



Common sense might have convinced him that the Christians could only be justified in their exaltation of Jesus, because they believed that his Father had given him that name which is above every name; that he united with his manhood the divine nature; and that he had been from the beginning "God over all, blessed for evermore." Thus he is entitled and enabled to be "the Mediator between God and man," and an efficacy is given to his intercession which it is absurd to predicate of the best of men, who, with the nature, must partake of the sinfulness of the race for which he would wish to intercede.

The utmost that can be claimed for Mohammed is, not that he redeemed man and reconciled him to God, and "opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers," but simply, that he shewed the way of acceptance, a way, according to his own confession, which had been revealed to Abraham, and which he was commissioned again to open. There has been a growing tendency among Moslems to magnify, not only their prophet, but their sheiks and religious guides, which is incompatible with a pure Deism, and shews that such a system will gradually degenerate into a superstitious reverence for fellow-men assumed to be superior in sanctity. Such exaggerated encomiums would have been distasteful to one who said, "God has not commanded you to take the angels and the prophets for your lords" (K. iii.), and who avows himself to be an ordinary man (K. viii. 100), and a sinner (K. xlvii. and xlviii.), and disclaims the possession of the treasures of God and a knowledge of his secrets. On his own testimony he must be inferior to Jesus, for he declares him to be without sin; and, as having no human father, he intimates that he must be more than a man. There is a tradition, that previous to the prophet's ascent into heaven, and, according to some, in childhood, two angels cut open his body, and Gabriel took out his heart, which, before replacing, he washed, to cleanse it from natural corruption. This is a great concession, since it concedes the doctrine of original sin, and admits that none who has not been cleansed from this taint can be inspired by God as his prophet. The further consequence ensues, that the ordinary believer, without this process, cannot





acceptably serve his Maker; and thus the Moslem may be led to see the hopelessness of those who trust to the performance of a covenant of works, the inadequacy of which is to be made up by the uncovenanted mercy of the Creator. It is the universal custom of Moslems to pray for God's blessing on their prophet, which is a strange inconsistency in those who believe him to enjoy already the highest state of exaltation and blessing.

The Sheyahs add to this short creed, "Ali is the wali of God," a term equivalent to khalif; and some of them even regard him as an incarnation of the Deity. Considering him as the legitimate successor of the prophet, his three predecessors they condemn, and even curse. The Turkish confession of faith, with a reference to this schism, adds to the acknowledgment of the prophet, that whoever does not honour all his companions is a schismatic. The Sonnites have never been provoked to speak disrespectfully of Ali, but honour him in the fourth degree. I introduce a passage from the *Dabistan*, a Persian survey of religious sects, as it conveys the impartial judgment of one who was neither Sonnite nor Sheyah, but a philosophical professor of the religion of Zoroaster—

"Two learned men having a dispute concerning the superiority of Ali the Elect (whose face may God honour!) over the two Sheiks, Abubekr and Omar, and Othman, the lord of the two lights, that is, husband of two daughters, of the prophet (upon all of whom be the mercy of the Almighty!), referred the dispute to Kaivan, who observed,

"All four are the four perfections of the prophetic edifice,  
All four are the four elements of the prophet's soul."

The distinction between the two exalted parties is difficult, as two of them claim supremacy on the celebrity of being fathers-in-law to the Arab founder of their religion, and the other two are fitted for dignity by being his sons-in-law. "But the excellent Ali, the Lion of God, was esteemed so pre-eminent an object of divine favour among the Moslems, that want of faith, and ignorance, induced many to worship him as the true God, until this great person openly disclaimed such a pretension.





Also during the Khalifate of Abubekr, the faithful witness, of Omar, the Separator, and of Othman, the lord of the two lights, error misled many to such a degree that they denied their authority, until these legitimate directors asserted their claims to that dignity.\*\*

To an impartial observer, this canonization, as it may be called, of Ali is peculiarly absurd. We may allow him to have been like the preceding khalifs, a sincere believer in the mission of his father-in-law, and an honest supporter of the divine Unity. But he laid no claim, any more than them, to inspiration; nor have even the most enthusiastic of his supporters, though they say that Gabriel, by mistake, communicated the Korán to Mohammed instead of to him, assigned to him any revelation. His partisans declare that he was formally inaugurated khalif by the prophet, but this is contradicted by history; and even allowing his right to the khalifat, which is very questionable, they should remember that he actually enjoyed it, and that, when sovereign, he shewed himself in no respect superior to his predecessors. Indeed his services were inferior; for the first two vastly extended the empire of Islam, and the third brought the pretended revelation into a permanent and readable form. The contention as to Ali's right is the more ridiculous, since the khalifat has been for centuries extinct, and whatever prerogative the Turkish Sultan may claim is derived from the Fatimite khalif of Egypt, his reputed descendant. His long-postponed reign was inglorious and unfortunate, illustrating Tacitus' proverbial censure of Galba, that he would have been deemed an excellent emperor if he had never reigned. The lingering death of his son Hosein, who suffered in the spirit of a martyr, is a tale, the annual commemoration of which, by the Sheyabs, keeps up an enthusiastic interest in the family, and, however often repeated, excites the sympathy even of the Christian reader. His pious resignation and charity reflect a glory upon his father, and also shed one upon his heirs, who led lives of innocent and austere devotion, embit-





tered, and sometimes shortened, by the jealousy of the relatives who occupied the throne to which they had an hereditary claim. The head of Hosein is interred in a mosque in Cairo, and even in that land of Sonnites the anniversary of his death is kept with great solemnity; and throughout the Turkish dominions the reputed descendants of Ali, a large body, who are distinguished by green turbans, enjoy certain privileges, and are distinguished by the respect which in other countries is paid to nobility.

But not only is this unreasonable respect shewn to the memory of the prophet, and of his family and successors, but the many countries professing Islam abound in holy sheiks and dervishes, whose sepulchres are visited, and whose prayers are solicited, like those of the inferior deities of the Pagan world, and of Roman Catholic saints. This illustrates the unwillingness of unrenewed man to presume to approach the awful Governor of the Universe, whose justice he fears too much to regard him with reverential love, and his tendency to seek his forgiveness and his support through other men more worthy to be heard, yet who can put forth no claim to entitle them to act as intercessors. Yet reason and conscience bear witness to this feeling; and the Missionary might take advantage of it, to shew, that neither heathen nor Moslem can draw nigh to his Maker direct, but that he will be accepted and heard for the sake of Him, who, in order to be a Mediator, has united the nature of the two parties who were at variance, and can alone make them at one, *the man Christ Jesus*.

Such is, I believe, a correct exposition of the dogmas and positive duties of Islam, the system of him who represented himself as the restorer of the religion of Abraham, but is more truly designated by Schlegel,\* as the false Paraclete of misconceived promise and idle phantasy, who announced a faith without mysteries, and a morality without love. Pascal† asks "What mystery did he reveal? what miracles did he work?" To these queries his followers can give no satis-

\* Philosophy of History, Lecture XII.

† Pensées II. xii. 7.





factory reply. His teaching nothing which had not been known to the Patriarchs is surely fatal to his claim of being the last and greatest of inspired guides, the seal of prophecy. Without Moses, the prophets, and Christ, Mohammed is inconceivable; without the Old and New Testament, or rather the Talmud and the apocryphal gospels, the Korán could not have been imagined. Mohammed is described by the modern German historian of the church as actuated by a zeal for the honour of the one only God, whom the primitive traditions still extant among his countrymen, and conversations with Jews and Christians (strengthened, I may add, by his own meditations), had taught him to recognise and adore. A feeling of the infinite distance between the Creator and his creatures, and of complete dependence upon Him, was the predominant element in his religious character, while that of relationship and communion with this almighty and incomprehensible Being was wholly wanting. Hence, his one-sided mode of apprehending the divine attributes, excludes parental love, which ennobles every other quality; and if compassion was assumed to temper justice, it was only that of a sovereign to a slave, and did not harmonize with the prevailing tone of his religion. This explains the predominant fatalism of Islam; and as it is the moral character of the Deity which determines the spirit of a religion, the whole system of Mohammed, notwithstanding some sublime maxims scattered over the Korán, because wanting a right foundation, is radically defective. The God who is worshipped as an almighty and arbitrary Will could be honoured by the performance of insulated outward services, as the repetition of prayers, and ablution, and pilgrimage, which he has seen fit to prescribe as marks of reverence, and, especially, by the extermination of his enemies, the idolaters. Redemption finds no place in this scheme. The fall of the first man occurs indeed in the Korán, but it is as an insulated fact, and connects itself so little with Islam, that its omission would not affect its essence or genius, for man appears in the Korán as a frail and feeble being, unable to render perfect obedience, but not as a sinner, whose nature requires to be renewed.





Mohammed declared himself a messenger sent from God for the restoration of pure Theism, by whom it was to be freed from the foreign elements which had become incorporated with it, even in Judaism and Christianity. Still, his hostility against the latter did not so much arise from the corruptions which had debased it, as from his own abstract Monotheism, which placed a chasm, never to be filled up, between God and his creatures. From this point of view any mediatorial action of God, for the purpose of bringing human nature into fellowship with himself, must appear as derogatory from His dignity and an approximation to idolatry. It was not merely a certain speculative mode of apprehending the Trinity which offended Mohammed, as savouring of Tritheism; but it was the essential element of Christianity, the divinity of Christ and His sacrifice of himself, to reconcile God to man and man to God, which he could not receive. Still, a natural feeling of man's inability to fulfil the law of God, even in the lower view of outward obedience, in which it principally appeared to him, led him to adopt the notion of intercession, though in his scheme of Deism it could rest on no reasonable foundation.\*

Mohammed could not have comprehended the first principles of Christianity, for, with the Gnostics, he did not believe in its fundamental doctrine, the crucifixion. Judging him, however, independently, as we should judge of Zaleucus or Lycurgus, we must allow him to have been a practical reformer. He found his countrymen so infatuated with the passion of gaming, as not only to risk the loss of all their property, but even liberty: they were also addicted to hard drinking. But both together, with divination, are forbidden in the Korán V. 92, 53: "O, true believers, surely wine, and lots, and images (supposed by commentators to be chessmen), and divining arrows, are an abomination of the work of Satan: therefore avoid them, that you may prosper. Satan seeketh to sow dissension and hatred among you, by means of wine and lots, and

\* Neander, vol. V., p. 117, &c.





to divert you from remembering God, and from prayer. Will ye not, therefore, abstain?" In an earlier command (Korán II. 216.) he had left it doubtful: "They will ask thee concerning wine and lots. Answer, In both there is great sin, and things of use to men, but their sinfulness is greater." The discretion which seemed granted in this passage is abrogated in the former. Adultery and all illicit intercourse are forbidden: the number of wives he restricted to four, and rendered divorce less easy. He prohibited the practice of burying alive female infants, and hostilities between different tribes, whom he taught to regard one another as brethren. But if we extend our view beyond this limited horizon, and estimate him as the author of a new religion, which has been accepted by so many nations, whatever moral improvement he may have effected among the Arabs sinks into insignificance with the evils inflicted on more populous countries; and we may pronounce him the scourge of God, raised up to punish his professing people, who had so adulterated the true faith with human corruptions, as to have impaired, if not destroyed, its efficacy. More fully does he deserve the title than an Attila, or any other military conqueror, whose devastations, however calamitous, are but temporary; whereas Islam, from the truth admixed with it, and its plausibility, lays hold of the mind of the idolater, and instead of being, as some have hoped, the pioneer of Christianity, is its most formidable opponent, not only by satisfying those who had grown ashamed of polytheism, but by representing it as a more refined idolatry, which commands the worship of three gods. We should also remember that it was long before it came into contact with the heathen, and that its first triumphs were over the Christians in Syria and Egypt, and the religion of Zoroaster in Persia, which also acknowledges but one Deity. (At the outset of his career Mohammed only claimed the office of an Admonisher, placing Judaism and Christianity on the same level with the revelation made to himself, and denouncing as an intolerable presumption the maintaining that there is only one faith in which a man can be saved. But when settled at Medina he first (Korán XXII.) permits his followers to defend themselves, then (LXI.)





he commands them to defend the truth with their substance and their persons; and, finally, he represents aggressive war, to enforce religion, as meritorious, promising to those who fell as the reward of martyrdom—an immediate entrance into paradise. The conquered were invited to adopt Islam, but were allowed to retain their ancient faith on the payment of tribute; but they have always been exposed to mortifying and humiliating degradation. And many Christians have, no doubt from worldly motives, professed the religion of their masters; while some, unable to read the Word of God, and knowing Christianity only in a corrupt form, have preferred a system which prominently brings forward the Deity as the only object of worship, and appears more rational and more spiritual than the superstition in which they have been educated.

As contrasted with idolatry, Islam must appear to advantage; but, upon close inspection, it is not the pure Deism which it boasts to be, for it is degraded by the Pagan ceremonies of the pilgrimage, and an irrational alloy of Judaism; for its sacrifices, not being typical, are absurd. Mohammed professed to be sent with a revelation to all mankind; while the revelation from Sinai was designed to keep Israel distinct from all nations, till, in the fulness of time, its meaning should be explained by the propitiatory death of the only Being who could take away the sins of the world. The Jewish element of Islam is without an object, for Mohammed could not see how the law was no more than a schoolmaster, to bring the believer, when come to years of discretion, to Christ. His religion, having no sacrifice, properly so called (for every Moslem offers his own victim), has no priesthood; and having no *commemoration* of a sacrifice, like Christianity, it does not know the distinction of clergy and laity. This recommends it, as exempted from superstition, and to those who, though baptized into the Christian faith, have renounced or doubt its essential and characteristic doctrines. But sacrifice was instituted, I firmly believe, by God himself, when the fall of man caused him, in infinite mercy, to substitute a remedial system





for the broken covenant of works. It has been grossly abused, not only by the heathen, who, while they retained it, had lost the key to its meaning, but, unhappily, also by Christians: still its very abuses shew that the doctrine is congenial to the human mind. It is wonderful that Mohammed did not discover its importance from the sacrifice of Abraham, whose religion he professed to restore; but, failing to perceive its efficacy as a trial of the patriarch's faith, and indicating a nobler victim, he has left an immeasurable distance between man and God, whom a sinful being does not dare to approach, and whom, at the best, he views, not as a father, but as a merciful sovereign. A thoughtful believer in a Supreme Being, his Creator, whom he expects to be, after his resurrection, his Judge, must, unless assured of his reconciliation, from a consciousness of his own shortcomings, and even transgressions, feel uneasy respecting his future destination. For he knows that he cannot satisfy the claims of justice, and he can have no peace and joy in believing a system which holds out no reasonable assurance of forgiveness. The intelligent and well-disposed Moslem, therefore, will thankfully embrace the Gospel, which, if clearly explained to him, he will allow completely justifies its appellation, and he will say, as the early seeker after truth said to the first inquirers into Islam, "What you seek, I have found." In morality, also, the Korán resembles not the gospel, but the pentateuch. The former teaches the spirit of ethics, leaving the believer to work it into his practice. The latter keeps the mind in tutelage by commanding specific acts. Precepts of ritual observance, as Hallam\* observes, being always definite and unequivocal, are less liable to be neglected, after their obligation has been acknowledged, than those of moral virtue. Thus, the long and rigid fast, the pilgrimage, regular prayers and ablutions, the constant almsgiving and abstinence from stimulating liquors, created a visible standard of practice, and preserved a continual recollection\* of the Law.

I will conclude with a few observations on the tendency of this religion. It has been charged from the beginning with encouraging sensuality; and its success has been all but uni-

\* Middle Ages, vi, p. 115.





versally ascribed to its removing the restraints which morality imposes on the passions. It cannot be denied, that, though Mohammed reduced to four the legal number of wives, and, in other respects, limited the indulgence which, in the East, has always been granted to those whose circumstances allow them to gratify their desires, his own increasing licentiousness, for which he claimed a special dispensation, may, as example has more weight than precepts, justify this charge. The Korán, moreover, it has been truly said, turns paradise into a boundless harem; and the minute accounts of its enjoyments continually recurring, if they do not disgust, must increase the sensual propensities of the reader. The consequences, however, that may be logically deduced from premises do not always practically follow, and I should say that these reasoners overlook another element in Islam, of counteracting influence, the uncontrolled sovereignty of an omnipresent, almighty God, to whom his creatures must return, and who expects them to obey Him, and to be resigned to his will. Judging, as far as I am able, of the Mohammedan character, as exhibited in its most favoured specimens the result of the creed appears to me to be a philosophical austerity, which is at least in danger of degenerating into a satisfied self-righteousness. Gibbon\* observes that the legislator who enacts these painful restraints (that is, the rigid fasts and the interdiction of wine) cannot be accused of alluring his proselytes by the indulgence of their sensual appetites; and I am borne out by the more weighty authority of Hallam, who observes, that a devout Moslem exhibits much more of the stoical than of the epicurean character; a stoic, I may add, of more humility than that of the school of Zeno, who boasts of being superior to Jupiter, since his excellence is not from necessity, but choice, because his system is humanized by his acknowledged dependence upon his Maker, Teacher, and ultimate Judge. It must be allowed, with him, that no one can read the Korán without being sensible that it breathes an austere and scrupulous spirit; and, in conclusion, I observe, that its spirit seems to have been generally imbibed by those who

\* Decline and Fall, chap. I.





acknowledge its authority, and that the praises of the Deity, and injunctions of resignation to his will, which pervade their conversation, apparently influence their conduct. It is, however, no more than resignation: there appears to be no peace and joy in believing, at best a dutiful submission to the sovereign Disposer of events, no sign of that spirit of adoption which cries "Abba, Father." An eastern city has no exhibitions of paintings, no concerts, no dramatical representations; only recitations of tales in prose and verse, in coffee-houses; and the prohibition of games of chance excludes cards and dice. Wine can only be drunk in private, and strict casuists bring coffee and tobacco under the same condemnation. These luxuries were discovered centuries after the era of the Prophet; but the houses which were opened for the purpose of indulging in them, have been shut up, from time to time, by the sovereigns of Constantinople, and only finally tolerated. And it would appear, from Lane's full and minute account of Life at Cairo, and from other authentic sources of information from eastern travellers, that gravity, not dissipation, is, at least in public, the characteristic of a Mohammedan nation.





SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTING  
THE  
CONVERSION OF MOHAMMEDANS.

---

THOUGH the whole human family be descended from one parent, nations are distinguished from one another by a diversity of religions. All, however, fall under two grand divisions—that of those who have been left to discover the truth by what is called the light of nature, that is, their own reasoning aided by traditions; and those justly called in the Korán “the people of the Book,” because they alone claim the benefit of a divine revelation. The first may acknowledge one Supreme Being; while they are worshippers of many false deities, of like passions with themselves: but the creed of the latter, that is, of the Jews and Christians, and the Moslems, who acknowledge, the one true God, creator, preserver, and governor of the world, who will recal men from the grave to life, and judge them according to their works, alone deserves examination.

The three profess to have a volume revealing the will of God for their guidance in this life, with a promise to his faithful people, who believe and obey him, of a happy eternity. The earliest is that of Moses; the second that of the Christians; and the faith of both was followed by Arab tribes long before the birth of Mohammed, of the noble race of Koreish, the hereditary guardians of the temple of Mecca, and reputed descendants of Abraham, through his son Ishmael, who declared himself to be the last of the prophets, and destined to supersede all other teachers of religion.

The Jew receives only the law announced to Moses by the voice of God himself from Mount Sinai, and the other Hebrew scriptures, because, though he expects a Messiah, whom God



has promised he would raise up out of his brethren, like unto Moses, as a legislator, he does not, like the Christian, discover him in Jesus; and he rejects the Korán, because he needs no new prophet. The Christian acknowledges the Jewish dispensation, but only as preparatory to his own; and, feeling complete in Christ, as the Son of God as well as the Son of man, and the author of eternal salvation to all who obey Him, he needs no other guide; and finds that Mohammed, even if the Korán were a divine revelation, has nothing to offer him which he does not already most abundantly possess.

The Moslem believes that all the prophets, including Moses and Jesus, came from God, and to the latter he concedes pre-eminence over those who came before him; but he maintains that Mohammed is the seal of the prophets, the greatest as well as the last, and that the Korán abrogates both Law and Gospel. Mohammed announced himself as the ambassador of God to the red man and to the black, that is, to the whole human race; and he and Christ alone claim the allegiance of all, coming with a universal religion, and that religion committed to the clear and unvarying record of writing. The inquiring unbeliever, then, who is, with reason, dissatisfied with the contradictory speculations of those who, from the unassisted resources of their own intellect, set up as the guides of their brethren, has to choose between Mohammed and Christ; for the introductory revelation to Moses is only addressed to Israel, and is avowedly preparatory to the doctrine of a superior prophet, whom God would raise up, a descendant of their own race. The Moslem is continually praying to the merciful and compassionate God, whom he calls Lord of all worlds and king of the judgment-day, to guide him into the right path.\* And let us invoke the aid of our heavenly Father, who is the hearer of prayer, to enable us to exhibit the truth in love, and to bring it home to the understanding and heart of the reader, and to shew that Christianity, and not Islam, was the

\* رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ مَا لَكُمْ يَوْمَ الدِّينِ إِعْدْنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ





real faith of Abraham, whom Moslems call حنيف, *hanif*, that is *the orthodox*, and the *Friend of God*. Mohammed was in the habit of retiring for meditation and prayer, from time to time, to mount Harah, near Mecca; and here, in his fortieth year, we are told that the angel Gabriel came to him and revealed, for the first time, some verses of the Korán, which continued afterwards to be communicated to him as required, in portions, at Mecca or Medina, until his death. His first converts were his wife Kadijah, his slave Zaid, his youthful nephew, Ali, whom he called his friend and vizier وزير, or *bearer of his burdens*, and his first successor Abubekr. Three years were silently employed in the conversion of proselytes, and it was not till the fourth that he announced himself as a prophet, at a party of forty of his kinsmen, whom he had invited to an entertainment. Ali alone believed. He afterwards, as opportunity offered, at the festivals at the Caaba, and in private, conjured the Arabs to reject their idols, and resign themselves to the service of the only God, who had no companions. But how should the idolaters of Mecca know that Gabriel had really spoken to him? Some proof might reasonably be required, and we know no more than two, predictions, and miracles. Now both are possessed by Christianity in the most copious abundance. These predictions begin with the first book of the Bible, and end with the last. The intimation of a deliverer, one of her own descendants, made to Eve on the fall, is, from its generality, obscure. But age after age the prophecy is renewed, and becomes more and more particular. Thus this descendant of Eve is promised to Abraham as his seed; is announced by Balaam, as a star out of Jacob and a sceptre out of Israel; and to David the king, as of his family. The period of his coming, obscurely foretold by the dying Patriarch, was long afterwards, fixed by Daniel; and Micah declares his birth-place. His character, his miracles of mercy, his humiliation unto a disgraceful death as a satisfaction to the justly offended Creator, whereby God, being reconciled to man, could continue just, in justifying the ungodly, his resurrection on the third day after his death, by which he was



proclaimed to be the Son of God with power; his sitting now at his Father's right hand, as the sole Mediator between God and Man, and his future coming to judge mankind, are foretold in the Old Testament, and their accomplishment, as far as they have been fulfilled, may be read in the New. But where are the predictions of Mohammed?

When a person comes as a messenger of God, and requires obedience to his message, it is natural to ask for his credentials; and the demand is so reasonable, that God has been always pleased to grant it, by enabling his true messenger to work miracles, that is, such acts as exceed the power of man, which are therefore properly called signs, *معالم*. The eminent Arabian philosopher, *ابن سينا* Ebn Sina, thus shews the reasonableness of this :

فواجب اذن ان يوجد نبي وواجب ان يكون انسانا وواجب  
ان يكون له خصوصية ليست لساير الناس حتي يستشعر الناس  
فيه امراً لا يوجدنا لهم فيتميز به عنهم فتكون له المعجزات التي  
اخبرنا بها، فهذا الانسان اذا وجد يجب ان يسن للناس في امورهم  
سنة باذن الله تعالى وامره ووحيه وانزاله الروح المقدس عليه

"It is necessary that a prophet should be found, and that he should be a man; he should have special peculiarities which other men have not, so that they shall acknowledge that there is in him what is not found in them, and that by this he should be distinguished from them. And it is fit that this man, when found working miracles, should give men a law to guide them, by the permission, command, and revelation of God most high, and by the descent of the Holy Spirit on him." Thus, when Moses announced to Pharaoh the divine command concerning the children of Israel, and that tyrant replied, "*Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice, and let Israel go?*" he was





made to know, by a succession of miracles, that He spoke by a higher authority than that of man, and the declaration of Jehovah was fulfilled, "*I will stretch out my hand and smite Egypt with all my wonders, which I will do in the midst thereof, and after that he will let you go. (Exodus iii. 20.) And then God said, I will multiply my signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord, when I stretch forth my hand upon Egypt, and bring out the children of Israel from among them.*" Our Saviour, too, justified his claim to be Messiah by miracles, and He worked not, like Moses, as the agent of God, but by his own inherent capability, which he also gave in measure to his apostles after his resurrection, when he had received from his Father *all power in heaven and in earth.* Jesus appeals to these signs, as rendering those who did not receive him inexcusable. "*If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, if ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.*" (John x. 37.) "*The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.*" (John x. 25) "*If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin.*" (John xv. 23.) Indeed, this reasoning is so just, that it occurs to all men; and we find that, in the Korán, the miracles both of Moses and of Jesus are allowed to be true. Thus, for example, of the first:

"And Moses said, O Pharaoh, certainly I am a messenger from the Lord of the worlds. It is right for me not to speak of God other than the truth. Certainly I am come to you with evidence from your Lord. Command, therefore, to go with me the children of Israel. He said, If you have come with a sign, produce it, if you are one of those who are true. Then he threw down his rod, and, lo, it was a manifest serpent; and he drew forth his hand, and, lo, it was white to the spectators." (Chapter cii. 102.)

١٠٢ وَقَالَ مُوسَىٰ يَا فِرْعَوْنُ إِنِّي رَسُولٌ مِّن رَّبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ ١٠٣ حَقِيقٌ



عَلِي أَنْ لَا أَقُولَ عَلَى اللَّهِ إِلَّا أَحَقُّ قَدْ جِئْتُمْ بِنَبَأٍ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ فَارْسِلْ  
مَعِيَ ابْنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ قَالَ إِنْ كُنْتَ حِقَّتْ بِابْنٍ فَأَتِ بِهَا إِنْ كُنْتَ  
مِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ ١٠٣ فَالْقَى عَصَاهُ فَإِذَا هِيَ ثُعْبَانٌ ١٠٤ مَبِينٌ وَنَزَعَ يَدَهُ  
فَإِذَا هِيَ بِيضَاءٌ لِلنَّظَرِ

Those of the second are also specified. Thus, in the third chapter, v. 14, "when the angels said, O Mary, God certainly has sent thee good tidings of his word from Him. His name is the Messiah, Jesus, the son of Mary, honoured in the present and in the future world, and one of those who are near to God. And he shall speak in the cradle, and in advanced life, and shall be one of the righteous."

١٠٤ إِذْ قَالَتِ الْمَلَائِكَةُ يَا مَرْيَمُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُبَشِّرُكِ بِكَلِمَةٍ مِنْهُ اسْمُهُ  
الْمَسِيحُ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ وَجِيهًا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ وَمِنَ الْمُقَرَّبِينَ  
١٠٥ وَيُكَلِّمُ النَّاسَ فِي الْمَهْدِ وَكَهْلًا وَمِنَ الصَّالِحِينَ

"And he shall say to the children of Israel, Certainly I come to you with miracles from your Lord. I will create unto you of the clay as the figure of a bird, and I will breathe into it, and it shall become a bird, by the permission of God. And I will cure him that hath been born blind, and the leper, and I will raise the dead, by the permission of God. Verily, herein will be a sign to you, if you believe."

إِنِّي قَدْ جِئْتُكُمْ بِآيَةٍ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ إِنِّي أَخْلُقُ لَكُمْ مِنَ الطِّينِ كَهَيْئَةِ  
الطَّيْرِ فَانْفُخْ فِيهِ فَيَكُونُ طَيْرًا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ وَأُبْرِئُ الْأَكْمَةَ وَالْأَبْرَصَ  
وَأُحْيِي الْمَوْتَى بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَةً لَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ



And in the chapter, called *المائدة* The Table: "O Jesus, Son of Mary, remember my favours, and when I defended thee from the children of Israel, when thou camest to them with evident miracles; and those among them who were unbelievers said, 'This is nothing but evident magic.'"

يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ اذْكُرْ نِعْمَتِي وَاذْكُرْتُ بِنِي اِسْرَآئِيلَ عَنْكَ  
اِذْ جِئْتَهُمْ بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ فَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْهُمْ اِنْ هَذَا اِلَّا سِحْرٌ مُدِينٌ

Thus we see that the miracles of Christ are allowed by the Korán, yet in bearing testimony to them it betrays the ignorance of the author, and therefore its human origin; for it not only specifies his curing bodily defects, diseases, and restoring the dead to life, but the absurd wonders of speaking in his infancy, and making a bird, childish displays of power for its own sake, confounding the former, contained in the four genuine Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, with those in the false ones, written long after, and never accepted by any branch of the church, in the East or in the West. The confirmation of the mission of Moses and Jesus by miracles was a fact well known to the inhabitants of Mecca and Medina; for though they were pagans, many of the Arahs had been converted both to Judaism and to Christianity; and there were tribes in Mohammed's time who acknowledged, some Jewish, and others Christian sovereigns. They reasonably required of him the same evidence, and this we learn from the Korán, which introduces them continually speaking to this effect. (V. Sur.): "We will not believe until you bring us what has been granted to the messengers of God."

لَنْ نُؤْمِنَ حَتَّىٰ تُوْقَىٰ مَثَلُ مَا لُوْقَىٰ رُسُلُ اللّٰهِ

Thus, in chapter XVII., *الاسراء* Night Journey:

"And they say, 'We will by no means believe in thee until thou cause a spring of water to gush forth for us out of the





earth; or thou hast a garden of palms and vines, and thou causest rivers to spring forth from its midst abundantly; or thou causest the heaven to fall down upon us in pieces, as thou hast boasted; or thou bring down God and the angels to vouch for thee; or thou have a house of gold; or thou ascendest by a ladder to heaven.”

٩٣ وَقَالُوا لَنْ نُؤْمِنَ لَكَ حَتَّى تَنْفُجَ لَنَا مِنَ الْأَرْضِ نَبُوعًا ٩٣ أَوْ تَكُونَ لَكَ جَنَّةٌ مِنْ نَخِيلٍ وَعِنَبٍ فَتُفَجِّرَ الْأَنْهَارَ خِلَالَهُمْ تَفْجِيرًا ٩٤ أَوْ تَسْقِطَ السَّمَاءُ كَمَا زَعَمْتَ عَلَيْنَا كِسْفًا أَوْ تَأْتِي بَالِلًا وَالْهَائِكَةَ ٩٥ قَبِيلًا ٩٥ أَوْ يَكُونَ لَكَ بَيْتٌ مِنْ زَهْرٍ أَوْ تَرْقِيَ فِي السَّمَاءِ

And again, in chapter **xxl**, **الانبياء** The Prophets:

“And they who act unjustly discourse privately together, saying, ‘Is this person any more than a man like yourselves? Will ye, therefore, come to hear a piece of forgery when you plainly perceive it to be such? But they say the Korán is a confused heap of dreams, nay, he has forged it, nay, he is a poet. Let him come unto us, therefore, with some miracle, in like manner as the former prophets were sent.’”

وَأَسْرُوا النَّجْوَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا هَلْ هَذَا إِلَّا بَشَرٌ مِثْلُكُمْ أَفَتَأْتُونَ السَّحَرَةَ وَأَنْتُمْ تُبْصِرُونَ ٥ بَلْ قَالُوا أَضْغَاثُ أَحْلَامٍ بَلْ افْتِرَاءُ بَلْ هُوَ شَاعِرٌ فَلْيَأْتِنَا بِآيَةٍ كَمَا أُرْسِلَ الْأَوَّلُونَ

There are many Mohammedan theologians who will accept the challenge of their prophets incredulous contemporaries, both Jews and idolaters, and furnish an abundance of marvellous stories concerning him; some of them going so far as to say that his miracles exceed in number those of any pre-





ceding prophet, and reckoning a thousand, and others even three thousand. Among them are the cure of diseases, and restoration to life; but these, which, if true, and confirmed by contemporary evidence, might be justly called signs, are few indeed in comparison of those of a frivolous and legendary character, such as shew the reporters to be credulous lovers of the marvellous, and to have had no just conceptions of the nature of this species of evidence. "They affirm that trees went forth to meet him, that he was saluted by stones, that water gushed from his fingers, that a beam groaned to him, that a camel complained to him, and that a shoulder of mutton informed him of its being poisoned."\*

Two of these they endeavour to support from the Korán—his night-journey to the throne of God, and his splitting of the moon. They tell us that a mysterious animal called Borak, *براق*, from *برق* lightning, conveyed him one night from the temple of Mecca to that of Jerusalem, which they forget had been destroyed centuries before by the Romans. With Gabriel he is said successively to have ascended the seven heavens, and received the salutation of patriarchs, prophets, and angels, in their respective mansions, and that he alone was permitted to proceed beyond, within two bow-shots of the throne, when he felt a cold pierce him to the heart on his shoulder being touched by the hand of God. After an important conversation, it is related that he descended to Jerusalem, remounted Borak, and returned to Mecca, having performed, in a tenth part of a night, this prodigious journey, a real one in the opinion of most of the Moslems, but regarded by the more judicious as a vision. It is recorded, with variations, and appears in the *Sonnah*, on the authority of some of his companions. But who can vouch for them who could only derive their knowledge of it from the reputed traveller? If we turn to the Korán, *xvii. 1*, we shall be surprised at the inventive power of traditionists, for the text upon which such minute commentaries have been raised contains only this sentence :

\* Gibbon, *ch. l.*



سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ إِلَى الْمَسْجِدِ الْأَقْصَى الَّذِي بَارَكْنَا حَوْلَهُ لِنُرِيَهُ مِنْ آيَاتِنَا إِنَّهُ هُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ

“Praise be to Him who transported his servant by night from the sacred mosque to the most distant mosque, the circuit of which we have blessed, that we might shew him some of our signs, for God is he who heareth and seeth.”

The other legend, for which they endeavour to obtain the authority of the Korán, is the mode in which their apostle confounded, in a national assembly, the malicious challenge of the Koresh. His resistless word, according to the tradition, split asunder the orb of the moon, which, descending from her station in the sky, accomplished the seven revolutions round the Caaba, saluted Mohammed, and, suddenly contracting her dimensions, entered at the collar of his shirt, and issued forth through the sleeve. The whole is built upon this simple passage, the commencement of chapter LIV.

اقْتَرَبَتِ السَّاعَةُ وَانْشَقَّ الْقَمَرُ ۚ وَإِنْ يَرَوْا آيَةً يُعْرِضُوا وَيَقُولُوا سِحْرٌ مُسْتَهْرَجٌ

“The hour approacheth, and the moon hath been split asunder; but if they see a sign, they turn aside, saying, ‘This is a powerful charm.’”

The past tense is here supposed by many to have a future sense, and this splitting is regarded as one of the promised signs of the day of judgment.

We have here specimens how the fertile imagination of admiring Moslems complete the picture, of which, at the best, the original gives but the slightest outline; and if any one would only cursorily examine the works on the Korán of Beidhawi, and their other admired commentators, they will find that they continually forget their proper province of explaining, and introduce into narratives, which are rather hinted than told, new circumstances, without stating any authority for them. Every person, who has any notion of





evidence, must perceive that such assertions are worth nothing, and, indeed, most of the miracles ascribed to Mohammed are only found in very late authors. And here it becomes important to state, that, in all the religions of the people of a Book, as the Mohammedans call all who profess to have a divine revelation, the Book should be considered as the sole authority. It is, however, a melancholy fact, that, for want of attending to this plain and simple rule, Jews, Christians, and Moslems have worked out systems of religion, with a multitude of ceremonies unknown to Moses, Christ, and, Mohammed, and in many instances, contrary to the genius of their respective systems. To begin with the Jews. Jesus told those of his generation, not merely that they added human inventions to the divine oracles, but even rendered the latter of none effect through their traditions; and He shews how their casuists ingeniously contrived to evade the fifth commandment, which requires children to honour, and, if necessary, maintain their parents, not even by giving to God's service what ought to be expended in this obvious duty, but by merely declaring such to be their intention. In his age these traditions were only oral; but after the destruction of Jerusalem, for fear of their being lost, they were committed to writing, and fill many volumes far larger than the Law and the Prophets, to the study of which their Rabbis devote their lives, to the comparative neglect of the Scriptures, and shew their estimation of the two, by likening the latter to water, the former to wine. Again, the Christians, though they have no such written collections, but must gather their traditions out of Councils and the writings of the Fathers, as they call all early ecclesiastical writers, have strangely corrupted the simplicity of Gospel faith. The reader of ecclesiastical history knows that this corruption early began, and, when the Roman emperors embraced the faith, grew worse and worse; so that Mohammed, who probably never read the New Testament, and knew only Christianity as it prevailed in Syria and his own Arabia, might well regard it as little better than the idolatry of his countrymen. This the Korán itself shews; and we, to whom the Bible is open, and who have rejected the hay and stubble which the Roman Ca-





tholics and the Eastern Christians have built upon the true foundation, the Lord Jesus Christ, believe that God raised him up as a scourge to punish these corrupters of the faith, and to deprive them, as a judgment, of the light, against which they shut their eyes, preferring darkness. In a wonderfully short period the armies of the first khalifs overrun and occupied the eastern provinces of the Roman empire, and at length Constantinople, the capital, became the seat of a Mohammedan power. The people generally embraced the simple creed of their conquerors, which their descendants continue to profess; while those who retain the religion of their fathers use liturgies in their ancient languages, which few, even of their priests, understand, and, not reading their scriptures, know little of real Christianity.

The Moslems, too, have their traditions, which the majority of them, like the Jews and Christians, value at least as much as their Book. Their most approved doctors, as we have seen, agree that the edifice of Islam rests upon the Korán, and upon the Sonnab, or Tradition; that is, as they maintain, the Word of God, as communicated to the Prophet, and the report, on credible witnesses, of his sayings and doings, which are presented to mankind as a model of conduct.

It is in these traditions that we read the minute particulars of the Prophet's night journey to heaven, and of the miracles ascribed to him. Bokhari is careful to notice the names of all those through whom a tradition has been transmitted; and most of these are ultimately traced up to Abu Horira, a friend of Mohammed, or to his favourite wife, Ayesha. But who can prove this succession, and what reliance may be placed upon any of them? Many may be true, but they sometimes favour doctrines contrary to the genius of the Korán, and positively contradict it, when they ascribe miracles to the Prophet. We read in the Korán that both the Jews and the pagan Arabs required a sign from him as evidence of his mission from God. The Jews said, "God has made a covenant with us that we should not believe any messenger till he bring us a sacrifice which the fire shall consume. Answer, "These messengers



came to you before me, with demonstrations and with that which ye require, (sacrifice), and why did ye kill them, if ye be true?"

قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ عٰهَدَ اِلَيْنَا اَلَا نُوْمِنُ لِرَسُوْلٍ حَتّٰى يٰۤاْتِيَنَا بِقُرْاٰنٍ  
تَاْكُلُهُ النَّارُ قُلْ قَدْ جَاۤءَكُمْ رَسُوْلٌ مِّنْ قِبَلِيْ بِالْبَيِّنٰتِ وَبِالَّذِيْ قُلْتُمْ  
فَلِمَ قَتَلْتُمُوْهُمْ اِنْ كُنْتُمْ صٰدِقِيْنَ

(K. III. 18.) The Arabs making the same demand, he is instructed to reply (XVII. 93) "Praise be to my Lord, I am only a man, a messenger."

يُسَبِّحٰنَ رَبِّيْ هَلْ كُنْتُ اِلَّا بَشَرًا رَّسُوْلًا

And in the XIII. chapter 34 it is said, "This thing belongs exclusively to God. Do not believers know, that if God were willing He would guide all men?"

لِلّٰهِ اَمْرٌ جَمِيْعًا اَلَمْ يَبۡيۡسِ الَّذِيۡنَ اٰمَنُوْۤا اَنْ لَّوۡ يَشَآءَ اللّٰهُ لَهۡدٰى  
النَّاسَ جَمِيْعًا

And he even declares that miracles were withheld from him in mercy, lest the condemnation of those not convinced by them should be greater. "Nothing prevented our sending thee with the miracles which the people of Mecca desired, except that the former, to whom we sent, treated them as false, and we destroyed them." (XVII.)

وَمَا مَنَعَنَا اَنْ نُّرْسِلَكَ بِالآيٰتِ الَّتِيۡ نَتُرٰۤىحُهَا اَهْلَ الْمَكَّةِ اِلَّا اَنْ  
كَذَّبَ بِهَا الْاَوَّلِيْنَ لَمَّا اَرْسَلْنَاهُمۡۤا فَاِهْلٰنَاهُمۡ

One miracle, however, he has the confidence boldly to claim, and one which the Moslem maintain to be superior in its evidence to every other, namely, the very book itself, which he appeals to as the credentials of his embassy. "This Korán could not have been composed by any except God. Will they say Mohammed has forged it? Answer. Bring, therefore, a





chapter like unto it, and call whom ye may to your assistance, besides God." (38.)

وَمَا كَانَ هَذَا الْقُرْآنُ أَنْ يَفْتَرِيَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ أَمْ يَقُولُونَ افْتَرَاهُ  
قُلْ فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا مَنِ اسْتَلْعْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

And again (II. XXI.), "And if ye are in doubt concerning the revelation which we have sent down to our servant, produce a chapter like unto it, and call upon your witnesses, besides God, if ye speak truth."

وَأَنْ كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِثْلِهِ  
وَادْعُوا شُهَدَاءَكُمْ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

And not only does he so challenge them, but all intellectual beings (XVII. 90.): "Say, verily, if men and genii were purposely assembled that they might produce the like of this Koran they could not, although they assisted one another."

قُلْ لَئِنْ اجْتَمَعَتِ الْإِنْسُ وَالْجِنُّ عَلَىٰ أَنْ يَأْتُوا بِمِثْلِ هَذَا الْقُرْآنِ لَا  
يَأْتُونَ بِمِثْلِهِ وَلَوْ كَانَ بَعْضُهُمْ لِبَعْضٍ ظَهِيرًا

The Moslems, in their discussions with Christians, continually endeavour to silence us with this miracle, which they represent, from its permanence, as far surpassing all others, which, from their nature, terminate in their performance, and by a future age can only be received on testimony; whereas this is called a standing and never-ending miracle, by Jelalaldin in his commentary :

اية مستمرة لا انقضاء لها

and Algazali magnifies it by saying that such a miracle was peculiar to Mohammed, and that "God granted it to an uneducated man, who had never exercised himself in knowledge, and never studied books or travelled in order to acquire knowledge, but had always lived among the most ignorant of the Arabs, an orphan, weak, and neglected."



اتاه الله جميع ذلك وهو رجل أعمى لم يبارس العلم ولم يطالع  
الكتب ولم يسافر قط في طلب علم ولم يزل بين أظهر الجهال من  
الاعراب يتيها ضعيفاً مستضعفاً

And we may add, that he had no access, except by conversation, to the knowledge of others, for he could neither read nor write; but in those days of ignorance, as these are called, this was no disgrace, since he shared it, generally speaking, with his fellow-citizens at Mecca, who were called ignorant, **الأميون**, in opposition to the Jews and Christians of Medina, who were termed people of the book, **أهل الكتاب**. This notion of the unrivalled superiority of the Korán is, as a literary work, general among Moslems; yet it has not been universal, for among the sect of **المتزل** Motazeleites, **عسي المرشار** Isai Almerdar maintained the possibility of writing a more eloquent work; and Sharastani tells us, in his account of religious and philosophical sects, **الحل والنحل**, which has been translated into German, that the miracle, according to Alnadham (**النظام**), consisted, not in the style, but in the matter. It is not for me, an European, imperfectly acquainted with the language, to oppose the general opinion, though I may think that the genius of Arabic, and its copiousness, has been far more fully exhibited by Hariri in his Discourses, **مقامات** Makamat, or in the works of Ebn Arabshal; and I believe that it was not the mere diction, but the morality, superior to that then prevalent in Arabia—the narratives of Abraham, and Jesus, and Moses, and others, interesting, though inferior to the true history in the Bible—and, above all, the sublime descriptions of the Deity interspersed, that produced so great an impression. The wonder, too, increased with each successive age while literature flourished. But, on the other hand, the impartial will consider that the Korán was from the first regarded as a model of ornamental prose composition; and this principle once established, none would venture to deviate from it, or, if they did, would find few admirers. The Arabs of those times,





we know, had no other literature than their heroic songs, in the composition of which, no less than in feats of arms, their tribes contended; and certainly the confession of Lebid, one of the most eminent of these, who preferred a chapter to his own poem, and became a zealous convert, goes far to establish the superiority of the Korán. It is only fair to add, on the other side, that this is a miracle only to competent judges, and they are a very limited number; for we must exclude not only the many foreign nations who have been converted, as the Turks and Persians, but even those whose native tongue is Arabic if uneducated.

Mohammed disclaiming, as we see, the gift of miracles, appeals to prophecy, and takes to himself the office of the promised monitor and advocate, which, it is remarkable, had been previously assigned first to Montanus, and afterwards to Manes; but in both cases, even if interpreted only as endowed with a fuller measure of the Holy Spirit, positively contradicted by the context. According to the Korán (lxi. 6.)

وَإِذْ قَالَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ يَا بَنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ

Jesus, the Son of Mary, said, Verily, ye children of Israel, I am the apostle of God, confirming the law which was before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who is to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmed.\* But our Lord's words, as recorded by St. John, shew that they cannot apply to any subsequent prophet. "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you," xvi. 7. This interpretation can only be supported by reading *περικλυτος* for *παρακλητος*, a change which would seem inconsiderable to one

\* This word is derived from the same root as Mohammed, and is nearly equivalent in meaning.



accustomed to a language in which vowels were not inserted. The text is thus explained by a Mohammedan defender of Islam:

معني القارظليط هو الخامد والحمد او الحمد او المعرفه هذا الوصف ظاهر في محمد. The meaning of Paraclete is "praise or praiser," or "praiser or glorifier," and these qualities were manifest in Mohammed. Having made this mistake, he renders the word by المعزي (glorifier), instead of المعزي (consoler). A person of any candour, who reads the whole discourse, must perceive that the context upsets the verbal criticism. This Comforter could not be Mohammed, for how could a man, not born till six centuries later, comfort these disciples, and bring things to their remembrance. Certainly he could be no man, for Jesus expressly said that the world cannot see Him, and that He shall dwell in them: and we read, in the opening of the Book of Acts, that our Lord having, after his resurrection, assembled the eleven apostles, commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, he says, "ye have heard from me; for John truly baptized with water, but *ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence:*" and when the Jewish feast of Pentecost was come, only *ten* days after, we read that they were all, with one accord, in one place, and were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. It was also the office of this Comforter and Advocate, not to make any new revelation, but to glorify Jesus—to take of his doctrines, and to shew and to explain them to his apostles. It is manifest, then, that the prophecy was fulfilled in that generation, and by the miraculous power the Holy Spirit conferred on the first teachers of Christianity.

Both Jews and Christians might reasonably reply that he had altered the received text; that the Messiah had been from the beginning, through a succession of ages, the grand object of prophecy; and that, if the Almighty had determined to reveal his will through another messenger, he who assumed that character should be able to bring forward from the ancient Scriptures some clear and manifest prediction. He en-



deavours to escape from this dilemma by boldly maintaining that there had been this evidence, but that it had been suppressed, and he charges the Jews of Mecca with this guilt. But in meeting this popular objection he unconsciously injures his own cause; for if the Scriptures have been corrupted, they cannot, as he affirms they do, confirm his own revelation. "We believe," he says, (xxix. 51.) "in that which has been sent down to us, and in that which has been sent down to you, and our God and your God is one."

أَمَّا بِالَّذِي أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَأُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَإِلَيْنَا وَالْهَيْكَلِ وَاحِدٍ

He also maintains, that as the Gospel confirmed the previous revelation to Moses, so it does the subsequent one made to himself. It would seem, therefore, that he limited his charge of corrupting the Scriptures to the suppression of predictions of himself and his mission; his followers, however, reject the whole as spurious. Nevertheless, they are ready to except from this condemnation any passages which they think can be made to tell in their favour. The following were cited by their early controversialists, and are continually repeated: they need only to be stated, to shew how vain is the attempt. The first is the commencement of the hymn in which Moses blesses the children of Israel (Deut. xxxiii.): "*God came from Sinai, and rose up from Seer* ساعير *unto them. He shined from Mount Paran, and He came with ten thousand of holy ones: from his right hand went forth for them a fiery law.*" The context shews a reference to a single event, namely, the promulgation of the law; and these three mountains must have been peaks of the same chain. But Moslem divines, without any attempt at reasoning, assume that the three dispensations are figuratively represented by these mountains; the first, of course, the Jewish; the second the Christian; and the third the Mohammedan, because there is a mount Paran near Mecca. But to establish their interpretation they are forced to assume that Sair is a mountain in Galilee, an assertion in which they derive no assistance from geography. The second passage is from the fiftieth Psalm,





and, we may add, is still more forced, for it is absurd to suppose, because the Prophet's name is the past participle of the verb "to praise," therefore it, and like derivations from this root, must, wherever they occur, refer to him.

يظهر الله من صهيون اكليل محموداً

"God shewed from Sion a praised crown."

This is, indeed, the sense of the Syriac version, yet it is not so rendered in the Arabic; and the idea of praise is not found in the original, which is rendered, "Out of Sion the perfection of beauty hath God appeared."

Of the two credentials which are justly required of a divine mission, miracles and predictions, Mohammed, by his own confession, did not possess the first, and we have shewn that he can establish no claim to the second; and as he was not the subject of prophecy, so he was not himself, like Jesus, or even Moses, endowed with that gift. His assumed revelation, made to a mere man, must rest on its intrinsic excellence. Christ, on the contrary, has been, from the first to the last book of the Hebrew Scriptures, the grand theme of prophecy, and that with a such specification of his character, his work, and the minute particulars of his death, as can apply to no other person. The Korán allows that He came with manifest signs, and enumerates among them the curing the sick and raising the dead, while it declares Mohammed to be but a mere man raised up to be an admonisher of his brethren. Jesus is indeed represented as a creature who claims to be no more than the servant of God, yet he is announced as not like other sons of men, but (IV.) as the Word of God conveyed into Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him; and his being always called the Son of Mary, intimates that he had no father. Beidhan says he is therefore the Word, because created by the word spoken; but Gazali, in his Confession, uses language not unlike that of the Greek Fathers, speaking of it as eternal, subsisting in God's essence, ازلّي قائم بزياته, and unlike the speech of his creatures, which is spoken by the tongue and committed to writing. Mohammed, the Traditions tell us, to qualify





him for his office, had his body opened and his soul washed from the stain of Adam's guilt. But Jesus is declared to have been conceived and born without sin. His crucifixion is denied, but his exaltation to heaven is affirmed; but he is to come again at the close of the dispensation, not, as we believe, in glorious majesty to judge both quick and dead, but to destroy Antichrist, and to prepare the way for the return of the Arabian Prophet. The message, it is reasonable to suppose, is proportioned to the dignity of the messenger, and so argues the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who, beginning with declaring that God, who spoke in times of old through the Prophets, has in these last days spoken through his Son, goes on to say, "*Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip, for how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation.*" The conclusion is of course denied by Mohammed, for the admission of it would be fatal to him, for he professes to come with no new revelation, only with a revival of the religion of Abraham. Even this we deny; for we maintain that the religion of the Father of the faithful was not mere Deism, but belief in the promise of salvation through the future sacrifice of the Son of God, and that he rejoiced when he saw it typically exhibited to him in the substitution of the ram for his own son. The Korán demands obedience to the commandments of God as the condition of salvation, but these commandments are not represented, to use the Psalmist's language, as exceeding broad: they have neither the strictness of the Mosaic law, nor the perfection of Christian ethics; and the forgiveness of the shortcomings of the Moslems, by the mercy of God, as no other grounds for forgiveness are assigned than his goodwill, makes him (as all systems but the Christian must) the minister of sin. Mohammed could never have read the Scriptures, for he speaks of them as if they had been sent down from heaven, as the Korán professes to be; and he even speaks of books which have never existed, as in this passage—"Say we believe in God, and in that which has been sent down to us, and in that which came down to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac,





and Jacob, and the tribes of Israel, and that which came to Moses, and Jesus, and the Prophets, from their Lord, and make no difference between them." His gross ignorance both of the Law and of Christianity could not have been imagined except on his own shewing, for he speaks of them as codes, as if the former was not intermixed with the history of the Israelites, and that there was not one, but four gospels; none of which could have been sent down to Jesus, since they are narratives of his life and death, and resurrection and ascension, and must have been written after those events. The Epistles seem not to have been known to him, even by name, and he is evidently ignorant of their contents, and of the very essence of Christianity, for he adopts the absurd notion of the Gnostics, that Jesus was taken up alive into heaven, while another was crucified in his stead; thus acknowledging that the doctrine of the Cross was to him not the power or wisdom of God, but foolishness, as it was to the Jew and the idolater.

Notwithstanding the guesses which have been repeated from age to age of the assistance of Christians in the composition of the Korán, the book itself seems to shew that all his knowledge of facts was derived from Jewish traditions and apocryphal gospels. Thus, by additions and alterations he has deprived the interesting history of Joseph of the attraction which it possesses in the Bible narrative, without in any degree strengthening his own cause, and, instead of enlarging on the genuine miracles of our Lord, he specifies his speaking in the cradle, and his making sparrows out of clay, and giving them life. Such miracles we may read in apocryphal gospels still preserved, and many of his variations from the Old-Testament history may be traced to Jewish authorities. The remainder, we may therefore presume, were derived from the same source, and believed by himself to be true. And now, if the Jewish and Christian narratives in the Scripture be true, the contradictory statements in the Korán must be false, and consequently that book cannot have been a divine revelation.

Our Saviour condemned his own generation for misinterpreting the Scriptures, but he never said that they had corrupted





them. St. Paul observes that it was their glory that to them were committed the oracles of God, and we have reason to believe that they were faithful to their trust. Their reverence, indeed, in every age, for the integrity of the text, has been unexampled, and to it we owe the wonderful conformity to one another of the Hebrew manuscripts that have been collated. There is no reason to suppose that the Jews of Arabia were an exception; and, even if disposed to alter their copies, their fraud would have been of no avail without the co-operation of the Christians, who, by their spiritual birth, had inherited their Scriptures, agreeing in the text, while they differed in their interpretation of it. The limited vision of the Arabian Prophet did not extend beyond the narrow circle in which he moved, and it never occurred to him that the Jews were found in all the principal cities of the Roman empire, which, long before his time, had embraced the Christian faith; and that those two bodies, jealous of each other, offered the best guarantee for the integrity of the ancient Scriptures. The Jews still carefully preserve their prophecies of the Messiah, though they cannot fail to be embarrassed by their application to Jesus, which in some instances they can only evade by the fanciful invention of two Messiahs, one to suffer, and the other to reign, and to be born in different tribes. Surely if they have not yielded to the temptation of altering some of these, it cannot be supposed that they would blot out the predictions of another Prophet. The modern Mohammedans, who repeat this objection, ought to be able to shew us some copies that bear out this assertion, and, if candid, they would allow that the objection is untenable. It should be explained to them that it is a fact, of which, as controversialists, they ought not to be ignorant, that the Scriptures have from the beginning been read out in considerable portions in the respective religious assemblies of Jews and Christians; that copies must have been soon multiplied; that they have been quoted as Scripture by a long series of authors, beginning with those who had known the first successors of the apostles; that they had been translated into the Latin and Syriac probably before the end of the first century; and that in no controversy did





either party bring forth in its support a text which was not allowed by the other.

Alterations, then, of any importance could not have escaped detection, and we might without hesitation have accepted as genuine the Scriptures which, as now printed, we hear or read. Still it is a satisfaction to know that many manuscripts, both of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, are extant, of great antiquity, and some of the latter are pronounced, by those who, from study of the subject, are competent to form a judgment, anterior to the time of Mohammed. The Old Testament was translated into Greek long before the coming of Christ; and the Samaritans, who have been the rivals of the Jews ever since their return from Babylon, have also a Pentateuch, certainly not altered after that era, and only in a few points, and those not bearing upon doctrine, differing from the Jewish copy.

It would be easy to prove from these premises the substantial integrity of the text of the Old and New Testaments, but the Moslems have of late been told of various readings, and their informers dishonestly, or from ignorance, magnify their importance. It should be explained to them that there are none in the Old Testament, and very few in the New, that affect any doctrine. The collations that have been made attest the diligence of Biblical critics; and their general consent to exclude from St. John's first Epistle, notwithstanding the internal evidence in its favour, and the support of the Latin version, the formal declaration of the Trinity, is an incontrovertible instance of their honesty. The only remaining doctrinal texts are positive declarations of the divinity of the Saviour, but both doctrines may be proved from other passages: and, as it has been justly observed, the divinity of Jesus is interwoven into the very frame and texture of the Bible, and written in it as with a sunbeam.

The Moslems, however, do not deny that these doctrines are contained in our present copies. The great point in arguing with them is to shew the impossibility of any material variation in a volume which has been preserved by all Christians, however they may differ in its interpretation, as their





common property, which they would not suffer to be altered.

We accept the Korán as it is presented to us ; but were we to call in question its authenticity, how much less would its advocates have to say in its support. The Korán professes to be a direct revelation from God to one man. Our books were written, during a period of fifteen centuries, by several, moved by the Holy Ghost ; and if the authenticity of any one were doubted, and we consented to reject it, the same doctrines could be proved from the rest. The facts in the gospels are the basis of the reasonings and exhortations in the epistles ; and both, by shewing the fulfilment of many prophecies, confirm the books in which they occur. But it would not be easy to satisfy an objector that the Korán, edited by the Khalif Othman from the copy made by his predecessor, Abubekr, and committed to the custody of Hafsa, one of the Prophet's widows, was substantially the same as that which he himself communicated in his lifetime. We read of no careful collection of his numerous revelations, though he had so many secretaries ; and if we ask how it happens that there should be so few and such unimportant various readings, the answer is, that Othman ordered all the copies that differed from the one in Hafsa's keeping to be destroyed. The chronological order would have best conveyed the state of mind of the author, and this would seem to have been the natural arrangement, as we are told that some chapters were revealed at Mecca, and others at Medina. But commentators inform us, I believe without stating their authority, that there are in both interpolations of verses revealed at the other city. The transitions, also, to different subjects are frequent, and we may suspect that many of these chapters have been subsequently put together. The difficulty, probably, of carrying out a better arrangement, led the compilers simply to class them according to their length. The Korán, during Mohammed's lifetime, was read, and recited, and committed to memory, so that we may reasonably receive it as genuine, and believe that none would presume to add to what they respected as a divine revelation. Omissions are more easily conceived,





and we know of an important one, on no less an authority than that of the Khalif Omar. The worst feature of the Korán, and which, duly considered, is fatal to its claim of a revelation, is its palpable contradictions, and an attempt is made to save its credit by the doctrine of abrogation; but this shews the unsatisfactory arrangement of the book, for the abrogated verses sometimes follow these that abrogate. Such a theory is very convenient, but the unbeliever has clearly a right to ask why God should make, and at such short intervals, contradictory revelations, assigning, too, no reason for the change.

Haji Khalfa, in his encyclopædia of oriental learning, has, among his numerous branches of the interpretation of the Korán, one on the knowledge of abrogating and abrogated verses; and Maracci, in his elaborate edition of the Korán, cites an instructive passage from Abu Alkasim Hebat Allah, from which we learn that there are no less than 225 abrogated commands. This is no ingenious modern device to solve the difficulty and save the reputation of the revelation, for the contradictions are so palpable, and so important, that they must from the first have been brought forward by Mohammed's opponents. And he himself thus endeavours to meet the objection: "When we substitute a verse in the place of a verse, (and God knows best the fitness of that which he sends down,) unbelievers say thou art only a forger."

و اذا بدلنا اية مكان اية و اللم اعلم بما ينزل قالوا انما انت مغتر

This fact, which is undeniable, must convince any impartial inquirer of the human origin of the Korán, and the absurdity is heightened on the supposition of its being an eternal transcript of the divine will, especially when no cause is assigned for the change. Thus the worshipper had been first commanded to turn in prayer to Jerusalem, and within a year the Kiblah, or place to which he is to look, is changed to Mecca; from the temple of Solomon to that of Abraham. This arbitrary change ought to shake the faith of the Moslem. Those who reject the authority of the Prophet can easily explain it, on the supposition that, after a short trial, he found he had more to hope



from his pagan countrymen than from the Jews. He says, in explanation, that every sect has a tract in heaven towards which its members turn; but inconsistently occurs, a little earlier, this verse, which the context shews must be abrogated: "To God belong the east and the west: therefore, wherever ye turn yourselves to pray, there is the face of God, for God is omnipresent and omniscient."

وَاللَّهُ الْمَشْرِقُ وَالْمَغْرِبُ فَأَيُّمَا تَوَلَّوْا فَثَمَّ وَجْهَ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيمٌ

A still more important change appears in Mohammed himself. As a preacher at Mecca, he claims no more than toleration for his religion; but at Medina, as a prince, he declares Islam to be the only true faith, and appeals no longer to argument, but to the sword.

In the 21st verse of the 5th Sura, Christians and Jews are accused of considering themselves to be the chosen people of God, while they might easily conclude from the divine punishments with which they were visited that they stood in the same position with other men whose merits would not be determined till the day of judgment. The remark follows that God had impressed a particular mark upon each nation, and as it had not pleased him to unite them all in one religion, it followed that each nation would be judged by its own law. The practical precept is deduced that they only who have transgressed the law vouchsafed unto them shall be considered guilty: and in the same Surah it is declared that no fear shall come on any one among Moslems, Christians, Jews, and even Sabians, who believes in God and the last day, and has acted justly, and that he shall not be afflicted. At Medina he entirely changed his tone: these liberal sentiments are abrogated and now—

وَمَنْ لَمْ يُؤْمِنْ بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ فَإِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ سَعِيرًا

"For those who do not believe in God and his prophet, certainly for the unbelievers we have prepared hell." (XLVIII. 13.)





إِنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِنَا سَوْفَ نَصْلِيهِمْ نَارًا كُلَّمَا نَضِجَتْ جُلُودُهُمْ  
بَدَلْنَاهُمْ جُلُودًا غَيْرَهَا لِيَذُوقُوا الْعَذَابَ

"Verily those who disbelieve our signs we will surely broil in the fire: as often as their skins shall be burned we will give them other skins, that they may taste the torment." (iv. 59.)

وَمَنْ يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنَ  
الْخَاسِرِينَ

"Whoever followeth any religion but Islam it shall not be accepted, and in the next world he shall be of those who perish.

With abrogation may be classed the Prophet's express exemption from the law which he binds upon his followers, which would be considered a large indulgence if we did not know that the Arabs, before his time, were under no restrictions. Four wives is understood to be the allowed number, but it is expressly said in the Korán that it is his peculiar privilege to marry as many as he pleases, above the rest of the true believers (xxxiii. 49); and he appears, from good authority, to have had at least twenty-one. To us these facts speak for themselves. We are only astonished that they did not break the charm in his lifetime, and that even now they do not diminish the reverence or shake the faith of his followers.

Mohammed, as the seal of the Prophets, claims, both for himself and his message, a superiority which he is unable to substantiate. An impartial observer, one who is neither Christian nor Moslem, must allow his inferiority even to Moses, a man like himself; and though the Korán rejects the divinity of Christ, yet it raises him above humanity, and thereby renders his subordination absurd and untenable. If we ask in what respects the Korán excels the Gospel we can get no satisfactory reply. It is nothing but an authoritative republication of the religion of nature, the revelation of one God, the





creator and governor of the world, who requires obedience to his commands, which, in a future state, he will reward with eternal happiness. Islam, therefore, places man under the covenant of works, which he is unable to keep, and holds out neither the promise of spiritual aid, nor any reasonable expectation of the pardon of his transgressions, or of omissions of duty.

The Mohammedan standard of morality is far higher than that of the Hindoo or Chinese, or any other people who do not walk in the light of revelation. It surpasses, too, that of the heathen philosophers, even of Aristotle or of the Stoics, because it derives obligation, not as they were forced to do, from the fitness of things, its suitableness to a rational being, or the inherent loveliness of virtue, but from the will of God, creator and governor of mankind, of duty to whom, the most important branch of morality, they were necessarily ignorant. Still it will bear no comparison with that of the Law, and yet less with that of the Gospel, which developed the true principle of the former, and extends the prohibition from overt acts to the desires from which they spring. We learn from the highest authority that Moses allowed the Israelites, on account of the hardness of their hearts, a facility of divorce, contrary to the design of the Creator; and we know that, from the example of Abraham and Jacob, it silently tolerated polygamy. The Korán expressly allows four wives, and sets no limitation to the number of concubines; and, by a strange law, requires that no husband can take back a repudiated wife till she has married another and been divorced by him. The object of the law we may presume to be to check the practice of a hasty, inconsiderate dismissal of a wife. Retaliation, and the avenging of bloodshed, which Moses found prevalent, he did not abolish, but modify, and these are retained by Mohammed; though he forbade female infanticide and other barbarous and superstitious customs of his idolatrous countrymen. The special command to exterminate the Canaanites he pleaded, to justify the use of the sword as an instrument of conversion when argument had failed to produce its proper





effect. In the earlier and better days of his adversity in Mecca, he had disclaimed any other method than persuasion, and even declared that it was not necessary for salvation to embrace the true religion, for God would accept all who, under any system of faith, endeavoured to discover his will, and to obey him. But the chapters which profess to have been revealed to him at Medina, where he reigned without control, breathe a less liberal spirit, requiring all to submit to Islam as the only road to salvation. Such a fundamental change excites a strong suspicion against the legislator, and an argument against the inspiration of the Korán; for reason confirms Balaam's declaration that God is not a son of man that he should repent: He who knows and has arranged all things from the beginning changeth not. And a method of conversion that was allowed afterwards, could hardly have been objectionable before. The authorized use of the sword invests with a peculiar glory the champion of the faith, and if he falls in a religious war he is reckoned in the army of martyrs, and admitted into immediate bliss. It was the conviction of this doctrine, strengthened by the assurance of a divine predestination, which overruled the result of battles, that rendered the Moslem soldiers invincible, and tended so powerfully, when the faith was fresh and vigorous, to spread Islam rapidly in every direction. With more mercy and prudence than consistency, the alternative of a capitation tax was offered to the conquered, and, in consequence, those denominations of Christians who were treated as heretics by the dominant party in Syria and Egypt preferred the supremacy of a Moslem governor to the yoke of the Emperor. In many respects the Korán imitates the Pentateuch, but its spirit is comparatively from the earth. With all its declarations of the unity of the Godhead, it has no equivalent to the call to love Him with all the powers both of the heart and of the understanding; and though among the epithets of the supreme Being, the merciful, the compassionate, and the gracious, are intermixed with those that announce his power, intelligence, and perfection, it is not as an affectionate father, but as a just and merciful sovereign, that God appears in the Korán; and the Moslems that deserve the





name are his respectful and obedient servants, not his adopted children, and the brethren of his Son. Intercession is acknowledged in words, but can have no reality when undertaken by a mere man, however excellent he may be; and the Korán rejects with horror the idea that God has begotten a Son, and has no notion of the efficacy of sacrifice, which alone, in conjunction with his divine nature, enables the Man Christ Jesus to be the Mediator between God and man. The superiority of Christian ethics to any other will be allowed at once by all competent judges of such questions, and admits of no discussion; but, independently of its intrinsic excellence, it has two special recommendations which no other code can boast. The first is, that its precepts are all embodied in a living and perfect example of excellence, whereas the most enthusiastic admirers of Mohammed must believe him to have been an imperfect and inconsistent character. After making the most indulgent allowance for his position, his conduct respecting women convicts him of licentiousness and duplicity; and though he might honestly proclaim the unity of the Deity, there was presumption and selfishness in making his own apostleship its inseparable adjunct. The best system of ethics is in itself powerless: the imagination may admire, and the judgment may approve, but without an adequate inducement it must remain an inoperative, a dead letter. For who will have resolution to deny himself, in order to conform to laws which would restrain his passions, and sometimes oppose his interests, and even his reputation? The virtues that promote the welfare of society, as charity almost always, and sometimes justice, are popular; but a stricter life than that of the generality, notwithstanding prudence and forbearance, will provoke censure, since it conveys a silent reproof which free livers cannot endure. Now Mohammed had no higher motives to enforce obedience than those common to all religions—the joys of paradise and heaven, and the torments of hell, on which he is continually expatiating, and which he describes with the minute accuracy of an eyewitness. For their reality we have only the testimony of a man like ourselves, who, if his word be doubted, cannot appeal





to prophecy or miracle, or any attestation to his veracity. Whereas the apostles persuade men knowing the terrors of the Lord, and, by the promise of such happiness as eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor human understanding has conceived, yet is revealed to believers by the Spirit. Our Saviour, by his resurrection, brought life and immortality to light, and this provided a strong motive to obedience; and by his ascension he obtained the graces as well as the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. His Gospel also exhibits a constraining motive in his disinterested philanthropy, surpassing knowledge, which led him to die for mankind while yet, as sinners, his enemies; and to reconcile, by his painful and ignominious sacrifice of himself, once for all, upon the altar of his cross, men to his Father, and his Father to men. Love to him, their Redeemer and Intercessor, their Victim and their Priest, their King and their future Judge, is the governing principle that is to regulate their lives, and produce a steady, consistent, and faithful obedience to all his commandments. *"The love of Christ,"* says one apostle, *"constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again."* 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. And another apostle writes (1 John iv. 21), *"And this commandment have we from Him, Let him who loveth God, love his brother also."* And again, says St. Paul (Romans xiii. 10, 9), *"Love is the fulfilling of the law; for this, thou shalt not commit adultery, for this thou shalt not kill, for this thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."*

If a godly and righteous life is to entitle a man to eternal happiness, the Christian has many advantages over the Moslem, who cannot deny that his law is purer and more comprehensive than his own; that it also exhibits a more complete pattern of obedience, and is enforced by better promises of divine aid, and recommended by more effectual motives.





The Law, however, is perfect, and requires perfect obedience; and he who perfectly fulfils it in every particular may claim eternal happiness of right, as the reward of his obedience, and a just God will allow his claim. But where and when has any individual lived who could put forward such pretensions? None will venture to deny, that in some respects they require forgiveness; but the uncompromising language of the Law is "Do this and live," and St. Paul tells the Galatians, iii. 10, that it is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Law, to do them." A perfect law, clearly defining duty, but allowing no excuse for the least failure, and holding out no assistance towards keeping it, is calculated to drive an awakened sinner to despair; and those to whom the only way of salvation has not been made known, take refuge either in self-imposed austerities, or in self-denying works, or in any forms of will-worship by which they hope to appease the wrath of a justly-offended God. His holiness cannot pardon without an adequate compensation, and to provide this, and to pacify, in consequence, a disturbed conscience, has been the endeavour of every false system of religion. The Gospel alone, in conformity with its meaning of good news, shews, by the voluntary sacrifice of the Redeemer upon the cross, that God can be just even in the act of justifying for his sake the ungodly; but then it can only be those who accept his finished salvation, because the Father has laid upon his co-equal Son the iniquity of all believers, and it is by *His stripes that we are healed* (Isaiah liii. 5). By his own works no man living can be justified. Salvation, consequently, must be entirely of grace (favour): and he who has discovered his own sinfulness and the holiness of God, will renounce all pretensions to merit, and, throwing himself unreservedly upon sovereign mercy, will joyfully accept the proffered robe of the Redeemer's righteousness, in which alone he can venture to appear before God.

Mohammed disclaims the notion of having received a new revelation: for he again and again declares that he is sent only to restore the religion of his progenitor, Abraham the orthodox. It





is manifest, that though he had some notion of his history, gathered, I conceive, not from the perusal of Genesis, but from conversation with Jews, and the traditions of his tribe, he perceived no pre-eminent act of faith in his intended sacrifice of his son; and though he applies to him his scriptural title, the Friend of God, he has no conception of the propriety of its application. So eminent was the faith of Abraham, that he is justly called the Father of the Faithful, and this, his characteristic virtue, was exercised continually. For though the offering of his only-begotten son, believing God was able to raise him up again from the dead, may be considered as the crowning act, his whole life was a life of faith, from the time that the Lord said unto him, "*Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, into a land which I will shew unto thee*" (Acts vii. 3.) When the birth of a son was foretold to him in the extreme age both of his wife and himself, the apostle Paul tells the Romans "*that he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, being strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what He had promised He was able to perform,*" and therefore he adds, "*it was imputed to him for righteousness*" (iv. 20—22). Paul goes on to give the result of this faith: "*Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him who raised up Jesus from the dead; who was delivered up for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.*" "*Know ye, therefore,*" he tells the Galatians (iii. 7—9) that "*they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed; so then they which are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*" He proceeds to shew, that if a man be justified it cannot be by the law, which requires perfect obedience, which he finds it impossible to render, but by faith; adding, that "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of law, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles, through Jesus*





*Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."* It is desirable that Moslems should be prevailed upon to read, in Genesis, the history of Abraham; since they will there find that it was not Ishmael, the child of Hagar the concubine, as their commentators maintain, who had been long before sent away, but Isaac, the promised offspring, the son of Sarah his wife, that he was called upon to sacrifice. This substitution of the elder son naturally recommends itself to the Arabians, who claim Ishmael for their progenitor, but it is rather suggested than affirmed by the Korán; and certainly, in the authentic history, it is Isaac whom he is called upon to sacrifice, and it is in Christ, the descendant of that son, that, according to the promise made to him, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. He is the subject of this and all the spiritual promises; and there is none to Ishmael, any more than to Esau, like him, the progenitor of a nation. Abraham had, indeed, prayed that in Ishmael all nations might be blessed, but the spiritual blessing was reserved for his legitimate son, (*in Isaac shall thy seed be called,*) while far greater temporal prosperity has been assigned to the descendants of Ishmael. The Israelites never, even in their highest estate, possessed the whole of their promised land: the Ishmaelites, under the successors of Mohammed, soon conquered Persia, and wrested Syria and Egypt from the Roman empire. Abraham had grown attached to Ishmael, and when promised a son by Sarah he exclaimed, instead of expressing his thanks to God, "*O might Ishmael live before thee!*" Gen. xvii. 18. But God had determined contrary to his wish. "*With Isaac,*" He said, "*I will establish my covenant for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.*" Worldly prosperity was to be the blessing of Ishmael. "*And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee. Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.*" (Gen. xvii. 18—20.) Abraham abounded in good works, but it was not they, but his faith, that was imputed to him for righteousness; and it is not the Moslem, who endeavours to please God by his own righteousness, and must





fail in the hopeless attempt, but the Christian, who by faith lays hold of the Saviour's righteousness to clothe him, that is of the religion of Abraham.

The morality of the Gospel, which extends to the thoughts and desires, and, instead of being limited to overt acts, of which alone human tribunals can take cognizance, seeks to purify the heart out of which they proceed, and in which are the issues of life, must be allowed by the unprejudiced to be superior to that of the Korán; and I believe the most bigoted Moslems have never called in question its excellence, or denied the prophetic character and superhuman nature of the Messiah, though they inconsistently regard him as subordinate to the promulgator of Islam. The higher the standard of course the more difficult it is to attain to it, and man cannot reach even that of the Korán in his own strength. The Moslems maintain that their Prophet is the Messiah's promised substitute, but have transformed the Comforter and Advocate, the Spirit of holiness, into a human prince, who goes forth conquering and to conquer with carnal weapons. They hold forth no spiritual aid, but leave man to the direction of the book, which, if it points out the road, and is a lamp unto the feet, cannot warn him when he deviates from the strait and narrow path, or give him consolation in his trials, and strengthen him to endure the journey. To him who has transgressed the commandments the Korán can offer no more than any man's own unassisted understanding suggests, that is, a reliance on the goodness of God, whose mercy is over all his works, but who, even in his providential operations in this world, must appear to the thoughtful transgressor at the best, according to His own declaration to his servant Moses, as one who, though he *forgives iniquity and sin, will by no means clear the guilty* (Ex. xxxiv. 7.) And what more could any of the sons of men, even if commissioned by the Almighty to reveal his will, communicate, than the answer of Balaam to the king of Moab, recorded by Micah, vi. 8—*"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"* To fulfil, as here





expressed, the duty of justice and benevolence to men, and to conduct ourselves as we ought towards our God, is a summary of morals which the judgment approves, but, at the same time, finds so exceeding broad as to render it in its full extent impracticable; and it makes no provision for those who have neglected it, and are conscious of having too often, not only omitted to do what is right, but even done what is wrong. The sinner whose understanding is not obscured by a wicked life, will acknowledge, while sensible that he has frequently yielded to his passions, that the *commandment is holy, just, and good* (Rom. vii. 12.); but he feels that such a law, from its very perfection, may well be called by the apostle, who says that "*he should not have known lust if the law had not said 'Thou shalt not covet, the ministration of death and of condemnation* (2 Cor. iii. 7, 8). Happily he has taught us that there is *no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, that is, to those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made the genuine believer free from the law of sin and death. But others have still reason to say with Balac, "*Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousand of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgressions, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?*" Natural religion, as it is called, that is, religion as it is delineated in the ancient classics, or as exhibited in the reports of modern travellers who have associated with the heathen of our day, is always of a piacular character. The wrath of God against all ungodliness and unrighteousness to which the human heart responds, appears to have been transmitted by tradition to all the descendants of Noah, wherever dispersed, and in whatever stage of civilization. An angry God, called by the father of history (Herodotus, iii. 40.) an envious being, required, as they, whether barbarous or civilized, alike believed, to be appeased by costly sacrifices; and in times of extraordinary calamity the altar was, as it were, sanctified by human blood. Such sacri-





fices we know were common among the Phœnicians, and their colonists the Carthaginians; and probably the custom prevailed in Canaan when Abraham's faith was tried by the command to offer up his son, through whom blessing was promised, not only to his family, but to the whole race of mankind. The Greek drama affords an affecting exhibition of the practice in the immolation of the daughters of both Priam and Agamemnon. It was endured by the Athenians, whom we regard as so intellectual, during the Persian war; it occurs, also, in Roman History, and was only abolished in the empire, as late as the second century of the Christian era, by Hadrian.\* Thus we see that the necessity of a propitiation was everywhere acknowledged; yet, strange as it seems, the belief in the promised atoning victim died away, and was only dimly visible in the Mosaic ritual. That law testified, that "*without shedding of blood there is no remission*" (Heb. ix. 22); and before its introduction, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in whatever part of Canaan they pitched their tents, erected altars unto the Lord; and a sacrifice was the first act of Noah on quitting the ark and taking possession of the renewed and desolate world, and we know that it was accepted. Reason, unenlightened from above, would surely never have inferred that the slaughter of animals could be an act of worship which their Creator would approve, and might well adopt the Psalmist's language, "*Thinkest thou I will drink bulls' blood, or eat the flesh of goats? If I feel hungry I will not tell thee, for all the beasts of the forest are mine, and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills.*" It is a reasonable presumption that the skins with which God clothed our first parents were those of animals which He had instructed them to sacrifice; and we can hardly doubt that the cause why Abel's animal sacrifice was accepted, while Cain's thanksgiving offering of the fruits of the earth was rejected, was, that he com-

\* We learn from Plutarch, in his life of Themistocles, that the people compelled him to sacrifice three Persian captives to Bacchus Omestes (the Devourer); and in the life of Marcellus, that in obedience to an oracle at the commencement of the war with the Gauls, a man and a woman of that nation were buried alive. Even in the reign of Diocletian, a man was sacrificed at Rome itself, on the feast of Jupiter Latiaris.





plied with a divine ordinance; for, unless commanded, I cannot understand how, in the epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 4.), it can be described to be an act of faith. Sacrifice is the foundation of true religion, and requires a *priest*. Christianity has neither, because the only real Priest (who was typified by Aaron) offered up himself, once for all, upon the altar of the cross, and we have only a thankful commemoration of it by the Christian *minister*. The Korán, it is true, sanctions the practice both at the pilgrimage and at the two feasts, but, like circumcision, which it never mentions, it was retained by Mohammed simply because he had been accustomed to it; for he never alludes to its efficacy, and therefore with the Moslems it is an unmeaning imitation of Abraham and their Pagan ancestors. This shews his utter ignorance of the spirit of the Jewish and Christian systems, though partially, and only partially, acquainted with the historical facts on which they rest. And this is the more extraordinary as his own father had been devoted to death, and was redeemed by a costly ransom.

The Divine Unity, as we have seen, is the grand dogma of Islam, and this would recommend it to the philosophical professor of polytheism; yet it is degraded and weakened by its connection with heathen practices, to which it is pledged both by the Korán and the Traditions. The pilgrimage must appear to be an unreasonable burden to a thoughtful Moslem in a distant land, who has been taught that prayer is as acceptable at his home as at Mecca; and the only reason for the merit of pilgrimage is the unproved assertion that the Caaba was built by Abraham, whose residence in Canaan, instead of Arabia, may be shewn from his detailed history in the Bible. To this Deism is to be opposed the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity, which the Korán so strangely misrepresents. Not that I recommend it should be brought forward as a dogma apart from the scheme of salvation, but to indicate that scheme, by shewing that it was revealed to establish the foundation on which it rests. This will prepare the way for the doctrine of the twofold nature of the Saviour; and the reception of this stumblingblock to reason and pride the Korán itself facilitates, by its exaltation of our Lord above humanity. In the opinion





of Möhler,\* the Korán has ascribed such authority to the Gospel, and has so failed in establishing its own superiority, that, through that allowed authority, it will overthrow its own, and consequently retains in itself the elements of its own destruction, as soon as freedom of thought has been more widely circulated, and is directed by enlightened and spiritually-minded Christian missionaries. Then the Christianity partially admitted into the Korán will work out its own completion, and it will be manifest that Islam is a preparatory scheme, and that Mohammed is really the servant of Christ. This assertion can be sustained by facts, for instances are not wanting of thinking Mohammedans who have discovered the various and essential differences between the Korán and the Gospels, and have perceived that Christianity alone restores the original relation between God and man. What more easily forces itself upon the mind than the persuasion, that, according to the Scriptures, from the fall to the appearance of Christ all revelations, and all historical events, point only to Him, and that therefore all prophets before Him could only have been His servants, and all after Him could only be His chosen friends and assistants? It is consequently evident that the manifold relation in which, according to the Korán, Christ is placed to Mohammed, and the Gospel to Islam, offers to missionaries the most desirable points of connection from which they may at once advance without any difficulty into the very centre of Christianity.

Christian morality, as we have observed, is perfect, and this might be expected in a revelation from the Son of God, whether teaching in person, or through his inspired disciples; yet his teaching was only an incidental blessing: it was not the object of his mission. Nor did he become incarnate to bring *life and immortality to light* by his own resurrection; and by *shewing himself alive after his crucifixion by many infallible proofs*, though he thus proved what reason could only conjecture, and strengthens the faith of his people. The Gospel, the good news he brought, was the reconciliation through his death (which his two-fold nature rendered efficacious) of God to men, and of men to God. He was the *Lamb of God slain*,

\* Relation of Islam to the Gospel, p. 39.





in the divine decree, *before the foundation of the world* (Rev. xiii. 8.), and manifested in due time to take away the sins of the world. Thus alone can the Father shew mercy without any impeachment of his justice, and his holiness shines the brighter, because those whom he justifies he sanctifies. Thus, as predicted in the psalm, "*mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other.*" It is perhaps one of the strongest symptoms of the corruption of our nature that genuine Christianity is so distasteful, that it is with the utmost difficulty that sinners can be convinced of the sovereign efficacy of this divine remedy, which so far exceeds their expectations, and, I fear I may add, their desire. For man, proud and ungrateful, is desirous of performing a part at least in his own salvation. Not to speak of the gross errors of Romanists, who trust, in some degree at least to their own mortifications of the flesh in this life, and look forward to the completion of the work from their sufferings in purgatory, too many Protestants plead their sincerity, and talk of a mitigated law, and express a hope that their imperfect services will be accepted for the sake of Christ, whose merit will make up for their deficiency. But of these ingenious devices of theologians Scripture knows nothing. Our own best works are imperfect, even if not mixed with sin in themselves or in their motives, and can never bear the scrutiny of the omniscient judge. Before His tribunal perfect righteousness alone can appear, and, thanks be to God, the redeemed will be presented faultless, because clothed in the unspotted robe of the Redeemer. The honour of the law and of the lawgiver is thus secured; and though, from St. Paul's days to ours, the natural man has ever charged the doctrines of grace with Antinomianism, it will be found on inquiry that they alone produce and ensure, as necessary consequences, sanctification. These doctrines, which had been developed by Augustine, were never altogether lost in the west; but in the eastern churches there had been no revival of the truth, and Mohammed had no conception of it, for the epistles were to him a sealed book, and he would never hear it from Khadijah's aged cousin Waraka, or any of the monks





from whom he is supposed to have gleaned the little he knew of Christianity. Had his knowledge of it been more complete, he might have proved an heresiarch, but he would hardly have come forward with a special revelation, which, in fact, reveals no truth not already known to the believer, while it ignores some that are essential to his salvation. The believer is complete in Christ, and he, therefore, not Mohammed, is the seal of prophecy. God, in earlier ages, announced his will from time to time through prophets; but in the last day, as the Christian and final dispensation is called, he has spoken through his Son, who is the express image of his person, and a ray from his original light. He has revealed all that concerns us: what need, then is there of Mohammed or any other subsequent envoy? Jesus has not only atoned for our sins, but, through his exceeding great and precious promises, and the help purchased by him of the Holy Spirit, we are gradually restored to the divine image, and are enabled to render cheerful, willing obedience to the law, as a rule of life, though no longer a covenant, the breach of which must condemn. He has accomplished more than we could have imagined, and all that we could desire, through love, surpassing our comprehension, which led him to die for us while yet enemies to him, and to deliver us from a captivity from which, till touched by his constraining grace, we had no wish to be free. The faithful preaching of the law convicts of sin, for it detects its workings, and demonstrates our inability to keep it. The contrite sinner perceives his sinfulness, and pleads for mercy; and the Holy Spirit teaches him to look out of himself for relief to the righteousness of God, witnessed both by the law and by the prophets, even the righteousness which is by faith in Christ Jesus, and which will be imputed to all, as it was to Abraham. The apostle tells us that there is in this respect no difference between Jew and Gentile, because both have sinned and come short of the glory of God; and therefore all who will be accepted at the judgment-day, must have been, in this life, justified, that is, though guilty, treated as innocent, because God has set forth Jesus Christ as a propitiation through faith in his blood, that He might at the same time





be just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. At the first promulgation of the Gospel it was rejected, except by those who had been called to salvation, alike by the two great divisions of mankind. To the Jew it was a stumblingblock, because it contradicted the received interpretation of the prophets; and they whose carnal imagination was lifted up with the hope of a triumphant, conquering Messiah, overlooked the predictions of a contrary description, and could not perceive, like the apostles, till their minds were opened to understand the Scriptures, that He must suffer before He entered into glory; that He must endure the shameful death of the cross before He sat down on the right hand of God, waiting till his enemies are made his footstool. To the Greeks, who delighted in the speculations of a vain philosophy, by which they had been, as it were, taken prisoners, the Gospel appeared foolishness; yet when patiently and fairly examined, the former would find it, by happy experience, to be the power of God, and the latter the wisdom of God. And so it has proved in every age, and will to the end of the dispensation. Since the fall of Adam there has never been but one way of salvation. Placed on his creation under the covenant of works, and under circumstances more favourable than any of his descendants, he yielded to temptation, and transgressed the single command given him as a test of his obedience. His son and all his descendants being born subsequent to his fall, inherited a depraved nature, and had neither the will nor the ability to keep the law. If saved, then, they must be saved through the obedience of another, and that can only be the promised seed of the woman, whom even the Korán declares to be free from original sin, and intimates, by the designation of the Son of Mary, to have had no human father. Misled by Gnostic fancies, Mohammed maintains that he was raised to heaven without having endured the cross. His death on it, however, was indispensable to satisfy the justice of his offended Father; and to this sacrifice, to which we look back with adoring gratitude, the believers of preceding times are alike indebted for salvation, who received a good report through faith, yet received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not





he made perfect. The believer in one Supreme Being, who, like the Moslem, is jealous of his honour, no less than the ignorant idolater, as the Hindoo who worships gods many and lords many, the work of his own hands, must alike submit to the wisdom of God, who has declared that he is to all, except those who come unto him through Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, *a consuming fire*. The proud turn aside, rejecting this way of God's providing, with indignation, or so explain it, that it becomes another Gospel: the humble enter upon it with gratitude, and find peace and joy in believing. To convert the Moslem we must faithfully lay before him the unadulterated truth in all its simplicity, in full reliance on the Holy Spirit, who can alone enlighten the understanding, and bring it home to the heart. Humanly speaking, it is a far more difficult undertaking than to bring to the acknowledgment of the truth the heathen, who possess but a traditional religion, and, as they advance in civilization, can only retain it by allegorizing their absurd fables, and trying to discover, in the adventures of their gods, the personification of the powers of nature, or the attributes of one pervading spirit, the soul of the world. The Moslem has been instructed in the truth as far as his prophet knew it, and, unlike the Greek or Hindoo philosopher, he discriminates between the creation and the Creator. When living, as in Hindustan and Tartary, he cannot but feel the superiority both of his theology and his morality; and among the degenerate Christians of Syria and Egypt, like the Jew, he is too prejudiced to read the New Testament, and judges from personal observation, confirmed by passages in the Korán, that they worship three gods. He is proud of having a book to guide him, which he believes came down from heaven; and knowing his prophet to be later than Moses or Jesus, he believes, as that book informs him, that he enjoys a perfect revelation, free from the errors with which preceding ones had been intermixed and corrupted, and which was made known that he might be brought into the right path.

The Missionary to the Moslems must make the Korán his special study; and he must acquaint himself with Islam as reduced to practice, whether as modified by circumstances, as





in Hindustan, which has been debased by the adoption of heathen ceremonies, or in its purer form, in Turkey or Northern Africa, where it is the dominant religion, and retains more of its original proud, stern, and uncompromising character. This is requisite, in order to meet the cavils of those who object to Christianity; and at times it may be wise to expose the sophistry of the arguments by which the Moslems maintain their faith; but controversy has a tendency to rouse a sturdy, and sometimes a passionate opposition, and even when carried on with ability and temper is more apt to silence than convince. The prophets, indeed, expose and ridicule the folly of those who make and worship images, and many of their strong, sarcastic passages might be read with a beneficial effect to the heathen. But the apostles, as a general rule, instead of combating error, set forth and recommend the truth. That, received in the love of it, will at once banish error of every description, whereas we may confute errors one by one, till we have satisfied the heathen that those are no gods that are made by hands, and the Moslem that his prophet was an impostor, without being able to fill up the blank that is left, without being able to bring them to Jesus, that they may enjoy spiritual life. Islam, as presented in the Korán, and freed from the details of its jurisprudence and its ritual, is, in fact, nothing but the republication of the covenant of works, on the unsupported testimony of one who declares himself sent by God to reveal it as the last of his prophets. To this the Christian opposes his remedial scheme, which alone can bring pardon and peace to an awakened conscience, by shewing that the author and finisher of our faith is at once

“The sinner's friend, and sin's eternal foe.”

Mohammed boasts of no new discoveries in religion: he only professes to revive the religion of Abraham. Great use may be made of this concession. The Moslem should be pressed to read his genuine history, with the comments of St. Paul, and then he will perceive that it is not himself, but the Christian, who follows the religion of the patriarch.

The Missionary should endeavour to predispose his hearers in favour of his message, by satisfying them, in his own





behaviour, that it deserves the title of good news ; that he himself has found it an antidote of care, and righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost ; confirming the apostle's assurance that it has the promise of this life, as well as of that which is to come. The foundation of his teaching must be laid deep in the doctrine of human corruption ; but the disease and its remedy must be exhibited together. If we shew that in Adam we lost our original righteousness, we should be no less careful to shew, that "*if by one man's sin judgment came upon all to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life ; for as by one man's disobedience many are made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*" (Rom. v. *The first man was made a living soul, but the last Adam, the Lord from heaven, a life-giving Spirit ; for as we have borne the image of the earthly, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly.*") It must be explicitly stated that this original righteousness can never be regained by any austerities or services, or even by works positively good ; but that faith must lay hold on the Redeemer's perfect righteousness, and put it on for justification, which will admit him into privileges and enjoyments superior to those which Adam lost. The self-righteous Moslem, once convinced of sin, no longer seeking for objections, will deserve his name, for he will resign himself, not with humble submission, but with joyful gratitude to God, as an affectionate Father, and will find the Son of Mary, the Word of God, to be fairer than Mohammed or any of the children of men, the chiefest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely. Then Islam, which, like the moon, shines only with a borrowed light, will pale its ineffectual fires before the healing and warming, as well as enlightening beams of the rising Sun of Righteousness ; and the converted disciple of Mohammed, who has wearied himself with fasting, and prayer, and alms, and pilgrimages, and meditation, to work out his own salvation, and has made no progress, will thankfully accept eternal life as a gift, and will recommend, as a guide to others, Jesus the Son of God, whom he himself has found to be *THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE.*