of new dimensions, new problems, and new attitudes which must be briefly reviewed. In each case we can discern a similarity to the slower moving experience of Europe without attempting to do justice to all the differences. If we consider these elements in the context of one decade, no reader will forget that the waters of the river have come from far upstream.

THE CONTEMPORARY SETTING

III

A decade, then, may be a short time in human history but it is long enough to witness self-responsibility as the great new political fact of almost all Islam. With that fact go many important consequences, both intellectual and material. The situation seems to many minds like a recovery of the positive values of the Islamic past and a reversal of the reversals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. When the statue of Queen Victoria was removed from a public thoroughfare in the new Karachi and assigned to a corner of the city museum, the
citizens assuredly did not intend any calculated scorn. Indeed, as Professor Toynbee testified in *The World and the West*, relations, personal and institutional, between the people of the sub-continent and the British have been steadily improving since they became equals. What the Pakistanis meant was that history had come through an aberration and recovered the main highway of a proper Islamic course.

For the community of the final and ultimate religious faith for mankind must necessarily also provide the truest political order and demonstrate how human existence should be organized and controlled. Such a people can only conceivably be subjected to alien authority by a temporary coincidence of events, by some accident of historical forces making an interlude of deviation.

Just as the Qur'an reader continues to recite an abrogated verse of the Qur'an to remind himself of the mercy of God in the change, so the new present may keep in mind the immediate past in its gratitude for the living resumption of the essential self-sufficiency of Islam.

We do well as observers to recognize this deep sense of vindication, as well as of new opportunity, in the Muslim attitude toward recent changes. But in one important particular the new Muslim world is in marked institutional discontinuity with the old. The Caliphate is no more. Suppressed in 1924 by the new Turkey, efforts to resuscitate it have been fitful and inconclusive and the decade we have in immediate view has done nothing to renew or inspire them. No serious Muslim opinion appears to expect the revival of the Caliphate, not only for lack of agreement on an individual candidate, but for the more important.

When the nation-states of Western Europe broke out of the imperial, papal world—a process which can be noted as early as loan of Arc with her doctrine of France for the French—this political change proved coincident with many other changes widening the horizon of man and so transforming his mental environment. There was Columbus as well as Henry VIII, Copernicus as well as Luther—pioneers of new dimensions of human life. Steadily the "nations" discovered themselves in unfamiliar ways. Inventiveness, arising both from new propensities and new ambitions, slowly undermined the static features of the feudal world. The development of gunpowder transformed the arts of war and diminished the value of feudal forms of security.

The urge to wider voyages in new directions caused men to stumble upon new America on their way to the old India, an accident of purpose—if the phrase may be permitted—due in the negative sense to the great Muslim land barrier on the eastern route. Great new horizons thus opened before the spirit of man and he equipped himself steadily with a great new range of instruments wherewith to investigate and possess those regions. The horizons themselves receded in front of his advance until they opened into the vast, awesome perspectives of this atomic age.

Muslims of the same contemporary context have come into its process of change at a greatly accelerated pace. The opportunity to digest newness which the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European enjoyed has been far less gradual for the twentieth century Asian. The newness, more concentrated in its nature, is also more urgent in its impact. The accumulated results of processes of industrialization and technology, stemming from modern science, have pressed upon older societies so as, in some cases, to link Abraham with Henry Ford. Societies, already preoccupied with national "growing pains," are also summoned to grapple with issues of law, custom, and security resulting from vast economic and technical changes parallel to the political. Just as the spirit of Columbus transformed the vast ocean from a forbidding limit into the promise of a highway, and as Copernicus shattered the old earth-centered astronomy with its comfortable suppositions, so the twentieth century, spilling its manifold legacies over the older world, confronts its multitudes with totally new vistas of life and of meaning.
Consider the phenomenon of the Arabian-American Oil Company set down in the world of Eastern Arabia, and grown into a vast enterprise of oil exploitation since the end of World War II.

Formerly the region had changed little in the continuity of an immemorial past. Sparse tribal populations, governed and ordered according to ancient custom, eked out a precarious seminomadic existence in the area, while pearl-diving and coastal trade with Aden and Zanzibar constituted the only connection with the world outside Arabia. Such central authority as existed in the whole peninsula represented the most conservative, Wahhabi ideas of Muslim continuity. When that authority re-established itself in the first decade of this century in the spectacular capture of Riyadh by the late King Ibn Sa'ud, few could have ISLAM SINCE 1945 dreamed that the new leader would meet in Egypt two score years later with the two protagonists of Western civilization, Roosevelt and Churchill, as himself a figure of world significance, or that his long reign would leave the old hearth-land of Islam fabulously wealthy in oil revenues. Yet such is the saga of the house of Sa'ud.

The story writes itself not only in the names of the great but also in the lives of the humble. Bedouin and townspeople in considerable numbers have entered the employ of the Company or have found steady livelihood in subsidiary enterprises arising from its presence or its initiative. New projects are being developed—roads, railways, irrigation, preventive medicine, and commerce. New skills are learned accordingly and practiced for high and constant wages, replacing an economic form of life which was hitherto precarious and primitive. New attitudes are discovered as the new wage earners encounter the cinema and the radio, with novel methods of leisure-recreation and a new dignity, or dimension, in personal living. These accelerating changes influence more than they yet include and penetrate in repute where they do not yet penetrate in fact. The present generation has moved further than a whole score of its predecessors. One of the largest groups of Americans resident on non-American soil can hardly be set down in so static a territory without pointing many parables of technology and opening new vistas to watchful, wistful minds. These are the new horizons of the contemporary scene. An Aramco employee familiarizes himself and his context with new and incisive notions about man and his technical potentiality to make his habitat serve his needs; about a money economy and its advantages; about a society in which women and marriage are governed by other concepts, where leisure, literacy, comfort, and security replace the old perpetual struggle and the old uncertain life.

If other examples lack something of this spectacular quality, it is not because they are less inclusive or less radical. There is a steady and perceptible change in the lot of the fallahin. Peasant poverty, disease, and ignorance are still massive. But some state lands have been distributed among the landless in Iran

THE CONTEMPORARY SETTING start has been made on the long and arduous road toward the liquidation of Egypt's extreme social inequalities. The peasant in Iran, the Arab states, Egypt, and the Sudan is the clue to the deepest questions. And the peasant of today is not the peasant of fifty years ago. His expectation of life is somewhat longer; the suffrage may have come his way, in some cases almost too often; a governmental village center may have entered, if still tentatively, into his agricultural and personal problems. Modest at best and still pathetically insufficient, these measures of social concern for all their paucity are the promise of what can be.

Without them the peasant's existence is one unhappy treadmill of "todays" in which the capacity to think of a future beyond the next meal is all but non-existent. The dimension of existence, a little here, more there, is beginning to widen. Like the inhabitants beside the moving frontier of American history, the oppressed populations in many parts of the world are coming to be sensitive of a new summons waiting to be answered, new possibilities calling to be tried. The people who were formerly ignored by pashas or forgotten by
governments now have revolutions accomplished in their name. Justice and equality may be hardly less remote. But it is something that they are evoked as goals. The village may be still largely what it was, but the city is much nearer and the world much more intrusive. Where illiteracy still insulates the mind, mass radio undertakes to inform it.

What is generally called "the cold war" might better be described as "the shadow war." For everywhere in Asia and in Africa there is a struggle in the shadows about what external order and inward spirit can most surely actualize the aspirations of the multitudes. If there is appeal in Communism, then there must be meaning in its criticism of the old and expectancy toward its offer of the new. It is well, therefore, not to minimize or misread the outlines of hope in the shadows of discontent. For when discontent succeeds apathy, there is a new dimension. It will be our duty below to turn to specific forms of Christian ministry within this discontent.

The argument here is its existence as, in intensity and range, a new phenomenon in the Muslim world. In recent Muslim literature, both Arabic and Urdu, there are poems, essays, and novels vigorously expressing this social discontent. The old Quranic saying that God does not help a people until they help themselves is assuming new importance as a call to transcend the apathetic. Fatalism was never characteristic of Islam at its best, but, to judge from the strictures of its reformers, attitudes that might be so described have too often blunted its initiative and atrophied its will to change. But those days are proclaimed ended. The creation of Pakistan as the condition of an Islamic social ideal; the revolution in Egypt with its philosophy of work and discipline; the Ataturk legacy in Turkey as an example of drastic and successful surgery—all these and many less spectacular efforts vindicate in contemporary Islam the obedience of a new dimension and response to dynamic impulses.

My ringing cry has urged along the road The throng that lost their way upon the Plain.

wrote the poet Iqbal.

The soul of Persia [he went on] moves at my song The caravan moves on, my call is strong:
Out of my restless spirit the flames start.
In the East's bosom I have stirred a heart.

If it is not always easy, especially in translation, to know precisely what the poet meant, and if the reconciliation of his meaning with historic Islam must remain dubious, the enthusiasm of Pakistan for his memory and the volume of comment on his ideas make it clear beyond doubt that he has become the spokesman of something deep within the contemporary soul. His self-imposed vocation as a pioneer is confirmed by his posthumous authority. The age then must have felt its need of him. If the Arab Muslim world has not hitherto produced an Arab counterpart, that fact need only be understood as indicating Iqbal's uniqueness in a role for which the Arab mind makes different provision.

It would be wrong, in any event, to equate a single poet with a great faith. There are areas of Islam where Iqbal is entirely unintelligible. Yet he is witness, as surely as were Columbus or Francis Bacon, that times change.

IV New possibilities then, resulting from economic development and intensive Western technology bring new aspirations in the population and these in turn mean a new participation and involvement in affairs. Muslim nations share in the shaping of international politics. They helped to inaugurate the United Nations at San Francisco and compose a sizable and distinctive "bloc" at the U.N. in New York. All this is in strong contrast with the scant influence of Muslim delegations at Versailles in 1919-20. The widely respected Foreign
Minister of Pakistan was recently appointed to the World Court at the Hague. Muslims have been represented, with other Asians, in positions of key importance in world organizations. More important still is the new dimension of individual life as it reveals itself in Muslim literature and life. Assumptions of a more static time no longer keep men in familiar roles. The social sources of national leadership are changing—witness, for example, the revolutionary Junta in Egypt entirely replacing the former pasha-politicians, whose class once enjoyed almost complete monopoly of "parliamentary" politics. Former schoolmasters find themselves cabinet ministers and private soldiers of two decades ago may become present heads of state. This is not to say that leaders like Sa'd Zaghiil have not risen to eminence in the past. But the fluidity of today is more remarkable. In his autobiography, the late Dr. Ahmad Amin, a notable literary figure in Egypt, recalled the circumscribed social patterns of his father's generation. The elder Amin was a shaikh and a lover of Arabic calligraphy. His life revolved exclusively around mosque and school. He lived in the strict disciplines of his religion. A newspaper he rarely read: politics played no part in his thoughts or actions. The British in Egypt, when he thought of them at all, he regarded as part of the will of God, and as such beyond his questioning. He ruled his household with a strict and patriarchal law, prohibiting his wife from leaving the house without his authority and never seeing his children except to give them studies or hear their Quranic recitation. His only concession to "modernity" was that he believed in the education of his daughters. He died in 1925. Three decades later it would be rare to find in Cairo a similar figure maintaining with like severity the familiar patterns of the old Islamic world. The generations before him had been full of such.

How contrasted is the politically conscious student generation of the present day! The student in politics had grown to be until the very recent advent of military regimes—an often crucial factor in Arab politics. Perhaps the student was all the more vocal because the influence of wealth in politics thwarted more constructive pathways to a political career. But the attitude that regarded the Western "imperialism" as a Divine providence has long since disappeared. Though the organs of political consciousness are far from finally established in the Muslim world, there can be little doubt about the growth of the thing itself. As in the Western "renaissance," men are less inclined to accept as sacrosanct the old allotment of status and place. Leadership in many walks of life is liable to pass into unlikely hands. The leading scholar is no longer necessarily the Azharite, nor the influential lawyer the learned in the Shari'ah, or religious law.

In all fields of education and scholarship there has been an emergence of lay leadership and the prestige of the religious custodians of authority is proportionately diminished. A Pakistani writer of repute, Kemal A. Fariiki, has lately made a plea for a change in the qualifications traditionally required in a mujtahid, or one fitted to exercise intellectual initiative in framing Muslim public opinion. He regards status in the community, reputation for integrity in commercial relations, honorable success in life as a whole, as better criteria than abstruse learning in theology and a meticulous knowledge of the minutiae of Arabic grammar and legal law. His ideas are significant. The prolonged nature of Pakistani constitution-making may be explained by the fact that so many interests demanded a part in it. This development may complicate affairs, but it argues a new participation for many whose counterparts in an earlier time would have been inarticulate and passive.

Nowhere is this so evident and so far-reaching as it is in respect of the women of the Muslim world. When Mrs. Doria Shafiq and other feminist leaders with a thousand followers besieged the Egyptian parliament, complaining that its representation ignored half the nation, they were voicing a notion which would have seemed to most of their parents, of both sexes, and to all of their grandparents preposterous and absurd. Few indeed were the champions of
women's rights in Muslim countries when Qasim Amin in Egypt at the very beginning of this century wrote his Emancipation of Woman and The Egyptian Woman. His ideas are now widely recognized and applauded. Though some elements are still fighting a rear-guard action in the name of the old concepts of woman in Muslim society, the main victories seem to be assured. Pakistan, Indonesia, and Syria, among Muslim states, have already granted women's suffrage and the first has appointed women as ambassadors. The electoral and political aspects of this change are not, however, the most consequential. Changing ideas of marriage are reflected in new developments in the sphere of the home. The often young, always illiterate, brides and mothers of former generations, whose orbit was the inside of a house, are giving way to the more educated and mentally vigorous wives and mothers of today. They tend to marry somewhat later and to enjoy their husbands more exclusively. It becomes increasingly general to interpret the Qur'an's allowance of four wives on condition of equal treatment as a virtual prohibition of more than one. Whatever may be thought of the exegesis, the result is highly desirable.

That a popular Egyptian Muslim author called "the unused lung" is more and more coming into action, to the benefit of the body social and national. For the home is in the end the nursery of the state and the school of the race. In enlarging the dimension of her own world, the Muslim woman is widening the potential of her own society for the better.

It has become the practice of late in many city mosques to install amplifiers on the minarets, which carry the muezzin's recorded voice more widely than of yore. There may be aspects of the change that argue cause for regret. But at least it is certain that the world below the minaret is now a world of larger dimensions and the voice for prayer has further to penetrate. The generation of today is more distracted, more preoccupied, than those of yesterday, thanks to science, industry, and education, to new remedies and new aspirations, to new bewilderments, habits, and demands. Perhaps the new medium may be seen then as a symbol of the new dimensions.

That the external changes introducing the modern age in the West posed immense problems is familiar enough. Many of these found no immediate solution. Historians have noted interesting delays and diversities in the progress of basic ideas in different realms. Many of the features of Islam at mid-century may likewise be regarded as various stages of incompleteness in the patterns of change. The paragraphs that follow have no hope of being exhaustive even as a catalogue, still less as an exposition of these problems.

There is first the political problem. The Caliphate, as we have seen, is terminated, and separate national expressions have replaced it. But nationalism may exist under a variety of institutional forms. What is the true form of the Islamic state? Should it be avowedly Islamic so that non-Muslim minorities do not share altogether equal citizenship? Are democratic forms to be followed irrespective of their practical results? Should representation of the people result in legislative assemblies with absolute lawmaking powers? Or should there be some tribunal to pass upon the Islamic validity of legislation? If so, how is that tribunal to be constituted and reconciled with the representative principle? Should there be necessary religious qualifications, like mosque-attendance and almsgiving, as prerequisites for the right of suffrage? How are constitutions to be squared with the divinely given in revelation?

All these questions have been vigorously debated in Pakistan during the six years' existence of the Constituent Assembly. They have also inspired much Muslim Brotherhood activity and writing in Egypt and Syria.

Then there are the questions relating to the actual working of political systems. Experience since the nineteen-thirties indicates that the party system, so successful in the Anglo-Saxon world, lacks important conditions for effectiveness and vigor in the East. The economic realities justify the fear that democratic processes may not be productive of stable and honest government. While there is no doubt that Islam is "democratic" in that it proclaims that
earthly power stands under law—Divine law and is instrumental to a purpose greater than itself, there is much in Islam to call in question the assumption that it is "democratic" in the sense that it believes in the people as the final arbiters of that purpose. "Government of the people, by the people" is hardly the political philosophy of the Qur'an where the science of government is in some sense "theocratic." Thus indecision, experimentation, and a search for the answers are everywhere apparent from Indonesia to Damascus. Alongside these issues of a political nature are questions of law and jurisprudence. Almost all the countries of the Middle East have completed far-reaching changes in their civil and criminal law in the last two decades. Only in the realm of personal status-family, marriage, divorce, inheritance, and wardship—has the old legal order of the Shari'ah maintained itself. Even here modifications have been made which in Egypt are quite revolutionary. Beginning with Turkey in 1924, Muslim countries have in varying degrees rewritten their Islamic law on the model of Western codes, French, Swiss, Italian, and British. The early antecedents of these changes may be found in the Ottoman Mejjelle of 1869, which codified some areas of law, and in the example and influence of the Consular (later the Mixed) Courts, which supplied the pattern for a reorganization in 1883 of the national courts in Egypt. But these nineteenth-century measures were limited in comparison to the major legal changes in all the successor states to the Ottoman Empire after 1920, as well as in Iran. The greater range and clarity of the Western codes have served to bring judicial procedures to a sharper precision and a more ready efficiency. It is not only the substance but also the basis of these adopted codes that is significant. The Muslim Shari'ah was followed because it was divinely legislated. Now it finds itself accommodated to, superseded by, or at best co-existent with, provisions and precepts of wholly alien origin. In the eyes of the old conservatism to erect the man-made and the extraneous into law as binding as the Divine is to commit Shirk, or association, since the human is exalted to the status of the Divine. The sanction of law is no longer the decree of God but the will of the state. In the case of Turkey, of course, these scruples were of no weight. Ataturk intended to be brusque with the past. When the preamble to the Swiss Code, which he was borrowing, referred to "approved doctrines and tradition" as a proper area of appeal if the judge found the Code or customary law silent, Ataturk feared the phrase might leave a loophole for reactionaries. He, therefore, substituted "scholarly investigations and judicial decisions." In Egypt, however, the new civil Code finally promulgated in 1949, provided that in the case of silence or obscurity in the articles, the judge should have recourse to Muslim law, and in default of that to "principles of equity." This provision is in marked contrast to the Turkish deletion. In either case, however, there are far-reaching innovations in both content and spirit. The various codes differ in their selectivity vis-a-vis their Western sources. But this only means differing degrees of the displacement of the old Shari'ah. The justification of these measures, according to modern opinion, is that they are necessary because changing times have made changes imperative, and that Islam is a progressive allegiance in "the spirit," not a slavish bondage to the letter. The argument from necessity is more convincing than the argument from freedom. For there can be little doubt that the conservative is theoretically right in resisting what is un-Islamic in its origin. On the understanding of a thousand and more years that it derived from revelation, Muslim law cannot suddenly and blandly affirm that its true basis is pragmatic, prudent and worldly-wise. Nevertheless time compels modification, adaptation, and enlargement. The modern mind is right in its instinctive awareness that Islam must either baptize change into its spirit or renounce its own relevance to life. Since it cannot do the latter it must somehow do the former. But the problem goes very deep and the debate is, therefore, sharp. What is the valid form of the Shari'ah today and how is its validity identified?
Many of the changes which pose this legal question belong to the economic realm. Here also Islam is confronted with far-reaching problems to which the answers are being sought in new expressions of the old doctrines. Self-government means obviously national pride. Nationalism generates the resolve to demonstrate self-sufficiency. Islam must show itself capable for the solution of twentieth-century problems. New commerce, modern finance, joint stock banking, capital investments, and foreign trade send the Muslim economist back to the Quranic meaning of usury, profit, and property for direction.

There is the pressing problem of population, since numbers are growing in almost every state and are seriously taxing existing, or prospective, resources in several, notably Egypt and Pakistan. A sharp struggle between quantity and quality exists in Egypt where the pressure of numbers is overtaking the increase of crop acreage and general productivity. Some observers see little prospect of success in maintaining even existing standards of living for a population estimated at thirty-three million by 1975. According to official figures of the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture, the population increased by 121 per cent between 1867 and 1952, while crop acreage from the same date to 1947 increased only 35 per cent and only 1 per cent between 1947 and 1952. It is increasingly apparent to many Egyptians that solutions have to be sought in limitation, in the conscious preference of quality of living, to quantity, in the family. In Pakistan likewise there are not a few minds seeking the answer to poverty and social distress in the same direction. The optimistic may urge against them a sanguine-or perhaps heedless-philosophy. But meanwhile the pressures grow.

There can be little doubt that the consciousness of this situation poses far-reaching religious questions for serious minds. There is the haunting fear that family limitation may be an unwarranted interference with the Divine will-an attitude which could, of course, disqualify inoculation and even surgery in sickness and plague. There is the traditional Muslim conviction that to marry is to fulfill half of one's religion and that the family ought to be large, since marriage fulfils itself in offspring. It may be that the growing emancipation of women will lead to new attitudes in this respect, as women acquire other social roles beyond childbearing and as monogamous marriage becomes normal. Yet it is doubtful whether the effect of such silent changes will be either prompt enough, or large enough, for the problem as it is. When the muezzin in the minaret calls his hearers to their true welfare-Hayya 'alii-I-faliih-there may well be searching of heart as to what the good of society demands of the Muslim in this vital area of conduct. The resources of Islam in its teaching on the social order, as well as the duty of Christian ministry in this context, will be taken up below. The Muslim world as a geographical expression may be full of empty places, but they are not where or what they need to be to provide a solution for areas of population pressure. It is from the inner travail of self-responsibility, serving the new nationalism, that this contemporary problem must be met-unless the solution be to leave it with God. And even then, there will be the question of what He intends in returning it to us.

Those resources of social teaching reflected in the muezzin's appeal are put on their mettle also by a further new issue, about which some Western commentators on the Muslim world are so glib that they are able to speak of nothing else. The problem of Communism has become a matter of supreme political preoccupation since 1945-the year the Soviet Union emerged from war with vastly extended territories and a new authority in world affairs, the year Japan was defeated and the stage was set for the Communist triumph in China. A glance at the map indicates that the Soviet and Muslim worlds are everywhere contiguous, from the Balkans to Afghanistan, and where they are not Islam is a large factor in the struggle over Communism-not least in Indonesia. Astride the frontier of the two worlds are several minority groups, Kurds, Azerbaijanis, and the like, while within the Soviet Union itself are twenty or thirty million Muslims.
Beyond these obvious points of physical or racial adjacency to Communist Russia are deeper facts: the intellectual appeal of Communist philosophy, the economic and social challenge of Communist doctrine and practice. It may be safely said that Islam under the test of Communist pressures in all realms is an Islam facing a totally new summons. In that sense Muslims of this generation are in a position unique in their history. None of their predecessors since the rise of the faith have had to contend with so vigorous a challenge on so many fronts. The quality of response which Communism evokes, and the doctrinal resources of Islam out of which the response must be made, will concern us below, together with the forms that apology, active and written, has so far taken. We content ourselves here with the recognition of Communism as a great new factor in the Muslim obligation to Islam. For Communism refuses to be ignored and avenges itself on those who fail to take its real measure.

We need to beware of vulgarizing our estimates of its significance in the contemporary Muslim scene by assessing it solely in terms of whether or not this or that country can be brought into the orbit of alliances for our security. What matters ultimately are not bases, defensive or otherwise, in others' territories, but truth and righteousness in their hearts. Cultures in the end can only be defended inwardly and of themselves. Their frontiers may perhaps be held by dint of alien force-alien force which may ward off Communist force but is no barrier against Communist thought. We need, then, to see Communism as an inward summons to the Muslim mind and will and to concern ourselves therewith. This means more than estimating Communist party membership above or under ground. It means more than labelling every restless stirring as Communist intrigue. Selfishness, especially when it is afraid, is a poor hand at diagnosis.

What, so considered, are some of the basic problems that Communism poses for the Muslim spirit? The need for a new alertness to the evils of capitalism, a rediscovery of Muslim teaching as to the validity and obligation of property, an assessment of the appropriate Muslim forms of social justice, an investigation of its own history for guidance from the past, are some of the issues. Underlying these are questions of human nature and its attitude to the community and to the good. Communism, with its brutal insistence on the necessity of class warfare prior to the dispossession of the possessed, and its doctrine of the inevitability of violence in social revolution, compels the honest mind to question whether it is enough to say: "X-a religious culture has what is needed, if only it is followed." For Communism is amused, not satisfied, with exhortation. When we begin to pursue the question and turn serious attention to why it is that the perfect law-whose provisions make a state of affairs where Communist strictures can find no targets-does not actualize the perfect society, indeed never has actualized such a society throughout its historical existence as a revealed law, then it is that the Communist compels us into attention to the mystery of human nature and. human recalcitrance.

How do we actualize the good society or obey the good law? How in other words do we come by good men? We cannot face Communism with any evasion in our hearts about this issue.

The role of human nature in politics, in economics, in society at large, as the crucial factor in social justice and cultural health, is more and more engaging the attention of Muslim thought. "The good that I would I do not, and the evil that I would not that I do...O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me?" St. Paul's impassioned cry is the final term of this problem when it is transferred from the general to the personal. Precisely because of its cynicism about any "good" not physically and politically compelled, and its superficiality in supposing that the "evil" is inherently economic and not human, Communism forces this whole tremendous issue upon our hearts.
It is no injustice to great Muslim thinkers on man's sin and the psychology of temptation, like Al-Ghazali, to say that the cruciality and urgency of this problem is new in Islam. It is a familiar notion that Islam is optimistic and sanguine in its estimate of human nature—that it is far less radical and incisive than Christianity. Man's sin is weakness and forgetfulness, rather than defiance and rebellion. Today, however, the criticisms by Communism of the social order and its ridicule of "religious" solutions force the Muslim mind to more searching thought about man and his remaking.

In some quarters a passionate nationalism would seem to be the answer to personal selfishness. But, aside from the danger that a national selfishness is a worse, because a bigger, menace, there is the doubt as to whether patriotism alone can always and adequately discipline the "egos." In his illuminating The Philosophy of the Revolution) Egypt's leader 'Abdal-Nassir describes the disappointment experienced by the Junta after they had, as a vanguard, fulfilled their mission and dethroned Faniq.

Endless crowds showed up, but how different is the reality from the vision. . . If I were asked then what I required most, my instant answer would have been "To hear but one Egyptian uttering one word of justice about another, to see but one Egyptian not devoting his time to criticising wilfully the ideas of another, to feel that there was but one Egyptian ready to open his heart for forgiveness, indulgence and loving his brother Egyptians."

The twentieth century as it is distilled into the last decade is rife with new attitudes. They are implicit in all that has been noted already. The Pathan tribesman in the Khyber Pass region who begins to enjoy the convenience of electricity in his remote homeland, where lamp and firelight have reigned for centuries, is clearly involved in several. Likewise is the citizen of Jidda who could pick up from his newsstand after April 1954 the first weekly illustrated magazine in the history of his country. The writer browsed in an Ankara bookshop in July of that year among the Arabic texts of the classical authors. Outside were multicoloured printed posters advertising air trips to Mecca for the pilgrimage. To cross the threshold on leaving was to step across half a millennium. New attitudes, then, are legion. But there is point here in trying to assess a few of the more significant.

Among the familiar features of the European Renaissance were the growth of independence of authority in law and letters, the diminution of the "clerical" influence in state and education, the emergence of novel claims to cultural independence of dogma. These tendencies were sometimes dramatic but also always gradual. Many similar novelties can be observed in Islam in our time. The educational monopoly of ancient institutions like Al Azhar in Cairo, Al Zaitiinah in Tunis, the Qairawiyyah in Fez, and centers like Deoband in India has been curtailed if not terminated. The process, of course, stretches far back to Ahmad Khan in India and Muhammad 'Abduh, among others, in the Arab world. Western institutions, Catholic and Protestant and secular, have also played their part. The modern universities of Cairo (two), Alexandria, Damascus, Ankara, Teheran, Karachi, Dacca, Hyderabad, and elsewhere, with many others in embryo development, represent the apex of great new state educational systems which reach down in varying degrees into the whole population, rural and urban. Thus the old mosque dominance over education, with its grammatical and theological emphasis, is almost everywhere broken. New studies, scientific and technical, have become familiar to scores of thousands of stu-

Personal and persistent selfishness was the rule of the day. "The word 'I' was on every tongue." Out of this sense of undoneness and chaos the Army officers felt compelled to remain in power, insisting that otherwise they would gladly have returned to their staff colleges. That decision was one form of reaction to the need.
It is the recognition of its existence which is here important. The remedy must necessarily go beyond any leadership, for leadership itself can so readily succumb to the temptations it bewails. It must go also beyond politics, even beyond ideology as such, into those regions where men and nations are made and remade. All societies in the world are wrestling in some form with this problem. All that might usefully be said about the loss of old values, the rediscovery of new ones, the stirrings and aspirations, the hopes and fears of contemporary Muslims, is somehow comprehended in the mystery of this old saying from the minaret: "Come ye unto the good?" But how?

dents. With the new scholarship go new attitudes of mind and new preoccupations, as well as new skills—the former loosening the grip of religious concepts on the mind, the latter giving the graduate a more remunerative and often more desirable role in the community. The religious graduate, learned in the older disciplines of exegesis and the law, is liable to find himself a less esteemed, perhaps less significant, member of the community.
The old is, therefore, on the defensive against the new, and this fear of its own partial redundancy is itself a new, or relatively new, trial.
Kindred changes can be seen in the attitudes to authority and tradition generated by scientific education. These are not everywhere militantly secular as they were so noticeably in Turkey. Drift, indifference, bewilderment, or just preoccupation characterize the secular Muslim, rather than hostility. Many Muslim writers have criticized the mosque personnel and have noted the tendency of shaikhs and 'ulama' to be unaware of, or unsympathetic to, the spirit of the age, and their incapacity, in many instances, to meet, with ease and equanimity, the challenge of the cross-currents of thought and opinion.
The old allegiances have lost for many their sacrosanct authority. There are senses in which religion tends to become a cultural expression rather than a theological conviction. This does not argue any diminution—but only a change—in the authority of Islam. Consciousness of history, of community, of political and social distinctiveness, continues to be vigorous. It is alert in its self-defence, without always fulfilling, or even respecting, the obligations inseparable from the old piety. To speak of liberalism perhaps confuses more than it illuminates since the term can have so many meanings. But there can be no mistaking the leavening of new attitudes to life, to authority, to creed, and to outward forms. Old institutions like the pilgrimage and Zakat receive new interpretations. The quality of this generation's Islam differs subtly from that of its predecessors. In terms of freedom and openness it may be a difference for the better; in terms of piety and discipline, for the worse.
Evaluation, however, is not our purpose, but only description.
The new sense of the right of scholarly criticism has produced a few—but only a few—incursions into areas of dogmatic sensitivity. A few authors have suggested new lines of Quranic interpretation or new accounts of matters de fide. But theology in Islam is far behind all other academic disciplines in hospitality to new attitudes. None the less there is discernible, for example, a tendency to understand the Qur'an in terms of religious genius in Muhammad, making him the conscious literary architect of its contents, hitherto understood as wholly God's revelation. Where theological sensitivities are not involved, Muslim scholarship is busily engaged in the critical understanding of Islam's long history.
Perhaps one feature of this newer outlook may be singled out here for reasons which will be obvious. It is the increasing readiness of some Muslim leaders of thought to engage in friendly and equal debate with other religions, especially Christianity.
There have been significant occasions of late where Muslims and Christians have met together for discussion. The Muslim impulse is connected with the belief that Islam epitomizes the best in all religions. The more willingness there is to hold this belief seriously
and with due reference to its tasks of research and study, the nearer will Muslims come to understanding those other faiths from within. While it would be foolish to ignore the strong tendencies to isolation of mind in some Muslim quarters, there are these contrasted attitudes of new interest and colloquy. They are a striking departure from the long traditions of prejudice and rejection in respect of Christianity.

Another aspect of the changing temper derives from the impact of scientific procedures everywhere in the world. Applied technology is liable to create a profound sense of the apparent omnicompetence of men. Drainage clears swamps and eliminates mosquitoes and malaria; aerial surveys may forestall locust plagues and with them famine and disease; inoculation banishes smallpox and new techniques produce better crops and serve public nutrition. Wells can be sunk to transform the desert and steps taken to prevent erosion. Space is annihilated by speed and the lot of man transformed by medical skill. The modern hospital becomes a perpetual wonder of human potentiality in the understanding, the treatment, and the conquest of physical foes and ills.

All these, and a hundred other, tendencies of scientific mastery make their happy, yet often disconcerting, way into the minds and lives of man-as the village clinic opens, a mobile cinema visits, or an airplane flies overhead. These revelations are profoundly new to people habituated to disease as inevitable and inured to hardship, bereavement, and poverty as part of the very stuff of life. Unsophisticated Islam is accustomed to a sense of the immediacy of Divine will bearing directly upon all the events and vicissitudes of life-a baby's blindness, a child's dysentery, a cow's death in calving. Then it appears that these disasters are preventable, that trachoma need not happen or tuberculosis prevails. Much that was regarded as the Divine order comes to be seen as human ignorance. There happens a slow recession of the sense of God, imperceptible perhaps, but real. It is a dangerous time. The omnicompetence of men is illusory since it arises only from submission to the secrets of nature. It is as servant that man is succeeding. A new understanding of the relationship of the Divine will to human affairs has to arise-a relationship which leaves room for the valid operation of other wills in genuine, if limited, freedom. Such understanding cannot be attained overnight. But meanwhile, the mentality that relied on charms, taboos, superstitions, and ritual securities has been transformed. Always we have to reckon not simply with the material works of the scientific age, but with the presuppositions that underlie them and the mentality they generate.

Reference to this phenomenon should not, however, obscure from any reader the fact that vast stretches of Muslim humanity are only slightly affected by technology. It would be folly to suppose that the rural world in Asia and Africa is anywhere but at the beginning of what scientific solutions can do for its needs. Any illusion on that score can be dissipated, for example, by a perusal of Anatolian Village by Mahmut Makal-a remarkable description of poverty in rural Turkey. Nevertheless, as those solutions do widen, travel, and multiply, experience should teach us to look for the familiar pattern of their impact on religious belief. All the foregoing does not exhaust the new attitudes in Islam today. Arising out of them are two contrasted reactions, both of which are in certain senses new. Professor Arnold Toynbee, in Civilization on Trial has familiarized us with the idea of "Herodian" and "Zealot" attitudes to alien pressures. There is the instinct to absorb and find compatibles: there is the instinct to reject and affirm distinction. Applying the contrast to Islam we find there are tendencies that reconcile Islam with the new, welcoming it, with some discrimination, as "Islam," and tendencies which express loyalty in antagonism. The two have to be pursued into the understanding of the past, where they both claim to find their justification. There is no space in this context to illustrate either outlook fully or to indicate the varieties that exist within each of them. What matters here is the newness in both of them. The "progressive" feels himself grappling pioneer-like with a new destiny. The "defensive" is conscious of a critical
duty new in history. Islam has been in danger before, he knows, but never quite so searchingly. He feels a vocation to serve continuity, just as his opposite number does. They differ in their understanding of what continuity involves.

We hear many voices affirming the Qur'an's interest in science. Nature, said Muhammad the preacher, is to be contemplated and wondered at. This means empirical science, with its investigating curiosity. Knowledge, whether it be of prophetic lore or academic learning, is to be pursued, even though the seeking take the student as far as China. Science and true religion have no conflict since the Islamic doctrine of TAUHID (unity) proclaims the unity of truth. The two disciplines, science and religion, differ only as to method. A notable Rector of Al Azhar, Sheikh Mustafa al-Maraghi, when asked about the Qur'an and science, answered:

True religion cannot possibly be in conflict with true science: and when we are positive of the truth of some scientific proposition which seems to be in conflict with Islam, it is because we do not properly understand the Qur'an and tradition. We have a universal doctrine of our religion which states that when an apodictic proof is in conflict with a revealed text we must interpret the text allegorically. Besides the Qur'an was revealed in the Arabic tongue which as you know is quite elastic.8

without raises in the last resort the question of the definition of Islam. Change is the context and continuity is the theme of the story. But when at any time in history we bring together these two, continuity through change and change with continuity, we are faced with how the one is validated and the other controlled. How is essential continuity recognizable as such? What are the limits of valid change? Who is to define and who enforce them? At what point must we say that change has become destructive of continuity with the old, that the old, in becoming new, has ceased to be itself? This problem which Newman, in his day and situation, called the problem of development belongs to all faiths. It amounts to the question of self-definition. Islam is involved profoundly in such a question at the present time.

It may be retorted that historic Islam is readily recognizable and that there is no problem of identity-belief in the One God and Muhammad as His Apostle. Yet a revered Muslim expounds Islam without a single reference to the Prophet. One writer devalidates what another asserts, both in the name of Islam. A doughty champion of Islam in Pakistan, Abu-l-'Ala Maududi, is in prison following street riots over his demand that a sect of "Muslims" be declared heretical—a group which itself prohibits intermarriage with, or the use of the same mosques as, the orthodoxy A Muslim Prime Minister visiting the United States equates Islam with democracy and decency in a sense which would make valid Muslims of those who had never learned how to perform the prayers. Examples need not be multiplied.

There is nothing unique to Islam in this situation. All traditions know it if their history is long. But its application elsewhere does not make it any less a Muslim phenomenon.

Finally, then, "Islam," as a term and as an entity, is capable of receiving and does receive new meanings. In the diversity of the modern world "Muslim" may be a variable description. Some features of this fact will be taken up later in Chapter VII, "The Call to Understanding." For understanding and sympathy are certainly required. There is much in the situation which resembles for some minds the oft-quoted comment of John Donne on the seventeenth-century scientific destruction of the "universe" of medieval thought:

Thus the faith is regarded as entirely compatible with modern learning and Islam can very properly be at home therewith, since it was itself the matrix of medieval science and has long traditions of tolerance.

But this concept still does not reconcile the liberal and conservative attitudes. For the practice of liberal scholarship may lead into conflict with established dogma. The former then
demands that there must be no limits to its range of enquiry; the latter requires that certain areas are de fide where innovation is heresy and intrusion unwarranted. Such a collision happened in the case of the doyen of Egyptian letters, Dr. Taha Husain, in his discussions of pre-Islamic poetry in 1927. Though he now affirms his conviction that the battles of academic freedom have all been won, there has been a marked tendency to refrain from asserting it in certain sensitive areas, such as the literary study of Quranic sources. Yet whether defensively meant, or conceived as progressive, the new attitudes are there—new in their sense of the bigness of issues and the fluidity of the times. Nothing since its origin has faced Islam, as the twentieth century has, with exacting obligations for the shape of its future. Variety, debate, and controversy are to be expected within a living entity set in the swift flow of events and charged with a rich heritage. New attitudes toward authority and new interpretations of past legacies are bound to generate, to evoke resistance and so to shape change and continuity alike. It is a sign of the vitality of the world over which the call of the minaret is heard that there should be so many voices sharing in its interpretation and claiming to formulate the appropriate response.

There is one final consideration about contemporary Islam into which we are now led. The pressure of all that is new, within and the new philosophy calls all in doubt. . . . It’s all in pieces) all coherence gone.

Come ye to the best deed. [This phrase among Shi'ahs only] God is most great. God is most great. There is no god except God.

There speaks the voice of apprehension, which fears for its familiar beliefs and conjectures the loss of all, the voice which, as in the Muslim Brotherhood, calls out for renewed assertion and strives again to organize the present in the form and likeness of the past. It is a glib misunderstanding to dub such attitudes "terrorist" and "fanatic" despite the methods they may be tempted to employ. They are fundamental protests against change seen as peril and adaptation felt as disloyalty. They are the attitude of mind which cannot find the old reality any longer in the new meanings.

But the new meanings persist and develop. The ancient faith somehow disciplines them in its own way and rebukes the fears of its loyal devotees, though perhaps not till the generation has passed that knew the fears. In the strange but inextricable interaction of the faith and the faithful, the ethos and the participant, Islam and the Muslim, the valid changes are digested and the essential continuity maintained. If the course of the process is sometimes obscure, the fact of it must be known and understood. To miss it would be to disqualify oneself from the assessment of what Islam is both continuing and coming to mean for Muslims in the twentieth century.

And so let us follow a typical muezzin in his ascent of a typical mosque in the audience of typical Muslims—if such a combination can be found. To what is it that he is calling the faithful, as with his fellows across five continents he reiterates through the five prayer hours of every day the ancient summons to Islam? At least in the words he uses there is unbroken continuity since first the pattern was formed. Whence come they and whither return? What do they proclaim and accomplish in their going out and their coming in? Here, with slight variations in the number of repetitions are the familiar sentences:

God is most great, God is most great, I bear witness that there is no god except God: I bear witness that Muhammad is the Apostle of God. Come ye unto prayer. Come ye unto good. Prayer is a better thing than sleep.
THE USE OF THE PHRASES of the Call to Prayer as a basis for a simple presentation of Islam has much to commend it. For prayer, in whatever sense the term may be used, is the recognition and expression of a relationship, and such a relationship between God and man Islam emphatically is. The Adhan, as Muslims name the Call—from the same verbal root, which gives us our Anglicized "muezzin"—contains the basic creed of Islam. "There is no god except God and Muhammad is the Apostle of God." It uses the all important word "I bear witness" upon which the issue-Muslim or non-Muslim—turns for every man. To confess this confession, with intention, is to be a Muslim. And further in the inclusive word "Fahih" to which, in and through the prayer, the Muslim is invited lies an epitome of the essence of Islam as a communal allegiance, a social order, and a religious experience. Various translated as "salvation," "well-being," "good," "welfare," and" cult," it stands, not for an experience of redemption from sin, but for a state of spiritual and social "prosperity" brought about by pardon and obedience to God's revealed law in the state of Islam, or submission. It, therefore, serves as a comprehensive concept within which we may describe the Islamic order for human society. In this way all the central doctrinal and practical aspects of Muslim religion can be suitably considered under the muezzin's guidance.

There are other considerations also. The Adhan supplies a welcome principle of inclusion and exclusion. In so rich and diverse a theme as Islam, the would-be expositor may easily be bewildered by the quantity of his material and be tempted to perhaps unsound criteria of what he should treat and omit. Moreover, the subject is beset with prejudices and can so easily be provocative of unproductive controversy. It may perhaps be possible to demonstrate at least the will to positive relationships with Muslims if a Christian writer keeps close to the pattern of the mosque's own summary. There is also the fact that seemingly this path of exposition has not frequently been followed in the many manuals, small and great, which have been published about Islam. The most useful of these, listed in the notes and bibliography, must be consulted by the reader who intends a more comprehensive history or analysis than these pages can offer.

But the final reason is what Pascal might have called "a reason of the heart" and is calculated to appeal to the imagination that source and spring of the active understanding. We do not merely aim at a resume of Muslim belief and practice. We take it in its own most intimate and inward imperative because we seek to know it, as far as may be, from within. We wish to hear at the minaret what it is which greets every rising sun and salutes every declining day for millions of contemporary men, and thus to enter with them across the threshold of the mosque into their world of meaning. For it is a world which deserves to be penetrated with understanding and for which, as we believe, there is endless significance in another world of faith, whose trustees we are and whose interpreters we would become.

What does the minaret say to the Muslim? The Muslim confession of God there are seven syllables and six occurrences of the I consonant. LA-ILAHA-ILLAALLAH. The first three of the Is are what the phonetics writers call "clear" dentals. The second three are "dark" alveolars for which, as Gairdner says, "The tip of the tongue comes back and touches the teeth ridge, and at the same time the back of the tongue is raised towards the back of the soft palate or velum." A heavy sound is then produced which, if not unique to the Divine Name, occurs there most notably.

If the reader is alarmed at this linguistic beginning he will relent on recalling that the muezzin is our theme. There is a quality about the authentic pronunciation of the first clause of the Muslim creed, which impresses itself upon every sensitive hearer. The "clear" consonants run into the emphatic final syllables of the word Allah: the latter cast their force forward into the consonant of the particle "except" (illa), and the result is a kind of powerful climax which matches the emphasis of the sense. It is true, of course, that the diction of many muezzins is raucous and strained and that the Divine Name often loses its forcefulness in certain
grammatical or other situations. But there can be no mistaking the insistent and incontrovertible character of the affirmation within the utterance. No English rendering quite captures the Arabic enunciation of the Muslim witness to God. "La ihya illa Allah." It is for this very reason that we avoid in all that follows the use of the Anglicized Allah. It is so far from its Arabic original, when pronounced with a thin English consonant and feeble vowels, that many an Arab Muslim would find it unrecognizable.

But more important, there have grown up associations with the English usage of Allah that are sentimental, having to do more with melodrama than theology. These should be shunned. There may also be the idea in the user's mind that in referring to God in Islam as Allah he is distinguishing that Deity from the God Whom Christian English denotes. When the word Allah is intentionally used in this way it raises a serious implication we wish here to reject. Since both Christian and Muslim faiths believe in One supreme sovereign Creator-God, they are obviously referring when they speak of Him, under whatever terms, to the same Being. To suppose otherwise would be confusing. It is important to keep in mind that though the apprehensions differ, their theme is the same. The differences, which undoubtedly exist, between the Muslim and the Christian understanding of God are far-reaching and must be patiently studied. But it would be fatal to all our mutual tasks to doubt that One and the same God over all was the reality in both. Those who say that Allah is not "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" are right if they mean that He is not so described by Muslims. They are wrong if they mean that He is other than the One Christians so understand. The source of the confusion of thought encountered here is that to say who God is necessarily goes beyond saying that He is. If men agree on the second what they say relates to the same theme or subject, even though they differ markedly as to the first. No faith or believer, of course, can say that God is without being involved to some degree in what He is. But unless there is radical inconsistency within the very concept of existence itself as applied to God-the sort of difference which does not obtain between Muslim and Christian-they are speaking of the same subject. Perhaps we put the matter concisely if we say that I predicates about God may differ widely but that God as the subject of differing predicates is the same subject.

Before, however, leaving the Arabic term Allah in order to keep to the English equivalent God, we must investigate its precise literal meaning. The Arabic form ilahun meaning "a god" is similar to the Hebrew and Aramaic words for deity. When used with the definite article Al-Illahu meaning "The God" the l consonant of the article coalesces with the same letter in the first syllable of the word eliding the i sound to make Allah. If we take the word to be of genuine Arabic form this is the obvious origin. If, as some scholars believe, the word does not have this origin but is historically derived from a sister language, its significance is the same. Allah means "God" with the connotation English achieves by dismissing even the definite article and using the capital letter-a device which Arabic lacks. It is clear from the negative form of the Muslim cred, "There is no god except God," that the existence and lordship of Allah were known and recognized in pre-Islamic Arabia. The Prophet's mission was not to proclaim God's existence but to deny the existence of all lesser deities. The fact that Muhammad's own father bore the name 'Abd-Allah, slave of God, demonstrates that God was known by that name prior to Islam. The Qur'an in many passages refers to Muhammad's adversaries in Mecca, swearing by God, invoking Him, and recognizing His sovereignty as Creator. The name Allah is also evident in archaeological and literary remains of pre-Islamic Arabic. But the people of Mecca did not understand or allow that God alone should be worshipped. Indeed they contended against Muhammad that if God had willed it they would have refrained from believing in other deities (Surah vi. 148), clearly implying that God approved of their concurrent idolatry. When, however, Muhammad came bringing precisely that Divine claim to exclusive worship they refused the Messenger.
There can be no doubt then that the Prophet's contemporaries knew of a Supreme Being, but He did not dominate their minds. Rather they thought more directly and frequently of the lesser gods, the daughters, perhaps even the sons, of Allah who were far more intimately related to their daily lives, their wars, their harvests, and their fertility. They were also much concerned with a multiplicity of demons and jinns who inhabited natural phenomena, especially winds, hills, and wells. The fascinating theme of Muhammad's inner revolt against these notions and the pattern of his crusading controversy with the Meccans in the name of the Divine Unity must concern us in the chapter to follow, on the second clause of the muezzin's witness.

Here in the context of God and His Oneness we are faced with the supreme sin in the Muslim reckoning, itself the corollary of its great negation. This is the sin of associating with God. The Arabic term is Shirk. Its significance must be clearly understood if we are to enter validly into the meaning of the confession. Associating is the belief that God has co-existents or partners.

There must be no alienation of His Godhead, or Godness. It is not merely that He has no co-equals. He has no associates of any kind or rank. This was the gist of the Prophet's contention against the Meccans. God and idolatry were incompatible. It was not enough to confess that God was; He must be recognized as God alone. All the partners whom the pagan Arabs associated with Him were truly nonentities. They did not exist and they had no right to recognition. Muhammad, it is true, continued to believe in the existence of angels and jinns, but he repudiated any notion that these were deities. This tremendous breaking of the idols, dramatized by the physical cleansing of the central sanctuary in Mecca after its conquest by Muhammad, was the supreme achievement of Islam. It was an iconoclasm which came tragically to include in its great negation also the Christian faith about Christ. In abolishing the daughters and sons of Mecca's Allah, Muhammad failed to distinguish the wholly different meaning of the Christian Sonship. To this day the Muslim principle of Unity stubbornly refuses to accept any understanding of unity which it thinks at error by the criteria needed to purge Mecca of multiplied divinities. It has not distinguished between pagan men alienating God's prerogatives and God in His own undivided glory working according to them. But the Christian problem of Muslim attitudes in this realm is to be faced below.

So it came that Muhammad, son of 'Abdallah, Messenger of God, proclaimed the Divine Unity and disqualified all other worships, annihilating in word and in action the partners whom the pagan Arabs associated with God. The word Allah itself is grammatically incapable of a plural. It is a proper name. Repeatedly the Qur'an refers to God as Al-Wahid-the One. The Surah of Unity (Surah cxii) declares:

He is God alone, God the Eternal [undivided] He does not beget and He is not begotten. There is none co-equal with Him.

It may be that this brief Surah is a reply to a question from Jewish or Christian doctors as to the Muslim doctrine of God, though tradition regards it as a very early utterance before such questions could have been formulated. It is held to be worth a third of the whole Qur'an and the seven heavens and the seven earths are founded upon it. To confess this verse, a tradition affirms, is to shed one's sins as a man might strip a tree in autumn of its leaves. This doctrine of the Divine Unity, of the inalienable quality of God's Divinity, was a tremendous passion in Muhammad's heart. By virtue of His remoteness beyond His intermediaries, God was half unreal to the pagans. To Muhammad He was the only real. The Meccans might acknowledge and yet ignore Him saving their intimate worship for familiar substitutes. Did not God Himself say (Surah 1. 16): "We know what man's soul whispers and are nearer than his neck artery." The Messenger was dominated by the Divine Reality and spoke of Him and for Him in the burning language of conviction. The strictly theological problems were all postponed, to be taken up in the centuries after Islam's expansion by
thinkers of other races than the Arab with more inquiring minds and less intensity of purpose. Indeed "postponed" is perhaps an inexact word. The problems were not consciously deferred. They were not even felt. They had no place to develop in a mind—​that was fully possessed with its single mission. There is no valid understanding of Muslim theology that does not first strive to enter into this vivid awareness where it had its genesis.

"There is no god except God." Except God. The negation was the form in which Mecca could most arrestingly be given the affirmation. Muhammad proclaimed God to them in a sequence of descriptive which have been called, on Quranic ground, the Beautiful Names, Al-Asmii' al-Husnii. These number ninety-nine though the collections are not always quite identical. Most of them are found in the Qur'an itself, the remainder being traditional. Their variety is explained in part by the poetic style of the Qur'an, which tended to the use of rhyming endings, derived from a much smaller number of original roots with nuances or shades of adjectival meaning. The Names have been variously classified and interpreted by theologians. Edwin Arnold's Pearls of Faith is one familiar English rendering. The well-known Muslim "rosary" (sibhah) or chain of beads, in thrice thirty-three arrangement, is a means of recollecting serially the Ninety-nine Names of God. They may also be seen in the Arabic numerals 81 and 18, adding up to 99, which can easily be read in the left and right-hand palms.

The most important of the Divine Names in Islam are the twin titles, Al-Rahmiin al-Rahim, usually rendered into English "The Compassionate, the Merciful." They derive from the same verbal root, meaning mercy or compassion, but the first should probably be regarded rather as a noun than an adjective, with the second qualifying it: "the Merciful Mercier" or "the Compassionate Compassionator." The sequence is not mere repetition. The Rahmiin is the One Who is in His character merciful. The Rahim is He in merciful action. He who is merciful behaves mercifully. His mercy is of His essence, and also of His deed. This double title is used as an invocation at the head of all the 114 Surahs of the Qur'an, with the exception of Surah ix.

The Basmalah: "In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful," is, after the Shahiidah, the most familiar epitome of Muslim devotion. It is used in the recognition of God in all the ventures and vicissitudes of life even more widely than the confession itself. Before pondering further the quality of the Divine mercy, it is necessary to study the more significant of the Beautiful Names.

The next most familiar are the contrasted pairs: "The First and the Last: the Outward and the Inward"—sometimes called "the mothers of the attributes" since they comprehend all else. They suggest God's eternity, omniscience, and self-sufficiency. The same attributes are affirmed in: "the Living," the "Comprehending," "the Self-sufficing," "the Abiding," "the High," "the Mighty," "the All-Powerful," "the Exalted," "the Great," "the Praiseworthy," "the All-Compelling," "the Guardian," "the Victorious." Another title used only twice in the Qur'an, Al Qayyilm, may be translated as "the Self-subsisting," though Al-Baidawi, the most famous Muslim exegete, suggests the physical sense of "the always Erect"—"the Standing." The term graphically conveys the idea of God in alert relationship to the world. This eternal and all-encompassing God is described as "the Creator," "the Fashioner," "the Life-Giver," "the Provider," "the Opener," "the Bestower," "the Prevailer." He brings to life and He brings to death. He is "the Reckoner" and "the Recorder," He is "the King of Kingship" and "the Lord of the worlds." It is repeatedly declared in the Qur'an that there is no strength and no power save in Him. "He is over all things supreme." His also is the final knowledge. For the Muslim who has entered into this understanding, all problems end in, or are lost in, the phrase:

"God is the Knowing One." He is the One who is always "Aware." He hears, sees, and discerns. Nothing escapes His watchfulness or eludes His gaze.
The actions appropriate to these names, most of which are participial or adjectival forms, are frequently noted in the events and situations of the Quranic story. The relation of God to His Prophet, to His believing community, and to His adversaries is depicted in the active sense of these attributes. The Names are far, then, from being mere attributes to be listed in a theology: they are awesome realities of daily life. For God is Al-Haqq "the Rea", "the Veritable." He is the Supreme Reality of all existence, whose nearness, judgment, and will are the great facts of human life.

The relative frequency with which the different names occur is a matter of deep interest. The terms, or their corresponding verbs, that have to do with strength, majesty, and greatness are most prominent. There are also certain nouns used occasionally, such as "Peace" (Surah lix. 23) with the sense, probably, of self-perfection, "Justice" (in the tradition only), and "Light." The last occurs in the oft-quoted passage from the Surah (xxiv. 35) which bears the title "Light."

God is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The likeness of His Light is a niche wherein is a lamp. The lamp is in a glass. The glass is like a brilliant star lit from a blessed tree, an olive neither of the East nor of the West, whose oil would almost give light though no fire touched it. Light upon light.

The Prophet, it is said, was once asked about seeing God. "Can one see light?" was his reply. There are a few passages, outside the very frequent usage of Al-Rahmiin al-Rahim, which refer to God's mercy. The word Quddiis, or "Holy," is used in the Qur'an of God on two occasions. It is also applied to the Spirit, to Gabriel the archangel, to the angels, and to places of revelation. Its precise connotation is not readily apprehended. God is described as "the Forgiver" in several passages using three different derivatives from the same verbal root. He is also described as the "One Who repents and relents," "the Kindly," and "the Clement." Two passages only use the word Wadjid meaning "Loving," the second adding: "The Lord of the Throne, the Glorious, the Doer of what He intends" (Surah lxxxv. 14-16). That final phrase is indeed the perpetual condition of all the attributes. They are to be understood finally as characteristics of the Divine will rather than laws of His nature. Action, that is, arising from such descriptives may be expected, but not as a matter of necessity. What gives unity to all God's dealings is that He wills them all. He as Willer may be recognized from time to time by means of the descriptions given. But He does not essentially conform to any. The action of His will may be identified in this or that quality: His will of itself is inscrutable. One may not, therefore, say that God is necessarily loving, holy, righteous, clement, or relenting, in every and all relations.

It is this fact which explains the antithesis in certain of the Names. Such antithesis would not be theologically predicable if either element within it were essential to God's nature. Seeing they are not His action may demonstrate each element in differing relation. The antithesis is dogmatically resolved in the realm of will, in that God wills both in every other sense and realm, it remains. But the problem has no anguish and is, indeed, inscrutable, given the conviction of the Divine will as an ultimate beyond which neither reason nor revelation go. So God is "the One Who leads astray," as well as "the One Who guides." He is "the One Who brings damage," as also does Satan. He is described also by terms like "the Bringer-down," "the Compeller" or "Tyrant," "the Haughty" -all of which, when used of men, have an evil sense. In the Unity of the single will, however, these descriptions co-exist with those that relate to mercy, compassion, and glory. While we are concerned with Muhammad's own awareness of God we must leave the pressing intellectual questions, as to the relation of this unity of Divine will to the ultimate Unity of Divine Being which Islam confesses. It is the first unity which is perhaps most fully expressed in the single word Al-Rabb, "the Lord," by which Muhammad proclaimed God, especially in the period of greatest preaching.
One final observation on the Beautiful Names will introduce another important aspect of the Muslim understanding of God. There are other adjectives among the Asmii’ al Husnii which are also used of men, so that they stand for both the Godward and manward sides of the same transaction. Shakir, for example, means the grateful when applied to man, “the Cognizant of gratitude” when applied to God. God acknowledges the thankfulness man renders. One epithet suggests both postures. Similarly, Al-Mu’mi n used of God means “the Trustworthy,” of man it means “the trusting.” God is the object and man the locus of faith. Perhaps most interesting of all, because nearest to the Christian teaching as to the Comforter, is the word Al-Wan, sometimes translated “the Friend” or “Patron.” The root is very widely diversified. It means in its simplest sense “one who is near.” So Surah x. 62 refers to “the walis of God” - a phrase on which much mystical devotion to the saints of Islam has been built. Men may stand in nearness to God, even as Abraham was the Khalil, or Friend of God. But God Himself is also A. Z. Wiili “the One alongside” - in whose protection and succour man may find strength. So we have in the same term the idea of the human dependent on God and the Divine Patron of man. It may be added here that the Qur’an does not contain any articulated conception of God as Holy Spirit, though the terms “Spirit” and “Holy Spirit” are variously used in connection with the mediation of revelation.

Mention of these dual terms leads into the large and crucial theme of Divine-human relationships. For in so far as any doctrine of God is meaningful it is an account of such relationships. No theology could exist on the assumption that its theme meant nothing and mattered nothing. Certainly a monotheism so tremendous as that of Muhammad and Islam is through and through a Divine-human encounter. As such we must strive to know it. Whenever we study or confess doctrines of God we proceed upon parallel affirmations about man. So inseparable are the two realms that every theology is inevitably also an account of man. By what he means when he says “I bear witness that there is no god save God,” the muezzin is involved in an equally compelling faith about the men who walk the streets and come to worship in the court beneath him.

God’s relation to man begins in and with creation. The created universe takes its rise from God’s fiat. He says “Be and it is.” The initiative in creation is itself inscrutable. We need not relate the motive to the nature of God. He wills it. And all the sequences and generations of life are likewise willed. Nothing exists save by His providence, and there is nothing except Himself and His creation. All arises directly from Him and through Him. Man is His dependent creature.

As far as the Qur’an is concerned there is an unresolved duality about the Divine and the human wills, though the reconciliation is not recognized as necessary. Many passages refer to the will of God as the immediate source of all events. He has created both men and their actions. There is no other Originator than He. His is the Qadar, or “determination,” of all things and His taqdir, or “subjection,” covers all mankind and all history. Nature, whether animate or inanimate, is subject to His command and all that comes into existence—a summer flower or a murderer’s deed, a newborn child or a sinner’s disbelief—is from Him and of Him. Had God so willed, there need have been no creation, there need have been no idolatry, there need have been no Hell, there need have been no escape from Hell. This complete and stringent sovereignty of the Divine will is, however, counterbalanced by corresponding truths. The Qur’an proceeds upon them and leaves the tension of duality to the subsequent theologians. Clearly neither life nor religion can subsist on the inclusive hypothesis that God is immediately involved, involved, that is, without any human intervention, in all that is and all that happens. The Holy Book assumes that men are responsible creatures. Muhammad repeatedly exhorted his hearers to repent and believe. He treated them as capable of response and as responsible for their states of mind. He harangued
them as creatures of will. The creation itself, though in origin inscrutable, results nevertheless in a universe whose signs may be read for those who will to understand. The world is a witness to God's goodness and a means to His worship. Surah iv. 79 remarks: "Whatever of good happens to thee is from God: whatever evil happens to thee is from thyself." And there is the familiar passage, frequently cited in modern discussions of this theme: "God does not change what has to do with a people until they change what has to do with their own souls," arguing clearly that there are necessary human conditions upon which what God will, or will not, do is made to turn. The passage adds, however, that if God has willed evil to a people then none can turn it away (Surah xiii. II).

That quotation epitomizes the Quranic situation. God is the direct source of all existence and all occurrence, but man is treated as a responsible and, therefore, in some sense also a free, creature. The most characteristic descriptive of the, human status before God is 'abd, "servant" or "slave," a term that is so frequent an element in Muslim names. Man the creature stands under the Divine authority in all realms. He masters the natural world, in so far as he is allowed to, only by stooping to obey the conditions it imposes. The span and course of his days are ordered by God. Man is the creature of the Divine purpose and responds to it in worship and in submission. He is a creature also in that, when he falls short of that law, the offense is seen as lapse rather than as defiance. In its discussion of Adam as the archetypal man, the Qur'an does not see him as rebellious. For that would be to enlarge his stature over against God. It sees him rather as weak and forgetful, or lacking in firmness and resolve. Though still his responsibility and sternly required if God so wills, his sins are nevertheless rather his weakness than his revolt. Quranic man in other words is not Promethean or Shakespearian. When the stubborn recalcitrance of the unbelievers appears like a calculated defiance of God, it is understood rather as a delusion possible only by the Divine permission and as the prelude to their condemnation. Man is not able spontaneously to flout the Divine revelation. If he appears to do so it is because God has ordained this way to his destruction. For the rest, the sins of the believers, the delinquencies of the faithful, are lapses, over which there is hope that God may be lenient and merciful.

The status of 'abd makes the meaning of Islam) or submission, the only appropriate relationship with God. But to enter it consciously, to accept it for what it is, is itself by God's permission. The belief, or unbelief, by which men are distinguished into Muslims and non-Muslims is itself the determination here of God. Within the relationship of surrender, man recognizes the entire sovereignty of God in worship and behavior, in the two great concepts of the Call to Prayer-Salat and Falah-which will be studied in later chapters. The postures of the Muslim in the one and the dispositions of his conduct and possessions in the other are alike expressive of the single state of submission. In its finest form as exemplified by the Prophet himself, and by such successors as 'Umar, this relation of the 'abd to his Lord means a constant quality of consciousness and will unique to Islam. It produces a sense of totality in religion evident in the familiar refusal of the classical Muslim mind to differentiate between sacred and secular. Though many of the attitudes of the Muslim within religion may seem to outsiders to be in tension with his 'abd relationship, they are, as the Muslim sees it, nevertheless controlled and tempered by it. It is so because God Himself is inescapable. Therefore relationship to Him in everything is likewise inescapable.

There is not a private conference of three, but He is their fourth, nor of five but He is their sixth, nor of a lower or a higher number but He is with them wherever they may be. Then on the day of resurrection He will tell them what they have done. God knoweth all (Surah Iviii. 7).
It was this realization which gave to Muhammad's Islam that overwhelming sense of "the face of God" everywhere constraining the submission of His servants.

But surrender implies the revelation of the will to which obedience is rendered. The Quranic account of the relation between God and man hinges upon the fact of revelation. The Holy Book is the climax of a long sequence of volumes of revelation with which it is continuous, vouchsafed to a long succession of "prophets" of whom Adam was the first and Muhammad the last. Belief in God, therefore, for the Muslim involves also belief in His prophets, His angels, and His books. For these are the agencies of His making known His law to mankind. The revelation is conceived of, not as a communication of the Divine Being, but only of the Divine will. It is a revelation, that is, of law not of personality. God the Revealer remains Himself unrevealed. The Qur'an is a guidance for mankind. It brings that which men need to know in order to relate themselves to God as His slaves.

Revelation is not a personal self-disclosure of the Divine. It is for this reason, apart from its fear also of compromising unity, that the Qur'an does not use the term "Father" of God nor "son" of the believer. It allows only Rabb and 'abd. In either case, the terms require each other. If God is not addressed as Father, neither is it as sons that men come to Him. There remains beyond the revelation the impenetrable mystery of the Divine.

What the revelation does is to give men to know how God wills that men should live. It has a practical intent. It is true that intellectual curiosity has apprehended the Qur'an in many more senses than the practical. Revelation, too, whatever its intent, is necessarily involved in implications beyond law. The Qur'an has itself been understood as proclaiming this larger relevance. A crucial verse in Surah iii. 7 distinguishes between the unambiguous and the ambiguous, the clear and the allegorical. A succession of mystics found endless scope for their reverent minds in the manifoldness of the Qur'an. Nonetheless it remains broadly true that the substance of what God reveals is His will rather than His nature, and that the end of revelation is obedience rather than perfect knowledge. God sends rather than comes.

Though He makes plain, He remains above. Revelation is by tanzil) as the phrase goes, by causing to come down. God Himself is withdrawn in tamih) or transcendence.

Though there has been a vigorous, if intermittent, Muslim theological expression in history, the crux of Islam was law not metaphysics. Muhammad certainly was concerned only with what God demanded. His conviction was that God, in proclaiming His Oneness, proclaimed His sole sovereignty. In revealing His "Names" He revealed His relation to men. In sending His prophets and books, He communicated His intention for man in his affairs. Response and submission were the sole necessities. These beliefs were their own justification.

So the Qur'an was the speech of God, breathed instrumentally into the ear of the un-read Prophet and so transmitted into human ears by preaching and into the human mind by the record.

Problems implicit in the precise relation of that speech to God Himself were left to develop in later ages. God was simply uttering through Muhammad the words that would proclaim His Unity, warn "the associators" or idolaters, and guide the faithful.

It was auricular revelation in that it came to the Prophet's ear, as he understood it, in independence of conscious mental processes. It was oracular, also, in the sense that Muhammad uttered it without other argument than its own content, claiming implicit acceptance on the sole ground of its status as revealed, and his status as its messenger. The revelation did not envisage or establish the kind of situation in which men may speak to God, as to each other, and yet in the expression of those thoughts become truly instruments of a Divine revelation to all generations of the world. We cannot fully appreciate the Quranic doctrine of God apart from an understanding of its concept of revelation as something in
which God uses agents but teaches them by word, rather than by travail, by ear rather than by thought, by audition rather than by anguish.

A counterpart of the Quranic truth of God as revealer is the reality of God as judge. Indeed the imminence of the Divine judgment was a most compelling note in the original Muhammadan preaching. The Day of Judgment was not some distant event, but terrible and close at hand. It is proclaimed in some of the most eloquent passages of the Qur'an. It was the day of the encircling wall closing inexorably upon the wicked: the day of the reckoning: the day of the separation. Surah 74 on this theme is almost untranslatable. "The Qiiri'ah who shall teach you what is the Qiiri'ah?" it begins. The word has been rendered "the Clatterer" (Arberry); "the Calamity" (Pickthall and Muhammad 'Ali); "the Striking" (Bell); "the Smiting" (Palmer); "the Blow" (Rodwell). All of them fail. It might almost be called "the Knocking" if one keeps in mind the Hell's gate of the porter in Macbeth. It is a fearful summons striking terror into the hearts of all and ushering in the dread assize, the day of the retribution of God upon men. He whose deeds weigh heavy in the balance will lead a pleasant life. But he whose deeds are light in the balance will be thrown into the mother Pit. "And who shall teach thee what is the Pit? - a raging fire." That day is in the absolute disposal of God alone. It is a day.

as Surah lxxxii. 19 declares, on which "no soul hath any power at all for any other soul" The terrors of punishment and the blessings of Paradise are graphically portrayed, with vivid detail. The judgment turns mainly on belief or unbelief, with the idolaters and "associators" or polytheists in certain and condign damnation. There is some ambiguity on the point as to whether the confessed Muslim will enter the Fire. Though there are passages, and many more traditions, to suggest he will not, there is no ground for presumptive assurance. Only at the end will the end be known.

There are many aspects of the doctrine of Divine judgment into which we cannot enter in this context. The doctrine itself completes for present purposes that understanding of God-One, Sovereign, Omniscient, Revealing, and Judging-which Muhammad proclaimed. Wherever the Qur'an is read, pondered, and experienced this is the sense of God it conveys. When the muezzin in his witness links together God and His Apostle he bears witness to the identity, for multitudes of men, of the God they worship and the God Muhammad preached. The fullness of the Shahadah, however, is not appreciated by limiting ourselves only to the Prophet's word and time. A preacher's silences, in retrospect, are sometimes as meaningful as his words. It might be possible to expound the Muslim doctrine of God, in a further stage, not so much for what it says, but for what it forbears to say. It will be well, however, to attempt to hearken to the silences by means of subsequent Muslim thinking which did something to explore them. By these means also we shall be listening, as Emerson once said, to the centuries over against the hours. The almost fourteen centuries of Islam's existence, or some of them, must be consulted, if we mean to penetrate into the meaning of God in Islam.

It should not be supposed that the "silences" of Muhammad were culpable. His purpose, as we have insisted, was not theological debate. He was a preacher not a systematizer: a prophet not a theologian. His vocation was to confront men with the Living God, His law, His claim, and His judgment. But, precisely for this reason, the doctrine needed to be related by philosophic minds to its own assumptions and to other men's creeds.

Islam in expansion through the first two centuries after the Prophet's death came into contact beyond Arabia with Christian, Persian, and other influences which contributed considerably to its classical form. The entire Umayyad (Damascus) Caliphate (c. A.D. 661-750) was occupied with physical expansion and the Arabization and Islamization of the territories absorbed. Then began to develop under the 'Abbasids (from A.D. 750) the articulation of Muslim theological problems in the minds, for the most part, of non-Arabs. There is no intention here to attempt even the outlines of that story. The desire is to sketch the main
themes of intellectual concern, without losing sight of the fact that our purpose is not a history of theology but the Muslim apprehension of God. We must be confined to those questions which serve to illuminate further what Muslims understand God to be and to will. All the questions were in some way aspects of the meaning of Divine Unity. Tauhid was the term used to describe that theological principle by which there was only God and God was One. And all the points were somehow involved in the silences of the Prophet, the issues he had not recognized or raised.

The earliest questions were, characteristically, practical. In the time of the Umayyads, Muslims, even exalted ones, became careless and worldly. Many were content to confess the faith, but unwilling to live austerely in its obedience. Were they then true Muslims? And if rulers, had they the right to be obeyed by Muslims who were? A group known as the Kharijites thought they had not and refused allegiance on the ground that the ruler's Islam was invalid. Here was the problem of faith and works. Did confession alone make a Muslim, or was performance indispensable? This problem merged into larger ones. Who should decide? The community, the "puritan" groups, the worldlings, or God? How was God's will to be known in this matter? For indubitably He had a will and, moreover, nothing but this will could be done. How, then, explain the quarrel? If the will of God was being done in the actuality, the complaints were baseless, not to say blasphemous. If it was not being done, as the Kharijites insisted, then in this respect the will of God was being overborne? How came it that men could behave with such recalcitrance?

These questions, fed by other perplexities, shaped themselves into the most characteristic of Muslim theological inquiries: the relation between the human and the Divine will. The reader may be assured, or warned—as mood requires—that we intend no exhausting investigation of predestination, Muslim or Western.

The question was simply an aspect of Tauhid. Was God all in all? Was there no other god than He? If not, why was not His will necessarily done? Could there be any successful alternative to the Divine will? If not, why were men ever involved in disobedience? The course of thought oscillated for two centuries over this question. But despite some "liberal" tendencies, perhaps over-esteemed in Western orientalism, the Muslim mind was rarely ready to accept any view that left a real freedom, even unto lawlessness, to man within the permissive sovereignty of God. In the early tenth century the discussion reached its term in the classical solution associated with Al-Ash'ari. It was a solution that gave the questions back in the form of an answer. The Muslim mind was not prepared to compromise its belief that God was the sole Creator. Therefore He was the final source of every event and every deed. But it saw the need to recognize the role that man played in life and the reality of moral choice. To hold the two together it fixed upon the concept of "acquisition" (hasb). By this man "acquired" the action, which was created in him by God. God willed evil in the act of the sinner and good in the behavior of the well-doer. God remained the sole source of creativity; man remained responsible. The power and choice by which the individual performs his action are God’s: man "acquires" the action which is consequently his. Though this theory may serve to explain the illusion of freedom, if such it be, it hardly succeeds in reconciling moral responsibility with Divine sovereignty. But it pointedly illustrates one facet of what orthodox Islam means by the confession "There is none other than He." The belief in the Unity led into an even more searching question. Was God Himself morally accountable? How were the different aspects of God, His Beautiful Names, reconciled where they were morally antithetical? Could God be both "loving" and "the best of deceivers"? If we answer: Yes! Because He is One will and both the attributes describe that One will at different points, then what of the moral sense which disposes men to say, even of God, "This ought not to be"? Can we in other words forbid attitudes to God which, when found in men, are morally reprehensible? The instinct was always to answer "No!" since no limits could be placed on
God's action and no criteria placed upon His choices. His will was His law. Yet there were sensitive thinkers in the ninth century who felt that if there were to be valid moral distinctions applicable to men, they must have their ground in the Divine character. God Himself must be motivated by them. Otherwise they would lose also their human authority. These thinkers, therefore, preferred to think of "justice" rather than "will," as the ultimate term of reference to God, so that what God willed was always just and He could not be conceived as willing the unjust. But the majority of thinkers feared that this meant somehow a limitation of God. It left them also with the problem of how to account for evil, if the thesis of an only good will in God were accepted. Moreover, they were reluctant to believe that God was under any necessities, not even moral ones. So they fell back upon the belief that God was open to good and evil as He pleased and that His will was finally inscrutable. This was the measure both of the price they were ready to pay for the idea of Unity, and of the way they understood it. 

There are other clues to this understanding of God's Unity which must be considered in order to estimate it further. "There is no god save God" says the witness. How were human minds to understand the relation to God of the realities that issued from Him? These were chiefly two: the created world and the revealed law. Clearly God was in relation to men and the world. Man, as we have seen, was the "slave" of God. From God other existences took their rise. But were they necessary to God? Orthodox Islam has always inclined to the answer: No! For God is Self-subsistent.

Had He willed otherwise no worlds would have been. Yet to believe that the world is not necessary to God is a poor basis for religion, since it is liable to make unreal the faith that man has meaning for God. If prayer and worship are to be meaningful to man, he surely needs to believe that they are meaningful to God.

Much mysticism in Islam has solved this problem devotionally by bringing God and the world closer together, and explaining Muslim mind found decision difficult. It related to the sense in which men should understand the Divine Names or attributes. When adjectives like "kind," "gracious," "wise," and the rest were used of God, did the meanings hold which the terms carried when used of men? To answer with an unqualified "Yes!" seemed to bring God and men too close together and so compromise His transcendence and otherness. This might amount to a violation of Tawhid and an indirect form of Shirk) since human descriptives were "associated" with God. But to answer with an unqualified "No!" threatened all theology with meaninglessness.

In any event such terms were used in the Holy Qur'an and the Tradition. Their use must, accordingly, be valid.

Classical Muslim theology developed a form of compromise solution in effect inclining to the negative answer. There developed the idea of Al-Mukhliifah) "The Difference." Terms taken from human meanings-and there are of course no others-were said to be used of God with a difference. They did not convey the human connotation but were used in those senses feasible of God. When the further question was pressed: What then do they convey as applied to God? No precise answer was capable of being formulated. Islam here falls back upon a final agnosticism. Terms must be used if there is to be religion at all. But only God knows what they signify. Muslim theology coined the related phrases Bilii kaif and Bilii Tashbih. We use these names "without knowing how" they apply and without implying any human similarity. In a real sense the Muslim awareness of God is an awareness of the unknown. The revelation communicated God's Law. It does not reveal God Himself. He remains inscrutable and inaccessible to knowledge. Sometimes described as the negative theology, this faith that only God knows the sense of the terms in which we speak of Him has characterized Muslim attitudes far beyond the range of those who could understand its intellectual grounds. If some readers find the point under discussion abstruse, they can be assured that it attaches to the Muslim sense of God in everyday life. Only God knows. The problem of meaning in
language exists for all religions and is not unique to Islam. It can only be solved within the
conviction that the Divine and the Unity in pantheistic terms. But, though built upon possible
Quranic exegesis, this attitude has remained suspect among orthodox theologians. Yet if God
is One in a religiously meaningful sense the Oneness must leave room for the world as
somehow within its range and yet maintain the Self-sufficiency of God.

This was the problem of creation.

It had ramifications in other areas of life, notably in relation to physical causality. When
leaves fall and the seasons change, when fire burns and wounds fester, are these physical
events to be accounted for by causal connections in the chemical or physical environment? If
so, are they an area distinguishable from the Divine will? Are they independent of God? In
what sense are they attributable to Him? In more recent times this question has been
sharpened by man's increasing ability to manipulate natural causality for his own ends. The
modern Muslim tends to understand this as an aspect of the authority given to man in the
Qur'an. But many in an earlier time were required, by their understanding of the principle of
Unity, to believe that all these multifarious events issued directly from the action of God.
The problem involved in revelation, however, is even more controversial in Muslim
intellectual history. The Qur'an was God's word, God's speech. It was what God Himself said.
When, however, you use an apostrophe after God, and refer to "God's speech," or even
"God's will," or "God's face," you may appear to speak of a second thing besides God. The
word is clearly not the speaker. Yet it cannot be a second God. Nonetheless, if it is truly
God's speech, it must be as eternal as He. From musings of this kind rose the bitter
controversy, which reached its climax in the ninth century, on the status of the Qur'an. Was it
created or eternal? The final orthodox view was that it was uncreated.

For to think otherwise surely would be to render dubious its Divine origin. The more
adventurous thinkers, who were finally overcome, were impressed with the problem of
regarding as eternal that which was involved in temporal issues, in the fortunes of specific
battles and the domestic relationships of particular families. If these occasions in time were
themes or points of revelation, were they somehow eternal also?

This question merged into an equally puzzling issue where the human are truly meaningful to
each other: only in the confidence that the relationships God has with man are really
indicative of His Nature. We only put these convictions more shortly and sublimely, when we
say: "God is Love." Islam has never felt able to say that. The pressure of these problems is
the measure of its reluctance.

This brief attempt to convey something of the historical travail of Islam over its belief in the
One God must face one other issue-and seek forgiveness for the torturing brevity into which
it is compelled. This formal problem, like all the foregoing, arises out of the doctrine of
Unity. As a religion of revelation Islam believes that God has communicated His will and has
caused the faithful to use, if not fully to apprehend, His Names. This realm of revelation,
however, is not the sole source of human knowledge. There is the natural reason of man
operating from sense experience to study and know the external world. In the Qur'an there are
fervent appeals to man to recognize the splendour of God in nature and the sureness of His
ways.

A ready example can be found in Surah IV, with its repeated refrain: "Which of the favors of
your Lord will ye deny?" and its eloquent celebration of the punctual sun and moon, the
pearls of the sea, and the fruitful oases. "Lord of the daybreak" is one of the titles of God. It is
He Who has set in the heavens the lamps of the stars and bounded the everlasting hills.
"Praise the Name of Thy Lord most High Who creates and makes complete. He determines
the ends (of things) then guides them. He brings forth pasture and turns it into tawny stubble"
(Surah lxxxvii. 1-5). "Wilt thou not regard. . . the heaven, how it was raised. . . and the earth
how it was spread forth?" (Surah lxxxviii. 18-20). These passages are also understood as in
junctions to the scientific spirit. From this natural scientific area of human knowledge, certain ideas of God and man, of duty and meaning, may be constructed by rational processes. There comes, then, the problem of reason and revelation in their inter-relationship—again a large issue, not unique to Islam.

The Muslim doctrine of the Unity of God includes the unity of truth. Truth is not inconsistent with itself. Though it may be known by different methods, it is one essential truth. Accordingly, traditional Muslim thought has tended to explain the difference between reason and revelation primarily as a difference in method or means. It has two words, aql and naq, to describe reason and revelation. There is what man investigates and what God delivers. There is a tendency evident in some Muslim thinking to leave aside the task of reconciling what reason thinks and revelation says, on the ground that they are simply different methods. This may generate an insensitivity in some theologians to the full impact of scientific criticism. It tends to immunize dogma from critical exposure and to leave science mistrustful of faith.

Some of the greatest Muslim thinkers, however, have erred in the other direction. Writers of great eminence inclined to the view that religion and faith were the form in which the vulgar throng of ordinary men in the mosque could grasp spiritual truth. These men needed the help of symbol. The philosopher, however, with his educated mind, could dispense with external forms and hold loosely to established dogma. Such thinking was hard to detect under outward conformity. Founded on an aristocracy of reason, these attitudes were by no means common. But they represent another form of the tension in the Muslim mind between 'aql and naql, and an original account of their relationship. There are some in contemporary Islam who accept religious dogmas as a political or communal necessity without giving their minds to them. Moreover, the obligation to concerted theological thinking is not stimulated by the underlying feeling that only God knows. Conviction about the oneness of truth sometimes excuses the mind from the task of understanding its unity.

It is for these reasons that the Islamic faith that God is God alone is not always adequately articulate in the intellectual sense.

As Professor Gibb remarks, the genius of Islam is originally law and not theology. In the last analysis the sense of God is a sense of Divine command. In the will of God there is none of the mystery that surrounds His being. His demands are known and the believer's task is not so much exploratory, still less fellowship, but rather obedience and allegiance.

The foregoing venture into some of the characteristic issues of Muslim thought on God is in no sense an adequate analysis. It does scant justice to its vast theme. It is intended only as illustrating what faith in God has meant to Muslims, in so far as that meaning can be gauged in external debate. We can perhaps understand more fully the all-embracing principle of Unity if we take note of what it has meant to some who have essayed its exposition. We turn now to some of the significance of the confession of the One God for the moral life of the believer.

might in some contexts be called the "religious" ones are fulfilled, leaves men and society a wide freedom. The customary division of ethical categories in Islam is fivefold. There are those actions the performance of which is obligatory and their omission forbidden. Conversely there are actions which must be shunned absolutely and whose commission is forbidden. In the center are a great number of actions which are matters of indifference, where there is an entire option. On either side of these, but not as far as the two absolute extremes of "must" and "must not," are actions not commended but tolerated, and not forbidden but disapproved. Among the worst of the latter, incidentally, is divorce. Since our purpose is to understand the sense of God, there is no occasion to pursue this analysis further as an ethical study. Though the demands of God are thought of as paramount everywhere there are many areas where they neither enjoin nor prohibit. These areas of complete human
option are evidence of the largess of God. But even where no specific injunction controls an act the sovereignty of God is to be recognized in the attitude that enjoys the freedom. These issues implicit in the Muslim understanding of God occupied the minds of successive generations of Muslim theologians and philosophers especially from the ninth to the eleventh Christian centuries. A close study of the course of their debate would be a most effective commentary on the theme of this chapter. It would then, however, cease to be a chapter and become a tome. Some scant justice may be done to its history by means of three representatives. The first two belong to the "classical" age, the third is possibly the most adventurous of Muslim philosophers in the twentieth century. There will remain one vital task when these three authorities have been heard.

The first duty of the Muslim is belief; belief in God, His Unity, His revelation, His prophets, His books and angels, and the Last Day. This imiin, or Faith, must issue in Din, or Religion. The latter has its five pillars, Confession, Prayer, Almsgiving, Fasting, and Pilgrimage. These will be discussed in later chapters on religious and social life in Islam. They are the particular focus of the inclusive sovereignty of God which is held to pervade the whole of life. Islam does not accept the interpretation of religion which allows it to be understood as a branch of human life, a piece of personal privacy, or the area of existence that relates to God. All things relate to God and the God-relationship of man involves all his affairs. This inclusive interpretation is under some criticism from within in view of the factors demanding the separation of politics from religion. But it remains the classic Muslim concept—a God-relatedness in all things.

The ideal does not, in its Muslim form, take note of the human capacity for insubordination. It knows, of course, that man, in all realms, political, social, and personal, does not fully do the Divine will. But it does not take that knowledge seriously into account in its doctrinal estimate of the situation. It believes that human life is a realm in which the Divine will can be done simply by its being known—as known it is in the Muslim law. All is, therefore, in the classic view, an aspect of 'Ibiidah, or worship. 'Ibiidah is the abstract noun defining the attitude of the 'abd, or servant.

This does not mean, however, an extravagant saintliness or abstraction. On the contrary, the law, when those demands which Since three out of many scores is drastic selection, it may be well to explain why Al-Nasafi: is first chosen. Of no great distinction in his own right, he was the author of a creed in the second quarter of the twelfth century which had prolonged currency as a textbook and manual. It became the basis of later commentaries. Al-Nasafi: himself was a disciple of Al-Matur'id'i, whose school of teaching, along with that of Al-Ash'ari, formed the main orthodoxy of Islam after the controversies of the earlier centuries. With little to choose between them, the two schools fashioned and dominated the mind of Sunni Islam. To quote the main paragraphs of Al-Nasafi's creed in relation to God is to have in convenient form a concise statement of how orthodoxy understood its own confession. The translation is by Duncan Black Macdonald.

His creatures whether of unbelief or belief, of obedience or of rebellion: all of them are by the Will of God and His sentence and His conclusion and His decreeing. After discussing man's ability to do actions of choice within this decreeing, the creed adds: 'God leadeth astray whom He wills and guideth aright whom He wills, and it is not incumbent upon God Most High to do that which may be best for His creatures.'

The Originator of the world is God Most High, the One, the Eternal, the Decreeing, the Knowing, the Hearing, the Seeing, the Willing. He is not an attribute, nor a body, nor an essence, nor a thing formed, nor a thing bounded, nor a thing numbered, nor a thing divided, nor a thing compounded, nor a thing limited: He is not described by quiddity, Mihiyah) nor
by modality, Kaifiyyah) and He does not exist in place or time. There is nothing that resembles Him and nothing that is beyond His Knowledge and Power. He has qualities from all eternity existing in His essence. They are not He, nor are they any other than He. They are Knowledge and Power, and Life and Strength, and Hearing and Seeing and Doing and Creating and Sustaining and Speech. And He Whose Majesty is majestic speaks with a Word. This Word is a quality from all eternity, not belonging to the genus of letters and sounds, a quality that is incompatible with coming to silence and that has a weakness. God Most High speaks with this Word, commanding and prohibiting and narrating. And the Quran is the uncreated Word of God, repeated by our tongues, heard by our ears, written in our copies, memorised in our hearts, yet not simply a transient state in these.

And creating is a quality of God Most High from all eternity. . . . and Willing is a quality of God Most High from all eternity, existing in His essence. . . . And God Most High is the Creator of all actions of

An older contemporary of Al-Nasafi and a far more significant figure was Al-Ghazali (A.D. 1059-1111). A formal creed is one thing but a deep personal travail of conviction is another. There is no more eloquent document of religious experience in Islam, outside the Qur'an itself, than the autobiography of Al-Ghazali, known as "The Deliverer from Error." Though responsible in part for an unhappy anti-intellectualism in subsequent Muslim theology, Al-Ghazali illuminates, as no other writer does, the meaning of faith. Beginning as a successful teacher in the Asharite tradition, he experienced in his late thirties an intense crisis, in which rational confidence forsook him. He was overcome by a deep religious scepticism and a sense of self-reproach from which he was finally delivered by reliance on the path of moral discipline and intuitive insight. Herein he was greatly influenced by Al-Muhasibi, and others of the Sufi, or mystical, school, who taught that the knowledge of God turned upon purity of soul, to be sought by sustained asceticism and spiritual renunciation.

Al-Ghazali himself renounced his role as an academician and became for some years a pilgrim and a wanderer. Out of the fullness of his inner experience he found certainty of a different quality from that which he had known within scholastic theology. Something of his legacy might loosely be expressed in the idea that he altered the "person" in the Muslim confession from: "There is no god save He," to: "There is no god save Thou." The use of "He," only, serves to convey the sense of inadequacy in the formal relations of orthodoxy in the soul of AI61

Al-Ghazali. He saw the importance, as he said, of experiences rather than definitions, and recognized his lack, not of instruction, but of ecstasy and initiation. In "The Deliverer from Error," he examined the theological limitations of reason and offended hash, or discovery through illumination, as the sure way to the knowledge of God. Yet he was careful to recognize credal theology and he saw in the Qur'an and the Prophet the supreme example of revelation through and to the pure in heart. In this understanding he was aided by a remarkable sense of the psychological in worship and religious practice. His greatest work, known as The Revival of the Religious Sciences, discussed such themes as the psychology of temptation, the relation between ritual and belief, the disciplines of the soul and its intricacies. It contained forty books divided into two parts: (a) external acts of religious devotion, both Godward and man ward and (b) the heart and its workings, including both the destructive and the redeeming elements in human life. The whole was an eloquent
compendium of living religion, more deeply self-aware, more alert to its duties and dangers, 
more vibrant and intense, than anything in the history of Islam after Muhammad. 
Here many of the earlier "silences" were treated with a painstaking devotion. 
A prolific author, Al-Ghazali reproduced many of the arguments of his magnum opus in short 
manuals for believers. He also expounded his view of the theological limitations of reason in 
a famous work: The Disintegration of the Philosophers. Elsewhere he expounded the stages 
of the mystic's way through the degrees of the Divine unveiling. 
No summary can do justice to him. There were many commentators on his works. But thanks, 
in part, to the suspicion of reason he helped to generate, Muslim theological activity became 
more and more a matter of Quranic exegesis and traditional commentary. The celebrated 
names after him are those of Quranic commentators and historians of past theology. 
Nevertheless, no attempt to understand the meaning of La Ilaha illa Allah is complete without 
a deep reckoning with Al-Ghazali. He lived to express that conviction on its inward side as an 
experience and a way of life. He sought a psychology that would subdue every subtle 
challenge in the recesses of the will and spirit to the sole mastery of God. He practiced a 
loving submission that went far beyond the bare requirements of the pillars as traditionally 
understood. He taught men to realize that the Beautiful Names of God were not for 
description merely, but for imitation. Men were to strive after a Divine likeness, even when 
they confessed His credal unlikeness. The emphasis was not on the ways in which God could 
be meaningfully defined but on the attitudes in which He was to be devoutly obeyed. If God 
was called "the Repenter," man must know the meaning of repentance. Something of the 
starkness of transcendence was corrected and man's knowledge of God became a ground of 
communion with God. For: "If it assuredly be that God is beautiful, He must certainly be 
beloved by him to whom His beauty is revealed." The creature might remain the 'abd. But he 
was also a lover and this was the clue to the meaning and the health of his Ibadah. It is not 
without significance that the subtitle of "The Deliverer from Error" is Al-Muwasil, "the 
bringer unto" the Lord of might and majesty. For he was concerned not only to escape 
falsehood but to enter into truth and peace. Perhaps we may say that, for Al-Ghazali, the 
Muslim confession: "There is no god save God" had come near to meaning: "Whom have I in 
heaven but Thee? There is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee" (Psalm lxxiii. 25). 

There is a pregnant Islamic phrase which may serve as a bridge from Al-Ghazali to 
Muhammad Iqbal, from a great medieval figure in Islam to a twentieth-century thinker. It is 
the command: 
"Be fashioned after the fashion of God," or "Seek the character which God has." For this 
conception, which summarizes much of the message of Al-Ghazali, is also often cited by 
Iqbal. Born in 1876 in the Punjab, Iqbal became famous as a philosopher and poet. He has 
been remembered, since his death in 1938, with great fervor and admiration. It would not be 
improper to regard him as the patron saint of Pakistan where Iqbal Day is a national festival. 
In his poems, and in a series entitled Lectures on the Reconstruction of Religious Thought in 
Islam, he set forth a dynamic theism which, though not everywhere accepted, or even 
understood, in Islam, represents an attempt to express anew the fundamentals of Islamic faith 
in terms of modern thought. 
For this reason, though without analysis and only the scantiest exposition, he may be taken 
here as expressing the meaning the Shahadah has come to hold for some modern Muslims. 
Iqbal had studied Nietzsche, Bergson, and Bernard Shaw, among others, and sought in part to 
interpret the God of the Qur'an along the same lines. Crusading against apathy and 
decadence, he proclaimed the cultivation of the Self, or Ego. The universe was itself growing 
and maturing in dynamic creation, ever moving toward an unrealized perfection. Iqbal tended 
to see in the Quranic deity this continuous flow of creative energy and in the prophets the
special agents of creative life in which a dynamism was at work, to overcome inertia in the on-going surge of the life-force.

As a poet he availed himself of the privilege of suggestiveness, allusion, and even inconsistency. He was more concerned to galvanize believers than to define belief. He summoned the Muslim to exalt his Ego so high that God Himself would consult him before determining his destiny. He did not stay to explain how so daring a sentiment was to be reconciled with the traditional Muslim understanding of the sovereignty of God. His Lectures were of necessity more integrated than his poems. Nevertheless they left unfaced many questions involved in the "reconstruction." For himself, and for numbers of his subsequent expositors, he found the secret of Islam in creative dynamism. "God is most great" meant that God is the inclusive Ego. Muslim history became for him a unique example of dynamism at work. The worship of "the Lord of the Worlds" was the Ego affirming itself.

Iqbal addressed God in the words: "How farest Thou without me, 0 my whole?" The God Whom Islam proclaimed was also "the not-yet," the still-to-be realized unfolding of infinite possibilities. Creation was not a deed which made the world something "other" than God. It was, and is, the self-revelation of the great "I Am." The Islamic doctrine of the Divine Oneness meant that there is no reality outside Him. Nature is to the Divine Self as character is to the human self. A critical evaluation of the form Iqbal gives to classical Islamic meanings cannot be undertaken here. This brief reference does justice neither to the daring range of his intellectual flights nor to their often tenuous connection with what is historically Islamic. But their boldness and the reputation of their author are sufficient indication that, for all its authoritative simplicity, the Muslim creed is capable of widely diverse interpretations.

Without staying to ask what was the sense of Quranic passages to Muhammad himself and his immediate hearers, modern interpreters proceed to borrow and claim them for beliefs that may well owe more to current philosophy than to traditional faith. Such spirits are, no doubt, part of the valid fullness of any wide religious system, however disconcerting they may be to the orthodox. Even the most emphatic dogma stands finally in the meaning believers give to it. The faith that "there is no god save God," is terse enough, inclusive enough, vast enough, to mean tremendous, and not always recognizably compatible, things to different Muslims. If we have concentrated on the classical, historic meanings in this chapter that is no more than our duty to the consensus of the Muslim centuries. But it is with the fourteenth in the series that we are also concerned. Iqbal, who, for all his provocative quality, deserves fuller study, is here no more than a witness to the inexhaustible meanings which Muslims may yet find and proclaim, within their ancient creed of the Oneness of God.

Though the muezzin and his colleagues in the mosque are among the last to yield to the possibility of these modern interpretations of their familiar words, the sense of God is evidently more fluid, less clearly definable, among many of their listeners.

It is into this realm of the awareness of God in the Muslim community that we finally attempt to pass. Leaving behind the traditional issues of theology and representative leaders of interpretation, there is need to face the question: What does the fact of God mean in the life of the individual? Theology always issues in doxology when it is true to its theme. It is the worshipper, in the fullest Muslim sense of the word, who really demonstrates what faith in the Unity means. The temper it fashions in the people who hold it is the final clue to the nature of a religious faith.

Yet how formidable a task rightly to identify and to describe the elemental truths about this Muslim sense of Godly Multitudes of humble believers have given no tongue to their experience.

The sultans and viziers do not always speak for them. There are competing voices and discordant sounds. Shall we take Harun al-Rashid and his splendid autocracy in Baghdad as
an index to the faith, or its gilded travesty? The stories of The Thousand and One Nights, though, for all their diversity of origin and content, unmistakably Islamic, give the lie to as many Muslim virtues as they depict. That unpredictable tyranny, the cheapness of life, the successful villainy, and the unabashed casuistry—are these to be taken as the consequence, in some sense, of the enthronement of celestial will? The Assemblies of Al-Harraz, among the most famous of Arabic literary works, breathe a dubious piety and make a hero of a charlatan. Should their moral then be the ethical discredit of excessive transcendence in popular theology? And that old familiar charge of fatalism, as dogging perpetually the average Muslim believer, with his apathetic conclusion that what is, had to be, and what will be, will be—should these be the text of a critic's sermon on the Li'i liiha lii A liih?

Hardly. These are elements in the total picture. But they, and much more from all the centuries, could as well be attributed to the enervation of faith as to its vitality. Though the kind of compromise that happens to a faith is sometimes a clue to its nature, it is not in compromise that faiths should be finally judged. The student must acquaint himself with all that Muslim literature and history have to tell him about what God came to mean to Muslims. But it will be soundest in the end if he assesses the lights more than the shadows. He will find a consciousness of God which has produced a recognizably Muslim character, sometimes even of face, always of conduct. Pressures of secularity may have gone far to transform it in this century. But in history it is there. It is a temper that is grave, perhaps even a little joyless, but marked by probity and discipline. The sense of God's Oneness, at its purest, has emancipated men from all other fears and so fostered imperturbability and strength of soul. Legality and communal consciousness may have their demerits, but they generate a dignity and loyalty that are characteristic Muslim virtues. Islam's faith in God has taught the oneness of believers and class consciousness, though it may be economically real, is religiously repudiated.

The relative ranks of men diminish alongside the sole sovereignty of the Divine. Then there is hospitality, that identifying quality of Muslim society. There are attitudes of responsibility— to family, to community, to God—which mark the believing Muslim, as a moral consequence of the recognition of God.

But the task of assessing fully the bearing of the Shahiidah on the making of the characteristically Muslim temper and attitude is in the end too large and intangible. Nor are the necessary criteria all agreed. Our duty is rather to invite the student to keep always in view the reciprocity between the idea of God and the idea of life as it abides through the Muslim story, and to trace its workings as he can.

No doubt his surest clue will be the Prophet himself. For the meaning of God to Islam is told and retold in the biography of the Prophet in its inward compulsion and its outward success. We come back in the end to that eloquent "and" that links the Unity of God with the Apostleship of Muhammad in the muezzin's witness. It is in what Islam came to believe about the Prophet of God that the community found and learned its awareness of the nature of God and His relation to men. As Muhammad was the final instrument of revelation, so his story in all its aspects provides the framework in which we may understand the God revealed. I BEAR witness that Muhammad is the Apostle of God." So the muezzin and so every Muslim, in the indispensable second clause of the Shahadah, with its inseparable relationship to the first. Though there is no doctrine of divinity as to Muhammad in Islam, but rather sustained insistence to the contrary, the Prophet of Arabia's is the human name most closely associated with that of God. In many a mosque, great and small, the name Allah appears on the right, that of Muhammad on the left, on either side the mihrab, or above where the dome springs from its supporting arches. The two names are the double motif of calligraphic design and are uttered in close succession on the lips of multitudes of the faithful. "I bear witness that there is no god save God and that Muhammad is His Apostle." Small conjunctions often
carry profound significance. There is none more tremendous than that which links the One God with the human instrument of His revelation and His will, in the creed and the devotion of Islam.

A few sentences from a familiar manual of adoration in one of the orders of Muslim mystics, or Sufis, will serve to illustrate and introduce this theme. After the proper acknowledgment of God Himself, there follows the traditional petition: "Let blessing and peace, 0 God, be upon the noblest of all creatures, among men and jinns, the master of glorious illumination. 0 God, let

in Arabic. At the close of an intimate discussion of the pilgrimage in Ft Manzil al-Wahy (In the Home of Revelation), Haykal writes of Muhammad:

blessing and peace be upon him, his people, his children, his wives, his seed, the members of his household, his brethren among the prophets and faithful ones and also upon whoever believes on him and follows him, from the first to the last-our master and guardian-Muhammad." The manual continues: "0 God, make him unto us a spirit, and to our worship a secret (of well-pleasing). 0 God, cause his love to be our nourishment, whereof I seek help in magnifying him. 0 God, make the celebration of him life in our hearts. I perform it seeking help from it for his remembrance, and the remembrance of his Lord." There, in the same intimate association, is the recollection of God and of His Prophet. This mystical ardour may exceed in degree and expression, but not essentially in kind, the consciousness of Muhammad which pervades Islam. The more strictly orthodox disqualify some of the terms of Sufi fervor. Yet these only give a warmth of personal intensity to the general attitudes toward Muhammad in the community that confesses his apostleship and lives by the confession. In the spate of new publication in Islam there have been more Muslim biographies of the Prophet in recent decades than in the same number of centuries past. Most of them dwell enthusiastically on the same features of excellence and uniqueness. That by 'Abbas Mahmud al'Aqqad, a noted Egyptian author, may be taken as typical. Entitled The Genius (or Excellence) of Muhammad, it proclaims that his greatness is evident in all fields! He entered a world which had lost faith, and with it the secret of inward peace and outward order, a world which, accordingly, was waiting for the liberating voice of Islam. Muhammad was the paragon of both the preacher's and the soldier's virtues. He had eloquence, conviction, and intensity as the one; courage, chivalry, and success as the other. Superb in his gifts and character, he dominated his time as he dominates all succeeding history. No event that has since happened, writes the biographer (the date is 1942), has been what it would have been had Muhammad never appeared. Before him history is one thing and after him another. In similar vein writes another biographer, Muhammad Husain Haykal, former President of the Egyptian Senate and author of the longest and most scholarly of Muslim studies of the Prophet

His is a power which can lift mankind to the heights of the spirit where life will be brotherhood and love and care for the, knowledge of all that is in the world of existence, so that knowledge may illumine brotherly concord and love, and that both may grow in human worth and excellence and bring us by their protection into the fullest peace.

Comparable expressions of the surpassing merit and influence of Muhammad could readily be quoted from scores of Muslim pens in this generation. Our duty is to study how Muhammad is for these multitudes the supremely significant figure in history and what their conviction means in their experience. What is this Muslim meaning of Muhammad? The attempt to answer will be the aim of what follows rather than an analytical biography. The latter can be found in several competent studies in English. Our purpose may be served by adopting a division used in a popular account published in 1954 by Father Radwan, Minister of State in the first revolutionary Cabinet in Egypt following the 1952 changes, and entitled
Muhammad: the Greatest Revolutionary. On his title page are the celebrated words of Abu Bakr, the close friend, father-in-law, and first successor of the Prophet, who, summoned to his daughter's apartment after Muhammad's death, turned back the coverlet and addressed the departed leader: "Thou art my father and my mother, O Apostle of God, most sweet in life, most sweet in death." Muhammad in life, then, and Muhammad in death, or rather, in history. There is a passage in a later Surah of the Qur'an (Surah lviii. 12) enjoining an alms on all who seek an interview with the Prophet, though it is added that this is not to deter them if they lack the means. The Prophet was always accessible, though in later years, because of greater pressures or wider veneration, almsgiving became an appropriate prelude. To come into spiritual colloquy with the life of Muhammad is an aspiration that exacts a claim on imagination and painstaking. The student must be ready to pay in diligence the price of understanding. The Qur'an, although its biographical data is limited, is our prior source. The traditions are most unlimited. Both are alike demanding in their character-the former with its almost untranslatable "feeling" as well as its discouraging repetitions, its lack of order and its intricacy; the latter with their strange meticulousness, bewildering variety, and tedious fullness. Then there are the difficulties deriving from times and places contrasting so completely with our own, not to mention the formidable relations between dogma and history belonging to this field. All conspire to make a challenging task for any who would adequately face the question:

"What manner of man is this?" It is not that the general outline of Muhammad's biography is not clear. The hard part is understanding the full import of the facts. The latter can be readily set down. The historical fulcrum of Islam is the Hijrah) or Emigration, of Muhammad and his small community of believers from Mecca to Medina. This event, marking the beginning of the Muslim chronology in A.D. 622, makes the story of Islam a tale of two towns. The transition also marks an evident development in the function of the Prophet, implicit in the emergence of the preacher into the ruler, the "warner" into the warrior. Dates in the earlier life of the Prophet have to be reckoned backwards from the Hijrah at which time he had been teaching and preaching from some twelve or thirteen years. This sets the original call to prophecy at A.D. 609-610, when he was about the age of forty years, the date of Muhammad's birth being A.D. 569 or 570. Few figures of such significance in history have begun their active careers at so late an age as the Prophet of Islam.

Mecca was the first of the two towns in the story of primitive Islam. Though often surpassed in later history by imperial centers, Damascus, Baghdad, Cordoba, Istanbul, it has always remained the focal religious point in Islam, its name a synonym for a magnet of the faithful. Such was Mecca at the time of Muhammad's birth. The pilgrims who then came to it from widely scattered areas in the Arabian Peninsula were pagans. The Ka'bah or shrine, in the heart of Mecca, contained the famous Black Stone, an object of immense veneration, as well as numerous idols, the most familiar among them being Al-'Izzat, goddess of power, Manat, goddess of fate and Allat, goddess of fertility. These deities were far from being the only objects of worship. Arabian paganism at that time is best described as polydaemonism, the worship of a multiplicity of divine powers or agencies, associated with particular natural phenomena or events or places.

There is overwhelming evidence, from inscriptions and from pre-Islamic poetry and nomenclature (Muhammad's own father being named 'Abd-Allah), that there was knowledge of a supreme deity, already called Allah-the God. The essence of Muhammad's message was not the enunciation of His existence, but of His sole existence and of the criminal folly of all worship outside His worship.

Another notable feature of contemporary Arabian society was belief in jinn possession, often evidenced in ejaculation, divination, and the utterance of rhyming prose. One of the first and most persistent accusations against Muhammad was that he was demon-possessed. It seems
likely that he feared this himself before he grew into a firm conviction as to the heavenly origin of his revelations. There were dark features about this pre-Islamic Arabian society, this jahiliyyah) or Time of Ignorance, prior to the coming of Islam. Pressure of poverty led to the practice of infanticide among the bedouin tribes and outside the month of truce there was widespread feuding and inter-tribal warfare. Attempts had been made earlier in the sixth century to bring about some political order and unity, but they had failed for lack of a compelling moral and religious force, such as Islam was shortly to supply.

The picture, however, is not wholly dark, even on the religious side. The Qur'an speaks of men, known as Hanifs) whose anti-idolatrous sentiment was an important factor in the background of Muhammad's experience. The extent and precise form of the Hanif attitude are somewhat obscure, though the subject has great fascination. But Islam is later described as fulfilling the religion of the Hanifs) whose great ancestral prototype is Abraham, the hero of ancient iconoclasm in the name of the single sovereign Lord. It seems reasonably certain that Muhammad was, in some sense, the spiritual kinsman of these disclaimers of idolatry and that they planted in his searching spirit the seeds of ardour against idol-worship which blossomed into the experience that made him the Prophet of Unity.

Not compose it as orthodox Islam firmly insists he did not rather than that he could not actually pen any word.

Be the historical verdict on this question what it may, two facts are clear. Traditional Islam believes Muhammad to have been actually illiterate, so that the Qur'an is indubitably and entirely God's Word. Muhammad can hardly in fact have been a reader of any older Scriptures. What then of his oral sources of knowledge? Here, too, there is a tantalizing divergence of opinion. Some hold that the predominant influence was Jewish, others that it was Christian. The most confident theory on the Jewish side is that which actually gives Muhammad a Jewish rabbi for tutor in Mecca, assuming that he sought out such a person when his religious yearning was first aroused. All that can be said with certainty is that Muhammad knew of Jews and Christians and something of their history; that the former were numerous around Medina and present in Mecca; that the latter were strong across the Red Sea in Ethiopia and had a chequered, declining role in Southern Arabia and in the border areas of such princedoms as the Ghassanids in the north, where Byzantium merged into the peninsula. It was not, by and large, a Christianity calculated to present Muhammad with a fully authentic picture of Christ and the Church. Some of the urgent issues of early Church history, docetism and monophysitism, are mirrored in the Quranic account of Jesus as non-crucified Prophet-Messiah. But it gave to Muhammad, under what precise circumstances may never be known, the most fundamental concepts in his vocation and in subsequent Islam, a sure monotheism and a prophetic mission in which a Divine relationship of revelation, through a Scripture, created a community of faith.

It was a tremendous step when Muhammad became assured of himself as a new and final term in prophetic continuity, making a new book, and thence a new faith.

In The other, and apparently greater, factor in the formation of Muhammad's mission was the presence of "the People of the Book"-the Quranic phrase for Jews and Christians-greater because they symbolized the germinal idea of prophecy and of peoples unified around a "scriptural" center. Scholars have differed widely both as to the details of Arabian Jewry and Arabian Christianity in the sixth century and as to the circumstances and quality of Muhammad's personal contact with these sources. Traditions as to his acquaintance with Christian monks and priests on caravan journeys have to be treated with reserve. If we take the contents of the Qur'an as the decisive area for discussion of this problem, it would seem conclusive that Muhammad had no personal contact with the written Scriptures of either antecedent faith. The Biblical narratives reproduced in the Qur'an differ considerably and
suggest oral, not direct, acquaintance. There is an almost complete absence of what could be claimed as direct quotation from either Testament. The matter hinges in part on the vexed question of Muhammad's literacy. The well-known phrase al-nabi al-ummi, "the unlettered Prophet," could signify: "The Prophet to the people without a Book." to those who are as yet scriptureless. Certainly a great part of Muhammad's vocation lay in the conviction that his fellow Arabs should also have their Divine Book, an Arabic Qur'an, a purpose which awaited an Arab Prophet, in the same tradition as Moses, David, and Jesus. Because non-Jews are referred to in the Qur'an as Ummi, the word is sometimes taken as meaning "without Scriptures of their own," rather than "illiterate," though this argument is weakened by the fact that Jews are occasionally referred to also as Ummi. In their case it can only mean "illiterate." When the Qur'an states explicitly that Muhammad did not write the Qur'an, it may mean that he did.

If this be the creative background of Muhammad the Prophet, what of the circumstantial setting of Muhammad the man? Mecca was "no mean city," with its pilgrim prestige and its wide ranging caravan commerce. For Islam was not of desert origin, despite the persisting illusion which calls its rigid monotheism a reflection of desert vastness and the majestic sun. In its genesis it was an urban entity. Its founder was not one of the Badu, but a citizen and reputedly a merchant. He was a posthumous child and became in early boyhood a complete orphan, protected first by his grandfather 'Abd al-Muttalib and later by his uncle Abi Talib. His parents were 'Abdalliih, grandson of Hiishim, and Aminah. The young child thus knew the privations of poverty and yet also the dignity of a family line. For his parents belonged to a branch of the powerful Quraish, custodians of the sacred Ka'bah and the leading tribe of Mecca.

History has little to record, though tradition is fertile, about those early years. Muhammad rose to manhood with a reputation for reliability and at twenty-five was married to Khadljah, a widow his senior in years, in whose service he is said to have been employed. The marriage gave Muhammad security and domestic happiness though not-unhappily-any male issue surviving. Four daughters of the union grew to adult life. Two sons died in early infancy. Muhammad remained in sole wedlock to Khadijah until her death, which occurred at a very low ebb in his fortunes just before the scene moves to Medina. His plural marriages belong entirely to the period following Khadijah's death. She played an important role in the formative years of Muhammad's vocation and he was steadfastly devoted to her memory. Her death is probably reflected in some of the changes which later supervened.

Little is known about the Prophet's personal and commercial life in the decade and a half between his marriage and his prophetic call. But undoubtedly two formative ideas were working deeply in his soul—the oppressive folly of idolatry and the role of prophethood, through Scriptures, in the life of great religious communities, both corroborated by the strong, if rare, example of the Hanifs, with their repudiation of idols and their wistfulness for larger truth.

Brooding in the gaunt foothills of Mount Hirii in the region of his native Mecca, Muhammad came into the strong conviction that idolatry was criminal folly and that God the One commanded utterance against it. "Let the word be spoken." "Cry in the name of the Lord." God Who taught man the use of the pen and from Whom flowed all the scholar's wisdom was about to teach a more urgent and more potent truth, a word of mouth, an oral affirmation. Steadily the mission to be the mouthpiece apprehended Muhammad until it drove him into preaching and transformed the Meccan citizen into the "warner" from the Lord.

Such was the ground and meaning of Muhammad's call, in a brooding "wilderness" experience, where facts of conscious observation in the contemporary scene became articulate in a personal calling to utterance and warning in the city. Though Muslims in general hold that Muhammad's call did not derive from the conscious processes of his mind,
but came wholly from without, so that what he felt and said was entirely God's and not the
product of genius, of travail, or even of intelligence, that are the Prophet's own, it seems
impossible to do justice to his stature without reference to the personal context.
Let us, then, accompany Muhammad on the decisive journey into Mount Hirii' when the first
revelation came. It was the forerunner of many and the climax of a deepening experience.
The earliest accounts vary in lesser details but describe Muhammad as within, and then
without, a cave. He became aware of a voice and of a figure which stood compellingly on
every line of vision wherever he turned or walked. The figure was the angel Gabriel bearing
the message of God. His command, if the traditional identification of the first revelation is
correct, was to recite, cry, speak, in the name of the Lord.

Recite in the name of thy Lord, who created man from a clot, recite! For thy Lord is most
gracious who taught with the pen Taught man what he knows not (Surah xcvi. 1-4).

The commanding voice assured the wondering listener that he was the Apostle of God.
Referring later to the same experience, Muhammad is made to say:

It is none other than a revelation revealed. One mighty in power taught it to him, One endued
with strength and he stood erect on the highest horizon. He drew near and came nearer still,
until he was within two bows' length or nearer and He revealed unto his servant that which he
revealed (Surah liii. 4-10).

The injunction was to "Read," or "Recite." The word means the making vocal of that which is
already written. The revelation, here in its initiation and throughout, is understood as the
coming down of a pre-existent Book, a transaction that extended over some twenty-three
years during which the contents of the original Book ("The Mother of the Book") preserved
in Heaven with God were uttered, recorded, and then perpetually recited in devotion, on
earth. The instrumentality of this process known as Tanzil, "sending down" is usually that of
Gabriel or of a Divine Spirit. The recipience on the earthly side is Muhammad's alone,
standing as the last in the long series of prophets each of whom had received earlier "Books."
It was in the nature of Muhammad's initial experience that it should be successively repeated,
from that first occasion in the month of Ramadan until death terminated the then perfect
Book and took away the point of its earthly impact. It was well that the experience renewed
itself, for Muhammad's first reaction was dubiety and apprehension. He feared lest he had
been beset with malicious jinns or was the victim of a destroying illusion sent to mock him.
Reassurance, however, slowly displaced misgiving, thanks in part to the tenacious confidence
and discerning kindness of Khadijah, who solaced and supported her husband.
He had great need of her faith and friendship. The revelations were accompanied by intense
emotional stress, physical limpness and perspiration, and a state of trance. Though the onset
of the experiences subsequently came to occur without the same intensity of degree in these
phenomena, they seem always to have been present in some form as the qualifying
accompaniment of the "Quranic" state, as distinct from the other, personal deliverances of the
Prophet incorporated into the later traditions. In some accounts the state of Quranic revelation
had further physical symptoms, so that a camel, for example, sank down under the sudden
weight when the Prophet was riding. It would appear that the coming of the experiences was
unpredictable. In the Medinan years they bear more appearance of conscious relation to
particular, legal or administrative situations for which directives were necessary. There is no
time or place here to seek to penetrate into the deep inward mystery of Muhammad's
revevatory experience. It is perhaps too distant and too charged an area of historical
significance for any purely scientific analysis to be either feasible or sound. What is of vastly
greater importance is how these experiences shaped Muhammad's life-story and what they came to mean for him in terms of character and destiny and for his followers as a God-given reality.

As his assurance of the validity of his call increased, Muhammad began slowly to fulfill the preacher's commission and the revelations came in greater frequency. The style and form of his message is reflected in the earliest Meccan Surahs of the Qur'an, with their ecstatic quality—short, staccato sentences, proclaiming the majesty of nature, the evil folly of idol-worship, and the impending judgment. Though the style later became more argumentative and hortatory, with lengthy passages developing the themes of patriarchal history, the earliest deliverances are fervid and trumpet-like. Muhammad's reception in Mecca was at first dubious. His hearers were uncertain how to take him. Was he unbalanced, jinn-possessed, or eccentric? As he persisted, however, and became more defiantly assertive, within his small, mainly domestic, circle of early adherents, bemused interest passed into scorn and contumely. These, in turn, grew into active hostility as the people of Mecca came increasingly to sense in Muhammad's doctrines a threat to their dearest vested interests. They could not have known that Mecca's Ka'bah, purified of its idols, would remain as the integral center of Muhammad's monotheism, its pilgrimage prestige unimpaired. Had they known this in advance, their championing of idolatry might have been less insistent. But in prospect a threat to idols looked unmistakably a threat to the Ka’bah and thus a threat to the hegemony and income of the Quraish.

Despite this intensifying antagonism, Muhammad was personally secure in the constancy of his powerful uncle Abi Talib, who without accepting Islam refused to bow to intimidation or subterfuge and surrender his nephew. Others in the small group of believers, being more exposed, suffered considerably. In the sixth year of the revelations Muhammad encouraged a party to seek refuge in Ethiopia, whither a second emigration followed shortly afterwards. The earliest of Muhammad's prominent disciples after Khadijah was Abi Bakr, Al-Sadaq, two years Muhammad's junior and a staunch comrade. 'Umar, another close associate often thought of as the Saul of Islam, by reason of his dramatic conversion, acceded after the Ethiopian emigration.

Both were to become fathers-in-law to Muhammad. The fewness of these converts and the resistant quality of Meccan heathenism perplexed and tried the Prophet. Was the new movement to remain perpetually in jeopardy, a despised minority with no Arabian foothold, compelled to seek sanctuary across the Red Sea and denied victory in the central citadel of the idolatry against which it was set? Muhammad slowly ripened into a decision that shaped the whole future of Islam. The faith must find expression in a community which would insure it external force and the opportunity to prevail against the opposition. The Qur'an, in this middle Meccan period, lays increasing stress on the historical parallels of earlier prophets, all of whom are pictured as manifestly victorious over their foes. Noah's denigrators are drowned in the flood; those of Moses in the Red Sea. Abraham and Joseph, teachers of the Divine Unity, come into their own. Just as it had been with those generations so it would be with the scornful fellow citizens of the Meccan Prophet.

Little is clearly known about the internal organization and worship of the Muslim group inside Mecca during these early years. Institutional Islam is more readily studied in the second city of its genesis-Medina. Meanwhile, however, that city had not come within the conscious hopes of Muhammad. Only the decision was shaping within him that if Mecca did not respond, the faith of Islam must root itself elsewhere and find some civic cradle where it might one day grow into a purging conqueror of Mecca. The eleventh and twelfth years after Muhammad's call moved imperceptibly in the direction of such thoughts, with the future
center beginning to present itself. The developments came only just in time to save Islam from the possible Meccan consequences of the deaths, in 619, of both Khadijah and Abi. Talib, the devoted wife and the loyal protector.

Though their passing exposed and saddened the Prophet, it also sharpened the decision facing the Meccans. Should they slay Muhammad, their own kin? Putting him under a ban had been tried without success. There seemed no hope of silencing him.

Nor was he to be cajoled into retreat. On the other hand, since 'Umar, he had won no conspicuous allegiance. Even while they were debating he had returned from a preaching mission to Al Ta'if, southeast of Mecca, chastened, scorned, and upbraided, with nothing save scars and defeat. There seemed little likelihood that any other center would receive him.

Though Abi. Talib no longer remained to deter their threats, they perhaps need not take the irrevocable step. Islam might peter out in the frustrations of an odd enthusiast.

If they did reason thus, the Meccans reckoned without Yathrib, the important city to the north, soon to be renamed Madznatal-Nabz, "the City of the Prophet." A few of its pilgrim people encountered Muhammad in Mecca after his return from Al Ta'if.

They showed a welcome interest in his message and took back in their hearts the seeds of potential discipleship. Jewish influence in Medina was greater than in the Meccan region and may have disposed the citizens towards Muhammad's message. There were also family ties. Muhammad's great-grandfather Halshim had married a Medinan lady. Internally, the situation in Medina awaited a master-hand which might curb dissension and unite the factions. In 621 the Medinan group returned on pilgrimage and to Muhammad's great joy demonstrated their continued affinity with his teaching. In the First Pledge of Al 'Aqabah, they bound themselves to abandon idolatry, theft, adultery, fornication, and infanticide and to obey the Prophet in all that was right. They returned to their city and subsequently called for a teacher who had marked success in widening the Muslim allegiance.

Muhammad's hopes grew. "Northward, look!" he might have said, "the land is bright." He bided his time, concealing from the Meccans his Medinan links. He knew they could be relied on to appreciate that Muhammad at large would be far more serious a danger than a restive and frustrated Muhammad in Mecca. In 622, the Medinan Muslims returned, reporting a larger adherence to Islam and entered the Second Pledge of Al 'Aqabah, this time binding themselves to defend the Prophet.

This undertaking was all that he needed. It was an implicit invitation to seek a new base of activities in the northern city.

Muhammad ordered his disciples to emigrate to Medina where the Medinan Muslims were ready to receive them. The famous Hijrah happened with most timely expedition. The suspicions of the Quraish had been aroused and they had been anxious at all costs to forestall such a departure. But they were the victims, in part, of their own indecision and had not reckoned that the whole Muslim band would forsake all their immovable property. When at length they did take action, Muhammad and Abi Bakr, following in the wake of the main emigration, succeeded in eluding pursuit and made good their escape.

The emigrating party was probably less than seven score strong but it made one of the most successful voluntary exiles in human history. The step brought clearly into the open the logic of Muhammad's inner decision. The faith was built into a community. The city of the lawgiver and ruler made possible the ultimate reconquest of the city of the preacher. The tale of the two towns passed into its second period and both Muhammad the man and the Qur'an the Book reflect the inclusive meaning of the transition. Muhammad had passed upwards of twelve years proclaiming the message in which his mission was generated. The following ten years were to see him establishing the empire in which his mission was embodied and enforced.
Henceforward, the biographer finds the increasing amalgam of faith and rule, of creed and organization, in the Prophet's story. Those parts of the Qur'an belonging to the Medinan years are predominately legal and political. Their concern is with campaigns, confiscations, customs, and behavior, rather than with patriarchs and preaching. There are corresponding changes in the role and quality of the central leader himself. Those unmistakable elements of greatness in the suffering preacher prophet, bearing obloquy and calumny with tenacious fidelity to the truth he had been given to see, loom greater in retrospect than the qualities demonstrated in the mingled magnanimity and opportunism that mark the post-Hijrah leader. When Muhammad arrived in Medina the position was fraught with peril. The allegiance in which Muhammad had read an invitation to immigration there was far from unanimous. The non-Muslim Medinans, at worst resentful, at best uncommitted, needed to be brought into unequivocal allegiance. Even the Muslim Medinans were committed only to a defensive pledge. Islam now had two component groups, in a situation potential of much strife and misunderstanding unless a sagacious mind controlled them. For the Meccan fugitives were without homes and possessions, helpless guests of their Medinan co-religionists. Yet they had been longer in the Prophet's obedience and had suffered more. Tact and statesmanship were manifestly required. That Muhammad lacked neither was symbolized when he rode into the city and, throwing the reins on the neck of his camel, vowed that the camel should decide where his headquarters and the first mosque should be located-'thus saving himself from the invidious consequences of any personal choice. Though he succeeded resoundingly in riding out these initial difficulties, there was one area of his expectation where Muhammad suffered acute disappointment. Throughout his preaching he had looked confidently toward the Jews and Christians, as "People of the Book," to welcome and accept his prophetic claims. In Medina this hope had occasion to be tested, at least in respect of the Jews, far more extensively than was possible in Mecca. The result was bitterly contrasted with the Prophet's hopes. Closer proximity to larger numbers of Jews soon revealed to Muhammad that, far from acknowledgment, Jewry treated him with amused disdain. His claims they flatly rejected as pretentious. The inevitable consequence was that Muhammad became increasingly hostile to the Jews and interpreted their non-acceptance as disloyalty to their own inheritance. Islam became, from this point, much more distinctive and consciously self-sufficient. The Quranic passages, exhorting to friendly relations with the "People of the Book" and confirmatory study of their Scriptures, give way to flat disavowal and explicit condemnation. "God fight them, what liars they are" (Surah ix. 30). Most significantly of all the qiblah or direction of Muslim prayer, was changed at this time from Jerusalem to Mecca, evidently to the initial consternation of some of the Prophet's own followers. At this time Mecca, though associated with traditions of Abraham, was still idolatrous. The change of qiblah surely implies the intention to repossess it. Jerusalem's monotheism was a perennial symbol, which was none the less abandoned in the name of Islam's independence and distinctiveness. Apparently in the same context are the larger emphases concerning Abraham at this time. In the early preaching he had been cited as a preacher of God's Unity and as a champion against idols. Ishmael now comes into great prominence in association with Abraham and both are linked with Mecca and the building of the Ka'bah. Islam is proclaimed as the faith of Abraham, going back beyond the Mosaic Law, whose Jewish legatees had been unfaithful. Similarly we find in the years after the Hijrah a growth of distinctive Muslim rituals and practices, some of which will be our concern in the chapter that follows. Meanwhile the Jews, having failed to fulfill Muhammad's expectations, came increasingly into the line of Muslim hostility. But they were not alone in this experience. A kind of triangular situation developed in which the "corners" are Muhammad, the Meccans, and the Jews-excluding the non-Jewish, non-
Muslim elements in Medina itself, whose steady approximation to Muhammad's cause was brought about largely by their involvement with him in the other struggles. It proved difficult to live in the same city as Muhammad and not become physically implicated in his purpose. War, deliberate if intermittent, is what followed.

To set forth this period in the Prophet's career objectively, without offending modern Muslim susceptibilities, is difficult in the extreme. His departure from Mecca and Meccan hostility to the prosecutor of their idols certainly made for a situation of potential conflict. It should be noted that some of Muhammad's allegiance and circle, remaining in Mecca after his departure, were unmolested. The Muslim thesis, however, is that the campaigns which followed were essentially defensive. They were necessary to the survival of Islam. The position of the Qur'an itself is that war, not least in the month of truce, is essentially an evil, but the threatened extinction of Islam is a far greater evil (Surah ii. 217). Peace, therefore, is not to be preferred to war, until Islam is inviolable and secure. Muhammad is to be the judge of the extent and persistence of the danger which justifies fighting. Some observers interpret this necessity to fight as arising from the need to provide, through booty, for the unhoused Muhajirun or immigrants, to consolidate all Medina by implication in Muhammad's cause, and to accumulate the means of warfare for the final conquest of Mecca. But taking the basic thesis of Muslim apology that the wars were defensive, another basic decision is evidently involved, namely, that religious survival should be served and guaranteed by force. Muhammad's policy, as recognized by the fourteen slain to some fifty of the Meccans, not to mention a large number of captives. Muslim history regards the Battle of Badr as crucial. Certainly the sword was unleashed and the scabbard cast away. The Jihiid, or appeal to battle, had been irrevocably invoked.

Before the Muslims faced the inevitable Meccan reaction to this reverse, the opportunity was taken to bring increasing pressure upon the Jews, several of whom were put to death or dispossessed. Within a month after the return from Badr there were individual acts of intimidation, culminating in the expulsion of the Banii Qainuqa'a. Almost a year after Badr, came the Meccan advance to revenge. On this second occasion the issue was less favorable. Apparently in overconfidence the Muslims lost discipline and were in danger of being routed. They were only rallied in a desperate effort by the Prophet himself. The Quranic passage relating to the Battle (Surah iii. 120 seq.) rebuked the Muslim presumption and interpreted the reverse as a test of faith and a deserved chastisement. Over seventy Muslims were slain to some twenty of the Quraish. Muhammad had need of all his resourcefulness to survive the serious loss of prestige, though the Meccans on their side do not seem to have realized or utilized the full extent of their victory. They withdrew after mutilating the dead and Muhammad, after a delayed show of pursuit, returned to Medina. Perhaps enheartened by this set-back, perhaps fearful of further Muslim evident from the ill-starred and inept "siege" of Medina known in Muslim history as "the Battle of the Ditch."

Like people acting inadvisably out of fear and bewilderment, they only succeeded in fulfilling their worst dread. The siege was raised after the besiegers found the weather too cold for them and the irresolute Quraish, lacking energetic leadership, withdrew, leaving their Jewish partners to face the accumulated wrath of Muhammad. There followed the massacre of the Banii Quraizah which marks the darkest depth of Muslim policy, a depth which the palliatives suggested by some modern Muslim historians quite fail to measure. The whole tribe was dispossessed and after suing for clemency, the women and children were enslaved, while the men, traditionally numbered at seven hundred, were executed beside long trench graves in a day of signal terror. The fearful fate of the Banii Quraizah far outweighed their deserts and contrasted darkly with the magnanimity of Muhammad when subsequently he faced their Meccan allies in the "siege" after his re-conquest of the Holy City.
But the circumstances were different. Muhammad, by canons of soldierly wisdom, could hardly yet afford to be magnanimous. Not all the Muhiijiriln Muslims were yet re-propertied, nor was the situation at all secure in the region. In approving, and later eulogizing in a funeral speech, the judge who had decided the sentence on the Banii Quraizah, Muhammad was no doubt following the behests of a stern policy. Certainly the step succeeded. Disaffection, both religious and political, was cowed into paralysis, if not submission, throughout Medina. The next main confiscatory enterprise took the Muslims some hundred miles north of the city to the Jews of rich Khaibar, who could have been only remotely related to Medinan affairs but who none the less were made to forfeit all their possessions. This immense plunder greatly consolidated and enlarged Muhammad's potential. Meanwhile his decision to revisit Mecca in A.D. 628 six years after the Hijrah revealed the direction in which his policy was moving and for which the potential was required. The Meccans, having word of his coming, refused to admit him as a pilgrim, fearing the consequences, but entered into an agreement whereby he would be free to make the pilgrimage peacefully the following year, when the Meccans themselves would evacuate the city for three days. As part of this compact, known as the Treaty of Al-Hudaibiyyah, Muhammad agreed to a ten years’ truce between the Muslims and the Quraish, during which either side would be free to federate with any tribes. He also allowed a Meccan right to extradite all fugitive Meccans coming over to Islam, while conceding that any fugitive Muslims returning to Mecca should not be handed back by the Meccans. This seemed to some of Muhammad's followers a concession of weakness and he was much criticized also for deferring to a Meccan demand that he should not sign the treaty document as Apostle of God, but as Muhammad, son of 'Abdallah. But the Prophet was playing his hand shrewdly and overrode the querulous Muslims. He had established a kind of equality with the Meccans, by with potentates in the Christian world to Islamize, and in expeditions into Ghassanid territory, he concentrated on the prior Meccan objective. When a tribe in treaty-bonds with the Quraish attacked another tribe in alliance with Medina, he denounced the truce and refused to heed the pleas of Abi Safyan, personally made in Medina, for its restoration. The head of the Quraish returned to Mecca with no assurances and much misgiving. But even with this premonition, the Meccans were completely surprised by the speed and thoroughness of the Prophet's moves. He gathered a formidable force and set out early in the ninth year after the Hijrah, not revealing his destination until secrecy had become unnecessary. As he drew near to Mecca, Al-`Abbas, his uncle, came out and joined him and was followed later by Abi Safyan. The Quraish resistance evaporated before it could be mobilized. Four Muslim columns entered the city and occupied it in the name of Islam. The Prophet's triumph was complete. The tale of the struggle of the two towns had ended: the tale of their new empire was about to begin.

Muhammad, conqueror of Mecca, proved a magnanimous victor. The Meccans were required to abandon and destroy their idols and seem to have done so with far less compunction than later characterized the heathen of Al Ta'if. There was almost no bloodshed. The Meccans were assured that their city was the dearest place on earth to the Prophet's heart. Its citizens as Muslims underwent no confiscations—even the returning Muhjiriln foregoing their old properties. Muhammad was anxious to pacify the religious capital of Arabia as rapidly as possible and to incorporate the purged Ka'bah into Islamic pilgrimage, thus preserving for the new faith the cohesive power of Meccan prestige. The subsequent year was spent in extending the sway of Islam over an increasing number of tribes beyond Mecca until at the pilgrimage of the immune from protection and exposed to any Muslim attack as long as they failed to Islamize—saving only those having treaty
arrangements with the Prophet. When these had run their course, such groups might also be attacked. In the same Surah, though not in the "Release" itself, is the command to fight Jews and Christians until they also become subject peoples. Thus was enunciated the basic principle of Jihad, or martial endeavor, on behalf of Islam, going beyond the earlier provision which enjoined fighting only after the enemy had first attacked. It thus became a ruling precept in Islam that all areas of non-Islam were areas whose conquest the true Muslim was enjoined to seek until the inhabitants either submitted or were reduced to subject status, the second alternative obtaining only in respect of the tolerated minorities, "the Peoples of the Book." It will be seen that this principle was the extension in permanent, legal form of the plan of action developed by Muhammad in the early years of the Hijrah. That pattern which had been brought to conspicuous success in the case of Mecca was to become the precedent for all other victories, far and wide, over territories yet to be brought under the political suzerainty of Medina and into religious allegiance to Mecca, now cleansed of idolatry. The Prophet himself survived to see only the beginnings of the Jihad that, within a decade of his death, was to add Egypt, the Levant, the valley of the twin rivers, and Western Persia to Islam in one of the swiftest conquests of history. Symbolically, at the onset of his last illness, an expedition was ready to set out into the border lands of Arabia and Byzantium. He completed the Farewell Pilgrimage to Mecca, one year after the "Release." In a moving address he proclaimed the perfecting of the religion, Al-Islam, as the culmination of the Divine Mercy to men. He was sixty-three years of age. Worn by two and a half decades of intense, emotional and spiritual stress, as recipient of the Qur'an, as leader, ruler, legislator and nerve-center of a new and vibrant politico-religious entity, he seems to have sensed the approaching end. But the climax of his last illness was dramatic. When death took him, it seemed to some of his stunned and griefstricken disciples that it could not be. It was A.D. 632. When finally Abu Bakr, his long companion and immediate successor in authority, prevailed upon the distracted assembly gathered in the mosque to realize the truth of the incredible, it was with the reminder that the Prophet, who had now breathed his last, was no more than the servant of the ever-living God. Abi Bakr's speech beside the death precincts linked together, as the call to prayer has never ceased to do, the One God and His Apostle, the first faith of Islam that belongs with the second: "There is no god save God and Muhammad is His Messenger." To the numbed and distraught faithful in Medina and beyond, to the new and sometimes dubious adherents throughout the peninsula, some of whom were ready to withdraw in pagan reassertion, it was as if some giant oak that filled the landscape had been felled, making a great void that left the very scheme of things shorn and unfamiliar. How Abi Bakr, and 'Umar after him, succeeded in rallying the whole cause and launching it upon the vast career, for which the Prophet had shaped and destined it, is part of Islamic history. What faith, devotion, and religious awe have done with the vacuum left by the Prophet's death, filling it with the possessive instincts of communal memory, will concern us shortly in this chapter. It remains to try to take, in some inclusive assessment, the measure of the historical Muhammad.

Of the broad sweep and import of the facts as now summarized, there can be little doubt, though specialists will be always delving afresh to reconsider some particular aspect. Finally it is not so much the facts, but the criteria, which constitute the problem for the biographer of Muhammad. Shall he look backward into Arabian paganism and find the Prophet great and reforming? Shall he look forward into the first Muslim century and beyond to see in this biography one of the rarest potentialities of human history? Or is he to look backward into the great Old Testament prophetic tradition, to Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah, to find in Muhammad a strange, and yet unmistakable, shift in the whole concept and expression of prophethood? Or backward, less far, to the hills of Galilee and Judaea where there are criteria of almost insupportable contrast? Should the criteria be only local and contemporary, when
Muslim faith and practice give to the facts of that place and time a significance of universal range? Perhaps here, as not seldom in human relationships, the task of the outsider is only rightly to formulate the questions. He can never give the answer from within, though he may well be in a better position than the adherent to see what it should include.

Two crucial points are all that can be made. It should be understood, in the first place, that to account for Muhammad in terms of personal genius, though an increasing number of Muslims tend to do so, is to part company with orthodoxy. When Sayyid Amir 'Ali, for example, in his well-known and often reprinted The Spirit of Islam, spoke of "the wisdom of the inspired lawgiver" and referred to Quranic institutions as Muhammad's provision, he was adapting the older belief that the revelation came wholly from God, without involving Muhammad's conscious will or reason. The traditional view insists throughout on the instrumentality of the Prophet, not his initiative; on his being the agent not the originator. Nevertheless, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that historic Islam is decisively shaped by the manner of man Muhammad was.

Here, in the second place, there is need to beware of missing the ultimate in the circumstantial details. The latter have been the theme of much unhappy controversy which has tended to confuse itself. Too much and too little is then made of him. Too much, it may be, of plural marriages and too little of their political, and other, significance and of Muhammad's devotion to Khadijah; too much of the opportunist tactics, too little of the unswerving singleness of mind; too much of the tribal confiscations and repressive measures, too little of the solicitude for orphans and magnanimity to certain foes; too much of his ruthlessness, too little of the hypocrites and false dealers with whom the Qur'an affirms he was often surrounded. Or it may be that, conversely, too much is made of Muhammad's circumstances and too little of his obligation to the absolutes of every age. If much criticism is too naive, it shares that quality with much vindication. Muhammad has been condemned, and again justified, in terms that have not taken the measure of their theme. He has proved, both for good and ill, profounder than much criticism and eulogy.

Where, then, shall we seek this ultimate decision? Surely in the supreme crisis of the biography where the faith has located and dated it genesis. As the tale of two towns, the Prophet's biography is finally the story of a crucial choice, no less crucial than that implicit in the contrasted Gospel saying: "The cup that my Father hath given me shall I not drink it?" It is the decision arising from the question: "How should Prophethood succeed?" What is the final relation of the messenger of God to the people to whom he is sent when they forbear to hear? The Muhammadan decision here is formative of all else in Islam. It was a decision for community, for resistance, for external victory, for pacification and rule. The decision for the Cross-no less conscious, no less formative, no less inclusive-was the contrary decision. It is impossible to say precisely when the choice became final in Muhammad's career. We have suggested that he determined on a new center because he sought a means of prophetic victory. But it may be that finding himself in a new center he resolved to make it an instrument for the submission of the old. Some have argued a marked deterioration in the character of Muhammad in the Medinan years. That is probably too simple, mistaking a symptom for its source. The deeper truth is that at some point Muhammad elected for a religious authority, armed with sinews of war and means of government, and that the decision worked itself out in character, conduct, and destiny. Externally it succeeded. It has become fashionable in vindicating the decision to insist that it was reluctant and uncharacteristic. He who never in his life had wielded a weapon, to whom the sight of human suffering caused intense pain and pity, and who against all the canons of Arab manliness, wept bitterly at the loss of his children or disciples...this man was now compelled from the necessities of the situation, and against his own inclinations, to repel the attacks of the enemy by force of arms,
to organise his followers for self-defence, and often to send out expeditions to anticipate treacherous and sudden onslaughts.

The original Muslim historians do not bear out this idealistic view. But the more out of character the choice, if so it be, the more evidently chosen. The more fully the modern Muslim interpretation of the choice be accepted, the more decisive its quality as the way Muhammad took to answer the fundamental question confronting all religious mission: "How shall, how should, the truth prevail?" Opposition there was, in Mecca; vested interest, bigotry, sin, and evil. Bearing the brunt of that opposition in single-minded devotion, Muhammad the preacher is a person whose nobility still reaches us through the intervening years. Is the returning conqueror a greater figure?

The meaning of the muezzin's witness to the Apostle of Islam is not, of course, limited to his biography. The Prophet's passing, as we saw, left a tremendous vacancy in the lives and emotions of his followers. But death itself in certain ways closed up the gap it had created and Muhammad in death became the universal possession of Muslim history, so soon and so far to spread in the world. It did so, in that the vacuum for practical purposes demanded to be filled. The institution of the Caliphate was the answer. Abi Bakr immediately stepped into the administrative authority of Muhammad and with 'Umar, his next successor, provided the leadership for which the new day of Muslim expansion called. Whether we regard this as a Divinely willed succession or an empirical solution to an obvious need (the latter view being very recent), the fact is the same. Muhammad had been so towering a figure that wherever his mantle fell it necessarily conferred immense prestige and authority. Its first two bearers were equal to their destiny, and what they inaugurated continued through all vicissitudes until 1924.

This succession, however, was civil and administrative only. Muhammad, as Prophet, was unique, final, irrepeatable. Thus death closed as well as occasioned the prophetic break. It was true that Muhammad would no longer be there among men to receive the Quranic revelation. But by the same token that volume was now entire and complete. The loss of the Apostle was the final fulfillment of the Book. Those twenty-three or so years had sufficed for its coming down and the point of its earthly impact was in that sense no longer necessary. Muhammad passed into history, in the legacy his death had made final of the book his apostleship had made complete. Any consideration of Muhammad in history takes us at once to the Holy Book of Islam, of which he was the human instrument and which epitomizes so much of his story.

tenth year after the Hijrah Muhammad, who was not present, caused the "Immunity," or "Release," to be read as an edict by 'AIL This document, preserved in Surah ix, served notice on all pagans that none such could participate in any later pilgrimage. It gave the tribes four months in which to return to their homes and, thereafter, declared them lawfully

the Quraish but to accept their capitulation. The story of the two cities was moving to a dramatic climax in which they would both become Islam's. There was first, however, the intervening pilgrimage duly performed in 629, under the terms of the treaty, which the Meccans strictly observed, evacuating their city while Muhammad and the Muslims performed the rites, but refusing, when requested, to prolong their absence more than three days. The visit brought Muhammad a few notable accessions, including the custodian of the Ka'bah and a future leader Khalid, destined for great military exploits. The star of Islam was moving into the ascendant; that of the Quraish was waning.
Muhammad's plans for the final settlement with his Meccan adversaries were carefully laid and boldly carried through. Despite clearly growing aspirations for the expansion of the faith into northern regions, indicated in letters summoning several having negotiated with them. The pilgrimage permission was important. He calculated that there would be few, if any, Muslim fugitives to Mecca, while would-be converts sent back to Mecca would be rescued by Islam in the final conquest. The truce would give valuable time for preparations and tribal accessions. When Muhammad returned to Medina, the logic of events leading to their consummation in Mecca's reconquest unfolded itself steadily. Within two years the Prophet returned not to debate

acts of hostility, the Jews of the Medinan region began to make closer cause with the Quraish. Their economically superior position exposed them to dangers of expulsion such as had already been indicated. The increasing menace from the Muslims suggested common action with Mecca, with which, however, there were few other ties. It was the familiar story of the common enemy bringing together unwilling allies. While it seems clear that Jewish elements were implicated in Meccan enmity to Muhammad, it is also clear that both elements in the uneasy alliance were blundering and vacillating. Any situation like that confronting them, and relating to an adversary of Muhammad's resolve and resource, calls for comparable resolution and tenacity. These the Jews and Meccans lacked as is only too highest Muslim evaluation of the events now to be summarized, was to answer the situation as the soldier does.

Medina under the Prophet's rulership thus found itself increasingly implicated in hostilities with the Meccans. They began over the Meccan caravans whose route to the north passed precariously within Medinan range. The Muslims participating in these activities became steadily more bold and more numerous until the Battle of Badr closed the first chapter of the Medinan period with a clear victory to which the Qur'an refers as "the day of the Furqan", or criterion-a day of putting to the test and of the emergence of Islam as the signally favored, and so distinctive, cause (Surah viii. 41). The Battle might well be described as an encounter since by later standards the numbers involved were slight. But even skirmishes can be historically decisive. Having tidings of a Muslim venture, a returning Meccan caravan from the north sent for protective reinforcements from the city and it was with these that the Muslim band engaged.

Under the Prophet's own skillful military leadership some three hundred Muslims dispersed a thousand Meccans, losing only

The Qur'an is the ultimate miracle of Islam. It is the final evidence of the Divine origin of the Prophet's mission. Its Arabic eloquence is indicative of its source in God, since its bearer was illiterate. Its literary form, in the orthodox view, is inextricably part of its nature. Its contents alone do not constitute it as the Qur'an. Inasmuch as translation inevitably destroys the form, however successfully it renders the contents, translation has been regarded until the second quarter of this century as generally inadvisable and impossible. The initiative to Quranic translation has mainly come, until lately, from non-Islamic sources and while orthodoxy has
come now to admit the desirability of making it available for non-Muslims, such non-Arabic renderings are technically not the Qur'an, but only its meaning. The Qur'an has a culminating relation to all other Scriptures which it confirms in so far as they are valid and corrects where they have been corrupted. Muhammad is thus the "Seal of the Prophets" with whom Divine revelation reached its climax. This conviction of continuity with previous Scriptures is an important reason why the Muslim is satisfied that Islam is final and that all valid religion tends toward it. The Qur'an is the determinative source of all dogma and law. Through it the overriding sense of God through the Prophet, of the Prophet on behalf of God, that makes Islam, is continually renewed to the devout soul. The Qur'an brings Mecca and Medina, as the Prophet addressed them, into the ken of every generation. In these pages, "he being dead yet speaketh." If attention to doctrine compels us to correct ourselves and say "God speaketh," there is perhaps no great point in the distinction. For the whole Muslim status of the Qur'an is that God here speaking has Muhammad for His voice. Forever wedded together and heard by the pious soul in mosque and wilderness, in home and street, is the cry of the seventh-century Apostle as the speech of the Eternal God.

Every memorizer of the Qur'an, every reciting muezzin or kha'if renews in this living perpetuity the words that made Islam.

Muhammad in the Qur'an becomes, so to speak, the great contemporary of them all. Nor need there be serious doubt that the voice in the Book is authentically the voice of the Prophet. That there are critical problems connected with the Qur'an no intelligent student will deny—not least among them the chronology and the vocabulary sources. But there is no place for serious misgiving that what is here was substantially what the Prophet said or that what he said under conditions of Quranic inspiration is not here. Though at first recorded on diverse scraps that lay to hand, animal bones, leaves, skins, and the like, the growing revelations were carefully treasured and devoutly memorized. When the contents were collected in Zaid's recension, later made the basis of 'Uthman's authoritative version, or canon, of the sacred Scriptures, it was believed that the Prophet's own will in the matter had been fulfilled. It can hardly have been that the Prophet himself made any final decision on the order and arrangement of the Holy Book. Had he done so it would seem impossible for anyone else to have undertaken the task. Perhaps it was that death overtook him before this could be taken up. 'Uthman, it is true, ordered the destruction of all alternative versions such as had been gathered in different centers like Kiifa, Basrah, and Damascus, thus making almost impossible any comparative study. None the less the consensus of view—Sh'ahs excepted—is that the Qur'an as it stood in 'Uthman's recension omits no significant and includes no extraneous material. The Prophet's death had decisively closed the Book. Twenty-three years and sole authorship allowed no time or opportunity for confusion and the canonization was complete before the original Arabian generation of readers had finally passed away. All these factors, coupled with the retentive memory and reverent literalness of the faithful, seem to have insured an authoritative text, whose puzzles are not of authorship.

Yet despite the authority and sanctity of the volume of revelation, it does not exhaust the historical legacy it enshrines. Muhammad has a place in history beyond that implicit in his being the spokesman of the Qur'an. Given its brevity and its context of events, the Qur'an proved an incomplete source of communal guidance, as the community spread into new lands and discovered new cultures. The Qur'an, for example, contains no single comprehensive code of personal or commercial or social conduct, though there are several passages which suggest codes in embryo. It is full and detailed on certain matters, especially those of personal status. But in other realms it is either completely silent or strangely brief. Orphans find more legal space than Caliphs and private heirs than public courts. While
MINARET AND MUSLIM exegesis and interpretation have greatly widened the scope of Quranic brevity, the very existence of alternative, though subordinate, sources of law demonstrates that the Qur'an alone awaits and requires enlargement consistent with itself. Where, then, should Islam better turn than to the person, the behavior, the obiter dicta of the spokesman of God's directive and of the Holy Book? This explains the rise of Tradition, Hadith, on a vast scale, giving to the biography of the Prophet, a kind of implicit, legislative quality and turning the indicative of description into the imperative of law. "Muhammad did this," it runs, "the Muslim ought to do the same." It should be clear that Muhammad as the source of Tradition stands in a different category from Muhammad as the recipient of the Qur'an. The latter status is that of wahy or revelation, accompanied by external signs, in limpness of body, swoon, ecstasy of spirit, which have remained a perpetual and puzzling theme to his biographers. Quranicity is more than Tradition. It is God's speech, which the Prophet hears and relays. But this recipience gave Muhammad such status in the community, such uniqueness in the Divine economy, that everything about him, even outside this Quranic sphere, came to be considered in some sense revelatory. This further role met, and largely satisfied, the extra-Quranic needs of the community, though requiring to be supplemented further by analogy and communal consensus. Tradition thus became the second major source of Islamic law. A term less than wahy and indicating non-Quranic inspiration is used to designate this exemplary quality attaching to Muhammad's deed and word. Tradition, as a matter of record, is called Hadith; as a matter of obligation it is called Sunnah. Undoubtedly, large areas of customary law in the conquered lands came into Islam in the form of traditions about the Prophet. Muhammad being credited with behavior or preferences or attitudes which reflected newly absorbed practices compatible with Islam. Similarly the main political and local factions and divisions which developed in Muslim history during the decades after his death inevitably expressed themselves in terms of competing traditions about him, each party being anxious to give their position the sanction of his anticipatory favor. The development of Tradition thus became a prerequisite of the development of law in Islam and Muhammad became, so to speak, the posthumous arbiter of his people's destinies and daily lives. His mind and his example were endlessly, and inconsistently, invoked, until a host of traditions related the Prophet, positively or negatively, approvingly or disapprovingly, with almost every conceivable issue of life and society. The great mass of traditions later required rigorous pruning.

The name of the most famous of the outstanding traditionalists, Al-Bukhari, has a tremendous sanctity in Islam. Al-Bukhari is said to have been aroused to his life task as editor of traditions by a vision in which he saw the sleeping Prophet's face pestered with innumerable flies, which a merciful fan kept at bay. It certainly was a life task which he and his fellow traditionalists undertook. For the verification of a tradition depended not primarily on the substance or matn but on the isniid or chain of attestation. The question was not so much: Could the Prophet have said this? Is it reasonable and in character? but rather: Who said that he said this? Was that reporter an eye witness? Was he honest? And who tells us now, that he heard or saw the Prophet do or say it? Is the chain of attestors unbroken? Did they all know personally the man in front of them in the sequence going back to the first source? All these technical questions, though they had their importance, almost excluded internal concern with substance. Biographical lore about attestors and companions become voluminous. Traditionalists traveled across the continents in search of authentication or in order to add their own name as the last in the chain, through face-to-face contact with the immediately preceding reporter. To eliminate the indirect and the second-hand became more important than to identify the conjectural.
This fascinating subject might be pursued much further but we must strive, as the best traditionalists did, to keep close to the Prophet. Despite the prolixity of invented or unverifiable traditions, there remains a substratum—variously estimated by scholars, Muslim and Western—of biographically valid data. But if we cannot always be sure that we are receiving authentic material about the Prophet, the question of criticism is perhaps unimportant. It is not so much whether this or that is validly Muhammad's but that numbers of Muslims thought so. It is the principle rather than the detail that here matters, the fact of belief rather than the bare fact. Muhammad became the universal exemplar. The assumption, theologically unexamined, was that in this particular—Muhammad in Arabia A.D. 570–632—the universal made itself manifest. The good, worthy to be the timeless example, was available for recognition and imitation, in this life at that time. This meeting of the universal and the particular, the plural and the singular, the eternal and the temporal, is the ultimate mystery of all existence. There is, therefore, nothing unfamiliar in thus conceiving of the universal as having become an inclusive particular, a singular which embodies, in a revelatory way, the eternal. Christianity sees just this fulfilled and realized in the Incarnation of "the Word made flesh," in "God with us." It acknowledges this situation with joy as an act of God in grace and assurance.

The instinctive Muslim acceptance, however, of a universal significance for the person of Muhammad not only lacks, but specifically repudiates, this metaphysical confidence in God made man. Nevertheless, the view of Muhammad implicit in the traditions amounts to some form of the belief that a human particular has become a universal, that all particular men may know God's will. But this attitude to Muhammad has never been expressed in a recognized metaphysical doctrine of his person that would undergird its tremendous ethical and legal role. As often elsewhere, Islam has been content with the practical result. Some effort to think out the implications in the relation of this exemplary Muhammad to God is long overdue.

These considerations, though theological, are inseparable from any adequate discussion of Muhammad in history. For Tradition implies a cosmic relevance in the historical character. It proceeds upon it with great thoroughness and close detail. Even the smallest points about the Prophet become significant. Al-Ghazilli writes in the eleventh century on the Sunnah as follows:

Know that the key of happiness is following the Sunna and imitating God's Apostle in all his goings out and comings in, in his movements and times of quiescence, even in the manner of his eating, his deportment, his sleep and his speech. I do not say that concerning his manners in matters of religious observances alone, because there is no reason to neglect the traditions which have come down concerning them: nay, that has to do with all matters of use and wont, for in that way unrestricted following arises. God said: "Say: 'If you love God, follow me and God will love you' " (Surah iii. 29).

And He said: "What the Apostle has brought you, receive; and what he has forbidden you, refrain from" (Surah liv. 7). So you must sit while putting on trousers and stand while putting on a turban: You must begin with the right foot when putting on your sandals, and eat with your right hand: When cutting your nails you must begin with the forefinger of the right hand and finish with its thumb: in the foot you must begin with the little toe of the right foot and finish with the little toe of the left. It is the same in all your movements and times of quiescence. Muhammad b. Aslam used not to eat a melon because the manner in which God's Apostle ate it had not been transmitted to him.

To this meticulous degree Muhammad became the norm of true Muslim behavior and the unconscious source of the community's manners and total conduct as far as the pattern could
be ascertained. The whole phenomenon, whose detailed illustration might be-as it often was-a life-study, is one of the most remarkable of the Prophet's legacies. There are some traditions that indicate it was an unintended legacy, though many more sustain the contrary. But however, precisely, this outcome is associated with the conscious will of Muhammad, there could be no clearer evidence of his stature and uniqueness in his day and beyond. Only the very few so effectively determine the shape of the world after they have left it, and maintain their authority by their example so far, so deep and so wide. The Muhammad of Tradition belongs to all ages of Islam, inasmuch as each of them returns in some measure to him as its criterion of all that it approves.

It can hardly be doubted, however, that the process is in some sense reciprocal. It is not simply that the historical Muhammad fashions the values and standards of the centuries, but that the centuries in their turn make and define the traditional Muhammad. Almost from the beginning forms of customary law, or policies of special groups, were read back into prophetic conduct or table-talk and in that form found Islamic expression. Down the centuries there has been, in differing degrees, the same tendency to draw the image of the Prophet in harmony with prevailing needs. The tendency is conspicuous enough in our own day. Muhammad is taken out of the seventh century and emerges in some biographies as the protagonist of the welfare state, as the first practical socialist and the prototype of Lincoln or Garibaldi, the spiritual ancestor of John Stuart Mill and Henri Bergson. It may be argued that any great personality who belongs to the ages comes to be reinterpreted in new lights and his "legend" is not always strictly tested by his historical role.

But it can also be argued that these posthumous achievements are part of the historical role itself, seen in large perspective. Historians are obliged to take note of what the communal memory affirms to have been, as well as what the chronology contains. There are few personalities where this double duty is more important than in respect of the human founder of Islam.

This is true perhaps most of all for those who would be Christian ministrants to his heirs. There are yet other aspects of Muhammad in history which will become apparent in the two succeeding chapters-the Sufi repossession of the mystical Muhammad; the social reformer's invocation of the iconoclast and the rebel; the contemporary philosopher's appeal to the dynamic Muhammad. There can be no hope here of completeness. Nor is the story itself finished.

The process, so to say, is proceeding. But perhaps we have succeeded in doing some justice to the muezzin's total meaning when he reiterates his conviction that Muhammad is the Apostle of God. It is those Arabian years, now thirteen centuries away; it is how the Muslims of those centuries have understood those years and what the sacred Book has made of them as believers and followers.

From the twofold witness now considered, the muezzin T passes to a twofold summons to response, with an interesting imperative or evocative verb that might well be translated: "Look alive," or, more usually: "Come." It calls the hearer to Prayer, Saliit, and to Good, Faliih. These are inclusive concepts whose significance is the theme of this and the following chapter.

The form used as an imperative is in the singular. For though the response involves community, it is made by the individual. Moreover, the word does not differentiate, as other imperatives do, between masculine and feminine. It is a kind of common singular, including all who hearken and respond.

Even those who know least about Islam are somewhat familiar with the place of prayer in its life. If they have traveled, they may have seen Muslim seamen on shipboard, or stevedores on the quayside observe the hours of prayer, with a naturalness, an absence of self-
consciousness, surprising to the Westerner. Or they have seen photographs of serried ranks of prostrate forms behind a leader, or imiim, filling the wide mosque spaces, or pictures of a solitary cameleer spreading his prayer mat on the desert sands. Islam and Muslim prayer are in truth inseparable.

Just as Muhammad's career revolved around Mecca, the city of his first prophetic warnings and his final victory, so his community acknowledges the religious centrality of the Meccan qiblah, or direction of prayer, toward which every praying Muslim turns his face in a gesture which makes him part of one history and one solidarity. "Come ye unto the prayer" says the muezzin. For generations Muslims have actualized their Islam in their response. The ground, meaning, and pattern of the resulting religious life deserve patient and discerning study.

For, however true it may be to speak of Islam in our time as a cultural or a political expression, it is only such because it is primarily a religious allegiance. As such it must first be known.

The institution of Muslim prayer rests upon the precept of the Qur'an and the example of the Prophet. The word itself is perhaps better translated "worship," since it means to supplicate with adoration. The same word is used of God in the familiar invocation upon Muhammad: "May God magnify (or exalt) Muhammad and preserve him in peace." It should be distinguished from spontaneous and intercessory prayer, known as Du'ii', where the individual may use ejaculatory phrases of his own choice, Quranic or otherwise, without following any necessary pattern or ritual. Saliit, however, is strictly ordered. The form must be followed if the prayer is to be valid. "Establish" or "perform" the worship is the usual formula by which the Qur'an enjoins the practice, often in the context of conversion.

There is no doubt that Muslim prayer is meant to be a distinctive rite, the fulfillment of which is a witness to the new allegiance. Apart from the enjoining of the qiblah, the main details of the Saliit, including its fivefold daily iteration, rest on extra-Quranic injunctions. In one passage (Surah xi. 114) the Qur'an directs: "Establish worship at the two ends of the day and in the parts of the night close to them." (See also Surah xxiv. 58.) Tradition, however, has understood the directive to include the five prayers as follows:

Saliit al-Fajr-the dawn prayer, said when the dawn has broken and before the actual sunrise.
Saliit al-Zuhr-the noon prayer when the sun passes the meridian.
Saliit al-'Asr-the late afternoon prayer.
Saliit al-Maghrib-prayer immediately after the sun sets. Saliit al-'Ashhii' -prayer after sunset before retiring to sleep and not later than midnight.

Each occasion of Saliit has its stipulated number of ritual movements or rukil' and never less than two. In addition to the five obligatory prayers there are two optional ones: Saliit al-Lail, said in the night after sleep but before dawn and Saliit al-Duhii, which would fall between the dawn and the noon prayer and perhaps coincide with breakfast. It can be seen at once that these daily prayers make a considerable demand upon the faithful. Though their performance takes a brief time their frequency requires a readiness to combine prayer with affairs. Many exponents have seen this as one of their chief lessons-the obligation of the believer to recognize God in the midst of, rather than in escape from, his distractions and duties. For a similar reason Islam does not recognize a Sabbath. The daily hours replace the holy day.

The ritual of each raka'h (plural: rukil') is carefully prescribed and rigorously followed. It consists of seven movements each having certain accompanying recitations as follows:

The two hands are raised to the ears, while the pray-er stands, facing the qiblah. He says the takbir: "God is most great." The right hand is then placed over the left upon the chest or
bosom with ascriptions of glory to God and the confession of submission, ending with the phrase: "I seek refuge with God from the accursed devil." Then the opening Surah-Al Fatiha—is recited. This position is called "The Standing." With a new takbir, the worshipper lowers the head with the palms of the hands on the knees—a position called "The Bending." He repeats ascriptions of praise to God.

A standing position is resumed, followed by the prostration proper. The toes of both feet, both knees and both hands touch the ground as well as the forehead, while ascriptions are repeated.

With a takbir, the worshipper raises the upper part of his body to the sitting posture with two hands on the knees. A prayer for mercy and protection is offered.

A second prostration, repeating the praises of the first.

The worshipper returns to a standing position, saying a takbir, and the raka'h is at an end.

There are certain slight divergencies according to whether or not the series of positions known as a raka'h is the last in the sequence of the whole prayer. The final one ends with a salutation on all brother Muslims and the angels with the face turned right and left as in greeting. The prescribed phrases must be used in Arabic if that language is known. The worshipper may only add praises of his own when the ritual is complete.

The whole ordinance is intended as indicative of the relationship to God implicit in the Muslim understanding of Him.

Though Islam prides itself upon its freedom from sacramentalism and priesthood, in that each worshipper worships for himself, it is evident that in the general sense the Salat postures are profoundly sacramental. Prostration, in particular, proclaims and serves to actualize a totality of surrender. The face, the proudest thing in man, comes into contact with the dust, the lowest thing in nature. The physical thus embodies and expresses the spiritual.

The same may be said of the careful washing, or wudu' which precedes every Salat, typifying a cleansing of the soul accomplished therein. "Prayer," according to Surah xxix. 45, "preserves from impurity and evil." To remember God in this way is to be restrained from evil. The washing, therefore, both fits the worshipper for prayer and demonstrates what his worship is meant to do for him.

It relates to those parts of the body which are mostly exposed, the hands and arms to the elbow, the mouth and nostrils, the face and the head, and finally the feet to the ankles, beginning with the right foot. Running water is always preferred for Muslim ablution and it is used from, not in, receptacles. Hence the picturesque fountains in mosque courts. If water is not available a less desirable cleansing can be had with the use of sand or clean earth. The familiar prayer mat is linked in the same realm. It protects the worshipper from possible contamination and makes clean the immediate area of his prostration. To pray in a dirty state would be improper and nugatory. The Quranic passage (Surah v. 6) which stipulates the washing, explains that God does not wish to be tedious with His people, but seeks to purify them and fit them for His goodness.

All times of prayer must be prefaced by the niyyah, or "intention," just as is the case with the other four pillars of religion, or obligatory ordinances of Islam. The "intention" is the declaration of purpose. It would be possible to go through all the motions and phrases of the ritual without in fact performing the prayer, just as the syllables of the Confession recited, for example, in a grammar lesson, would not constitute a personal witness. The need for the "intention" makes evident that true prayer cannot be perfunctory or mechanical. It is a means of defense against inattentive and external performance. The movements no doubt become habitual, but habituation should not be forgetful.

The place and pattern of the mosque in Muslim religious life is a vital topic to which we will return. But discussion of prayer would not be complete without reference to its public, but in no sense exclusive, place. The English word is a corruption of the Arabic masjid, or place of
prostration. If a mosque is accessible and convenient it is desirable to use it at all times. Water for washing is available there, if anywhere, and there is the stimulus of association and fellowship. But every man's prayer mat is a portable mosque and wherever he chooses to spread it he can find his qiblah and fulfill his worship. He needs no priest or mouthpiece, since the prayers are known. Since prayer has to intermingle with his journeys, his trading, and his conversing he cannot always repair to certain precincts. The physical mosque is dispensable. Nevertheless the noon prayer on Fridays is to be said as far as possible in the place of corporate prayer. When so said its four rukû' are reduced to two. Occasion is taken for a Friday discourse from the mosque pulpit and the worshipper shares the unison prostrations as led by the imam standing toward the niche, or mihrab which indicates the direction of Mecca. The Friday, however, in contradistinction to the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, is not a day of rest. Business precedes and follows the noon prayer (see Surah lxii. 9 and 10). For the Adhan, or Call to Prayer, the mosque is, of course, indispensable. But the duty to which it calls may be answered without as well as within.

fore and after meals, in front of a mirror, after a bath, on first partaking of any item in the yearly harvest, in distress, and in trial. In many cases the words have come down from traditional practices or phrases of the Prophet himself. The purpose of such devotional recognition of God in the minutiae of the everyday is to make one's Islam, or submission, comprehensive and alert and to evoke the spirit of gratitude and humility. Bodily functions which may so easily go awry and which in their wholeness are so wonderful should be the occasion of ejaculatory worship. The characteristic phrases of these acts of devotion deserve study. The keynote is surrender and trust. "O God I have given my soul, my journey, my objective, into Thy charge." The idea of submission is usually linked to that of refuge and the reiterated phrase is "I seek refuge with Thee," from the accursed one, from wandering and error, from danger and mischief, from fear and calamity. This seeking argues reliance, expressed in the words Alaika Tawakkaltu: "In Thee have I trusted," often to be seen inscribed on trucks and buses, and elsewhere. These attitudes are no doubt comprehended in the most familiar of all phrases: "Bismillah," "In God's Name," which when used with attentive sincerity confesses the God-relatedness of all things. Other petitions make the occasion a parable of larger need: a bath may denote spiritual purity, entering a house serve to recollect the entering of heaven, and a mirror's reflection remind one of the call to be virtuous as well as comely. The Muslim's principle of Tauhid or Unity runs through all these prayers. God alone is a sure protector, or right guide. There is no other arbiter, no other enricher, no other Lord. Hence the blessing of God is indispensable. Its enjoyment or its denial makes the entire difference. May we, then, as the opening Surah has it, be among those upon whom God shows favor, not among those who stand under His wrath. The awesome distinction felt and feared here is an ever-present element in the form and quality of these prayers. A glance at a selection of other prayers used in the Qur'an shows that the devout Muslim in his incidental petitions is close to the temper of his Holy Book. Many of these Quranic phrases are recited voluntarily after the Fatiyah on any occasion when

Prayer in Islam is by no means confined to the ritual form now described. There is the whole realm of petition and adoration in which the Muslim soul relates itself to God in the various crises of existence and in the lesser occasions of daily life. Even here, however, the worshipper tends to rely on familiar phrases or forms of an ejaculatory kind many of them being derived from the Qur'an or Tradition. A new-born infant is greeted with the phrases of the muezzin's call recited in the ear. At death there are prayers over the dead body in the
mosque or dwelling or at the graveside, after the corpse has first been thoroughly washed, beginning with those parts which are customarily cleansed in the wudu’ before prayer. The imam and those present recite the takbir and the dhikr of the Prophet with variant forms of intercession in which there will be phrases like the following:

Forgive 0 God our dead and our living. Cause him who is alive amongst us to live in Islam, and he whom Thou takest to Thyself let him die in the faith. Do not forbid him his reward: make gracious his reception and spacious his coming in. Cleanse him with water, with snow and with ice and purge him of sins as Thou cleansest a white cloth of its stain.

At marriage there are exhortations setting forth the duties of the parties and recitation of the Shahadah, as well as various optional prayers for the welfare of the couple and the prosperity of all families. Many of the routine events of daily life are occasions of ejaculatory petition-entering and leaving the house, entering and leaving a lavatory, retiring and rising, or visiting the sick, passing a graveyard, embarking and disembarking, bellO

the latter is used. They express a strong sense of life's precarious nature and the decisive role of faith. "0 our Lord grant us good in this world and in the world to come and save us from the pain of the fire." "0 our Lord do not let our hearts stray after Thou hast guided us and grant us mercy." "0 our Lord forgive us our transgressions and our excesses." "Let us die with the righteous and bring unto us what Thou hast promised by the apostles and let us not be confounded on the day of resurrection." Throughout, there is this sense of the confrontation of the believing and the unbelieving and the confidence that the former are the gainers and the latter are the losers. Yet there is no presumptuous assurance. The categories are clear and fixed but membership is not. "If Thou forgive us not and dost not have mercy upon us then are we verily among the losers." "0 Lord indeed I am a poor man in need of all the good Thou bringest down unto me," All these prayers are associated, in some sense, with the character and attributes of God. The Ninety-nine Names are used, with varying frequency, as the ground of the petition or the point of the aspiration, as well as in adoration. The Christian notices at once the entire absence of anything resembling the traditional Christian phrases of commendation: "for the sake of . . ." or "in the name of . . ." For the offering of prayer depends altogether for its acceptability upon the Divine will and all that can rightly be said is to associate some known descriptive of God with the relevant petition. In one respect the pattern is the same. For the Christian use of the Name of Christ is the invocation of that inclusive sense of God, upon which all prayer depends, as it is made plain and sure in Jesus Christ. The Christian's standing in Christ is not external to God as if it were a persuasion from without. It is rather his recognition of the place where God has made His grace actual and His accessibility indubitable. Muslim prayer links itself to the attributes of God without believing that they are anywhere finally pledged or necessarily operative.

As for the question of the intercession, Shafa'ah, of prophets and saints in Islam, there is some uncertainty as to how the Qur'an should be understood. There are several passages like II10-Surah lxxiv. 48 which affirms: "The intercession of those who make Shafi’ah will not avail them." Surah ii. 48 depicts the day of judgment as a day on which no intercession will be allowed.

These verses, however, can be understood, in a less than absolute sense, as disqualifying certain groups from intercessory power or efficacy. Such an interpretation is confirmed by other verses which attribute intercession to the angels or speak of it as occurring by God's permission. Surah ii. 255, it is true, asks: "Who should intercede with Him (God) even by His permission?" But Tradition has given an affirmative answer and has expressed itself fully as to those capable of intercession by Divine consent.
There are prophets, martyrs, saints, and apostles, as well as angels. But traditional belief is insistent that Muhammad is the truest intercessor, where he is not also the sole one. A repeated tradition describes the day of judgment when all the prophets from Adam to Jesus transfer, each to the next, the role of intercessor, all disclaiming the privilege. Finally Muhammad takes it up and intercedes with God, by God's permission, until there are left in Hell only those for whom no intercessor can avail.

Intercession is much more widely believed in Shi'ah Islam, and belief in the saintly efficacy of holy founders is one of the main factors in the cohesion of Sufi orders. There are also strong traditions of Muhammad's own practice during life in visiting the cemeteries, often by night, to seek from God the forgiveness and the welfare of the dead.

Two other pillars of religion fall within this chapter, namely fasting and pilgrimage.

The ordinance of Saum, fasting, in the month of Ramadan, in which the Qur'an began to be revealed, is at once a product of, and a reaction against, Jewish-Christian practices. Though Ramadan seems to have been a holy month among the Arabs prior to Islam, its designation as a month of fasting derives from the example of ascetic discipline among the "People of the Book," and the fast of the Day of Atonement. In the Meccan days the early community appears to have followed something of this pattern and Surah ii. 183 declares: "Fasting is enjoined for you even as it was enjoined for those before you." But in the sequel to this passage is the record of the duty prescribed for and by Muhammad when his experience with the Jews in Medina provoked him into studied disconnection. The Day of Atonement fast in Muharram was abandoned, except as a voluntary act, for one of a month's duration in Ramadan. Moreover, a still later revelation transferred the fast from the period between sunset and sunrise to that between sunrise and sunset. "Eat and drink until it appears that a white thread may be distinguished from a black, then keep the fast strictly until nightfall" (Surah ii.187). The same passage indicates that abstention from sexual intercourse by night is 'not incumbent as part of the fast.

The observance of Ramadan is binding upon all adult Muslims of both sexes, save for the aged, the sick, pregnant women, nursing mothers, and travelers. When the exempting circumstances are changed the equivalent period of consecutive fast is to be observed. The month of fasting is a rigorous exercise and is probably more widely practiced than the daily prayers. Muslims who may sometimes omit the latter keep the former. No food or drink is to pass down the throat, from the break of dawn to sunset. Food is partaken during the hours of darkness. The fast closes with the 'id al Fitr, the Feast of the breaking of the Fast, which is the Little Festival of the Muslim year. It is begun when the new moon appears, and is celebrated with even greater eclat than the Great Festival, or 'id al Adhii, which coincides with the offering of pilgrimage sacrifice at Mina, near Mecca. Bairim, an alternative name generally but not solely used for the feast that ends Ramadan, is derived from the practice of giving and receiving gifts of sugar sweets. Greeting cars also are exchanged.

Indeed there are some aspects of the 'id al Fitr which resemble certain features of the Western Christmas season. It is a time of general desire after better things. Presents symbolize mutual affection and there is a surge of satisfaction and aspiration which, for Muslims, terminates an exacting discipline. Evil is somehow temporarily allayed. Shakespeare, in Hamlet, found the nights of the Christmas season joyously wholesome.

The bird of dawning singeth all night long. . . . no planets strike No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm, So hallowed and so gracious is the time.

The Qur'an observes that on the night in Ramadan of the Book's first descent: "Angels and the Spirit descend to earth." and it is peace until the rising of the dawn" (Surah xvii. 4 and 5).

Through the fast there is also an emphasis on deepened devotion and more frequent mosque attendance. "Be at your devotions in the mosque" says the passage enjoining Ramadan (Surah
The need for the "intention," daily repeated, emphasizes the conscious discipline the soul requires, and into which it enters intelligently. The traditions and Muslim theologians concur in this understanding of the fast. Though, doubtless, multitudes in Muslim history observed it as a fiat of their own faith, as an ordinance which required no justification, the perceptive modern exponents recognize that in itself the transference of eating and drinking to hours of darkness has nothing intrinsically to commend it. What is significant is the assertion that man has larger needs than bread, that his body is to be his servant not his master, and that ordered voluntary privation is a fine school of patience and endurance. There is no doubt of the value of the fast as a witness to these truths, though, when the revolving Muslim calendar brings Ramadan into the trying summer heat, it may be questioned whether exasperation and strain are not also a consequence. These, it will be said, are part of the price of a necessary institution. There is no general tendency to permit symbolic interpretation of the fast to weaken the actual observance. Ramadan may stand for spiritual discipline but such interpreters cannot claim their own freedom to override it.

Islam, by and large, is as tenacious of its times and seasons as any other faith, including those more commonly described as sacramental. Fasting is good. But to fast in Ramadan is traditionally thirty times better than at any other time. Such other fasts are possible as a means of expiating manslaughter, or a broken oath, or the killing of game while on pilgrimage. Though traditions emphasize the meritoriousness of fasting in general there is a strong insistence, throughout the Qur'an and in Muslim practice, upon the error of asceticism. Ramadan sufficiently demonstrates the soul's priority. This truth must always be kept in mind. But the stipulated fast suffices.

The good things of nature and of appetite are to be taken in moderation and not refused. It is unwise and unbecoming to reject the gifts of God. Whatever may be said of Muhammad's debt to hermits and monks as examples of solitary devotion, the Qur'an in the Medinan period, repeatedly urges that the reasonable desires and needs of the bodily life—food, drink, sex, and sleep—be properly and thankfully satisfied. Islam disavows "monkery." There is nevertheless a strong, though limited, temper that seeks the ascetic way, thus dissociating itself from the general teaching. Al-Ghazali insists that a fast which means only a consequent hunger and thirst is not a finally meaningful fast. For if only hunger results the fast is only physically felt. It should be an occasion of that remembrance of God which is not a temporary, negative abstinence, but a positive preoccupation with God. So understood, there are fasts for the eyes, from impure seeing; for the ears, from unsavory listening; for the mouth, from scandal and gossip. Such purposeful asceticism as the pathway to the Divine knowledge is admittedly a special vocation. As a deep and important area of Muslim religious life we shall take note of it later. Its existence only serves to throw into contrast the more general attitude to natural satisfactions and to the Ramadan fast as a yearly reminder that the gracious God, Who gives for our enjoyment, also requires that we observe a month of special endurance as an education in submission.

Christianity is often reproached by Muslim writers for its alleged renunciation of this world. It errs in asking too much) of the natural man and so remains either an unsound, or an unfulfilled, ideal.

speak, the annual expression of the constant centrality of the Ka'bah and its environs in the practice and faith of Islam.

The Qur'an, in Surah iii. 97, lays upon the loyal Muslim, who is capable of travel to Mecca, the obligation of pilgrimage once during his life. "Whoever is able to make his way thither" should repair before he dies to the holy city, the navel of the earth, and to the haunts of Abraham and Ishmael where the Holy Prophet was born. 'Arafat and Mina in the Meccan
vicinity are included in the pilgrim rites but Medina, city of the Prophet's death and burial, is not, though many pilgrims include Medina in their travels before leaving the Hijaz.

What constitutes ability to be a pilgrim has been much discussed within the schools of law and by individual Muslims deciding whether and when to make the journey. Lack of means, slavery, feebleness of mind, lack of escort (in the case of women) are traditionally recognized as proper incapacity. The first has often been extended to excuse neglect on the ground of preoccupation with necessary affairs, insecurity on the road, hazards to health, and the like. With other strength of will has made up for arguable deficiency of means. In the long history of Islam, there have been many, Caliphs and Sp.aikhs, the mighty and the erudite, as well as the lowly, who never sought the sacred precincts. There have been others like Harin al-Rashid and his predecessor Al-Mansir, who made repeated pilgrimages to the Holy City. It would be impossible, as well as idle, to attempt a statistical assessment of the incidence of pilgrimage in any single generation. Some inveterate travelers in the heyday of Muslim tradition-building and of science wandered almost incessantly over the wide areas of the Muslim world, taking in Mecca at pilgrimage time as they went. There have been communities which, over long decades, through circumstances, local or Meccan, through schism or indifference, sent scarcely a trickle of visitors to the sanctuaries. Into these vicissitudes we cannot enter. A full and detailed history of the pilgrimage in Islam is yet to be written. It should be remembered also that the glory of Mecca has been borrowed or usurped by other centers. For pilgrimage is a powerful factor in the cohesion of empires. Thus Shi’ah Islam has its Karbala and Najaf and Persian Muslims have Meshed.

By means of the qiblahJ Islam made Mecca the center of day-to-day devotion. The pilgrimage or HajjJ the fifth "pillar" of religion, makes it the focal point of a yearly homage that often represents the aspiration of a lifetime. The pilgrimage is, so to

MINARET AND MUSLIM and Qum. These rivals apart, the holiest city in Islam has been at times besieged by rebel Muslims. Nevertheless the age-long sanctity remains and the pilgrimage today is a powerful unifying factor in the life of Islam.

In recent years official returns place the annual number of pilgrims at around 170,000. A sizable proportion are now airborne. The air line agent is more and more replacing the old muqawwim into whose care a caravan would entrust itself when setting out from Cairo or Damascus. Pilgrim ships to Jiddah are also more commodious than of yore. There have also been great improvements of late in the facilities for the health and security of the pilgrims on Arabian soil. Several leading Muslim states have opened national hostels in Mecca for their citizens. The deterrents which formerly intimidated the intellectual or the cultured have now been greatly mitigated. Currency control is more the stumbling block now to some would-be pilgrims than the lack of health control that daunted earlier generations. There are many intriguing issues connected with the contemporary pilgrimage but the temptation to discuss them must be resisted. Our purpose here is with an understanding of its general role in Muslim life. No discussions of numbers and conditions, however, would be complete without the observation that the pilgrimage in Islam involves and affects more people than physically perform it. It becomes in a sense a vicarious experience.

The village, the small mosque community, or the city quarter greets the returning pilgrim with possessive pride. It dubs him how a Hiiij and relives in his tales the emotions he has known.

His impact provides, so to speak, a participation by proxy. In this way the real defaulter, if not stimulated into action, at least knows what he has neglected. The believer who is genuinely incapable of pilgrimage enters in part into an awareness of Mecca that compensates for his inability to go there. Attendance—thus mediates the meaning of Mecca to
all the local levels of Muslim society. How many there are who are impervious to this secondary influence it is impossible to say. More important to discover is what the pilgrimage experience constitutes for those who are directly or vicariously part of it.

It should be clear that pilgrimage like any other pillar of ISLAM can be physically performed without being spiritually fulfilled. It is possible and desirable to visit Mecca at any time but the proper pilgrimage is that which takes place, with intention, in the stipulated month of Dhil-al-Hijjah. This, like all Muslim months, rotates round the seasons: the summer pilgrimages are the most exacting. There is a lesser pilgrimage, known as the 'Umrah, which is not fixed to any particular month. The rites are restricted to Muslims. No non-Muslim has in fact entered Mecca except in disguise or by subterfuge.4 The confession of the pilgrimage is symbolized by the ceremonial state of consecration, or ihram, into which the pilgrim must enter at some point between his departure and his arrival in the Hijaz. This state is symbolized by the wearing of a white, unsewn robe thrown across the body leaving the right arm and shoulder bare. The robes should be simple, silk being forbidden.

While in the state of ihram the pilgrim neither shaves nor washes, apart from the ceremonial ablutions at the various stations of the pilgrimage. Women are traditionally clad in a long robe reaching from head to foot. The veil is held off from the face in some way, so that the skin is technically uncovered. Sexual relations and other infringements of the ihram render the pilgrimage null and void.

The stages of the pilgrimage, in brief, are as follows. After arrival in Mecca the pilgrim makes seven circuits of the Ka'bah in the Great Mosque, during which he touches, or if possible kisses, the sacred Black Stone in the wall of the shrine. The circuits are performed barefoot. Leaving the mosque by another door from that used for entry the pilgrim makes the ceremonial running between two points in a wide Meccan street. This procession may be a recollection of Hagar's search hither and thither for water for Ishmael and is also connected with Abraham's eluding Satan. On the eighth day of the pilgrim month, these ceremonies being completed, the pilgrimage proper begins.

After a mosque discourse the pilgrims set out for Mina and 'Arafat some five and thirteen miles respectively from Mecca. The former is a narrow defile and the latter an open area, below the Mount of Mercy. Here the pilgrims stand from noon to sunset and sermons are delivered. This is the ninth day of the 19th month and the climax of pilgrimage. The night is spent in the open at Muzdalifah, on the route back to Mina. The following day comes "the stoning" in which each pilgrim casts seven small stones upon a large stone heap. Abraham is believed to have dismissed Satan by this means. The stoning brings to an end the pilgrimage proper and the pilgrim prepares to withdraw from the state of consecration. He sacrifices a sheep, a goat, and a camel and has his head shaved. He returns to Mecca where again he does a Ka'bah circuit and bathes in the water of the holy well of Zamzam, or sprinkles himself with it. There follows on the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth days of the month the so-called tashriq, or relaxation and pleasure. The consecrated state is terminated though stone-throwing ceremonies continue. Before leaving Mecca the pilgrim briefly resumes the ihram for a farewell visit to the Great Mosque.

Precise details of the ceremonies differ from time to time and from school to school. The lesser pilgrimage makes circumambulation the central ceremony and desacrilizing follows at once.

Simultaneously with the sacrifice at Mina and the tashriq of the pilgrims at Mecca the whole Muslim world celebrates its Great Festival, the 'Id-al-Adhii, when besides exchanging presents the devout Muslim may offer sacrifice. This association of the Great Festival with
the pilgrim rites serves to bind into one celebrating community the whole household of Islam within and beyond its religious center. After the completion of his farewell the pilgrim, in the state of Ihilil, or "secularity," makes his way home, visiting en route as he wills.

Some aspects of the pilgrimage have passed into Islam from pagan Arabian practice. Other elements of that origin, like circuits at 'Arafat and the state of nakedness during the Ka'bah circuits, were eliminated by Muhammad. The "standing" at 'Arafat is probably a pre-Islamic survival, as is also the sacrifice at Mina. But Islam gave new meaning to the surviving practices and baptized them into its strict monotheism. The incorporation of the pagan pilgrimage into Muslim ritual may be seen as the ceremonial counterpart of the political importance of Mecca already studied.

No discussion is possible here of the topography of Mecca and the historical affinities of the pilgrimage. The writings of Burton, Rutter, and Hugrnonje abound in descriptions of the Meccan terrain and the pilgrimage rites as they appeared to these observers.5 More significant here is the Labbaika cry with which the pilgrim punctuates his devotion from his first entry into the consecrated state to the completion of the stoning at Mina. The cry of the takbir, "God is most great," is, of course, characteristic also of all the pilgrim stages. But Labbaika takes us even more expressively into the heart of this experience at its best. "Doubly at Thy service, 0 God" is perhaps the best English rendering of the word. It is twice repeated, each time in the dual form to indicate emphasis. Arabic grammar describes it as an absolute complement of its original verb. It thus means that the pilgrim presents himself wholeheartedly before God with no other thought than this Divine encounter. His physical coming to Mecca is a kind of parable of his spiritual response to the revelation and law of God which he believes were historically communicated at this focal point. His cry of recognition of God and of what God has sent down pledges him to a sustained and ever-renewed devotion. He is gathering the rest of his life in the protest of unfailing allegiance: "Thee it is before Whom I stand." A description of the pilgrim rites and the observations of travelers, Muslim and Western, suggest to some outsiders a feeling of strangeness, if not revulsion. What can be the significance of thousands of flying pebbles and of animal carcasses strewn on the ground after a devotional "massacre," or of seething multitudes of humanity in the hot discomfort of unwashed garments and unshaven faces? Abuses, too, of pilgrim devotion there have sometimes been, and other unhappy features incidental to the whole. These are diminishing in face of a stricter system and more developed organization. But in any event it is well for the outside observer to look with understanding, even where he quite fails to penetrate the secret. Diverse and sincere participants have expressed in Muslim literature, old and new, their sense of elevation and insight during the pilgrim days. The pilgrimage, known from within, appears as a potent sacrament of Muslim unity and conveys a sense of inspiring solidarity. It is a yearly renewal of Meccan, or rather of Muhammad's, history in UI

the Muslim soul. It is a geographical expression of the religious heritage.

Perhaps the surest way to enter into this experience is to study the pilgrim prayers. Various manuals of pilgrim devotion, known as Manisik al HajjJ are supplied to Muslims bound for Mecca. A few extracts follow from one of them. On first beholding the buildings at Mecca, the pilgrim says:

In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful, 0 God, let this become to me an abode and grant me herein a valid profit.

On entering the precincts of the sacred Ka'bah he cries:
0 God, this sanctuary is Thine, the country is Thine, the safekeeping is Thine and the worshipper is Thine.

I have come unto Thee from a distant country with many transgressions and evil deeds. I beseech Thee, as one who has deep need of Thee, seeking the merciful relenting of Thy punishment, to receive me in Thy pure pardon and to bring me into Thy spacious paradise, that gracious abode. 0 God, this is Thy sanctuary and the sanctuary of Thy apostle. So keep me, flesh and blood and bone, inviolate from the fire. 0 God, preserve me from Thy condemnation in the Day when Thou dost raise up Thy servants. I beseech Thee, for Thou art God, there is none other save Thee, the beneficent, the merciful. Blessing and peace be upon our Lord Muhammad, upon his household and his companions. Let it be a great, eternal peace.

The prayer at the seventh circuit of the Ka'bah runs:

0 God, I ask of Thee a perfect faith, a sincere assurance, a reverent heart, a remembering tongue, a good conduct of commendation and a true repentance, repentance before death, rest at death and forgiveness and mercy after death, clemency at the reckoning, victory in paradise and escape from the fire, by Thy mercy, 0 mighty One, 0 Forgiver. Lord increase me in knowledge and join me unto the good.

At the "standing" of Abraham, the pilgrim prays:

0 God, Thou knowest my secret and my open things. Receive my plea. Thou knowest my need, grant me my petition. Thou knowest what is in my spirit. Forgive me my trespasses. 0 God, I ask Thee for a faith which will occupy my heart and a sincere assurance so that I may know that nothing will befall me except what Thou hast written for me. Thou art my guardian in this world and that to come. Let me die a Muslim and join me to the good. 0 God, do not let there be in this standing any guilt, save what Thou hast forgiven: no grief save what Thou hast assuaged: no need save what Thou hast satisfied and hast made easy. Render our affairs prosperous and enlarge our bosoms and illumine our hearts and seal our deeds with good things. 0 God, let us die Muslims and raise us to life as Muslims and join us to the good, not as those who are ashamed, nor as those who are seduced.

The prayers of the pilgrim at Mecca bring us back to the Meccan direction of all prayer, and so to the mosque, the local focus of Muslim devotion. Imaginative and observant study in the mosque may more truly apprehend the nature of the Muslim's religion than many a treatise in Islamins. Each mosque is in some sense an epitome of Muslim life and the Muslim story. Some of them are former churches recognizable still, yet unmistakably transformed. Others are vast, original monuments of Muslim architecture and vitality. Not least appealing are the unpretentious and modest ones which in their very ordinariness seem to embody more intimately the life of believing generations. Nor are they all out of the far past and laden with years. The traveler in Algeria, for example, will come upon many new mosque structures, gleaming in their whiteness, an index to the vigor of the Society of the 'Ulama' responsible for their erection.

Whether old or new, majestic or unobtrusive, the mosque is full of clues to the nature of religious life. It expresses in structural form the pattern of the Muslim faith. Its most conspicuous features are the minaret, the mihrab, and the minbar. These serve respectively the call to prayer, its direction and unity, and its interpretation. They are identical with three roles belonging to the mosque personnel-that of muezzin, imiim, and khatib.
In large and well-endowed mosques these are usually different individuals. They may also be assisted by others such as the muwaqqit, who keeps the hours for the muezzin, the qiss, who relates stories for instruction and devotion to the faithful, the qiirî, or reader, who chants the Qur'an and, perhaps, a muhtasib to supervise the morals of the community. In the more modest mosques these offices may be performed by the same individual at different times. The duty of the u'mezzin, in this context, needs no further description. The earliest call to prayer seems to have been given from the roof-tops of the Prophet's quarters in Medina or of other near-by houses. Traditionally, the first muezzin was Bilal, an Ethiopian. The minaret, though admirably suited to the call to prayer and itself, in some forms, a kind of stabbing summons to the upward relation of life, may not have evolved only for this religious function. It no doubt incorporated features of the Christian architecture absorbed through conquest. Its name, place of light or fire, suggests that it may have had strictly utilitarian origins, as a watchtower for fire signals. Christian history reminds us, too, that towers had their attraction for ascetics and devotees. There is record of at least one outstanding Muslim theologian who owed much to the seclusion of a minaret. But whatever the diverse factors, architectural and otherwise, contributing to its evolution, the minaret is the muezzin's world.

It is the vantage point of a devotional appeal. The artist may find in it an excuse for an exquisite theme. But the man with a mission in words is finally his master. When the minarets began to go up one by one, in the fifteenth century, around the ancient Church of Saint Sophia in Istanbul they marked the edifice as indubitably Islamic. The minaret everywhere serves to identify on the landscape the community of the faith of Muhammad. Its form is a silent embodiment of the oral summons which it houses.

The imiim, however, within the mosque, is a more important official since he leads that to which the muezzin only calls. The word imiim, in Sunni Islam, means simply the leader who stands in front of the assembled believers, to insure unison in the movements of the prayers. The congregation follows him in the recitals and prostrations. The mihriib, or niche, toward which he stands, marks the qiblah toward Mecca. It is always empty, though its walls may be exquisitely adorned with tiles and texts.

The recess serves as a focal point that sets the faces of the faithful on the line to Mecca where they find spiritual rendezvous with the rest of the'ir brethren. By the mihriib the congregation is consciously set on one of the radii from the gravitational center of Islam. Like the minaret, the mihriib may also have derived from non-Islamic factors similarly subdued. The earliest traditions suggest that a spear, thrust into the ground, sufficed to mark the direction. But when churches were taken into Islam, the numerous niches in familiar use for statua~ or episcopal thrones, seemed to suit the need. Emptiness was all that was required to baptize the old into the new and to proclaim the iconoclasm and equality of Muslim devotion. Similarly the minbar, or pulpit, gave the mosque a rostrum for exhortation and preaching, in which earlier forms were readily adapted. The characteristic Muslim pulpit is a projection at right angles to the main wall, often adjacent to the mihriib, with steps leading upward through a screen or curtain surmounted by a lintel. The preacher faces down the steps from the platform at the top, and addresses the people without a reading stand. His words are usually extempore, though carefully prepared. The spacious areas on both sides of the minbar give ample scope to the artist in calligraphy and design. Sometimes the minbar is retractable, being provided with wheels in order to be pushed into a recess when not in use. For the sermon by the khatzb is a weekly institution at the time of the noon-prayer on Fridays. At other times the shaikhs and readers recite or catechize from lower, less pretentious, desks or platforms, on which they squat in closer audience among smaller groupS. Several such low rostrums may be seen in any sizable mosque. In populous cities the visitor will often find such instruction in progress.
The place and function of the mosque sermon in Muslim religious life needs to be more fully investigated. The discourse is generally hortatory rather than discursive. It does not so much defend the faith as commend it: it encourages to practice rather than to apology. The underlying assumption seems generally to be that the believers know what they believe but may be forgetful in the fulfillment of their duties. The non-believer is never present to listen so that the sermon is never directed toward an outsider. This fact has deeply influenced the form and temper of the average preacher. His discourse is usually divided into two parts, the first and much longer section beginning with certain conventional openings and containing the substance of the theme, the second following as a brief peroration, after a pause.

Many mosque preachers follow a calendar sequence and fit their themes to the significance of the season or approaching festival. They may also comment widely on current political and social affairs, though the liberty to do this has been strictly curtailed in certain areas of late because of the delicate nature of mosque-state relationships. Nevertheless, the close connection between the preacher's duty and social life is traditional. The minbar was in early Islam the place of Caliphal pronouncements and sometimes of judicial and other judgments. The sermon has often been an instrument of public education in particular points, even in emergencies of public health. It has also been a means of ruling indoctrination or propaganda. This was natural in a society when the mosque was the chief place of assembly amid a population that was largely illiterate and where there was no sense of any incompatibility between worship and affairs.

Much contemporary criticism of the mosque preaching in the past concentrates on this point of its subservience to ruling authority and its function as a means to state control. Other critics deplore the lack of originality displayed by many preachers and trace the neglect of the mosque by some sections of the population to the stereotyped form and content of the sermon.

There is impatience when the preacher repeats pious platitudes and demonstrates that he is incapable of any adequate intellectual or spiritual wrestling with the realities of the world as some at least of his hearers know it. The need for the improvement of the mosque sermon is widely felt in responsible circles and there have been a number of manuals in the recent past seeking to grapple with it. The ultimate future of the preacher in the life of Islam would seem likely to turn upon the adequacy of theological education.

The following sermon from the Diwfm, or published collection of 'AbdalHih al-Maraghy of Cairo, may serve to illustrate the manner and content of a mosque discourse. The theme is "Faith in God."

Praise be to God, Who guides the hearts of His chosen ones by faith, and makes tranquil the hearts of His elect in confidence. I bear witness that there is no god except God. In His dominion nothing occurs save by His willing it. I bear witness that our Lord Muhammad is the Apostle of God, whose resolution was not weakened by adversities.

God most High has said in His glorious Book: "He who believes in God, his heart is guided, and God is in all things most knowing." Ye who worship God: Faith is the devoting of the heart unto God by man and his acceptance of what God has revealed to His Prophets, his belief in His determination and His will. It is a breath from the spirit of God, by which He confirms those who sincerely believe among His worshippers, in trials. It is a torch lighted from the light of God, irradiating in the hearts of the chosen ones among those who love Him. Faith has signs which point the way to it, and conviction has indications that guide (men) towards it. God Most High said: "Those believers whose hearts glow at the mention of God, and whose faith is increased when his verses (signs) are read to them, those who rely upon their Lord and perform the prayers and give generously of that which we have bestowed upon
them, these are the true believers indeed, they have honour with their Lord and forgiveness and gracious benefits." These are the indications of the true faith: the fear of God which impels a man to magnify Him and extol Him, meditation on His signs which stimulates him to trust in His promise, reliance upon God leading him to conformity to His decree, so that he reverences Him in his prayers and is obedient in his almsgiving. God will increase him in rank and forgive him his evil deeds and bestow upon him gracious blessings and guide him in the path of the upright.

Ye worshippers of God: how wondrous it is that everything belonging to the believer is good. It is only so for the believer. If some good fortune befalls him, he gives thanks and it becomes a blessing to him. If some misfortune, he is patient and it becomes a blessing. A gift does not make him negligent, nor does catastrophe anger him. That is how Muhammad was. God tried him with blessings and he received them with great gratitude. He tested him with calamity and he met it with splendid patience. He went one day to the people of Al-Ta'if to preach to them the message of his Lord. They stoned him until the blood flowed. He took refuge in a vineyard and sought shade there. Then he turned unto God and said: "0 God I plead before Thee for the feebleness of my strength which has been patient with men. 0 Thou Most Merciful Thou art the Lord of those who acknowledge weakness. Thou art my Lord. It is not Thy anger that is upon me. I will not care anything of it." Such also was the life of his companions, the believers. They did not weary of the animosity of the unbelievers and did not despair at their seeming victory.

They drew out of failure the means to success, and out of disaster a road to victory, taking refuge with their Lord in loyal resolve, and entire confidence. They it was who hearkened to God and to the Apostle after wounds befell them. They it was to whom people said: "Verily men have gathered together against you so fear them." But that only increased their faith and they said: "We have considered God and the grace of the One we trust." So they overcame by grace and favour from God and no evil touched them. They followed a course well-pleasing to God Who is the Lord of great goodness.

0 ye worshippers of God. Faith guides believers, both as individuals and communities, to bear hardships, however great they may be, and to clear open the way to a happy life, however difficult be its attainment, and to the performance of religious obligations however arduous. Hardships reward the believer with rest and quiet and confidence. Difficulties repay him with strength and courage. Acts of worship make him grow in faith. Fasting is half of patience. Patience is half of faith. How great is our need in this life of a disposition which will implant fasting in men's souls. It will nourish the feeling of mercy and train the power of the will and the purpose and lift man to the loftiest character. Prayer is a link between the servant and his Lord and between the believer and his fellow believers. Pilgrimage means mutual awareness and mutual goodwill, sacrifice, patience and fortitude. Zakiit is goodness, liberality, righteousness and the payment of debt.

Then fear God, 0 ye worshippers of God and lay hold of the bond of faith for that is the strong tie of God, gathering believers into one mind. Take pleasure in his blessings and find your beauty in His glories. May God cause quietness to descend upon you and bring your hearts unto unity.

Tradition records that the Apostle of God said to his companions: "Ask me anything you wish." A man cried:

"Apostle of God: What is faith?" He said: "Sincerity." "And what is conviction?" and he said: "Honest dealing."

Despite the criticisms directed against him from several sides in Islam the preacher still has an influential role in the community. On his lips the religion becomes articulate and
something of its daily meaning is expressed. Though there are powerful factors working in
the direction of secularity and irreligion the mosques are frequently crowded and listeners
overflow on to the sidewalks where loud-speakers relay the discourse. Even in Turkey where
the pressure of a laic state has been strong for three decades, there are marked signs of a
revival of mosque attendances, not least in Ankara itself. If then the khatib is far from
enjoying the prestige he once wielded, he and his art maintain a vigorous continuity with the
great past and have still to be reckoned with in the understanding of Muslim religious life.
Certain other features of the mosque as an index to Islam deserve attention. The notable lack
of seats strikes the Western visitor though it is by no means so strange to the Eastern
Christian. More significant still is the total absence of a special sanctuary or altar. Two large
candlesticks may flank the mihrāb but their meaning does not hold a central place. Long lines
of pillars support the flat roofs, or wide expanses of carpeted space stretch beneath a soaring
dome. The Qur'an is everywhere the theme of decoration. A clock will often be found in a
prominent position. Small folding stools that serve to support the reader's Qur'an are about
the only movable furniture. In some mosques a balcony or gallery runs along one side or even
around the structure. Outside the mosque proper is a wide sahn, or court, unless the mosque is
small. Here stand the fountains in open cisterns or under cupolas with columns. If the mosque
is famous it may boast some celebrated tomb of patriarch, traditionalist, exegete or ruler,
where, behind a grille or under an ornate canopy, a sarcophagus will be found. Around these
shrines the visitor may see candles, ribbons, and other decorations, placed there by the
faithful at times of remembrance or invocation. In small local mosques the memory of some
saint or marabiit may dominate. Signs of special veneration then become more evident. For
popular Muslim devotion has not seldom broken out of the strict rigidities of orthodox
theology to find satisfying popular forms by which to express and arouse itself.
For all its wide variety, however, the mosque has a clear unity of function pervading and
constraining all its architectural diversity. This unity arises in the last analysis from Islam
itself and has been deepened by the fact of pilgrimage. In the great ages of mosque-building,
travel was frequent and extensive.
Masons, designers, craftsmen, and ceramicists traveled from center to center, on their long
way to or from Mecca, studying the edifices they saw, noting details, and comparing skills.
They learned in this way how to combine their artistic tastes with the requirements of the
faith. Such luxury as they might allow themselves was transmuted into forms at least
basically subdued to the dictates of dogma. Carpets on which men prayed could be richly
dyed and patterned; lamps by which they recited the sacred text could be lavishly inlaid with
gold and silver; domes that symbolized the over-arching unity could be elaborately adorned
with color or gold. These were compensations for the prohibition of statuary, ikons, and
pictorial art. The mosque, then, can be seen as the majestic synthesis of prevailing religious
dogma and a worshipful art that accepted its limitations creatively. Nowhere can the soul of
Islam be so movingly read and pondered as in its hallowed precincts.
A study of the religious reality which the mosque expresses would not be complete without
some reference to its principal historical division. Early in its career, Islam suffered a serious
schism, dividing it into two major groupings described as Sunni and Shi'ah. There is no space
here for a detailed exposition of the factors involved, nor of the other subdivisions into which
both, but Shi'ah Islam in particular, are divided. The context of devotional life seems to be the
most appropriate area in which to set a brief explanation of this duality in Islam, though
originating factors were political as well as theological.
Sunni Islam follows the rule of the orthodox Sunnah, or Path, of the Qur'an and the (Sunnī)
Tradition. It believes in the validity of the historic Caliphate and in the utter finality of the
Prophethood of Muhammad. Shī'ah Islam holds that 'An, fourth Caliph, cousin and son-in-
law of the Prophet, should have been his immediate successor and, therefore, disallows the
first three Caliphs and the de jure status of the subsequent Umayyads and their successors. The dark family tragedies of the house of 'An, culminating in the massacre of Husain and his retinue at Karbala in A.D., 680, gave to Shi'ah Islam a background of martyrdom that shaped its whole theology. Devotion to the tragic three, 'Ali, Hasan, and Husain, evoked religious attitudes to which Sunni Islam has remained for the most part a stranger.

In its main areas in Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, the Yaman, and India, Shi'ah Islam is devoted to the memory of the Prophet's family and sees in its story of death and defeat a drama of redemptive sacrifice. The celebration culminates in the Muharram rites when the tragedy of Husain is re-enacted with intense emotion. Here, more than anywhere in Sunni Islam, the Shi'ah Muslim comes to grips with the mystery of suffering and grapples with areas of meaning the average Sunni ignores. Descriptions of Shi'ah devotion in its supreme festival are readily accessible. What is of importance here is to appreciate the underlying reasons for the deep contrasts in Shi'ah devotional life. The crux lies in the contrasted Shi'ah concept of the relation of the Divine revelation to men in time. Shi'ah Islam believes in Muhammad as the culmination of prophethood. But whereas the Sunni believes that the succeeding centuries enter into the Muhammadan revelation through the Qur'an and the orthodoxy of the possessing community, Shi'ahs believe that it is mediated to the generations through Imaams, without whom its relevance cannot be known. These Imaams do not replace the Prophet or impugn his finality. Rather they are the indispensable media) of the understanding of the truth the Prophet proclaimed. It is through them, and them alone, that he is made contemporary. The truth is not possessed in an orthodox continuity of retrospective education. The community is not the repository or the guarantee of valid understanding in reliance upon the prior documentary sources. The guarantee lies in the Imaam who is thought of as an emanation of the Divine light and of the wisdom of God in the time of his life. Whereas the term imam in Sunni Islam simply signifies the leader of the mosque prayers, habitual or actual, in Shi'ah Islam the Imaam signifies the agent of the Divine illumination of the age. The succession begins with the Prophet and 'An and his sons and passes down to the number of seven (in some Shi'ah thought), or to twelve (in other sects). By virtue of its more immediate sense of Divine revelation, Shi'ah Islam has shown much greater tendency to sectarianism and schism. It is subdivided into many forms, one of the most notable being Ismailism. Its doctrine of the Hidden Imaam gives rise to speculative excesses far more readily than the disciplined orthodoxy of Sunnis. Shi'ahs have their own traditions and separate schools of law. Many racial and cultural tensions can be read into this central schism and the cleavage goes very deep. New sects like Babism and Bahaism arose in the nineteenth century from Shi'ah Islam, carrying some of its ideas into wider disparity.

The issue between Sunni and Shi'ah ultimately concerns the relation of dogma to devotion and of the eternal universal to the temporal particular. Is the individual believer related to Muhammad as the place of final revelation, backward through the generations? Or does that essential truth break upon him freshly in more contemporary occasions of new radiance and articulation? Shi'ahs have affirmed the latter. What they have lost in schismatic divisiveness when compared with Sunnis, they may have gained in devotional immediacy and the sense of urgency. Though devious and proliferating in many of its forms Shi'ah Islam has often greater spontaneity and intensity. It has escaped the aridity and formalism which have periodically afflicted the Sunni segment. It has shown more hospitality, or been more exposed, to esoteric confusion. Under its influence many non-Arab elements have come to coalesce with original Muslim forms. Because of their doctrine of the sinlessness of the Imaams Shi'ahs look much more largely for intercession and mediation.

Relations between Sunni and Shi'ah have varied through the centuries. The extremer sects, carrying their doctrines of emanation to a point where the supremacy of Muhammad is denied...
and he comes to be merely one in a series, have naturally aroused the strongest antagonism. Shi'ahs in general have much ground for hatred when they relive the agonies of Husain or remember such episodes as the defeat of their own Fatimid Caliphate by that earnest Sunni Saladin or the bitter zeal of the last great Mughal, Aurangzib. On the other hand, there have been many efforts to draw the household of Islam together and to develop its underlying common heritage. But devotionally it would seem that an irreconcilable difference of mood, emphasis, and emotion divides the two.

Beyond reason and revelation dogmatically defined. He discounts what Muslim theology calls 'aql, intellect, and naql, or transmitted truth, and concentrates on hashf, or discovery, in which the meaning of faith and truth is given in experimental immediacy to the seeking soul. The insight is the reward of a path to knowledge which involves moral discipline and ascetic life. This Sufi way, or tariqah, is understood to consist of stages, the three main grades of which are the murid, or novice, the siyir, or traveler, and the wissil, or attainer. The conditions of knowledge are, for the Sufi, primarily spiritual, not intellectual. Muhammad is the exemplar of the path. He exemplifies faith as an attitude rather than dictates it as a dogma. The Qur'an likewise is a textbook in the method. The findings to be valid must be the Sufi's own. But because they are experimentally known they cannot be readily defined in intellectual terms. "Come where I am; I can show you the way" is the mystic's call to man, not: "Believe what I teach, I can tell you the orthodox truth." As such the Sufi represents at once a protest, an aspiration, and a goal. His very lack of rational concern and some of the forms of his technique are liable to lead him into aberration and bring his purpose into disrepute. Some Sufi doctrines of passivity and the Sufi veneration of saints have occasioned no little apathy and crude superstition. Sufism has suffered from its own excesses and is reproached by many modern reformers. Yet even these critics, Muhammad 'Abduh, for example, and Iqbal, have themselves owed not a little to Sufi influence in their upbringing.

In its finest forms Islamic mysticism has inspired the greatest devotional literature in Islam. There is the celebrated poetess Riibi'ah (died A.D. 801); Al-HaIIaj, the Persian writer (crucified in A.D. 922); Al-Ghazali, himself; Ibn al-'Arabi "the greatest mystical genius of the Arabs" (died in Damascus in A.D. 1240); his contemporary the famous Jalal al-Din Rumi, author of the immortal Mathnavi. The writings of these and lesser leaders are becoming increasingly available in translations and anthologies for Western readers.12 They are living testimony to the vitality of the tradition to which they belonged. Here the student may find in their most eloquent expression the characteristic Sufi in-

If Shi'ah Muslims represent a plea for greater immediacy of the soul to truth than Sunni Islam provides, the same is true of the long and deep tradition of mysticism, the Muslim forms of which are known as Sufism. It is in this area that the devotional achievements of Islam as religion are greatest. Sufism has a long and chequered history. There were times in the later centuries when it did more to conserve and perpetuate Islam than did orthodoxy itself. Its beginnings go back to the Prophet who is claimed and possessed by some Sufis as the supreme exponent of disciplined mystical ecstasy. The Qur'an, in this view, is then the greatest product of the Sufi approach. This understanding, sustained by many texts capable of such interpretation, justifies the Sufis in asserting a direct intimacy with the truth such as outrages or dismays the orthodox custodians of the faith. The strong development of Sufism, associated with such teachers as the Brethren of Purity and Al-Muhasibi in the ninth and tenth centuries of the Christian era, largely came in protest against the increasing formalism of Muslim theology. Whatever elements in primitive Islam
served to give it positive generation, it drew strength from the failure of the orthodox to
satisfy the demands of the devotional spirit. The mystic, being always suspect to the
custodians of dogma, seeks the attainment of Divine knowledge by a contrasted attitude to
the deeds or documents of the historic faith. He believes in an alternative way to truth,
tensions: the yearning after the knowledge which is absorption; the joy of penetration beyond
the shell of selfish selfhood into wholeness; the price of discipline and the meaning of
temptation; the purity and poverty of the ardent spirit; the disinterestedness of valid love; the
stations and states of the progress of the soul; the anticipations of illumination and the climax
of fanii’ where the soul transcends itself and its search in passing into love.
The most notable external feature of Sufism is its organization into orders for the better
fulfillment of its purposes. These orders became a profound factor in the whole life of Islam.
They resembled economic guilds or fraternities and gave a cohesion to Muslim social life that
often outweighed the mosque and orthodoxy in local importance. The orders gathered around
first the person and then the reputation of some great founder, whose devotions they used.
The most famous of the orders were the Qadiriyyah founded by 'Abd al-Qadir al-Jilani (1078-
1166); the Suhrawardiyyah, named after Shihab al-Din al-Suhrawardi (1144-1234); the
Shadhiliyyah, deriving from Nur al-Din al-Shadhili (1196-1258); and the Maulawiyyah, from
the title of Maulawi, given to the author of the Mathnavi. Numerous other orders and
innumerable offshoots developed throughout the world of Islam. Their rituals differed
considerably but all in some sense used the technique of the dhikr. The dervish is no doubt
the most familiar image to the Western mind in this connection. The dhikr is the use of
rhythmic recitation and rhythmic movements of the body to induce that sense of abstraction
from the physical world which the Sufi seeks. Repeated ejaculations of Alliih or Subhiin
Alliih or the words of the Fiitihah serve to sever attention from the senses and concentrate it
on the thought of God. That the practices of the mystics have encouraged charlatans and
rogues is a familiar denunciation. But the scandalous excesses of some should not blind the
critic to the force and fervor of restrained and disciplined mysticism. For all the tensions they
have set up in Islam the Sufis have not seldom been its salvation. Among their humblest
devotees one may still find a rare quality of spiritual desire and a sensitivity of soul to God,
life, and eternity.

Here from a Sufi manual, or rather, scroll, of devotion carried in the long robe of what
unknown artisan or in the camel holster of an unnamed cameleer, undated and yet timeless, is
a translated extract.
It breathes an unmistakable, religious self-awareness, that knows both repentance and
confidence, entreaty and adoration.

0 Lord, open to us Thy mercy and clothe us, 0 Lord, in the most excellent robe of guidance
and prayer. Be glad, 0 God, at Thy greatness... and let the sighing of our tears flow, 0 God,
into Thine awful worship.
Correct, 0 God, in me the allurements of evil for the sake of my entreaty. 0 my God, if Thy
mercy had not shown me the good way then who would have led me unto Thee in a plain
path? ... If Thine aid had forsaken me when self and Satan struggled with me, then verily
Thy forsaking would have left me in misery and loss.
0 my God, I knocked at the door of Thy mercy with the hand of my hope. I fled unto Thee,
seeking refuge from my multiplied sins and I hung upon the borders of Thy garments with the
fingers of my trust. So pardon, 0 God, the wrongs I have done, the evils and the sins, and rid
me, 0 God, of my evil state, for Thou art my Lord and Sovereign, my reliance and my hope,
the goal of my desire in my calamity and distress.
0 my God, how wilt Thou reject a worthless one who takes refuge with Thee, fleeing from his sins: or how wilt Thou disappoint one who implores guidance of Thy excellence with entreaty: or how wilt Thou cast off one who longs to drink of Thy waters? No! Thou wilt not. . . for Thy door is open to the seekers and the homeless. Thou art the end of our search and the goal of hope, 0 my God.

This is the Sufi's A-Zaika tawakkaltuJ "Lord in Thee have I trusted"-one of the most familiar phrases in the religious life of all Islam.