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And how many a prophet has fought with whom were many worshippers of the Lord; so they did not become weak-hearted on account of what befell them in Allah's way, nor did they weaken, nor did they abase themselves; and Allah loves the patient.

And their saying was no other than that they said: Our Lord! forgive us our faults and our extravagance in our affairs, and make firm our feet and help us against the unbelieving people.

So Allah gave them the reward of this world and better reward of the hereafter; and Allah loves those who do good (to others).

—The Holy Qur'ân, Ch. III, vv. 145-147.

The Purport

Patience in suffering, fortitude in trials and unyielding resistance to the forces of evil, are the hall-marks of Islam. But this adamantine faith and courage is to be sustained by constant prayers and supplications before God as has been the practice of all holy men,
prophets and saints—prayers on the lines suggested here. Let our minds be turned with the words of the prayer and a world of inspiration and courage will be revealed to us. With these spiritual resources to back our actions we shall not only have the victory of our cause assured to us but also a foretaste of the life and bliss eternal, which all religions promise to their respective followers, but which now Islam alone can vouchsafe.

‘ID-AL FITR (1366 A.H.) AT WOKING

The Muslim festival of ‘Īd al-Fitr, which marks the termination of the fasting month of Ramadzān was celebrated at the Shah Jehan Mosque, Woking (England) on Sunday the 17th August this year. The weather was exceptionally fine. Over three hundred persons participated. Believers assembled represented various nationalities of the East and the West. Particularly noticeable were those who hailed from Irāq, Irān, Sa‘ūdī Arabia and Palestine. The prayers were led by Al-Hājj Dr. Shaikh Muhammad Abdullah, Ph D, the acting Imam of the Mosque.

The inspiring sermon which we publish elsewhere, the weather, the orderly arrangement of the function—all combined to make the celebration the happiest for many years as some participants rightly remarked.

THE ‘ID-AL-FITR SERMON

BY AL-HĀJJ DR. S. M. ABDULLAH, PH. D.

He is Allah besides whom there is no God: the Knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allah besides whom there is no God, the King, the Granter of security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness; Glory be to Allah from what they set up (with Him).

He is Allah, the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner; His are the most excellent names; whatever is in the heavens and the earth declares His glory; and He is the Mighty, the Wise.


We are assembled here to celebrate the ‘Īd-al-Fitr, that is, the festival of the breaking of the fast, and our common tie is the religion of Islam which was the
religion of Abraham, revered as much by the Muslims as by the Jews and the Christians. Muhammad's message was not new, for truth is one, universal and eternal. It had been delivered before, but mankind had lost it. The blessed month of Ramadzan—the month of supplications and prayers, the month of spending our wealth for the benefit and the upliftment of the poor and the needy, the month in which the Holy Qur'an was revealed, is over. Today we meet together to offer prayers in thanksgiving for His enabling us to fulfil our duties to Him; the fundamental idea in Islam being "submission to His will". Today is the day when once again the lawful things, from which we abstained simply to obey His commandment, are made lawful for us and we enjoy them. True happiness lies in the performance of our duties and Islam is a religion not of individuals but of a closely knit society, so in order to mark our collective rejoicing, we have not only prayed together but practically all of us, all those who can afford to pay, have paid certain sum of money towards the charity fund, known as Sadaqat-al-Fitr, so as to enable the poorer and less favoured members of the Islamic brotherhood also to enjoy the occasion. Charity, as the Qur'an says, purifies our souls, our property; purges us and our wealth of the materialistic dross so very common in the present-day materialistic life of ours.

As I have just now mentioned, the corner-stone and the basic principle of Islamic teachings is "Complete submission to His Will." The Holy Prophet Jesus, (may peace and blessings of God be upon him), was also driving home to his followers the same idea when he said: "Not my will but Thy will." This, in fact, has been the one theme of the teachings of all the Prophets and God's revelations from time immemorial. But humanity today has forgotten and neglected this very important foundation, with the result that it is faced with the biggest catastrophe and the severest crisis that it has ever seen. The devastations of the First World War were yet fresh in the minds of the present generation, when within the short space of twenty years, we found a veritable hell raging on this earth from one end to the other in the form of the Second World War and whilst this conflagration has hardly subsided we hear of a Third World War and who knows if a fourth or a fifth visita-
tation, each more horrible than the one that precedes it, is yet in store for this world.

Material advancement, which was believed to be the source of increased happiness for the human race, has brought instead untold misery and wide-spread destruction. Professor M. L. E. Oliphant, pioneer of atomic research, while speaking to the scientists of all nations at Birmingham, in July last, spoke of the possibility of total destruction through developments in chemical and atomic warfare. He said, "Science leads more rapidly to the development of methods of destruction than of preservation." The world is almost in a chaotic condition and security of life, property and honour has vanished from the entire world. Picture to yourself the state of affairs in China, Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan, Palestine, Europe and see for yourself if there is any spot of God's earth where peace and security exist today. Humanity has been divided into races and nations which hate one another, and in their march for advancement and their passion for more and more of material comforts and worldly pelf and power, seek to destroy one another, not being bound by any moral code. Humanity has banished God from this world and so God has banished "peace and security" from it. The material civilization of the West has refused to admit the value of any spiritual forces. In the materially advanced Western world, the seismic centre of the convulsions which are shaking the entire world, such a moral and a spiritual force does not exist. Religion is recognised only as a man's private concern, and people feel shy to speak of it in society. The name of God is on the lips, and the politicians, instead of serving Him, requisition His services in some great national calamity or for victory in a war. God is more needed to further material gains and to serve political ends than to bring contentment of mind.

Now let us see if Islam has to make any contribution towards the establishment of "peace and security" in the world. The object of Islam is not merely to preach the doctrine of the existence of God as a theory, it goes far beyond that. Religion seeks to instil the conviction that God is a living force in the life of man; and prayer is the means by which it is sought to achieve this great end. The real conviction that God is, comes to man, not by
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the belief that there is a God in the outer world, but by the realization of the divine within oneself. The Qur’an says: “Peace and tranquillity of mind is attained through remembrance of God.” Islam has devised ways and means and established institutions, to keep alive the idea of God and true and living faith in a living and loving God.

All religions preach and teach about Faith and Belief in God. But the result of all these pious teachings is practically nil. Mere catchwords and phrases and high sounding ideology and sermons, which look very promising on paper and sound very well on lips, do not lead us very far. It is a common experience that mere philosophical expositions, or even moral exhortations backed by religious authority, are not efficacious. There is something else which is wanted. There is still something which is missing. The diagnosis of Islam is that it is the lack of so-called formalism, and of institutions, through which man can get an opportunity to keep alive and nourish any noble idea to feel the presence and existence—nay the nearness of God, we must have some suitable and proper institution to buttress it. Any one who has studied the practical life of a Muslim must have noticed how Islam proposes to create this suitable frame of mind in a Muslim. In Islam, as you all know, there is no Sabbath. No particular day is set apart for worship, as in Judaism and Christianity. One day of prayer with no business and six days of business with no prayer, is not the Muslim’s rule of life. Prayer is made a part of the everyday affairs of man. There is a prayer in the morning before sunrise when a man rises from his bed; another just after midday; a third in the afternoon; a fourth at sunset; and a fifth before going to bed. Prayer is thus the first daily work of a Muslim and it is also his last work of the day. Thus Islam requires that in all the varying conditions through which man has to pass, his spirit should be in touch with the Divine Spirit. Even when busiest, he should still be able to disengage himself from all worldly occupations for a short while and resort to prayer. The object in view in this arrangement is clearly that man should feel the Divine presence under all conditions, so that while he is doing his work, God should still be nearest to his heart. But Islam does not stop
here. If practically all the other religions have reduced this all important institution of prayer and confined it to a Sunday or Saturday service, Islam and the Holy Prophet Muhammad, (peace and blessings of God be upon him) has taught short prayers for each and every act of a Muslim. Any one who cares to glance through the sayings of the Holy Prophet Muhammad will be convinced of the fact that the entire life of a Muslim is dedicated to the service of God. Islam tries to spiritualise the physical side of our life, or, in other words, intertwines the worldly with the religious. To make this point clear let me mention some of the common prayers taught by the Holy Prophet for various occasions of our ordinary daily life. A Muslim is asked to think of God just as he gets up from his sleep. He says: “All praise is due to God, who brought us to life after He had caused us to die, that is, sleep.” Similarly, when he goes to answer the call of nature, he seeks refuge in God from physical and spiritual ailments. When washing his face or taking a bath he again utters a short prayer: “O Allah, make me of those who turn to Thee again and again and make me of those who purify themselves.” Again, before meals and after meals a Muslim thinks of God. He starts with the name of God, the Beneficent and Merciful and ends with praise and thanksgiving to Him. While mounting on or dismounting from an animal, or getting into a train or any other means of conveyance, he again remembers God in the form of a short prayer. Even when enjoying the closest companionship of one’s wife one should utter: “O God, ward off from us the devil and ward off the devil from that which Thou grantest us.” In short, every act of a Muslim is religious, no matter however worldly it may be from the point of view of a non-Muslim. In Islam there exists no distinction between religious and mundane life. Each act of a Muslim is motivated by the desire to seek the pleasure of God. It is this motive which spiritualises the actions of a Muslim.

So, we have seen how Islam has achieved this important and distinctive feature. Even Christian writers have realised it. Mr. W. E. Hocking in his book called Living Religions and World Faith says: “To Muslims, God is surely a near and present God, more so, I am tempted to
say, than to most Christians. Within Islam one is aware of a dignity, a sense of the constant Majesty of God, which we Christians lack. Among Islamic peoples one sees how the habitual thought about God becomes a part of the personal quality of man; dignity enters into him also. To the Muslims, God in His majesty is also a near and present God. A Muslim never forgets that it is God with whom he has to do."

Before concluding I may mention another important achievement of Islam which is based upon the absolute Unity of God. Fatherhood of God has founded a unique brotherhood of man. The same writer, Mr. Hocking, says: "Islam has also an effective fraternity which crosses racial bounds with an ease which Christianity professes but Christians seldom attain." I need hardly dilate upon this wonderful achievement of Islam, because the present gathering of ours is an irrefutable, convincing proof of the universal brotherhood of man. Here you do not find any difference between rich and poor, educated and illiterate, white and black, master and servant, high and low and all sit and stand together and will presently dine together, without any distinction. Thus Islam has really succeeded in removing all kinds of barriers from at least one-fifth of the human race and we Muslims believe that the justification for our existence lies in our carrying through the world a practical brotherhood of man.

* * * * *

Today we have another occasion for our gratitude and thankfulness to God Almighty; and that is the achievement of another large Muslim state, nay, the establishment of the biggest Muslim state, Pakistan. We are thankful to God that this achievement has been brought about in a peaceful manner and in a non-violent way, so very characteristic and distinctive of Islam. Let us pray for its prosperity and success. May it thrive and flourish in accordance with the ideals of Islam! May God grant us power and strength to be able to live up to the tenets of Islam. Let the Holy Qur’ān be our guide and the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad inspire us to be of service to the entire human race! Amen!
WHY THIS STRIFE?

BY M. A. HAMID

The difference in view-points between the Hindu and the Muslim is so wide that in spite of their living side by side as neighbours for centuries, no cordial relation could be successfully established between the two elements. India is going to throw off the foreign yoke and just going to be independent. But in independent India the Hindus and the Muslims are showing their obvious determination not to live in one and the same state. As a consequence the foundation of two independent States, Pakistan and Hindustan, have just been laid. Where lies the root cause of this strife? Some lay the blame on Mr. Jinnah, some on Gandhiji and yet there are some who try to make a short-cut to understanding by pointing to the British as the prime mover of all these events. Leaving aside for the time being the act of throwing mud at each other, if, just like an experienced physician, we try to make a correct diagnosis of the case from these outward symptoms then we think it will be easier to select a specific for this disease of the Human Brotherhood. Permeating through the superficial courtesy and outward unity between two neighbours, one, a Hindu and the other a Muslim, a perspicuous divergence of opinion and inherent antagonism of feeling ever continues to exist. Some of our leaders are apt to opine that the Hindus and the Muslims are of the same nation, have the same blood-ties and often speak the same language and therefore there is nothing on earth to prevent them from being one. That they are not one, has been decidedly and conspicuously proved in spite of repeatedly advancing various theories and hypotheses to the contrary. Hence we can safely draw the conclusion that the source of this divergence of opinion between the Hindu and the Muslim lies with their respective idealism of life. Or in other words the original point at issue is Hinduism versus Islam.¹

¹ A great authority of our times, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, expresses the same view on this question in his last work The Message of Peace, published after his death in 1908. He says: "Brethren! the cause of this (i.e., the Hindu-Muslim distrust) is to be found in religion alone.... This shows that what lies at the root of mutual hatred is religious antagonism. It is religious antagonism which when carried to extreme results in bloodshed."—Ed.
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On a careful study of the history of India from the very ancient times we understand that whichever race or nation has entered and settled in India with whatever culture of their own, the Hindus have invariably absorbed those races and peoples in their mass and swallowed up the in-coming culture and incorporated it in the body of the Hindu culture. This state of affairs at a cursory glance will appear to the student of Indian History as the supremacy of the Hindu culture. From a particular angle of vision the Hindus may be entitled to the dignified adjective of ‘superior’, but from the point of religion, the orthocentre of human culture, the Hindus have suffered an enormous set-back. This set-back or religious complicity has developed slowly and imperceptibly in the disguise of the ‘Evolution of Hindu Philosophy’ with the inevitable result that the religious view-points of the Hindus have been reduced to a conglomeration of conflicting ideas and the pure monotheistic religion of the Vedas can hardly be recognised in the present religious ideal of the Hindus. By the term “Hindu” we at present understand the combination of those sects or castes whose religious views comprehend gnosticism and agnosticism, sentimental monotheism and transcendental monism, anthropomorphic polytheism of the never-ending denomination and metamorphic fetishism of the ever-winding imagination,—all conglomered in an awful mess. As an inevitable result of this divergence of views the subdivision of the Hindu society into innumerable castes and sub-castes has become an indispensable feature of Hinduism. Hindu leaders and patriots are very well realising that this chaotic condition of the society cannot be put up with any longer as it is standing in the way of national progress as an insurmountable barrier.

However, of all the races, peoples or nations, carrying whatever ideal and culture, the Muslims appeared into the social and political arena of India in such a way that the Hindu Law failed so far to completely absorb them within their fold. There is such a peculiarity in the social and political idealism of Islam that far from surrendering itself to Hinduism it has drawn the Hindus into its own religious ideal. Whoever steps into the fold of Islam, suddenly and miraculously refuses to call himself a Hindu and assumes an entirely different name; a Muslim,
and at once recognises himself as a member of the Universal Islamic Brotherhood. A Hindu as a man, is never an alien or enemy to the Muslim. All the divergence and antagonism emanate from the central factor, i.e., their respective philosophy and idealism of life. It has often been noticed that at the heat of excitement when a Muslim takes a Hindu as his deadly enemy, it is peculiarly surprising to note that if the same Hindu assumes the idealism of Islam, the savagely excited Muslim throws away his weapon and at once embraces this erstwhile opponent as his brother!

A Hindu is by nature a thinker, a poet, a philosopher. It would have been quite natural for him to call ‘good’ whatever is actually good. Every educated Hindu will, we believe, admit that Islam contains all the principles beneficial to human society. Many Hindus, particularly of the lower order of caste, have been accepting Islam for social advantages. Other Hindus, with all their senses awake, are witnessing this. Why then does a Hindu hate a Muslim and carry a feeling of antagonism towards the Muslim in every walk of life? Being disgusted with the chaos of their social structure, the Hindu intelligentsia are bent on seeking relief through the Godless Communism of Russia. That Russia is no longer able to stand as absolutely ‘Godless’, is but a glaring evidence of the broad daylight of current history. Although the Hindus are carefully witnessing this turn of events, yet the modern Hindu intellectuals will speak of Communism, Socialism, etc., with their bent of mind towards atheism. Islam contains all the good things of all the modern “isms” plus Godliness. In spite of this why should a Muslim be ‘untouchable’ to a Hindu and why Islam so repulsive to him? If we go deep into the problem we can find a clue of this bewildering paradox. This perversity of ACTION with respect to REASON is obviously an atavistic mentality of the Hindus arising out of their sub-conscious National Mind handed down from their remote ancestors. The diagnosis of the problem appears to be this. It is due to the gigantic folly of the agents of Islam who carried the culture into India. The first representative of Islam could not represent the “Truth” to the Hindus in its celestial sublimity as a panacea for individual, social, and political concord of
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The standard bearers of Islam on their first entrance into India struck a brutal blow to the Hindu mind. The pain and insult from the blow is still prevailing, rather subconsciously, throughout the National Mind of the Hindu right up to this day. The aversion, antagonism and hatred which a Hindu shows to a Muslim, consciously, subconsciously or unconsciously is nothing but the deep-rooted, far-fetched and long-carried reaction of the old, old non-Indian Muslim invasions of India. The first Muslims entered India intoxicated with military power, like a tornado, and themselves held the sceptre. As an inevitable result of this, howevemuch the Muslim rulers exhibited the superiority and sublimity of their creed, the Hindu mind ever remained sullen. If a father strikes his grown-up son for some folly of the young man, all the senses of honour and prestige of the son revolt against the action of the father. However much one goes to explain the action of the father the son’s mind often refuses to reconcile. Perhaps the father in such cases has to shed at least a few drops of tears later on. The Hindu-Muslim case is very similar to this. The Muslims throughout the last few centuries and particularly in the recent past have atoned for the conduct of their forefathers, or more correctly the precursors of their creed. God knows how far more they have yet to expiate.

But whatever may be the justification of thoughts and actions of the Hindu society, the reaction in the opposite camp grows. This reaction of the Muslim group has been accentuated by the teachings of Islam, which ever and anon indicate point blank the right course of life like the magnetic needle of a Mariners’ compass. Hence we find a clue to all our failures to reconcile the two elements of Indian society and thus the consequence has just assumed its material shape in the form of Pakistan and Hindustan.

Two independent states we have founded no doubt. But have we thereby actually solved the problem for good? Let any sensible Hindu and Muslim search every nook and corner of his heart, and he will realise that struggle will still continue. Muslims will remain in Hindustan and Hindus in Pakistan. Taking it for granted that Hindustan becomes Muslimless and
Pakistan becomes Hinduless, still there is no escape. The mutual antagonism accumulated through centuries will continue to exist and the problem will assume an international form. What then is the way out? Way No. 1 is,—let the conflict go on, happen what may, let us see who wins at last. Another way, i.e., “Way No. 2” is,—come, let us all accept one and the same Ideal of life. We must all acknowledge some transcendental Power by the name of GOD and submit to a collection of personal and social ethics called RELIGION. Both the Hindus and the Muslims acknowledge God and Religion. Then what on earth does keep us so poles apart and always at daggers drawn? Why, after all these sanguinary conflicts, do we still resolve to fight on and on?

Here is our fervent appeal to all the Hindus and Muslims,—Come let us get our heads together with open hearts and try to find out a solution of the problem. Let us see if we cannot have one religion for the whole of this subcontinent. We Muslims keep an open mind. We are prepared to consider the case of Hinduism, as we have ever been. Let our Hindu friends explain to us:

1. What more individual, social, political and universal advantages shall we get after our conversion to Hinduism than what is in the Muslim society?

2. In which of the four Varnas shall a Muslim convert to Hinduism be accommodated?—Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra?

3. Whether democracy will be established in the society and state; if so, in what way and how will the castes stand?

4. What social Institution will be established to curb a man’s tendency towards personal greed and pride, the greatest obstacle to democracy?

Or in other words how do you propose to purify and discipline the mind of each individual of the society and state?

5. What line of action will you choose to solve the most complicated problem in the world politics originating from the pride of race and colour?

6. We are witnessing with pain that to establish a World Federation of States and to maintain World Peace,
the League of Nations has already failed and the U.N.O. is not sufficiently satisfactory, and may also liquidate in the Third World War. What better and more effective system will you adopt so that a man from any part of the globe with any shade of colour on his skin will have a natural tendency of good-will to another man whoever he may be.

Alternatively here is another proposition i.e., "Way No. 3" Come, let us all accept the creed of Islam. Before accepting this Creed we will certainly answer all your queries regarding all the features of a Muslim's life in this world. On the other hand, if we see that you can offer us a better solution of our life problems we shall have no hesitation in accepting that solution.

**DOES CHRISTIANITY NEED MORE LEAVEN?**

**BY MUHAMMAD SADIQ DUDLEY WRIGHT, PHIL.D., F.S.P.**

A very frequent expression of Christian apologists of the present day has reference to the need for leaven in Christian teaching. If asked what they mean by "leaven" the answer would doubtless be "spirituality" or "spiritual teaching." In proof they would, of course, refer to the parable of the leaven in Matthew xiii, 35 and Luke xiii, 21.

But leaven is not a purifying influence and it was always used by Jesus as a symbol to express the direct opposite to its signification and application by modern expositors and commentators. The fact that 'leaven' is used in both the Old and New Testaments to signify corruption and as the symbol of false teaching is ignored and it is contorted to symbolise Truth. The meaning and force of the symbol are changed entirely by a false application and interpretation.

Let us examine a few of such instances. In Matthew xvi, 6, the disciples are enjoined to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees (hypocrisy) and of the Sadducees (false teaching); in Mark viii, 15, of the leaven of Herod (worldliness); while in I Corinthians, v, 5, 7, Paul urges the readers of his epistle to beware of the old leaven of
sensuality: all of which are the cause of ferment, disturbance and disintegration.

It is clear from Matthew xvi, 11, 12, that the disciples in no way misunderstood the meaning of Jesus when he spoke of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees and C. F. Kent, commenting on this passage, says:

It is a pregnant, concrete figure, which well describes the secret, persistent, corrupting influence of Jesus’s foes, who were seeking in an underhand way to pervert the loyalty, even of his immediate followers.

A more feasible interpretation is the fact that the reference is to the pernicious and false teachings which became current even in the early days of the teaching known later as Christian—a name, be it noted, that did not come into usage, until many years later than the date assigned to these utterances. Paul gave an injunction to his own personal disciple in II Timothy, iv, 3, 4, in the words:

The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine (Marg. R.V. “healthful teachings”) but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables.

Nowhere in the New Testament is it stated or even suggested that the kingdom is to be victorious or triumphant on earth: Jesus, as prophet, asked the question recorded in Luke xviii, 8: “When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?” and in Matthew xxiv, 12, he predicted that “because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold.” In the parable of the wheat and the tares, separation does not take place until the harvest. The suggestion would seem to be not that men knowingly and purposely adopt false teaching, but that it insinuates itself through the affections, where it remains hidden in the Truth (indicated by the meal, or fine flour) until it secures a firm hold and has done its destructive work. Thus, the leaven is represented as hidden amid Truth, within which it is working assiduously and insidiously but certainly. Leaven, or yeast, can only work in the dark, when it spreads with facility, rapidly making the bread light by puffing it up but at the expense of the nutritious ingredients, particularly sugar, which it destroys. If its influence is not negatived by putting the bread into
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a fiery oven, thus burning the leaven, the whole loaf will become unfit for consumption. Hence the injunction in I Corinthians v, 6 and Galatians v, 9, not to let evils go unchecked or unrebuked, because “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,” which was evidently a common proverb. Leaven cannot produce a good effect, though it may result in a temporary fascination. Many dieticians recommend bread in which yeast is not one of the constituents. The early disciples were described as “the salt of the earth”; as “the light of the world”; as “branches of the vine”; but never as “leaven.” The use of wafers made of fine flour without yeast, in what is regarded by many as the principal sacrament of the Church, is in accordance with the occult meaning of that sacrament, for the bread is ‘without blemish’.

Leaven is *torula* and *torula* is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “a genus of fungi, chiefly fermentative”. When Louis Pasteur was appointed Professor and Dean of the (then new) Faculty of Sciences at Lille, in September, 1854, he at once gave attention to the process of alcoholic fermentation, because one of the chief industries of that locality was the manufacture of alcohol from beetroot and grain. This led him to undertake an intensive study of the action of yeast and its connexion with the process of fermentation. He demonstrated it to be a microscopical fungus which, in the course of its destructive growth, by decomposing the sugar of the weed and, setting free its carbolic acid, serves to swell and raise bread by means of this gas, in much the same manner as a balloon is filled. A modern theory with regard to disease says that the serious maladies of humanity may be traced to poisonous fungi, such as *torula*, or the yeast plant. It will thus be seen that leaven is an apt symbol of evil, or false teaching, in which sense it is undoubtedly used in the New Testament.

But yet more striking illustrations are to be found in Jewish history and lore. On the institution of the Passover—a joyful feast, ordained to be observed ‘for ever’—and the seven days of unleavened bread, frequently but mistakenly described also as Passover, leaven was rigorously inhibited. This restrictive observance persists to the present day.
Maurice Myers, in *Haggadah*, points out that "spring-cleaning" is a religious act in every Jewish household and the search for leaven on the eve of Passover is a symbol of the moral 'spring-cleaning' which the Jew is required particularly to carry out. The 'ferment' of the mind, the base desires and impulses, the evil inclinations which would lead into sin must be searched out and removed, so that, in celebrating the Festival of Freedom, we may do so in the knowledge that our souls are free—free from all that may lead us away from God, who brought us out of the house of bondage.

This search for leaven on every Passover Eve is carried to every nook and corner of the dwelling. It is conducted with a lighted candle in silence but before it is begun the master of the house recites the following blessing:

*Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and commanded us to remove the leaven.*

The study of the Scriptures must even give place to the duty.

The symbolical meaning attached by the Jews to leaven admits of no mistake: by them it represents 'evil affections', 'error' or 'wandering', *i.e.* 'departure from truth'. The following prayer is in the Talmud:

*Lord of Ages, it is revealed and known before Thy face that we would do Thy Will, but do Thou subdue that which hinders—*the leaven which is in the lump.*

There is a Rabbinical saying which reads;

*Trust not a proselyte until twenty-four generations, for he holds his leaven.*

Rabbinical writers invariably used 'leaven' as a symbol of sin and corruption. They referred to evil desires as 'the leaven which is in the dough' and in this sense it was used by the Kabbalists of the middle ages.

When the mysterious strangers arrived in the plains of Mamre, Abraham, according to tradition, caused unleavened bread to be prepared as an indication of their high character and as betokening the purity of purpose and the disinterested motive of his hospitality. On a subsequent occasion, Lot did the same as a sign that he dissociated himself from the contaminating influence of his immoral surroundings. Unleavened bread, moreover, is prepared in a very short time and was often made for guests who arrived unexpectedly. It also formed part of
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the oblation which Gideon brought on his appointment to the leadership of Israel, to denote that he was in possession of the high qualities needed for the exalted position he was called upon to fill in an hour of dire distress.

The prohibition of leaven in sacrifices is also to be found in pagan ritual. At Rome the Flamen Dialis or High Priest of Jupiter (Aull. Gell. X, xv, 19) was forbidden to touch leaven, on the ground (Plutarch tells us Quest. Rom. x, 9) that

Leaven is itself the offspring of corruption, while it also corrupts the mass of dough with which it mingled.

Anything infected with leaven was also regarded as unfit for use in certain parts of the sacrificial ritual, just as honey was forbidden in the Levitical sacrifices (Leviticus ii, 11) because of its tendency to fermentation.

With regard to the Jewish laws as set out in Leviticus, the critic may raise an objection to what has been here written on the ground that some of the offerings (Leviticus vii, 13; xxiii, 17 and Amos iv, 5) were commanded to be offered with leaven. Exactly, but when these passages are examined it will, I think, be found that they emphasize the symbolical meaning of leaven as signifying corruption and the reason for its inhibition in sacrifices. Leaven was prohibited in the meat offering (Leviticus ii, 11); the consecration offering (Exodus xxix, 2; Leviticus viii, 2); the Nazarite offering (Numbers vi, 15) and more particularly, as already noted, the Passover and the feast of unleavened bread (Exodus xii, 18, 19; xiii, 7; and Deuteronomy xvi, 3-8). On an examination of these passages, it will be seen that whenever the offerings entailed the shedding of blood or they were to be consumed upon the altar by fire, leaven was prohibited (see Exodus xxiii, 18; xxxiv, 25; Leviticus ii. 11; vi, 17; and see 1 Corinthians v, 7, 8) but offerings not consumed upon the altar or not necessitating the shedding of blood—the fruits of the corruptible earth—they were to be offered with leaven. The former typified sinless, spotless offerings; the latter were accompanied by a sin offering, which was unleavened, but were themselves leavened. Leaven was excluded because there must not be in the sacrifice anything that savoured of nature’s sourness,
nothing inflated, but all must be pure, solid and genuine. With the bread baked with leaven were to be offered "seven lambs without blemish."

One writer has compared leaven with the Matador or Murderer tree, which grows in Brazil. Its slender stem creeps at first along the ground, until it meets a healthy tree when, with a clinging grasp, it attaches itself to it and climbs up the stem, sending tendrils which embrace it, which grow larger and larger and clasp it more tightly. When it reaches the top of the tree the parasite scatters its seed on the ground to continue its deadly work.

THE WAY OF LIFE

BY WILLIAM BASHYR-PICKARD, B.A. (CANTAB.)

The Guidance

Having now reached the half-way pillar upon our pilgrimage over "The Way of Life", we may take breath and fortify ourselves for further journeying by a perusal of the very guide of our wayfaring, even the Glorious Qur'ân.

Not every word upon all occasions shall we find applying to our need and our refreshment. Indeed, sometimes inspiration will flash itself to us from a single sentence in a passage otherwise of no seeming reference to our immediate circumstances.

Be that as it may. The Qur'ân is a guide and we will search it for guidance and illumination.

So, then, we read:

"This book—there is no doubt in it—is a guide to those who guard (against evil),

"Those who believe in that which has been revealed to you and that which was revealed before you, and they are sure of the hereafter.

"These are on a right course from their Lord, and these it is that shall be successful."¹

Pondering these verses, we realize that in the Qur'ân will be found, by those who seek with an enquiring, desiring mind, sure guidance to discriminate between right and wrong and a clear knowledge as to the way to guard against evil. The unseen is proclaimed as real and, in truth, what reality is there apart from what remaineth unseen? Prayer stretches out into the unseen and, to

¹ The Holy Qur-an, II : 2–5.
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those who habituate themselves to its use, it becomes a ready storehouse of strength and a perennial spring of refreshment in the drought of defeats and disasters. Moreover, God is Bountiful. Portion of what in bounty we receive should be given away gladly for love of the Bountiful. The Faithful should believe in the message from God delivered to mankind by the Prophet Muhammad. The Faithful should also respect and believe in those revelations from God which came to mankind before the time of the Prophet Muhammad. Indeed, there are many messages from God to mankind delivered during the lives of many and various other prophets than Muhammad. Let these messages also be held sacred by the Faithful, while they remember that this life is not all, but the hereafter is an abiding certainty.

Continuing our perusal of the sacred book of guidance, we find:

"Do you not know that the kingdom of the heavens and the earth belongeth unto God, and that besides God you have no guardian or helper?" \(^1\)

Verily, all existence and the path of all events is in the hands of God, and if thou turn not to Him, whither canst thou turn? If thou ask not His guidance, whose guidance wilt thou ask? Truly, apart from Him, where canst thou find any help for thyself?

Also:

And keep up prayer and pay the poor rate; and whatever good you send before for yourselves you shall find it with God; surely God sees what you do. \(^2\)

Keep up prayer. Commune with God frequently, for so the bonds and fetters of the world will lose their hold upon you, and the power of evil will dwindle to vanishing point from your life. Pay the poor-rate. Be practical in well-doing, for, may be, many are worse off than thyself. Neglect no opportunity that offers of helping thy brother and, in respect of God, fear not that thou shalt sustain loss in any respect. Thy good doing is not wasted with God, though thou see no immediate recognition.

Similarly, on this subject, reflect upon the following verse of the Qu’rân:

Yea! whoever submits himself entirely unto God and he is the

---

\(^1\) The Holy Qur’an, II : 107. \(^2\) Ibid., II : 110.
doer of good (to others), he has his reward from his Lord, and there is no fear for him nor shall he grieve.¹

Hear also this verset:

And Allah's is the East and the West; therefore whither you turn, thither is Allah's purpose: surely Allah is Ample-giving, Knowing.

Surely, herein is food for thought! There is no exclusiveness in God's choice. The East is His. The West is His. Ground for superiority of race or civilization, either of East or West, is thus swept away. So, too, any claim to be the "only chosen race". God createth. God indwelleth. God knoweth, and His fairness of dealing with, and His equal care for, both East and West is here proclaimed.

Later we read:

"Say: We believe in God and in that which has been revealed to us and in that which was revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes and in that which was given to Moses and Jesus and in that which was given to the prophets from their Lord: we do not make any distinction between any of them, and to Him do we submit."²

What a memorable verset! and how oft should this be proclaimed across the world! Herein we find a solid basis for enduring amity between Jew and Arab and Christian and Hindu, could we but with unbiased mind penetrate to fundamentals. Let us set aside superficial differences of custom and civilization. Let us rise above the pettiness of inessential preferences. Let us sweep away the fog of lazy persisting prejudices and let brother take hand of brother. If we still agree to differ upon many points (as we probably shall), let the emphasis in future be upon the agreement, not upon the difference!

Continuing, read also:

"Say: Do you dispute with us about God, and He is our Lord and your Lord, and we shall have our deeds and you will have your deeds, and we are sincere to Him?"³

Together with the following:

"This is a people that have passed away: they shall have what they earned and you will have what you earn, and you will not be called upon to answer for what they did."⁴

¹ The Holy Qur‘án, II : 112. ² Ibid., II : 139. ³ Ibid., II : 130. ⁴ Ibid., II : 141.
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Now, in the above quoted two verses, we have a succinct and imperishable basis upon which to rest an attitude of tolerance as of brother towards brother, though beliefs and opinions, practices and customs may differ widely.

God is our Lord and also your Lord. The fact that we recognize and serve the One Lord, while possibly you do neither of these things, does not modify the essential reality that the One God is Lord of us all, believers, unbelievers, the wise, the foolish, the aware and the unaware, those who submit, those who rebel and those who maintain indifference in a state of ignorance or spiritual sleep. Further, whatever we believe or disbelieve, it seems but an expression of common justice that few would dispute when it is said that the reward of our deeds will fall to us, while the punishment for your deeds will fall upon you the reward likewise for your deeds will be to you and the punishment of our deeds will be upon us.

This being so, can we not exercise an assured tolerance towards those in the world who think and act differently from ourselves? The practice of this tolerance would in itself remove many of the bitter animosities and abolish many of the sufferings that to day afflict nations and communities and individuals.

A spirit of tolerance also clears the ground for a better understanding, while bigotry and fanaticism raise up barriers and fan to flame that smouldering hate which is the great obstacle to peace.

The following passage from the Guidance requires no comment, but deserves that we ponder it and realize its sublimity and the grace of God unconfined.

Thus:

"The East and the West belong only to God. He guides whom He pleases to the right path."1

How often in this life is patience the key of right action! So we find this adjuration:

"O you who believe, seek assistance through patience and prayer: surely God is with the patient."2

Which verse is quickly followed up by a fuller explanation of the necessity for patience.

1 The Holy Qur’-án, II : 142.
2 Ibid., II : 153.
Even thus:

"And We will most certainly try you with somewhat of fear and hunger and loss of property and lives and fruits: but give good news to the patient.

"Who, when a misfortune befalls them, say: Surely we belong to God and to Him we shall surely return.

"These are they on whom are blessings and mercy from their Lord, and these are the followers of the right course."\(^1\)

In these days, when six years of devastating war have passed away, the following Quranic verse may well be a beacon of hope to prostrate humanity and may stand as a sign-post guiding them to better things and a saner way of life.

Even this:

"(All) people are a single nation, so God raised prophets as bearers of good news and as warners."\(^2\)

Thus is emphasized the essential oneness of humanity in the sight of God, though during the ages His mercy has streamed down the world through different channels and upon different races. Yet He remains the One, the Same and all humanity is His care.

And now a change of thought—comes this verset; for guidance hath many facets and shines not only upon the hereafter, but also upon the practical present of this our work-a-day life.

"They ask you as to what they should spend. Say: Whatever wealth you spend, it is for the parents and the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer; and whatever good you do, God surely knows it."\(^3\)

With this verset join also:

"And they ask you as to what they should spend. Say: What you can spare. Thus does God make clear the communications that you may ponder."\(^4\)

Now surely in this earthly life right spending is a very important part of our worldly economy—something indeed which we must get right. The Guidance makes clear how we may spend rightly.

Firstly, the direction our expenditure is to take, the object upon which we should spend, and secondly, the manner of our spending.

The objects are, first and foremost, the parents. When to-day often we find parents neglected and enduring

\(^1\) The Holy Qur'an, II : 155—157.  \(^2\) Ibid., II : 213.  \(^3\) Ibid., II : 215.  \(^4\) Ibid., II : 219.
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straitness of means, while offspring move in affluent circles, it would seem that the West hath need of this reminder of the pre-eminent rightness of spending wealth upon the parents.

Then we should spend upon the near of kin. Such spending is most easily free from the taint of bribery or of currying favour.

For the benefit, too, of the orphans our purses should be readily open. To them we may give and may make provision for them, not expecting to receive again, but in the hope of removing somewhat of the handicap under which they face the struggle of life.

So also to the needy: it is no bribe, but a human kindness. To give to the needy will not be a wasting of our substance.

And finally, the wayfarer, cut off, maybe, from native land and relatives and friends, has claim upon us to relieve the hardiness of his way; and by this act of kindness we do but demonstrate that all humanity is one brotherhood and bound by God's ordinance to aid one another in need.

Upon the practical side, too, we find this verse:

"They ask you about intoxicants and games of chance. Say: in both of them there is a great sin and means of profit for men; and their sin is greater than their profit."1

Now, in fairness to the gift of reason planted in each human being, shall we not say that, for the steady pursuit of the way of life and for constant guarding against evil, to avoid intoxicants and to refrain from gambling are two mighty blows struck for right and the sweet peacefulness of life? When wine has beclouded reason, the gate of the citadel lies open and unguarded for the entrance of those three foes—folly, waste and violence. When the reckless gambling spirit enters the breast of man, his sense and judgment give way, numbed as by poison gas.

It seems many find pleasure in dallying with these two subtle enemies, wine and gambling. There may be sweetness therein, there may be pleasure therein, there may be a strange kind of profit therein, but assuredly the pleasure turns to after-pain, and the evil indeed outweighs the profit.

1 The Holy Qur'an, II: 219.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOSQUE PLAN

BY PROFESSOR HECTOR CORFIATO, S.A D.G., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

The Arab conquest which like a desert wind swept from the Hedjaz over a great part of the world, subjected countries which already had a civilization of their own. Some of the countries had formed part of the Roman or East Roman Empire, like Syria and Armenia. The lands of Mesopotamia to Turkestan and Afghanistan were parts of the Sasanian Kingdom, and Spain captured from the Visigoths had been previously a Roman province. In all these countries the conquerors found skilled builders and buildings Roman Coptic or Visigothic, San‘a in Yemen possessed a Christian cathedral. Yet this race of conquerors, inspired by religious fervour, were nomads, not from dwelling people. It is interesting, therefore, to follow the development and evolution of an architecture which created a character and individuality of its own. Although it started from nothing, was subjected to so many influences and in spite of its diverse origins, it achieved a remarkable unity of style. The factor that created this style and welded these various influences, into an individual art, was the faith of ISLAM. The buildings erected by the Arabs were mainly mosques or religious buildings. The Mosque was the foremost product of Islamic architecture and it is this type of building I propose to analyse today.

The Mosque in its main characteristics does not alter, but according to the country in which it is built, it takes various features which have a colour appertaining to the country to which they belong. The first Mosque at Madinah built by the Prophet Muhammad in 622 C.E. formed a prototype. It was a square enclosure bounded by walls. The part where the Prophet led the prayers was roofed. The congregation knelt facing the direction of Jerusalem, i.e., north. This direction qiblah, formed a special feature. This direction was changed from north to south in the case of Madinah when the qiblah was changed from Jerusalem to Makka in 624. Up till then there

1 Being the text of a lecture delivered before the Muslim Society in Great Britain, at 18 Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.
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was no need of complicated architecture. In 639 the Mosque at Kūfah was built. It was square but enclosed by a small moat instead of a wall. The roof was carried on columns borrowed from a Persian palace at Hirāh. In 642 a Mosque was founded at Fustāt (Cairo) by 'Amrū. It was square again and contained a new feature, the minbar. The maqsūrah or screen, the minarets and the mihrāb appeared later. Thus we find now all the principal features of a mosque within a short time of the foundation of the first Mosque at Madinah. The liwān or colonnade in the sahn or courtyard appeared almost at the same time. This rise, from practically nothing to splendour and grandeur, thus came within a short time of the foundation of a cult, the adepts of which practised strict austerity. Twenty years after the Prophet's death the mosque at Madinah was rebuilt on a grander scale. Towards the end of the seventh century, the "Dome of the Rock" (qubba-tal-sakhrāh) was erected in a unique style and very richly decorated. In adopting the dome, the Arabs created a building for the purpose of sheltering a tomb or sacred place. In this they followed the Roman or Byzantine example, without necessarily copying it. It is this dome we shall find with various alteration in later Islamic religious buildings. In the 8th century, the great Mosque at Damascus was erected, incorporating some new features such as the three aisles, of the liwān, with a central, transept and a dome over it. The round horseshoe arch is used, the interior of the building being decorated with rich mosaics and marbles and windows of coloured glass. The design of this original plan may have been influenced by the plan of Syrian Churches which had been converted into Mosques.

We find again the Mihrāb or circular niche, thus following the example of Madīnah and Fustāt. The horseshoe arch has been figured as decorative motives in pre-Islamic architecture, especially in India, but it is here, in Damascus that we have an earlier example of it as a structural feature. An explanation of it may be that after striking down the timber centring which supported the brick arch, the builder continued the curve of the arch for perspective reasons to pick up the end of the abacus which supported the centring. The earliest surviving minaret is that of the Mosque at Ka'rawān in Tunisia, built by Caliph Hishām in the first half of the
8th century. The purpose of the minaret was to provide a place for calling the faithful to prayer, a call by voice in contrast to the Jewish use of a horn and the Christian use of the clapper before bells were introduced. The great Mosque at Cordova in Spain, built in 786, is on the traditional congregational plan. But the columns used were taken from older Roman buildings, they were found to be too short to give the necessary height, these columns were prolonged by superimposed shafts and arches, thus giving an early idea of Gothic construction.

In Mesopotamia a series of Mosques were built in the traditional brick style. There were Mosques at Raqqah, Abū-Dulf and Samaria. They were all of the congregational plan and they form a link between the early Mosque at Madinah and the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn at Cairo. In the Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn, we now observe a new feature, the Ziyāda, an open enclosure outside the main walls. From the end the 9th century to the beginning of the 13th century the Mosques follow the traditional plan, until we come to the Mosque buildings of India. It is at the beginning of the 13th century that we find Islamic buildings in Old Delhi. About the same time we have Mosques in Anatolia with Seljuk and Byzantine influence.

Thus we see that one can divide Islamic architecture into five schools. The Syro-Egyptian school, which flourished in Syria, Egypt and Arabia; the Maghrib school which flourished in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Spain and Sicily; the Persian school in Persia, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Afghanistan, etc.; the Turkish school in Constantinople and Anatolia; and last, the Indian or Mughal school in India. Egypt conquered by ‘Amru soon after Caliph ‘Umar had taken Syria, has had its history so closely connected with the latter that Islamic art not only flourished in a parallel way but influenced one another. In this school, the main theme in Mosque design is the portico or arcade, and we have all the classical elements present, Mihrāb, Sahn, Liwān, Dakkūs (for the readers of the Qur’ān) and the Kursis. This arrangement will be found in Egypt until the time of the Ayyūb rulers when the plan of the Mosque changes into cruciform design and in the 15th century, after the conquest of Constantinople, the cupola is introduced.
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I would like to examine the Mosque of 'Amr, where the arcades on the Mihrāb side are more numerous, six in depth for the side Liuān. This arrangement is explained by the fact that the faithful pray turning towards Makka and, therefore, extension of space has to be made in width. Most of the columns came from Roman or Byzantine buildings in the neighbourhood. Amongst the early Mosques in Syria or Egypt is that of Damascus. Originally a Christian Church erected by the Emperor Theodosius in 379 on the site of a temple and restored by his son Arcadius. After the conquest of Damascus, Muslims and Christians shared the same building until the time of the Caliph Al-Walid. According to Mas'ūdī until 708 C.E. (87 A.H.), the Mosque was destroyed by fire several times, but in its character it is still Byzantine. In 868 (254 A.H.) Ahmad Ibn Tūlūn was appointed Governor of Egypt. Soon he became independent and al-Makrizī has left many descriptions of his existence. The Mosques of Ibn-Tūlūn similar in plan to that of ‘Amrū, built in porticoes, measuring about 370’ x 1025 width with its courtyard resembles the plan of the Egyptian Temple at Edfu. This Mosque contains the oldest Arabic inscription dating from Ramadzan 265 (379 C.E.)

This Mosque presents an interesting fact. It is built in brick in spite of the fact that it is near the Muqattam stone quarries. The architect was a Christian from Chaldea and used materials with which he was familiar, brick being the natural material in that part of Mesopotamia. Al Makrizī tells us a nice story. The Governor needed 300 columns for the Mosque, and wanted to take them from Christian churches, but was afraid that this action might cause a revolt. The Copt architect (as he says) was for some reason in prison, and proposed that he could build a Mosque with no columns to support the roof. Hence the piers and arches. The details of the piers suggest Assyrian influence while those of the decoration suggest Sassanian influence. The Mosque of Al Azhar (converted into a Madrasah at a later period) was built by Djohar El-Moezz’s general denotes a change from the Mosques of ‘Amru Ibn Tūlūn. Here is a central nave much wide than the adjacent aisles.
In the XIV century we find great change in the plan of a Mosque. Syrian influences are very strong. The cruciform plan is adopted in Egypt, and one of the finest Mosques is certainly that built by the Sultan Muhammad Al-Hasan, seventh son of An-Nasr. The plan presents a square Sahn, on the east side the magnificent original liwâns. Three other liwâns complete the plan forming cross. Two minarets adorn the Mosque, one being approximately 170 feet high. Khalil Zahiri mentions that the Sultan Al-Hasan invited many architects from different countries and asked them which was the highest building in the world, as he wanted his Mosque to be higher still. He was told it was the liwâns of Kisra Anushirwan. He had it measured and then had the Mosque built. No wonder we find something similar to the character of Ctesiphon. Undoubtedly the architect was a Syrian, as the decoration of the Mosque reproduces many features common to the Mosques of Damascus.

Many of the features to be found in the Mosque will be found again in the Mosque of Kât Beg. Certain domes to be found in Mosques like those of Barquq or Kait Beg have a silhouette and a technique of construction flashing an inspiration hailing from Samarkand.

(To be Continued)

JESUS SON OF MARY
HIS BIRTH AND DEATH

BY KHWAJA NAZIR AHMAD

(Continued from Vol. XXXV, p. 293)

I must now refer to chapter XXI entitled: The Prophets. It is so called because it mentions the various Prophets and chosen of God who had made certain specific prayers under particular circumstances. The Holy Qur-án explains in this chapter how their prayers had been granted. For example, we are told that when Abraham had prayed for a son, his wife was given the good news of the birth of Isaac and of a grandson Jacob. She had said:

O wonder! shall I bring a son when I am an extremely old woman, and this my husband an extremely old man!  

1 The Holy Qur-án XI: 72.
In this chapter we are told that the prayer of Abraham having been heard, her defect was removed and Issaac was born and then he begat Jacob.¹

A little further the prayer of Zacharias is mentioned. We are told:

And (as to) Zacharias when he prayed to his Lord: Leave me not alone (without offspring) and Thou art the Best of those who inherit. Then We responded to him and gave John and We cured his wife for him.²

Let me pause here and remark that according to the Holy Qur án the birth of Issaac and John was in no way supernatural. Thus the significance of the answer to Zacharias: "Kazālik (so shall it be) as it is easy for Me," does not imply that the physical obstacle mentioned by him had continued to subsist and that in spite of this obstacle John was born. Kazālik (so shall it be) was merely meant to convey that the physical obstacle did exist at the time of the prayer, but that it would subsequently be removed as this was an easy matter for God. Thus Kazālik (so shall it be) in fact indicates that a son would be born in the very manner in which Zacharias contemplated that the birth could take place, or in other words it was meant as a prophetic utterance that the obstacle, referred to, shall be removed. The violation of any natural Law of God was not contemplated, nor was a supernatural or immaculate birth foretold; for the way or the means adopted for granting the prayer of Zacharias are clearly indicated in this verse, to wit, his wife was cured and made fit for him.

The same phrase Kazālik (so shall it be) with a small jeem is found in verse 21 of chapter XIX which deals with Mary. The commentator of Tafsir Ruh-ul-Ma‘āni gives four different meanings of the word Kazālik. Dealing with the third meaning, he says that it is a predicate and its subject is Al-amr, which is in fact mahzūf (omitted) in the text. With this subject, he says the sentence would be qala al amru Kazālik: And he said: so shall (like you say) the matter be. He further states, that these words merely assert that the preceding sentence (the obstacle mentioned by Mary) in itself gives the indication how the matter shall take place.³

---

¹ The Holy Qur án, XXI: 72.
² Ibid., XXI: 89-90 Translation by Hādz Ghulam Sarwar., The same significance is given in Tafsir-Rūh-ul-Ma‘āni.
Thus if we give the same meaning to Kazālik (so shall it be) to wit, the physical obstacle mentioned by Mary did exist at that time but that it shall be removed, the word Kazālik (so shall it be) would signify that Mary shall give birth to a son in the very manner (through marriage) in which she knew a son could be born. That is why, while Mary talked in the present tense, the angels always spoke in the future tense.

The prayer of Hanna regarding Mary and her offspring had been granted. We have, therefore, a right to expect that the Holy Qur’ān should explain how the obstacle mentioned by Mary had been removed. This explanation is again to be found in the chapter entitled, The Prophet (XXI). In this chapter we are told:—

And she (Mary) who guarded her chastity, so We breathed into her of Our inspiration and made her and her son a sign for the nations.

In another place we find another similar passage:

And Mary, a daughter of Aaron, who guarded her chastity, so We breathed into him of Our inspiration and she accepted the truth of the words of her Lord and His books, and she was of the obedient ones.

The words allāti ahsanat farjāhā which have been translated in both the verses: who guarded her chastity furnishes us with a key to the solution. Farjāhā merely refers to pudendum. The word ahsanat is derived from the root hasan meaning a fortress. It also means a virtuous, a chaste or a married woman. As a verb ahsanat would mean: she was or became continent or chaste, or she abstained from what was unlawful or indecorous. Lane on the authority of the Maghrīb of Al-Mutarrizee the Misbah of Al-Feyyoomee, the Sihāh and the Qamoos says that ahsanat also means “she became married or she had a husband.”

The Lughāt-i-Kishōrī also gives the same meaning. The Lisān-ul-Arab also states ahsanat imra’at means that the woman got married or got into the protection of her husband. In Taj-ul-'Arūs under the word hasan the learned author while dealing with the very words of

---

1 The Holy Qur’ān, III : 36.
2 Ibid., XXI: 91.
3 Ibid., LXVI : 12.
4 Lughāt-i-Kishōrī, 154.
7 Lughāt-i-Kishōrī, 154.
JESUS SON OF MARY

the Holy Qur-án ‘allati ahsanat farjahā which occur in these two verses says:

In the Qur-án-i-Majíd there occurs allati ahsanat farjahā: such woman can be called a chaste woman or a married woman, but the real meaning are a continent and a pregnant woman because pregnancy protects her from a man going into her.¹

Lane also explains that allati-ahsanat farjahā means “a woman who guarded her pudendum for that which was unlawful or indecorous or one who protected her pudendum by marriage.”²

In the Holy Qur-án itself the word ‘Muhsanát,’ which is derived from the same root, has been used for married woman.³

Thus by using the words ‘Allati-Ahsanat farjahā the Holy Qur-án conveys that Mary was married subsequently and had offspring as prayed for by Hanna her mother and thus her prayer was granted.

But apart from this meaning of these words, there is in the Holy Qur-án another reference to the marriage of Mary. We read:—

This is the announcement relating to the unseen which we have revealed to you (O Muhammad) and you were not with them when they cast their pen (to decide) which of them should have Mary in his charge and you were not with them when they contended one with the other.⁴

The word ‘yakfulu’ which is translated as ‘should have in his charge’ is derived from Kafíl which means a person who makes himself responsible for another.⁵

Now Mary, according to the Holy Qur’án, had already been given “into the charge of Zacharias.”⁶ The question, therefore, of another person being put in charge of Mary could not have arisen during his life time. But the Holy Qur’án mentions this second Kifalat apart from and independent of the guardianship of Zacharias. We know otherwise also that this question did arise a second time while he was alive.⁷ Besides there must be some reason for her to leave the temple and for Zacharias to have given up her charge. Zacharias as a high priest could not leave the Temple,⁸ but Mary on

⁴ Ibid., III : 43.
⁵ Lane Arabic English Lexicon, Vol. VIII : 3001.
⁶ The Holy Qur’án III : 36.
⁷ I. R., Vol. XXXV : 34.
⁸ Lev. XXI : 12.
account of her puberty had to leave the place. Her parents had died and she had no other relations. It was for these reasons that another person, who should be responsible for her, had to be found. I again refer to the author of the Rūh-ul-Ma‘āni. While commenting on this very verse and discussing the question: whether lots were drawn at the time of Mary’s childhood or when she had grown up, he says: “The lots were drawn up at the time of her puberty and because (for this reason) Zacharias had been rendered helpless and could not be her guardian (any longer).” And why should so many people have contended one with the other? The mere fact that a Divine oracle (casting of pens or rods) had to be resorted to, indicates that the occasion was a solemn and religious one. I have already stated that Zacharias himself sent for the bachelors of Israel in the locality and they one and all contended one with the other, for her hand in marriage as her father was a rich man and her parents had died.

Zacharias then had to draw lots, by invoking the Divine oracle, in the usual prescribed manner by means of pens, in or near the river Jordan, and the Divine oracle pointed to Joseph the Carpenter as the only suitable person who should be given her charge. She was, therefore, married to him. Abu Ja‘far Muhammad ibn Jarir at-Tabari while commenting on this very verse says that with the passing of the time Zacharias had to give up the charge of Mary. He consequently sent for the children of Israel and invited them to take over her charge. Lots had to be drawn. “The lot pointed to one of them who was a carpenter....The charge of Mary was entrusted to him. From thence onwards he used to provide her with sustenance and, she lived with him, Ibn Jarir cites Muhammad bin-Is-hāq, one of the most authentic narrators of Hadis, as his authority for these facts. I now revert to and quote once again the same verse:

And she (Mary) guarded her chastity (by marriage) so We

1 *The Gospel of Mary* See Yrjo Hertog in *The Sacred Shrine*, 201.
3 *J.S.A.* XI : 1.
4 *I. R* Vol. XXXV : 34.
6 There were different methods of casting lots: by the sacred rods (Hos. IV : 12) or arrows (Ezek., XXI : 21). The pens here may stand for rod (or reeds) or arrow.
breathed into her of Our inspiration and made her and her son a sign for the nations.¹

With this interpretation, the next incident related in the Holy Qur’án and which deals with her pregnancy becomes very clear:

So she conceived him, then removed herself with him to a remote place.²

Let me quote here a saying of Imam Wahab Ibn Munabbá which is quoted both by Imam Saalabi in his world famous Commentary the Ārais and also by Imam Shahab-ud din in his Tafsir Rūh-ul-Ma’ān.

When Mary became pregnant her cousin (uncle’s son) called Joseph, the carpenter, was with her and they both left for a temple towards Mount Tabor and they were both pious and he was the first to know of her pregnancy and he had not been separated from her for a minute.³

The saying of Imam Wahab Ibn-i-Munabbá clearly indicates, though not in so many words, the relationship of Joseph and Mary to be that of a husband and wife.

The word “conceived” in Arabic is hamalat. The word have already explained how according to the Holy Qur’án a conception takes place:

He it is who created you of a single kind, and of the same (kind) did He make his mate, that he might incline to her, so when he covers her, she conceives a light burden.⁴

The Marriage of Mary and the conception of Jesus thus took place at or near the residence of Zacharias. She had to stay there for some short time as she was charged with the completion of the Dividing Veil,⁵ during which time Joseph took a Vow of Separation.⁶ Thereafter she left with Joseph for his village Bethlehem in Galilee, “a remote place” from Bathabara.

As the time of delivery approached near it was but natural that in keeping with the Oriental traditions Mary should return to Elizabeth her cousin. She had to pass on her way through her own town Nazareth. I have already mentioned that Jesus was born at Nazareth and not at Bethlehem Judah. It is obvious, therefore, that her labour must, have started as she reached that

¹ The Holy Qur’án XXI : 91.
² The Holy Qur’án, XIX : 22.
³ Tafsir Rūh-ul-Ma’ān, Vol. V : 69. The name of the mountain is given as Jabal Saihin, which stands for Mt. Tabor. For going to Bethlehem in Galilee from Bathabara they had to pass Mt. Tabor.
⁴ The Holy Qur’án XIX : 22.
place. She was but human and she suffered the pangs of an expectant mother. In these circumstances and in her peculiar condition she could not go to any one's house and must have taken refuge in the grounds of a temple on the hill. The Book says:

And the throes (of child birth) compelled her to betake herself to the trunk of a palm tree. She said: Oh would that I had died before this, and had been a thing quite forgotten. Then (a voice) called out to her: Grieve not, surely your Lord has made a stream to flow beneath you. And shake towards you the trunk of the palm tree, it will drop on you fresh ripe dates, so eat and drink and refresh the eye.¹

The palm-tree stands for food as it was the chief source in that country of supplying sustenance for life.²

In those days the temples were on the hills, and Nazareth was in the time of Jesus on a hill, with palm trees and springs in them. Thus we read in Ezekiel of a stream flowing out of God's sanctuary.³ These references really indicate that Mary at the time of the birth of Jesus needed sustenance and her husband was comforting her.

These verses are most significant. The utterance of Mary is incompatible with the Virgin birth theory. Every mother who conceives in the ordinary way is ordained to bring forth her children in sorrow.⁴ The reference to the throes of child-birth clearly establishes that an ordinary human child was coming into the world and no extraordinary circumstances attended the birth of Jesus. If the conception was immaculate, the delivery ought to have been without "sorrow." Besides, if, to her knowledge, the conception was without any male agency, and without her volition, her anguish and regrets became incompatible with her character as portrayed in the Holy Qur'ān. Why should she have given vent to such feelings and have wished that she were dead? No, in her moment of extreme trial, she felt like any ordinary human being.

And here ends the Qur'anic version of the birth of Jesus. Thus according to the Holy Qur'ān Jesus was born of a woman like any other human child.

(To be continued)

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT IN ISLAM

BY S. MAH Mud-ur-Rahman

(Continued from Vol. XXXV, p. 299)

It was undoubtedly with the best intentions that the theory of individualism was propounded and worked out. Great men like Ricardo, Turgot and Adam Smith wrote vigorously for freedom of contract, of trade and industry and of competition. They are idealists, but they have been deceived. Their theory has done the greatest harm to the world. Free trade and free competition have brought into prominence capitalism which has become today the cause of much human villainy and mischief. Class war between capital and labour, extreme wealth and extreme poverty, imperialism and materialism all these owe their origin to the selfish ego fostered by capitalist economy.

More than thirteen centuries back Prophet Muhammad knew intuitively what would befall the world if guided by such a theory as does away with the intervention of the state in the solution of vital problems in social life. The mere fact that the doctrine of laissez faire accords the largest measure of freedom must not prejudice us against the need of state interference because the vast complexities of modern life and the inability of an individual to cope successfully with them make state interference all the more insistent.

We have another theory of functions of the state—we call this socialism—whichholds that the weakness of the laissez faire theory can be remedied if the state assumes absolute control over private or public conduct of its body politic. It is the duty of the state to save the people from the evil consequences of free competition in the economic field for the material rewards of life. So it is necessary to entrust maximum governmental functions to the state in order to secure a more equitable distribution of economic goods and opportunities and ensure the material and spiritual welfare and happiness of the people. Thus considering from the socialistic point of view, the
state is not only a necessity, but also a positive good, because the interference of the state is the only means whereby the gross inequalities of rank and wealth can be corrected.

This leads us to the question whether such absolute state control leaves any room for individual liberty. The individualists contend that socialism takes away freedom and leaves no alternative but to subserve the wishes of the state. This state-worship is a serious hindrance to moral, intellectual and economic progress. It tends to produce a type which is shapeless and amorphous—a type without individuality, and hence the realisation of self which is the goal of all efforts is stifled. But the contention is not wholly based on truth. Freedom is as dear to the advocates of governmental minimum as it is to those who want to establish state control over all men and things in the country. Difference between them lies only in the manner of approach to the goal. The socialist approach, from the Islamic point of view, is more amenable to reason and argument because of the fundamental principles of justice and fair play which socialism embodies.

To kill capitalism and its concomitant evils which thrive on private enterprises, socialism seeks to establish collective ownership and management of agents of production and transportation—land, capital and organisation. The state or the organised society is the principal owners of wealth and property in the country. There is a common pool from which each member of the state can draw according to his needs and not more. Private property is not allowed except in things actually used by him. In such a system, opportunity for exploitation does not exist; even if there are spare things and money, these cannot be used as capital by an individual.

The similarity between Islam and socialism in the conception of society is very striking. In Islam all men are a common brotherhood, sharing among themselves rights and privileges, joys and sorrows, lights and shadows that attend life. All the gifts of nature which man can exploit to meet the vital needs of his existence—land, air, light, water and minerals—belong to Allah, and therefore to society as a whole, and not to any particular
man or group of men. So these gifts should be distributed equitably to all according to their physical and spiritual needs and capacities. But on the other hand no one should be allowed to monopolise them or exploit them simply to gratify whims, because he has the capacity to do so. The Qur'án explicitly says:

"And God has made some of you excel others in the means of subsistence, so that those who are made to excel do not give away their sustenance to those whom their right hand possesses, so that they should be made equal therein; is it then the favour of God which they deny?"¹

In the Qur'án and the Traditions there are numerous injunctions directly or indirectly requiring the state to control business of all sorts.

Socialism should, however, be confused with communism which stands for the ownership in common of all things in the state. Communism gives a complete picture of a classless society in which every man is equal to the other and entitled to the same rights and privileges and the same quantity of food and other necessities of life. Such an extreme view of society is not favoured by the advocates of socialist theory of state, who hold that by equalising opportunities and distributing the products of economic efforts more fairly and equitably, the government ensure more freedom for the individual than he can have in any other social order to develop his potential capacity. They look at the state from the standpoint of a fraternal co-operative commonwealth, and its object is not to add more power to the government, but to organise industry, production and distribution in such a way as to secure maximum benefit for the individual as well as society.

In spite of the similarities between socialism and the conception of state-function, we must not lose sight of the characteristics of the Shari'át in determining the intricate state-policy. There are the points of differences which we should not overlook—differences which look more apparent than real if the objectives behind Islamic economy and socialist economy are taken into account. Islam sanctions limited private property in land and capital, but prescribes rigorous laws against banking, profiteering, speculation, insurance etc. which

¹ The Holy Qur'án, XVI : 71.
lead to accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few capitalists. Although inheritance is permitted in Islam, its law is socialistic in character, it does not help concentrate wealth in the hands of a few as in the law of Primogeniture in England and Hinduism in India, but it operates in such a way as to make possible an equitable distribution of the leavings of the deceased.

These differences are easily understood, but they do not mean that the Shari'ah makes any objection to any scheme of society which proposes to have collective industries, collective pooling of all resources in the country, collective management of all instruments of production and transportation for common good. The power of control vested in a socialist state is not acquired by force. It is the electorate or the people themselves, who make the state militaristic, capitalistic or socialistic. If collective ownership of wealth and property and socialistic distribution of the products of economic activity are adopted as the deliberate state policy, then it is according to the will of the people themselves. To speak more clearly, the people who so long hold land and capital individually, now, by mutual agreement, will hold all their land and capital in common, not because by so doing they barter freedom for the shackles of slavery of their own free accord, but because collective efforts with a common end in view will bring more energy to bear upon production and because increased output of economic goods and their fair distribution will enhance relative comforts and happiness.¹

The Shari'ah will go against such a scheme of society only if the positive laws of Islam are violated—namely, the rituals of worship and fasting, pilgrimage, laws of marriage and divorce. In Islam these laws are of a socialistic character and hence there is small chance that they will conflict with the secular laws of the state if these secular laws are made in accordance with the socialistic principles laid down in the Qur'an and the Traditions.

(To be Continued)

¹ If the experiment is agreed upon by a group of believers the Shari'ah perhaps, has nothing to say, but we still believe the system in which private ownership and inheritance of the Islamic type have room for play will, in the long run, prove to be the ideal.—Ed.
CORRESPONDENCE

Englefield Green,
Egham,
Surrey,

Dear Dr. Abdullah,

I will not be over on the 17th May—and unless other arrangement might be made I may never come over. However, I wish you to know how much I appreciated your talk on Islam when I entered the Mosque with Mr. R. K. Group—and your kind hospitality.

I can see that my letter—mentioning the phrase—"looking for God" would be almost a heresy to a Muslim who is aware of God's presence and big faith reveals Him.

I wish for a philosophical discussion with you, but I can see that at the moment. I am not fit for such matters—so will postpone it indefinitely.

I was very impressed by your regard for the welfare of our coach-driver—a matter which would slip the notice of many Western clerics.

I have very great difficulty in bringing the realisation of God in terms of our Western civilisation which with its greed and hate is slowly preparing to commit suicide and the obvious fact—that Life is Righteous and good and that the universe is wonderful beyond all understanding.

I cannot write further now as I have preparation of lessons and so forth.

I thank you again for your hospitality and send my regard for your welfare.

Yours sincerely,

J. M. F.

South Dakota State College,
of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts,
Brookings, South Dakota,
April 22, 1947.

The Imam,
The Mosque, Woking.

Dear Sir,

I requested from British Ambassador at Washington, an address of a person who would be qualified to offer an opinion on the present view of evolution. Your name was forwarded to me.

Would you be kind enough to give me the opinion held by the Mohammedan World concerning the theory of evolution? I am teaching a course in evolution and I am interested in obtaining the present day views toward this theory by the different religious
groups of the world. I am particularly interested in the point of view of Mohammedans concerning the ideas of evolution. Any information or help that you can offer will be very deeply appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,
RAYMOND J. GREB,
Assistant Professor.

[The Muslim world is not of one opinion on the theory of evolution as propounded by Darwin. Maulana Jalal-ud-din Rumi, the world-famous Muslim mystic whose Mathnawi has now been rendered into English held the view that consciousness starts at the mineral world and goes on evolving from stage to stage through plant and animal life until it reaches the state of human consciousness. But according to this Maulana, it goes on developing further even beyond angelic consciousness.

In modern times Maulana Muhammad Ali, the famous commentator of the Holy Qur-an in English, seems to support Darwin on the basis of the Qur-an. Thus on p. 1120 of his Commentary, he makes the following observation in his comment No. 2573.

"The words may be taken as alluding to the theory of evolution. But they may as well imply that man has been brought to the present state of physical perfection after passing through various conditions."

Khwaja Kamal-ud-din, the founder of the Woking Muslim Mission who is a fellow-disciple of Maulana Muhammad Ali, can not see eye to eye with Darwin in the matter of the evolution of the species. He thinks one species does not grow out of another species. Species no doubt show affinity but that is because they are parts of the same scheme and grow out of same matter. This discussion is to be found in his book "Table Talk." But in spite of this view held by the founder, the policy of the Mission does not ban support of Darwin’s view. Thus an article will be found published in November 1945 issue of the Islamic Review "Darwin and Islam" by M. A. Samad who contends that the Qur-an is in agreement with Darwin’s theory and concludes his articles with the English translation of Maulana Rumi’s view which reads as follows:

I died from the mineral, and became a plant.
I died from the plant, and reappeared in an animal.
I died from the animal and became a man.
Wherefore then should I fear? When di I row less by dying?
Next time I shall die from the man, that I may grow the wings of the angel.
As angel, too, must I seek advance, “All things shall perish save His Face.”

Once more shall I wing my way above the angels:
I shall become that which entereth not the imagination.
Then let me become naught, naught, for the harp-string.
Cryeth unto me: “Verily, unto Him shall we return,”
Under separate cover we are sending you a copy of our journal containing the article of Mr. A. Samad. —Ed.
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