



righteous body, chiefly when there is some one among them master of a country and sword and possesses army and weapons. Such people cannot be affected without punishment and order of a king. The bad custom that cannot be abolished to-day through the efforts of hundreds of eloquent speakers and preachers can be given up to-morrow by a nation from one end of the country to the other, hundreds of examples of which are still found not only in the uneducated countries like Asia and Africa, but also in the civilized countries of Europe and America. Was it not the mercy of God in the aforesaid case to send the last prophet in majestic display? Surely it was. Again, if the prophet after whom no other prophet was to come, was not to establish a heavenly kingdom in which all mankind may have equal rights and the lowest of the nations may be able to obtain the highest degrees of civilization; the ways of improvements may be open to all, there may be no preference to the white over the black; to the Brahmins and Chhatris over the Vaises and Shudras, then what else was he to do? In this case war and fighting is necessary. In war and fighting, to incite, to encourage the people and to appoint a merit in both worlds over the patience and forbearance is also necessary. To bring such verses of the Qurān in opposition to mercy and brotherhood of man is like a fool who having shown the doctor's operating instruments tries to cause the patients to hate him. It is the Islamic crusade and the war verses, the opponent brings before the uneducated public.

Likewise, the doctrine of polygamy cannot stigmatize the name of our prophet for several reasons.

Firstly.—Because Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, etc., had also several wives. David and Solomon had hundreds of wives. He is the same David whose book being considered as inspired is used in prayers, and up to whom by way of boast and holiness, Christ's line is traced. The



Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament give an ample proof to the doctrine of polygamy, which no man among the Jews and the Christians can deny. Then on what reasonable grounds the Christians have to raise objections against our holy prophet with regard to polygamy?

The Hindus call Sirī Kirishn and Kanhaīyā as incarnations. They had several wives in addition to the *gopīs* (milkmaids) who were countless, with whom they led a life of licentious merriment and dances. At the time the *gopīs* used to bathe, Krishna and Kanhaīyā took their clothes and ascended the trees. The conditions laid down by the *autars* to return their clothes was to come before them with folded hands and not to conceal their *andām-i-nihānī*—private parts, with hands.

Secondly.—Besides the Christians (even among them long after Christ) in every nation and country not recently but for thousands of years, there was a common custom to keep several wives and bond-women. It was not considered as an evil deed, nor were such people thought as blameworthy for it. Surely, it did not chance for several reasons to Christ to marry and he also lived very little in this world. Who knows how many wives would he have taken, if his life had been prolonged to 60 or 70? After his departure his disciples undertook to travel for the purpose of propagating his religion and suffered various kinds of hardships for it, still it was only Paul who limited the number to one—chiefly for those who were appointed in the ministerial lines. Neither he nor Christ ever forbade all other persons to have more than one wife. However, among friars and nuns, to live unmarried was considered as the example of Christ and the common people were also so much influenced thereby that they believed that to have more than one wife was blameworthy. But it is not a religious thing. It is only a social custom.



In consequence of this unmarried life so much adultery abounded in the sacred convents and so great a number of infants was found dead that when the tank of Gurjius, which was in the convent of the sacred persons, was cleared of putrid matter, about 700 skulls of infants were counted. To commit adultery having accused a wife of it, to divorce one wife and to take another in her place, or to cause the first wife to be killed with poison and then to take another instead, became common among the public. Again, the want of *parda* system and the excessive use of alcoholic liquors aided adultery so much that during the recent days of education and progress so much evil of this nature is current in Christian countries, chiefly in Europe and America, that even a tenth part of it cannot be found in other countries, so that to commit adultery with the unmarried women is not considered as blameworthy.

Thirdly.—When polygamy according to religion and custom was not deemed evil, then how is it blameworthy, unreasonable and irreligious for him, after entering Medina, to take several wives for the following sound policy, after the age of 53 when sensual appetites generally lessen. It is not strange if a *padree*-like taste may find fault in it. But it is not the duty of the world to follow *padrees*. The reasons above alluded to are :—

I. The prophet was also responsible for the wants of the emigrant women who were related to the famous persons of their tribes. Islām did not leave even a mark of adultery, then, how was it possible for them to be allowed freedom in this matter. So they were necessarily married to the faithful. And in order to please some of them who had desired to obtain honour of this world and also of the world to come, it was desirable on the part of our prophet to take them in marriage to himself and to honour them thereby.



II. The Arab clans had a considerable regard for their relations and to marry among them was to take part in their favours and kinship. This kind of regard is shown wherever there are tribes and their kinship. As the late King of Kabul *Ziā-ul-millatī wad-dīn* gives the same reason of causing his sons to take several wives from several clans and tribes which is very reasonable. Our prophet considered it very useful and it was really proved to be so, to take his wives from the different Arab families and tribes in order to cause union between them and thereby to spread among them civilization and Islām.

III. There were many among men who had dedicated themselves to religious purposes and had nothing else to do. They were called *Ashāb-us-Suffa*. As men, in order to earn their livelihood they were able to work as day-labourers and were not in want of private buildings with their necessary provisions. But among women there were none who would, in consequence of the *parda* system, be able to do so, although there arose a necessity that some persons should teach them the tenets that are particular to their sex. Because, in the Mohamedan religion there are certain doctrines for women, concerning their menses, childbirth, bath and cohabitation, to explain which in plain words through a strange man to a strange woman is considered shameful and blameworthy. Also, how to live with them, to treat them and to be patient in opposition to their crooked disposition, are the teachings which cannot be carried out, unless a leader of nations may not exhibit them practically. Again, none other than wives were able to know the prophet's private and open worship, social manners and methods. Therefore, he established a number of women and taking upon himself the responsibility of their livelihood, made them free from the cares and anxieties of the world, and by taking them in marriage they were at liberty to take part with him in private and



in society and to ask about every kind of teaching they liked. If they were not his wives, they would not be able to have such mutual intercourse with him, or if they would do so, they would not be safe from the accusations of their enemies. To give their lives to religious services was represented with the word to grant themselves to him. It was inwardly a contract to pass all their lives in religious devotion and not to marry others and spend their time in the cares and anxieties of looking after children. In such a case to treat them kindly and carefully was a reward of their self-sacrifice. An enemy may take it either in good or bad sense, it depends on his disposition and the purity of his mind.

Again, in the aforesaid state, it would be quite contrary to his original purpose to confine a number of his wives, and it was also a responsibility upon them, according to their own contract, not to marry others after him. Although these wives were fitted with all good qualifications, still they were women and belonged to mankind. For rivalry to appear among them, for them to insist upon something particular, before him, like women, and afterwards to be appeased by the prophet, was an ordinary thing that happens in every-day life to the best man in his family. To represent such private matters in an evil sense and to describe them in a disgusting manner is mean-mindedness of the enemy and a description of his own ill-nature.

A REASONABLE JUDGMENT ON POLYGAMY.

It must be borne in mind that Islām does not give order to take more than one wife, nor encourages people to do so; but it says to them in clear terms that if it is possible, they ought to confine themselves to one only. And if there arises some necessity, they are allowed to take the second wife, provided they may be able to protect equally the rights of both and to practise justice and impartiality between



them, which is a very difficult task. It is therefore desirable to be content with one and if unable to guard the rights of the one, not to marry at all.

There arises now a discussion which is simply this :— Whether it is reasonable or unreasonable to take more than one wife when there arises such a necessity for it ? The mind that is hidden in the darkness of customs and manners declares that it is unlawful, because both sexes are equal ; the rights that are set forth for the one, are also for the other. If it be lawful for a woman to take two husbands at a time, when necessary, then a man can be justified in taking more than one wife. Else, the preference of the one over the other shall be held as unreasonable. Moreover it cannot be denied that two wives are the cause of a great harm to, and interference with, the household arrangement and with the comfort and happiness of the husband.

A reasonable mind that can observe the matter gravely, does not only allow, but also holds it as desirable when needed for the following reasons :

First.—The doctrine of equality is unreasonable and is against human nature ; because when nature has put in the construction of both sexes a clear distinction that cannot be denied by an intelligent mind, how, then, can they be equally disposed to manners, morals, modesty and sympathy. Man is naturally stronger than woman. He does very hard work, earns his livelihood and feeds her—protects national and religious rights at the risk of his own life. He devises plans of common welfare. He is greatly ambitious and courageous. His physical construction tells that he is the ruler, and that of the other that she is ruled. When there does not exist natural equality between them, the doctrine that holds polygamy to be unlawful is futile and worthless.



We accede to it that woman is equal to man in human rights. To consider her like quadrupeds, to treat her like cows, goats and other animals as it is the custom among the uneducated and savage nations, is prohibited by the law of reason just as Islām does. She has also some rights, privileges and honours that are particularly granted to her person. Hence, as the above-mentioned preference of man over woman, is prohibited by reason, this degradation, that is, to make him quite equal to woman is also unlawful. We comply with this that the household arrangement generally belongs to one wife only, it is not, however, opposed to the permission that is given for polygamy in consideration of the needs that occasionally arise. A little defect in the aforesaid household arrangements in comparison to the needs that require polygamy as warrantable, is quite insignificant.

Second.—If it be agreed that both sexes are equal in number, then the decrease that naturally and habitually happens in the numbers of the male sex will prove the female sex to be greater in number. Now, suppose that polygamy is illegal, men are not procurable and the antagonist holds equality to be right, then what are the women to do? Are they to commit fornication? Lacks of men are enrolled in the army and are stationed in places where it is difficult for every soldier to have his wife with himself. Again, thousands of persons are killed in battles, thousands undertake sea-voyages in order to earn their livelihood. Thousands are killed by hitches, getting entangled in mines. Thousands wander in lands, in search of a living and die of starvation, etc.

If polygamy may not be lawful, then, according to the aforesaid number of men, women will be deprived of men, will commit fornication and will be bereft of the privileges of nursing their children.



Third.—It sometimes happens that a wife, in consequence of disease that prevents childbirth, is unable to bring forth children and it is natural for man to desire continuation of his descent (lineage). Whether such a man having accused his wife of adultery may divorce her, and then take another in her stead, as it happens day and night in Europe, or having protected the rights of the first, may take another. Which of the two is better or more desirable for a woman ?

Or suppose a woman is not sufficient to satisfy her husband's desire (lust) in consequence of continual births of children and diseases, etc., and she is also unable to make the household arrangements properly. In such a case what is her husband to do ? May he seek some sweetheart in theatres and parks and squander his wealth, or he, having divorced her, may expel her from his house at such a time, or may he guard her privileges and take another also ? Tell me, my readers ! which of the three courses is better or more desirable ? A reasonable mind will surely point out to the last course, as the best of all, which is what you call, polygamy.

Fourth.—What will the countries and nations do who require an increase in their population ? Those who believe in the equal rights of both sexes, if they place two men, rather 10 or 20 men for one woman, the same result will come which does from the one man. On the contrary, if one man were to take several wives, each would give birth to children. Again, a woman, at the age of 50 often becomes barren, whereas a man to the last stage of his life can cause a woman to conceive. In such a case why should a man, being confined to one woman only, be prevented so long from having children, and from increasing the number of his descendants ? Islām, however, has not left polygamy to be unlimited like other nations, but has



greatly restricted it. The greatest number of wives that we are allowed to have, is four only.

There is also a precautionary measure in it, and, that is, that a man, in accordance with the principles of physics, can cohabit with a woman for three months only, after conception. After that period, it is injurious to the child and also to the health of the woman to do so. In like manner, three months after the birth of a child, cohabitation is injurious to an infant. According to this principle, if a man cohabit with a woman who gets pregnant immediately, he is at liberty to benefit himself for three months, by taking the next wife. Suppose, the next one also conceives, he may go to her for three months, and then take the third and be benefited by her for three months and so on with the fourth. According to this arrangement, there will pass three months to the first wife, after she gives birth to her child and the husband will be at liberty to revert to the same course he adopted at first among his four wives.

SECTION II.

OBJECTIONS OF ANTAGONISTS TOGETHER WITH THEIR ANSWERS.

In earlier ages of Islām, the Christians, for several centuries, more particularly up to the time they did not commence crusades, were not so bitterly opposed to Islām, nor did they show an inveterate enmity to the Mohamedans, nor were the Christian authors free from virtue and modesty. To tell lies, to raise false charges against any one and to proclaim them in public, was held by them as blameworthy. But afterwards, they unlimitedly adopted the opposite course. Their leaders, beholding the progress that was natural to Islām, got frightened at it, and were afraid that their sheep would slip, through their



hands. The poor uneducated and the unintelligent public were so far misled by them as to believe that they were at liberty to obtain indulgences for their sins, instead of money, and likewise to recommend them to the angels for heaven, or for any kind of treatment they liked. They also had perfect control over Christian rulers and kings through these machinations and threats. Beautiful young girls were in the habit of dedicating themselves to their services which services the girls regarded as religious works of great merit, some remnant of which is still found in the countries of Europe and America. Hundreds of young women, called nuns, are even now seen in chapels as attendants to these unmarried nuns. Why may not the nuns attend their friars, if the latter, the pious secluded persons, do not marry at all for the same reason? Such leaders thought it as their obligation to show up Islām to their people in a very disgusting form. Hence they began to talk about the Founder of Islām in such words as these:—

The Founder of Islām was a hypocrite. Besides beating and murder, he wrought no miracle, nor had he any kind of attractiveness in himself. Having given to the savage Arabs an encouragement for heaven and a fear of hell, made them his followers. After he had succeeded in gathering such a horde of savage people, he commenced highway robbery. Taking possession of other persons' wives and daughters, to enslave them, and to use them in different ways, was a delightful task, in consequence of which the horde excessively increased. Licentiousness was a part of their physical construction. To robbery and murder they were accustomed from the beginning. The stories and commandments of the prophets, the rituals and ceremonies of the Parsees and the Arabs, he gathered in a book-form that was named the Qorān. He also patched up a law-book. As he was an eloquent speaker and an orator, the uneducated Arabs who had no taste for prophetic



writings, favoured the books and declared them to be unparalleled. For fear of them no one had power to bring an equal to them and put the people to shame. To satisfy others, they had nothing but sword. He who rose in opposition to them, was instantly beheaded. The greatest Islāmic worship is to take part in the rustic fair of the Arabs called *hajj*, pilgrimage to Mekka:—having reached there to cut off cruelly the heads of animals and having formed themselves in shapes of bear or monkey dancers to wander about the mountains and hills in making noise.

And what is the social life of Islām, to surround one with many women, to keep swords in the house, and whenever a non-Mahomedan, more specially a Christian, is found to strike off his head, whereupon they possess a merit and obtain a martyr's rank. In short, a deception is always a deception. No sooner he died, than all the coating of hypocrisy and fraud became clear. There arose a bitter strife among themselves. How unjustly the associates and the companions of the prophet, treated his daughter, son-in-law and grandsons. These Mussulmans did also clearly show that the Qorān was not a miraculous and unparalleled book from God. Holding it as an altered book, they composed several Sūras, rather ten Sūras, better than the original ones and showed them to the public. And as it was habitual to Mohamed, so they also praised Mohamed's family with great many praises. Mohamed himself cared nothing, but to make people worship his descendants. He who will have regard to Fatima, Ali, Hasan and Husain, will enter heaven and whoever will hate them will be cast in hell. All selfish persons establish rights for their descendants and families. Ask the Pandits of India, how they praise Brahmins and listen to them, what kind of respect and honour they claim for them. In like manner the Syīds say that the Law of Mohamed is *nil* before them. It is impossible for them to go



to hell, as the Jews also claim that they belong to Abraham, the hell-fire cannot affect them. The daughter of Mohamed became ill-disposed towards Abū Bakr so much so that she did not speak to him all her life, simply because of a few *bighas* of land and a number of trees—the only property not given to her, in opposition to all other inheritance, although to uphold her father's seat, he held the land and the trees as wakf-property, an endowment, and did not refuse to give her the income accruing from it—which was not a true example of disregard towards this world. Alī, the son-in-law of Mohamed, though he hated Umar and Abū Bakr inwardly, yet apparently always flattered them, in consequence of fear and could not lay open their heartfelt hatred, nay more than that, he gave his daughter in marriage as a flattery to Umar ; on the other hand, Alī was famous for his dauntless courage and bravery. More than half the number of Mohamedans adore him and his sons, beseech his help and raise the cries of Hasan and Husain every now and then.

The Moslems opened their eyes when Islām reached foreign lands and countries. Their sages having made slight changes in their religion, assimilated themselves to the Christian and the Jewish hermit lives. When they entered India, they accepted the Hindū ascetics and saints' customs and manners. They held it as their wonders and their saintly lives, to sing with instruments, to ring the bells, to jump and frisk about, to do some other mad-like movements as the Hindūs do at the time of their idol-worship and to utter blasphemous words. If they were real believers in the unity of God, they would not adore their god-fathers, their graves and the descendants of Mohamed. If there were any truth in their traditions, their Maulvis and learned men would not forge hundreds of traditions. In order to make lawful what they wished to do, they used to forge them. There has been a number of traditionists



among the Moslems who were always ready to fabricate new traditions. This is what they call their religion, their prophet, the Qorān, the descendants and the disciples of Mohamed, their saints, their durveshes, the workers of miracles and wonders, their Sūfis and their learned traditionists. It is also well known to the Moslems that both the prophet and God wanted Alī to become *Caliph*, the successor of Mohamed, but for fear of Umar and Abū Bakr could reveal no such verse in the Qorān as to express plainly about the succession of Alī and his family-members. Therefore, the poor Shīahs try to twist some verses to draw such a conclusion and being unable to do so have to say that there were such verses in the Qorān, but were taken out afterwards. Again, there are some among the Shīahs who hold the opinion that the prophet made Alī as his successor before his disciples who were more than 100,000 in number on *khum-m-i-gadīr*, a Shīah festival, but the nation after the prophet's death rejected the succession, from which it appears that it was very disagreeable to them. And because they followed the prophet's order in giving up idolatry, but they did not care to carry it out in this respect, from which it appears that Alī was so ill-natured that people generally disliked him. Nowadays, the Mohamedans continually worship Alī, Hasan and Husain, the graves of the dead, the taazīas, their saints, and their spiritual guides; yet they claim themselves to be Unitarians and call their religion as sacred. We find no distinction between these Moslems and the idolators of India. As the Hindus bow down before the Brahmins, so these Moslems treat their spiritual teachers together with their descendants and their orders are held in higher estimation than those of the Qorān and the prophet. The guides plainly say that the Qorān and the religion are good for nothing, that heaven and hell are nonsense. Burn the Qorān and pull down the *Kaaba*. God can be had in eat-



ing and drinking, in singing and dancing. Everything is God; the dog and the ass is the same. The children of the spiritual teachers having attached many qualifications to their predecessors, order their followers to read them on beads or on their fingers, and for the purpose of their own respect praise their forefathers and describe the stories of their wonders to such an extent that a wise man gets surprised at them. What are these stories and fables? They are of the following nature :—

A certain spiritual guide quarrelled with God and threatened to demolish his heavenly throne if He did not consent to his will. Poor helpless God, getting frightened at it had to do what the spiritual teacher desired. These persons have many times beaten the angel Gabriel.

The angel of death was once going with the deceased spirits confined in his vessel when suddenly he was caught and a fight took place between them in which the vessel of spirit slipped from his hand, so he went up to God as a complainant but what answer did God give him? He said that He was quite helpless before him. He could not help it, even if He himself were beaten by the aforesaid teacher. The works of both the worlds are under their charge, and this is the reason why the people offer their offerings to them.

Being pleased with it perhaps the teacher and the graves of these men would very likely grant them children, prosperity and health, give them victory over their enemies and save them from famine and calamity. When the pilgrims reach the tombs of each teacher, the attendants having caught them by their necks cause them to bow down before the tombs and invoke with the statement :— Oh teacher give them all spiritual and worldly success—as if they are the sole agents of God.

These foolish persons do not understand that prior to them all, the affairs of this world were carried out just as



well as they are done now, and those who do not believe these teachers are also prosperous and successful in their business. Then how can it be understood that a certain success came to appear from the grave or from the spiritual guide in lieu of the aforesaid offerings? What line of distinction can be drawn between idolators and the beliefs of the unitarian Moslems. If an educated Moslem call it a medium of acceptance before God, then the educated Hindūs call their gods as channels through which they receive their blessings from their gods. How strange is it then that the Moslems who are considered as unitarians will inherit heaven and the Hindūs who are held as idolators, *Mushriks* (those who attribute to God co-partners) be considered as fuels of hell and fit to be killed.

These kinds of statements the Maulvis prove from the Qorān and the tradition of Mohamed (peace be on his soul) and are held as faithful and holy. If this is what the Moslems call Islām and the teaching of the Qorān and *hadises* as surely it is, then the nature of Islām is well established.

ANSWER.

The aforesaid objections can be divided into two parts. The first part consists of those that are about Mohamed, his nature, and the teaching of the Qorān. The second part consists of the conduct and dealings of the Moslems. In the first part the antagonist brings no proof, but simply displays his suspicion or rather his inward malice towards Islām. This sort of mistrust the heretics can exercise towards all the prophets of God. It is originally an objection of the Atheists. Neither Moses, nor Abraham nor Jesus can be free from this kind of suspicions of the Atheists. All of them encourage their people towards heaven and frighten them from hell. All had a body of followers. God forbid! The Jews draw such a



bad picture of Christ that we dislike to describe it. Those wretched malignant fellows keep saying that Christ was an illegitimate child of his parents. Such children are naturally artful and cunning. He had learnt from Egypt some tricks of a juggler and had coveted to declare himself as a prophet. Nay ! more than that, from his shameful birth, he was led to hold himself as the Son of God. Neither he wrought miracles, nor his preaching and sermons were efficacious. A few washermen and fish-mongers having seen some of his tricks became his followers, whereupon he became so puffed up with pride that he began to boast of his superiority over all the other prophets previous to him who were as if thieves and robbers. The Law of Moses that was given for ever was totally abrogated by him. At last, in consequence of his conduct he was caught by the authorities of his day and being proved as guilty of crimes he was crucified. Then all the effect of his teaching and preaching came to naught. His disciples fled, refused to have any knowledge of him and openly cursed him before the public. At the time, the people were taking him to crucify he was asked to show some miracle which he could not and did not. In short, he gave his life in great agonies and thus he falsified his divinity. He was given to threaten the people with heavenly kingdom and to tempt them with happiness and ease therein. Afterwards his friends and disciples wrote his biographies and called them the Gospels, which are full of vain boast and useless thoughts. When Paul, a Jew, entered their society, in order to incline the people towards his religion, he openly declared before the public that nothing is lawful or unlawful, eat, drink, whatever you wish. Do what you like. Commit evil deeds freely. Simply believe in Christ. This religion which is free from all kinds of obligations and limitations gives also the assurance that Christ bore upon the Cross the sins of all mankind. Constantine the Great, who was



very cruel and a murderer, accepted this religion and forced his people with the sword to accept it.

Paul spread out such a Satanic net to ensnare the people that even Satan himself is ashamed of it. Their traditions, creeds, and conduct are enough to disgrace their religion. Paul gives his people full permission to speak falsehood. Hypocrisy and deception is a part of this religion. In the beginning, therefore, hundreds of persons began to make spurious gospels, and to ascribe them to Christ. Here ends their statement. Again, if the useless performances of Christian sects be fully described the hearers will burst forth into sudden laughter. Thousands of them like the Hindūs go to dive in the river Jordan with the belief that they will thereby receive salvation from sin. Again, as the Hindūs carry the water of the Ganges as a sacred thing to their homes, so the Christians do with the water of the Jordan. They offer their prayers to Christ and invoke him instead of God. We do not know, how they snatched away the doctrine of the Hindū Triad. The Hindūs say that three persons—Brahma, Vishnu and Mahadeo are united into one God. The Christians also believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God which they name the Holy Trinity, and upon which they hold that their salvation depends. Their religious leaders, the preachers and missionaries single out the world in telling lies, raising disturbances and in teaching mercilessness to their people. They are not ashamed of writing false histories and fabricating baseless geographies. To represent the most important matters of others as trifling and insignificant and to show their own things which are really below notice, as very weighty and important, is the practice of this body. To accuse a good man with whom they may be on bad terms, to show his affairs in evil exaggerations full of taunting expressions and heart-rending phraseology, and to laugh at his good



qualifications with the exception of a few Christians, is the custom of all the present and past of them. This they consider as their eloquent statements and of which they boast. However, even in this age of freedom and liberty this religion is held among the educated people of Europe so poor of truth and so trifling that they have begun to hate even the name of religion. How strange it is then that such people having concealed their religious titles, in order to bring a credit to themselves and having added to their names the high-sounding titles of the sages, the philosophers and the doctors accuse our holy prophet (peace and safety be on his soul) with false accusations and consider it as their bounden duty.

Now, it remains to deal with the pious missionaries, who having perpetrated unspeakable deeds wherever they reach, raise tumults and wars. If they may not receive high salaries from their missions, then, it may be apparent that how do they abuse Christianity. Under the pretence of helping the orphans and treating the sick, they collect money as charity and squander it in spoiling the orphan's religion and in passing their own days in ease and pleasure. The objection that the Qorān is a collection of some verbal stories is quite baseless. Would there be self-wrought subjects and events in it, however, it has shown a miracle also in this particular ; because when the inspired writers of Ahl-i-kitab (people of the book) waver in their accounts which are full of discrepancies* in themselves, the holy Qorān is quite free from these defects, and the style of its writings is not like stories of the Bible. It is a stupid objection that Mohamed has borrowed his religion from different sources. When the former religions have been acknowledged as inspired ones, then what necessity was

* With regard to Christ, compare the four Gospels with each other, first, then with Chronicles I & II, and Samuel I & II. How many errors will be found in his genealogy. How much will it differ in itself.



there for him to have recorded a strange thing in opposition to the former inspirations. Islām itself claims that it has come to remove the discrepancies and changes of the former religions and to select a true and natural religion therefrom. Is not that, a perfect proof of its truth that in its nature it does resemble the former prophets' religions? It is a statement of the uneducated and ignorant persons that it was for fear of Mohamed that people could not bring an equivalent to the Qorān. It claims to be of such a nature from the time the Quraish were most powerful at Mekka and the faithful were bitterly persecuted. Many tribes of Arabia fought battles with the Moslems for this very reason. Was it then for fear of them that they could not bring an equivalent to the Qorān. At least they would do so for their own people. Again, there were in Syria, in those days, Christian Arabs who are still found. They were not afraid of Moslems and were able to write an Arabic book in the most elegant style and circulate it among the public in order to falsify the aforesaid claim, and who prevents them now from doing so, if they can? It is worse than useless to say that the Moslems themselves, having composed some Sūras similar to the Qorānic style, have refuted the aforesaid claim, that the Shīahs are familiar with the 10 pāras (pieces) that have been taken out from the Qorān, that they openly declare it to be altered and that the verses relating to the superiority of the members of Mohamed's family have been removed. No one among the Shīah* critics holds this opinion, nor does any of them believe that the 10 pāras above referred to have been taken out from the Qorān. Sheikh Sadūq and other learned Shīahs have fully explained the matter. Surely after the conquest of Persia

* There are 3 great sects among them, viz., Zaidia, Ismāliā and Isnā Asharia whose learned critics unanimously deny the existence of any such defect in the book.



by the Mahomædans, some magicians contrived* to proclaim themselves as Moslems and friendly to Ali, and in order to satiate the inveterate enmity they had cherished towards Omâr the conqueror of Persia, they exaggerated in partiality to Ali, the ordinary difference of opinions, with regard to the successors of the prophet, to such an extent, and fabricated the traditions that were not only to stigmatise Omar and Abû Bakr, but also to Ali, Fatima, the prophet, the omnipotent God and the Holy Qorân as have been stated by the above-mentioned objector, and a few stupid persons having believed the aforesaid statements spread them among the public.

When about the succession of Ali, there arose a dispute, on a point, in consequence of the wickedness of these evil-doers between Ali on one hand, and Talha, Zubair and Aisha on the other, and battles were fought which, though settled afterwards, yet gave the fore-mentioned wicked persons a good opportunity to proclaim the fabricated traditions, and those who were partial to Ali got a good chance to listen to them. Again, on account of the opposition of Amîr Muâwiya, the traditions got a still greater notoriety. Then the cruelty that was practised by the wretched Yazîd towards the members of Mohamed's family caused them to get a good credit among the friends. No wonder if the reckless learned men in their zeal and love for the prophet's family might have entered them in their books, which, it is not unreasonable, may have been considered by the followers as arguments and perfect proof against the opposite party. The family-members of Mohamed having a natural qualification in themselves, were

* It has been foretold in the Epistles of Zorast (fire worshipper) that the magicians mixing with the societies of Mahomedans will corrupt their faith and religion. Some Jews of Yaman, a part of Arabia in the guise of Islâm and in their love for Ali, were famous for such heresy. Among them there was one by name Abdullah, the son of Saba, who was several times turned out by Ali himself, for his irreligious statements.



worthy of commendation and respect. In the matter of faith, they had made great efforts and many spiritual sciences had been handed down through them to the succeeding generations. What fault is it then, of the prophet if he ordered his people to love and to respect them? It is not unreasonable to think that Banī Ymaīyas during their reign practised persecution; many friends of Ahl-i-Bait for the purpose of raising a body of people in their favour, might have invented traditions about superiority of Saiyids and commendations of Ahl-i-Bait. However, it is an erroneous and rude thought to draw such a conclusion from the above-mentioned statements that Mohamed had arranged for them to be worshipped. The prophet of God had never shown his partiality towards any person with regard to religious laws and orders. Two of his traditions are a perfect proof of this. When he warned his followers about the next world, he spoke to his own daughter thus:—"O my darling Fātima, never give up yourself to the vain thought that you are my daughter; I will not be able to remove God's punishment from thee. Make therefore efforts to do good. Yes! in worldly matters I can help thee, as a father does his children." When he orders his own daughter thus, what right has then a Saiyid or a Sheikh to lay claims of salvation like the Jews. The second tradition states that a woman belonging to the Quraish tribe had stolen something at Medina. To cut her hand according to the then existing law of the country, was quite disagreeable to Quraish. Wsāma, the son of Zaid, who was greatly loved by the prophet, was sent to him for recommendation in this matter. No sooner he spoke a little about it, than he incurred great displeasure of the prophet and was told that the former nations were destroyed chiefly because they were given to carry out the divine orders upon the poor and not upon the rich and high-born people. "I swear by God," said he, "if my own daughter



Fātima would have been guilty of theft I would not hesitate in having her hands cut off.”

The same magicians imputed that Omar kicked Fātima in consequence of which her pregnancy was lost, and that he treated Ali very badly. *Firstly*—What power and authority had Omar to do so? He had no army. The people of the tribe to which he belonged were very few in number. So he was quite unable to do so. What relation had the Muhājirs (the emigrants) and Answārs (the helpers) with Omar in preference to Ali and Fātima, in whose father they believed, that they would allow him to treat them so cruelly.

The Banī Hāshims were not so few in number that they, in order to keep up their respect, would let the matter go easily. The countries of Arabia where people live in tribes and families are famous for their self-respect and honour. In opposition to Omar, Banī Umaīyas would have also taken part with Banī Hāshim, who were very near descendants of the same forefather. The poor magicians having judged according to the circumstances of their own country, fabricated stories and traditions that have been proved by facts to be spurious and false. The office of Abū Bakr and Omar as successors of Mohamed (caliphs) was not externally after the manner of kings. They did not walk in pomp and show with a body-guard of horses and elephants. Their houses were not built like palaces and were not thronged with beautiful women. They had not the kitchens where thousand of kinds of food were cooked. The Government of the day was purely a republic. The caliphs received a very limited monthly salary of nearly 30 rupees a month for their household expenses. They were unable to expend a single pice in personal and household expenses. Every Moslem had freedom to raise objection to their conduct. During the time of both successions, Ali served as Secretary to Abū Bakr and Omar.



Now, my readers, let me know what right did they possess and what worldly riches had they hoarded up that they took by force or snatched away from Ali? It was only a service to their nation and a place of such a great responsibility that they did not like it for their own sons and grandsons, but left it to the choice of their people. Again, it seems very unlikely that the nation which did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for their prophet in his life-time, and which was filled with the same religious zeal after his death, would hesitate to carry out his order, if he had appointed a certain man, more particularly Ali, as his successor, who was at last elected as a *caliph* by the nation among which he was famous for his good qualifications.

Now, we come to see what was the nature of the garden *Fidak*, etc., with regard to inheritance. Fātima might have perhaps wanted to inherit it as her father's property, but when she was told that the prophet of God left nothing as such and it was not appropriate to his divine office. Yes, the estate he left as an endowment and from which he was given to defray the expenses of his people, will be used as usual and the stipends will continue as before. So Fātima consented to it and said nothing about it again. How greatly was this matter exaggerated by the magicians, and was believed by simple-minded persons. Having considered Abū Bakr and Omar as enemies to Ahl-i-Bait (household people) they took to abusing them as part of their faith. To say that the inward feelings of Ali towards the caliphs were different from what he showed outwardly. It is really an abuse to him, which is refuted by his blessed son Imām Husain, during the battle of Karbalā. An army of Yazīd nearly 25,000 in number had surrounded and demanded of him a formal acceptance of Yazīd as true caliph of Mohamed. Although his comrades were very few in number, he did not practise hypocrisy. How daringly he fought with the army and proved that Banī Hāshim



could not be submissive to any. The magician posterity having held this battle according to their own way and thinking after their own women's bewailings and weepings composed elegies and ballads to put the hearers to cry and mourn bitterly and to hold mass-meetings successfully for the purpose. It is quite stupid to say that the prophet of God wrought no miracle and that it was with the sword that the people were subjugated, because no sword was drawn at Mekka previous to his migration, and also in the conversion of Answārs (the helpers) to this faith. Thousands of trustworthy and God-fearing persons who witnessed his miracles and signs profess to have seen them with their own eyes and give that as reason for their conversion to the faith, whereas a person after hundreds of years, either purely from his incredulous, envious, and malignant spirit, or having based his statements on the baseless traditions of the hypocrites and enemies of Islām may deny these miracles and wonders. Well, my readers! Is it possible for a reasonable, God-fearing and just person to accept such denial as reasonable.

It is a still greater folly to say that the greatest worship in Islām is to take part in the savage-like assemblage—and having transformed themselves into the form of barbarians to make noise and to slaughter animals. Alas! if the prejudiced person who raises these objections, before doing so, had only been acquainted with the virtuous principles of Islām and had been aware of the spiritual blessings and the reality of *Hajj* (pilgrimage to Mekka), he would not insult himself by raising an unreasonable objection like this, nor would he make himself a laughing-stock to those who have the deep knowledge of the Qorān.

To say that Mohamed was the central place of hypocrisy and deceitfulness, that after his death the false coating was removed, that his followers began to fight among themselves and that his influence soon disappeared, is to



throw dust in the eyes of the world ; because all the historians, though prejudiced and enemies to him, unanimously agree that what the prophet of Arabia inculcated about the unity of God and his worship, upon the hearts of the people, was so perfect that even after his death, when his followers became master of the fertile kingdoms of the world and took the Crowns from the heads of Cæsar and Kistrā, and their fear over the populous part of the world, was so great that the mightiest people of the world trembled to think of the glittering swords of the Arabs, even then, they were qualified with durvesh-like simple dispositions and were accustomed to lead the pure and pious life of righteousness and politeness with the spirit they received from their leader.

They had the same spirit of night waking (for offering their prayers to God), of temperance, piety, patience, devotion, humility, forbearance, hospitality, valor, religious zeal, indifference towards worldly-troubles and a desire for the next world, which they had learnt from their leader.

An answer to the second part of the objection.

To raise objection to the Moslem society, the way they treat their women and to say that they put people to death, is mere falsehood. All this can be refuted by evidence of the people and by the philosophers of Europe. On the contrary, Christian societies are tempered with licentiousness, intoxication, hypocrisy and deceitfulness. Some uneducated Mahomedans catch these evils from the societies of the uncivilized peoples, the idolators, the Jews, the Christians and the magicians. When the Qorān and the traditions clearly count them as evil and the learned Moslems reject them as bad things, then what defect can they produce in Islām ? They would surely be considered as defects of those who are involved in them, whether they may be



Maulvis or religious leaders, or their descendants or Saiyids or Sheikhs, be they what they may.

Now, we quote from the European authors the statements that help our claim.

Godfrey Haggins, in his *Apology for Islām* quotes from Gibbon thus :—The manners of the first four caliphs were alike and were well known to all. Their zeal and interest in their works was from the purity of their hearts. After receiving wealth and power they spent their lives in the performance of moral and religious duties. When Mohamed was surrounded on all sides with troubles and difficulties and the arrows of calamities had overwhelmed him and he was compelled to leave his birth-place, these persons took part with him and patiently bore the persecutions they received from the hands of their enemies. Their conversion to Islām, at the time, proves their truth and righteousness. And to take possession of the fertile kingdoms of the world, points to their superior ability. Who can think in the aforesaid circumstances that the persecutions they bore, the religion they accepted and stuck to, piously to the point of death and the banishment they took from their own country, was all this simply for a person who was full of every sort of evils, was artful and a hypocrite, whose teachings were opposed to their previous lives and freedom? No one can believe it and it is not possible. It is better for the Christians to remember that Mohamed's teachings produced in the heart of his follower a true love and zeal for their religion which is useless to seek among the early followers of Christ. Their religion spread so rapidly over the world that its parallel cannot be found anywhere. Before the half century passed, Islām gained victory over the most fertile and powerful kingdoms of the world. Whereas, when Christ was taken to be crucified, his followers fled, their religious zeal disappeared and they ran away leaving their Saviour as entangled in the claws of



death. If they were unable to protect him from his enemies, they were at least able to remain near him for his comfort and were strong enough to threaten his enemies. Mohamed's faithful followers always mustered around their persecuted prophet and for his protection put their lives in danger, and ultimately prevailed against his enemies.

The learned Gibbon says in his history that Mohamed's religion is pure from superstitions and doubts. The prophet of Mekka rejected with reasonable argument the worship of men, idols, planets, and stars. With ardent love he acknowledged for the founder of the universe an existence that has neither beginning nor ending, nor is He limited to a form or place, nor has He His parallel with whom he may be compared. The messenger of God uttered the deep truths of theology and his followers readily accepted them. The commentators of the Qorān explained them with reasonable arguments. A great philosopher who professes to believe in the nature and attributes of God can declare that Mohamed's belief is superior to his knowledge and recent faculties. The principles, the foundation of which is laid upon reason and inspiration, became strong and perfect by the witness of Mohamed. His followers from Mekka to India have the honour of being styled as Unitarians who having held the idols as abomination removed the danger of idol-worship for ever.

Dr. Springer says, Mohamed always penetrated the hand of God's power in the rising sun, the raining water, the growing grass and heard the voice of His praise in thunder-clap, in flowing water, in melodies of birds and beheld signs of His power and might in dreary deserts and in the old desolate cities.

Rodwell in his Preface to the Qorān asserts that Mohamed was moved in doing all his works with the good intention to release his country from ignorance and the disgrace



of idolatry and the most earnest desire he cherished in his heart was to spread the truth, *i.e.*, the Unity of God. Although for some reasons he thought himself to be an apostle of God, still Mohamed's person was a curious example of the power and life that has a perfect belief in God and resurrection from which a lot of good results can be produced. There cannot be a bit of doubt that in consequence of his generous person and truthful nature, he ought to be considered among the people—who have perfect authority and full power over faith and conduct and over the whole life of mankind which can be found in none except him who belongs to the highest order.*

Sir W. Muir, though he was a bigoted Christian, was at last compelled to assert in his *Life of Mohamed* thus:—From the time unknown, the spiritual power of Mekka and of Arabia had become quite insensible, though a weak and faint influence of Judaism and Christianity or of philosophy had appeared in Arabia, such as the surface of a non-flowing brook waves here and there, without a motion at its bottom. All the Arabs were engrossed in the darkness of superstition and wickedness. It was a common practice among them that the eldest son after his father's death took his wives as his own. On account of their pride and poverty, they used to kill their daughters, when infants, like the Hindus. Their religion was the most degraded form of idolatry. They did not believe in the

* The last part of the sentence is a characteristic of his missionary prejudice that came to appear from his pen, else, there can be no doubt about the mission of him who is qualified with qualifications that belong to the highest order of the prophets, concerning whom clear prophecies are found in the Bible and it is a still greater surprise that Christ has said nowhere that no apostle shall appear after him. On the contrary he has somewhat winked at his appearance. Next to Christ, the Christians believe also in the mission of those who had nothing of the good qualities in comparison to our great prophet as Paul was. We are at a loss to find what difficulty arises in believing Mohamed as a true apostle of God, although he asserts the truth of the Gospel of Christ and witnesses the chastity of his mother.



Almighty God, the cause of all effects, but were entangled in the false superstition of the unseen spirits. Resurrection, reward and punishment that are the cause of merit or demerit were quite unknown to them. Thirteen years before the Hejira, *i.e.*, previously to the time Mohamed declared himself to be a prophet, Mekka was quite senseless of its disgraceful condition, yet what an important and immense effect was produced within these 13 years that hundreds of persons having forsaken idol-worship undertook to adore the one true God alone—and according to their belief submitted themselves to the directions given them in the inspired word of God, began to pray with great devotion unto the Almighty, to expect mercy and salvation from Him alone and to take pains in doing good and in practising justice and piety. Day and night they began to think over the power of the Almighty to recognize the fact that He is the Person who takes care of them even in their trifling wants. In every natural circumstance, in every thing that pertained to them in their daily life, in every incident that took place in private or in society and in all the changes that happened, they always beheld Nature's hand. Besides this, the spiritual state in which they felt themselves continually delightful and used to praise Him, was looked upon as a sign of His particular grace and mercy. The infidels who were their kinsmen and lived in their cities and towns, etc., were considered as doomed to destruction and Mohamed was looked upon as the person who gave them a new life. (Here ends Muir's statement.) In a short space of time, in consequence of the curious effect that Islām produced, Mekka was split into two societies. Hundreds of men and women not accepting to depart from their dear faith were compelled to quit their houses and migrate to Ethiopia. Again, the prophet himself together with more than one hundred of his followers left his dear city and the Holy Kaaba and took his abode



permanently at Medina. Here also, the aforesaid wonderful effect caused him and his followers to form a brotherhood ready to sacrifice their lives under the protection of the prophet and other Moslems. The people of Medina although had heard ere long, and were familiar with Jewish truths, were still engrossed in darkness and had not hitherto risen from their slumber. But now, the prophet of Arabia's effectual and heart-seeking public discourses aroused them to a new spiritual and devout life.

In one place of his book he says that "we acknowledge without hesitation that Islām has removed many a false and superstitious rite for ever. Idolatry disappeared before the war-cry of Islām and the doctrine of unity together with the unlimited perfections and power of God became a vigorous principle of the religion in the hearts and minds of Mohamed's followers just as it was in Mohamed himself.

The most important truth of Islām which bears also the sense of the word *Islām* is to resign one's self to the will of God. It has no less virtues in regard to society. All Moslems are ordered by their religion to treat one another, among themselves, with brotherly love, to do good to the orphans, to be kind to their slaves and not to use alcoholic (intoxicating) liquors at all. It can boast that it has in itself a part of temperance not found in any other religion. (Here ends his statement.) Besides the aforesaid authors many learned French and Germans bear witness with a still greater force to the Islāmic truth, and to prove their statements, they bring arguments in great detail.

And the number of witnesses concerning the state of caliphs is so great that we cannot count it exactly. It has been acknowledged by all the world that the caliphs after taking possession of the fruitful kingdoms of the world within the short space of time, of which there is no parallel in the universe, were accustomed to pass duryesh-like



lives and to perform religious and moral duties with the same devotion up to the point of death.

There was no particular palace for the caliphs to live in, nor the royal building to set under; their houses were lower and worse than those of middle-class men. Mud-built (kuchcha) houses roofed with date-tree wood that leaked in excessive rain and were likely to fall down, were very small and scanty in accordance with their poor wants. The caliphs were not distinct from the common people of their country. They used to live in a state that was lower than the aforesaid people.

The coat Omar used to put on was patched up with many patches. There was no watch at their doors, nor did they ride in carriages with great show and splendour, but they were accustomed to walk lonely like common persons, wherever they wished. They were not ashamed to do their own domestic works of buying and selling. Every complainant was at liberty to appear before them. On account of their remaining busy in their official duties, their nation had allowed for them a very poor monthly stipend which amounted to nearly 30 or 32 rupees a month in which they had to support themselves and their family. In addition to all the abovementioned things, to wake up in the night for God's worship, to be indifferent of the troubles of this world and to prepare themselves night and day for the next world are clear proofs of their supremacy over all. In morality, humility, meekness, forbearance, self-denial and forgiveness they were counted as perfect men. A man of the lowest grade had authority to make objection to their practice and conduct, and they had listened to them as carefully as they did to the respectable persons of their nation. They were unable to beat with a lap or to imprison for a day the lowest person of their society. If stories of their justice and impartiality be recorded at length, many large volumes would not suffice.



When Ibn-i-Walid, the chief commander, was discharged from his post by Omar in consideration of some prudent and national measure and the place was filled up by Abū Ubaida bin-il-jarrāh and a declaration to this effect was made in a speech before the nation, a young lad who belonged to Khālīd's clan, spoke loudly before the meeting in such harsh words that could not be heard even by a common person. "O Omar! thou still cherishest the same hatred and enmity towards Khālīd which thou hadst before Islām." Whereupon the chief persons of the mass-meeting were grieved. But in order to appease their passion, Omar said, he is a lad and does not know the secrets of government.

Omar was once on his travels to Medina and the night was dark. Without knowing he stepped on another man's foot who said "art thou blind." "Excuse me please, the darkness of the night hath blinded me" said Omar to the afflicted person—who having recognized him began to make excuses. Never mind, Sir, you are right; the fault is actually mine, replied Omar. When Jerusalem, the Holy City, was surrounded by the Moslem army, the citizens agreed to make over the city to them, on condition their caliph may come, whom they might be able to see and with whom they may be able to make a formal agreement. The people of Medina were of different opinions concerning the matter. But Alī said "it is surely desirable that the Head of the Faithful may go there." Now, Omar took his journey to Syria and what kinds of preparations were made for him by his people? A camel on whose back was put a little flour of parched barley for his meals with a wooden dish hanging on it and a slave to accompany him. Let us see how they finished their journey. When Omar rode half-way, his slave used to take the nose-string and led the camel. When the slave rode on it, Omar used to alight, to take the string and to conduct it. At their



halting places, they were accustomed to do their work alternately. In the intervening districts, wherever they heard complaints against their officers and the cruelties they practised therein, they made amendments. When they reached their destination, the Moslem army as a reception for them raised the cry of *Allāh Akbar* the Great God. The people of the city found out that the Head of the Faithful had come. Now the head was compelled by his people to put on fine garments, to ride on a good horse and then to converse with the Christians. Having gone four or five paces, he dismounted from his horse and said : “ Bring my patched-up clothing, for, of this garment and appearance I feel proud. I have heard from the Messenger of God whosoever hath a bit of pride in his heart, he will not be able even to smell the scent of heaven.”

The facts that concern Alī are more surprising than these. One of them is the following. During his reign he had bought an armour from a Jew and had paid him its price. However the Jew in order to try him, instituted a case against him in the Court. Shuraih was the Qāzī (the Judge) in those days. According to the common course of the Mahommedan Law, he summoned also his king (Alī) who attended the Court and was informed of the suit that was brought against him by a Jew. Alī said that he had already paid the price. You are now responsible to prove it, else, I will have to pass a decree against you,” said the Qāzī. Alī brought his son Imām Husain and his slave Qambar as his witnesses. The Jew made an objection to it saying that a son’s evidence for his father and that of a slave for his master cannot be accepted. The Judge, in acknowledgment of the cross-question, passed a decree against Alī who paid the money to the Jew for the second time. The Jew having obtained the decree-money confessed that he was a liar. It was merely to try the Mos-



lem Court and the justice practised by the judge and the king. Afterwards, for this very fact he became a convert to Islām.

It must be acknowledged that the caliphs were always godly and divine persons, before their prophet as well as after him. They did not rule their kingdoms despotically, nor had they an army except the nation that believed in the mission of their prophet and were ready even to sacrifice their lives on their behalf, nor had they wealth and property, the means of splendour, then to believe in the traditions that they turned* from their faith afterwards, that they did not stick to Islām, that they felt no love for their prophet after his death, that they did not remain as submissive to the injunctions of the Holy Qorān is a sheer absurdity and is entirely opposed to what is self-evident which can convince neither a Mahomedan nor a non-Mohamedan. After all, if it be supposed that a diversity of opinion arose among them, concerning some matter, and consequently on a worldly affair some brotherly complaint might have been made or they might have been aggrieved for some reason, which is natural to man, then to take this to mean that they were enemies to and felt hatred

* "*Laqad rasī Allāho an il mominīna iz yubāyūnaka tahtash-shajarate.*" "Surely God is pleased with the faithful who make a confession with you, O prophet! under a tree." *Wa alsamahum kalimat-ul-taqwā wa hānū ahaq qa biha wa ahlaha.* "And piety was a part of their Obligations and they deserved it and were fit for it also." *Walla-zīna maahū ashiddao alal kuffari ruhama bainahum, tarāhum rukka an sujjadan yabtagūna faalan min Allāhi wa rizwana, simāhum fi wajūhi him min asar-is-sujud.* And they who belong to the society of Mohamed are strict to the infidels but sympathetic among themselves. You will behold them in reverential prostration and in bowing down their heads in prayers, the signs of which are apparent from their faces." The companions of Mohamed who were *muhajirs* and *answars*—the emigrants and the helpers—are spoken of very highly in the Qorān for their efforts in the cause of Islām. In opposition to these verses and incidents that are given in the Qorān, to consider them as wicked and sinful, does not befit a Mohamedan, nay it does not become even a wise non-Mohamedan.



towards each other, and thereby to form the judgment that they had deep-rooted hatred towards Fatima (the head of all the women) and that they had treated her with injustice and cruelty, or that they had enmity against Ali (the chosen), or that they practised cruelties upon or injustice to him, or that Ali himself felt hatred towards them on account of the election as Mahomed's successor or that the nation had deep-rooted enmity against the holy descendants of the prophet, or that they were always in pursuit of their dishonour or disgrace, is entirely an absurd idea and is a submission to the ignorant and the triflers which again is quite contrary to facts and the holy Qorān.

Surely Banī Umaīya and more particularly Yazīd purely for worldly motives of obtaining the Mohamedan kingdom and being styled as the head of the faithful and the caliph of Mohamed opposed Ali and his descendants and treated them cruelly on account of which all the Moslems with the exception of Yazīd's army and their subordinates were displeased with them and always held them as blameworthy. The people of Mekka and Medina all of them were greatly displeased with Banī Umaīya. It was their old family-hatred which was in the beginning suppressed through the influence of the prophet, but in consequence of worldly authority and exultation, it reappeared in the end. For which Banī Umaīya alone and not all the followers of Mohamed are responsible.

However, it is very strange that the Christians show deep-rooted enmity towards Islām and its prophet, because, leaving aside the Christian practice of prejudice and intolerance and the religious fanaticism, their last leaders have shown recently, Christianity is so similar to Islām that there is not so much affinity between any other two religions, throughout the world, so that some learned Christians have confessed that Islām is a branch of Christianity, if all the unnecessary additions of the religion be



put aside. While Mohamed bears witness to Christ and the Qorān describes the chastity of his mother Mary, then, we the Christians have no right to abuse and to oppose him which is a great disgrace to us ; at least we ought to think him as a reformer of the Christian religion. There is no reason why we may not consider him as one of those leaders of Christianity who having seen into the general teachings and creeds of the religion has tried to reform it to a certain limit. Following the missionaries of to-day, the idolatrous nation which is the most degraded of all, has felt encouraged to attack the gracious prophet, and what mean language they use against his holy person !

SECTION III.

INSPIRATION OF THE QORAN, ITS RECENT ORDER AND COLLECTION.

The Holy Qorān was not revealed all at once. It came down little by little, from time to time within the space of 23 years, ten years at Mekka, after the declaration of our prophet's mission, and 13 years at Medina. The verses and the sūras that were inspired at Mekka are called the Mekkan verses and sūras, and those at Medina the Medinites. The Mekkan part of the Qorān consists chiefly of creeds, the unity of God, the evils of idol-worship and of superstitions, the proof of God's nature and attributes based on arguments of nature and things and of retribution after death. The Medinite part of the Qorān has more commandments than the former. Whatever came down was gathered in the original order which had been appointed in heaven. Mohamed was himself a *Hāfiz* (one who commits it to memory) and had also a society of other *hāfizes*. They were also in the habit of reciting the new part after placing it in its proper place. The writers of inspirations who were especially appointed to do the work



were also receiving their information from him about inserting the new verses into certain places of the sūras. During the last days of his life, Zaid bin Sabit an Answārī, Abd-Ullah bin Masaūd, the four caliphs, Muāz bin Jabal, Ubāī ibn-i-Kaab, Saad bin Abī Waqqās, Abd-Ullah bin Arqam, Sabit bin Qais and many *Ashab-i-Suffa* (people of the platform) and others were such good hāfizes that the whole Qorān from the beginning to the end was fresh in their memories. It is no wonder, that in every town and village numbers of persons, men, women, children, the young, the old, the blind and those who have sight are found as hāfizes. When in India the number of hāfizes who do not know even the meaning of the Qorān but simply appreciate its elegant style, is so great, then it was very likely that the number of hāfizes was still greater among the Arabs of those days whose memories were strong and who remembered by heart hundreds of poems of pre-Islāmic ages and hundreds of genealogical tables of families, even more than that, they also remembered the genealogies of their horses and camels, and in addition to the afore-said things the sweet language of the Qorān with its soul-searching effects was more than enough to attract their hearts. Again, it was considered a virtuous and meritorious act to recite the Qorān day and night; in each prayer they had to read some portion from it.

Besides this, the Qorān was also found in a written form. It had been wholly and perfectly recorded during the life-time of our prophet. However, there had arisen no need to gather all its portions in one volume. Shortly after his departure from this world, a severe battle was fought between the people of Musailima, the false prophet of Yamāma and the Moslems. The enemy fought bravely and was utterly routed in the end; many of his troops together with the false prophet were killed in the field, and after this, no war of this nature was fought in Arabia.



Still, among the Moslems also, many useful men, especially hāfizes, received martyrdom in this fight.

Omar as a fore-sight for future emergency thought it desirable to get the separate pieces of the Qorān gathered or written in the form of a volume. He thought that if three or four battles like the one above-mentioned, took place in future and the hāfizes fell victims to them in the above-mentioned proportion, the best medium of preserving the Qorān would be lost.* So he laid the plan before his people which was approved. Accordingly Zaid bin Sabit an Answārī, who used to write inspirations in the life-time of our prophet, was appointed as manager in charge of this important task, who having carefully compared the previous portions with what he obtained from the memory of the hāfizes, prepared a copy which was kept under the care of Abū Bakr. After his death, during the reign of Omar, it was entrusted to him.

During the reign of Omar Islām had spread in far distant countries. People of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Syria, Persia and many other countries had become converts to Islām in great numbers. Hāfizes were unable to reach

* There occurs to me an interesting story appropriate to this place. It runs thus:—A venerable old person said to me that in the beginning of the British reign the missionaries had control over the sale of the Qorān. They were given to buy it in great numbers. In the city of Meerath there was a department to carry on the business. The old person was accustomed to go to the missionary very often, who had treated him kindly and had bought also the copies of the Qorān from him. The old man once asked the missionary the reason for the purchase in so great a number of the book. After a good deal of hesitation on the part of the missionary, he was told not to tell any other that his object was not to carry on trade, but to destroy the copies altogether. As there was no press in India, the copies would be lost ultimately. Then, he said, they would send the printed copies from England to India. This way they would regain the squandered money of the mission and would be able to gain another object in view, then, *i.e.*, would be able to produce differences in the Qorān. Whereupon the old man said it is a vain speculation. In every village are found hāfizes who can make the Qorān written from beginning to end. He then took two or three hāfizes to the missionary and proved his claim. So the arrangement was dropped.



everywhere. So people began to fear discrepancies in the Qorān caused through forgetfulness. Therefore, Huzaifa bin-ul-Yamān applied to prepare some copies from the original and to send them to different parts. This incident took place in the reign of Othmān, who appointed Zaid bin Sabit again, to prepare some copies from the original. Zaid made the same arrangement again, collected its portions and participated also with the hāfizes. The original version was used and kept carefully. Two persons were seated at the door of the mosque for the purpose of telling the people coming to offer their prayers, to bring two witnesses with whatsoever portion of the Qorān they had (one witness for the written portion and the other for the sake of the hāfiz). The leading linguists Abd-Ullah bin Zubair, Saīd bin As and Abd-Ullah bin Haris, bin Hishām had also taken part in this managing committee, because the Qorān was sent down in the language of the Quraish, in which the aforesaid persons were well versed. So all the words of the Qorān were recorded according to the Quraishic idioms. By this careful arrangement six or seven copies had been prepared and sent to Mesopotamia, Egypt and Syria, and other countries. The original copy had been sent again to the house of Hafsa, the mother of the faithful and the daughter of Omar. This original version passes by the name of *Umm* the mother. As the arrangement of the preparation of the Qorān had been made anew, during the reign of Osmān, so he had been styled by his people with the title of Jāmi-ul-Qorān, one who collected the Qorān in one volume.

Afterwards, hundreds and thousands of copies were made from these and spread in Islāmic countries. Since then, the two channels of Qorānic protection, *i.e.*, by rote and written records, have been handed down up to the present time. Therefore, the Qorān still exists just as it descended and was found in the life-time of our prophet;



it does still exist without a bit of deficiency and will continue to the end of this world. Friends and foes all acknowledge this fact. All the Moslem sects are unanimous on this point.

OBJECTIONS.

When great many discussions took place between the Moslems and the Christians, the latter agreed that the four gospels far from being the productions and inspirations of Christ were not recorded even in his life-time. Surely some of his statements are given in them. If they may be proved as free from error, they can be considered as inspired and sent down from God. Again, disputes arose concerning the four gospels themselves, namely, if their authors be acknowledged as true apostles, inspired writers and those who wrought miracles, then whether the gospels are free from fluctuations and changes or not. It has been proved from the works of trustworthy Christian authors and historians that there do exist in them errors of writers in hundreds and thousands of places, the declarations of which are found in the commentaries of Horn, Henry, and Scott. Rev. Phaunders himself acknowledges at the end of the religious controversy held at Akbarābād (Agra), that some critics as Greisbauch, etc., have accepted it in plain words. In opposition to the above, the poor missionaries thought it advisable to raise objections to the Holy Qorān, thus :—

(I.) It is recorded in the commentary of Itqān, etc., that Zaid bin Sabit bin Answārī says, in gathering the portions of the Qorān he found the verse *laqad jā akum rasulum min anjusikum*, etc., nowhere except near Khuzaima an Answārī. One of the traditions says that Hazrat Aesha (peace be on her), tells us that one of the written verses was found in her bed, which was eaten up by a goat. Likewise it is possible that other verses may have been left out.



(2.) Similarly, it appears from the traditions of Sihāh-i-Sitta that many verses have been obliterated from recitation. The first part of sūra Baqra (cow), is also cancelled. This has been shown by the Rev. Master Rām Chander, in a book called Tārīf-ul-Qorān, from which it is proved that the Qorān has reductions and changes, and that it was at first, like other works, a rough copy, from which the prophet, because of defects in idioms and contents, reduced or cancelled as much as he liked.

(3.) Shīas, a Moslem sect, up to the present day openly declare that Osmān has caused many sūras and verses of the Qorān relating to the succession of Alī, and the supremacy of the members of his family, to be taken out, and with the intention to blot out their traces, the copies of Abd-Ullah, the son of Masūd, etc., had been burnt. Sūra Alī, Sūra Fātima, and Sūra Husain, were previously found in the Qorān.

ANSWERS TO THE ABOVE-MENTIONED OBJECTIONS.

These objections are three in number, in the explanation of which, books of big volumes have been written. If our statements be read over carefully, the aforesaid objections cannot be raised at all. Still it is desirable here to give the answers in detail.

(1) In reply to the first objection I say that many people had remembered the Qorān by heart. It had been recorded also in portions during the time of our prophet and a complete volume of all was ready. In such a case, suppose not only one verse, but even ten verses were found missing in some portions or a complete volume of the Qorān had been eaten up by Aisha's goat, was it possible for a single iota of the Qorān to diminish? No, never. A search of Zaid bin Sabit is a proof that like other hāfizs he had known it beforehand, still he was careful to compare and then to take it also from the Qorān of Alī Khuzaima.



(2.) In answer to the second objection I have to say that the traditions that hold some verses as abrogated are of doubtful nature, unfit to be believed, and that the Qorān together with all verses and letters therein, is an authentic truth. As long as the last verse or verses cannot be proved as part and parcel of the Qorān, no part thereof can be held as unrecitable and abrogated, and to call such as a part of the Qorān is a groundless objection.

The Holy Qorān which all the Moslems possess, is the same that has been continually copied and come down to us from generation to generation and in addition to it, it may have been found in both the aforesaid rolls and volumes. If it be not so, we cannot call it as the Qorān. On this ground if the so-called abrogated portion of it, may not be so named by a Mohamedan, he will not be considered as a heretic and turned out from the Moslem society. On the contrary, one who does not believe in one or one-half of a verse is considered as an infidel. In addition to the above, to think that there was a rough copy of the Qorān, and that a revision of it had taken place is a delightful thing that has been created by the opponent. I have also treated at full length, all the disputes and all about "Taarīf-ul-Qorān" in one of my treatises named Taarīf-ul-Qorān. If all the objections be accepted as true, even then, the Qorān would be held as free from change and abrogation, for all this had taken place before the prophet, not after his death.

It is true that our prophet in reciting the verses of the Qorān had given something by way of comments. People having considered it as sacred, caused it to be written with the original verses of the Qorān. But in the last recitation when Gabriel let the prophet hear the whole Qorān, as well as Gabriel heard it from him in return, and the explanations given from time to time by the prophet, did not come then, as it ought to have been, the people came to



conclude that the portions left, were also really parts of the Qorān, however, their recitation is stopped. All traditions of the traditionists on this point were based chiefly upon this idea. Therefore, not only the caliphs in their respective times, but all the Moslems destroyed the copies the people had, and also of Abd-Ullāh, the son of Masūd, for fear that the public may not be led to think the verse left as part of the original, and the people were strictly ordered not to write anything else with the Qorān—even to record the word *amen* at the end of sūra *Alhamd*. Those who are accustomed to make the distinguishing emblems and the punctuation marks, etc., on the margins of the holy book, have been justified to do so, by some orthodoxes of recent times, simply because that, that liability may not recur.

(3.) An answer to the third objection is this that, critics among the Shīa sects are quite averse to such an idea and clearly show their disapproval of it. *Sheikh* Sadūq Abū Jaafar Mohamed, the son of Alī Bābaya, tells us in his *Treatise upon Creeds* that “the Qorān given by God to the prophet is just the same which people have near themselves. It has neither reductions nor additions in it.” Saiyid Murtaza who had been acknowledged as one of the learned Shīas, thus writes in his commentary called *Majma-ul-Bayān*, “the Qorān is exactly the same that was in the time of our prophet, without a bit of change.” Qāzī Nur Ullāh Shustarī in his book *Masāib-un-nawāsib* writes that it is quite wrong to ascribe it to the Shīahs that they believe there are changes in the Qorān. The critics among us do not believe it at all. It would bring no credit to some who might be led to do so. Mulla Sādiq in his book *Sharh-i-Kulāinī* says that the Holy Qorān will remain quite free and safe from changes up to the time of Imām Mahdī. Muhammad, the son of Amilī, has refuted this spurious idea with strong arguments.



THE REALITY OF THE MATTER

is this that, in the first century there arose a dispute among the Moslems with regard to succession and leadership *khi-lāfat and imāmat*. To the public, the succession of the first three caliphs was lawful and genuine. A body of persons called Shīahs raised objection to the aforesaid arrangement. The public said that the caliphate is a managing service ; whosoever has been elected for it, in regard to his ability and experience is entitled to be the *caliph* and the *leader* (*khalifa* and *imām*). A body of the Shīa sect passing by the name of Zaidīya, and the ancient people of another group named Ismāīliā did not care much to oppose this election. Yes ! they said, Alī had a better claim for the succession, although it was lawful to select an inferior before a superior. The third body of the aforesaid sect was of opinion that such a selection was quite unlawful because the office of a successor and a leader is a divine office, regardless of any selection or non-selection of any other. It is next to the order of a prophet and is subordinate to it. *Imām*, a leader, is always free from sin and is also an inspired person. As salvation cannot be obtained without believing in the prophet of the time, so it cannot be had without the latter (*imām*). The right *imām* was Alī, next to him were his sons Hasan and Husain, then Zain-ul-ābidīn, Bāqir, Jaʿfar Mūsā, Kāzim and his son, respectively and lastly, the *imāmat* ends on the twelfth *imām* Mahdī. He is hidden in a cave called *Surra man raā* (Sā-mira), and will appear at the close of the resurrection.

The Mohamedan public raised an objection to it and said that the last part of the verse is *Al-yauma akmalto lakum dīnakum*, which means "to-day I have accomplished for you your religion ;" from which it is apparent that the holy prophet departed from this world after having accomplished "this religion." The *Qorān* says all about salvation in detail, then such an important teaching upon



which the salvation of man depends, ought to be found in it. Please trace and show it to us in plain words. When they could not help it, some of them thought it as a timely relief to say that the verses and sūras in which the teaching did exist, have been taken out from it by the caliphs. But really they did not believe so, nor could they obtain relief from the objection. Because the verse *innā nahno nazzalnāz-zikra wa innā lahū la hāfizūn*—"we have sent down the Qorān and surely we are its protector," is quite opposed to them, then who can interfere with the Qorān? Secondly when there arose disputes with regard to *imāmat* and *khilāfat*, Ali and Banī Hāsham did not quarrel about it at all. How strange it is then, that changes could have been made before them in their religious book and they keep silent. The caliphs had neither personal armies, nor power; all this consisted in their nation. The nation who did not grudge even their lives and wealth, gave up their houses, were ready to die in battles for the sake of their religion, would they keep silent at the dishonesty of their caliphs? They would surely oppose them for their succession and would be partial to Ali. Regardless of them, Ali, Fātima, Hasan, Husain, and Banī Hāsham themselves were able to protect their sacred book the Qorān, from changes. They had also the same Qorān with them. Therefore both reason and religious proof cannot acknowledge this objection. On this answer, the wise Shīas became satisfied and openly declared that they never believed the Qorān to be liable to changes. If the uneducated might have such a belief, they are of no account and credit to others. The Shīas in order to uphold the aforesaid question of *imāmat* invented traditions and interpretations which have been for a long time, a magazine or morsel of quarrel and strife. The learned men of other religions and the public, up to this time, charge the poor Shīas with the useless statement of some of them. It is of no use for



an enemy to bring the dispute in his favour. To bring it as an argument in opposition to us is a pure absurdity.

SECTION IV.

ON VARIOUS READINGS.

A TRADITION which all the learned Mohamedans hold as genuine and correct says, that “verily the Qorān is sent down upon seven readings, all of which are satisfactory and perfect.” *Innal Qorāna unzila alā sabati ahrufin—Kulluhā shāfin kāfin.* With regard to the meanings of the *harf*, there are several statements of the learned men, however, it is a mistake to take from it the various readings of the famous *Qārīs* as Jalāl-Uddīn Suyutī in his preface of the Qorān’s Commentary, *i.e.*, Itqān says: *wa qad zanna kasi-rum-min-al-awāmi annal-murāda bihā al qirāat-us-sabato-wa huwa jahluṇ qabihun.* Many among the common persons have thought that seven kinds of reading are meant by it, which is a sheer ignorance, because the prophet of God spoke the tradition at the time the seven *qārīs* were not even born. The learned critics having carefully observed all the events of their time, describe that by the word the seven kinds of idiom, then current among the seven famous tribes of Arabia are meant, which is very probable; because in every country although the same language is spoken, still in regard to different tribes, divisions, and districts of the country there appears some difference in their dialects and idioms. For instance, in India, Delhī has distinct idioms from those of Lucknow, although both the cities are not very far from each other. Much more then there should be diversity of expressions in the Dekkan, Madras, Bengal, the Panjab and the Upper Provinces. This kind of difference is found more or less in every language of the world. None can speak so fluently in an idiom spoken and used by others. When Islām spread from



Medina among the several Arab tribes and the Holy Qorān became the sacred book of all from which they had to read some portion, especially in five times' prayers of every day, the people were unable to control themselves in expressing their particular dialects and idioms, to do which they should have been ordinarily forbidden and thereby they might have been affected in their minds at the idea of reading against what has been sent down from God. At last the question arose in the presence of our prophet who having explained the difficulty asked permission from God through Gabriel for the use of different dialects, whereupon for the sake of convenience, the people were allowed to read the Qorān in their own dialects. For instance, some Arabs call a sinner with the word *fājir* ; but in the eloquent language of Quraish *asīm* is used for it. So in place of *inna taām-al-asīmi*, they were permitted to recite *inna taām-al-fājiri*, which means verily "the food of the sinners." All this came to pass ; but in writing and also in teaching the Hafizes, the Quraish language was always carefully taken. This state lasted for a time in the beginning, but afterwards all the tribes of Arabia were accustomed to read the Qorān in the sweet language of the Quraish. In the history of a book, this sometimes happens in the beginning ; but by-and-by people begin to follow the original language of the author.

When the Qorān being recorded in the language of the Quraish was sent all round the countries, the people followed the same ; but in the writing of those days the vowel-points were not given and the sentences were free from punctuation marks. Some letters were dependent in their writings upon their vowel-points, as the word *malik* that can be pronounced in two ways *mālik* or *malik* without points. These slight differences which can produce change worthy of observation, did still remain. During the time of the disciples of our prophet no notice was taken of them, for the reason that Arabic was their mother language ; at



a slight suggestion of a word they were able to pronounce it correctly, however, in the last part of the time of our prophet's companions, people undertook this task. At every central place well-versed people came who recited and taught the Qorān in the original manner. There still remained a slight diversity which is particular to dialect, and which the extent of a language is capable of bearing. This diversity is extensively found in every polished or elegant language. If one sentence be mixed with another it gives a different sentence; if it be separated from the latter, it bears another sense. Sometimes it exists in the pronunciation of words, as *waddihā* and *wādūhāha*, *kum* and *kumū*. This kind of diversity is called seven continuous readings, i.e., the readings that are handed down to us from the time of our prophet who, in regard to the extent of the Arabic language, has read it several ways, in order to comprehend all the senses. Among the companions of our prophet, the seven distinguished readers of the Qorān were the following persons:—

Usman, Ali, Ubai-ibn-i-Kaab, Zaid ibn-i-Sābit, Abd-Ul-lah ibn-i-Masūd, Abū Dardāa and Abū Musā Ash-arī, as Zahabi describes in his *Tabqāt-il-Qurrā*. Afterwards the most renowned and illustrious pupils of the above-mentioned persons spread all over the cities, each began to read and teach after the manner they learnt from their masters. Thus at Medina, Saīd ibn-ul-musaiyib, Urwa bin Zubair, Sālim bin Abd-Ullah ibn-i-Umar, Umar ibn-i-Abd-ul-aziz, Sulaiman, Atā, Muāz bin-Haris, Abd-ur-Rahmān Hurmuz, Muhamed bin Shahāb Zahri, Muslim bin Jundub, and Zaid bin Aslam were the readers of their times and bearers of hadises. At Mekka, Ubaid, Ata bin Abī Ribāh, Tāūs, Mujāhid, Akrama, Ibn-i-Abī Mulaika were the famous readers. At Kūfa, Al-qama, Aswad, Masrūq, Ubaida, Umar bin Sharhabil, Hāris bin Qais, Rabīa, Umar bin Maimūn, Abū Abd-ur-Rahmān Sulmī, Zarr bin Jaish, Ubaid bin Fuzaila, Saīd bin Jubair



Nahafī and Shaabī were the most renowned readers of the Qorān. At Bassora, Abul Alīa, Abū Rijāa, Nasr bin Asim, Yahyā bin Yāmar, Hasan of Bassora, Ibn-i-Sīrīn and Qatāda were the well-versed readers. In Syriā, Mugīra bin Shahāb Makhzūmē and the pupils of Usman, and besides these there were many others there. Again, in the above-named places the following *imāms* (leaders) were more especially celebrated for this art. At Medina, first Abū Jaafar, then Ibn-i-Nassāh, then Nāfia, at Mekka, Abd-Ullāh bin Kasīr, Humaid bin Qais, and Muhamed bin Mahīz, at Kūfa, Yahyā bin Wasāb, Asim bin Abin-Nujūd, Sulaimān Aamash, then Hamza, then Kisāi; at Bassora, Abd-Ullah bin Abī Is-haq, Isā bin Amrū, Abū Amrū bin-il-Alāa, then Asim, then Yāqūb Hazramī; at Syria, Abd-Ullah bin Amīr, Atiya bin Qais Kilābī, Imāel, then Yahyā bin Hāris Wamārī, then Shuraih bin Yazīd Hazramī were the leading readers of the Qorān.

Among the aforesaid persons the following seven persons are those towards whom the seven various readings of the Qorān are ascribed. They are held as acknowledged Imāms (leaders) of this art.

(1.) Nāfia of Medīna, who had obtained his knowledge from 70 *tābiīns* (the disciples of our prophet's disciples are called *tābiīns*). He is different from Nāfia who was a student of Abd-Ullah bin Omar and teacher of Imām Mālik.

(2.) *Ibn-i-Kasīr*.—He was an Imām (principal) at Mekka and was a student of Abd-Ullah bin Sāib, one of the companions of our prophet.

(3.) *Asim at Kūfa* who was a student of *tābiīn*.

(4.) *Hamza*.—He was an intelligent scholar of Asim.

(5.) *Kisā*.—A promising student of Hamza.

(6.) Abū Umar at Bassora who was an intelligent scholar of the learned *tābiīn*.

(7.) *Abd-Ullah bin Amir* at Syria. He was a student of Abū Dardā and Osmān. The last-named two persons



were the scholars who had acquired their knowledge from the disciples of our prophet's companions.

Now, among the aforesaid seven recitors, every one has two narrators who differ in among themselves with regard to the pronunciation of words, that is, the above-described persons had learnt the same pronunciation of the Qorānic words that was handed down to them from the prophet himself. The narrators of Nafia's reading and pronunciation are Qālūn and Warish his students. The narrators of Ibn-i-Kasir's reading are Qanbal and Bazzī, those of Ibn-i-Umar are Dūrī and Sūsī; those of Ibn-i-Amir are Hishām and Zakwān. Those of Asim are Abū Bakr bin Ayāsh and Hafs. (The people of Khurasān, Turkestān and India follow Hafs in pronunciation.) Those of Hāmza are Khulf and Khilād and those of Kisāi are Dūrī and Abūl Hāris, through their mediators. On this extensive knowledge called *Fanni Tajwīd*, the art of pronunciation rather of delivery, books have been written. But similarly to music it cannot be obtained without listening to its teachers. Learned authors have written very important books on this art and treated it at full length, first of whom is Abū Ubaid Qāsim bin Salām. Next to him in order stands Ahmad bin Jubair of Kūfa. Then comes Ismāel Mālikī, then Abū Jaafar of ibn-i-Jarīr Tibrī; then Abū Bakr Moḥammad Dawwājūnī, then Abū Bakr bin Mujāhid. After them there appeared many other authors. Jazrī and Shāfiḥī's books are also good in this art and are used nōwadays in studies. The public are mistaken to think that the art consists of merely sweet sounds and melodies. In these days Egypt has people well versed in this art.

After this, there is one thing more, to which I may call my reader's attention, namely, as the aforesaid readers (Qāris) of the Qorān have controlled and gathered all about sounds of letters and pronunciation of words and deliveries, etc., and invented an extensive art for the pronunciation



of the above, so in order to preserve the writing also, there arose a body of learned men in those days, who put the vowel-points in the Qorān, fixed different kinds of stops, pointed out places, necessary, lawful and unlawful stops, established marks for them and applied distinguishing marks for long sounds, etc. In short, whatever these great men had in their hearts and tongues, they put it in written language and invented for this purpose a science called Rasm-ul-khatt (method of writing).

Learned men have also composed (1)* very nice and useful books on this art, so that they have counted all the sūras, the verses, the letters, the vowel-points, the dots, the long and the short sounds of letters (2)†, etc. All the sūras of the Qorān are 114 in number. The verses in the estimation of the public are 6,666; but the people of Kūfa count them 6,236. According to the numeration of the people of Medina, they stand 6,214 in number. The reason why this difference exists is simply this that, by a verse a full sentence is meant. Some hold two sentences as one and count it as one verse. Hence the difference arises in the number.

The last two sūras are generally held as a part of the Qorān. Still some traditions prove that Abd-Ullah, the son of Masūd, neither disbelieved in their divine origin, nor considered them as separate from the Qorān; what he said

(1)* Jaiāl-Uddīn of Assiyūt in Northern Africa, says in his Itqān, *Afradahū bit-tasnīfī, khālāiqum minul-mutaqaddimīna wal mutuaḥḥ khīrīna minhum Abū Amir of Wuddān wa minhum Abū Abbās-ul-Marāeashī (of Morocco), sannafahū kitābon sammaho Unwanad-dalāli fī mārsūni khottī Tanzīlī.* Many persons among the anteriors and posteriors have written a good deal on this art; one of them is Abū Omar of Wuddān. Abul-Abbas of Morocco has also written a book called a Commencement of the Leader that shows all about the Qorānic writing.

(2)† Abdullah, the son of Masud, has counted them to the number 322,670. The reason of difference here is also the same as has been described above, that some count the double letters of a word as two and others as one and hence the difference.



was simply this that, they are prayers sent down for protection from evil, from which some persons came to conclude that he did not take them as part of the Qorān. This is a mistake, and to think that the Moslems hold different opinions concerning the two sūras of the Qorān and some of them do not take them as part of the Qorān is a still greater mistake. God forbid! Abd-Ullah always took them as part of the Qorān.

(1.) Learned men during the last ages have marked some verses with *kūfī* and some with Syrian which means that the orthodox or those of Syria, hold it as a complete verse, not that the verse was set down at Kūfa or at Syria.

(2.) Learned men for the sake of convenience and ease, in committing the Qorān to memory, divide it into 30 parts, according to the number of the days of the months of the year and call each part *aljuzw* or *pāra*. (the part) and write at the head of every part *aljuz-ul-awwalu* or *aljuzw-us-sānī* the second part, just as the case may be. Again, every para. is divided into four parts and marked with *ruba* (the fourth), with *nisf* the half, with *suls*, the three-fourth part of a para. Again, every part of a para. is sub-divided into *rukūāt* which are marked by the letter *ain* thus (ع). Again, the verses which a *rukūa* contains are marked with letters, a detail of which is as follows:—

(*) is an abbreviated mark of the Arabic word *kham-sa*, by which the people of Bassora and Kūfa together or that of Kūfa alone mean five verses.

(ع) is the first letter of the Arabic word *ashra* as (*) was the letter of *kham-sa* (5), in order to convey the idea of 10 verses.

(ع) points out that in the estimation of the Bassora people 10 verses end here. (ع) represents *ashra* which means 10 and (ب) represents the Bassora people.



(خ) means that the Bassora people think five verses to end here. (خ) represents *khamṣa* which means five and (ب) signifies the Bassora people.

(ب) shows that the people of Bassora hold it as complete verse. (ت) hints at *āyat* a verse and (ب) (*b*) at Bassora.

(ب) gives the idea that the people of Bassora do not consider it as full verse. L points at *laisa* meaning not and *b* hints at the Bassorites.

(3.) To stop where the sentence ends is called *waqf* in the Arabic language. Such is the case in every language. Because if the sentence be not followed by a pause but mixed with the next sentence, then it often or occasionally spoils the meaning. For instance, in the verse *jalā yahzunka qauluhum innal izzata lillāhi jamīan*—if we do not pause at *qauluhum* then the meaning of the whole sentence stands thus :—“O messenger do not be grieved at the statement of them that all honour and respect is due to God.” Now, by taking the two different sentences as one, the original sense of God’s word is lost. It was impossible for the prophet to be grieved at the statement of pure unity. While if we pause at *qauluhum* and hold the next phrase as a separate sentence then the meaning would be “O my prophet ! do not be grieved at their statement (which was in the denial of our prophet’s mission or in that of the day of judgment) because, all honour and respect is due to God.” This is what was truly meant here. In like manner in the verse *wa laqad hammat bihī wa hamma bihā*—if we pause at *bihā* and the next part of the verse namely *lau lā burhanā Rab-bahū*—be held as a separate sentence then the real meaning is lost. Because on this supposition we have the meaning thus :—Zalikhā (Potiphar’s wife) had inclined towards Joseph and Joseph towards Zalikhā, although *hamma bihā* is a co-relative put before *laulā*, its relative and the object



of the whole clause is that Joseph had intended towards Zulikhā, had he been unable to see some sign from God. Having seen some divine mark on the occasion he changed his mind. Nāfi'a is of opinion that a stop is always to be made in regard to the meaning of an expression. Ibn-i-Kasīr and Hamzā, however, state that with the exception of a few places, it is no matter if we pause, wherever we cannot hold in our breath. Both Asim and Kisāi also hold this opinion. Abū Umar says that we ought to stop wherever the verse ends. This is called a stop in imitation to our prophet, because he always used to stop at the end of verses.

Imām ibn-i-Ambārī divides a stop into three kinds, full stop, fair stop, deficient stop. It is a full stop where a sentence is complete. It is a deficient stop where without being the end of a sentence, in order to breathe, we pause at a noun qualified, as "all praise is due to God;" but when we read on further, we ought not to commence with the adjective running before, e.g., "the Lord of all the universe," but we ought to repeat the noun first and read thus:—"God the Lord of all the universe." It is a deficient or rather an unfair stop if we pause over a noun possessed without the possessive noun, as in the phrase *with the name of God* we pause at the word *name*, without reading the phrase "of God."

Some readers of the Holy Qorān give other kinds of stops as an essential stop, etc. (waqfi-lāzim). It is an essential stop where the meaning changes, if we mix a sentence with the foregoing one.

N. B.—On the question of how to make a stop, the readers of the Quran take it in 9 forms. (1) *Sukūn* to make it a pointed letter silent as *Rabb-ul-alamina* had *a* in the end, which will be omitted if we stop there and we will have it thus:—*Rabb-ul-amin*. (2) *Ish-mam*, *ibdat*, *naql*, *idgam* *hazf*, *isbat*, *ilhaq*, a detail of which is given in books on the art of reading. Now, I wish to describe the punctuation marks which the learned have used for reading verses correctly.