

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL, 1832.

ART. I.—REVIEW.

Book on the Soul, First part. Book on the Soul, Second part. By the Rev. T. H. Gallaudet, &c.

THERE is, perhaps, no field for benevolent enterprise, which has been more neglected, or which promises a richer harvest to the cultivator, than the preparation of suitable books for children. It is somewhat surprising that the attention of philanthropists has been so little turned to this subject, and that while so much has been published of late on the importance of education, and of commencing our efforts early, so little has been done in the way of furnishing the means of communicating knowledge to the minds of children. At first view, it seems an easy task to prepare such books as are needful for the instruction of youth; yet when we come to ponder the subject deeply, we cannot but confess, that it is a work of extreme difficulty. We do not speak of the elementary books which are needful to teach the art of reading: these, however useful, communicate no instruction to the mind; they only furnish one means of acquiring knowledge. We refer to books adapted to the minds of children in the several stages of their development, and which are calculated, especially, to train the thoughts, 'to teach the young idea how to shoot;' and by which their

VOL. IV. No. II.—T

the sanction of the celebrated scholar who prepared the second; Dr. Wilkins having examined every sheet before the final impression.

We have said thus much about this sumptuous and colossal book, because the increasing taste and zeal for Oriental studies give an interest to every thing adapted to facilitate and forward them. We have no idea that it will find its way into many private libraries; but we do think that it should have place upon the shelves and tables of those public institutions, where the taste for such pursuits is generally fostered, and sometimes created, by accidental contact with a work like this. A larger supply of philological appliances, and a freer access to them, on the part of students, would, we think, without constraint, or even formal exhortation, do a great deal for the benefit of biblical, classical, and oriental learning. Many scholars, both in Europe and America, can, no doubt, trace their relish for the course of study which they have pursued, to incidents almost too trivial for remembrance; the opening of a book, a casual conversation, or an item of intelligence. Philological reading-rooms have done much good, not so much by direct operation on the intellect, as by their indirect influence upon the taste. Why may they not be multiplied?

ART. V.—HISTORICAL STATEMENTS OF THE KORAN.*

THE Mohammedan imposture is, in some respects, the most remarkable of all false religions. The specious simplicity of its essential doctrines, and its perfect freedom from idolatry, distinguish it forever from the gross mythology of classical and oriental paganism. But besides these characteristics, it displays a third, more interesting still. We mean the peculiar relation which it bears to Christianity. Whether it happened from a happy accident or a sagacious policy, we think it clear that Islam owes a vast proportion of its vast success, to the fact that Mohammed built upon another man's foundation. Assuming the correctness of the common doc-

* The citations in this article are chiefly in the words of Sale, with occasional departures from his phraseology, too minute to need specification. Where there is more than a verbal difference, the reader is apprized of it.

trine that the impostor was a brilliant genius, though a worthless libertine, and that his book is the offspring, not of insane stupidity, but of consummate artifice, there certainly is ground for admiration in the apparent union of simplicity and efficacy in the whole design. The single idea of admitting freely the divine legation of the Hebrew seers, and exhibiting himself as the topstone of the edifice, the Last Great Prophet, and the Paraclete of Christ, has certainly the aspect of a master stroke of policy. Besides conciliating multitudes of Jews and soi-disant Christians, at the very first, this circumstance has aided the imposture not a little ever since. It relieves the Moslem doctors from the dire necessity of waging war against both law and gospel. Whatever can be cited from the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, without disparaging Mohammed, they admit as readily as any Jew or Christian. Whatever, on the contrary, is hostile to his doctrines or pretensions, or at all at variance with the statements of the Koran, is disposed of, not by an absolute rejection of the Bible, but by a resort to the convenient supposition of corruption in the text. It is not the policy of Islam to array itself against the Jewish and the Christian dispensations, as an original and independent system; but to assume the same position in relation to the Gospel, which the Gospel seems to hold in relation to the Law—or, in other words, to make itself the grand dénouement of that grand scheme, of which the Old and New Testaments were only the preparatory stages. Indeed, if we were fully satisfied that the Rasool Allah* had any plan at all, we should be disposed to account for it in this way. He was acquainted with three forms of religion, Judaism, Christianity, and Paganism. Disgusted with the latter, he was led, we may suppose, to make some inquiries into the points of difference, between the Jews and Christians. This he could not do, without discovering their singular relation to each other—the Christians acknowledging the Scriptures of the Jews, but adding others to them, and regarding Jesus Christ as the Messiah—the Jews on the other hand rejecting the New Testament, and bitterly denying the Messiahship of Christ. This fact might very readily suggest the project of a new dispensation—a third one to the Christian, and a second to the Jew. The impostor would thus be furnished with an argument *ad hominem* to stop the mouths of both. To the Jews he

* The Apostle of God. We are not aware that Mohammed ever called himself a prophet.

could say, Did not Moses tell your fathers that a prophet should rise up in the latter days, greater than all before him? I am he. Do you doubt it? Here is a revelation just received from Gabriel. Do not all your sacred books predict the coming of a great deliverer, a conqueror, a king? I am he. In a few months you shall see me at the head of a thousand tribes going forth to the conquest of the world. If this was the ground really taken at first, how striking must have been the seeming confirmation of these bold pretensions, when Mohammed and his successors had in fact subjected, not Arabia only, but Greece, Persia, Syria, and Egypt.

To the objection of the Christians, that the line of prophets was long since completed, he could answer, Did not Jesus come to abrogate or modify the law, when its provisions were no longer suited to the state of things? Even so come I, to supersede the Gospel—not to discredit, but to render it unnecessary, by a more extensive and authoritative doctrine. So far from being antichrist (as some no doubt objected) I am the very Comforter whom Jesus promised.

That such sophistry might easily have undermined the faith of renegadoes and half-pagan Christians, is certainly conceivable. Whether this was in fact the course adopted in the infancy of Islam, will admit a doubt. Be that as it may, it is certain, that the impostor considered it expedient to incorporate the leading facts of sacred history into his revelation, so far as they were known to him. That his knowledge of the subject was imperfect, need not excite our wonder. The sources which probably supplied his information, could scarcely be expected to emit a purer stream than that which irrigates the pages of the Perspicuous Book.

Sale's Koran is a very common book, and has passed through a surprising number of editions, considering its character. The text is, however, of necessity so dull, that nobody can read it patiently for fifteen minutes, without taking refuge in the more amusing matter of the notes and preface. Were there any continuity, connexion, consistency, or unity to be discovered in it, this would be of less importance. But in such a jumble of discordant elements, it is hard to get any information by just reading on in course. Remote parts must be brought together, and arranged, in order to enucleate the mysteries of Islam; a task which most would look upon as vastly disproportioned to the value of the object. And yet it is important that the Koran should be better understood.

It is daily growing more important, and will very soon be thought imperatively necessary. Theological students who look forward to the missionary service, are too apt to under-rate one class of difficulties, while perhaps they magnify another. You will find a man hesitating whether he shall run the risk of being bastinadoed, or of dying with the plague, while he forgets that if he had a perfect security against infection, and corporeal violence, he might still be disappointed and defeated in his whole design. That a man should go to convert the Moslems, with an impression on his mind, that they are fools or children, is not merely proof of ignorance on his part, but a melancholy omen for the cause which he espouses. It would be well, therefore, if at this time, when the Mohammedans are objects of so much attention to the friends of missions, a little preparatory study could be spent upon the Koran. It is certainly desirable that he who undertakes the instruction of a Mussulman, should know what the false opinions are which he must combat. If he expects to find the mind of his catechumen a *tabula rasa* on the subject of religion, he will find himself most grievously at fault. Such strength of prejudice has rarely been exhibited, as that which is the product of a thorough education in the doctrines of Mohammed, aggravated, as it must be, by the fixed belief of fatalism. No less erroneous, on the other hand, is the opinion, that the Moslem's creed is wholly false, and must be utterly destroyed before the truth can find admission. There are two questions, therefore, which the missionary should know how to answer: what are the peculiar dogmas of Mohammed's system? and what has it in common with the true religion? It ought to be considered as a great advantage, that the facts of sacred history are not wholly unknown to the Mohammedans. For though they may consider our intelligence as borrowed from their Book, it is, nevertheless, something to be able to appeal to striking facts, by way of illustration, confirmation, or induction. This might, as it were, present a vulnerable point, when all the rest is shielded in impenetrable prejudice. A beginning might be made by a judicious use of facts which they believe as well as we, from which occasion might be taken to correct the errors of Mohammed's narrative, and eventually to demonstrate and explain important truths.

What are these facts, then? or, in other words, how large a portion of the sacred history has been wrought into the Ko-

ran, and thereby placed beyond the reach of cavil on the part of all true Moslemin?

There is but one passage in the Koran, we believe, where a connected account is given of the creation of the world, though it is frequently mentioned incidentally as God's immediate and almighty act. The passage alluded to occurs in the forty-first chapter, and is very brief. The amount of it is, that God made the universe in six days, two of which were employed upon the earth, two more upon its products, and the remaining two upon the heaven. The latter, we are told, was made of smoke into which it is again to be resolved hereafter.* This element was moulded into seven distinct heavens, each having its own office. In the lowest of the seven the great lights were placed.

In glancing at this passage, we have had occasion to observe Sale's assiduity in striving to impart coherence and significance to his author's text—not by false or loose translation, nor by sheer interpolation, but by adding something to fill up the yawning chasms of the porous and Perspicuous Book. In a word, he makes Mohammed say in English, not what he does, but what he should have said in Arabic; a harmless artifice, so far as substance is concerned, but disingenuous, so far as it conveys too high a notion of the pseudo-prophet's merits. For example, after stating the creation of the earth, Mohammed says, he blessed it, and provided therein its food, or their food, (for the words admit of either sense). What says Sale? "He blessed it and provided therein the food of the creatures designed to be the inhabitants thereof." To the last eight words there is nothing corresponding in the Arabic.

One thing more in this account of the creation may deserve our notice, "He said to the heaven and the earth, come either obediently or against your will; they answered, we come obedient to thy will." This was obviously intended as a match for that inimitable sentence, "God said, Let there be light, and light was." One can hardly help smiling at the Irish sublimity of poor Mohammed's master-piece, the alternative proposed to two nonentities, and their sagacious choice. It is but just, however, to admit, that the language may be considered as addressed to the heavens and the earth after they were created, but before they were arranged and beautified.

* See the chapter entitled *Smoke*. Sale, vol. ii. c. 41. Lond. 1801.

The Genii, we are told in the chapter of Al Hejr,* were made of *subtle fire*, as Sale translates it. The original words are *nar semum*,† the latter term properly denoting the hot wind of the desert called *simoom* by travellers. There is something poetical in this idea, which would, no doubt, strike the fervid fancy of a Bedouin with mighty force. The account of the creation and fall of man is scattered piecemeal through the Koran. The narrative is given, more or less completely in the second, seventh, eighth, fifteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth chapters. By putting together the *disjuncta membra*, we make out this story. After the earth and angels were created, God announced to the latter his intention to create a *khalif* or vicegerent upon earth. The angels are represented as remonstrating, and saying, "Wilt thou place there one who will do mischief and shed blood, whereas we celebrate thy praise and glorify thee? What suggested their forbodings is not mentioned. The only reply was, "I know that which ye know not."‡ Agreeably to this annunciation, a body was formed of black mud and dried clay, into which God breathed a spirit.§ Adam, thus produced, was taught by revelation the names of all the animals, which were then presented to the angels with these words, "Declare the names of these, if ye are upright!" They said, "God forbid! we have no other knowledge than that which thou hast given us: thou art the Knowing and the Wise!" He said, "Adam, tell them the names of these!" When Adam had told their names, God said, "Did I not tell you that I knew the mysteries of heaven and earth?"|| The angels were then required to worship Adam. All did so except Iblis, who, Mohammed says, "was of the genii, and resisted the commandment of his Lord."¶ From this it appears that the Jinn or Genii were included under the term Angels or Malayic. Whether they were before this *evil* spirits, we are left to guess. The prophet's notions seem to have been exceedingly confused.

In another place we find the following dialogue between the Almighty and the devil.

Allah. 'O Iblis, what hindereth thee from worshipping that which I have created with my hands? Art thou elated with vain pride, or art thou really one of exalted merit?'

* c. xv.

§ xv. 25. 28.

† xv. 26.

|| ii. 30, &c.

‡ ii. 30.

¶ xviii. 50.

Iblis. 'I am better than he; thou hast created me of fire, and hast created him of clay.'

Allah. 'Get thee hence, therefore, for thou shalt be driven away from mercy, and my curse shall be upon thee till the day of judgment.'

Iblis. 'Oh Lord respite me till the day of resurrection.'

Allah. 'Verily thou shalt be one of the respited.'

Iblis. 'By thy might I swear, that I will surely seduce them all, except thy servants who shall be peculiarly chosen from among them.'

Allah. 'It is a just sentence: I speak the truth: I will fill hell with thee, and with such as follow thee.'**

The same account, substantially, is given in the seventh and fifteenth chapters. In one of these passages, *Iblis* is made to say, 'Because thou hast seduced or deceived me (*Sale* says *depraved*,) I will lie in wait for men in thy strait way; and I will come upon them from before and from behind, and from their right-hand and from their left, and thou shalt not find the greater part of them thankful.†

Such is the account of the apostacy of *Iblis*. Its immediate consequence was the fall of man, which is related thus: "God said to *Iblis*, Get thee hence, despised and driven away! Verily, whoever shall follow thee, I will surely fill hell with you all. But as for thee, O Adam, dwell thou and thy wife in the garden, and eat of it wherever ye will, but approach not this tree, lest ye be of the wicked. And Satan (i. e. the adversary, as in Hebrew) whispered to them that he would reveal their nakedness which was concealed from them. And he said, your Lord has not excluded you from this tree, except for fear that you should become angels or immortal. And he swore to them, I am one of those who give good counsel. And he caused them to fall by his deceit. And when they had tasted of the tree, their nakedness appeared to them, and they began to join the leaves of the garden upon themselves. And their Lord called to them saying, Did I not forbid you this tree, and tell you that Satan was your avowed enemy? They said, Our Lord we have sinned against our own souls, and unless thou forgive us and have mercy upon us, we shall certainly be of those who perish."‡ "And Adam learned words (*of prayer*, *Sale* adds) from his Lord, and he turned unto him, for he is easy to be turned

* xxxviii. 76—86.

† vii. 16, 17.

‡ vii. 18—23.

and merciful. And God said, Go down, the one of you an enemy to the other, and there shall be a dwelling place for you on earth and provision for a season.”* “Therein shall ye live and therein shall ye die, and therefrom shall ye be taken forth (Sale adds, *at the resurrection.*)† “There shall come to you a direction from me, and as many as obey that direction shall be free from fear and grief; but as many as disbelieve and charge our signs with falsehood, shall be companions of hell-fire. Therein shall they dwell forever.”‡

The account of Cain and Abel is very brief. Brief as it is, however, there was room for one sheer fabrication, borrowed from the Rabbins. “Tell them the story of the two sons of Adam truly. When they offered an offering, and it was accepted from one of them and not from the other, he said, (*Cain said to his brother*, quoth Sale) I will kill thee. He said (*Abel said*, id.) God accepteth gifts from those who fear him. If thou stretch forth thy hand against me to slay me, I will not stretch forth my hand against thee to slay thee, for I fear God the Lord of the Universe. I am willing that thou shouldst bear my iniquity and thine own iniquity, and that thou shouldst become one of the companions of hell-fire; for that is the reward of the unrighteous. And his soul permitted him to slay his brother, and he slew him, and become one of those who perish. And God sent a raven which scratched the earth, to teach him how he should hide his brother’s nakedness. Then he said, wo is me! am I unable to be like this raven that I may hide my brother’s nakedness? And he became one of the penitent. On this account, we prescribed it to the children of Israel, that whoever slays a soul without a soul (i. e. probably, *without having slain a soul*) or without having acted wickedly in the earth, shall be as if he had slain all mankind, and he who saveth a soul alive, shall be as if he had saved the lives of all mankind.”§ This last fine sentiment is finely countenanced by the repeated order to exterminate the infidels, and the many promises of everlasting happiness to those who die upon the field of battle.

It will be observed, that in the narrative just given, the names of Adam’s sons do not occur at all, except in Sale’s translation. We have no recollection of their being mentioned elsewhere. Noah, the Koran says, was sent to warn his

* ii 36, 37.

† vii, 26.

‡ ii, 38.

§ v. 29—34.

contemporaries, and remained among them “a thousand years save fifty.”* The only persons, who submitted to his guidance were obscure and abject; the nobles and the wealthy stood aloof. At length it was revealed to Noah, that all had believed who would believe, and he was directed to construct a vessel. While engaged upon this task, he was treated with general derision and contempt. At last the appointed time arrived, “and the oven poured forth boiling water.”† The narrative then proceeds as follows: “We said unto Noah, carry into the ark of every kind of animal one pair, and thine own family (excepting him on whom sentence had already passed) and those who believe. And there believed not with him except a few. And Noah said, embark upon it in the name of God, while it floats and while it is at rest. Surely my Lord is merciful and gracious. And it floated with them upon waves like mountains; and Noah called to his son who was separated from them, Oh my son embark with us and be not with the unbelievers. He said, I will ascend a mountain which will secure me from the water. He said, there is no security to day from the decree of God except for him on whom he shall have mercy. And a wave passed between them, and he was one of the drowned. And it was said, oh earth swallow up thy water, and oh heaven withhold! And the water subsided, and the decree was accomplished, and it (the ark) rested on Al Judi; and it was said, away with the ungodly people! And Noah called upon his Lord and said, oh my Lord, my son is one of my family, and thy promise is true, for thou art the most just of those who judge. God said, Noah, he is not one of thy family; this is not a righteous work (viz. his intercession). Ask not of me that of which thou hast no knowledge, I admonish thee not to be one of the ignorant.”‡ Noah then acknowledges his fault, leaves the ark, and receives a benediction. At the close of the history the prophets adds, as if apprehensive that some of the faithful might have been beforehand with him, “This is a secret history which we reveal unto thee; thou didst not know it, neither did thy people before this.”§

With respect to Abraham,¶ there are many statements and allusions in the Koran. The substance of his history is this. While yet a boy, he was led to disbelieve in the idolatrous religion of his father and his countrymen. Having secretly

* xxix. 14.

§ xi. 49.

† xi. 40.

¶ Ibrahim.

‡ xi. 40—46.

renounced the worship of images, he was in doubt, to what object he should pay his adorations. He first pitched upon the sun and moon, but afterwards reflected that their setting every day rendered them unworthy of divine honours. He came at last to the conclusion, therefore, that he would worship God alone.* Having formed this resolution, he remonstrated with his father on the folly of idolatry. Ezer, however, as Mohammed calls him, rebuked his son severely and threatened him with death.† Even this, it seems, did not deter the young reformer from playing a bold and witty trick upon his pagan friends. Absenting himself from one of their festivals, “he went into the temple where the idols stood, and he brake them all in pieces except the biggest of them, that they might lay the blame upon that. And when they were returned and saw the havoc which had been made, they said who hath done this to our gods? He is certainly an impious person. And certain of them answered, We heard a young man speak reproachfully of them: he is named Abraham. They said bring him therefore before the eyes of the people, that they may bear witness against him. And when he was brought before the assembly, they said to him, hast thou done this unto our gods, oh Abraham? He answered, nay, but that biggest one of them hath done it; ask them if they can speak. And they came to themselves, and said one to the other, verily ye are the impious persons. Afterwards they turned down upon their heads (i. e. *relapsed*) and said, verily thou knowest that these cannot speak. Abraham said, do ye therefore worship besides (or instead of) God that which cannot profit you at all, neither can it hurt you! Fie on you and upon that which ye worship besides God! Do ye not understand? They said, Burn him and avenge your Gods. (And when Abraham was cast into the burning pile‡) we said, oh fire be thou cold, and a preservation unto Abraham. And they sought to lay a plot against him, but we caused them to be the sufferers.”§ After this miraculous preservation, he boldly inveighed against idolatry in public, but without effect. Lot alone believed, in company with whom Abraham forsook his native country “to go to the place which the Lord had commanded him.”||

* vi. 74—79.

† xix. 46.

‡ These nine words are interpolated by Sale.

§ xxi. 58—69. (Sale, vol. ii. p. 158. Lond. 1801.)

|| xxix. 26.

The reader will have observed, amidst the fiction and obscurity of these details, not a few glimpses of the truth from which they were derived. We find the case the same as we pursue the narrative. The very next step brings us to a lamentable travesty of Genesis, xv. 7—12. “Abraham said, Lord show me how thou wilt raise the dead. Dost thou not believe? He said, yes, but that my mind may be at ease. He said, take then four birds, and divide them, and place a piece on every mountain. Then call them and they will come to thee in haste; and know that God is mighty and merciful.”*

The visit of the angels is related with laudable accuracy as to some particulars, and woful want of it in others. The object of their coming and the mode of their reception, are correctly stated. But the laughter of Sarah is made to precede the promise of a son.† This slight anachronism has occasioned an incredible deal of pains to the Mohammedan commentators who, we need not say, are very numerous, voluminous, minute, and silly. They have attempted in vain to account for Sarah’s laughter, and the ground of its connexion with the promise which ensued. The son thus promised is correctly stated to have been called Isaac;‡ and yet that patriarch is treated, both by the Koran and the commentators, as a very obscure and unimportant personage. He is only mentioned incidentally, and then but briefly. Ishmael§ is constantly brought forward as the leading character. The reason of this is plain. It was intended to exhibit his descendants, instead of the Jews, as the chosen people. The only wonder is, that he was not made the child of promise. We mention it as an instance of the clumsy manner in which Mohammed put his stuff together.||

The account of the incidents immediately preceding the awful overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, so far as it goes, is tolerably accurate. Abraham’s intercession, and the outrageous conduct of the wretched Sodomites, are stated briefly but distinctly. On reaching the catastrophe, the reader is surprised to learn that it was effected by a storm of brickbats! Sale gives it thus, “And when our command came, we

* ii. 259.

† xi. 71.

‡ Is-hak.

§ Ismail.

|| It may have been because the etymology of Isaac’s name would suggest the same idea to an Arab as a Jew, viz. laughter.

turned those cities upside down, and we rained upon them *stones of baked clay*, one following another.”*

The facts in relation to the sacrifice of Isaac, are stated in the thirty-seventh chapter of the Koran, without any material departure from the truth, but also without the touching simplicity and circumstantiality of the original. The last passage which we shall advert to, in the history of Abraham as scattered through the Koran, is purely Koranic, and was obviously designed to trace the imposture of the camel-driver up to the father of the faithful. We give it in the words of Sale, inserting brackets to denote interpolations. “God said, verily I will constitute thee a *model of religion*† unto mankind: he answered, and also of my posterity? God said, my covenant doth not comprehend the ungodly. And we appointed the [holy] house [of Mekka] to be a place of resort for mankind, and a place of security; and said, take the station of Abraham for a place of prayer; and we covenanted with Ismael and Abraham, that they should cleanse my house for those who should compass it and those who should be devoutly assiduous there, and those who should bow down and worship. And Abraham and Ismael raised the foundations of the house, saying, Lord, accept it from us, for thou art he who heareth and who knoweth. Lord, make us all **RESIGNED** unto thee, and of our posterity a people resigned unto thee, and show us our holy ceremonies, and be turned unto us, for thou art easy to be reconciled and merciful. Lord, send them likewise an Apostle from among them, who may declare thy signs unto them, and teach them the book, [of the Koran,] and wisdom, and purify them; for thou art mighty and wise. Who will be averse to the religion of Abraham, but he whose mind is infatuated?‡” This last triumphant interrogatory harmonizes well with the assertion elsewhere made that “Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but a Hanif, or orthodox believer.§

In the passage just quoted, we find the religion of Mohammed identified with the *millah Ibrahim* or religion of Abraham. We also find the origin of the distinctive name of the imposture. The Arabic word which Sale translates *resigned*, is *Moslimin*, a participle. The verb *Aslama* means to yield one’s self up unreservedly. It is used to denote entire resignation to God’s will, and devotion to his service. The par-

* xi. 82. † (Arab.) an Imam. ‡ ii. 124—130. § iii. 67.

tiple Moslim, (plural moslimun, moslimin) is the proper equivalent to our word Mohammedan, which they seldom employ, and signifies one resigned and devoted. The infinitive of the same verb is Islam, resignation and devotion, the term used by Moslems to denote their own religion. and one which might well supersede the uncouth European form, Mohammedanism.

Dr. Scott says, somewhere in his correspondence, that the history of Joseph is worse murdered in the Koran, than his brothers ever wished to murder him. Comparitively speaking, this is quite too harsh a judgment. That narrative, compared with others which Mohammed gives us, is a model of coherence and correctness. There are fewer anachronisms and interpolations here, than in almost any other of his attempts at history. Joseph's dream concerning the sun, moon, and stars, and its effect upon his brethren, are correctly stated. In order to gratify their spite, they are represented as requesting Jacob to send Joseph to the pastures with them. The proposal to kill him, and Reuben's interference, are distinctly mentioned, but without the name of Reuben. They are said, moreover, to have left him in the well, and carried the report of his death to Jacob. "And certain travellers came, and sent one to draw water for them; and he let down his bucket, and said, good news! this is a youth! And they concealed him, that they might sell him as a piece of merchandize."* He is carried to Egypt and sold. The wickedness of his mistress, and his constancy, are related with substantial accuracy; but by an awkward blunder, Joseph is sent to prison after being pronounced innocent. The dreams of the baker and butler, Joseph's interpretation of them, Pharaoh's dream, and Joseph's liberation and promotion, are given, without much deviation from the truth. He is made, however to propose his own elevation to the chair of state.† The famine in Canaan, the journey of Jacob's sons to Egypt, Simeon's detention, the restoration of the money, Benjamin's visit, the recognition of Joseph, and Jacob's emigration are all mentioned. Some embellishments are introduced, no doubt. Jacob is blinded by weeping for the loss of Joseph, and restored to sight by the application of Joseph's under garment. The following nonsense is put into the mouth of the venerable patriarch, on sending his sons a second time to

* xii. 18.

† xii. 53.

Egypt. "My sons, enter not into the city by one and the same gate; but enter by different gates. But this precaution will be of no advantage unto you against the decree of God, for judgment belongeth to him alone." By a ridiculous anachronism, Joseph is made to reveal himself to Benjamin, before the discovery of the cup; and thus the stratagem is left without an object. Joseph's messengers despatched to bring his brethren back, offer a reward of a load of corn, to the man who should produce the cup. His brethren are made to say, "If Benjamin be guilty of theft, his brother Joseph hath been guilty of theft heretofore!"

Still, as we said before, the narrative, compared with others in the book, may be said to be consistent, continuous, and even accurate. At the same time, it should be mentioned as an interesting fact, that from beginning to end, there is no approach to pathos, nor the slightest indication of that masterly acquaintance with the human heart, which shines in the inimitable and divine original. And we venture to say, that no one, after reading the Koran in its native dress, however much he may be pleased with many rhythmical and sonorous passages, will be able to recall one solitary sentence which evinces either tenderness or purity of feeling. Let those who would see this difference between a genuine and spurious revelation exhibited in very striking contrast, read the twelfth chapter of Sale's Koran in connexion with the history of Joseph in the book of Genesis. The comparison is fair; for both are literal translations from cognate dialects. To take a single stroke from either picture as a specimen, we give the account of Joseph's making himself known, as recorded by Moses and Mohammed. "Then Joseph could not refrain himself before all them that stood by him; and he cried, cause every man to go out from me. And there stood no man with him while he made himself known unto his brethren. And he wept aloud. And Joseph said unto his brethren, I am Joseph. Doth my father yet live? And his brethren could not answer him; for they were troubled at his presence. And Joseph said unto his brethren, come near to me, I pray you; and they came near. And he said, I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. Now, therefore, be not grieved nor angry with yourselves, &c. &c. And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept." (Gen. xlv.) "Wherefore Joseph's brethren returned into Egypt: and when they came into his presence they said, noble lord, the famine is felt by us and

our family, and we are come with a small sum of money: *yet give unto us full measure, and bestow corn upon us as alms*; for God rewardeth the alms-givers. Joseph said unto them, do ye know what ye did unto Joseph and his brother, when ye were ignorant of the consequences thereof? They answered, art thou Joseph? He replied, I am Joseph and this is my brother. Now hath God been gracious unto us. They said, now hath God chosen thee above us; and we have surely been sinners. Joseph said, let there be no reproach cast on you this day. God forgiveth you; for he is the most merciful of those who show mercy." (Kor. xii. Sale, vol. ii. p. 50. Lond. 1801.)

The twenty-eighth chapter of the Koran, called The Story, opens with these words: "In the name of God most merciful, T. S. M. These are the signs of the Perspicuous Book. We dictate unto thee some of the history of Moses* and Pharaoh† with truth for those who believe." And accordingly we have a very copious account of the great lawgiver, both in this same chapter and in several others. In reading it over we are struck with the illustration which it yields of the way in which these shreds of sacred history were gathered by the pseudoapostle. We can perceive throughout an effort to retain as much as possible of what he had been told, without regard to the causes and connexions of events. Facts, which are stated in the Scriptures as the natural results of antecedent facts, stand here detached and unaccounted for. This would indeed be in Mohammed's favour, if he were alluding to events already known, as such—just as the allusions in the Psalms and Prophets prove that the Jews were acquainted with the Pentateuch. But such is not the case. Here, as elsewhere, he professes to reveal what was before unknown, and by so doing proves himself a liar. Our object is, to show how much of the Scripture history is borrowed, and how much new matter is interpolated. He mentions Pharaoh's tyranny, and speaks of it as general, though most excessive towards the Hebrews. He mentions the sanguinary edict with respect to Jewish children, and the signal deliverance of Moses from the water, his adoption by Pharaoh's wife (not daughter,) and his strange restoration to his mother as a nurse; his killing the Egyptian, and his flight to Midian,‡ his behaviour

* Musa.

† Firaun.

‡ Madian.

at the well, and his introduction to the family of Jethro, who is here called Shoaib. We are then told, that he served eight years for Shoaib's daughter, a circumstance borrowed from the history of Jacob, who is scarcely ever mentioned except in the history of Joseph, and in a few other cases where his name is joined with those of Abraham and Isaac. Having fulfilled the term of his engagement, he set out for Egypt with his family. While on his journey, he perceived a fire upon the side of Mount Sinai which he turned aside to, with a view to warm himself and ascertain the road.* On his approach, however, a voice commanded him to put off his shoes because he was in the holy valley Towa. The two miracles are then recorded, without any reason for them being given. That of the serpent is correctly stated, but the other is ridiculously misrepresented. The account given by Moses himself is, that he thrust his hand into his bosom and drew it out leprous as snow (*m'tzoraath casshalag*). Whether the former of these words was wanting in the copy of the law which, more or less remotely, furnished Mohammed with his information, or whether his Jewish teacher did not know its meaning, or whether he himself remembered only half of what he heard,—these questions must forever keep their place among the mysteries of which he talks so much. Certain it is, however, that he says not a word of leprosy, and makes the miracle consist in his drawing out his hand *white and uninjured!*† To make the aspect of the thing a little marvellous, the Moslem commentators tell us that Moses was very swarthy, and that his hand underwent a miraculous change of complexion! How much perplexity may be occasioned by the misconception or omission of a word! And oh, how hard, how impossible it is, for awkward imposture to ape the consistent simplicity of truth!

The fact of the prophet's hesitation and reluctance to obey the Lord's injunction, is here mentioned; but the grounds of it are strangely jumbled. "Moses said, oh Lord, I have slain one of them, and I fear they will put me to death; but my brother Aaron§ is of a more eloquent tongue than I; wherefore send him with me for an assistant, that he may gain me credit; for I fear lest they accuse me of imposture."||

Pharaoh charges them with a design to dispossess him of his land by magic, and challenges them to a competition with the

* xxviii. 1—30.
§ Harun.

† Exodus, iv. 6.
|| xxviii. 34, 35.

‡ Koran, xx, 22.

sorcerers of Egypt. Moses accepts the challenge, and a great feast-day is appointed for the contest.* The people assemble, and the magicians come prepared with cords and rods, which they make by their enchantments to appear like serpents. The rod of Moses swallows up the rest, whereupon the magicians publicly acknowledge their belief in the God of Moses and Aaron. Pharaoh, enraged with this defection, threatens them with the severest punishment.

In this part of the narrative, there is a single sentence which is itself a curiosity. Pharaoh said "Oh Haman, burn me clay into bricks, and build me a high tower, that I may ascend unto the God of Moses."† Here we have Haman burning bricks in Egypt, in the days of Moses, for the purpose of building the tower of Babel! We say the tower of Babel, because there is no notice taken elsewhere in the Koran of that striking incident in sacred history, and because the motive here ascribed to Pharaoh is so near akin to that mentioned in Genesis. Gross as the anachronism seems to us, however, the Moslems stedfastly maintain that Haman was prime minister to Pharaoh.

The Egyptians refusing to believe on Moses, were punished by a flood, locusts, lice, frogs, and blood, distinct miracles."‡ These being removed by the intercession of Moses, they broke their promise and refused obedience.‡ Moses was then directed to withdraw with the Israelites at night. Pharaoh pursued them. The sea was divided into twelve parts, separated by as many paths, through which the Hebrews passed, while the Egyptians were all drowned.§ The Israelites proceeding on their journey, came among a people who worshipped idols, whereupon they requested Moses to give them idols also. This he refused; and in obedience to the divine command, fasted forty nights, after which God wrote the law upon tables, and delivered them to him. During his absence, however, the people made a calf *which lowed*, and which they worshipped. The chief agent in this business was one Al Sameri, who declared that he had given life to the calf by sprinkling on it a handful of dust from the footsteps of the Messenger of God. The calf was burnt and pulverized, and Al Sameri condemned to say to every one who met him, Touch me not. A singular speech of Aaron's is recorded here. He is made to say on the return of Moses, "oh, son of my mother, drag me not by my beard nor by the hair of

* xx. 59.

‡ vii. 130, 131.

† xxviii 39.

§ xxvi. 53—67.

my head.”* In a parallel passage it is stated, that Moses threw down the tables, and seized his brother by the hair.†

The division into tribes, which is spoken of as arbitrary, the appointment of the seventy elders, the smiting of the rock, the giving of manna and of quails, are all-recorded.‡ In connexion with these incidents we find the following, which has occasioned no small difficulty to the hapless commentators. “We said, enter into this city (no city had been previously mentioned) and eat of the provisions thereof plentifully as ye will; and enter the gate worshipping and say *Hittaton!* We will pardon your sins and give increase to the well-doers. But the ungodly changed the expression into another different from what had been spoken, &c.”§ The following passages, are no less valuable. “Ask them concerning the city by the sea, when they profaned the Sabbath; when their *fish* came unto them on their Sabbath day, appearing openly on the water, but on the day whereon they did not keep the Sabbath, they came not unto them * * * And when they proudly refused to desist from what had been forbidden them, we said to them, be ye transformed into *apes*, driven away from the society of men * * * And we shook Mount Sinai over them as though it had been a covering.”|| Having despatched the fish and the apes, we must by no means overlook the *cow*, since it has given name to one of the longest chapters in the Koran,¶ and since it affords a proof of the divine legation of Moses, which he has himself forgotten to record. The story may be gathered from the following dialogue:

“*Moses.* God commandeth you to sacrifice a cow.

People. Dost thou make a jest of us?

M. God forbid that I should be one of the foolish!

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us what cow it is.

M. She is neither an old cow nor a heifer, but of middle age between both: do ye therefore what ye are commanded.

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us what colour she is of.

M. He saith, she is a yellow cow, intensely yellow: her colour rejoiceth the beholders.

P. Pray for us unto thy Lord, that he would show us

* xx. 94.

§ ii. 58, 59.

† vii. 146.

|| vii. 153. 156. 161.

‡ ii. and vii.

¶ The second.

further what cow it is; for several cows with us are like one another; and we, if God please, will be directed.

M. He saith, she is a cow not broken to plough the earth or water the field; a sound one, there is no blemish in her.

P. Now hast thou brought the truth.”*

“Then” says the Book, “they sacrificed her; yet they wanted but little of leaving it undone. And when ye slew a man, and contended among yourselves concerning him, we said, strike the dead body with part of the sacrificed cow. Thus God raised the dead to life.”† Among the many animals for which the Moslems entertain a high regard, none, we believe, not even Ezra’s ass, nor the seven sleepers’ dog, is more esteemed than this middle-aged, intensely yellow, cow.

In connexion with the history of Moses, Karun must be mentioned. He is the Cræsus of oriental history and fiction, being described in the Koran as immensely rich. Nothing more is there related of him, except that on account of his presumption and ingratitude, the earth opened and swallowed him up, which identifies him with the Korah of the Pentateuch.‡

The only other incident related of Moses, is a purely fictitious one. It is interesting, however, in itself, and also because it has furnished the conception and the leading incidents of a well-known poem, Parnell’s Hermit. Where Mohammed got it, is a matter of dispute. Lord Teignmouth, we believe, has traced it into Hindostan. The passage in the Koran occupies some pages of the eighteenth chapter.

From Moses, the false prophet takes a sweeping stride to Saul whom he calls Talut. As if to compensate for this yawning chasm, he contrives to bring into connexion with this prince, two facts belonging to two other periods. After mentioning the application made by the Israelites to their prophet (Sale adds *Samuel*, in capitals) for a king to command their hosts, he says that they objected to the person chosen. To remove this difficulty, they were told that a proof of his divine vocation should be given. “Verily the sign of his kingdom shall be that the ark shall come unto you: therein shall be tranquillity from your Lord, and the relics which have been left by the family of Moses and the family of Aaron.

* ii. 67—71.

† ii. 72, 73.

‡ xxviii. 77—83.

The angels shall bring it. Verily, this shall be a sign unto you, if ye believe.”* The word, which Sale here renders tranquillity, is *sekinah* or *sekinaton*, the Hebrew *schechinah*. To the Arabic commentators it seems to have been exceedingly mysterious.

The enemy against whom Talut led the Hebrews, was Goliath, here called Jalut. The form in which these names appear, is easily explained. It is well known, that to an elevated style oriental rhetoric makes jingle an essential requisite. This may result, in part, from organic sensibility, since rhyme is confessedly a product of the east, and since the Hebrew Scriptures furnish some examples of paronomasia.† The proximate cause of this perverted taste, however, is the usage of the Koran, that standing miracle of perfect eloquence, in which not only pages, but whole chapters, have a rhythmus and a rhyme, which to our ears is paltry, but to a Turk’s or Arab’s is the music of the spheres. This childish weakness leads the orientals to take undue liberties with foreign names. The Greeks who were above this folly, had another of their own. Every thing with them must have a meaning, sense or nonsense; and accordingly they tortured Persian and Phœnician simples into Attic compounds. With the Arabs on the other hand, and their disciples, sense must yield to sound. Names historically cognate, must likewise rhyme together. Thus in the case before us, Jalut really varies very little from Goliath, the radicals being the same. But poor Saul is made to rhyme with the Philistine. *Talut and Jalut* is a combination full of beauty to an Asiatic ear. So is *Harut and Marut*, which occurs in this same chapter.‡ So is *Habel and Cabel*, the Mohammedan improvement upon *Cain and Abel*.

In the account of Talut’s campaign against Jalut, the other

* ii 247.

† We say *some* examples, for a part of those collected by Gesenius cannot be fairly reckoned as belonging to this class. His remarks upon the subject have a tendency, indeed, to make the reader think, that the Bible is deformed throughout with this most offensive form of rhetorical affectation, which he calls a *lieblingszierde* of the Hebrew language! We venture to affirm that a large proportion of the cited instances are purely accidental, and might easily be matched by German phrases from the *Lehrgebäude*; and that as to the rest, they almost all occur in peculiar idiomatic and proverbial phrases, not as in Hariri, at the end of every clause of every paragraph, prosaic or poetical.

‡ ii. 102.

misplaced incident, which we referred to, is inserted, Gideon's method of selecting his followers, by their drinking, is transferred to Saul.*

Jalut is killed by David, who is abruptly introduced for the purpose, and correctly spoken of as Saul's successor.† Of David we are elsewhere told, that he was a true penitent, that he was endued with strength, that he was inspired with the art of making coats of mail, that the mountains sang in concert with him, and the birds also, a notion founded probably on the frequent personifications and apostrophes in the book of Psalms.‡ The passage, which we are now about to quote, is an instance of Mohammed's skill in divesting his stolen scraps of all historical, rhetorical, and moral worth. It surpasses even the example before given from the history of Joseph, as a specimen of the Koranic process for the transmutation of pathos into bathos. Let the reader turn to the exquisite parable, by means of which the prophet Nathan touched his master's conscience.§ With that passage fresh in his mind, let him read as follows. "Hath the story of the two adversaries come to thy knowledge; when they ascended over the wall into the upper apartment, when they went in to David, and he was afraid of them? They said, Fear not, we are two adversaries who have a controversy to be decided. The one of us hath wronged the other: wherefore judge between us with truth, and be not unjust and direct us into the even way. This my brother had ninety and nine sheep; and I had only one ewe: and he said, give her me to keep; and he prevailed against me in the discourse which we had together. David said, verily he hath wronged thee in demanding thine ewe as an addition to his own sheep: and many of them who are concerned together in business wrong one another, except those who believe and do that which is right; but how few are they! And David perceived that we had tried him by this parable [what parable?] and he asked pardon of his Lord, and he fell down and bowed himself and repented. Wherefore he forgave him this fault [what fault?] and he shall be admitted to approach near unto us, and shall have an excellent place of abode [in Paradise]."|| Of this poor parody, Sale says with great sang-froid, "it is no other than Nathan's parable to

* ii. 248.
§ 2 Sam. xii.

† ii. 250.

‡ See ch. xxi. xxxiv. xxxviii.
|| xxxviii. 22—26.

David, a little disguised.”* A little disguised! disfigured, mangled, massacred, he surely meant to say.

That Solomont acts a most conspicuous part in oriental fiction, is known to every reader of the Thousand and One Nights. For this distinction he is indebted, remotely to the Rabbins, more directly to the Koran. In the latter may be found the germ—the crude and shapeless elements—of that extravagant, but fascinating, species of romance, which the western Asiatics doat upon so fondly, and which, in the hands of their prolific writers, has grown up like an enchanted palace full of mysteries and wonders, of ethereal spirits and of airy tongues that syllable men’s names. There is something in the eastern tales of genii and faries, most agreeably contrasted with the sombre aspect of the Gothic legends which people our nurseries with grisly goblins. There is something gross, as well as dismal, in the latter, which offends the taste, while it agitates the nerves. The eastern fables, on the other hand, are airy and poetical. Their fictions savour of the palm-grove and the fountain, ours of the churchyard and the charnel-house. Both are equally unreal and unprofitable. But their very unreality (to coin a word) is different. Both are mere dreams. But theirs are the dreams of childish gaiety, ours are the *somnia ægri*, the visions of disease. And as to their unprofitableness, when we consider the effects of ghost stories heard in childhood, we can boldly say, that if we must have the stimulus of falsehood, we would rather have the exhilarating gas of eastern fancy than the harrowing opiate of home-brewed superstition. Of that sort of fiction, which has led us into this digression, the embryo exists in the Koranic account of Solomon. He is represented, not only as remarkable for wisdom, but as gifted with sundry supernatural advantages; as empowered to control the winds, † as acquainted with the language of animals; § as possessed of a fountain which emitted molten brass; || but above all, as invested with absolute authority over the *Jinn* or *Genii*. We have said, that with respect to this class of beings there is some obscurity in the Koran. It would seem from certain passages, that they are what we call demons; ¶ and yet the oriental fabulists do not exhibit them precisely in that light. The probability is, that there has been an amalgamation of the

* Vol. ii. p. 319. London. 1801.

† Suleiman.

‡ xxi. 81.

§ xxvii. 17—19.

|| xxxiv. 12.

¶ E. g. ch. xxxviii. 38, where the word used is *Shayatin*, or Satans.

Jewish doctrine with another from a different quarter, probably from India. Accordingly, it seems to be the popular opinion in the west of Asia, that between the good angels and the devils there are two intermediate orders—the one, called Peris by the Persians, excluded from heaven, yet allowed to hope—the other, whom they call Divs, unhappy and depraved, yet not condemned to hell. The Arabic word Jinn sometimes denotes the devils, sometimes the Divs just mentioned. In which sense Mohammed used it, we do not know. Most probably, he did not know himself, or rather employed it to express the vague idea suggested by his converse with the Jews on one hand, and the Magians on the other. Be that as it may, he constitutes king Solomon, sole monarch of Jinnistan, the oriental Faery-land. For him the genii dived and quarried, carved and built, and rendered other services recorded in the Koran, which we have not time to copy.* It might be a question of some interest, how far these fables may be traced to misconceptions of the Scriptures. The fountain of molten brass and the mysterious manufacture, by unseen hands, of dishes like fish ponds, and gigantic cauldrons,† have certainly more than a fortuitous connexion with the works of Hiram as described in Scripture.

The only real incident in Solomon's history which is distinctly mentioned, is the visit of the queen of Sheba, and even that is loaded with embellishments. The marvellous account of Solomon's march at the head of an army of genii, birds, and men—the intelligence brought to him from Sheba by a lapwing—his letter to the Queen—the transportation of her throne through the air by the agency of genii—the sudden conversion of herself and all her nobles to the true religion (Islam)—and other equally authentic statements—may be seen, at large, by turning to the twenty-seventh chapter in Sale's Koran.

Some of the statements and allusions in this history are so concise and obscure, that they seem to imply a previous acquaintance with the facts which they relate to, on the part of those who were to read the Koran. For example: "When the horses standing on three feet and touching the ground with the edge of the fourth foot,‡ and swift in the course

* xxxviii. 38.

† xxxiv. 13.

‡ The sixteen words in *italics* correspond to three in the original: of course the meaning must be very dubious.

were set before him, &c. (See Sale.) Again, "We also tried Solomon and placed on his throne a counterfeit body. Afterwards he turned unto God and said, oh Lord forgive me."* And again, in relation to his death: "When we had decreed that Solomon should die, nothing discovered his death unto them, except the reptile of the earth which gnawed his staff."† This the commentators explain by saying, that the time of his death arrived before the temple was completed, and that in order to keep the genii still at work, his corpse remained in a standing posture leaning on his staff, till they had performed their task. This they did in about a year, at the end of which time a worm gnawed the staff in two, and the body fell. This gloss is favoured by the words immediately succeeding in the Koran, "Then the genii plainly perceived, that if they had known what was secret, they had not continued in a vile punishment." Sale justly observes, that this story has perfectly the air of a Jewish invention.‡ But even though it had not been forthcoming from that quarter, there would have been no difficulty in the exegesis. The orthodox expounders of the Koran have a very easy process for solving the enigmas, and salving the absurdities of the sacred text. On a single fact, or an obscure allusion, they erect a superstructure of minute details by way of explanation, descending even to dates, genealogies, and surnames. Thus Al Beidawi does not scruple to enumerate by name the Egyptian magicians placing Simeon (Simon Magus?) at their head; though on this important point he is probably at sword's points with his brother Jallalodin; for, of course, each commentator is at liberty to manufacture stories at his pleasure, and he whose fables are the most ingenious, bears away the palm. This license notwithstanding, they prefer, where it is possible, to borrow from the Rabbins, through the medium of the Sonnah or canonical traditions.

The only other characters transferred from the Old Testament history to the Koran, are Job and Jonah. The account of them is so concise that we give the substance of it in Mohammed's words. "Remember our servant Job,§ when he cried unto his Lord, saying, verily Satan hath afflicted me with calamity and pain;|| and thou art the most merciful of those who show mercy! And we answered his prayer and

* xxxviii. 35, 36.

† Vol. ii. p. 289. Lond. 1801.

‡ xxxiv. 14.

§ Ayyub.

|| xxxviii. 42.

delivered him from his distress.* And it was said to him, strike with thy foot. This is for a cold bath and a drinking place. And we restored to him his family and as many more with them, through our mercy, and for an admonition unto those who are endued with understanding. [And we said] take in thy hand a handful [Sale adds, of rods] and therewith strike [Sale adds, thy wife.] And break not thine oath. Verily we found him a patient person; how excellent a servant was he, for he was one who frequently turned himself to God.”†

Jonah is, in the Koran, called by two names, *Yunas* and *Dhul'nun*. This last denotes about the same that *Fish-man*, or *He of the fish* would in English. His story is as follows: “Jonah was one of those sent by us. He departed in a rage, and thought that we could not exercise our power over him. When he fled into the loaded ship; and they cast lots; and he was condemned; and the fish swallowed him, for he was culpable. And if he had not been one of those who praised God, verily he had remained in its belly unto the day of resurrection. And he cried aloud in darkness. There is no God besides thee! Praise be to thee! I am one of the wicked. And we answered him and delivered him from his distress. And we cast him on the naked shore; and he was sick; and we caused a gourd plant to grow up over him; and we sent him to a hundred thousand persons or more, and they believed. Wherefore we prolonged their lives for a season.”‡

The account of John the Baptist in the Koran, approaches very nearly to the truth. We are not told who Zacharias was, but are informed that he prayed for a son because he was afraid of his heirs at law. An answer was brought by angels to his chamber, assuring him that he should have a son, and should call his name *Yahya* (John), a name never borne, as he was told, by any one before. Zacharias doubted and desired a sign. He was, therefore, informed, that he should not speak for three days except by gesture. He was also told that his son should be a holy man, and should bear witness to the WORD, which the Moslems properly apply to Christ, referring the name, however, to his miraculous conception, produced by the mere command or word of God. Nothing more

* xxi. 82, 83.

† xxxviii. 43—45.

‡ xxi. 87. xxxvii. 138—146.

is said of John except what follows. “[We said to him] receive the book [of the law] with resolution [to observe it;] and we gave him wisdom when a boy, and mercy, and purity, and he was devout and dutiful to his parents, and was not proud or rebellious. Peace be on him the day of his birth, and the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.”* Not a word is said of his peculiar mode of life, nor even of his office as baptizer.

The statements of the Koran, in relation to the Virgin and our Saviour, when picked out and arranged, form the following narrative. The wife of one Imran (whom Mohammed seems to confound with Amram, notwithstanding Sale’s denial) in expectation of a son, devoted him to the service of the Lord. The child, however, proved to be a daughter, whom the mother named Mariam, or Mary, and solemnly commended her to the divine protection. The care of the child was, after a time, committed to Zacharias the father of John, who was surprised, when he visited the chamber, to find her supplied with food without his interference. Mary, on being questioned, answered “It is from God. He supplieth whom he will, without measure.”†

The Annunciation, and miraculous conception of our Lord, are distinctly mentioned. God is said to have conveyed the intelligence to Mary by his Spirit, as, in another place,‡ he is said to have sent down the Koran by his Holy Spirit. Both these expressions the Mohammedans apply to the angel Gabriel, in which point they agree verbally with those Christian writers, who consider Gabriel a name of the Holy Spirit. The annunciation was in these words: “Oh Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the Word, proceeding from himself: his name shall be Christ Jesus the son of Mary, honourable, honourable in this world and the world to come, &c. He shall speak to men in the cradle, and when he is grown up; he shall be one of the righteous.”§ Not a word is said of Joseph, or of any espousals. Nor are the stable and the manger mentioned. The suspicion, which by Matthew is ascribed to Joseph, is spoken of as common to her friends and relatives. One of the reproachful speeches here set down begins, “Oh, sister of Aaron!” a sufficient proof that the Miriam of the Pentateuch was stu-

* xix. 1—15. iii. 38—40.

† xvi. 102.

‡ iii. 35—37.

§ iii. 45, 46. xix. 16—28.

pidly confounded with the Mary of the Gospel. Yet even in the face of this strong fact, Sale is "afraid" that the charge of anachronism cannot be sustained!

"But she made signs to the child [to answer them;] and they said, how shall he speak to us who is an infant in the cradle? Whereupon the child said, verily I am the servant of God; he hath given me the book [of the Gospel] and hath appointed me a prophet. And he hath made me blessed wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to observe prayer, and give alms, so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful to my mother, and hath not made me proud or vicious. Peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life. This," says Mohammed, "was Jesus the son of Mary, the Word of truth concerning whom they doubt. It is not worthy of God, that he should have a son. God forbid! When he decreeth a thing he only saith unto it, Be, and it is. And verily God is my Lord and your Lord; wherefore serve him; this is the right way. Yet the sectaries differ among themselves concerning Jesus, but woe be unto those who are unbelievers, because of their appearance at the great day."* A very respectable Socinian sermon, with the exception of the concluding woe, which is rather too illiberal.

To the children of Israel, Jesus offered to perform the following miracles; to make a bird of clay and then animate it with his breath; to give sight to one born blind; to heal the leprous; to raise the dead; and to declare by inspiration what they ate, and what provision they had stored away. This last appears to strike the Mussulman with special force, as it holds a conspicuous place among Mohammed's own alleged performances. A full detail of this pretended wonder may be found in the treatise written about twenty years ago, by Aga Acber, a Mollah of Shiraz, in reply to Henry Martyn. A large part of the tract is given, both in Persian and English, by Professor Lee in the "Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism.†"

Jesus also informed them, that he came to confirm the truth of the Law revealed before him, but at the same time to abrogate some of its restrictions. The Jews, however, charged him with imposture, and ascribed his miracles, as usual, to

* xix. 29—37.

† Cambridge, (Eng.) 1823.

magic. Jesus then asked them who would be his helpers in the cause of God? To this appeal none responded but the apostles or Hawariyun, a word which signifies *sincere* or *candid*, but is applied by Mohammed to our Lord's immediate followers.*

In the chapter called The Table, being the fifth in order, we find a story which was probably derived, remotely and obliquely, from the scriptural account of our Lord's last supper, and may have been designed to account for the solemn and mysterious observance which was seen to prevail among the oriental Christians. The statement is, that the apostles said to Christ, "Oh, Jesus, son of Mary, can thy Lord cause a table to come down to us from heaven?" He replied, "Fear God if ye be true believers." They persisted, however, on the ground that they must have some satisfying proof of his divine legation. Jesus then said, "Oh God our Lord, cause a table to come down to us from heaven, and let the day of its descent be a festival day† to us, to the first of us, and to the last of us, [i. e. to us and our successors] and do thou provide food for us; for thou art the best provider." God replied that it should be done, but declared that all who withstood such evidence should inevitably suffer an aggravated punishment.‡ It may be well to add, that among the remarkable days in the Mohammedan calendar is one called Yd-Mesiah, or the Festival of Christ, being that on which this table is supposed to have descended.§

No other of the acts of the apostles is recorded in the Koran, if we except an obscure and confused statement in the chapter called Ya Sin. We are there told that two of Christ's apostles came to a city, for the purpose of preaching, and were joined on their arrival by a third believer. The name of the city is not mentioned in the text, though Sale has inserted ANTIOCH in capitals, according to the commentators. The people, instead of hearing them, forbade their preaching upon pain of death by stoning. The apostles continued, however, to exhort them, and while they were so doing, "a man came hastily from the farther parts of the city," and made a very unintelligible speech in the apostles' favour. The nar-

* iii. 49—52. lxi. 6.

† Literally, let it be a festival.

‡ v. 112—115. There is a remarkable coincidence between the language of the Apostles here and that of the Israelites, Ps. lxxviii. 19. Mohammed may very possibly have mingled the events. No elements are too discordant to enter into his untenpered mortar.

§ Richardson's Dictionary, p. 1038.

rative then proceeds abruptly, "It was said to him, enter into paradise," leaving us to infer that he was stoned, which inference is introduced by Sale into the text. Here, it would seem, we are presented with the death of Stephen and that of the penitent thief in a compound state. We are informed moreover, that the city was destroyed.*

The next passage that we shall advert to, is the famous one with which the zealous Moslem stops the mouth of Christian cavillers, and which, in his opinion, is abundantly sufficient to decide the controversy, wholly and forever. It is as follows, "Jesus, the son of Mary, said, oh, children of Israel, verily, I am the apostle of God sent to you, confirming the Law that was before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, named Ahmed."† All that need be said, in explanation, is, that *Ahmed* and *Mohammed* are regular derivatives from one root, and are nearly synonymous, the latter meaning Praised, and the former Praise-worthy, or in the superlative, Most Laudable. Whether the pseudoapostle was actually known, in common life by both names, is of little moment. To an Arab, the very sound would be sufficient to identify them, even if tradition had not fixed the application far beyond the reach of oversight or error. It admits of doubt, whether this false citation was a sheer invention of Mohammed's own, or whether it was palmed upon him by his Christian accessories. The question depends upon the general view, which is taken of his character and that of his imposture. On the supposition, that he was himself a dupe, in whole or in part, it seems most likely that this forged prophecy was furnished by another; for if he had manufactured it, he would probably have shunned all ambiguity by using his real, or his most familiar name. If, on the contrary he laid his plans sagaciously, which is the common theory, this very equivoque resolves itself into a stroke of policy, a sly contrivance to elude suspicion, by affecting the obscurity which most men look for in a bona fide prophecy.

This notable prediction is of course regarded by all *true believers*, as an accurate quotation from the uncorrupted Gospel. For they admit that there was once a Gospel pure and undefiled, now utterly disfigured by malicious mutilation. Here is a spot of ground on which the champion of the cross must be prepared for battle. It is easy for us, assuming all the

* xxxvi. 13—29.

† lxi. 6.

controverted points, to laugh at the Mohammedan opinion. But on missionary ground, in actual conflict with intelligent, though prejudiced and obstinate opponents, a laugh will hardly do. Nor will a simple charge of falsehood and absurdity, however gravely urged, decide the contest. Its only result, most probably, would be a volley of Arabic or Turkish curses, and, where the necessary power was possessed, a summary *reductio ad absurdum* in the shape of the bastinado. How could it be otherwise indeed? To make Mohammed out a liar, you urge the very fact, which they employ to prove the corruption of the Christian Scriptures. You tell them, that their Book is false, because it puts words into the mouth of Jesus which he never uttered. They tell you that your Book is garbled, for it omits a most remarkable and memorable prophecy. Can such recriminations prove a point? Surely not. The only human means that can avail in such a case is argument, legitimate argument, logically accurate, historically just. Now, we ask, is it probable that men who cannot reason at home, will be able to reason at Cairo or Algiers? And in view of the efforts which are likely to be made for the conversion of the Mussulman, we also ask, would it be prudent, would it be right, for minds without strength or discipline, to be enlisted in this war? Let those who think that Moslems cannot argue, read their subtle arguments, and bear in mind the fact, that Martyn, the first mathematical proficient in his class at Cambridge, found no cause to repent the rigid discipline of St. John's and the Senate House.* We have chosen to express these opinions in connexion with the main point of controversy between Islam and the Gospel.

The Moslems, it is well known, like the Cerinthians and other early heretics, deny the crucifixion of our Saviour. The Koranic doctrine, upon that point, may be gathered from the following quotations. "They [the Jews] contrived a plot; but God is the best contriver of plots. And God said, oh Jesus, I am about to make thee die, and to take thee up to myself; and I will cleanse [or free] thee from the unbeliev-

* We take this opportunity of asking for the ground of the assertion sometimes vented, that Martyn was a man of very common-place abilities. His course of life precluded a display of brilliant talent, and his printed sermons cannot furnish a criterion, considering the light in which pulpit performances are viewed by English churchmen. We are acquainted with no *proofs* of his inferiority, and his standing at Cambridge is at least a presumption in favour of his powers.

ers, and I will place thy followers above the unbelievers, at [or until] the day of resurrection.”* “They [the Jews] say, We have killed Christ Jesus [Ysa the Messiah] the son of Mary, God’s apostle; whereas they did not kill nor crucify him, but he was counterfeited [or personated] to them.† And those who differed respecting him were in doubt about it; and indeed they had no knowledge, but followed mere conjecture. They did not really kill him; but God took him up to himself, and God is mighty and wise.”‡

To set Mohammed’s unitarianism in a clearer light, we need only quote a few sentences from different parts of the Koran. “They are certainly infidels who say, that God is Christ the son of Mary. For Christ himself said, oh children of Israel, worship God, my Lord and your Lord. Verily he who gives God a companion shall be excluded from paradise by God, and the fire shall be his dwelling place. Surely they are infidels who say that God is the third of three; whereas there is no God but one God, and if they do not cease from what they say, grievous torments, &c. &c.§ “Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, was an apostle from God, even his Word, and a Spirit proceeding from him. Verily God is one God. Far be it from him that he should have a son. Christ does not disdain to be God’s servant, &c. &c.|| “When God said” [Sale renders it, *when God shall say at the last day*; but the verb is in the past tense, without any thing to modify it] “oh Jesus, son of Mary, didst thou say to men, Take me and my mother for deities besides God? He replied, God forbid! I have no right to assert what does not truly belong to me. I have told them only what thou didst command me, to wit, serve God my Lord and your Lord.”¶ “He is only a servant whom we have highly favoured, and set forth as an example to the children of Israel, and verily he shall be a sign of the Hour, (viz. the last).”***

“Verily, Jesus, with respect to God, was just like Adam. He created him of dust, and then said to him, Be, and he was.”††

Besides the denial of our Lord’s divinity, the attentive reader will observe, throughout these sentences, another strong resemblance to a certain class of writers, in the clamorous as-

* iii. 54, 55. † He was represented by one in his likeness.” Sale.

‡ iv. 155—157.

§ v. 74, 75.

|| iv. 168, 169.

¶ v. 116, 117.

** xliii. 58—61.

†† iii. 59.

sersion of some tenets, as peculiar to themselves—such as, that God is one, that there are not three Gods, that Jesus Christ was the servant of God—tenets which all true Christians hold as fully and as firmly as any Socinian or Mussulman on earth. It is but just, however, to repeat, that the Arab's creed breathes too much of a fire-and-faggot spirit to please the fastidious taste of a latitudinarian.

We believe we have now noticed all the fragments of the sacred history, occurring in the Koran. It must be observed, however, that some of the stories are repeated half-a-dozen times over, in as many different places. In that case, we have selected the most minute and circumstantial of the narratives, adding the facts which it omitted from the parallel passages.

Besides the statements which may thus be traced to scriptural originals, there are a number of stories and allusions in the Koran which derive their origin exclusively from profane history, rabbinical traditions, monastic legends, or the romantic fictions of Arabia itself. It is true, that even those purloined from Scripture have received embellishments from all these quarters, but we now refer to such as rest entirely upon that foundation. Of this kind are the celebrated story of the Seven Sleepers, the account of the Prophets Hud and Saleh, the obscure and scanty notices respecting Dhu'lkarnein, commonly supposed to be Alexander the Great, and other minor passages in historical form. How far some of these might be identified as mutilated fragments of the Bible and Apocrypha, we do not now inquire. At first view they have no such aspect, and our only object here has been to give a connected view of those whose pedigree is obvious.* We are aware that we have been employed upon a very humble task, in collecting and arranging the absurdities and falsehoods of an impudent impostor. Perhaps, however, we have done for our readers what they would not have been willing to do for themselves, and what some of them may find it just as well to be acquainted with. Our hasty and imperfect, but methodical synopsis will, at least, present a clearer view of the Mohammedan belief upon the points in question, than could possibly be gained by a continuous perusal of the book itself.

* In doing this we have confined ourselves, in almost every instance, to the text of the Koran. The commentators explain every thing abundantly, as may be learned from the specimens in Sale. We have chosen rather to exhibit its native imperfection and obscurity.

We have also had occasion, here and there, to point out instances of Sale's strange fondness for interpolations tending to raise his author in the reader's estimation. We have often been at a loss to reconcile his scrupulous precision as a mere translator, with the disingenuousness of his latent glosses and disguised interpolations. Some one has said that "Sale was half a Mussulman;" but this we think incredible. That he was not a very zealous Christian, may be safely granted, but we cannot think it fair to push the accusation further. Our own explanation of the matter is, that he was biassed by the feelings which all scholars feel in relation to their favourite pursuits, and to the subjects of their diligent and long continued study. That Sale did study both the Koran and the commentators deeply and successfully, no one can doubt who has carefully inspected his translation. As to the rest, we suppose that he was led to interpolate a little, by a natural unwillingness to look upon the object of his toils as wholly worthless. When we have spent time and labour on a thing, as valuable, we are loth to see it treated with contempt. This explanation we prefer, because we would have justice done to a distinguished orientalist, even in stripping a deformed imposture of its borrowed garments.

We shall add a few words with respect to the study of Arabic. It is highly desirable, on various accounts, that a knowledge of this noble and important language should become more common. Biblical learning and the missionary enterprise alike demand it. What we most need, is a taste for the pursuit, and a conscientious willingness to undertake the task. The great deficiency is not so much in grammars, as in men to study them. We observe that Mr. Smith, the American missionary, now at Malta, has declined to undertake an English version of Ibn Ferliat's grammar. His views are such as might have been expected from a man of sense and learning. It may, indeed, be stated as a general truth, that translated grammars are as likely to be hinderances as helps. A grammarian cannot possibly explain the phenomena of a foreign language, except by appealing to the structure of his own, or of that in which he writes. Now as every language has its peculiarities, both great and small, no two can stand in the same relation to a third. Latin and French agree where French and English differ. The same form of speech in Latin, therefore, which must be explained to English learners, may be as clear, without elucidation, to the

Frenchman, as if founded upon some fixed law of nature. Give the latter the same comments that you give the former, and you not only do not aid him, but you really confound him. For we need not say, that the attempt to explain what is perfectly intelligible must have that effect. The same remark may be applied to any other case. For a familiar instance, we refer to Josse's Spanish Grammar, as translated into English by Mr. Sales of Cambridge. The original work was designed for Frenchmen, and as the translator, we believe, is himself a Frenchman, many rules and statements, in themselves just, and in their proper places useful, are wholly unintelligible to the English reader. Analogous cases will occur to every scholar, abundantly proving, that the servile transfer, not of language merely, but of rules, arrangements, proofs, and illustrations, is unfriendly to the only end which grammars should promote. While we believe, with Dr. Johnson, that the practice of translating (in the proper sense, and on an extensive scale) is injurious to the purity of language, we likewise consider it injurious to the interests of sound and thorough scholarship. To avoid the former evil, we would substitute the transfusion of thoughts for the translation of words. To remedy the latter, we would have bilingual scholars to study, sift, digest, remodel, reproduce. By this we should avoid the needless introduction of an uncouth terminology and the practical paralogism of attempting to explain ignotum per ignotius. By this means, too, a freshness would be given to our learned works, very unlike the tang contracted by a passage over sea. This too would serve to check the strong propensity of young philologists towards a stagnant acquiescence in the dicta of their text-books, which is always attended with the danger of mistaking form for substance, and forgetting the great ends of language in the infinitesimal minutiae of a barren etymology. In Germany, that great philological brewery, the extreme of stagnation has been long exchanged for that of fermentation, and although we do not wish to see the eccentricities of foreign scholarship imported here, we do believe that much of their advancement may be fairly traced to their contempt of mere authority, their leech-like thirst for indefinite improvement, and their practice of working up the material of their learning into new and varied forms without much regard to pre-existent models. Let us imitate their merits and avoid their faults.

Let us mount upon their shoulders, not grovel at their feet. Let us take the *stuff* which they provide for us, and mould it for ourselves, to suit our own peculiarities of language, habit, genius, wants, and prospects. Let our books be English, not Anglo-French or Anglo-German. Let us not make them as the Chinese tailor made the tar's new jacket, with a patch to suit the old one.

To return to grammars—though what we said above may seem directly applicable only to those written in one language to explain another, it applies, *a fortiori*, to what are called *native* grammars, which are merely designed to reduce into systematic form the knowledge previously gathered by empirical induction. To those who have become familiar with a language in the concrete by extensive reading, such works are highly useful and need no translation. To beginners they are useless; for they presuppose the knowledge which beginners want. Besides, they are *untranslatable*, as Mr. Smith justly affirms—with special reference, indeed, to *Bahth El Mutalib*, of which we know nothing but through him. We may add, however, that even if that work admitted of translation, it would scarcely throw more light upon the subject than de Sacy's lucid digest (pre-eminently lucid after all deductions, drawbacks, and exceptions) the fruit of most laborious and long continued study of numerous authorities—a work, too, which has had more indirect influence on biblical philology than many are aware of.* When de Sacy has been mastered and exhausted, he may very fairly be condemned and thrown aside. To those who would prefer a shorter grammar and the Latin tongue, Rosenmüller's book may be safely recommended. It is Erpenius re-written, with improvements from de Sacy. Meanwhile, we look with some impatience for the forthcoming work of Ewald, whose acuteness, ingenuity, and habits of research, afford the promise of a masterly performance.

It must be owned, however, that we do need reading-books, or Readers, for beginners. Most of the Chrestomathies prepared in Europe appear to presuppose some acquaintance with the Koran.† For us this will not answer. Here, where the study is, at most, but nascent, we need an introduction to

* No one, we think who is familiar with de Sacy's noble work, can fail to recognise its agency in giving form, perspicuity, and richness to the famous Lehrgebäude of Gesenius.

† See, for example, the preface to de Sacy's Chrestomathie Arabe, Paris, 1826.

the Koran itself. We have often thought, that a selection of historical passages from that book, reduced to order, with grammatical notes and a vocabulary, would answer the ends of a chrestomathy for mere beginners most completely. It is highly important that the learner's first acquaintance with the written language, should be formed upon the Koran. Amidst all the dialectic variations of a tongue which is spoken from the great Sahara to the steppes of Tartary, there is a large proportion, both of words and phrases, every where the same. These are the words and phrases of the Koran, which religious scruples have preserved from change, and religious use made universally familiar. He who is acquainted with the language of the Koran, has the means of oral access to any Arab, and to almost to any Mussulman. He may not understand as yet the many variations of the vulgar from the sacred tongue, much less the local diversities of speech; but he has the foundation upon which these rest, the stated formula from which they are mere departures. He will also have acquired a measure of that knowledge, with respect to facts and doctrines, which no man can dispense with, who would either vanquish or convert the Moslem.

ART. VI.—ON CERTAIN ERRORS OF PIOUS STUDENTS IN OUR COLLEGES.

IT is pleasing to observe that, in our Church, almost all disputes with regard to the importance of an educated ministry have died away. Great as is the demand for labourers in the Lord's vineyard, it appears to be acknowledged that ample literary and scientific discipline is equally demanded. Hence the eyes of Christians are turned with peculiar interest towards the hundreds of young men, who are at this time engaged in preparatory studies, with a view to the sacred office. Of these, a large number are to be found within the walls of our colleges, engaged in that part of their preliminary discipline, which, when we look to its bearings on future usefulness, must be seen to yield to no other in momentous importance. It may be assumed, as a maxim universally conceded, that the first steps in all mental and moral training are most carefully to be directed and watched, as giving character to