

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

one instance in which I thought an unjust sentiment found expression in him, and, as my own feelings were then decidedly adverse to the conclusion reached, I may have partially misjudged him.

There is nothing in human history more profoundly interesting than these victories of love, this rendering into life of the precepts of life. When God sends an apostle, we crave the wisdom to see him, the power to be inspired by him. How large a chapter in Grecian history is illumed by Socrates; in Roman history, by Marcus Aurelius. Though Christianity has made the philosophy of living far more familiar to us, no place or time can well spare one of its clear lights. Such a light to many college generations was Professor Albert Hopkins. Wherever else the alumni of Williams College may wander for great men, their eyes will turn lovingly to him as their type of Christian manhood.

ARTICLE VI.

THE POWER OF ISLAM.

BY REV. GEORGE F. HERRICK, MISSIONARY OF THE A. B. C. F. M.,
CONSTANTINOPLE.

It has often been asserted that the religion of Mohammed is losing power over its votaries; that, before the civilization and religion or infidelity of Western nations, Mohammedan power, both civil and religious, is giving way; and that the downfall of the whole system, especially in Turkey and in India, cannot be distant. The crescent is thought to be no longer a fit symbol for a waning faith; and there is the expectation, how general the writer does not presume to say, of the end of Islam, both as a temporal and a spiritual power, by some sudden movement near at hand, like the putting out of a candle or the crash of a falling wall.

Doubtless, the recent progress of the religion of the Arabian prophet among certain African tribes is a disturbing

and contradictory fact; and the tenacity with which everywhere, and especially among Arabic-speaking Moslems, those who have professed the faith of Islam hold, at least formally and outwardly, to their ancient religion, is somewhat baffling to our enthusiastic hopes. So that, while we believe the decay of the system as a faith is a fact, and expect that the men of the next generation will see the end of all Mohammedan civil power, yet it is evident that elements of power still exist in Islam, which, without a miracle in the conduct of his providence, God cannot eliminate and suppress, except by the working of gradual forces and influences. And, while experience has shown us the very great difficulty of properly estimating those forces and influences, of truly and clearly conceiving and representing just what Islam is, and of rightly showing what are the elements of its power, we shall attempt to point out some of the pillars of its strength, which will at the same time make evident the hold it still has upon the Mohammedan mind.

I. ONE ELEMENT OF THE POWER OF ISLAM IS THE ONE GREAT TRUTH ON WHICH IT IS BASED.

No great system of pure error has ever existed in the world. No such system could possibly exist. The revulsion of men from bald and unmixed falsehood is a fact of human consciousness and human history. Men have great mental capacity for receiving lies in the place of the truth, folly instead of wisdom; but they will neither be deceived nor humbugged, unless at least some grains of sense and truth are skilfully mingled with the potion they are invited to swallow. Confucius taught a high morality. Buddhism answers, in a way, the aspirations of men towards the supernatural. The system of the better Greek philosophers contained more of truth than of error. And Islam draws the very breath of its life—has ever nourished the sinews of its power—from a clear, stern, and polemic utterance of the primal truth of the existence of one supreme, personal God. This was boldly uttered against the old heathenism of Arabia. It thundered against a

corrupt and weakened Christianity in Palestine, Egypt, and North Syria, before the faith it had begun to publish with the sword, as its one flaming and conclusive argument, was half a century old. It flashed from Turkish scimitars four centuries later when Togrul was founding the empire which, later, took the name of Ottoman. Everywhere, from the first till now, "There is no God but God," has been the one all-powerful watchword which the tens of millions who own the name of Mohammed hear uttered, and themselves utter, at least five times each day. What power this truth had in the ancient Jewish theocracy! And Mohammedanism is built on Judaism, so far, that we find this great truth braced up in the Koran by many a narrative of Old Testament history.

It must not, however, be supposed that the doctrine of God means, in its practical bearing, the same to the Moslem that it does to the Christian. How, and with what, does he hold his fundamental doctrine? If he "hold the truth in unrighteousness," of course its practical influence will be either nullified or transformed. Mohammedan history shows how skilfully pleasing error has been grafted upon fundamental truth in that system. When we inquire into the value and influence of what the Moslem holds in reference to the divine character—the attributes of God—upon his practical belief and conduct, we find that the expressions, "God is great" and "God the most merciful," are oftenest used, and more than all others, influence the life; as it is these which chiefly mould the Moslem's idea of God. The distinct divine attributes enumerated in Islam are very many; but of the hundred names, or attributes, many are, in effect, repetitions of others; and while the attributes, e.g. of justice and holiness, those fundamental moral attributes of God, are distinctly stated and theoretically received; yet these attributes have little real influence in the creed of the Moslem, and still less on his life. The Moslem not only professedly, but actually and firmly, believes in a personal God; in the absolute and unconditional unity of God; in God as an absolute and glorious Sovereign; as eternal and unchangeable, and as a

God of mercy ; and to this God of power and mercy he commits himself, resigns himself ; and this " resignation " (Islam) is his religion and the essence of his faith. However profane or sensual he may be, however grossly he may habitually violate all the laws of truth and justice, he throws himself, with an assured confidence, and in the punctilious discharge of the prescribed formal duties of his religion, on the divine mercy. Theoretically and practically, he recognizes no need of any atonement for sin ; and of that holiness and moral purity which reaches the heart, and is shown in a renewed and internally upright and pure soul,— of that, namely, which is the fundamental condition of discipleship to Christ,— the Moslem knows nothing. Of sin in the heart as guilt, and punishable without reference to anything external, he knows nothing.

So far is the attribute of holiness in the divine character ignored in the practical belief of the Moslem, that his highest ideal of heaven is of a sensual—a refined, but still a sensual—paradise. According to his expectation, as the highest gift God has to bestow upon his servants, in his own highest heaven, there is to be the fullest gratification of all his sensual appetites. When we consider the character of Mohammed himself, especially his unblushing sensuality in his later years, it is not strange that the worst examples of beastly sensuality, even of " doggishness," to be found anywhere are found among the Moslems, and that too, oftentimes, when the days of youth have long since passed away. It is natural, therefore, that to the Moslem the idea of God as one who cannot look upon any, even the most secret sin, without loathing and hatred, is one removed at least from all practical influence upon his life. This point needs to be carefully observed in order that the extent and meaning of the doctrine of God in the Mohammedan system may be justly weighed. But it still holds true that the great fundamental truth of all religion, although it is held by the Moslem in connection with a practical ignoring of some of the most essential of the divine attributes, is still the one corner-stone of his system,

and of its success in the world. And although it is not necessary for our purpose here to state the several doctrines of Islam in detail, it may be well to add that its doctrine of decrees is a doctrine of fate; the doctrine concerning the human will is of a "partial will"; i.e. will in man is distinguished, on the one hand from the instinct of mere animals, and on the other hand is distinguished, in a marked manner and in well known terms, from "the absolute will" of God. So that, literally, in this system, "sin is no more sin, and grace is no more grace," and, as has been before observed, no atonement is regarded as necessary, and none is taught. The necessity of regeneration is not recognized. *In* man no radical change is regarded as needful. *For* him no objective atonement is provided. There is a formal righteousness here, and a sensual heaven hereafter. In the life, there is an absence of all rectitude of soul and real pacification of the human conscience. In the conception of God, there is the absence of all just estimate of his most distinguishing moral attributes.

II. THE PRESTIGE OF ISLAM IS DOUBTLESS TO-DAY ONE MAIN ELEMENT OF ITS POWER OVER THE PEOPLE.

From the middle of the seventh century till past the middle of the sixteenth, the successive great Moslem empires were, beyond all question, if we except the great empires founded by the barbarous and terrible Mongul conquerors, the leading powers on the earth (and this exception is, perhaps, unnecessary, for those gigantic empires, though founded by merciless conquerors who swept the whole of Asia almost with irresistible fury, hardly outlived their founders. Humanity itself, the very earth, hastened to obliterate the memory and the works of such a blood-thirsty fiend as Timour the Lame). Not alone to Mohammedans themselves, but to the Christian nations as well, the worldly power of Islam appeared, through all those centuries, invincible. Mohammed had not been in his grave twenty years, when, in Egypt and Syria, some of the fairest possessions of the Christian church were subjected to the rule of the successors.

of the Arabian prophet. Before Mohammedanism was one century old the Moslem rulers had subjected all Africa, and had founded a powerful empire, long famous for its military and literary glory, in Spain. And although, after their defeat by Charles Martel in the battle of Tours in 732, their farther conquests in Europe were stayed for more than six centuries, still their prestige suffered nothing, either among Mohammedans or Christians. The Crusades, while they naturally embittered Moslems against Christians, and furnished a good pretence, if not a justification, for the invasion of Europe by Moslem conquerors in subsequent years, certainly added to the glory of the Moslem arms. Think of the millions of European soldiers who followed, as their leaders, knights, dukes, princes, kings, and emperors to Palestine and to Egypt, and melted like snow on the battle-plain of Moslem countries, and some conception of the rapid growth of Moslem power and glory and prestige can thus, perhaps, be gained. But one of the most signal successes of Islam was its conquest, as a religion, of its own conquerors, the Seljuk Turks, who, besides possessing the existing Arabic kingdom and caliphate in Asia, founded Mohammedan empires in Syria, Persia, and Asia Minor, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which have held a most prominent place in the world's history; not even receiving serious permanent harm from those terrible Mongul conquerors, Zengis Khan, at the end of the twelfth century, and his descendant, Timour the Lame, at the end of the fourteenth. After the newly founded Ottoman empire, which from that time to this has been the chief bulwark of Mohammedanism, had recovered somewhat from the wounds it suffered at the hands of the bloody Timour, the Turkish sultans began their victorious march westward. Orkhan, the second Ottoman ruler, made Brusa his capital; and, later, in the fourteenth century, his son, the first Murad, established his capital at Adrianople, in Europe itself. His son, the fiery Bayazid, is one of the boasted names of Turkish history. The second Mohammed took Constantinople in 1453; and till the end of the reign of Soleyman, the mag-

nificent, in 1566 (whose whole reign of forty-six years was one blaze of glory to the empire), the prestige of Islam, and of its defenders the sultans, had not at all been dimmed. The Moslems had not, till that time, taken one step backward in the path of glory. Their power in arms and conquest was at its zenith, and had no worthy rival. The dread crescent appeared a crescent still; well might "the faithful" believe, as some do to this day, that all the rulers of the world wear their crowns at the permission and bestowment of "his august and imperial majesty the ruler of the two seas and the two lands." It is not in human nature that a political and military history so glorious as Mohammedanism had put upon record at the date above mentioned, should not have a very great influence on the devotees of that faith to this day. And it must not be forgotten that this glory and prestige are perpetuated, as has been done among all other civilized nations. Tradition perpetuates them; anecdote, proverbs, narratives from the lives and acts and words of such Sultans as Soleyman, Murad, Bayazid, Mohammed, Ahmed, Mahmud and Selim are preserved, and told still in cafés and by fire-sides all over Turkey. Minute and careful histories of all the great facts of the past have been written, and constitute what is valuable in Turkish literature. And poetry also has not failed to sing such deeds of daring and heroism and success as delight the minds of the present generation, and awaken, at least, some aspirations to emulate those great acts of the caliphs and their armies when Islam was in its glory.

But beyond the influence of tradition, history, or poetry, or all these put together, is the influence of the great mosques. The greatest names in Turkish history, and thus the great acts, and the glory of those acts, are perpetuated in solid and imposing buildings, not given to state uses, not devoted as mere monuments of great deeds, but consecrated to the worship of God. First at Brusa, then at Adrianople, then, and more numerous, at Constantinople, these buildings—surpassing, beyond all comparison in cost, in solidity, in impres-

siveness, not only private dwellings but all public edifices, — have been in turn erected by Orkhan, Murad, Bayazid, Selim, Soleyman, Ahmed, Mohammed the conqueror of Constantinople, and Mahmoud ; and any one knows, who has visited Constantinople, how these mosques (with that one wrested from its original design and use as a Christian cathedral, St. Sophia, and which now forms the brightest gem of all in the crown of the Moslem's boasting) constitute, aside from the natural grandeur of its site, the glory of the city. The writer has lived for years in Constantinople, and repeatedly gazed at the whole city from every possible point of view ; and the image of the city now in my mind is chiefly that of these great historic monuments, at once of Islam conquest and the Islam faith. They overshadow everything. Their minarets, their domes, are seen from sea and gulf, and from the land on every side. They are preaching to the people in the morning, at noon, at evening, by sunlight and by moonlight, of the glory and power of Islam. No change comes over them. They, with the splendid tombs of their illustrious dead, seem above all possibility of decay. Europe may talk of the weakness of Turkey ; we may assert that Islam has had its day ; but the mosques of St. Sophia, of Ahmed, near it, of Soleyman (more grandly beautiful than either), and others only just inferior to these peerless temples, are standing in unchanged majesty, proclaiming loudly five times each day from their minarets, and silently all the day and all the night, from year to year, from age to age, from century to century, — who can tell with what all-controlling power to the masses of the adherents of Islam, — the glory, the abiding glory, of their faith, their history, their worship.

III. THE POWER OF ISLAM CONSISTS LARGELY IN ITS PECULIAR POLITY AND DISCIPLINE.

The use, in an ecclesiastical sense, of the words "polity" or "discipline" in reference to the Mohammedan religion is, of course, a use by accommodation ; for "ecclesiastical," as distinguished and separate from "civil," does not exist among

the devotees of that faith. The Roman Catholic church has furnished to the Christian world an impressive and striking example of the power of ecclesiastical dogmas, commands, and interdicts, when supported and made effective for the enslaving of men by a supreme and irresistible civil power. But the religion of the Moslems is indissolubly connected, rather it is fused and made indistinguishably one, with their duties to the state.

a. Islam has no strictly and distinctively religious officers. This will appear, probably, a startling statement, and it is one I would not have ventured to make some years ago; but from what follows its truth will appear evident. There is, however, one singular exception; viz. the muezzin, that is, the man who calls the hours of prayer from the minaret. He is scarcely an officer at all, and frequently mere boys, with sonorous and clear voices, are appointed for this service. But the office or duty, such as it is, is strictly religious. There is another seeming exception, which is not a real one; and that is found in the large and numerous sects of Dervishes scattered all through Mohammedan countries. These sects present the singular spectacle of really religious, as distinguished from secular bodies, professedly Mohammedan, and, therefore, directly protected by Mohammedan governments, while really caring nothing either for Mohammed or his religion. These bodies fully recognize, and make much of, the ancient and Oriental distinction between the esoteric and exoteric, the initiated and the uninitiated; and asceticism, superstition, hypocrisy, religious pride, and the other abnormal phenomena of man's religious nature, find among them abundant and striking illustration. But they are only parasites on Mohammedanism, and do not at all show what that religion itself is, either in its doctrines, its worship, or its relations to man's social or civil life.

It will, of course, be expected, in a system where Islam is a state religion, that the king, the sultan, should have prerogatives of a religious as well as civil nature. It is well known that the sultan is the successor of the prophet. But

this idea is familiar to us even though in our own country no such relation exists. Everywhere else, in Christian countries, this idea would not be found foreign to the conceptions of the people.

We will now examine certain terms, and certain titles of office that are generally supposed, among us, to be appropriated to strictly religious duties :

(1) The term *Oolema* has been used as corresponding to "clergy" with us. In justification of this use, it is granted that the Turkish *Oolema*, as a body, are the intelligent, influential, and zealous supporters of the Mohammedan faith ; and that, educated as they are in Mohammedan learning, — the Koran, traditions, the Arabic language, etc., — they are the instructors of the masses of the people in the elements of the same learning. But the term in question means simply "the learned," and has no properly religious sense or application. Civil officers, equally with the so-called religious officers, come from the *Oolema*, and in the apprehension of Mohammedans themselves there is no religious sense to the term.

(2) The term *Mulla*. — This is a literary term, meaning "master," and is given to those pupils of the higher schools who have distinguished themselves in their studies, and is retained afterwards, as a title of distinction, when they become judges or teachers.

(3) *Sheikh ul Islam* and *Mufti*. — These terms, among us, are often supposed to be nearly correspondent to archbishop or primate, and bishop, respectively. It is supposed that the mufti, for example, hears and decides religious questions or causes on, and according to, the Koranic or religious law, while civil causes belong to the hakim or *cadi* (judge) ; but this is not the distinction. The difference is in the method of the inquiry and the grounds of the opinion given. The mufti hears any cause presented to him, and gives his opinion, somewhat as our grand jury does ; while it remains for the judge, as to our petit jury, to call witnesses, *pro* and *con*, and decide on the evidence. The opinion of the mufti is,

however, as a matter of fact, usually final in the great majority of cases presented to him. The cases, too, in which his opinion is sought, it should be observed, are often questions of casuistry, or of the interpretation of law ; and the sheikh ul Islam is simply the first mufti of the empire, a very high officer of the government. His office is nearer that of our attorney-general than to any other known among us.

(4) *The Imam or priest.* — This is, perhaps, the most universal officer in Mohammedan countries. Every mosque, every quarter of every city, has an imam ; and the officer is, partly, at least, a religious one. The care of the mosque, the leading of the devotions of the people in the mosque at the stated seasons, are among his duties. But he is also clerk or registrar of his quarter, attends funerals, both as priest and undertaker, performs marriages (marriage is not, with Moslems, a sacrament — not religious, but civil), etc. ; and he has properly no concern with the strictly spiritual instruction of the people. There are, connected with the principal mosques, or itinerating from one to another, *preachers* ; but they do not form a distinct office, and are not an essential to the Mohammedan system ; they are from the number of the Oolema.

While, therefore, it appears that Islam has no strictly and exclusively religious officers, it is a fact, —

b. That all the officers of the Mohammedan state are officers of its faith, and every man, official or unofficial, is engaged for the establishment and preservation of “ecclesiastical” discipline.

The schools teach Arabic, the sacred language, and the tenets and customs of “the faith,” and, except the general schools lately established, they teach little else. There has grown up among the people, in the course of ages, such a “public sentiment” against defection from the national faith, that only the strongest motives which influence human action can avail to make a man break away from his religion. Moreover, to leave the national faith is to deny all one’s rights and duties as a citizen. The Osmanly is the ruling race. Its

religion is Islam. A man cannot drop his faith and keep his citizenship, any more than he could cut out his lungs and still breathe. And while the death-penalty for defection from Islam is formally abolished, and there live certain Christian Turks in the capital, yet they are considered as expatriated ; while every expedient, of persuasion, of intimidation, of interest, is used openly and secretly, officially and by friends and neighbors, to keep the ranks of the Moslems unbroken. Every man is, as regards his profession, and the public discharge of the prescribed duties of Islam, under the surveillance of all his neighbors ; and any dereliction is not a religious offence merely, but an offence against the state, a failure to meet one's duties as an Osmanly citizen.

Defection from Islam into infidelity, however, provided there remains the shell even of a profession of the national faith, is tolerated ; and instances of this are numerous and well known. This fact is another evidence that the Moslem cares little for his faith considered as a religion, while it makes it the more evident that he holds to it with the utmost tenacity considered as a symbol of that national glory and glory of conquest which is the proudest boast of his citizenship.

c. Islam makes no attempt to retain the heart-service of its devotees. Witness the numerous tribes of Kuzelbash Koords, who often curse Mohammed in secret, and to whom the Koran is no more than the Vedas. Witness the crowds of dervish sects. Witness the infidels of the present day, on the model of French infidelity. The same is true also in reference to those who have become convinced of the truth of evangelical Christianity. There are such men, some scores at least, known to us. But those who, in the face of all the opposition, have had the boldness to declare themselves Christians, and then live as Christians, are very few. Said a general in the army to a captain who had acknowledged himself a Christian : " Be a Christian if you want to ; it is nobody's business what you are at heart, what you believe, but keep it to yourself. Be outwardly a Moslem, and you may be as devout

a Christian as you please at heart, and keep your place. I don't care for my religion any more than you do ; but if you declare yourself a Christian, I'll disgrace you." This fairly represents the sentiments of the great body. Said a gentleman, high in office in the government, to me : " With us, a man's religion, strictly speaking, is entirely a thing between himself and God ; no man and no power on earth has the right to interfere with it. It is only when what a man says or does publicly implicates him in some offence as a citizen that any authority can take hold of him." Very many would not accept language so strong as this, but doubtless it is not very far from correct as expressing the fact that the discipline of Islam concerns only the outward, and makes no claim to control the inner belief. At the same time it is manifest that the natural tendency of all this is, in the highest degree, demoralizing. It directly encourages, in fact it gives a premium to, hypocrisy, and makes its premium greatest when duplicity and hypocrisy are most artful and complete.

In conclusion, it is obvious to remark, although it is common to forget, that Islam is not heathenism. It differs most materially in its fundamental doctrines and in its entire cultus from heathenism. And Moslems themselves recoil with the greatest aversion from heathenism in every form. Again, while we must not suppose, because the Moslem is ready to receive from the Christian the superior benefits of his material civilization, that he is, therefore, ready to receive the Christian's faith ; and while, as yet, efforts for the conversion of Mohammedans have met with little encouraging and enduring result, still it must not be supposed that effort for the enlightenment of Moslems in reference to the saving truths of Christianity is vain ; unless, at the same time, we are prepared to limit the power of divine truth to races of men. Because Mohammedans have preferred their own faith to the corrupt Christianity which it superseded, is no reason why they will persist in preferring their own faith, when it has grown effete, to a Christianity truthfully taught and illustrated worthily by living examples.

Finally, it is fitting to observe that Christian faith, instructed by history, may fairly expect that when God has used the religion of the Arabian prophet, as he has long done, to shame and rebuke the unworthy and false representatives of Christianity who have lived side by side with Mohammedans, for as long a time as shall subserve his wise purposes of discipline or of punishment, he will make effective, by his providence and by his Spirit, the means used for the enlightenment and Christianization of the Moslem races, and greatly increase those means in volume and in spiritual power.

The power of Islam is yet to wane and fail before the power of Jesus and his gospel. The gospel is adapted to accomplish the destruction of that which opposes it. It waits the worthy exercise of faith on the part of the Christian church, and when that faith is so exhibited we may then be ready to see and acknowledge that the waiting on the part of God's providence was but apparent.

ARTICLE VII.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE RAWLINSON THEORY RESPECTING THE SITE OF UR OF THE CHALDEES.

We have received, and here insert extracts from, a letter of Rev. Lucien H. Adams, an excellent missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., who describes his recent tour in Mesopotamia, and his detention at the modern Oorfa. He believes that the ancient "Ur of the Chaldees" was *at or near* the present Oorfa. A theory, however, which about twenty years since was advocated by Sir Henry Rawlinson, and has been restated in Smith's Bible Dictionary by Rev. George Rawlinson, D.D., is that Abraham's birth-place was at least four hundred miles from Oorfa; that the patriarch was born in Mugheir, originally a seaport upon the Persian Gulf, but moved one hundred and twenty-five miles inland in consequence of alluvial deposits, and six miles from the Euphrates, upon its western bank, and that a tribe, including Abraham's family, migrated to Haran upon its way to Palestine. Mr. Adams objects to what he terms the Rawlinson theory, because it opposes a tradition of twenty centuries, opposes the opinions of many emi-