THE BOOK WAS DRENCHED

TIGHT BINDING BOOK

TEXT CROSS WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164848

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 297/F 73M V.1 Accession No. 4759

Author Forster, C.

Title Mohammaten ism Unveild. 1829

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

MAHOMETANISM UNVEILED:

AN INQUIRY,

IN WHICH

THAT ARCH-HERESY,

ITS DIFFUSION AND CONTINUANCE,

ARE EXAMINED ON A NEW PRINCIPLE,

TENDING TO CONFIRM THE EVIDENCES,

AND AID THE PROPAGATION,

OF

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

BY

THE REV. CHARLES FORSTER, B.D.

CHANCELLOR OF ARDFERT, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF LIMERICK.

Mahometanism began as a Christian heresy — JOSEPH MEDE.

The extraordinary success, which has attended the imposture of Mahomet, has exercised the ingenuity of Christian writers, and yet does not appear to have been satisfactorily explained. — PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN HISTORY.

Ex Hagare Ismaelem suscepit Abrahamus; rem omnem, ad arcanos fines, ita dirigente Numine. — BUDDEUS

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. DUNCAN, 37. PATERNOSTER-ROW;

AND J. COCHRAN, 108. STRAND.

MDCCCXXIX.

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN JEBB, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF LIMERICK,

ARDFERT AND AGHADOE.

My Lord,

In inscribing these pages to Your Lordship, were it my object simply to express my respect and grateful affection towards the friend of my youth, and the guide of my maturer years and studies, a sense of delicacy would have obliged me to convey these sentiments in the shortest and simplest form of dedication.

But Your Lordship will not take the confession amiss, that I have another object in view; that I trespass on your indulgence a little further, as it may seem of some preliminary advantage, to notice briefly the circumstances, which led, first, to the conception, and, gradually, to the design and execution, of this inquiry into the rise of Mahometanism, and the real causes of its success.

These circumstances I can communicate to no living friend with so much propriety as to Your Lordship; since it was under your roof, and early in the period of that domestic intercourse, which, through a course of years, it has been the privilege and happiness of my life to enjoy, that the subject of the present work engaged my serious attention.

For a considerable time, I had read and thought on the Mahometan apostasy, purely for my own satisfaction. But, while my judgment readily acquiesced

in parts of the explanation offered by approved authorities, to account for the case of Mahometanism, there remained still the painful conviction, that some of its most important features were left wholly unexplained. The most popular English work on the subject, the eloquent Bampton Lectures of the late Dr. White of Oxford, impressed me as labouring fatally under this defect; notwithstanding the frequent acuteness of the reasoning, and the general force and beauty of the style. Nor was it possible to rest satisfied with the view of a subject so momentous, presented by a volume which was always supposed, and, by the appearance of a late publication, has been completely proved, the product of different pens: the materials of which, contributed by minds the most unlike, in power, in principles of reasoning, and in their views even of the Christian scheme, necessarily lay under the disadvantages of a dubious and divided parentage; in some parts, the chief arguments being inconsis-

The plan of the work may be stated in few words. The principle on which the whole argument rests, is first presented in general terms; and then confirmed and elucidated through a series of inductive proofs. The Introduction contains the announcement of that fundamental principle; the proofs of it will be found in the succeeding sections. With a view to the preservation of order, several topics of importance have been transferred to the Appendix, at the close of the second volume.

In the distribution of the notes, a method has been adopted, differing somewhat from those in ordinary use. Notes of moderate length, and of more immediate value to the argument, have, together with nearly all the references, been placed at the foot of the page. The larger and more discursive annotations have been disposed at the end of the work. It is hoped, that, by this arrangement, the clearness of the general statement may be aided, without any sacrifice of solid information.

As my argument will consist of a series of separate inductions, at the same time corroborative and independent of each other, I would ask, in this respect, similar candour and indulgence to that which Dr. Paley has claimed from the readers of his inimitable HORÆ PAULINÆ: in his words, I desire, once for all, to intimate, "that *the instances are independent of one another.* I have advanced nothing, which I did not think probable; but the degree of probability, by which different instances are supported, is undoubtedly very different. If the reader, therefore, meets with an instance that appears to him unsatisfactory, or founded in mistake, he will dismiss that instance from the argument, but without prejudice to any other."

In the early progress of this inquiry, the manuscript was communicated but to two individuals; Your Lordship's brother, the Honourable Mr. Justice Jebb, and him to whom these lines are addressed.

placed unreservedly at my command, his valuable and various collection on oriental subjects; including, among other rare articles, the *Adversaria*, and unpublished MSS. of the learned Sale: materials by which I have not failed to profit; especially in the final notes.

May I be permitted, also, to notice the liberality of my respectable publishers; who voluntarily engaged to supply me with all the necessary authorities; and have made their engagement more than good; sparing, for this purpose, neither their trouble, nor their time.

But my last, no less than my earliest, acknowledgments, are due to him, who, "even from my youth up," has been the chosen guide and guardian of my pursuits and studies. Through every previous stage of the present work, it has been my happiness to find in Your Lordship a safe and wise adviser; and, in passing it through the

Press, each sheet has had the advantage of being submitted to the censure of a vigilant, but friendly eye.

I have the honour to remain,

With dutiful respect,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most faithful

and affectionate friend and servant,

CHARLES FORSTER.

London,
February 16. 1829.

SECTION I. — Pages 113—161.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GOD'S TWOFOLD COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM, IN BEHALF OF HIS SONS ISAAC AND ISHMAEL.

Original promise to Abraham. Two parts — lineal — social. Twice renewed in former part. Third renewal — to Hagar for Ishmael. Enlarged for Isaac — in both parts. Two distinct covenants — Bishop Sherlock. Spiritual blessing peculiar to Isaac. Chief portion of Ishmael — temporal blessing. Not without spiritual signification — proofs. Common predictions — corresponding fulfilments. Nature of proof. Tabular view of promises. As to worldly prosperity covenants nearly identical. Balance in favour of Ishmael — a great nation. Subject of inquiry — not the fact but mode of fulfilment. Comparison of prophecy with events. History of Jews — of Arabs. Twelve patriarchs — twelve princes. Twelve tribes — twelve nations. Judah — Jews — Messiah. Kedar — Kedarites — Mahomet. Covenant of Isaac — Christianity. Covenant of Ishmael — Mahometanism. Appropriate characters of promises and accomplishments. Two promises to Abraham — confounded by Jews. Temporal blessing — application of to Jews — to ancient Arabs. Appearance of Mahomet — clears the two promises — completes the analogous fulfilments. Nations of earth adopted into families of Isaac and Ishmael. Mahometanism compared with Christianity — with Judaism. Correspondence and contrast of systems equally important. Existence of two-fold promise a pledge of twofold accomplishment. Covenant of Isaac fulfilled — manner of fulfilment known — its fulfilment an assurance that Ishmael's will be accomplished in like manner. Anticipations met — by history of Israelites and Ishmaelites — of Jews and Saracens — sustained by intermediate prophecies — realized in Christianity and Mahometanism.

SECTION II. — Pages 162—209.

PROPHETICAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MAHOMETANISM; AND PROPHETICAL PARALLEL BETWEEN MAHOMETANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Covenants of Old and New Testaments allegorized by covenants of Ishmael and Isaac. Child of spirit — child of flesh. Religion of peace — religion of persecution. Creed sprung from Ishmael superior to all other false creeds. In this view a blessing. The only false creed foretold by prophecy. Book of Daniel — history of God's world — of God's church. Western church — Eastern church. Analogy of Scripture. Corresponding predictions in Daniel and Apocalypse. Two little horns — two beasts. Papacy — Mahometanism. No other power so answering description. Broad view recommended. Prophecy and Providence reciprocal interpreters. Little horn of he-goat. Various applications of. Applied to Mahometanism. Harmony of vision and interpretation. Theatre of the prophecy at large. Great horn broken. Four notable horns unbroken. Little horn comes out of one of them. Agreements of Mahometanism with little horn — a king — understanding dark sentences. Spiritual tyranny indicated. Host of heaven cast down by horn — by Mahometanism. An host given to horn against daily sacrifice — explained from Mahometan apostasy. Described by Saint John under same type. Terms of Jewish ritual denote Christian Church — more properly than Jewish — Bishop Newton. Symbol of horn appropriated to Mahometanism. Dan. xi. xii. a commentary on Dan. viii. Interpreted of Mahometanism by — Sir Isaac Newton — Bishop Newton. Text must have same sense as comment. Periods of Daniel identified with those of St. John. Final object of these related prophecies.

SECTION III. — Pages 210—279.

PROPHETICAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MAHOMETANISM; AND PROPHETICAL PARALLEL BETWEEN MAHOMETANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Mention among the great predictions of Old Testament implies mention among those of New Testament. Rev. ix. Fifth trumpet. Characteristic description of Saracens — Dr. Zouch. Locusts an appropriate symbol. Prophetic locusts more so than natural. Signs of spiritual pestilence in their origin. Chronology alike responding to natural and Saracenic plague. Sixth trumpet. Four angels. Horsemen of the Euphrates. Seljukian princes. Turkish armies. Marks of spiritual tyranny. Agreements with book of Daniel. Rev. xiii. Horns of Daniel — beasts of Apocalypse. First horn and first beast admitted to be papal Rome — second horn and second beast inferred to be Mahometanism. Distinctness of beasts:—Sea—West; — Earth — East. So distinguished by Jews. Mr. Culbertson. Dr. Hales. Distinctness marred by every other application of prophecy. Beasts antichristian powers. Islamism identified with the second beast. The mark historically verified. Number of the name. Second beast—false prophet — proper title of Mahomet. Unheeded prophecies — example of. Prophecy interpreter of Providence — value of as first-principle. Predictions and events commensurate. Dan. vii. viii. compared. Rev. xiii. 1—10. xiii. 11—18. compared. Beasts identified with little horns. Distinct tyrannies — kindred tyrannies. Their true character. Objections examined. The powers symbolized are allied as heads of antichrist. Mahometan antichrist erects an image of papal — similar tyranny. Papacy the offspring of Christian church — Islamism only engrafted on it — image. Authority of the first beast exercised by second — in what sense. Chronology — Dean Prideaux — Bishop Newton — Dr. Hales. Time of end a

period of persecution and apostasy — its measure supplied only by the Papal and Mahometan despotisms. Times and seasons not to be curiously scanned. Concealed under various dates of Daniel. Title of Antichrist fixed on the Papacy as well as on Mahometanism. Result.

SECTION IV. — Pages 280—314.

HISTORICAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Analogy between the founders. Moses a type of Messiah. Mahomet a pseudo-messiah. Resemblances chiefly imitations. This a confirmation of providential analogy — Antichrist to imitate the Christ. Some resemblances not imitations — also marks of providential disposal — of Antichrist foretold in Scripture. Both kinds of resemblance in Mahomet. Table of analogy with Moses and Christ. Recapitulation. Equal value of designed and undesigned agreements. The studied coincidences prove Mahomet an Antichrist — the unstudied show agency of permissive Providence. Table of analogy between the religious systems. Recapitulation. Object of Section. Its materials furnish subjects of succeeding sections.

SECTION V. — Pages 315—363.

MORAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Mahometanism a servile copy. Counterpart of corruptions in the true revelation. This analogy without value as an infidel argument. Valuable as a link between covenants of Isaac and Ishmael. The moral codes preserve the distance marked by the natural relation of these brethren. Design of Section. Mahometan scheme of morals — its sources. Christian morals inimitable — by Mahometanism

—by Judaism. Law of Mahomet to be compared with law of Moses. Error of controversialists — judge Mahomet as a Christian heresiarch — seem to forget that he was a heathen. His moral system conformable to Arab usage — restricted national licence. Personal immorality of Mahomet — mark of false prophet. Polygamy — regulated after Jewish tradition. Prohibited degrees — after Pentateuch. Mahometan code a reform of Pagan Arabia. Reformation necessarily imperfect. Analogy of Mahomet with Moses — as legislator. Mosaic toleration — explained by our Lord — explanation not wholly inapplicable to Mahometanism. Jewish laws of divorce — of concubinage — against adultery — against fornication — imitated. Retaliation — regulated after Mosaic law — aim of both legislators to restrain revenge. Murder — Koran reverses the primeval sentence. Mahometan code alloyed from Rabbinical tradition. Higher ordinances of Judaism not altogether neglected by Koran — moral virtues inculcated — moral duties prescribed. Some things rather in spirit of Gospel than of law. Mahometan tradition — Proverbs of Ali — selection from: Piety and trust in God. Patience. Love of the world. Charity. Returning good for evil. Self-government. Purity of heart. The tongue. Contentment. Death. Eternity. Good works. Humility. Faith. Mahometan beatitudes. Saracen ethics — an advance on Koran. Use of Islamism in raising morals of heathen nations. Testimonies.

SECTION VI. — Pages 364—402.

DOCTRINAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

The Apostles preached Jesus and the Resurrection. The Jews believed in a Messiah and a resurrection. The religion of Mahomet confesses faith in Christ and a resurrection. In these fundamental articles Mahometans above

Jews. Mahometan creed—respecting Christ—respecting resurrection. Mixture of ridiculous figments with Christian truths. General judgment. Rewards and punishments. Plagiarism from Rabbins — from Magians and Gnostics. Perversions of Scripture figures. Likeness to fanciful phraseology of early Fathers — S. Irenæus. Koran spiritualized by its commentators. Tendency of Mahometanism to improve. Mahometan and Scriptural representations of Paradise compared. Doctrinal schemes of the three religious systems unfolded gradually. Authority of tradition. Origin of evil. Approximations of Mahometan heresies so called to catholic Christianity. Divine attributes. Nature of Godhead. Predestinarian controversy. Grace and merit. Further doctrinal correspondence. Absurdities borrowed from Rabbins and heretics. Mahometanism less heretical than some heresies called Christian. Eventual acceptance of Christianity. Prospect of its universal reception. Decay of Mahometan, growth of Christian empire, in the East — signs of approaching fulfilment of prophetic Scriptures.

SECTION VII. — Pages 403—427.

RITUAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Chief Mahometan rites from law and Gospel. Circumcision. Baptism. Sabbath. Ablution. Stated prayers. Legal postures and forms. Devoutness of Mussulman worship. Fasts and festivals. Ramadan — Lent. Bairam — Carnival. Fast of Ashur derived from Jews. Fasts obligatory and spontaneous — of Rabbinical origin. Mahometan ritual in austerity surpasses Roman. Fasts moral and ceremonial. Orders and degrees of fasting. Priesthood — sacrifice — Mr. Gibbon's unfounded assertion respecting. Proved from Koran — from history. Almsgiving. Prohibited meats. Annual Pilgrimage.

VOL. II.

SECTION VIII. — Pages 1—93.

ANALOGY OF THE KORAN WITH THE BIBLE.

Affinity of the Abrahamic covenants still kept alive. Servile imitation — very extensive — avowed by Mahomet himself. Titles — divisions — subdivisions — borrowed from Jews. Question concerning creation of Koran — of Rabbinical origin. Alleged revelation by parcels — after Rabbins. Similar reverence paid by Mahometans to Koran — as Jews pay to Pentateuch. Professed completion of preceding Scriptures. Contents plagiarized from both Testaments. Common historical details. Facts of Scripture mingled with fictions from Talmudists and Apocryphal gospels. Koran antichristian parody of Bible. Analysis of structure. Koran, classes itself with Bible. So classed by Mahometan tradition. Selection of plagiarisms. Order and design discernible. Favourite authorities of Koran. Preference for Old Testament. Table of remarkable parallel passages. Imitations of leading facts and narratives of Scripture — of its minuter peculiarities — manner — figures — expressions. Koran so far regarded on favourable side. Borrowed beauties of Scripture not wholly lost. Demerits of Koran beyond present limits — collected by various writers. Specimens of its hideous and hateful deformities. The bad and better features alike belong to antichristian heresy. Descriptions of hell — some too horrid for insertion. Caricatures of sublime imagery of Scripture. Exposure of defects consistent with fair justice to merits. Beauties of Koran — happy imitations — sublime original conceptions. Impression always marred by context — want of uniform im-

pression on the mind. Concluding specimen. Mahomet proved an Antichrist by contents of the Koran.

SECTION IX. — Pages 94—111.

ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN ITS SECTS AND REPUTED HERESIES.

Professed agreements in history, subdivisions, and number of sects — stated by Mahometan tradition. Statement corroborative of the providential analogy. Comparison of the chief sects under Law, Gospel, and Koran. Kindred sects from corresponding disputations. Pharisees — Sadducees: Romanists — Reformed: Sonnites — Shiites: opposed on authority of tradition. Latins — Greeks: Turks — Persians: opposed on ecclesiastical discipline. Jewish Gnostics — Essenes: Christian Gnostics — Ebionites — Cerinthians — Manichees, &c.: Mahometan Gnostics — Hashemians — Nodhamians — Mozdarians: source — origin of evil. Arians — Hayetians: nature of Godhead. Catholics — Pelagians: Jabarians — Kadarians: Liberty and necessity. Christian schoolmen — Mahometan schoolmen: Divine attributes — Sefatians accused by Motazalites of Christian notions respecting Deity. Pharisees — Publicans: Catholics — Pelagians — Calvinists — Arminians: Dervises — Tzofilar: Faith and works — Grace and merit.

SECTION X. — Pages 112—141.

ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH POPERY.

Prominent feature in general correspondence. Claims separate consideration. Timing of Mahometanism. Simultaneous with Papacy. Similar growth of corruptions in Eastern and Western churches — met by similar visitations. Mahometan tyranny counterpart of that of papal Rome. Outline of their correspondence. Papal tyranny distinct from Western church — Latin church oppressed by yoke

of Rome. Life-spark of Christianity preserved. Individual lights found in West through darkest ages of decline. Church and court of Rome — mystery of iniquity — identified with mystic Babylon — with Antichrist. Grounds of comparison with Mahometanism. Controversial objects disclaimed — single aim to elicit truth from history and prophecy. Analogy of popes with caliphs — alike claimed universal sovereignty — alike distributed kingdoms at will — alike promoted creeds of violence and persecution. Practical exemplifications of these tenets — right of war against infidels — of persecution against heretics — faith not kept with either. Vain attempts of Romanists to disown these tenets. Candour of Mussulmans. Pilgrimage — Romish — Mahometan — to Jerusalem — to Mecca — to tombs of saints and martyrs. Analogy in religious orders — Mendicants — Dervises — common rules and vows. Ascetical severities — show of external sanctity — celibacy — Scripture marks of Antichrist. Seculars and regulars — Tusmans and Dervises. Romish and Mussulman priesthood — influence in secular affairs. Mahometan holy wars — Papal crusades.

SECTION XI. — Pages 142—199.

THE CRUSADES.

Re-action of Saracenic eruption. Judgment formed of by modern historical writers. Dr. Robertson — denies original policy — admits beneficial results. Mr. Gibbon — questions existence of political motives — denies eventual benefits. Crusades in both aspects eminently providential. Some of their political bearings certainly foreseen. Political motives urged by their first projectors. Paradox advanced by Mr. Gibbon. Steps of his reasoning pursued. Important admission of, noticed. Crusades only sufficient obstacle to Turkish career. Their effects — on empire of Turks — on Greek empire — conceded by Mr. Gibbon. His premises and conclusions contradictory —

vindicates Popes and European princes against his own aspersions. National security and independence necessary for national prosperity and improvement. Fruits of crusades. Mahometan and Papal sacred wars complete the prophetic struggle between Isaac and Ishmael. Speculations of Dr. Robertson and Mr. Gibbon respecting crusades, fallen into disrepute. Results of more recent inquiry — establish at once the human policy and providential benefits of the holy wars. The Reformation itself one indirect consequence. Immediate evils as nothing compared with compensatory good. Both warfares providentially timed and adjusted for punishment and improvement of mankind — parts of great providential administration of the world. Sacred wars of Saracens natural products of Islamism — Crusades unnatural fruits of perverted Christianity — Gospel of peace converted by Popes into a religion of the sword. Change brought about in the crisis of Europe and the world — Turks meditate universal dominion — on eve of erecting it — arrested by crusades. The rival warfares commenced alike in dark ages — conducted alike to ages of light. Crusades opened a communication with Mahometan Asia, just before Saracen lights were extinguished by the Turks. Concurrence of circumstances apparently providential in their rise — superstitious panic of Europe in the tenth century — coincident with the birth of Turkish power. Persecution of Latin pilgrims in Palestine — consequent sympathy and indignation of the West. Peter the Hermit raised up — character — qualifications — compared and contrasted with Mahomet. Analogy between wars of cross and crescent — motives — agents — co-extensive fields. Crusades diverted from primitive object — to propagation of Popery by the sword — Waldenses — Albigenses — Prussians — Teutonic knights. Iniquity over-ruled for good. Historical parallel of opposed tyrannies sensibly providential. Recurrence to fundamental principle — Covenants with Abraham —

Ishmael to inhabit in face of all his brethren — Saracens penetrate to gates of Rome — Crusaders to walls of Mecca — fulfilment of promise co-extensive with Roman world — eastern and western Christendom measured and re-measured by armies of contending faiths. Concluding remark.

SECTION XII. — Pages 200—245.

ANALOGY BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND MAHOMETANISM, IN THEIR INFLUENCES ON NATIONAL CHARACTER AND CIVILIZATION; ON INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURES, AND COMMERCE.

Double triumph of Christianity — over citizens of Roman empire — over barbarians of Scythia and Germany. Double triumph of Mahometanism — over Christian citizens of Greek empire — over pagan barbarians of Turquestan and Tartary. Characteristic contrast between these parallel victories. Relative influences of Gospel and Koran on national character — barbarians of north of Asia and Europe. Mr. Gibbon — testimony to effects of Christianity on barbarians of North — assigned causes. Analogous effects of Mahometanism — similar causes assignable. Primitive influences on Arabs — on pagan Africans: subsequent effects on Turks and Tartars. Saladin — anecdote of. Best fruits of Islamism imitative. Gospel and Koran alike sources of two great civil confederations. Effects on national character equally traceable to operation of religious belief. Saracen genius imitative — imparted what it had plagiarized from Eastern Christendom — planted seed in new ground. Agriculture — studied — improved — diffused by Arabs — progress of in Asia — in Spain. Irrigation. Horticulture. Cotton-plant. Sugar-cane. Manufactures — of Africa — of Spain. Cloths. Silk. Paper. Steel. Principles of taxation — revenue of Saracen Spain — surpassed the united revenues of Christian Europe. Commerce. Saracens,

though not a seafaring, a commercial people. Carriers of ancient world — propagators at once of Mahometanism and inland commerce. Re-open the communication between extremities of Asia and Europe. Erect a naval power — acquire empire of Mediterranean — make voyages of commerce and maritime discovery — penetrate Chinese seas — traverse Indian ocean. Commercial influences of Mahometanism replaced and excelled by those of Christianity. Civil and social influences of Gospel. Husbandry — in disrepute among the barbarian conquerors of Roman empire — revived by Mahometanism and the Crusades. Holland — Netherlands — north of Germany — schools of Agriculture established. Sicily — Italy — agricultural industry restored. Manufactures. Branches cultivated among the Saracens, imported by Crusades. Silk stuffs — Manufactories — transit of through Sicily and Italy to France and England. Cloths — Netherlands — excel fabrics of East. Military arms — Milan competes with Damascus and Toledo. Glass and paper — Manufactories introduced from Spain and Tyre. Commerce. Navigation as a science, the offspring of the Crusades. Mariner's compass. History of commerce changed by influences of Christianity. Portugal and Spain — discovery voyages — connected with agency of Islamism — coincident with its fall in West. New route to India — New World. Portuguese empire in India counteractive of Ottoman power. Christianity and Mahometanism, in their opposite commercial careers, meet at the Cape of Good Hope. Portuguese persecutions — Inquisition of God. Great Britain — Episcopal church in India — prospects of Christianity.

SECTION XIII.—Pages 246—360.

ANALOGY BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND MAHOMETANISM, IN THEIR INFLUENCES ON ARTS, SCIENCES, PHILOSOPHY, AND LITERATURE.

Industry and commerce parents of science and civilization. This principle signally exemplified during interval between eighth and sixteenth centuries. Joint agency of Christianity and Mahometanism instrumental to the entire process of improvement. Parallel action of the two creeds for mental renovation of mankind — in producing the intellectual wealth of modern Europe. Erection of great cities throughout East and West. Cities of Spain and Italy chief seats of commerce — these countries the providential sources of general revival of letters. Mahometan knowledge originally derived from Christianity — subsequently resigned back to right owner. Saracens never effected conquests without founding cities. Architecture — character of Saracenic style — Progress of in Asia — Africa — Spain. Visits of Europeans — especially of ecclesiastics — to Saracen Spain — A. D. 900—1100. Intercourse of Crusaders with cities of East. — Coincident rise of architectural school in Europe — probabilities respecting origin. Previous state of European architecture. Lombard school exchanged for Norman. Its marked resemblance to Saracenic. French architects accompany S. Louis into East — on their return erect Holy Chapel and Church of Chartreux at Paris. Saracenic architecture discovers first principles — Gothic reaches perfection — of pointed style. Sculpture — painting — Saracens precluded from cultivating by religion. Music — Saracenic — its connection with restoration of art in West. Geography. Its study promoted by Saracen discoveries. Science of, advanced by Arabs. Practically restored in Europe by Crusades — by early voyagers. Scientifically perfected by subsequent agency of Christianity. Mathematics. Study congenial to Saracens.

Source of all their mental advances. Arabs imparted to West previous knowledge of Greeks — improved by their own. Arithmetical notation — cyphers of Saracenic derivation — passage of into Europe. Algebra. Its invention by Arabs probable — its first application certain. Their algebraic discoveries. Moderns excel ancients in mathematical sciences — our debt to Spanish Saracens. Astronomy. Peculiarly the science of the East. Arabians eminent in — correct and improve on Greeks. Albatagnus — worthy precursor of Newton. Saracens discern defectiveness of Ptolemaic system. Transit of astronomy into Christian West. Roger Bacon — pupil of Arabs — emendator of Kalendar — anticipator of Copernican system. Optics. Arabs first restorers of. Al Hazen — immediate successor of Ptolemy — though at an interval of 1000 years — his great optical discoveries — followed by Roger Bacon — glasses — theory of the telescope — foresight of invention of Galileo. Chemistry. Saracens its undisputed inventors. Greeks theorists — Arabs experimentalists. Alchemy fosterer of chemistry. Marks of Providence. Proficiency of Arabians in chemical science — its introduction into Catholic Europe. Alchemy the superstition of science — its uses again apparent. Roger Bacon — Robert Boyle — Sir Humphry Davy. England unrivalled in chemical science. Gas—Steam — Watt. Medicine. Arabs study Greeks — distance their preceptors. Pharmacopœia enlarged by chemistry. Medical analysis of vegetable and animal substances — of metals — of minerals — mercury — fruits of chemical researches of Arab physicians. Botany. Science of medicine — progress of Arabs in. Doctrine of symptoms. Classes of malady discovered. Transmission of art of medicine into Christian Europe. Saracen medical seminaries — Norman school of Salerno. Way led by church—Monte Casino—monastery of — Constantine Afer. Subsequent progress of art of healing among the happiest social influences of Gospel. Hospitals. The first founded by S. Ephrem Syrus. Multiplied by Crusades. Charit-

able foundations for sick — religious societies for their superintendance. Christian charity the great auxiliary of medical science. Harvey. Philosophy. Its revival and progress — effects of Mahometan and Christian faiths. Philosophy of Greeks — its meridian in the age of Alexander. Moral branch raised by Eclectic school — its unacknowledged plagiarisms from Christianity — its early disappearance — instrumental in forming school of the Fathers. Arabs pass boundary line between ancient and modern learning. Aristotle their one great guide — his practical spirit meets and awakens experimental genius of Saracens — harmonizes with their religious belief. Arabs enlarge their experiments — and their inductions — reach solid conclusions. Peculiar service rendered to philosophy by Mahometanism. Reception of by Catholic Europe. Gothic and German character — adapted to pursuit of physics. Its superiority of judgment — frees itself from shackles of Aristotelic system. Churchmen and physicians the only scholars of the age. Peculiar service rendered to philosophy by Christianity. Effects of the two creeds on history of modern philosophy. Logic and metaphysics. Studied by Saracens for defence of Mahometan faith. Controversies with Jews and Christians — origin of Arabian scholastic theology. Rise of scholastic disputes in the bosom of Mahometanism — transformed into a chaos of contradictory tenets — Saracenic intellect edged by dialectic debate — directed to substantial objects. Arabs first unite abstract science with experiment. Union augments powers of both. Scholastic theology of Arabians the origin of Christian schoolmen. Mahometan Ramists and Radicalists — Christian Realists and Nominalists. Aristotle — in Arabic version and with Arabic comments — equally supreme director of both schools. Effects also similar. Bad effects — beneficial effects — on Christendom. Providence triumphantly justified in the result. Scholastic theology the pioneer of experimental philosophy. Moral science. Fitness of the Saracens for ethical pursuits.

Aristotle their chosen preceptor in ethics. Practical moralists — illustrious examples. Romance of Hai Ebn Yokdan. Exalted philosophy of Al Gazal. Progress of Arabian learning inseparable from influences of Mahometanism. Subsequent agency of Christianity — advancement of moral science. Jews a providential link between Mahometan and Christian worlds — especially in history of ethics. Experimental philosophy — rise of among Saracens — connected with their progress in physics. Arabs soon employ physical facts in service of reason. Mr. Sharon Turner — character of Arab philosophers. Effects of their writings on their European contemporaries. Progress from facts to principles — from experiments to laws. Roger Bacon — an experimentalist of Saracenic school — the unowned preceptor of Lord Bacon. Elements of the Novum Organum in the Opus Majus. Table of direct coincidences — comprises several of the most important deductions of the Baconian philosophy. New law of philosophy traced to the impulse given by Mahometanism. Literature. Poetry and romance among Arabs before Mahomet — Moallakat — Antar. Both branches of polite letters most probably introduced into France and Italy from Asia and Spain. Saracen romances. Moorish origin of Spanish literature. Songs and ballads of Troubadours — Arabesque. Rise of Italian poetry — of English — connection with effects of Mahometanism. Intervention of Judaism — conspicuously providential. Jews from commercial converted into intellectual carriers of the world. Public schools — colleges — universities — of Saracen empire: models to Christian Europe. Comparative scale of the universities of Bagdad and Paris. Public libraries. Cordova — Cairo — Fez — notice of libraries in — above seventy opened in cities of Andalusia. These foundations imitated in West. S. Louis — Royal library of Paris. Encouragement of learned men — by caliphs of Asia and Spain — by the Italian states. Learned societies — established in Saracen Spain — illustrious fe-

males among their chief ornaments. These institutions copied eventually in Italy — progress of reviving knowledge also promoted by distinguished women. Christianity primitive source of the two great restorations of learning. Mahometan aids tributary — transitory. Saracenic learning initiatory — Christian, perfective. The covenant of Ishmael still essential to developement of that of Isaac. Connection of the twofold restoration of knowledge with influences of religious belief — summary of confirmative evidences. Merits and defects of Greek philosophy. Mental revolution consequent on influx of northern tribes into West. Office discharged by Arabs. Great fabric of European intellect rests on ground-work laid by Christianity. Past services of Mahometanism — its prospective services. Fulfilment of Abrahamic covenants — re-union of Isaac and Ishmael as civilizers of world.

CONCLUSION. — Pages 361—380.

Nature and amount of general argument. Series of cumulative evidences. Heads of induction recapitulated. Its fundamental principle necessarily supposes a final spiritual consummation. Mahometan superstition the middle term between truth and error. Obstructions to diffusion of Christianity among barbarous nations — existence of evidenced by facts. Action of Mahometanism upon barbarian population of Asia—upon negro tribes of central Africa—its inherent aptitude for proselytism of uncivilized heathen. This view of the subject presents a sphere for Islamism, suitable to the covenant of Ishmael — consistent with the honour of God — with the analogy of Providence. Brings near to the Gospel a portion of the heathen world apparently unapproachable by a higher system. Uses of Arabic tongue. Golius. Mercy of God secretly preparing a way for restoration of the East — for universal diffusion of the Gospel. Past uses of Mahometanism — its prospective spiritual uses. Eventual conversion of Mahometan nations — anticipated by Mussulmans themselves. Work once begun —

progress probably rapid. Supplies a new instrumentality for the conversion of heathen. Our great present duty. Pre-requisites for wisely acting on Mahometan world. Fatal effects of erroneous notions respecting Mahometanism on Mahometans themselves. Happy effects of opposite course anticipated.

APPENDIX. No. I. — Pages 383—416.

INQUIRY INTO THE DESCENT OF THE ARABS FROM ISHMAEL.

Foundation of the preceding inquiry rests on the Abrahamic origin of the Arabian family — questioned by infidels — by some Christian scholars. Investigation of the subject unavoidable. Ishmaelitish descent noticed by Mr. Gibbon — his affected doubts — his studied insinuations — gratuitous — in face of ancient records often used by himself as historical authorities — his misrepresentation of actual state of evidences. Evidences of national pedigree twofold — Scripture history — Arabian tradition. Scriptural testimony — two branches; direct — incidental; Mosaic records — Old Testament at large. Strength of double proof. Job — Chronicles — Prophets — Psalms. Union of testimonies irrefragable. Sceptic forced on incredible hypothesis. Ishmaelites — proportion in which Arabia peopled by. Arabian tradition. Its existence disputed by Mr. Gibbon — suppression of historical facts — invention of gratuitous theory. His statement confronted with history. Rite of circumcision — national usage of Arabs — after manner of that of Ishmael in commemoration of parentage. Testimonies of Josephus — of Origen — of S. Jerome — of Melo — of Plutarch — of Strabo. National names land-marks of history. Scriptural proofs completed by evidences of Arabian tradition. Traces of national tradition in Koran — in early Mahometan writers. Appeal to non-existing traditions by Mahomet — incredible supposition. Temple of Mecca — contained vouchers of national descent — statues of Abraham and Ishmael. Abulfeda. Doctrine of Divine Unity — always existing

in Arabia — patriarchal origin. In imminent perils Arabs always had recourse to Most High God — contrast with Greeks and Romans. Worship of Caaba — signs of a patriarchal derivation. Evidences recapitulated. Review of Mr. Gibbon's discharge of the duty of an historian — confounds history and heraldry. Question of national descent unaffected by loss of pedigree. Personal descent of Mahomet—an Ishmaelite—of tribe of Kedar. Original settlement of Arabia — two particulars of it noticed. Ishmaelites reinforced by confluence of Abrahamic tribes — from Keturah — from Lot — from Esau — from Nahor. Ascendancy of Kedarites. Ranks of Saracens filled on all sides from the stock of Abraham. Descent from Ishmael ever a matter of national pride among the Arabs — corroborative inference. Object of dissertation. All Christians bound to an implicit reception of the Scriptural account.

APPENDIX. No. II.— Pages 417—434.

SCRIPTURAL INDICATIONS OF THE PATRIARCHAL ORIGIN OF RELIGION AMONG THE ANTE-MAHOMETAN ARABIANS.

Belief of ancient Arabs elucidated from Scripture history. Ishmaelites and Midianites inhabiting Arabia as one people in time of Moses. Jethro — prince of Midian — guide to the state of national belief. Worshipper of true God — evident from sacred narrative. Example of patriarchal religion among Abrahamic Arabs to the age of Moses. Job — antiquity of book — author an Edomite — his faith indisputably patriarchal. State of religion in Arabia inferred from book of Job—from conversation of the interlocutors. Three interlocutors of the stock of Abraham. Agree in confirming authority of Arabian tradition. Bp. Sherlock. Persons of this sacred drama speak in character — represent popular notions of the time — conclusive proof of Abrahamic origin of those notions. Views disclosed in book of Job superior to any in books of Moses.

Its place in the canon of Hebrew Scripture an evidence of connection between the faith of Jews and that of Abrahamic Arabians. Subsequent periods of Jewish history — continuance in Arabia of patriarchal belief. Kenites and Rechabites — mention of in Jeremiah. Queen of Sheba — an Arabian — her visit to Solomon — connected with religion — natural inference. Gospel Magi — from Arabia — probably of race of Abraham — their journey to Jerusalem — its object — inference confirmative of preceding indications. Their knowledge of prophetic sign of Christ — favoured with direct communication from heaven. Summary of argument.

APPENDIX. No. III. — Pages 435 — 448.

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE SEVERAL APPLICATIONS OF THE PROPHECY, DAN. VIII. 9—25.

Relative merits of views taken of this prediction — Antiochus Epiphanes — Romans — Mahometanism. Objections to last application — examined — disproved — equally applicable to Rome. Type of little horn far more appropriate to Mahometan tyranny than to Roman power. Chronology of vision. Rise of horn certainly posterior to age of Antiochus or of Vespasian — its period apparently fixed by Dan. xi. 40. Latter prophecy interpreted by Sir Isaac Newton, and by Bp. Newton, of Saracens. Agreement of rise of Mahometan apostasy with chronology of vision — with that of parallel symbol and apostasy, Dan. vii. Conclusion of Mr. Whitaker arrived at by a different process. Germinant interpretation — admits several applications of same prophecy. In this sense, little horn may include all the received applications. Table of comparative correspondences with type. Inference left with the reader.

APPENDIX. No. IV. — Pages 449 — 455.

PROOFS OF THE IDENTITY OF THE CRUSADES WITH DANIEL'S "TIDINGS OUT OF THE NORTH."

Interpretation supported by the geographical and historical evidences. Geographical positions — of Europe — of chief powers engaged — of Turkish kingdom of Roum. Line of march of crusaders. Geography accurately corresponds with prophecy. Historical fulfilment in the crusades. Colonization of Europe from the North — at the fall of Roman empire — at subsequent periods. Normans — latest northern conquerors — flower of crusading armies. Achievements of Tancred — of Bohemond — of Robert of Normandy — of Richard Cœur de Lion. Norman standard first planted — on the walls of Antioch — on those of Jerusalem. Norman principality of Antioch a thorn in the side of Turks. Accomplishment of prediction stated in the words of Saracenic historians — in the words of Mr. Gibbon.

INDEX.

A

Abbas, i. 98. ii. 248. 290.
Abdallah, i. 237. ii. 180.
Abdelrahman, i. 85. ii. 213. 215, 216. 219. 251. 325. 334. 338. 467. 483.
Abelard, ii. 108. 296.
Abou-el-Cassim, ii. 482.
Abraham, i. 70—74. 87—95. 100. 110. 113—161. ii. 196. 199. 329. 362. 369. 384. 393. 395. 404. 469.
Abubeker, i. 220.
Abu Horeira, ii. 134.
Abu Taleb, ii. 459.
Abu Zacharia Jahia, ii. 225.
Abul Faraji, i. 409. ii. 291.
Abulfeda, i. 286. ii. 194. 252. 258. 266. 332. 347. 393. 404. 452. 454, 455.
Agobard, ii. 509.
Ahmet Ebn Abdalla, ii. 503.
Ahmed Ebn Hâyet, i. 386. ii. 104.
Ahmed Ebn Said, ii. 345.
Aixa, ii. 346.
Alaric, ii. 206.
Alasshari, ii. 292.
Albatagnus, ii. 266.
Al Beidawi, i. 406. ii. 476. 481. 484.
Albumazar, i. 53.
Alessandra Scala, ii. 348.
Alexander, M., i. 175—180. ii. 284. 437.
Alexius, ii. 157, 158.
Alfraganus, i. 53.
Al Gazal, i. 45. 356. 358. ii. 292. 301, 302. 305, 306. 332.
Alhazen, i. 53. ii. 269. 517.
Alhakem, ii. 213. 337, 338, 339. 545.
Ali, i. 342—353. ii. 61. 99. 299. 496.
Al Jannabi, ii. 393. 405.
Alkendi, i. 53. ii. 292.
Alwakidi, ii. 461. 480. 491.
Allwoerden, ii. 501.
Almamon, i. 46. 48. 98. ii. 266. 299. 336. 344. 469.
Alp Arslan, i. 19. 221, 222. 224. 332.
Alpharabius, i. 53. ii. 292. 300.
Alphonsi Chron. i. 85.
Alphonsus a Castro, ii. 504.
Al Raschid, ii. 300. 302. 319.
Alva, D., ii. 127. 505.
Ammianus Marcellinus, ii. 489.
Amrou, i. 46. ii. 336. 462.
Amurath, i. 201. ii. 498.
Anstis, ii. 517.
Antar, i. 217. ii. 319. 404, 405.
Antiochus Epiphanes, i. 172. 192. ii. 436.

Apocryphal Gospels, i. 91.
Apollonius Pergæus, i. 52.
Appian, i. 177.
Archimedes, i. 52. ii. 261, 262.
Ariosto, ii. 328.
Aristotle, ii. 287. 288, 289, 290, 291. 293, 294, 295. 299. 306. 309. 312. 315. 354.
Arius, ii. 105.
Arminius, ii. 110.
Arnald, ii. 198.
Arnaud, ii. 119.
Arnobius, i. 54.
Arzakel, i. 53.
Asam, i. 287.
Ashwell, ii. 308.
Asiatic Researches, i. 95. 360. ii. 77. 467. 475. 514, 515.
Athanasian Creed, ii. 103. 110.
Athanasius, ii. 105. 482.
Athelard, i. 53.
Attila, ii. 206.
Avenpace, ii. 292. 294. 301. 306.
Averroes, i. 45. 53. ii. 292. 294. 309.
Avicenna, i. 45. 53. ii. 292. 309.
Augustine, S., i. 391. ii. 106. 110. 496. 510.
Azhara, ii. 251.

B

Bacon, R., i. 50. 53. 232. ii. 117. 268, 269, 270, 271. 274, 275, 276. 309. 312—318. 344. 519.
——— F., i. 51. ii. 309. 312—318. 519.
Bagi Seian, ii. 452.
Bailly, ii. 266.
Bajazet, i. 201, 202. 205. ii. 232.
Balaam, i. 215.
Baldwin, Abp., ii. 150.
Baluz, ii. 509.
Banqueri, ii. 510.
Bartholomew, ii. 127. 131.
Barton, ii. 497.
Bayle, ii. 465.
Beattie, ii. 302.
Beckmann, ii. 283.
Bede, ii. 119. 510.
Beithar, i. 45.
Benjamin. Itin. i. 420. ii. 117. 332. 497.
Berengarius, ii. 468.
Bernard, S. ii. 119.
Berkeley, Bp., ii. 503.
Besoldus, ii. 489.
Bochart, ii. 385. 412. 427.
Bohadin, ii. 27. 160. 167. 198. 208. 455.
Bohemond, ii. 158. 452, 453, 454.
Boiardo, ii. 323.
Bossuet, ii. 126, 127.
Boulainvilliers, i. 343. 412, 413. ii. 406.
Bowyer, ii. 519.
Boyle, i. 241. ii. 276. 309.
Boysenius, ii. 501.
Brett, ii. 262.
Brucker, ii. 200. 268. 280. 286. 290, 291, 292. 295. 299. 301, 302. 305. 331, 332, 333. 345. 383. 427. 466.
Burckhardt, i. 15.
Busbequius, i. 422. ii. 498.
Butler, ii. 460. 463.

C

Cadiga, ii. 346.
Calchondylas, ii. 493.
Calmet, ii. 413, 414.
Calvin, ii. 110.
Campomanes, ii. 511.

Cantemir, i. 86. ii. 134, 135. 463.
Carima, ii. 347.
Casiri, ii. 345.
Cassandra Fidelis, ii. 348.
Cave, ii. 509.
Chaderton, i. 124.
Chardin, ii. 224.
Charles V., ii. 144. 151. 156, 157.
Chaucer, ii. 323.
Chosroes, i. 208.
Clement XI., ii. 505.
Cleopatra, ii. 210.
Coligni, ii. 130.
Columbus, ii. 238. 328.
Comnena, Anna, ii. 157. 183.
———, Isaac, ii. 160.
Conde, ii. 180. 200. 233. 469
Constantine Afer, i. 53. ii. 281. 518.
———, Palæol., i. 202.
Copernicus, ii. 269.
Copleston, Bp., ii. 505.
Cortez, ii. 522.
Cosmo de Medicis, ii. 347.
Critici Sacri, i. 141.
Culbertson, i. 230.

D

Danæus, i. 81. ii. 482.
Daniel, i. 166. 279. ii. 435—448. 449—455.
Dante, ii. 78.
Daubuz, i. 316.
David, i. 139.
———, Fr., ii. 500.
Davis, ii. 498.
Davison, i. 33. 216. ii. 460. 476. 479. 490.
Davy, ii. 276.
D'Ohsson, ii. 224. 490, 491, 492, 493, 494. 498, 499. 501. 503. 509. 524.
———, C., 513.
De Marlès, i. 15. 85. 94. 179. 187. ii. 99. 173. 180. 189. 194. 200. 216. 218. 221. 233. 247. 251. 347. 408. 467. 469. 481. 483.
De Choiseul D'Aillecourt, ii. 142. 191. 199. 200. 212.
Des Cartes, ii. 295.
D'Herbelot, i. 24. 106. 380. ii. 247. 294. 465. 467. 489.
Dibdin, ii. 504.
Diocles, i. 52.
Diodorus Siculus, ii. 393.
Diophantus, i. 52.
Dryden, ii. 121.
Dupin, ii. 509.

E

Ebn Al Athir, ii. 393.
Ebn Hanbal, ii. 247.
Ebn Thophail, 301. 307.
Eclectic Review, ii. 525, 526.
Edwards, ii. 459. 466.
Ekkehard, i. 198. 223. ii. 153. 183, 184.
Elmacin, i. 19. 21. 47. 287. ii. 129. 459. 462. 474. 478. 489. 493.
Elrington, Dr., ii. 505. 508.
Ephrem Syrus, ii. 283. 518. 519.
Epiphanius, ii. 437.
Erpenius, ii. 462. 469.
Eratosthenes, ii. 266.
Esau, ii. 443.
Eveleigh, i. 86.
Euclid, i. 45. 51.
Euthymius Zigaben., ii. 408.
Eutochius, i. 52.

F

Faber, i. 211. 216.
Fatima, ii. 346.
Fenelon, ii. 119.
Ferdinand, ii. 328.
Fevardentius, i. 238.
Figueroa, ii. 514.
Florus, ii. 437.
Fuller, i. 81.

G

Gagnier, i. 287. 366. 393.
Gale, i. 44.
Galen, ii. 339.
Galland, ii. 430. 509.
Garcias, ii. 240.
Genghis Khan, i. 204.
Gerard of Cremona, i. 53.
Ghengis Khan, ii. 207.
Gibbon, i. 25. 47. 49. 59. 61. 64. 86. 95. 197, 198. 201, 202. 205. 207. 217. 222. 224, 225. 233. 235, 236. ii. 130. 144—169. 180. 182, 183. 185. 198. 200. 203, 204. 207. 209. 219. 267, 268. 281. 321, 322. 339. 351. 358. 384, 385. 390, 391, 392—396. 409, 410. 419. 427. 452, 453, 454. 459, 460, 461, 462, 463. 472, 473. 480. 483. 485, 486, 487. 489. 498. 503. 505. 511. 519, 520.
Giraldus Cambrensis, ii. 150.
Gjannabi, i. 286.
Goa, Hist. de l'Inq., ii. 241.
Godfrey of Bouillon, ii. 155. 453, 454.
Golius, i. 47. ii. 369, 370. 407. 462. 489. 523.
Grævius and Gronovius, ii. 221. 251. 484.
Grasserus, i. 421. ii. 467.
Gregorio Ros., ii. 513.
Gregory VII. ii. 139. 182.
——— I., ii. 495. 510.
——— F. De, ii. 504.
——— S. Nyssen, ii. 508.
Grotius, ii. 427. 495.
Gualtperius, i. 140.
Guibert, ii. 187.

H

Hadrian, ii. 392.
Hagar, i. 90. 125. 128. ii. 409. 418.
Hai Ebn Yokdan, ii. 301, 302. 307, 308.
Hali, i. 53.
Hales, i. 203. 239. 268.
Hallam, i. 2. 328. ii. 406.
Haller, ii. 518.
Hamilton, Terrick, ii. 404.
Harvey, ii. 284.
Hasan, ii. 332.
Heber, Bp., i. 108. ii. 517. 523.
Heeren, i. 86. ii. 142. 200. 238, 239. 322.
Heliodorus, ii. 319.
Henderson, i. 361, 362.
Henry, Don, ii. 239, 260. 327.
Heraclius, ii. 461. 480.
Hermannus Contractus, i. 53.
———— Dalmatus, i. 53.
Hippocrates, i. 52. ii. 339.
Historical and Crit. Refl. ii. 499, 500.
Holaghou Khan, i. 204. 232.
Honain, ii. 326. 349.
Hooker, ii. 482.
Horace, ii. 57. 472.

Horne, ii. 516.
Horton, R. W. ii. 523.
Hottinger, i. 1. 4. 12, 13. 18. 21. 25. 29. 46. 58. 95. 106. 257. 354. 365, 366. 392. ii. 130. 138. 460. 462, 463, 464, 465. 467. 474, 475, 477. 480, 481, 482. 486, 487, 488, 489. 492. 497.
Hudson, ii. 427.
Huss, ii. 130.
Hyde, i. 380. ii. 401. 434. 460.

I

Jacob, ii. 252. 294.
Jallalo'ddin, i. 406.
Jebb, Bp. ii. 98. 497. 524.
——, Hon. Justice, ii. 517.
——, Dean, ii. 517.
——, Dr. S., i. 50. ii. 268. 517—519.
Jerome, ii. 398, 399. 409. 430. 437. 508. 510.
Jethro, ii. 418.
Inglis, Sir R. H., ii. 507, 508. 510.
Innocent, ii. 139.
—— III., ii. 794.
Johannes, Hier., ii. 508.
——, Diac. ii. 495.
John, King, ii. 327.
——, Saint, i. 167. 279.
Johnes, ii. 198.
Joinville, ii. 505.
Jonadab, ii. 424. 426.
Jones, Sir W., ii. 77. 469. 523.
Joshua, i. 292.
Josephus, i. 137. ii. 395—398. 409. 411. 427.
Judah, i. 139. 295.
Juvencus, ii. 430.
Jowett, ii. 489.
Irenæus, i. 378.
Isaac, i. 70—74. 82, 83. 87—95. 102. 110. 113—161. 182. 185. 294. ii. 100. 115. 165. 171. 174. 196. 221. 240. 276. 326. 329. 351. 362. 394, 395. 476. 484. 511.
Ishmael, i. 70—74. 82, 83. 87—95. 101, 102. 110. 113—161. 162—165. 294. ii. 100. 115. 165. 171. 174. 196. 198. 206. 210. 220, 221. 240. 277. 326. 329. 351. 362. 369. 385—416. 476. 484. 511.

K

Kaye, Bp., i. 68. 408. ii. 98. 516.
Kedar, i. 140. 295. ii. 387. 391.
Keith, ii. 308.
Kidder, i. 108.
Kitab-al-Felahat, ii. 225.
Kitab-al-Resula, i. 365.
Koran, *passim*.

L

La Croze, ii. 501. 503. 514.
Laud, Abp., i. 342.
Laurence, Dr. F., i. 216. 222.
Lavocat, ii. 462.
Law, Bp. of Carlisle, i. 78. 104. ii. 517. 521.
Lee, ii. 484, 485.
Leibnitz, ii. 302. 500.
Leo Africanus, ii. 307. 332.
—— X., ii. 344. 520.
—— Icon., ii. 468. 509.
—— Magn. ii. 510.
—— Mutinen. R., i. 323. ii. 496.

Leslie, ii. 263. 464. 499, 500. 503.
Liturgy, ii. 67.
Livius, ii. 339.
Lobna, ii. 346.
Lomierus, ii. 339. 340.
Lorenzo de Medici, ii. 341. 343. 347. 520.
Louis, S., ii. 125. 259. 336. 340, 341. 505.
Lowman, i. 216. ii. 494.
Lowth, ii. 497.
Lubinietski, ii. 499. 501.
Luther, i. 324.
Lux Renata, ii. 124.

M

Mabillon, ii. 509.
Magee, Abp., ii. 419.
Magi, ii. 429. 433.
Mahmud, i. 224. ii. 123, 124. 177. 463.
Mahomet, life of, i. 12. 285.
———, *passim*.
——— II., i. 198. 200. 206. 208. 222. 224. ii. 160. 493.
Maimonides, ii. 109. 408.
Makrizi, ii. 337.
Malek Shah, i. 199. 223. ii. 268. 332.
Mallebranche, ii. 295.
Malmsbury, W. of, ii. 119.
Maracci, i. 108.
Marco Polo, ii. 259.
Mariem, ii. 346.
Martel, Charles, i. 85. ii. 483.
Martene and Durand, i. 198. ii. 153. 155. 183, 184. 191. 470. 483.
Masson, ii. 509.
Maurice, ii. 123. 468.
Mede, i. 197. 203. 216. 277. ii. 493.
Mesuah, ii. 300. 349.
Messul, i. 48. ii. 349.
Mickle, i. 94. 302.
Michaelis, i. 104. 109. 328.
Military Reflections, ii. 492.
Mill, D., i. 366. 369. 374, 375. 394. 408.
Miller, i. 2. 37. 48. ii. 470.
Mills, i. 17—19. 76. ii. 463. 482. 485.
Milton, ii. 323.
Mishcat-ul-Masabih, i. 217. 278.
Moahwiyah, ii. 254.
Mohammed Ebn Musa, ii. 264.
Mohammedanism, Refl. on, i. 104.
Montanus, ii. 61.
Montucla, ii. 264.
Morley, Daniel, i. 53.
Moses, i. 76. 79. 200. 314.
———, Rabbi, ii. 307.
Mosheim, ii. 522.
Mutasim Billah, ii. 129.

N

Nadham al Molk, ii. 332.
Nadir Shah, i. 272.
Nearcha, ii. 340.
Nennius, ii. 322.
Neuser, ii. 500.
Newton, Bp., i. 63. 146. 188. 192, 193. 208. 216. 224. 268. 271. 276. ii. 399. 436. 444, 445. 448. 490. 493.
———, Sir I., i. 175. 190. 193. 216. 271. ii. 267. 436.
Niccoli, ii. 341.
Nicholas V., ii. 344.
Nicole, ii. 119. 497.
Nicoll, i. 342.
Niebuhr, ii. 411.
Nivernois, ii. 232.
Noureddin, i. 272.

O

Ocba Ebn Al Heyaz, ii. 330.
Ockley, i. 4. 11. 17. 46. 88. 96. 98. 220. ii. 192. 486. 461, 462. 473. 480. 491. 503.
Oelsner, i. 1. 30. 46. 290. ii. 99. 107. 143. 166. 200. 224. 237. 249. 257. 261. 263. 279. 331. 406. 414. 465. 479. 486.
Olaus Celsius, ii. 469. 480.
Omar, i. 48. 292. ii. 99. 192. 250. 252.
——— Ebn Ibrahim, ii. 264.
Ommiah, House of, i. 98. ii. 246. 325.
Origen, i. 119. ii. 397. 409. 484. 490.

P

Paddock, i. 16.
Paley, i. 1. 28. 30. 57. ii. 521.
Pappus, ii. 339.
Park, ii. 522, 523.
Parkhurst, i. 244.
Pascal, ii. 119. 506.
Patricides, ii. 481.
Paul, Saint, i. 73. ii. 236. 329. 367. 526.
——, Bp. ii. 269.
Pelagius, ii. 106. 110.
Peter, A. of Clugny, i. 53.
——— the Hermit, ii. 149. 184. 189. 511.
Petrus Diaconus, ii. 495.
Philip II., ii. 340. 483. 505.
Phocas, i. 267.
Pindar, ii. 526.
Pius V. ii. 505.
Pizarro, ii. 522.
Plato, ii. 285. 487.
Playfair, ii. 261. 263, 264. 269. 518.
Plutarch, i. 187. ii. 339.
Pocock, i. 21. 25. 46. 57. 356. 358. 366. 386. 389. 394. 408. 411. 414, 415. 426. ii. 95. 102—104. 107. 110. 308. 393. 406, 407. 427. 460. 469, 470. 472. 476. 482. 495, 496. 498. 503.
Polybius, i. 177.
Pope, ii. 57. 121.
Porphyry, ii. 286.
Postel, ii. 489.
Prideaux, i. 267.
Ptolemy, i. 45. 52. ii. 261, 262. 269. 517.

R

Rasmussen, ii. 258.
Raymond of Toulouse, ii. 511.
Raynal, ii. 239.
Raynard, ii. 509.
Rediya, ii. 347.
Reiske, ii. 194. 331.
Reland, i. 367. 377. 380. 394. 405. 426. ii. 93. 99. 393. 496.
Renaud, ii. 508, 509.
Rennel, i. 68.
Retrospective Review, i. 2. 21. 47. 104. ii. 459. 460. 470. 472. 474—476.
Richard I., ii. 198. 208. 452.
Riley, i. 16.
Robert Retinensis, i. 53. ii. 268.
——— Duke of Normandy, ii. 452, 453.
Robertson, i. 65. ii. 144. 151. 156, 157. 166. 169. 185. 239. 461. 489. 510.
Roderick of Toledo, ii. 459. 463.
Roscoe, ii. 341. 343, 344.

Roger, K. of Sicily, ii. 230. 513.
Rollin, i. 177.
Romanus, i. 197.
Rousseau, ii. 487.
Rubruquis, ii. 259.

S

Sacred Literature, i. 382. ii. 55. 83.
Saladin, i. 199. ii. 160, 161. 198. 207, 208. 455.
Sale, i. 2. 6. 19—21. 25. 57. 67. 76. 284. 286—288. 306. 326. 330, 331. 334. 336. 365. 368. 370. 373—378. 380. 405—409. 411. 413. 416. 423. 426. ii. 4. 6. 12, 13. 31. 43. 45. 61. 98. 105. 134. 302. 401, 402. 411. 466. 472. 480. 489. 497. 501. 503.
Sarah, i. 126. ii. 395.
Saville, ii. 469.
Scaliger, i. 44.
Schleusner, i. 244.
Schultetus, ii. 489. 492.
Selden, i. 324, 325. 397. ii. 407. 451, 452. 496. 503. 517.
Seljuk, i. 198. 200. 223. ii. 179.
Septem Castrensis, ii. 537.
Servetus, ii. 499. 501.
Shaheda, ii. 347.
Shakespear, ii. 516.
Shakspeare, ii. 323.
Shahrestani, ii. 406. 472. 476.
Sheba, Queen of, ii. 426. 429.
Sherlock, Bp., i. 114. 116. 119. 126. 143, 144. ii. 413. 421, 423.
Sobieski, i. 86. ii. 483.
Socinus, ii. 499.
Socrates, ii. 285. 289.
Soliman, i. 201. 203. 237. ii. 501, 502.
Sophronius, ii. 436.
Southey, i. 101. ii. 79. 252.
Sozomen, ii. 518, 519.
Spanheim, ii. 474.
Stephanus, ii. 408.
Strabo, ii. 399, 400. 409. 413.
Swinburne, ii. 470.
Sylvan, ii. 500.
Sylvester, i. 510.
———, II. (Gerbert), i. 53. ii. 183. 263. 268. 468.

T

Tacitus, i. 94. 135.
Talmuds, i. 91.
Tamerlane, i. 19. 205. ii. 463.
Tancred, ii. 452—454.
Tertullian, i. 408. ii. 61. 490.
Thabet Ebn Corah, i. 53.
Theophanes, ii. 413. 461. 480.
Thomas-à-Kempis, ii. 119. 504.
Thomas Aquinas, ii. 294.
Titus, i. 135. ii. 392.
Togrul Bey, i. 197. 221. ii. 493.
Toukush, i. 199.
Townson, ii. 425. 465.
Turner, i. 48. 50—53. 73. 79. 85, 86. 221. ii. 150. 153—156. 159. 173. 176, 177. 182—184. 189. 200. 210. 257. 263. 297. 304. 309, 310. 467. 470. 471. 488. 511.

V

Van Waenen, i. 342.
Vasari, ii. 504.
Ubertus Folieta, ii. 484.
Vertot, i. 81. 376. ii. 402.
Vespasian, ii. 396.
Villers, ii. 450. 504, 505, 506, 507, 508. 510, 511. 522.

Vivaldus, i. 367. ii. 93.
Universal History, i. 81.
Urban II., ii. 149, 150, 151. 182. 504.

W

Walid I., ii. 463. 482.
Wallichius, ii. 491.
Walton, ii. 463. 469. 489.
Warburton, Bp., i. 104. ii. 460. 498.
Warnerus, ii. 402.
Warton, ii. 322.
Watt, ii. 276.
Werdan, ii. 481.
Whitaker, ii. 435.
White, i. 1. 5. 13, 14. 17. 28, 29. 35. 48. 55. 57. 59. 61. 64. 77. 80. 82. 104. 108, 109. 150. ii. 460. 463. 466, 467. 469, 470. 472, 473. 488. 500. 503.
Wickliffe, ii. 468.
Wilkins, ii. 514.
William de Couchis, i. 53.
——— of Tyre, ii. 187. 470.
Wolff, ii. 425.
Woodhouse, i. 266.
Worthington, i. 366. ii. 487.

X

Ximenes, Cardinal, i. 47. ii. 340.
———, Roderick, i. 30. ii. 482.

Y

Yezid, i. 220.

Z

Zareddien, i. 95. ii. 241.
Zeineddien, ii. 455.
Zouch, i. 192. 216. ii. 436. 440.

Published by the same Author.

DISCOURSES principally on Subjects of Scripture History. Price 10*s*. 6*d*. in boards.

CRITICAL ESSAYS on Genesis, Chap. XX., and on St. Matthew, Chap. II. 17, 18. with Notes. — Price 4*s*. in boards.

MAHOMETANISM UNVEILED.

INTRODUCTION.

THE success of Mahometanism has been fairly stated, as the only event in the history of the human species, which admits of comparison with the propagation of Christianity.* This consideration is sufficient to account for the interest with which the religion of Mahomet has been surveyed, and continues to be surveyed, by men of reading and reflection: especially when the fact of its exclusiveness is taken in connection with the intrinsic force of the comparison between the two creeds. Beginning alike in silence and obscurity, they have advanced to a dominion equally unknown in any other age or institution†: while the general features of their

* Paley.

† For the course run by Mahometanism, see Hottinger, Historia Orientalis, p. 274. and pp. 279, 280. edit. 1651; White, Bampton Lectures, edit. Dublin, 1785; Oelsner, Effets de la Religion de Mohammed, chapitre iii.

history present resemblances and agreements abundantly in character with this fundamental coincidence, to fix universal attention on the parallel.[1] The importance of the subject may be fairly measured, by the degree in which it has exercised the conflicting zeal of the enemies and friends of our holy faith. In the estimation of the unbeliever, this parallel is still seen to furnish his most specious ground of attack; in that of the Christian advocate, it opens an arduous and anxious field for the defence of Revelation; while, by competent minds, neither deficient in sound learning and philosophy, nor wanting in genuine attachment to the great truths of Christianity, the question is, to this day, regarded as unsettled, and the causes which induced the success of Mahometanism pronounced an unsolved problem.*

Where the subject involves the best interests of mankind, this is obviously a state of the question in which the human mind will hardly consent to rest. Inquiry must, and eventually will, proceed. But the success of inquiry will inevit-

[1] Throughout this work, the figures refer to the Notes at the end.

* See Sale's Koran, Advertisement to Reader, pp. iii, iv.; Retrospective Review, vol. iii. article, Sale's Koran; and Philosophy of Modern History, vol. i. pp. 235, 236. "A full explanation of the causes which contributed to the progress of Mohammedanism is not, perhaps, at present attainable, by those most conversant with this department of literature." — History of the Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 163.

ably depend on its being instituted on a sound principle, and on its taking, from the outset, a right direction. The investigation of Mahometanism upon such a basis is plainly much to be desired: and where there is any reasonable hope that such a basis may be found, the research after it becomes an object, not merely of laudable pursuit, but (the great interests at stake duly considered) of positive and paramount obligation.

It is designed, in the following pages, to attempt an inquiry into the character of Mahometanism, and the causes of its success, upon new and untried ground: an undertaking which, if without better apology, is at least justified by the confessed failure or imperfection of the various solutions heretofore advanced. Whatever may be the fate of this inquiry, the writer will have at least the satisfaction to reflect, that it had its rise in an earnest solicitude for the honour of Christianity, and has been undertaken under a conscientious sense of the attending responsibilities.

The pretensions of the arch-heresy which is to form the subject of the present work, will be best understood from a short and impartial review of the leading phenomena of its history. The world is already familiar, indeed, with

statements of these phenomena: but such statements have too generally been made under the influence of a preconceived system. On the part both of infidel and of Christian writers, prejudice has been suffered to usurp the place of sound judgment; and indisputable facts have been made to bend, or accommodate themselves, to crude and undigested theories. It is, therefore, matter of serious moment, in the outset of an inquiry like that now proposed, that an impartial and dispassionate survey should be made afresh of the general features of Mahometanism; which survey may stand as the groundwork of our subsequent reasoning.

1. On a retrospect of the history of this vast superstition, the characteristic that first offers itself for consideration, is the obscurity of its origin. The religion of Mahomet, which extends its dominion over so many nations, and covers with its shadow so large and fair a portion of the earth, arose silently and unobserved, in a remote corner of the East, in a dark age, among a wild and ignorant people.* It owned for its founder a solitary Arab, bred up in the prevailing national idolatry †, professedly illiterate, and apparently without better opportunities of in-

* Ockley, History of the Saracens, preface, pp. vii. xv. edit. 1757.

† Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 152.

struction than were common to him with his untutored and barbarous countrymen.[2] Mahomet, it is true, possessed the hereditary advantage of powerful local connections. But much as this advantage has been insisted on by controversialists, it contributed little to his success in the earlier and more arduous stages of his career*: for his prophetic claim was rejected with scorn by his own family, and opposed with rancorous violence by the tribe of which he was a member. Whatever personal weight may have accrued to him from a lucrative marriage, certain it is, that this circumstance has not been shown, either to have materially increased the number or devotion of his friends, or at all to have diminished the muster and malignity of his enemies.

2. Neither was the obscurity of its origin the sole or chief impediment originally opposed to the progress of Mahometanism. Other and more formidable obstacles existed, in the social and political state of Arabia, and in the immemorial character and customs of its extraordinary population. So far back as the lights of history can reach, one uniform spirit of external hostility and internal dissension has characterised the tribes of these deserts. Beyond the bounds of the Peninsula, the roving Bedoweens, in every

* White, Bampt. Lect. p. 90.

age, carried on incessantly the same system of desultory and predatory warfare[3]; while within these bounds was maintained a perpetual conflict, yet more inveterate and deadly, in which tribe divided against tribe, and family against family, in relentless and interminable civil feuds.[4] To judge by all past experience, the sands of their deserts were not more incapable of union than the Arab hordes.* When pressed successively by Roman, Abyssinian, and Persian invaders, the love of freedom and independence, for which they have been ever famed, opposed, indeed, a formidable and successful resistance. But, through the long series of Arabian story, prior to the seventh century of the Christian era, no one example is on record, in which the Arabs, foregoing domestic hostilities, and forgetting private broils, agreed to band together for the assertion of their privileges, or the extension of their power, as a nation. At this advanced period, the rise of Mahomet wholly changed the character of his countrymen, and the face of things; insomuch that, were there nothing in Mahometanism strange or surprising beside, this one

* Mahomet himself makes the unprecedented union of the Arabs under him, a proof of the divine origin of his pretended mission: "If thou hadst expended whatever riches are in the earth, thou couldest not have united their hearts; but God united them." — Sale's Koran, vol. i. p. 238. ed. Lond. 1801, with translator's note.

fact might well fill the reflecting mind with wonder and admiration, that, under its irresistible sway, the habits and usages, the passions and prejudices of ages, became, as in a moment, extinct. Scattered and rival clans blended into one family; mutual hatred and hostility were simultaneously exchanged for the universal spirit of unanimity and fraternal fellowship; and the robbers of the wilderness sprang forth suddenly in the novel character of a great and conquering people.[5] This consummation, unprecedented in the history of mankind, cannot be dismissed hastily or cursorily from view, without injustice to the merits of the subject, and prejudice to the interests of truth. Whatever the controversialist may affirm, no adequate solution has yet been found or offered for the anomaly in question. And this admission the Christian philosopher will be the first to make, who cannot see the expediency of courting victory at the expense of fairness and candour.

3. Another peculiar feature in the history of Mahometanism is the abruptness of its rise. The way was successively prepared for the introduction of Judaism and Christianity, by a long train of previous circumstances and events. Not so, to any corresponding extent, in the case of Mahometanism. Arabia, it is admitted, could

number among its inhabitants some few Jewish and Christian tribes; yet, although the profession of both creeds within the Peninsula was coeval, probably, with the apostolic age, the tribes that embraced them appear to have exercised little or no influence in enlightening the great mass of their idolatrous countrymen. The majority, including the tribe and family of the pseudo-prophet, remained buried in gross idolatry, enslaved by a blind and bloody superstition. Notwithstanding, therefore, what has been asserted to the contrary, the state of religion in ante-Mahometan Arabia presented little that would naturally prompt the idea of a successful imposture.[6] For precedents, Mahomet had to look beyond the boundaries of his native country. So far as can now be collected, a creative genius, some national traditions, and such notices of the true religion as an obscure and distant view of the Jewish and Christian revelations could supply, were his only resources. With these most inadequate aids, he first emancipated himself from the errors of that heathenism in which he had been educated[7]; and then undertook and accomplished the almost incredible task of enlightening and proselytising the Arabian world. So sudden was the transition, that, within the space of twelve short years, those wilds which

had echoed to every impious form of idol-worship, responded only to the name and honour of one God.[8] To effect this change, indeed, the secular arm was lavishly employed; in the more advanced stages, especially, of the progress, the sword went hand in hand with the Koran: the question, however, remains (a question of greater difficulty than we are commonly prepared to allow), what must have been, originally, the force of that persuasion[9], which could, under all the circumstances, prepare and ensure a successful appeal to the sword?

4. The sudden and signal triumph of Mahometanism within the confines of Arabia, unprecedented as it must appear, is obscured and thrown comparatively into shade, by the rapidity and extent of its propagation beyond the bounds of the Peninsula. To the alleged unexampled circumstances of its propagation, accordingly, its votaries confidently appeal, as "the express testimonies of heaven to the truth and holiness of their religion." Nor is the appeal made without some show of reason: it undeniably stands good, so far as the mere success of a religion may be received as a test of its divine origin. For, taken in this aspect, the progress of the religion of Mahomet has plainly but one parallel in the annals of the world.[10] Let the

merits of the case be tried by a direct historical test: let the career of Mahometan conquest be compared with the course of other conquerors: some just estimate may thus be formed of a single peculiarity of this creed, — the extraordinary character of its promulgation.

An illustrious test is ready to our hand, in the history of the Roman empire. Aiming, from the epoch of her foundation, at universal dominion, her own imperishable annals painfully record how slow and difficult was the progress of the imperial city towards it. As the eye pursues the rise of Roman greatness, through an eventful period of more than seven hundred years, the mind is tasked, and the memory overburthened, by the series of great captains, and the succession of disciplined armies, which were required and employed to render Rome the mistress of the nations. Nor is the experience different, when we turn to survey the fall of the Western empire. Here, the long struggle of Roman history is, as it were, enacted anew, in the painful and protracted efforts, by which "the giants of the north" at length effected its overthrow. The fury of the outpoured tribes of Germany and Scythia, conducted by the destroying genius of an Alaric, or an Attila, and unremittingly exerted through a course of ages, hardly and

laboriously wrought out the work of desolation.[11]

To both results, the propagation of Mahometanism, whether considered in its rapidity or in its extent, presents a signal and singular contrast. Encountering, simultaneously, the rival empires of Rome and Persia in the East, the immediate successors of Mahomet established, in the same moment, their dominion over the fairest provinces of both powers, and their creed upon the ruins of Christianity and of the Magian superstition. The conquests of Syria[12], of Persia, of Egypt, of Palestine, succeeded each other with a celerity that outruns description. Thence the storm spread, without check or pause, eastward, to the frontiers of India and China, westward, to the pillars of Hercules and the shores of the Atlantic, and on the north, to the banks of the Oxus and Jaxartes, and the frozen borders of the Caspian. "The Mahometan crescent," observes the accurate and learned Ockley, treating of the *twenty-first year* of the Hejra, "began now to shed its malignant influence upon as large and considerable dominions as had ever been flown over by the Roman eagle." * — "The Saracen empire," says another writer, "extended its dominion in eighty years over more kingdoms and countries

* History of the Saracens, vol. i. p. 315.

than the Roman in eight hundred." * A few seasons more annexed Spain and Sicily to the empire of the Caliphs. And thus, in less than a century from the period of its rise in the barren wilds of Arabia, the Mahometan religion extended and bore sway over the greater part of Asia and Africa, and threatened to seat itself in the heart of Catholic Europe. [13]

5. The splendid success of Mahomet, and the unparalleled rapidity and extent of the propagation of his religion, is the favourite argument of Mahometans themselves in vindication of their creed. Mahometanism, however, possesses an argument in its favour, of far greater weight than any which can be drawn from the character of its original promulgation. I speak of its *permanence;* a feature of this extraordinary superstition which has never been accounted for; and which none but the prejudiced or unreflecting can pretend to contemplate without interest.† Reasonable explanations have been offered of its other chief phenomena. An intelligible cause has been assigned for the first establishment of a religion,

* Life of Mahomet, prefixed to Four Dissertations on the Mahometan Religion, p. 78.

† " Quæri cœptum est, non tam a Muselmannis, *quâm fidei Christianæ consecraneis*, unde factum quòd religio (Muhammedica) — tantum protinus non consecuta modò fuerit consensum, *sed et eundem obtinuerit ad hæc nostra tempora.*" — Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 274.

which is alleged to have founded itself in an artful accommodation to existing systems of belief, and to have addressed itself to the prejudices and passions of mankind: satisfactory grounds have been advanced for the successful progress of a faith, which silenced opposition by force, and seconded its pretensions with the sword: but no sufficient account has yet been given or attempted of that character of permanence, which the lapse of twelve centuries has impressed upon Mahometanism.* If its duration were commensurate merely with that of the empire to which it gave birth; if its spiritual sway could be measured, in after ages, by the rise and fall of its temporal power; much of the difficulty would be removed. The case, however, admits of no such relief. The whole facts of it, on the contrary, go to demonstrate, that the creed of Mahomet possesses an inherent spiritual influence, wholly distinct and separable from its secular domination; and that it is not more remarkable, for its despotism over the fortunes, than for its absolute dominion in the minds, of men.

6. The completeness of its mental domination is one of the most noted and best ascertained facts

* "Mille annorum flexus est et fluxus (is the nervous expression of Hottinger in the seventeenth century) ex quo infelicissimus Muhammedis fœtus, ab orbis magna parte exceptus est, *et retentus.*" P. 279. Compare Dr. White, Bampt. Lect. pp. 46, 47.

in the early history of Mahometanism. * It is legible in the high enthusiasm which characterised the first Moslems, from the near friends of the Prophet, to his meanest followers, from the leaders of the Saracen armies, to the servile refuse of the camp. But the point which now claims attention, is the durability of that first impression, the permanence of this mental subjection.[14] To determine this point in the affirmative, it will not be enough to consider the effects of Mahometanism upon the mind, in countries where it is dominant as connected with the state; for here it may be contended, that the fanatical spirit of the religion is fostered from motives of policy, and factitiously sustained by its alliance with the temporal power. Its genuine and undoubted influence can be seen only in a state of society, where its votaries are unshackled by the restraints imposed by a Mahometan government; and where, consequently, neither policy nor personal interest can be supposed to operate. Such a state of society happens to obtain in a quarter of the world, where Mahometanism has existed in an unestablished and insulated form, since the times of the first Saracen conquests. In their progress westward, through the deserts of Africa,

* White, p. 47.

the primitive Moslems left behind them the seeds of colonies, which continue to the present day thinly sprinkled over that vast wilderness; the Bedoween being naturally attracted and detained by the suitableness of the region to his desultory and predatory habits, and by the similarity of the soil and climate to those from which he had recently emerged.* These roving tribes have preserved the purity of their race, with hereditary jealousy, from admixture with the native Africans†; and holding little or no intercourse with foreigners, beyond the bare interchange of a few necessary commodities with the Moorish states, they present at this day the most genuine portrait extant of the character of their forefathers, the first Moslems. In the great desert of Africa, accordingly, there is a singular opportunity afforded of estimating the influence of Mahometanism, apart from its original and ordinary alliance with political domination. The result establishes, in the fullest extent, the fact of its permanent dominion over the human mind. The Arabs of the western desert graphically exemplify in the nineteenth century, the recorded

* So early as the eighth century of the Christian era, and second of the Hejra, we find Bedoween tribes in the African desert, already relapsed into their primitive migratory state. See De Marlès, Histoire de la Domination des Arabes en Espagne, tom. i. pp. 189, 190.

† Burckhardt, p. 217.

spirit of the Saracen conquerors in the seventh. The same high enthusiasm and anti-social zeal are strikingly visible, both in their intercourse among themselves, and in their carriage towards strangers. The perpetual maintenance of their independence is still their glory and boast; and they guard with a zealous and unceasing vigilance the traditions and the faith of their Arabian ancestors. Copies of the Koran, written on skins, are carefully preserved, and constantly studied, in each family*; and the calamities of shipwreck have recently afforded an opportunity of ascertaining the fanatical avidity with which its lessons are imbibed; and the opinions entertained by these sons of Ishmael respecting the character and situation of Christians. "The heads of their discourse concerning us," says a shipwrecked mariner, who learned the conversation of this savage people through the medium of a negro interpreter, "was, that we were a poor, miserable, degraded race of mortals, doomed to the everlasting punishment of hell-fire after death, and, in this life, fit only for the company of dogs."† If he forgets only the intervals of time and place, this language at once transports the reader among "the com-

* Riley's Narrative of the Loss of the Ship Commerce, p. 400, &c. Lond. 1817.

† Paddock's Shipwreck of the Oswego, p. 148. Lond. 1818.

panions" of the false prophet: its genuine fanaticism might have fallen from the lips of the fiery Kaled, or the ferocious Derar.*

7. The feature of Mahometanism which next lays claim to notice, is nearly connected with the preceding heads, of its permanence, and its mental dominion. This trait is, its power, as conquering, to change the creeds and characters of the subject nations†; and, as conquered, to absorb the conquerors and their religions in submission to its faith.‡

Under the former aspect, its prompt and effectual extirpation of the idolatry of Arabia, and the unparalleled revolution of mind and manners which the action of the new religion produced among its tribes, were but preludes and precursors to succeeding triumphs, in every clime where Paganism flourished, over Paganism in its best, and in its most degrading, forms. The rude idolatry of Scythia or of Inner Africa, and the refined and venerable superstition of the Persian Magi, alike fell prostrate before the law of the Koran; while the new converts, bound together as brethren by this common tie, forgot their personal prejudices, and national antipathies, as

* See Ockley, vol. i. pp. 12, 13. 33. 45. 65. 86. 91, &c. 115, 116.
† White, Bampt. Lect. p. 295.
‡ Mills, History of Muhammedanism, p. 180. London, 1818.

they fought side by side for the propagation of their adopted faith. But the memorable achievements of the followers of Mahomet, in subverting idol creeds, sink into insignificance in comparison with another triumph of Mahometanism, the almost utter subversion of CHRISTIANITY, in the East. This divine religion, which originally won its lowly and peaceful way in triumphant opposition to the utmost violence of political power, bowed itself to the dust, in the very regions whence it first emanated, and where for centuries it had most flourished, almost without a struggle, under the sword and law of Mahomet.* The strange and startling anomaly, which thus eclipsed the sun of Christendom, and which has left it, at the expiration of twelve hundred years, "shorn of half its beams," remains to the present hour unparalleled and unexplained. Every conquering faith beside has merged eventually in the Christian; but the banner of the cross itself has been seen to succumb before the victorious progress of the crescent.†

Nor is the power of Mahometanism more remarkable, in its influence, as conquering, to subvert, than in its efficacy, as conquered, to

* Mills, Hist. of Muhamm. p. 179.

† "Ab initiis parvis, perpetuo secundorum eventuum tenore, maximam et florentissimam orbis Christiani partem armis subegit, *et fidem infidelitati succumbere coegit.*" — Hottinger, p. 274.

absorb, the religions with which it has come in contact. For irrefragable vouchers of this characteristic, the reader needs only be referred to the history of the Turks[15] and Tartars. The successive invasions of the Saracen empire by these Pagan hordes, during the eventful period of its decline, terminated uniformly in the conversion of the barbarian conquerors. The Gaznavide and Seljukian Sultans, who shook, and the successors of Genghis Khan, who overthrew, the throne of the Caliphs, vied with one another in their adoption of the Mahometan faith. * And the fourteenth century invites the philosophical historian to survey, in the career of the celebrated Tamerlane, the singular spectacle, of a Tartar proselyte penetrating into India for the avowed purpose of bowing that vast peninsula to the yoke of the Koran.[16] The enthusiastic zeal of this conqueror for the propagation of the Mahometan religion, thus founded eventually, in India, the Mahometan empire of the Great Mogul. †

8. Had the effects now described attended the promulgation of a creed, rich in ceremonials, and presenting to the eye of the multitude visible and palpable objects of belief, the analogy of

* See Elmacin, Historia Saracenica, p. 267. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1625; Sale, Advertisement to Reader, pp. iii, iv.; Mills, p. 180.

† First consolidated under Sultan Baber, a descendant of Tamerlane, A. D. 1530.

history, and our experience of human nature, might unite to suggest some reasonable account of its success. But Mahometanism can lay claim to neither advantage. The pure and naked theism of its confession of faith *, however consonant it may, by some, be accounted to the dictates of right reason[17], is too abstract and impalpable to be, of itself, inviting to the popular tastes or feelings. Since the world began, there is no instance beside, and while the world lasts, there will probably be no second instance, of a simple theism recommending itself, as such, to the popular choice. † The laboured simplicity of its ritual, again, is, if possible, yet more repulsive, than the cold severity of its doctrines. Here are no splendid spectacles to strike the senses, no gorgeous apparatus to catch the fancy or kindle the imagination, no provision, in a word, for an appeal to the outward and animal man. ‡ A

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 93.

† The Mahometans themselves are less wedded to the abstract doctrine of the divine unity, than some denominations calling themselves Christians. Mr. Sale (no incompetent judge in this matter) lays down, as his fourth rule for the conversion of Mahometans, that we are "not to quit any article of the Christian faith, to gain them. It is (he observes) a fond conceit of the Socinians, that we shall, upon *their* principles, be most likely to prevail upon the Mohammedans: *it is not true in matter of fact; we must not give up any article to gain them.*" — Sale's Koran, Advertisement to Reader, p. vi.

‡ The pilgrimage to Mecca is, perhaps, an exception to this remark: but it is a solitary one; and, as such, could exercise little permanent or sensible influence on the imagination.

naked temple, and a solitary Imaum, include the ordinary attractions which Mahometanism holds out to incite the believer to the performance of his silent worship. Ablution, prayer, fasting, alms-giving, pilgrimage, form the sum of his positive religious duties. * Humanly judging, a faith thus simple, abstracted, and unadorned, contained (the warlike fervour of its first enthusiasm once subsided) little promise of progress, and less of permanence.

Mahometanism, however, has been largely progressive, independently altogether of its appeal to the secular arm †; while the permanence of its rigid and inviolable theism remains, after a duration of twelve hundred years, an unsolved, and apparently unsolvible phenomenon. [18] The tendency of mankind, under every other religious system, to create for themselves sensible and tangible objects of worship, is universal and immemorial. Under the Old Testament dispensation, the Israelites, possessing as they did the true doctrine of the Godhead, strangely and perversely forsook that doctrine, for the errors of a gross idolatry. Under the more perfect

* Pocock, Specimen Historiæ Arabum, pp. 26, 27., and pp. 294—303. edit. Oxon. 1806. ; Elmacin, Hist. Sar. p. 3. ; Hotting. Hist. Orient. pp. 247, 248.

† Sale, Advertisement, pp. iii, iv. ; Retrospective Review, vol. iii. p. 3.

dispensation of the Gospel, the divine truths of Christianity, in the progress of ages, were gradually clouded and obscured by the corruptions of idolatrous superstition. The disciples of Mahomet alone assume to themselves the enviable distinction, of having preserved the original doctrine of the divine unity in its permanent purity.

The foregoing short survey of its general features, supplies a sufficient index to the parallel which undeniably exists, between the religion of Mahomet and Christianity. The obscurity of its origin, the nature and amount of the early obstacles which it overcame, the abruptness of its rise, the rapidity and extent of its propagation, its permanency, and inherent dominion over the human mind, its power, as conquering, to change the creeds and characters of the subject nations, and, as conquered, to absorb the conquerors and their religions in submission to its law, the severe simplicity, lastly, of its rites, and the abstract and impalpable character of its doctrines, — these characteristic phenomena in the history of Mahometanism, when taken in connection with the great fundamental fact, that the religion of Mahomet, like that of Christ, was founded upon a supernatural or prophetic character assumed by its author, altogether suggest a parallel with the history and general features

of the Gospel revelation, which, partial and imperfect as undoubtedly it is, could not yet fail, to awaken inquiry, and command attention.

General attention, accordingly, has long been excited by this correspondence; and the spirit of inquiry is still anxiously directed towards it. Nor is the anxiety without foundation. For a successful counterfeit will necessarily be regarded, both by its enemies and by its friends, as the most available ground of objection to revealed religion. In this light, the success of Mahometanism is viewed and treated by the opposite parties. Infidel writers artfully press the parallel: the advocates of Christianity studiously expose the contrast. But, as the former have certainly pushed their argument beyond all reason and reality, so the latter, in return, have been disposed, perhaps, to concede less, than truth and fairness would seem to demand. On one side of the question, that of the Christian advocates, the course adopted has been a mistaken one; since a good cause can never fare the worse for a candid examination. The best cause, indeed, may be disserved and dishonoured by an advocate whose sole aim is victory: but we have yet to learn, that a good one has ever suffered by being brought to the test of its own merits, without prejudice indulged, or injustice

practised, against any other, with which it may stand in contrast. On this principle it is designed to proceed in the present work: however he may fail in doing justice to it in the execution, the author feels hopeful, that his motives will be fairly judged of, and that the principle itself will be respected.

The disciples of Mahomet appeal confidently to the success of his religion, as the grand test and argument of its truth. The enemies of Christianity have taken advantage of this appeal, to disparage and cast a doubt upon the argument arising from the success of the Gospel.* With this view, no pains have been spared by modern infidels and sceptics, to render the analogy between Christianity and Mahometanism complete, by a laboured comparison of the rival creeds, in all the available points of their origin and promulgation. Their obscure rise, their irresistible progress, and their rapid and wide diffusion, have been successively adduced and dwelt upon, in order to level to one and the same standard, the claims of the Gospel, and the pretensions of the Koran. The task was not an easy one. A religion of peace, and a religion

* M. D'Herbelot has observed, that Mahometanism is particularly valued by the Jews, as serving "de confondre les Chrêtiens, sur l'étendue, et sur l'universalité, de leur religion." — Bibliotheque Orientale, tom. i. p. 71. ed. 1777.

of the sword, a faith preached by the disciples of a meek and lowly Master, and a faith propagated by force of arms, under the banner of a warlike enthusiast or impostor, were too utterly at variance to stand credibly or even plausibly upon the same footing, with respect to the *causes* of their successful propagation. The intrinsic weakness of the comparison in these points was soon felt, and the ground silently abandoned, by later and more skilful practitioners in the school of infidelity. These advocates of scepticism wisely transferred their efforts, from the very imperfect analogy of the two religions in their rise and progress, to seize upon the parallel in its strong hold. "It is not," observes an eloquent and insidious writer, treating of the success of Mahomet, "the propagation, but the permanency of his religion that deserves our wonder: the same pure and perfect impression which he engraved at Mecca and Medina, is preserved, after the revolutions of twelve centuries, by the Indian, the African, and the Turkish proselytes of the Koran." * The

* Decline and Fall, vol. ix. p. 350. edit. London, 1802. Mr. Gibbon's assertion, however, holds true only so far as respects the maintenance of the divine unity. On most other points of doctrine and discipline, the Mahometan world is split into countless sects and schisms. See Pocock, Specim. pp. 19—25. 212, 214, &c.; Hotting. Hist. Orient. lib. ii. cap. vi. pp. 340—373.; Sale, Preliminary Discourse, sect. viii.; and sect. ix. of the present work.

argument here insinuated from the permanency of Mahometanism obviously aims to affect the parallel argument derivable from the permanency of the Gospel dispensation. And while the correspondence of the rival systems is thus shown to be complete in so capital a feature of the evidences, the inviolable purity of the sublime doctrine and simple ritual of the law of Mahomet is further brought into artful contrast, on the one hand, with the idolatrous deflections of Israel from the faith and worship of Jehovah, and on the other, with the gross corruptions which so early crept in to disfigure the purity of Christianity. The object of the sceptical historian is plain: for once, however, it is easier to perceive the disingenuousness of his purpose, than to deny the validity of his reasoning. In every prior stage of this controversy, the fallacies of scepticism have been sufficiently confuted and exposed: but the validity of the argument arising from the permanency of Mahometanism, and the preservation of its doctrines and rites in their original severe simplicity, may seem established by the silence of the ablest champions of Revelation. The admission implied by this silence is the more remarkable, as it leaves unexplained those characters of Mahometanism,

which most impress the mind as mysterious and inexplicable.

The suspicious zeal of infidelity in the investigation of the Mahometan religion, has not been allowed to pass unobserved by the guardians and defenders of Evangelic truth. To the popular argument in favour of Mahometanism, founded on its success, it has been summarily and fairly replied by Christian writers, " that success alone is no sufficient criterion of the truth and divinity of any religious system." This sound first principle being taken for the basis of their general reasoning, they proceed next to examine the *human* means possessed and resorted to by Mahomet, for the advancement of his imposture; and profess to discover in these means, seconded as they were by the favourable concurrence of the times, the whole secret of his success.

The means chiefly insisted on, are, the birth and family-connections of the pretended Prophet, which threw, at the outset, the weight of personal interest into the scale; the consummate art and prudence with which he conducted his design, which gave the strength and solidity of system to each step of his progress; the merit of the great doctrine of the UNITY, with which he set out, and which was already immemorially known and acknowledged by the various tribes

of Arabia *; his appeal, in alliance with their most cherished prepossessions, to the Ishmaelitish descent †, and patriarchal religion ‡, of the Arabs; the artful accommodation of his creed to the diverse classes of his countrymen, by which he contrived to draw Jew, Christian, and Idolater equally within its sphere; its skilful adaptation at once to the most deeply-rooted prejudices, and the most powerful passions; the general plainness and simplicity of the doctrines inculcated; the gross ignorance of the people to whom these doctrines were addressed; the cogent and opposite motives by which the mission of Mahomet was enforced, the most awful penalties present and future being denounced against infidels, while the most seductive pleasures were promised to the true believers, both in the present world and in the life to come; and, lastly, his conclusive appeal to the sword, made to the raised enthusiasm of a warlike people, — enthusiasm doubly fortified, by the constraining tenet of fatalism, and by the most animating hopes and the most alarming fears that religion could hold out, to the uncultivated minds, and the undisciplined imaginations, of the migratory Bedoweens. §

* See Koran passim, especially as cited apud Appendix, No. I.

† Appendix, No. I. ‡ Ibid. No. II.

§ White, pp. 49—69. and pp. 78, 79.: compare Paley, Evidences of Christianity, part iii. sect. iii.

resolute army."* And as its political divisions facilitated the establishment of a new government, so its religious divisions made the way easy for the introduction of a new faith. It already numbered among its inhabitants, Jews, Christians, and several denominations of idolaters†; and thus familiarised with an almost endless variety of religious opinions, it was incapable of combined or systematic resistance to the pretensions of a conquering creed. At the period, too, when Mahomet arose, while the once formidable empires of Rome and Persia were crumbling in the last stages of decay, Arabia, it is alleged, notwithstanding her internal dissensions, was in an eminently prosperous and flourishing condition. The inference is, that, at home, he found every inducement and encouragement to enter on a career of conquest; and, "after the reduction of his native peninsula, the weakness of the Roman provinces on the north and the west, as well as the distracted state of the Persian empire on the east, facilitated the

* Paley, Evidences, p. 550. ed. Dublin, 1794. But see Oelsner, Effets de la Religion de Mohammed, pp. 48, 49.

† The diversity of religions in Arabia, with the facilities thereby afforded to Mahomet, is accurately noted by Roderic Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo, in the 13th century:—"Cum Arabia et Africa, inter fidem Catholicam, et hæresin Arianam, et perfidiam Judaicam, et idololatriam, diversis studiis traheretur," &c. — Hist. Arab. cap. i. p. 2.

successful invasion of neighbouring countries." * The proselyting zeal and the relaxed morality of the Koran, the joys of the Moslem paradise and the terrors of the Moslem sword, appealed, with irresistible force, to the imaginations and the passions, to the hopes and to the fears, of mankind. Before a religion thus constituted, in the fervour of its first enthusiasm, all opposition was vain; while the ground once gained, was kept by a creed, which united empire with religion.

Such is the account given, by some of the ablest vindicators of revealed truth, of the success of Mahomet, and the propagation of his superstition †: an account which certainly contains much important fact, and some convincing argument; though not, it may be feared, without a serious admixture of alloy.[20] For, on those arguments which constitute the main strength of their opponents, on the permanency of Mahometanism, its inviolable maintenance of the grand doctrine originally impressed, and its absolute dominion over the minds of its adherents, Christian writers, it must be owned, have been either silent altogether, or have touched upon the difficulties slightly, and without offering any adequate solution of them.

* Paley, Evidences, p. 550.

† In the whole of the above statements, is there not too frequent a substitution of *consequences* for *causes?*

Between the opposed views and statements of the infidel and the believer in Christianity, respecting the rise and progress of Mahomet, and the causes of his success, it is difficult to adjust the real merits of the case. On the one side, the jaundiced spirit of a sceptical philosophy, and on the other, the pardonable prejudices of an honest zeal, combine to embarrass and obscure the original question. The insidious attempts of infidelity to lower and depreciate the Gospel evidences, by affecting to discover, in Mahometanism, a perfect or proximate parallel for the case of Christianity, are not more notorious, than they are unfounded and gratuitous. It is well, however, that they have been made: for the existence of such attempts, on the part of the unbeliever, is a virtual impeachment of his motives. Dishonest and disingenuous motives only, it will reasonably be supposed, could lead men to compare, as on the same footing, a religion without miracles, or the least accredited pretensions to miraculous evidences, with a religion founding itself upon miracles the most varied and stupendous, and whose claim to a miraculous origin is attested and authenticated in the amplest extent, and by the best and fullest conceivable authorities [21]: a religion without prophecy, with a religion sustained by a chain of

prophecies, reaching from remotest ages past, to the remotest ages of futurity [22]; a chain, no link in the continuity of which has yet been broken, and parts of which (as, for example, the present condition of the Jews *, or, to come nearer to the subject in hand, the immemorial character of the Arabs,) are, at this day, visible to all observers: a religion without those internal marks of truth, which arise from the exaction of a strict and pure morality, with a religion, whose code of morals, taken alone, affords fair presumption of a divine origin: a religion, in conclusion, which openly resorted to *every* human means to ensure its success, and which is avowedly indebted for its original promulgation, to the power of the sword, with a religion which rejected all ordinary human means, and which, to all outward appearance, rested, for its triumphant propagation, solely on the voice of persuasion, and on the spirit of peace.[23] By the very attempt, therefore, to institute a comparison, as on the same footing, between the religion of Mahomet, and the religion of Jesus Christ †, the institutor stands self-convicted of dishonest and disingenuous motives;

* This standard link of the evidences has been powerfully touched by a living writer. — See Davison on Prophecy, pp. 224, 225.

† The futility of this attempt has been no where more ably exposed, than in the important work of Mr. Davison. — See Discourses on Prophecy, pp. 41, 42.

and whatever ability he may display in the capacity of a controversialist, leaves a deep and indelible stain on his character as a man.

But, if the spirit of scepticism has seduced one class of writers, altogether to overstate the pretensions of Mahometanism, the prejudices of an honest zeal may have led another class, both to underrate its real merits, and to undervalue the unquestionable difficulties it presents. In many and main essentials, of the contrast which the Christian advocate has drawn between Mahometanism and Christianity, his argument, indeed, is unanswerable, and the triumph of the Gospel perfect. But some remarkable features of Mahometanism there unquestionably are, to which, however undesignedly, our best and ablest defenders have failed to do justice. Causes, too, have been assigned for several of the results, which, it may be feared, have no real connection with them. And conclusions unfavourable to the Mahometan system have been too frequently deduced, under the palpable influence of groundless, and sometimes contradictory, impressions. Common justice to the general argument for the Gospel, as well as common fairness to that for the Koran, demands some examination of these errors.[24]

The permanency of the religion of Mahomet

is certainly the most surprising and inexplicable trait of that fatal apostasy. No one feature of it more deserves, or stands more in need of, explanation. On reference, however, to what has been already done, or attempted, on the right side, towards the elucidation of this confessed difficulty, it will be found to remain substantially unsolved. Either the point is silently pretermitted by the Christian advocate, or made stronger by the weakness and inconclusiveness of his explanation. The first reasoner of our own times, the judicious and excellent Paley, in his masterly sketch of Mahometanism, and of the causes of its success, fairly exposes the circumstances which favoured its original promulgation; but leaves this point of its permanency unnoticed. The attempt to explain away the difficulty has been made by Professor White of Oxford: and the failure of this acute and elegant controversialist may serve to account for the silence or reserve of others. "Of the continuance of Mahometanism, when thus established," observes the Professor, "and of its existence to the present times, *various causes might be assigned*[25], whose joint operation would be sufficient to account fully for the effect, without having recourse to any miraculous or particular interposition of Providence. Of these causes, one

only shall be mentioned in this place, and that *because it appears to be of peculiar force and importance.* In almost all those countries which acknowledge the authority of Mahomet, so intimate is the connection, so absolute the dependence of the civil government on religion, that any change in the latter must necessarily and inevitably involve the ruin and overthrow of the former. The Koran is not, like the Gospel, to be considered merely as the standard by which the religious opinions, the worship, and the practice of its followers are regulated; but it is also a political system; on this foundation the throne itself is erected; from hence every law of the state is derived; and by this authority every question of life and of property is finally decided." *

The argument is just and forcible, but it stands alone, and its value obviously depends on the universality of its application. Now, so far from being universally applicable, it is good only so far as it applies to countries where the state is Mahometan; and where, consequently, the alleged connection subsists, between empire and religion. But here its pertinency is further limited by the remarkable fact, that the creed of the Koran has repeatedly survived its empire:

* Bampt. Lect. p. 80.

that where Mahometan states have been subverted, the Mahometan religion has remained. In some instances it has preserved its integrity amidst the fires of persecution[26]; in others it has withstood for ages the influence of the reigning faith: while signal examples are not wanting of the progress of Mahometanism among nations who never felt its sword[27], and of the national conversion of those Pagan conquerors before whom its empire fell. Thus, the Moors of Spain preferred death or exile to the adoption of Christianity; the Turkish tribes yielded a willing obedience to the teaching of peaceful missionaries of the Koran; and the Pagan hordes of Tartary, who, from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, overran and desolated Asia, universally embraced the confession of their despised Moslem slaves.*

But, to whatever extent this account of the permanency of Mahometanism may apply in other parts of the world, the reasoning of the learned Professor is wholly set at nought by the phenomena of this arch-heresy, as it exists in the interior of Africa. Insulated amidst the solitudes of the Great Desert, surrounded by the rites and votaries of a gross idolatry, the Arab of Western

* "As, in Europe, the Christianity of the Roman empire proselyted its German conquerors, so, in Asia, Mahometanism, *the spurious progeny of Christianity*, gained *a similar triumph over the Paganism of Tartary.*" — Philosophy of Modern History, vol. i. p. 263.

Africa preserves, to this day, unimpaired, the manners and the faith of his fathers. Here, Mahometanism can boast of no support or countenance from its alliance with the state, for these savages seem to live almost in a state of nature: yet here it exists, not merely in the form, but in all the fervour and fanaticism, which characterised its primitive establishment. One such fact outweighs volumes of controversial theories; and taken with the previous limitations, it must wholly neutralise any argument, which would bring forward the *political* character of Mahometanism, as alone sufficient to account for its permanent duration.

Notwithstanding the solutions hitherto proposed, the permanency of this religion, therefore, still remains an unexplained, and, apparently, an inexplicable problem.

But the attention of inquirers is claimed, not only by the durability, but by the perfectness also of the original impression. The religion of Mahomet does not merely continue to exist in its original fervour: it exists, moreover, in all its primitive simplicity of doctrines and of ritual. Here, again, is fresh ground of triumph for the infidel; and here, also, the Christian advocate maintains a singular reserve and silence. An abundance of popular argument is advanced, to

meet the lesser difficulties; but no attempt appears to have been yet made, to resolve the extraordinary and unprecedented fact, that, of all the systems of religious belief which have been professed by mankind, in all ages of the world, Mahometanism alone has preserved, unimpaired, its original principles of severe and naked theism. And thus, in the two capital features, of its permanence, and its inviolable preservation of the primitive impression, the opponents of its pretensions, it must in candour be confessed, have failed to do justice to the real claims and character of the religion of Mahomet.

But the spirit in which Mahometanism has been hitherto encountered, and the palpable injustice which has been done to its undoubted claims, may be more clearly judged of by a further standard. The comparison has been instituted between Mahometanism and Christianity, as opposed to each other in their respective influences upon the character of mankind. "The characters of the religions," observes a writer already cited, "which Christ and Mahomet have respectively founded, are not more different, than those of the nations which have embraced them. From the period of their primary establishment to the present hour, a different aspect seems to have belonged to them.

Wherever they have spread themselves, they have communicated their distinguishing properties to the understandings of the people whom they have converted; and in opposition to former experience, the influences of climate, of government, and of manners, have yielded to the effects of religious persuasion." *

On the head of government, the author undertakes to show, that, where "the religion of Christ is found to exist and to flourish under every variety of political rule; . . . the faith of Mahomet, wherever it is established, is united with despotic power. On the banks of the Ganges, and on the shores of the Caspian, under the influence of climates the most unlike, and manners the most opposite, it is still found accompanied with servitude and subjection." † Now, not to dwell upon the strong exceptions of fact, the uncontrolled freedom of the Bedoweens of Arabia and Africa in the East and West, and of the Mahometan tribes of Tartary, and the northern frontier of Asia, I would simply remind the reader, *where* it is that Christianity and Mahometanism now respectively prevail. And I would further ask, when has EUROPE submitted to the yoke of slavery? when has ASIA possessed the blessings, or manifested the love or capa-

* White, Bampt. Lect. p. 295.
† White, p. 296.

bility, of freedom? To the former inquiry, reply is needless: to the latter, the answer is plain. Whether under the rule of the successors of Constantine, or under the sway of the Caliphs, the eastern world presents the same uniform face of subjection and servitude. Whatever foundation of justice, therefore, may lie in this argument, there is, to say the least, little judgment or discretion observable in the extent to which it has been pressed.

But it is in their comparative influences on manners, that this author professes to discover the grand social distinction and opposition, between the two systems.

When Europe emerged from the darkness of the middle ages, Christianity is justly pourtrayed as the parent of science and civilisation. The light of knowledge, which had burnt in secret, in the recesses of monastic retirement, is beautifully traced and followed to a period, "which the bounty of Providence distinguished by discoveries the most salutary to the human race: — no longer confined, as in earlier ages, to the opulent or the powerful, it began to spread its equal lustre over the mass of human kind; and to illuminate those venerable forms of truth, of religion, and of freedom, which before were hidden from every vulgar eye." * Such is the

* Bampt. Lect. p. 301.

glowing, but just and true account given, of the social and intellectual influences of Christianity, in the West; "under whose happy auspices, men appear to have attained a vigour in their intellectual exertions, an extent in their intellectual pursuits, and a success in their intellectual cultivation, utterly unknown in any former period of their history." *

Now what, according to the same authority, is the painful contrast presented by Mahometanism? "In the East, under the influence of Mahometan belief, the human mind appears to have lost somewhat of its capacity and power; the natural progress of mankind, whether in government, in manners, or in science, has been retarded by some secret principle of private indolence or external control; and over the various nations who have either assented to the faith, or submitted to the arms of the impostor, some universal, but baleful influence seems to have operated, so as to counteract every diversity of national character, and restrain every principle of national exertion. Their progress in science, their capacity to invent, and even their willingness to adopt any useful or elegant arts, bear no proportion to their zeal and activity in the support of their religious tenets. Through-

* Bampt. Lect. p. 303.

out every country where Mahometanism is professed, the same deep pause is made in philosophy: and the same wide chasm is to be seen, between the opportunities of men to improve, and their actual improvement. * Every hearer whose mind has ever glowed with the love of learning, or melted with the feelings of humanity, must recoil with horror from the savage and brutal barbarity of those caliphs, who, not content with discouraging a spirit of inquiry among their subjects, effaced every vestige of the knowledge attained by former ages, and waged unnatural war against the mind, as well as the arms of their species." †

In this appalling description of the anti-social influences of Mahometanism, can the reader detect any traces of the religion and the people, which, during six long centuries of European darkness, preserved and propagated the light of knowledge through the world? ‡ the *first*

* How different the lights, in which the same subject will present itself, under different circumstances, to the same mind. In his sermon on the Propagation of the Gospel in the East, Dr. White describes the influences of Mahometanism in directly opposite language. "They (the Mahometans) are the subjects of regulated states; they are the observers of established laws; *civilised by the intercourse of agriculture and commerce, and polished by the use of letters and of arts.*" See Sermon X., appended to the Bampton Lectures, p. 380. The reader will chuse between the statement of Dr. White, as Bampton Lecturer; and that of Dr. White, as preacher before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

† White, pp. 298, 299.: compare p. 259.

‡ See sections xii. xiii. passim.

revivers of philosophy and the sciences? the link, as they have been termed, between ancient and modern literature? Such, according to every species of testimony, were the Saracens of Asia, and the Moors of Spain, under the Abbasside and Ommiadan caliphs.[28] Letters, which originally came to Europe from the East, were brought thither a second time by the genius of Mahometanism.[29]

"It is well known," says the learned Gale, "that arts and sciences have flourished among the Arabians, for almost six hundred years; whilst, among us, rude barbarism has reigned, and literature almost been extinct." *

"While the empire of the Arabians prospered," observes the great Scaliger, "the Latin church was notorious for its ignorance of all good letters, at the very period in which literature flourished most among the Mahometans. In short, whatever proficiency was made by the Latin writers, whether in philosophy, medicine, or the mathematics, after their ignorance had been reproved by the industry of the Arabians, they owed entirely to them. In fact, they were not masters of a single Greek author, except in Latin versions, rendered from the Arabic. It was through the medium of the Arabic, that the

* Court of the Gentiles, preface.

great Ptolemy first became accessible to the studious in a Latin translation. Thus Euclid, also, so long our chief preceptor in mathematical science, originally came into our hands, transfused from the Greek into Latin, by the intervention of the same idiom. Until, after the capture of Constantinople, the exiled Greeks taught us to forsake the aqueduct, and to return to the pure fountain-head." [30]

It would be easy to multiply authorities upon a subject, on which it seems strange that we should be forced, at this day, to produce authorities at all. But the intellectual influences of Mahometanism have been recently done so full justice to by a powerful writer, that on his statement I freely rest the merits of the question: —

"We must remind Europe, that she is indebted to the followers of Mahomet, 'as the link which connects ancient and modern literature,' for the preservation, during a long period of Western darkness, of the works of many of the Greek philosophers, and the cultivation of some of the most important branches of science. Mathematics[31], astronomy, medicine, &c. are highly indebted to their labours. Spain, Casino, and Salernum, were the nurseries of the literature of the age: and the works of Avicenna, Averroes, Beithar, Algazel, gave new vigour and direction

to the studies of those who were emerging from a state of barbarism.[32] Their zeal in the pursuit of geographical knowledge impelled them to explore and found kingdoms even in those desert regions of Africa, which are, at the present day, impervious to European enterprise. Through its brightest periods, nay, even from its origin, Mahometanism was comparatively favourable to literature. Mahomet himself said, that 'a mind without erudition was a body without a soul;' that 'glory consists not in wealth but knowledge*:' and his followers were charged to search for learning even in the remotest parts of the globe.† The caliphate was held, during several ages, by a race of monarchs, who rank among the most accomplished by whom any sceptre has been swayed.[33] Religious differences were forgotten: 'I chose this learned man,' said the caliph Almamon‡, speaking of Messul, a Christian, whom he was blamed for making president of a college at Damascus, 'not to be

* Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 328. Compare Oelsner, Effets de la Relig. de Mohamm. pp. 208, 209. for other golden maxims inculcated by Mahomet.

† Amrou, the conqueror of Egypt, and the reputed, but reluctant destroyer of the Alexandrian library, delighted in the conversation of learned men, and in rational and philosophical discourses. — See Ockley, vol. i. p. 312. for a highly interesting anecdote of this great captain.

‡ For the labours of this illustrious Mæcenas of Asia, in the cause of literature, see Pocock, Specim. pp. 171, 172.

my guide in religious affairs, but to be my teacher of science.' * Who has not mourned, too, over the fate of the last remnant of chivalry, the fall of the Mussulman empire in Spain? Who has not felt his bosom swell with admiration towards that brave and generous nation, of whose reign for eight centuries it is observed, that, even by the historians of their enemies, not a single instance of cold-blooded cruelty is recorded?[34] Who has not blushed to see a Christian priesthood† goading on the civil power to treat with unexampled bigotry a people, from whom they had always received humanity and protection; and to record the political fanaticism of Ximenes, in consigning to the flames the labours of the philosophers, mathematicians, and poets of Cordova[35], the literature of a splendid dynasty of seven hundred years?" ‡

The reader will please to compare these

* The historian Elmacin may be instanced as an example of the prevalence among the Saracens, in every age of their empire, of this enlarged policy. Elmacin flourished in the thirteenth century; and, although a Christian, held the high trust of state secretary, under the Fatimite Caliphs of Egypt. — See Golius, Præf. ad Elmac. Hist. Sar.

† It were to be desired that the writer had expressed his meaning more guardedly. "A Christian priesthood" is not the appropriate phrase by which to characterise the minions of the anti-christian papal tyranny in Spain. The mode of expression cannot be safe, which would appear to identify the *Inquisition* with Christianity.

‡ Retrospective Review, vol. iii. pp. 5, 6. "The Arabs created the most prosperous æra of the riches, the cultivation, and the populousness of Spain." — Gibbon, vol. x. p. 489. ed. London, 1802.

counter-statements; the one built on a controversial theory, the other bottomed in historical facts; and he will have the means of estimating for himself the measure of injustice, which Mahometanism has, in too many instances, received at the hands of the professed and prejudiced controversialist. Does the question regard the effects of this religion on literature? A sweeping induction is formed from the insulated, if authentic, fanaticism of Omar; while it is denied all benefit from the example of Almamon and his illustrious successors, and from the conspicuous place of the Arabs in the history of letters. Does it relate to its general action on the human mind? The penetrating and enterprising genius of the Saracens is unaccountably lost sight of; and the eye seems to become fixed exclusively upon those barbarians of Mahometanism *, the Turks.[36] European discoveries in science are deservedly put forward to elucidate the social influences of the Gospel: why, then, refuse to those of the Koran, in this particular, their proper place and share?† The discoveries of the

* I borrow this characteristic expression from Dr. Miller's "Philosophy of Modern History." Compare Mr. Sharon Turner's "History of England during the Middle Ages," vol. i. pp. 311, 312.

† When Christianity and Mahometanism are brought forward together, as conjointly the authors of the grand general revival and advancement of learning, it should be recollected, that their influence on human society, in the production of this result, is a distinction peculiar to themselves,

Arabians, it should be noticed, curiously preceded and prepared the way for our greatest European discoveries: as, for example, how imperfect must have been the uses of the art of printing, but for the prior invention of paper by the Arabs of Spain? The increased facilities of calculation, for which we are indebted to the adoption of the Arabic numerals, have, as is well known to the learned, mainly contributed to the advancement of modern science. A familiar notion of the ground here gained may be easily formed, by the simple comparison of our method, with the cumbrous and elaborate process in use among the ancients.[37] The art of medicine was revived, in Italy and Europe, by the schools of Spain and Salerno. "But the science of chemistry," observes Mr. Gibbon, "owes its *origin* and improvement to the industry of the Saracens. They *first* invented and named the alembic for the purposes of distillation, analysed the substances of the three kingdoms of nature, tried the distinctions and affinities of alkalis and acids,

---

and which can be affirmed of no third religious polity. In whatever light it be viewed, the *fact* certainly is most remarkable, and most worthy of consideration, that its brightest lights of knowledge have been, successively, preserved in, and diffused throughout, the world, by the agency of these two creeds.

and converted the poisonous minerals into soft and salutary medicines."

These important advances in natural philosophy were, however, but introductory steps. A wholly new system of thought and investigation was to be invented. And the crowning achievement of the Arabs, towards the restoration and advancement of learning, lay in a discovery, which, by changing the direction of the human mind, has proved the prolific parent of its highest attainments both in natural and moral science; the invention, namely, of the experimental philosophy. Their claim to this distinction has been triumphantly asserted by an eminent writer of the present day; who (and particular attention is desired for this independent testimony *) further traces the origin of this memorable invention to the peculiar character and influences of MAHOMETANISM.

"The Arabs, *under their new tenets* †, were precisely the people to effectuate this (the separation of the science of Greece and Rome from

* The first draft of this Introduction was written in the spring of 1825: the work presently to be cited in the text, came, for the first time, into the hands of the author, in the spring of 1827.

† The connection, between the doctrine of *one God*, and the progress of true science, did not escape the comprehensive sagacity of Roger Bacon: "Volo *unam sapientiam* esse perfectam ostendere. Quoniam *ab uno Deo* data est tota sapientia, et *uni mundo*, et propter *unum finem*." Opus Majus, p. 23. edit. Jebb.

their rhetoric and mythological poetry); and were the only people that could then have accomplished it. To them we are indebted for the revival of natural, and for *the rise of experimental philosophy.*[38] — It was *the steady warfare which Mohammed and his followers waged against paganism* in all its systems, mythologies, allegories, idolatries, mysteries, and later philosophical purifications and refinements, *that led the Arabians to this great improvement in human knowledge,* under the tuition of their masters, the Christian Syrians.[39] In the Macedonian establishments at Alexandria the foundations of this happy change were first laid, in the mathematical studies of the philosophers who were there settled and patronized. The mathematical studies are the scientific branch of natural philosophy. * Some great men of the Alexandrian school having peculiarly cultivated them, their works were introduced, by their Syrian teachers, to the Arabs, who immediately appreciated their value, with an extraordinary justness of taste and quickness of discernment; and devoted themselves to these sciences with an avidity and a success, which appropriated the treasures and enlarged the boundaries of all.† They translated Euclid,

* "Ancilla Scientiarum." *Franc. Bacon.* conf. *Roger Bacon,* Op. Maj. p. 57, &c.

† See section xiii. of the present work.

Archimedes, Apollonius Pergæus, Eutochius, Diocles, Diophantus, Hippocrates, and Ptolemy. On these they commented and disserted with emulous ingenuity. The establishment of a separate Caliphate in Spain, and afterwards in Morocco, created new seats of knowledge near the western regions of Europe, where it was zealously cultivated." The well-known providential coincidence between the location of these last Arab schools, and the exigencies of the period in which they were erected, are next forcibly exhibited. "While Europe, in the tenth century, was slumbering in that intellectual torpidity, which followed the downfall of the Latin rhetorical literature, the Arabs were following with ardour those scientific pursuits, which were to give a new spirit of life and knowledge to the western world. Their mental fervour was made to glow peculiarly strong in that part of their dominions, Spain, which was best adapted for the improvement of Europe." Into Spain, accordingly, France, Germany, Italy, and England poured a succession of inquirers; who, attracted by the reputation of the Spanish Mahometans, "ventured to explore what riches they possessed, and imparted to Europe the treasures they obtained. England had its full share in producing these intellectual Columbuses;" whose pro-

gressive intercourse with the Saracens of Spain and Asia, our author deduces downward, from the tenth century, through Gerbert (afterwards Pope Sylvester II.), Hermannus Contractus, Constantine Afer, Gerard of Cremona, Peter, Abbot of Clugny (the friend of St. Bernard), Hermannus Dalmatus, Robert Retinensis (an Englishman, and the first translator of the Koran), Athelard of Bath, William de Conchis, Daniel Morley, &c. in regular series, to the first introduction of the experimental philosophy into England, by the celebrated Roger Bacon. "It is in the compositions of Friar Bacon, who was born in 1214, and who learned the Oriental languages, that we discover the most extensive acquaintance with the Arabian authors. He quotes Albumazar, Averroës, Avicenna, Alpharabius, Thabet ebn Corah, Hali, Alhacen, Alkindi, Alfraganus, and Arzakel: and seems to have been as familiar with them as with the Greek and Latin classics, especially with Avicenna, whom he calls 'the chief and prince of philosophy.'"* From Roger Bacon, his great namesake and emulator in the seventeenth century, it is well known, imbibed and borrowed the first principles of his famous experimental

* Turner's History of England during the Middle Ages, vol. iv. pp. 418. 431—443. second edit. London, 1825.

system *; a fact which indisputably establishes the derivation of the Baconian philosophy, from the descendants of Ishmael and disciples of Mahomet.

To speak, therefore, of Mahometanism, as a bar to "the progress of science, and as uniformly occasioning a deep pause in philosophy [40]," can serve only to injure the cause which such reasoning is brought to defend: Christianity leaning upon support like this, is like Judah resting upon the reed of Egypt. But Christianity requires no such broken props: it rests unmoved and immoveable upon its own intrinsic merits. † To be unjust to the fair claims of any other system, is, in fact, to be guilty of gross injustice to the unrivalled merits of the Gospel. And they alone who are willing to do the fullest justice to Mahometanism, can expect to secure to Christianity its true and proper supremacy.

The permanent maintenance, by Mahometanism, of the doctrine of the divine unity, seems deservedly reckoned among the perplexing peculiarities of its history. Such, however, is the uncertainty of human opinion, that, to his uncompromising announcement of this very doc-

* See section xiii.

† "Suis illa contenta est viribus, et veritatis propriæ fundaminibus nititur." *Arnobius.*

trine, Mahomet, according to some authorities, was mainly indebted for his success.* There is something inconsistent, if not irreconcileable, in these opposite judgments. All history and experience go unequivocally to prove the natural tendency of mankind to corrupt the doctrine of the unity; and to seek a refuge, from its abstract severity, in idolatrous superstition.[41] The difficulty arising from the perpetual preservation of this doctrine by the followers of Mahomet, is therefore real and undoubted. Yet so it is, as we have just observed, that to the adoption of a tenet thus denied and resisted by the universal and immemorial practice of mankind, we are taught by some grave authorities, to ascribe the ready and full reception which Mahomet procured for his religion. This, to say the best, is poor reasoning, for it runs counter to the whole tenor of experience and history: and it is worse philosophy, for it stands opposed to every known principle of the human mind. The power of the senses is the strongest and most active power in the nature of man. The universality and the force of its operation are notorious and proverbial. Hence it springs, that the interest of all objects presenting themselves to the popular choice, ordinarily depends on the degree in

* White, Bampt. Lect. pp. 67, 68.

which they address themselves to the senses. But the control of sense is in nothing more conspicuous than in the great concern of religion. Of every form of natural religion, in every age and country, the assertion will hold true, that its interest and popularity have uniformly kept proportion with the measure of its appeal to the senses: with the degree, that is, in which it presented sensible and tangible objects to the view of its votaries. The philosophy, then, of the reasoning, which would attribute the success of Mahomet to his adoption and enforcement of an abstract and inflexible theism, (which, however it may suit the fancy of the speculative, never can be brought near to the capacity of the vulgar,) will not, for a moment, stand the test of analogy, in this case the only proper and sure touchstone of truth. Some force, it may be allowed, is given to the use of this argument in the present case, by an important qualification. Notwithstanding the long prevalence among them of a gross idolatry, we possess satisfactory proofs that the Arabians, before the time of Mahomet, generally knew and owned the doctrine of the divine unity[42]; to which doctrine, Mahomet himself professed only to *recall* them.* But even this historical fact is wholly insufficient

* Koran, passim.

to bear out the argument, as the total corruption of religion in Arabia abundantly demonstrates.* The admission, it may here be noticed in passing, is highly interesting and important in another view; as, in the progress of this work, I shall have occasion to show.†

His doctrine of the unity, then, is one plain instance of a cause assigned for the success of Mahomet, which has no real, or at least, no demonstrable, connection with it.

Another example of this error, almost equally striking, may be found, in the facilities alleged to be afforded for the progress of Mahometanism, by the political state of Arabia. "The condition of Arabia," according to an eminent authority already cited, "occupied by small independent tribes, exposed it to the progress of a firm and resolute army."‡ Whence, then, its famed and perpetual independence? Whence the triumphant resistance which the Arabian peninsula opposed, to the most formidable efforts of Rome and Persia, in the height of their power?[43] Why was Arabia never subdued *before* the time of Mahomet? Why never *since?* Questions such as these crowd upon the mind,

* Pocock, Spec. p. 90, &c.; Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 18, &c.

† Appendix, Nos. I. II., where this fact comes in to support the proof of the Abrahamic origin, and patriarchal belief of the Arabians.

‡ Paley, Evidences, p. 550. Compare White, B. L. pp. 59, 60.

at the bare mention of so utterly untenable an argument. At the same time, the occurrence of the argument to the clear and candid mind of Paley, serves to demonstrate the dangers to which even the best and most unbiassed judgments are liable, where the overthrow of a prevailing system is taken up as a set task.

It would be easy to multiply instances of similar errors of judgment: but thus much, under the present head, may suffice to show, that causes have too frequently been assigned for the success of Mahomet, which have absolutely no connection with it. *

Another line of argument has been unguardedly taken up to account for the success of Mahomet, in its nature highly hazardous and questionable; and in the adoption of which, the Christian advocate makes common cause, in the conduct of his reasoning, with the infidel. I allude to the assignment of causes merely human for the resolution of the phenomena, as contradistinguished from the operation of the special providence of God.

In a celebrated argument, aimed against the received origin of Christianity, and the esta-

* The reader, if desirous to examine authorities, may consult the elaborate argument of Hottinger, (Hist. Orient. pp. 274—339.) "De Causis Muhammedanismum conservantibus." It abounds with specimens of self-destructive reasoning.

blished belief respecting the success of the Gospel, a series of *secondary causes* has been assigned, which purports to instruct the reader how far he may rationally dispense with the PRIMARY.* The doctrine of a future life; the weakness of polytheism; the scepticism of the pagan world; and the peace and union of the Roman empire; are collectively urged, together with several circumstances more, in an artful recapitulation†, as fully sufficient to account for the astonishing success which attended the original promulgation of the Gospel.

By an unexpected, and not certainly a judicious concurrence, the success of Mahomet has been investigated by a Christian controversialist, precisely on the same ground, and in nearly the same terms. The doctrine of a future life; the weak and corrupted condition of Christianity in the seventh century; the religious divisions and polytheism of Arabia; the scepticism of the Arabs respecting the soul's immortality; and the distracted and divided state of the Roman and Persian empires; are successively advanced, as furnishing the full and final solution of the original triumphant propagation of Mahometanism.‡

Nay, so perfect is the coincidence of the argu-

* Decline and Fall, chap. xv. † Ib. vol. ii. pp. 353—358.

‡ White, Bampt. Lect. pp. 49—65.

ments, that, in some of the topics, the parallel statements read as if they had emanated from the same mind. "The ignorance, the errors, and the uncertainty of the ancient philosophers, with regard to the immortality of the soul," Mr. Gibbon points out as one principal cause, "that Christianity spread itself with so much success in the Roman empire."—"The ignorance, the doubts, and the uncertainty, which universally prevailed among the Arabians, with regard to the immortality of the soul," Professor White argues, "was also a circumstance which had no inconsiderable influence in the establishment of Mahometanism." The Christian champion thus condescends to assail the pretensions of the Koran, with the identical missiles, which had been just before unsuccessfully launched by infidelity, against the claims of the Gospel. It must be added, too, with hardly better success. Nor will this be thought singular, if it shall be made to appear, that the *principle* of the argument from secondary, or merely human causes, as applied finally to solve any of those great revolutions which have changed the face and history of the world, is unsound and unphilosophical.

Qualify it as men may, the foundation of this argument is unavoidably laid in the exclusion of the superintendence of a special, and even of an

ordinary, providence. The sceptic, it is true, will not shrink from this consequence; but his indifference will not shield him from the monstrous absurdities and inconsistencies to which the argument from human causes leads.*

When the successful propagation of Christianity is ascribed to the fortuitous concurrence of a variety of *secondary causes*, instead of weakening its general evidences, the unbeliever, in fact, sug-

* With inconsistencies springing from this source, the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire abounds. From among these, Mr. Gibbon's eloquent narrative of the fate of the Seven Churches of Asia, and of the preservation, conformably with one of the most remarkable predictions on record in Scripture, (see Rev. iii. 7—12.) of the single church of Philadelphia, may be selected as an example, and a memorable and melancholy example it is, of the irrational blindness induced by the "evil heart of unbelief." The miraculous survival, amidst surrounding desolation, of this one faithful church, here forces from the sceptical historian a testimony, and tribute of admiration, which are only heightened by the disgraceful and impotent effort to qualify them by a sneer. "The captivity or ruin of the *Seven* Churches of Asia was consummated; and the barbarous lords of Ionia and Lydia still trample on the monuments of classic and Christian antiquity. Philadelphia alone has been saved by prophecy, or courage. At a distance from the sea, forgotten by the emperors, encompassed on all sides by the Turks, her valiant citizens defended their religion and freedom above fourscore years; and at length capitulated with the proudest of the Ottomans. Among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia, *Philadelphia is still erect;* a column in a scene of ruins; a pleasing example, that the paths of honour and safety may sometimes be the same." Decline and Fall, vol. xi. pp. 437, 438. In the estimate of Mr. Gibbon it is as nothing, that the happy fortunes of Philadelphia had been graphically foretold in a record, preceding, by more than fourteen centuries, the period of the event: with him, facts the most unquestionable and conclusive share the fate of fables, wherever they tend to vindicate the truth and honour of Revelation. The impression on his readers, however, may sometimes be very different from that contemplated by the historian.

gests fresh evidence of the existence and agency of a great PRIMARY CAUSE. The question irresistibly arises in the mind, by what blind fortune, what mysterious chance, have so many independent and unconnected causes been brought thus to concur? By the admission of the unbeliever himself, the history of the world presents no period equally favourable to the progress of such a religion as Christianity, as that particular period at which Christianity arose. Now the advent, in the turning-point of such a crisis, of such a person as Jesus Christ, is an argument for the agency in this matter of a special providence, which, however the infidel may affect to depreciate, he can never hope to shake. The coincidence, taken in all its circumstances, is beyond the reach even of the speculative doctrine of chances.

Now, surprising as it may be thought, it is not the less certain, that similar difficulties attend the case of Mahometanism, and the attempt to ascribe the rise and success of Mahomet to merely human causes.[44] If the sceptic has succeeded in making out, in the case of the Gospel, an extraordinary convergence of circumstances favourable to its promulgation, the advocates of Christianity have been equally successful in pointing out a convergence not less extraordinary, of cir-

cumstances favourable to the propagation of the Koran. In no former or subsequent state or period of the world, it plainly is made to appear, could Mahomet have come forward with equal chance of success[45]: the coming, therefore, of Mahomet, at such a point of time, is a problem that can yield to no process of solution, which shall shut out the idea of a special and superintending providence.*

The force and fulness of this parallel becomes still more striking, when the twofold proof of a providential origin is considered, which arises out of the very opposite character of the circumstances conducing to the corresponding issues.

Christianity was a religion of peace; and a peaceful and united state of the world could alone forward and facilitate its successful propagation. Conformably with this necessity, the advent of Jesus Christ, as it has been well and often observed, found the whole civilised world, for the first time in the annals of history, at peace, and united under one dominion, that of the Roman empire. Had nation been divided against nation at the day of Christ's coming, all avenues must, humanly speaking, have been closed to the mild

* The fine observation of Bishop Newton on the Macedonian conqueror, may, with far more force and justice, be applied to Mahomet: "*The fortune of Alexander* is but another name for *the providence of God.*"

persuasion of his Gospel. But the power of man was here unconsciously made subservient to "the great power of God;" and, in a sense very different from that intended by the insidious observation, "the conquests of Rome prepared and facilitated those of Christianity."*

Mahometanism, on the other hand, was a religion of the sword; and to the progress of a warlike religion, the union of the nations under a compact and vigorous rule must have opposed insuperable obstacles. Its success obviously depended, not on the strength, but the decay, of the kingdoms of the earth: its establishment could be promoted only by the divisions and distractions of mankind. The appearance of Mahomet, accordingly, found the once formidable empires of Rome and Persia crumbling in the last stages of decay; and mutually exhausted, on the very eve of his approach, by external hostilities and internal convulsions.[46] Had the nations of the world, or even the various tribes of Arabia, been then united under one government, "the daring project must quickly and inevitably have been crushed by the weight of superior power."†

The unity of end attained by this remarkable diversity of means, and provided for by a two-

* Decline and Fall, vol. ii. p. 857. † White.

fold train of preparatory circumstances, at once so contrary and so harmonious, — the growth of ages, and wholly beyond the control or reach of human skill and foresight, — is sure, when once perceived, to arrest and rivet the attention of reflecting minds. To what source, then, is the Christian to trace this wonderful double fabric of scheme and contrivance? What unseen agency can he recognise, as competent thus to order and predispose the great chain of human circumstances and events? What cause, in a word, can he receive and rest in, as leaving room for a reasonable and intelligible account of the phenomena, save the one great primary cause and origin of all things, the special and superintending Providence of God? *

The argument, therefore, from secondary, or merely human causes, whether aimed by the infidel against the superhuman claims of the Gospel, or employed by the believer to invalidate the rival pretensions of the Koran, is intrinsically unsound and unphilosophical. For, both in the true revelation, and in the counterfeit, it wholly

* "It is evident," observes Dr. Robertson, speaking of another eventful period, "that the success of the Reformation was the natural effect of many powerful causes, *prepared by peculiar Providence*, and happily conspiring to that end." Life of Charles V. vol. ii. p. 160. ed. Lond. 8vo. Is the evidence of peculiar Providence, preparing the success of Mahometanism, at all less clear?

fails to solve the phenomena, or reach the acknowledged difficulties of the case. The full and unexampled convergence of circumstances, extraordinary in themselves, perfectly adapted to procure the respective consummations, and indispensable for their attainment, which synchronised successively with the advent of Jesus Christ, and with the appearance of Mahomet[47], bars at the threshold, in both, the success of any solution of the phenomena from secondary causes, as contradistinguished from the primary: the difficulties, I must add, presented by this double concurrence of events, are, in their kind, as unmanageable by mere human reason, as any which it takes offence at in the basis of miraculous evidences. Thus, when the infidel has succeeded in removing, to his own satisfaction, the miraculous evidences from the case of Christianity, by the argument from natural causes, and when the Christian advocate, by the adoption of the same argument, has summarily disposed of the case of Mahometanism; Christianity and Mahometanism remain still inexplicable by any theory, which shall exclude the idea and the agency of a special Providence.[48]

In the general conduct of the controversy respecting the success of Mahomet, the infidel and the believer have hitherto taken diametrically

opposite lines. The object of the former has been, by every artifice of exaggeration, to exalt the case of the Koran to an equality with that of the Gospel: that of the latter, to sink the pretensions of Mahometanism below all comparison with the claims of Christianity. The inevitable results of extremes on both sides are legible, in a fruitful growth of undesigned misconceptions, or intentional misrepresentations. This state of the question cannot but be hurtful to dispassionate inquirers, to minds that love fairness[49], and even to the cause of truth itself. In the advocates of Christianity, especially, it seems to imply an admission of dangers to be apprehended to the evidences of the Gospel, from a full and impartial investigation of the merits of Mahometanism. Christianity assuredly has nothing to fear from such an investigation.* The lustre of the Gospel evidences must utterly eclipse and obscure whatever parallel a comparison with the religion of Mahomet can furnish: sooner shall the light of the sun by day, yield to the borrowed brightness of the moon by night, than the lustre of the everlasting Sun of righteousness can wane before the pale glimmerings of the Moslem Crescent.

But, while the Christian has no reasonable grounds of doubt or fear to withhold him from

* Sale, Advertisement to reader, p. i.

doing the fullest justice to the phenomena of Mahometanism, the phenomena themselves are singularly interesting and mysterious. The origin and rise of this heresy, its rapid and wide diffusion, with the whole train of circumstances attending its first promulgation, are extraordinary facts. Its dominion over the human mind, and power, both as conquering and as conquered, to change the characters of nations, are facts still more extraordinary. Its progress, in quarters where it resorted only to the arts of peace and persuasion [50], is unexplained. Its permanency, and inviolable preservation of its original pure theism, are inexplicable on any ordinary grounds of reason or analogy. While, by the mysterious concurrence, unexampled save in the history of Christianity itself, of causes and events conducing to favour its introduction and establishment, the mind is naturally led to seek the explanation in the only adequate source, the interposition, for some wise and gracious, though inscrutable end, of the special and superintending providence of God. *

* "The existence of *heresy* is not merely *permitted*, but ORDAINED for a particular end." Bishop Kaye, Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, p. 340. — "What we loosely term *chance*, is but the work of his (God's) will, and the operation of his power, in the *ordinary* course of human events." Sermons by the late Rev. Thomas Rennell, p. 38.

The admission which thus seems forced upon us by the facts, is obviously exposed to very serious objections. The bare reference of Mahometanism, to a strictly providential origin [51], would appear, on the one hand, to annex a dangerous importance to this arch-heresy; and, on the other, to impugn the divine justice and goodness themselves. [52] Yet the insuperable difficulties which are confessedly inherent in this question; the failure of every attempt to meet these difficulties by arguments resting on any ordinary basis; and the sense of this failure, still entertained and avowed by men not less distinguished for the strength and soundness of their judgment, than by the firmness of their attachment to the interests and honour of Christianity; these powerful considerations irresistibly unite to produce the conviction, that the success of Mahomet, and the phenomena of his religion, can be satisfactorily accounted for only by a principle, which shall trace them, beyond causes merely human, to the agency of a controlling and directing Providence. [53]

The acknowledged difficulties which thus cling to this important question, and which have raised in some minds a painful feeling of doubt and dissatisfaction, produced in the mind of the present writer a very different effect. The case

of Mahometanism had long presented itself to him as a subject of the highest interest; and with the conviction that the question of its success was still unsettled, the persuasion gradually arose, that it ought not to be suffered to remain so. From the resistance of the phenomena to any theory which would reject the notion of a special providence, his conclusion was, that a special providence had interposed, and might possibly be discoverable, in their production. The train of thought to which this conclusion gave birth, naturally led him into the field of Scripture history, the most ancient and authoritative source of historical information. The country of Mahomet forcibly recalled the Abrahamic origin of the Arabians. And from the recollection of their origin, the transition was direct to the existence of a promise from God to Abraham, concerning his son Ishmael, and of a prophecy respecting the future fortunes of *his* descendants, singularly parallel with the great prophetic promise concerning "his only son Isaac." On comparing the fortunes of both sons, in the history of their descendants, the Jews and the Arabians [54], and in the positive and relative influence of these kindred nations upon the general history of mankind, with the terms of the original twofold promise concerning

them, there arises a beautiful and surprising proof of a designed connection, in their respective fulfilments, between the parts of that promise [55], from the exact and appropriate parallel which obtains between the historical events and circumstances. From Abraham, by his sons Isaac and Ishmael, went forth a twofold progeny, and a twofold promise. In each progeny the promise of Jehovah has, in point of fact, had a double accomplishment, a temporal and a spiritual. Isaac, the legitimate heir, through Judaism and Christianity, has given laws and religion to a great portion of the inhabited world. Ishmael, the illegitimate seed, through the primitive Arabians, and the variously incorporated Moslems, has given laws and religion to a still larger portion of mankind. Isaac new-modelled the faith and morals of men: first, through his literal descendants, the Jews; and, secondly, through his spiritual descendants, the Christians. Ishmael effected a corresponding revolution in the world: first, through his literal descendants, the Arabs; and, secondly, through his spiritual descendants [56], the Turks and Tartars. In the case of Isaac, the change was wrought by the advent of Jesus Christ; a person uniting in himself, by divine appointment, the offices of prophet and apostle, of priest, lawgiver,

and king; and whose character and claims are equally unprecedented. In that of Ishmael, the change was effected by the appearance of Mahomet; a person professing to unite in himself the same offices, as by the divine appointment; and presenting, in this union, the only known parallel to Jesus Christ and his typical forerunners, in the annals of the world.

Throughout the two cases, the force of the parallel is heightened by the appropriateness of the contrast. The blessing promised by God to Abraham in behalf of his sons, was necessarily a divided portion, since "the son of the bondwoman could not be heir with the son of the freewoman." * The division, it is observable, is apportioned with strict regard to this grand distinction, both in the wording of the two promises, and in the matter-of-fact accomplishments. The promise to Isaac is eminently a promise of a spiritual blessing: and it issues, accordingly, in the establishment upon earth, through his offspring, of a purely spiritual kingdom.[57] The promise to Ishmael is predominantly a promise of a temporal blessing: and it, accordingly, appears to issue in the establishment upon earth, through his offspring, of a temporal as well as spiritual dominion.[58] The birth of Isaac was the subject

* Gal. iv. 30.

of promise; and the Messiah, the heir and dispenser of his blessing, came by promise. The birth of Ishmael was *not* the subject of promise*; and Mahomet, the only analogous inheritor and conveyancer of his blessing, came without promise. Isaac was the legitimate seed; and, conformably with the dignity of his birthright, became the rightful promulgator, through Christ, his descendant, of the true faith of the Gospel. Ishmael was the illegitimate seed; and, consonantly with the disadvantage of his birth, became the suitable progenitor, through Mahomet, his descendant, of the spurious faith of the Koran.† In a word, the parts of this entire parallel lie over against each other, like two answering tallies: the discrepancies contributing, perhaps still more than the agreements, to the completeness of the proof[59], by the just distance which they preserve between the original promises, as viewed in their fulfilments.

The objects proposed in the following work are, to trace out these promises and fulfilments in their principal parts and bearings; to examine the case of Mahometanism, as a providential

* Saint Paul has specially noted this important distinction between the two brethren. See Gal. iv. 22, 23.

† Since this was written, I remark with satisfaction a valuable coincidence of view, in a philosophical observer of the phenomena. Mr. Turner styles "the Mahometan system, *a spurious offspring, the Ishmael of Christianity.*" Hist. of Eng. vol. iv. p. 431.

arrangement growing out of the Ishmaelitish covenant; and, by these means, to throw additional light on the truth and divine authority of the Gospel. It is hoped that, in the course of this argument, the chief difficulties of Mahometanism will be solved, and its embarrassments disentangled; while that which has hitherto been regarded as a triumph by the infidel, and a stumbling-block by many a sincere Christian, will be converted into a new argument and evidence, in behalf of our most holy faith.

The soundness of the principle on which this inquiry is conducted may be brought directly to a severe and satisfactory test, by trial of its effects upon the phenomena of Mahometanism: first, as measuring by a just standard, whatever is objectionable in its character; and, secondly, as vindicating the ways of Providence, in the permission of this overwhelming heresy.

1. An immediate result of the reference of Mahometanism, for its origin, to the promise of God to Abraham concerning Ishmael, must be the conviction, that, both as to its merits and its defects, the religion of Mahomet has hitherto been tried by a wrong standard. Its merits and defects have constantly been estimated by comparison with Christianity: whereas, if we at all admit the principle in question, Judaism, and not

Christianity, should, in the first place, be made the touchstone.[60] The questionableness of the comparison with Christianity is particularly observable, as it affects the objectionable features of Mahometanism. The purity of the Gospel presents a startling contrast with the lax morality of the Koran. Its spirit of peace is irreconcileably at issue with the spirit of a religion, preached by armed missionaries, and propagated by the sword. But it may fairly be asked, is this direct and unqualified comparison reasonable and just? And the principle on which our present argument is founded suggests the reply, that it is not. The reference of Mahometanism to the original promise in favour of Ishmael, and the admission of a pre-ordained and germinant connection between this lesser promise, and the great promise to Isaac, lead unavoidably to the conclusion, that, in the first instance, Judaism is the only proper standard of comparison.

But, as measured by this standard, the parallel stands upon very different grounds. Those features of Mahometanism, which wear only the character of unmitigated deformity, when tried by the pure and searching light of the Gospel, and which will not endure for a moment the touch of this Ithuriel spear, find sufficient precedents and parallels, when brought into contact

with the punitive precepts, and carnal ordinances, of the Mosaic law.*

The law of Moses, as well as that of Mahomet, recognised and enforced the doctrine of appeal to the sword.[61] The Mosaic and Moslem systems were equally remarkable for the exterminating severity, prescribed and exercised by both, against idolatry, in whatever form or disguise. And the conquest of Canaan presents, on a diminished scale indeed, but in a yet more rigorous and uncompromising shape, the perfect model for the erection, in an after age, of the conquering domination of Mahomet.[62]

Again, the law of Moses, as well as that of Mahomet, acknowledged, by its sanctions, the received laws and customs of the East, on the subjects of marriage and concubinage.† The doctrines of a plurality of wives, of divorce, and of legitimate concubinage, it is true, are barely deducible from the Pentateuch ‡, while they are palpably and obtrusively put forward in the Koran: but the practice of the Israelites, in process of time, went far beyond the permissive precepts of their law; and the inner apartments of their kings and nobles are graphically recalled to mind, by the similar and rival structures at Bagdad or

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 162.

† See section v.

‡ Mills, pp. 332—334.

Constantinople. Abuses, at once indicated and explained by the Gospel declaration, that the latitude allowed or tolerated by the law of Moses, was conceded, not in the way of precept, but of permission ; and that the concession was extorted from the reluctant lawgiver, by the waywardness of a hard-hearted and disobedient people. *

But if this explanation be sufficient, as undeniably it is, for the vindication of the law of Moses, we cannot with any consistency reject its application, so far as it applies, to the extenuation of that of Mahomet. He found the Arabs at least as corrupt and incorrigible in their morals †, as Moses, in his day, had found the ancient Israelites. Polygamy and concubinage had obtained the sanction of immemorial prescription among the tribes of the peninsula. If, therefore, he shunned the encounter with human prejudices and passions in these their strongest holds, it is bare justice only that this uninspired legislator, himself but just emerged from the darkness of Paganism, should be admitted to plead the apology, which the highest authority vouchsafed to offer in behalf of the inspired lawgiver of the Jews.

The personal morals of Mahomet, however,

* St. Matt. xix. 7, 8. † White, Bampt. Lect. p. 159.

may fairly be objected, as impugning *his* motives[63]; and his character, it must be felt, is thrown altogether into shade, by a comparison with the pure morality exemplified in that of Moses.[64] But, even here, truth and fairness require at our hands some notice of the palpable and unquestionable extenuations. Moses was born and nurtured among a people who knew the true God. He was personally led and inspired by the Holy Spirit; and his heart was leavened, in consequence, by the purificatory influences of divine grace. Mahomet was born an idolater, and bred up in the midst of a nation of gross idolaters, utterly corrupt, also, in their morals. He possessed no extraordinary advantages, or superior illumination. Surprise, therefore, that his moral code was not better, may fairly be exchanged for admiration, that it was not worse. "His system," as has been well observed by a Christian philosopher, "contains a great deal of pure Christianity[65]: it enforces the virtues of charity, temperance, justice, and fidelity, in the strongest manner: it prohibits extortion, and all kinds of cruelty, even to brutes; and it binds its votaries to the strictest regularity, order, and devotion."* Amidst the idolatrous inha-

* See Dr. Zouch's Works, vol. i. pp. 263, 264.; and compare Bishop Law, Theory of Religion, pp. 162, 163. ed. 1759, or pp. 194, 195. and

bitants of Mecca or Medina, or the barbarous hordes of idol-worshippers who frequented the Caaba, what new moral light could have arisen upon Mahomet, to raise his personal conduct above the surrounding dissolution of manners? We expect impossibilities, and wonder that the expectation is not realized. Our wonder ought to be greater, if it were.

A further objection, however, may be raised, of a very serious nature, and which carries strong appearance of fairness. Against the morality of the Koran, compared with that of the Pentateuch, it may be urged, that a superior light had come into the world before the time of Mahomet; that the Gospel of Christ had long superseded and made void the law of Moses. Christianity, already for more than three centuries the established religion of the Roman empire, had early gained, and still kept, a footing in Arabia. The Koran itself bears ample testimony to Mahomet's general acquaintance with it. As then he knew the better way, yet chose the worse, his case admits not of extenuation.

The reasoning would be unanswerable, if the

---

262. ed. Lond. 1820. The Bishop of Carlisle considers Mahometanism, "in the main, *a very considerable reformation.*" See also Turner, vol. iv. pp. 410, 411.

position on which it founds itself were tenable. But full proof of its untenableness is contained in the fact, that the ground has been deserted by the Christian advocates themselves; who are unanimous in ascribing the progress of Mahomet, to the *total corruption of Christianity* at the time of his rise. To this unsuspected quarter I shall direct the reader for information, as to the kind and quality of Christianity with which alone Mahomet could have been acquainted. "The Christians of this unhappy period," says Dr. White, speaking of the beginning of the seventh century, "seem to have retained little more than the name and external profession of their religion. Of a Christian church scarce any vestige remained. The most profligate principles, and absurd opinions, were universally predominant; ignorance, amidst the most favourable opportunities of knowledge; vice, amidst the noblest encouragements to virtue; a pretended zeal for truth, mixed with the wildest extravagancies of error; an implacable spirit of discord about opinions which none could settle; and a general and striking similarity in the commission of crimes, which it was the duty and interest of all to avoid." [66]

Such, not to multiply citations, was the general condition of Christendom when Mahomet appeared. The condition of the Eastern Church

was peculiarly deplorable; for to vice, ignorance, and superstition, this branch of Christianity added a rank and immeasurable growth of heresies and schisms.* These plants were peculiarly suited to the soil of Arabia; a country characterised by ecclesiastical writers as fruitful in heresies.† [67] With this bad harvest, accordingly, in the seventh century, Arabia was wholly overrun.‡ And thus Mahomet was condemned to collect his notions of Christianity, at the worst age, from the most corrupt branch, and in the darkest and most deplorably perverted quarter, of Christendom. His notions were naturally framed after the measure of his opportunities; and the piebald effigy of the Christian religion which he has left drest up in the Koran, may be received, if not as a full portraiture, at least as a fair caricature, of the then deformed and degraded profession of the Gospel. Such being his best lights on the subject of Christianity, the argument from his rejection of this heavenly system, or his transgressions against the purity of

* "The sins of the Eastern countreys, *and chiefly their damnable heresies*, hastened God's judgements upon them. In these Western parts, heresies, like an angle, caught single persons; which, in Asia, like a dragnet, took whole provinces." Fuller's Holy Warre, book i. chap. 6.

† "Ferax hæreseôn Arabia." Danæus, Comment. in August. de Hæres. p. 201.

‡ See Vertot, History of the Knights of Malta, vol. i. p. 231, folio ed.; and compare Universal History, vol. xviii. p. 360. 8vo.

its doctrines, is without weight; while its force, on the highest calculation, must be seriously weakened by the reflection, that his view of the Gospel was taken from a distance, and out of the depths of Paganism.

2. By deducing the rise and success of Mahomet from the prophetic promise to Abraham in behalf of his son Ishmael, a sufficient and satisfactory account is obtained of Mahometanism, in its least explicable features: its permanence, and perfect preservation of the original doctrines; its dominion over the human mind; and its power, by the arts of peace, no less than by the compulsory influences of war, to change the condition and the characters of the nations of the earth. *

But an adequate reason is still needed to justify the providential permission, supposed by this principle, of a spurious system of faith. And an adequate reason is found in the whole posture of things, as already detailed, at this epoch of history:—in the state of the world and of Christendom, at the time of Mahomet's appearance; and in the threefold warfare carried on by Mahometanism, against idolatry, Judaism [68], and heretical Christianity.

As a means to purge the world from idolatry,

* White, Bampt. Lect. p. 295, &c.

a scourge like this could never have been untimely: the sinful perverseness of the Jews[69], in rejecting the grace, and persecuting the disciples of the Gospel[70], cried aloud to heaven for such a visitation upon them: while eastern Christendom, at once the parent and the prey of hydra-headed heresy, demanded and deserved precisely the infliction, which the rod of a conquering heresiarch could bestow.[71] Such, in truth, was the utter corruption of faith and manners in the Eastern Church, that some of the best and ablest advocates of Christianity have not scrupled to pronounce Mahometanism an advance and improvement on the prevailing system.* When, therefore, the profession of the true religion, in the hands of the literal and spiritual posterity of Isaac, had sunk *below* the level of a mere theism, a naked and unmitigated theism was rightfully raised up, among the posterity of Ishmael, to avenge God's outraged honour, where it was impracticable to restore his worship, or rebuild his faith. It was not Christianity, but a vile parody of this divine religion, that Mahometanism interposed to subvert; and the progress of the sword and the Koran issued in the permanent erection of a

* See the authorities referred to in pp. 78, 79, *note.*

better structure, upon the ruins of heresy and heathenism.

The justice of God's providence, therefore, in the raising up of Mahomet, stands clear of all impeachment. But the vindication will be still more complete, when, from the survey of its extent, we pass to examine the *bounds* of this destroying apostasy.

While the Eastern Church was but a vast theatre for the exhibition and collision of rival schisms and heresies, the Western Church, however practically corrupt and superstitious, (a defection for which it, too, received its punishment in kind*,) in all the great fundamentals of doctrine, had preserved its Christianity, in substance, catholic.† The contrast is marked in the hour of providential retribution [72]: as the former community then reaped the full recompense of its infidelity, so the latter received the due reward of its faithfulness. Heretical Asia was swallowed up, as in a moment, by the Unitarian deluge: but Catholic Europe, safe under the shadow of her golden candlestick, sustained the Moslem storm uninjured and unmoved. The

* In the erection of the Papal tyranny; a morally corrupt, but *catholic* scourge. This tyranny, it is worthy of all observation, sprang up *contemporaneously* with the heretical tyranny of Mahometanism. See sect. x.

† It had its reward in kind, in a catholic reformation.

tempest broke with resistless force over the churches of Syria and Palestine: having inundated Egypt, the cradle of false doctrines[73], it swept without a pause along the continent of Africa; laid in ruins its altars, long polluted by the schism of the Donatists, and by the Vandal heretics[74]; and crossed impetuously these confines, to overwhelm Arian Spain.*[75] But from the adamantine frontier of Catholic Europe, it receded as from a rock. A minister of Providence was at hand, in the person of Charles Martel; and the bones of Abdalrahman[76], and of his attendant myriads[77], who "already adjudged to the obedience of the prophet whatever yet remained of France or of Europe†," whitened on the soil of a Catholic land.‡ "The victory of the Franks[78] was complete and final; the Arabs never resumed the conquest of Gaul; and they were soon driven beyond the Pyrenees by Charles

* "Omnis Hispania dudum sub uno regimine Gothorum, omnis exercitus Hispaniæ in uno congregatus, Ismaelitarum non valuit sustinere impetum." Chron. Alphonsi Regis.

† "Les Arabes, vainqueurs, auraient planté les étendards de l'Islamisme *sur les rivages de la Baltique*." De Marlès, Histoire de la Domination des Arabes en Espagne, tome i. p. 141.

‡ "At this portentous period, the great cause of civilization and *Christianity* hung chiefly upon the conduct of one single people and its rulers. — In 732, Charles Martel, the grandfather of Charlemagne, decided the great question, whether CHRISTIANITY or MOHAMMEDANISM should be the religion of Europe." Turner, vol. i. pp. 7—9. Compare pp. 313, 314, *note*.

Martel and his valiant race." * The fatal experiment was repeated in the opposite quarter of Europe, after the lapse of nine centuries, and with the same disastrous success. Catholic Europe was assailed, in the seventeenth century, upon her eastern frontier, by another Moslem destroyer †; when immediately a second Martel arose, in the great Sobieski, and set bounds for ever to the Turkish empire and faith. ‡ Can we survey this marvellous and mysterious coincidence, without instinctively recognising the hand and providence of HIM, who saith unto the sea, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed:" and who

* Mr. Gibbon's narrative of the crisis is deeply interesting: see vol. x. pp. 21—27. Even on *his* showing of the facts, the finger of God is visible in this whole catastrophe. "After a bloody field, in which Abderame was slain, the Saracens, in the close of the evening, retired to their camp. In the disorder and despair of the night, the various tribes of Yemen and Damascus, of Africa and Spain, were provoked to *turn their arms against each other:* the remains of their host were suddenly dissolved, and each emir consulted his safety by a hasty and separate retreat." Compare Judges, vii. 21, 22.; 1 Sam. xiv. 15, 16., and 2 Kings, vii. 6, 7. The irrational scepticism of the historian, in this, and in parallel examples of a clearly *providential* agency interposing to check the progress of the Saracens westward, is ably exposed and reproved by Dr. Eveleigh, in his Bampton Lectures; see pp. 130—135. third edit. Oxford, 1814, with the authorities there cited.

† For the imminent peril of western Christendom, see Turner, i. 313, 314, *note;* also Heeren, Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades, p. 265, *note.*

‡ For marks of a similar providence in this, as in the former great deliverance, see Cantemir, Hist. lib. iv. cap. i. §§ 63—79.

hath determined unto men "the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation"?[79]

The basis of the present argument is laid in the existence of a prophetic promise to Abraham, in behalf of his sons Isaac and Ishmael. By the terms of this promise, a blessing is annexed to the posterity of each; and on Ishmael, as well as on Isaac, this blessing is pronounced, because he was Abraham's seed *, and as a special mark of the divine favour.[80] This last consideration is worth attending to; since a promise to Ishmael, thus connected by Jehovah himself with his descent from the father of the faithful, seems to lead the mind naturally beyond the idea of a mere temporal fulfilment. *Some sufficient fulfilment* we are certainly authorised and bound to expect *for each branch of the original promise.*[81] The striking literal correspondence between the terms of its two parts appears to sanction the further expectation of an analogy equally strong between the respective fulfilments: which expectation, moreover, receives fresh warrant from the fact, that the promise in behalf of Ishmael was granted in answer to a prayer of Abraham, *in which he implored for Ishmael, the blessing reserved for Isaac.* †[82] According to the original promise concerning each, Isaac and Ishmael were

* Gen. xvii. 20. xxi. 13. † Gen. xvii. 18. 20.

severally to become the fathers of great nations; and the history of these nations was also to be signally connected with the history and fortunes of mankind. The Jews were the prophetic offspring of the blessing to the younger, the Arabians of that to the elder son. The promise to Isaac had, in point of fact, first, a temporal fulfilment in the establishment of his race in Canaan; and, secondly, a spiritual fulfilment in the advent of the Messiah, Jesus Christ, and in the establishment of Christianity throughout the world. In the promise to Ishmael, from the literal correspondence of the terms, coupled with the peculiar circumstances under which it was made, there seems to be just reason to look for an analogous double fulfilment. But the history of the Arabians, from the remotest antiquity, down to the seventh century of the Christian era, affords no shadow of a parallel.* At this advanced point of time, a full and exact parallel is presented, in the appearance of Mahomet; and in the establishment, through his instrumentality, by the descendants of Ishmael, first, of a temporal, and, secondly, of a spiritual dominion over a vast portion of the world.[83] Here, in point of fact, there obtains a parallelism of accomplishment, in per-

* So notoriously is this the case, that Mr. Ockley prefaces his History of the Saracens, with a remark on the obscurity and insignificance of Arabia, prior to the time of Mahomet; see Hist. of the Sar., preface, p. ix.

fect accordance with the verbal parallelism which subsists between the two branches of the original promise. * And the matter comes shortly to this plain issue: that either the promise to Ishmael has had *no* fulfilment analogous with that made to Isaac, with which it yet so singularly corresponds; or it has found its fulfilment, as the facts of the case so strongly indicate, in the rise and success of Mahomet, and in the temporal and spiritual establishment of the Mahometan superstition.

A most remarkable twofold prediction on the one hand, and an equally remarkable double and corresponding issue on the other, thus lie over against each other like two answering tallies. The facts of the analogy are incontrovertible; they require to be solved; and they admit of but the one satisfactory solution. We have only to receive the original promise to Abraham, according to the terms of it, as germinant and parallel in both its parts; and to recognise in Christianity and Mahometanism its twofold fulfilment †; and the whole doubts and difficulties of the question disappear.

The principle of this argument, it will be observed, is doubly sustained; first, by its perfect

* See section i.

† For a full exposition of the argument founded on these parallel covenants and fulfilments, see section i.

correspondence with the promises and prophecies of Scripture, and, secondly, by its accordance with the actual phenomena.

But the circumstances under which the two-fold promise to Abraham was made, necessarily suppose, together with a marked analogy, a wide interval in the characters of the two accomplishments. Isaac was the son of the free-woman, the legitimate seed, the true child and heir of promise: Ishmael was the son of the bond-woman, the illegitimate seed, and neither the offspring nor inheritor of any promise preceding his natural conception. * The nature of the case, therefore, requires a distance to be preserved between the blessings, suitable to that which obtained between these brethren; and points out, at the same time, what, apparently, this distance ought to be. If from Isaac was to spring the true religion; from Ishmael there might be expected to arise, as the counterpart, a spurious faith. If the true Messiah, the descendant of Isaac, and who, like him, came *by* promise, was to be the founder of the one creed; a counterfeit Messiah, the descendant of Ishmael, and who, like him, should come *without* promise, could be the only appropriate founder of the other. These anticipations are obviously

* The birth of Ishmael, by name, was foretold to Hagar; but this prediction followed, instead of preceding, conception. See Gen. xvi. 11.

suggested, antecedently, by the circumstances of the case; and they are accurately met, by the whole phenomena of Christianity and Mahometanism.

Christ and his religion, conformably with the dignity of his heirship, are infinitely perfect, pure, and holy: Mahomet and his superstition, consonantly with the disadvantages of his natural descent, are debased and degraded by an inordinate mixture of alloy. The two creeds, in a word, maintain throughout, the distance implied by the original relation between the two brethren. Christianity is, in every feature, the genuine offspring of the legitimate son Isaac: Mahometanism, in all its lineaments, the meet progeny of the spurious son Ishmael.[84] Accordingly, the creed of Mahomet is found to be composed, in its better features, from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures; and in its worse, from rabbinical and heretical corruptions of the one and the other.* Generally, where his doctrine departs most grossly from the true religion, he is to be traced in the Talmuds, or in the apocryphal gospels. His deflexions, no less than his approximations, thus confirm the relation of his lie to the truth.

It is remarkable, that one of the greatest ex-

* See sections iv.—ix. passim.

ceptions which has been taken to Mahometanism, namely, its plagiarisms from the Old and New Testaments, and its sweeping adoption of the dreams of the Talmudists, and the diseased speculations of Christian heretics, proves a main essential towards the establishment of a pre-ordained connection between the two systems, growing out of the original twofold promise.

But the distance and distinctness preserved in all the circumstances of agreement, are not merely appropriate as suited to the original contrast between the sons of Abraham: they are essential, further, to guard the truth and dignity of the greater prophecy concerning the Messiah, and to vindicate the consistency of the divine proceedings. Had Mahometanism approached more nearly to Christianity, in the soundness of its principles, and the purity of its precepts; had the personal character of Mahomet been at all assimilated to the holy and undefiled character of Jesus; painful and perplexing doubts must inevitably have arisen, not only as to the consistency of the divine government, but as to the claims of the rival prophets. Let us beware, therefore, to what extent we carry our unqualified reprehension of Mahomet and his superstition, lest we be found, in so doing, to cast reflections on the unerring wisdom, which has

made their defects and demerits signally instrumental, to guard the evidences, and proclaim the unrivalled supremacy, of the only true faith.

But the completeness of the analogy, in their respective accomplishments, between the branches of the original promise, it will presently appear, remarkably depends on two specific predictions, contained in the branch which relates to the covenant of Ishmael. It is foretold of Ishmael: "His hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him." It is also said of him: "And he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren."* Let these predictions be traced in the subsequent events of history, and the fulness of their accomplishment will furnish large materials for the establishment and elucidation of the present argument.

Planted by the hand of Providence, at the first, in immediate contact with his brethren, the offspring of Isaac, the Ishmaelite early cultivated a spirit of general hostility to mankind, by the exercise of an implacable and unremitting hostility against the Jews. Scripture abounds with notices of the mutual hatred of the kindred nations; and its prescriptive notoriety is attested by a significant sentence of the philosophic Ta-

* Gen. xvi. 12.

citus. * So long, however, as the two people maintained the rank, and stood in the position, of *neighbouring* nations, their mutual hostility was confined within narrow limits. And the general and final dispersion of the Jews, which ensued on the destruction of their city and temple by the Romans, seemed to elude even the grasp of prophecy itself, by placing them wholly beyond the reach of their hereditary enemy. But the word of God is surer than the foresight of man. His providence had means in store equal to the exigency. Mahomet was raised up, and, at his bidding, the tribes of Arabia became also dispersed throughout the world. † The posterity of the two sons of Abraham met in opposite quarters of the earth ‡, to renew the prophetic conflict; and the avenging bow of Ishmael § pursued, in her remotest isles, God's

* "Solito inter accolas odio, infensa Judaeis Arabum manus." Tac. Hist. l. v. § 1.—The mutual hostility of the nations bespoke, indeed, more than the hatred of neighbourhood; and induced "plus quam civilia bella."

† Attention has been drawn incidentally by a modern writer, to the curiously similar character of the two dispersions: "Though without any empire in a mother-country, they (the Arab colonists of Africa, India, &c.) were bound together by language and religion; and, *like the modern Jews*, were united together, though scattered over various countries." Mickle's Lusiad, preface, p. lxxiii.

‡ Spain, in particular, at the period of the Saracenic invasion, was colonised, it is worthy of notice, by vast multitudes of Jews. See De Marlès, tome i. p. 60.

§ Gen. xxi. 20.

outcast and apostate people.* The success of Mahomet was thus made effectual to the literal accomplishment of the prediction concerning Ishmael, as it related to the Jews, when, to all human appearance, every prospect of its accomplishment had been done away.

But the hostility of Ishmael was not limited to his brethren after the flesh. For, by the terms of the original prediction, the Arabs were virtually pronounced, "a people armed against mankind." † In their native deserts, they amply justified and illustrated their prophetic character. But what power could bring a remote and insulated people, from strong attachment to the soil disinclined to emigrate, and destitute of ships, of colonies, and of any but inland commerce[65], into hostile contact with every nation in the known world? No power, assuredly, save "the great power of God." But God had here spo-

* Hott. Hist. Orient. p. 216. This peculiar providential office of Mahometanism receives striking illustration from the narrative of a Mahometan writer, cited in the Asiatic Researches, relating to a cruel persecution against the Jews, on the coast of Malabar: "In the Hejirah year 931, answering to A. D. 1524–5, the Mahomedans appear, by Zeireddien's narrative, to have been engaged in a barbarous war on *the Jews of Cranganore*; many of whom *our author acknowledges their having put to death without mercy; burning and destroying, at the same time, their houses and synagogues.*" Asiat. Research. vol. v. p. 22.

† Gibbon. This forcible expression is only a metaphrase of the prediction, Gen. xvi. 12. How often, where the sceptical historian affects to reject the prophecy, is he driven by facts to admit the fulfilment!

ken, and his word must not return unto him void. Mahomet was raised up to introduce a new religion; and the spirit of fanaticism which he kindled in Arabia, transformed the Arabs, as by a touch of magic, into a race of conquerors. In their progress towards universal dominion, they encountered in all directions the Jews and the Christians, the literal and the spiritual posterity of Isaac. Invincible in every other quarter, the Saracen arms, however, were unable to penetrate into the heart of Catholic Europe. From Sicily, indeed, where, to borrow the words of an exact historian, "the religion and language of the *Greeks* were eradicated *," they infested and laid waste the coasts of Italy; made a temporary lodgment in Calabria; and carried their predatory warfare even to the gates of Rome.[86] But all efforts at conquest and settlement proved fruitless. Twice the gigantic project was formed and essayed, to march by the Rhine and Danube to the banks of the Hellespont; and to lay the spoils of a third continent at the foot of the throne of Damascus; but, in each instance, it expired in the birth.[87] A link, therefore, was still wanting to the fulfilment of the prophecy; some nations of Christian Europe there still were, with

* Ockley.—The destroying infliction, we observe, still follows its appointed victim, *the heretical Greek church*.

whom the sword of the Saracens had not yet encountered; but the immutable word of God was pledged for the accomplishment, and the link required is found in the Crusades. *

The career of Arabian conquest, which threatened nothing short of the utter subversion of Christianity, provoked a great revulsion; and this revulsion gave birth to those unexampled wars. The contest, which had been prosecuted by the literal descendants of Ishmael, as far as the western frontier of Europe, in the recoil was now carried, by the spiritual descendants of Isaac, into the heart of Asia, and centered once more in Palestine, where it originally arose. On the very soil where Abraham received the twofold promise, and which had given birth to both his sons, Isaac and Ishmael thus met, in their literal or spiritual offspring, after the revolutions of nearly three thousand years, to renew the prophetic struggle, which had continued without interruption until the final dispersion of the Jews. Gaul, Germany, and Britain, countries of Europe which the arms of the Saracens had rarely or never violated, supplied their chief strength to the armies of the Crusaders; and thereby was perfected the fulfilment of that which was written concerning Ishmael, that his hand should be

* See sect. xi.

against all mankind, and the hands of all mankind against him *; and, again, that he should dwell in the presence of *all his brethren.*

But, while the former of these predictions found an adequate consummation in the warlike character of Mahometanism, the latter was further and more fully verified in its cultivation of the arts of peace. † The conquests of the Arabs prepared the way for their civilization. The aim at universal empire was, in process of time, succeeded by a thirst after universal knowledge. The caliphs of the house of Abbas in the East, and those of the house of Ommiah in Spain, seemed to rival one another, in the protection and encouragement of commerce and of letters. The Arabians were first summoned to this new enterprise, by the genius and liberality of the Abbasside caliph, Al Mamon. "Nor," observes the learned Ockley, "did the sagacity and application of that ingenious, penetrating people, in the least disappoint the designs of their muni-

* There is, if the expression be not too bold, a philosophy of providence visible in this prediction, as interpreted by the results. Human nature, like the ocean, needs to be purified by friction; and in the prophecy concerning Ishmael, we find provision for so purifying it, providentially foreordered, on an unexampled scale. Mahomet has left a profound reflection on this law of our imperfect nature, in the Koran: "If God had not prevented men, the one by the other, verily the earth had been corrupted." Sale's Koran, vol. i. chap. ii. p. 47.

† See sect. xii. xiii.

ficent benefactor; their progress in learning, after they had once entered upon it, seeming no less wonderful than that of their conquests. — Which love of learning was not confined to the eastern parts, but diffused throughout the whole dominions of the Saracens; being first carried into Africa (where they erected a great many universities), and from thence into Spain *: so that, when learning was quite lost in these western parts, it was restored by the Moors, to whom, what philosophy was understood by the Christians, was owing." † In every climate, the arts and sciences, philosophy and literature, revived and flourished under this rule.[88] Ishmael and Isaac, who before met only in mutual hatred and hostility, here dwelt together, as brethren, in unity; and, as the first reviver of knowledge and restorer of civilization, Mahometanism claimed and merited a comparison with Christianity, in its peaceful influences on mankind.

* Spain, it will be recollected, was the grand point of contact, through which the literature of the Saracens diffused itself over Europe. The directing hand of Providence appears equally manifest, in the extent, and in the limits, of the original Saracen invasion. By the conquest and colonization of Spain, and by the final arrest of their efforts to penetrate beyond the Spanish peninsula, the Arabs obtained precisely that degree of contact with Catholic Europe, which enabled Mahometanism, eventually, to infuse its arts and letters, and with them the spirit of philosophical inquiry, into the West; without endangering the faith and freedom of Christendom.

† Hist. of the Saracens, preface, pp. xi. xii.

The prophetic analogy was now at length completed. The two sons of Abraham, in their literal and spiritual posterity, were brought into contact, in every country of the known world; and into comparison with each other, in all the relations of human life. The fact of the original promise, and the phenomena apparently announcing its fulfilment, stand thus strikingly confronted, and remain to be accounted for. The sceptic may still cavil at what he cannot confute: but the humble and faithful Christian, who sees and adores, the word of God in the prophecy, and the power of God in the event, will prove, after all, the best, and only true philosopher. That such a prediction concerning Isaac and Ishmael should have had existence, and that Ishmael and Isaac should have thus wonderfully met together, after an interval of more than two thousand years, is a problem which Christian philosophy alone is competent to solve.

The foregoing outline will suffice to explain the compass of the present argument: which, taking for its foundation the twofold promise to Abraham in behalf of his sons *, will attempt to trace the prophetic parallel, thereby instituted between these brethren, through the patriarchal times, and the history of the Jews, and of the

* Sect. i.

ante-Mahometan Arabians, to its grand and final consummation in the successive rise and establishment of Christianity and Mahometanism.

The inquiry will embrace the descent of the Arabs from Ishmael *; the religion and customs of the ante-Mahometan Arabs †; the lights afforded by prophecy respecting Mahomet and his followers ‡; the historical, moral, doctrinal, and ritual parallels §, between Judaism and Mahometanism, and between Christianity and Mahometanism; a comparison of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with the Koran ‖; of the Jewish and Christian, with the Mahometan sects and heresies ¶; the contemporaneous rise and analogy of Popery and Mahometanism **; the providential object and effects of the Crusades ††; and a comparative view of Christianity and Mahometanism in their influences, on national character and civilization; on industry, manufactures, and commerce; and on the pro-

* Appendix, No. I. See sect. i. *note* *, p. 113.

† Appendix, No. II. ‡ Sect. ii. iii. § Sect. iv.—vii.

‖ Sect. viii. ¶ Sect. ix. ** Sect. x.

†† Sect. xi. — The Crusades have proved a fertile source of controversy to the learned world: views the most opposite have been taken of their effects, in many a laboured argument. Mr. Southey has done justice to the subject, in a single sentence: "But for the Crusades," observes this masterly and philosophical writer, "Mahometanism would have barbarized the world." And so unquestionably it would; for it would have extinguished Christianity; and, deprived of this light, must itself have sunk into utter and irretrievable darkness. See Southey's Life of Wesley, vol. i. p. 310.

gress of arts, sciences, philosophy, and literature.

Christianity and Mahometanism, in this argument, are considered as the providential results of a twofold promise made by God to faithful Abraham, in behalf of his sons Isaac and Ishmael; by which promise, a prophetic blessing was annexed to the posterity of each; which blessings, again, linked the fortunes of their descendants, with the providential history and government of the whole human race. The Jews inherited the greater blessing of Isaac, which was mainly of a spiritual nature; the Arabians, the lesser blessing of Ishmael, which was manifestly of a temporal nature. But the Jews impiously slighted their own far better portion, and set their hearts wholly upon the temporal inheritance. Rejecting the lights of prophecy, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they coveted an earthly kingdom, administered by a temporal Messiah; and would receive nothing else as the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham concerning them. This, however, was the proper portion of Ishmael; and the earthly crown, and temporal conqueror, which the Jews vainly thirsted after, *his* posterity, accordingly, obtained. Mahomet, in a word, was to the Arabs, precisely what the Jews

* Sect. xii. xiii.

fondly expected the Messiah would be to them. Notwithstanding the final disobedience of his chosen people, the word of Jehovah remained stedfast and sure: through the Gospel and the Koran, the promise to Abraham continually advanced towards its fulfilment, in the posterity of his sons, until of these two brethren was the whole earth overspread.

But the promise originally framed for such a consummation, and already so marvellously and mysteriously accomplished, evidently supposes, on every analogy of the divine proceedings, an ultimate result, adequate to the provisions made, and worthy of HIM who made them. For an approximation to this result, I would direct the attention of the reader to the relative merits of the rival systems, and to the actual state of the world as affected by their operation.[89]

The merits of Christianity are supreme; and wherever it has prevailed, the Gospel of Christ has produced effects upon the minds and hearts, the manners and institutions of mankind, every way worthy of its divine original.[90] The intrinsic merits of Mahometanism, while utterly beneath comparison with the only true revelation, are yet confessedly superior to those of every other religious system which has obtained amongst

men. The most strenuous opponents of its pretensions freely admit, that Mahometanism, with all its errors and absurdities, is, *next* to Judaism and Christianity[91], the best and most beneficial form of religion that has been ever presented to the world.* As an instrument to purify the nations from idolatry, its efficiency has been largely proved by facts, and is willingly allowed by the defenders of Christianity†: some amongst whom discover in it, further, the most appropriate collateral means, for the eventual and universal diffusion of the Gospel.‡

"Doubts," Professor White remarks, "have

* See Conclusion, especially its notes, for unexceptionable vouchers of the advanced state of religious feeling and principle, in Mahometan countries.

† "Even after it (the law of Moses) had done its destined work, the vigour of the Mosaic revelation still working at the root enabled a bold impostor to extend the principle of the unity still wider, till it had embraced the remotest nations of the habitable world: so that, at this day, almost all the nations of the vast regions of Higher Asia, whether Gentiles, Christians, or Mahometans, are the professed worshippers of the one only God. *How much the extension of the principle of the unity has been owing to this cause,* under the *permission* and *direction* of the *Providence,* which is ever producing good out of evil, is known to all who are acquainted with the present state of the Eastern world." Bishop Warburton, Divine Legation, book v. sect. ii. See Works, vol. v. p. 81. edit. 8vo. 1811. Compare Retrospective Review, vol. iii. pp. 10, 11.; and Michaelis on the Laws of Moses, vol. i. pp. 181, 182.

‡ See *Reflections on Mohammedanism,* cited by Bishop Law, Theory of Religion, p. 194.: "Wherein the author attempts to show, that Mohammedanism may have been *ordained for the good of Christianity;* to withstand the corruptions of it in times past, and to *increase and enlarge it in times to come.*" P. 5, &c.

arisen with sensible men, how far the propagation of the Gospel in some countries be upon the whole practicable or desirable: whether the doctrines of it would not be imperfectly understood, or grossly misconceived, or professed to no good purpose: whether as Gentilism and Judaism infected Christianity, so the favourite and inveterate superstitions of the American idolaters would not soon debase its purity, and counteract its efficacy. But this objection does not reach with its full force to the Mahometans of the East, who *are lifted far above* the ignorance of barbarians, and the ferocity of savages; and a wider scope surely would be here given for instructing them successfully in the sublimer doctrines of Christianity. The savage, whose gloomy and confined theology was perhaps the growth of turbulent passion and wild fancy, might easily be persuaded to admit the existence of miracles; from the similitude they bear to the supposed interpositions of his deities; from his incapacity to ascertain the force of natural causes; and from a kind of instinctive propensity to believe in those which are extraordinary, But the Mahometans, while they admit the principle of miracles *, might be

* This particular of their belief is under-stated. They not only admit the principle of miracles generally, but prefer the authority of the Jewish and Christian miracles, to that of their own. " Les Musulmans (M.

made more distinctly to conceive, and more readily to embrace, the argument from prophecy, in all its nice dependencies, and gradual evolutions. Among them we are not to contend with the boisterous tempers and stubborn habits which characterize the human species in a state of barbarism: we should find them already a race of men and citizens, *who, by an easy transition, might pass to a full belief of the doctrines of Christianity.** For the propagation of the Gospel in the East many inducements and advantages are held out to us, which the savage condition of the Indians of America does not afford. The Mahometans are an immense body of men, natives of populous and mighty empires, greatly exceeding in population the kingdoms of Christendom,

---

D'Herbelot remarks) *pendant qu'ils doutent des miracles de leur prétendu prophete*, croyent, sans exception, ceux de Moyse, et avouent ceux de Jesus Christ, &c." Bibliothèque Orientale, Titre Aia't.

* "Illud viri docti, et orientalibus itineribus clari, non semel testati sunt, *seriam aliquando pro Muhammedanorum convictione curam, non fore inanem.*" Hottinger, Bibliotheca Theologica, lib. iii. cap. ii. p. 389.

In all efforts for the conversion of the Mahometans, Mr. Sale recommends the adoption of the rules, which Bishop Kidder has prescribed for the conversion of the Jews. See his very judicious remarks, Preliminary Discourse, pp. iv.—vi. It would be a result entirely consonant with the principle of the present work, if both branches of the Abrahamic stock should be thus eventually conducted, by one and the same process, into the fold of Christ.

and almost entirely occupying one quarter of the habitable globe. They are the subjects of regulated states; they are the observers of established laws; civilized by the intercourse of agriculture and commerce, and polished by the use of letters and of arts. They are neither involved in the impiety of atheism, nor the darkness of idolatry; and their religion, false as it is, has many articles of belief in common with our own: *which will facilitate our labours in diffusing the true faith, and dispose them to receive it.*[92] They believe in one God, Creator and Lord of all; to whom they attribute infinite power, justice, and mercy. They hold the immortality of the soul; and expect a future judgment, a heaven, and a hell; they acknowledge an universal deluge; they honour the patriarch Abraham as the first author of their religion; they acknowledge Moses and Christ to have been great prophets, and allow the Pentateuch and the Gospel to be sacred books.[93] Since, therefore, by our holy Scriptures, *the duty of attempting the universal conversion of mankind is amply ascertained; and since we find among the followers of Mahomet such favourable prepossessions and established doctrines,* AS WILL RENDER EASY THE APPROACH TO THEIR CONVERSION, neither force of obliga-

tion, NOR PROSPECT OF SUCCESS is wanting, to encourage our progress, and animate our zeal." *

In the joint operation, therefore, of Christianity and Mahometanism, there exists, in point of fact, a twofold instrumentality, acting co-ordinately, upon a vast scale, on the civil and social relations of mankind, and on their moral and spiritual interests and affections; and apparently tending, in an eminent degree, to bring about that consummation spoken of in Scripture prophecy, when the one true religion shall universally prevail, and "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea." [94] Christianity operates directly in the fulfilment of this prophecy: Mahometanism shapes the course of things indirectly towards it. † Both systems aim alike at the destruction of

* White, pp. 379, 380, &c. This extract, compared with pp. 298, 299. as cited pp. 42, 43. of the present Introduction, perhaps supplies one of the most finished specimens extant, of an author's skill in the art of self-confutation.

† Maracci concedes the point, that Mahometanism possesses greater facilities than Christianity, for the conversion of heathen nations. Viewing the religion of Mahomet as *opposed* to the Gospel, this property might seem dangerous to the cause of truth; but regarding Mahometanism as *introductory* to the more universal diffusion of Christianity, it obviously assumes high interest and value. See Maracci, ap. Reland. De Relig. Mohammed. Præf. For a most interesting confirmation of this predisposing agency of Mahometanism, observable in India, both in loosening the shackles of the Hindoo idolatry, and in leading the popular mind, beyond its own dim lights, towards the better realities of Christianity, see Bishop Heber's Journal, vol. i. pp. 346—348. 4to. edit.

idolatry *: the one by the introduction and establishment of true religion; the other by the introduction and establishment of a wonderful approximation to the true faith. Their influence is already universally diffused; "their sound is gone out into all lands, their words unto the ends of the world;" and they hold so many great fundamentals in common[95], that, in the judgment of the most unexceptionable authorities, they contain a natural and necessary tendency to convergence; the imperfect scheme, when its providential work shall have been accomplished, becoming absorbed in the perfect[96], and the moon of Mahomet resigning its borrowed rays, to melt in the undivided light of the everlasting Gospel. † Such is the ascertained action of the

* "Fight against them," is the uncompromising precept of Mahomet, "until there be no opposition in favour of idolatry, and the religion be wholly God's." Sale's Koran, i. 229. The providential office discharged by Mahometanism, as uniting with Christianity for the extirpation of idolatry, and as legible in the present state of the world, compared with the past, is well represented in an incidental remark of the learned J. D. Michaelis: "In *our times*, there is little temptation to believe in more than one God; for the greatest and most rational peoples on earth, are either *Christians* or *Mahometans*, and they coincide in this belief." Commentary on the Laws of Moses, vol. i. pp. 181, 182.

† In allusion to the history of the Israelites, Dr. White somewhere observes, "The plot, viewed only in broken and detached scenes, was embarrassed and involved; but there was an Almighty Presider over every successive event, who, by a gradual evolution of his designs, *conferred order and consistency on the whole.*" Is not this eminently beautiful and philoso-

two religions, and such their tendency to eventual union. When, therefore, we recall to mind, that these religions emanated from the sons of Abraham, in virtue of a twofold promise of Jehovah to the faithful patriarch concerning them, the final issue indicated by the whole phenomena is plain: namely, that, as from Abraham, by his sons Isaac and Ishmael, there thus went forth the true faith, and an extraordinary approximation to it, throughout the world; so by the convergement, in the fulness of time, of Ishmael to Isaac, of Mahometanism to Christianity, the whole world shall one day be poured into the fold of the true shepherd, our only Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.[97]

---

phical reflection, still more beautifully and philosophically applicable to Christianity and Mahometanism, viewed as the *ordained* fulfilments of a grand providential plan, originally announced in the twofold promise to Abraham, concerning his sons Isaac and Ishmael?

MAHOMETANISM UNVEILED.

THERE ARE TWO OBJECTS OF CURIOSITY, THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, AND THE MAHOMETAN WORLD: ALL THE REST MAY BE CONSIDERED AS BARBAROUS.

DOCTOR SAMUEL JOHNSON.

MAHOMETANISM UNVEILED.

SECTION I.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GOD'S TWO-FOLD COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM, IN BEHALF OF HIS SONS ISAAC AND ISHMAEL.*

THE patriarch Abraham first appears in the book of Genesis as the subject of a great prophetic promise on the part of Almighty God, which should afterward be fulfilled in his posterity. The primitive annunciation of that promise is contained in the twelfth chapter.

"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy

* The descent of the great Arabian family from the stock of Ishmael is the foundation-stone of the present work. The fact of this descent comes authenticated to the whole Christian world by the unvarying testimony of the entire canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. As, however, the authority of the national pedigree, incautiously questioned even by some Christian scholars, has been industriously assailed by infidel writers, who seem to have made the claim of an Ishmaelitish origin a favourite subject of cavil, the necessity is forced upon us of examining the proofs of this origin, supplied, on the one hand, by Scripture and Jewish history, and, on the other, by profane history and Arabian tradition. — Not to interrupt the order of the work, the statement of these concurrent evidences has been reserved for the Appendix, No. I.

kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

This original covenant, regarded independently of any declarations which follow, manifestly branches into two distinct parts: it conveys, in the first place, the clear promise of a lineal blessing on the posterity of Abraham, expressed in the words, "I will make of thee a great nation;" and, secondly, the mysterious promise of a social blessing on the whole family of mankind, through the posterity of Abraham, intimated in the words, "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." *

The original covenant was twice renewed to Abraham, while the patriarch remained still childless †; and it is remarkable, that, in each instance, the renewal is restricted to the *first* branch of it, which respects exclusively the lineal increase and aggrandisement of his literal descendants. It is repeated, subsequently, for

* See Bishop Sherlock on Prophecy, Discourse V. p. 109, &c. 6th edition, London, 1755.

† Gen. xiii. 14—17. xv. passim.

the fourth time, to Hagar, the handmaid of Sarah, on the eve of her giving birth to Ishmael, Abraham's first-born son *: an event in which God's covenant, in its former part, received a first, authoritative, and apparently complete, accomplishment.

The promise so far confirmed to Ishmael, is, however, presently followed by a further opening out of this part of the covenant. In the course of the year which preceded the birth of Isaac, there occurs an extension of the lineal blessing. In plain enlargement of the terms of that original promise, "I will make of thee a great nation," Jehovah now declares to Abraham, that he shall become "a father of *many nations;*" that He would "make *nations* of him," and cause "kings to come out of him." †

This declaration stands as the introduction to a fresh discovery of the divine counsels. The birth of a legitimate son, by his wife Sarah, is now, at length, specifically foretold ‡; and to this, "his only son Isaac," (as the sacred text emphatically designates "the child of promise,") together with full participation in the lineal blessing, hitherto solely in question, is exclusively given and confirmed the mysterious

* Gen. xvi. 7—10, &c. † Gen. xvii. 5, 6.
‡ Gen. xvii. 16.

and still reserved universal blessing, conveyed in the original covenant itself: for with Isaac alone, God promises to establish his "everlasting covenant *;" the promise, that is, that "in his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed."

With the annunciation of the birth of Isaac, therefore, the word of promise, as first made to Abraham, becomes properly resolved into two distinct covenants: the one appropriated to Isaac, the legitimate, the other to Ishmael, the illegitimate seed.

"This distinction," observes Bishop Sherlock, "of two covenants in the case of Ishmael and Isaac, made by God himself, is the foundation of Saint Paul's argument to the Galatians: '*It is written,*' says he, '*that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants:*' and whoever is capable of considering what is related concerning this matter in the book of Genesis, will evidently see, that these are indeed two covenants; and two such covenants as fully justify the apostle's reasoning on this point." †

* Gen. xvii. 19. 21. † Discourses on Prophecy, p. 114.

The fact of the existence of two separate covenants, in Isaac and Ishmael, branching out from the original promise of God to Abraham, being thus established, we proceed to consider, as the point next in order, the character of the analogy between them.

The everlasting covenant, now formally assigned over to Isaac, included all that was temporal in the original covenant; but it was peculiar, in appropriating to him its spiritual blessing. The covenant previously made with Ishmael rested predominantly in the temporal blessing; yet not, as will presently appear, to the total exclusion of a certain spiritual force implied in it also: for to both covenants there was set a common seal, that of circumcision; which seal, as the whole analogy of Scripture certifies, was primarily and essentially spiritual in its character. "The sign of circumcision," says an authority just cited, "was given to separate Abraham and his posterity from the rest of mankind; which shows that the rest of mankind was not called to that covenant, of which circumcision was the sign or *sacrament*."*

A further, and equally significant, indication of something intended beyond a merely tem-

* Bishop Sherlock on Prophecy, p. 107.

poral meaning and fulfilment, in the covenant of Ishmael, is contained in the fact, that this covenant was given as the immediate answer of prayer; of the prayer of Abraham for a spiritual blessing. The sacred record, moreover, is careful to inform us, that Ishmael obtained the promise of a divine blessing, for this special reason, *because he was Abraham's seed.* In the natural fervour of parental love, Abraham had prayed, that God would grant him, in favour of his son Ishmael, the blessing just promised in behalf of Isaac, who was yet unborn. "And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee!" — a prayer to which the consoling answer of Jehovah is, "As for Ishmael, *I have heard thee.*" * Then follows the promise concerning him, which is afterwards repeated with the remarkable addition, "And also of the son of the bond-woman will I make a nation, *because he is thy seed.*" †

The spiritual bearing of the former of these circumstances did not escape the sagacity of the ancients. It is the just observation of Origen, on this place of Genesis, that Abraham had not contented himself with praying that Ishmael might live; but adds the condition of life which he desired for him, *that he might live before God;*

* Gen. xvii. 18. 20. † Gen. xxi. 13.

but to live before God, proceeds this father of Scripture criticism, is *the portion only of the blessed and of his saints.*[1]

As the covenant made with Isaac, then, while predominantly spiritual, contains the express promise of a temporal blessing, so that entered into with Ishmael, while predominantly temporal, would seem, as well from the manner of its announcement, as from the general analogy of character plainly intended by the parallel terms of the two covenants, to contain a certain real, though low and subordinate, spiritual application. Indeed, that Abraham should have offered up the petition that Ishmael might live in the light of God's countenance, and under a divine blessing and protection, (a petition *certainly* implied by the prayer, that he might live before Jehovah; and inherit the promise granted in favour of Isaac,) may be received as conclusive moral evidence on this point: for a blessing of a merely temporal nature was little likely to be *thus* sought by "the father of the faithful;" in whose eyes things temporal appear invariably to have been held in little estimation.

In the sequel, these antecedent presumptions will be further corroborated by the fact, that prophecy has foreshown a great *spiritual* as well as temporal dominion, which should arise

eventually from the stock and country of Ishmael.

The promise to Abraham, which was originally *one*, has been now seen to unfold itself into two separate covenants, — the greater covenant of Isaac, and the lesser covenant of Ishmael. In its divided state, the parts, as might be anticipated, retain manifest tokens of its original unity. With the reservation only of Isaac's peculiar inheritance, the agreements of expression, throughout the parallel predictions which follow, amount to little short of identity. But identity in the wording of two strictly related prophecies will naturally suggest the idea, that we are to look for a correspondence in the respective fulfilments of those prophecies, answerable to the correspondence of the terms in which they were originally couched; in other words, so far as the related predictions themselves prove verbally co-ordinate, we are authorised to expect accomplishments substantially co-extensive.

The remarks thus far premised may suffice, it is hoped, to prepare the way, first, for an attentive consideration of the parallel between the distinct promises to Isaac and to Ishmael; and then, for the further comparison of this

* See sections ii. iii.

parallel, with the analogy which shall be found to obtain between the historical accomplishments of their respective promises, as seen to emanate from the posterity of each patriarch.

The case here under consideration is one which can be determined only by such comparison of the promises with the events: for it is a case of prophecies for the greater part already accomplished; and, therefore, so far as the train of past accomplishments extends, it is properly open to be tried and decided by appeal to the known historical facts. When the whole affinity between Isaac and Ishmael, in their natural, their prophetic, and their providential relations, is held in mind, the historical correspondence observable in the fortunes of their descendants may fairly be regarded as equivalent to an ordinary and approved species of proof, the correspondence, namely, between the notches of two answering tallies in numerical computations.

The remainder of the present section shall be devoted to the simple exposition of this double parallel: 1. between the scriptural promises; and, 2. between their actual historical fulfilments.

1. The scriptural promises, or the covenants of God with Abraham concerning Isaac and

Ishmael, come first under review. This fundamental part of the argument, or basis, rather, of the entire analogy, I shall proceed accordingly to dispose in a tabular form. The reader, it is conceived, will more readily perceive the nature and amount of the coincidences, when presented in this shape; and may be likely, also, to enter with greater advantage into the consideration of those remarks, which it will be necessary presently to submit, in elucidation of the sacred text.

THE ORIGINAL COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM.

Gen. xii. 1—3.

"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I WILL MAKE OF THEE A GREAT NATION; and *I will bless thee*, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

THE ORIGINAL COVENANT FIRST FULLY RENEWED.

Gen. xvii. 1—7.

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and *will multiply thee exceedingly:* and thou shalt be a father of many nations. And *I will make thee exceeding fruitful;* and *I will make nations of thee*, and *kings shall come out of thee.*

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.'

THE COVENANT OF ISAAC.

Gen. xvii. 15, 16. 19.

" And God said unto Abraham, as for Sarah, thy wife, *I will bless her*, and give thee a son also of her; yea *I will bless her*, and *she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.* — And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will establish my covenant with him for an *everlasting covenant.*"

THE COVENANT OF ISHMAEL.

Gen. xvii. 18—21.

" And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, As for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, *I have blessed him*, and *will make him fruitful*, and *will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget;* and I WILL MAKE HIM A GREAT NATION.* But my covenant will I establish with Isaac."

In these parallel contexts, where Isaac and Ishmael have assigned to them, for the first time, their several portions in the original covenant with Abraham, the temporal blessing is impartially shared between the two brethren; but the supreme spiritual blessing, entitled here God's " everlasting covenant," is reserved exclusively to the child of promise. In the contexts which immediately precede and follow, however, there occurs a clear proof of Ishmael's admission also, though in a low and subordinate

* Compare Gen. xxi. 18.

sense, to spiritual covenant with the God of Abraham; which proof, as we have already intimated, lies in his being made a partaker with Isaac in the rite, or sacrament, of circumcision.*

CIRCUMCISION THE COMMON SEAL OF BOTH COVENANTS.

Gen. xvii. 9—11.

"And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you."

Gen. xxi. 4.

"And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac, being eight days old, as the Lord commanded him."

Gen. xvii. 23. 26.

"And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and circumcised him. And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old when he was circumcised. In the self-same day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son."

The scriptural proof of the pre-ordained connection of the two covenants shall now be

* "In the families of Abraham and Isaac, being then onely the visible Church, Ismael, Isaac, Jaacob, and Esau, received circumcision, the externall signe of their profession: *by reason whereof, every of them were accompted true worshippers of the God of Abraham.*" — Sermon preached at Paules Crosse, by Laurence Chaderton, B. D. Oct. 26. 1578.

brought to its close, by simple juxta-position of the promises to Abraham in favour of Isaac, with those made to Hagar in behalf of Ishmael.

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.	PROMISES TO HAGAR.
Gen. xii. 1. 3.	*Gen.* xxi. 17, 18.
"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house: *And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*"	"And the Angel of the Lord called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; *for I will make of him a great nation.*"
Gen. xxii. 15—18.	*Gen.* xvi. 10—12.
"And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, — that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies: and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."	"And the Angel of the Lord said unto Hagar, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. And the Angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael, because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren."

On the general character of the promises re-

specting Isaac and Ishmael, it has been correctly observed by an eminent writer, "that the two covenants, as to worldly prosperity, are nearly the same."* Their identity in this respect will be rendered still more apparent, by a recapitulation of the leading verbal agreements in the several passages above cited. Thus, where the word of promise concerning Isaac declares, "As for Sarah, I will bless her," the declaration is responded to in the words of the promise concerning Ishmael, "As for Ishmael, I have blessed him:" when, in the case of Sarah, it is predicted generally, "Kings of people shall be of her," in that of Ishmael it is specifically foretold, "Twelve princes shall he beget:" if of the one it is prophesied, "And she shall be a mother of nations," of the other it is pronounced, "And I will make him a great nation."

The correspondence of the two covenants will be found not less strongly marked out, on a comparative reference of the special promises respecting Ishmael, to the wording of God's general promises in favour of Abraham's seed. To Abraham it is said, "I will make thee exceeding fruitful;" of Ishmael, "I will make him fruitful:" to the one, "and will multiply thee exceedingly;" of the other,

* Bishop Sherlock, ut sup. p. 116.

"and will multiply him exceedingly." — "I will multiply thy seed," is the declaration of God to Abraham, "as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore;" — "I will multiply thy seed," is the answering assurance of Jehovah to Hagar, "exceedingly, that it shall not be *numbered* for multitude."

This promise of an *innumerable* posterity to Ishmael, it deserves particular remark, is taken literally from the terms of the general promise to Abraham, as preserved in two independent repetitions of it: "And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to *number* them. And he said unto him, So shall thy seed be:" again, "And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can *number* the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be *numbered*." *

The verbal correspondence, thus far traced between the several promises, brings the two covenants apparently to a balance, in point of temporal prosperity. There remains to be noticed, however, one particular expression in the original covenant with Abraham, which does not recur in any repetition of the promise in behalf of Isaac, but which is so repeated in the predictions appropriated to Ishmael, as seemingly

* Gen. xv. 5. xiii. 16.

to incline the temporal scale in his favour. The expression in question, in the original covenant, is this, "And I will make of thee a great nation."*

Now, the promises regarding Isaac contain large predictions, of the nations, peoples, and kings, which should spring from his seed; but these predictions, it will be observed, are couched in general terms, and would seem rather to betoken, indefinitely, the multitude of Isaac's posterity, than to convey a defined idea of their concentrated power. In the case of Ishmael, on the other hand, over and above the like general promises of a countless posterity, in which respect he stands fully on a level with Isaac, we recognise distinctly the idea of a concentrated national dominion; since to him, and to him alone, is formally given and renewed that specific promise in the primitive covenant with Abraham, "And I will make of thee *a great nation.*"

"As for Ishmael," is the answer of God to Abraham, "I have heard thee, and I will make him *a great nation*†:" and this particular promise is specially renewed to Hagar: "Arise," said the Angel of God unto her, "lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand, for I will make him *a great nation.*"‡ The presumption

* Gen. xii. 2. † Gen. xvii. 20. ‡ Gen. xxi. 18.

supplied by the internal evidence is strong, that these passages contain a *designed* reservation in favour of Ishmael: the historical proof of such a reservation will hereafter be seen, when we come to compare the two promises, with their respective fulfilments in point of fact. In the course of this comparison, the temporal promise, appropriated by the terms of his covenant to Ishmael, that he should become "a great nation," may prove, on a review of the actual results, to be the providential counterpoise to the great spiritual promise peculiar to Isaac, that in his seed should "all the nations of the earth be blessed."

But Ishmael was not without his subordinate share in the lower elements of the spiritual covenant made with Abraham. For, as has been elsewhere remarked, the promise of God in his behalf was the immediate answer of prayer; the answer to the prayer of faithful Abraham; and granted, according to the express declaration of Jehovah, because he was his seed.* The sacrament of circumcision, moreover, lay equally at the root of both parts of the original covenant, as the common bond of a certain spiritual relation. From the wording of that more comprehensive covenant, of which circumcision was

* Gen. xxi. 13.

the appointed seal, it further appears, that this spiritual relation had in it a permanent and prospective force. For what is the primitive annunciation of the covenant of circumcision? "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; *to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. This is my covenant* which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; — *every male child among you shall be circumcised.*" * This sacramental condition of God's covenant, extended, without limitation, to Ishmael as well as to Isaac. The fact of its application to Ishmael is undoubted: the permanence and prospective force of this application can be fully ascertained only by an investigation of RESULTS.

God's promises are unchangeable, and cannot fail. To know that they were made, is enough to assure us, that they have been, or shall be accomplished. But the only means which uninspired man possesses of forming a judgment concerning the accomplishment, lie in the comparison of the promises themselves with subsequent events of history. The accomplishment being a thing certain, the legitimate question for inquirers obviously respects, *not*, the *fact*,

* Gen. xvii. 7—10.

but, the *mode* of the fulfilment. The only admissible course of inquiry, it follows, is that which aims to expound the word of promise from the history of the world. The exposition may be considered sound, wherever the historical facts adduced clearly emanate from, and can be distinctly and unequivocally referred back to, the original subject of promise: for, God being the Promiser, such a connection of history with prophecy supplies internal demonstration of pre-ordainment.

From the plain reason of the case, and from the peculiar nature of this whole analogy, it may further be received for a maxim, that parallelism in God's promises supposes corresponding parallelism in the fulfilments. Now, of the two parallel covenants in question in the present argument, that made with Isaac has incontrovertibly been fulfilled; and its accomplishment supplies the strongest antecedent evidence, in proof of the accomplishment of that made in behalf of Ishmael. But, in the case of Isaac, we know the precise manner and steps of the accomplishment; and, in our knowledge of this detail, possess the clue for investigating the analogous accomplishment, in the case of Ishmael. It is requisite only, that the apparent historical fulfilments of the covenant of Ishmael shall be

found on examination to correspond with the ascertained historical fulfilments of the covenant of Isaac, and, if there be any force in the scriptural analogy established between those brethren, the demonstration aimed at in these pages must be considered complete.

2. On the principles here laid down, I shall now take up the analogy, between the parallel promises to the two sons of Abraham, and the parallel fulfilments discoverable in the history of their respective temporal descendants, the Jews and the Arabians; and of their respective spiritual descendants, the Christian and the Mahometan worlds.

The first stage of this analogy respects the history of the Jews and Arabs; and it is our proper object to seek, in the annals of the two nations, traces of a mutual conformity answering to that correspondence, which has been already pointed out in their hereditary covenants.

To begin with a circumstance which connects the history with the promises: from the sacred narrative we learn, that the family of Ishmael, while his sons were yet unborn, had been numbered in the hidden counsels of God. In the promise to Abraham concerning him, Jehovah thus predicts the appointed number of his sons:

"*Twelve* princes shall he beget." * Now, this remarkable prediction lays the foundation, from the outset, of a strict historical parallel between the posterity of Ishmael and the posterity of Isaac, from whom was to spring the same prophetic number of princes, or heads of tribes; and whose offspring are elsewhere enumerated, in similar terms, by an inspired authority: "And Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat the *twelve* patriarchs." † Moses, also, dwells on the appointed number of the patriarchs: "Now the sons of Jacob were *twelve*." ‡

Let us examine how far the history of the two families, in its earliest stages, corresponds with these parallel enumerations. The Pentateuch records the existing state of both progenies, in the time of Moses; that is, about six centuries subsequent to the promulgation of the two covenants. The following are the conclusive scriptural statements: —

POSTERITY OF ISAAC.	POSTERITY OF ISHMAEL.
Numb. i. 44.	*Gen.* xxv. 16.
"The *princes* of Israel were *twelve men;* each one was for the house of his fathers."	"These are the sons of Ishmael, *twelve princes;* by their towns, and by their castles;

* Gen. xvii. 20. † Acts, vii. 8. ‡ Gen. xxxv. 22.

POSTERITY OF ISAAC.	POSTERITY OF ISHMAEL.
Exod. xxviii. 21.	
" And the stones shall be with the names of the children of Israel; twelve, according to their names; every one with his name shall they be,	
according to the twelve tribes."	according to their [twelve] nations."

The first link of the connection, between the prophecies concerning Isaac and Ishmael, and the history of their descendants, and between the parts, also, of the historical analogy itself, is so far perfect: the twelve patriarchs, sprung from the former, and the twelve princes, sprung from the latter, in the time of Moses, had severally arisen into twelve tribes, or nations.

Again, in the prophecy respecting Isaac, we read this promise, that God would give to him, and to his seed after him, " all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession *:" in that relating to Ishmael, we meet the equivalent prediction, that " he shall dwell in the face (or presence) of all his brethren." † In this next link of its connection with the two covenants, the historical parallel stands out with the same accuracy and clearness as in the preceding

* Gen. xvii. 8. † Gen. xvi. 12.

example. For we find the twelve tribes of Israel, on the one hand, in actual and permanent possession of all the land of Canaan; and the twelve nations of Ishmaelitish Arabs, on the other, stretching themselves along the entire frontier of Canaan, from the Euphrates to the Red Sea.

But further, the expression, "he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren," is determined, by the context, and by the consent of most interpreters, to imply a posture of hostility; and to convey the intimation, that Ishmael should live in a state of perpetual hostile contact and collision with the legitimate descendants of Abraham. When this characteristic feature, in the prophetic portion of Ishmael, is compared with the history of the Jews and Arabs, the exactness of the correspondence between the prediction and accomplishment must strike even the cursory observer. Scripture, and Jewish history, alike abound with evidence of the rooted and hereditary antipathy, reciprocally indulged by the two nations; and with notices of the incessant, though desultory, warfare, which was carried on between them. Such, in fine, was the proverbial inveteracy of this international hatred, that we find Tacitus, in his enumeration of the forces which composed the army of Titus, pre-

paratory to the siege of Jerusalem, accompanying his laconic allusion to the Arab auxiliaries, with the mention of their notorious hostility towards their neighbours, the Jews.*

Nor is the matter-of-fact connection, between the two covenants and the two histories, destitute of marks of a spiritual correspondence, answerable to the foregoing political analogy. Traces of this nature are to be found, not only in the common use, by the Jews and Arabians, of the rite of circumcision, but in their common knowledge and preservation of the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and even in the common character of their idolatrous deflections from the faith and worship of the one true God.

1. The rite of circumcision, it has been shown, was the original sign, or bond, ordained by God himself, when he established his covenant with Abraham; the bond of that covenant, alike in both parts of it. At the period of institution, Isaac and Ishmael equally received this seal of their respective covenants; and so permanent was its transmission in both families, that, in the time of Josephus, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years, the sign of circumcision remained *nationally* in use among the Jews and the Arabians: the one people administering the rite

* See Introduction, p. 94. *note* *.

on the eighth day after the birth, in commemoration of the circumcision of Isaac; the other, in the thirteenth year, in memory (as the Jewish historian testifies) of the circumcision of Ishmael, their father.*

2. The foundation of the two covenants, originally, was laid, in the immediate revelation of Himself to Abraham, by the ONE TRUE JEHOVAH. The stedfastness with which the Jews, on the whole, maintained the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, is allowed, on all hands, to rank as the most prominent and peculiar feature of Jewish history. Now, it is a singular fact and coincidence, in the history of the Ishmaelitish Arabs, that, amidst the darkness of surrounding heathenism, amidst their own gross and multiplied forms of idol, or angel worship, the patriarchal belief in the *One most high God*, appears, by every species of evidence, to have been preserved and transmitted, uninterruptedly, from age to age, so as to form a fundamental part of the *popular* belief, among the Saracens, in the age of Mahomet. †

3. The original identity of the belief of the two nations in this prime fundamental of the true religion, may be inferred even from the sameness of character observable in their idola-

* For the decisive testimony borne by Josephus, see Appendix, No. I.

† See Appendix, Nos. I. II.

trous deviations: since both the ancient Israelites, and the ante-Mahometan Arabians, professed to cultivate their idols only under the character of angels or companions, subordinate and subject to the one supreme God. Their rites, too, appear to have been the same: consisting in meat-offerings and drink-offerings to stones; in dances performed around trees; and in causing men, or inferior animals, to pass through fires, in honour of their false deities.[2]

To the foregoing historical agreements, it will suffice, for the present, to add one coincidence more: a specimen of the historical analogy which has been purposely reserved for this place in the argument, because it unfolds and elucidates the parallel chains of events which will hereafter be shown to have sprung from the covenants of Isaac and Ishmael, so as to constitute the connecting link between the whole providential history, of the Jews and Arabs, and of the temporal and spiritual empires of Christianity and Mahometanism.

The following is the hitherto unnoticed coincidence in question: —

Jacob left twelve sons; the pre-appointed fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel: but the everlasting covenant established with Isaac (the right of primogeniture being waived a second

time) rested on Judah, one of the younger sons of Jacob; and on the tribe deriving from him. The twelve tribes long partook alike of the temporal prosperity of the Abrahamic covenant: but, as its spiritual accomplishment drew nearer, the name and nation of Israel passed utterly away; the ten tribes were lost in captivity; the remnant merged in the ascendency of the tribe of Judah; and this tribe became, thenceforward, invested with the whole privileges, temporal and spiritual, of the covenant of God with Isaac. The covenant with Isaac was fulfilled, when, from the house of Judah, and the royal line of David, there came forth the promised Messiah, Jesus Christ.

These are historical facts, belonging to one of the two covenants: let us try if there be any facts corresponding with them, in the providential history of the other.

Now Ishmael also left twelve sons; the preappointed fathers of the twelve tribes of Ishmaelitish Arabia. These tribes, as we learn from Scripture and Jewish history, long flourished together in the peninsula; and partook all in the temporal privileges of their father's covenant. In process of time, however, according to the uniform, and, in this matter, high authority of Arabian tradition, the other tribes descended

from Ishmael melted gradually away; and the entire privileges of his covenant centered in the single surviving tribe of Kedar, — the posterity of Kedar, a younger son.[3] The covenant of Ishmael, according to its lower standard of privileges, would seem to have had a strictly analogous accomplishment with that of Isaac, when, from the house of Kedar, and royal line of the Hashemites, there came forth the arch-antitype of all preceding "false Christs," the spurious messiah, Mahomet.

With the advent of Jesus Christ on the one hand, and with the rise of Mahomet on the other, there commences a wholly new era in the fulfilment of the two covenants; which, thenceforward, were successively accomplished on a scale before altogether unprecedented. For, in Christianity alone was literally realized the promise in behalf of Isaac, that in his seed should all families of the earth be blessed: and by Mahometanism alone was literally brought to pass the promise in favour of Ishmael, that he should become a great nation; and that he should dwell in the presence of all his brethren.*

* An interpretation has been given to this promise, of the more importance to the present argument, because it is established, as the true interpretation, by results which certainly had not at all entered into the contemplation of the learned interpreter. "Sensus est, Ismaëlem *fratres suos omnes*, POTENTIA, IMPERIO, TYRANNIDE, *longe superaturum*; necnon

Let the character of each promise be now compared with the character of the accomplishment assigned to it. Isaac's was the covenant of the legitimate, Ishmael's, of the spurious, seed: the one was the covenant of the Spirit; the other the covenant of the flesh: the former tended to liberty; the latter to bondage. Such, as Saint Paul has explained them, were the opposite characters and conditions of the original covenants themselves * ; and the whole analogy of their enlarged fulfilments, through Christ and Mahomet, is according to the tenor of this contrast.

Christ sent the sword of the Spirit throughout the world: Mahomet, that of the flesh. Christianity was characteristically the religion of peace: Mahometanism, the religion of war. Under the rule of the Gospel, enslaved nations became freemen; under that of the Koran, free nations were made slaves: and the spirit of freedom in the one system, and the spirit of bondage in the other, were equally characteristic of them, in their temporal and in their spiritual relations with mankind. The Gospel, in fine, by its peaceful influences, diffused the blessing

---

et adversus eosdem peculiarem immanitatem *ex omni latere* declaraturum." Gualtperius, ap. Crit. Sacr. in loc.

* See Gal. iv. 22—31.

promised to Isaac, and accomplished in Christ, through all the kindreds of the earth; and the Koran, in virtue of its subjugating sway, set the inheritance of Ishmael, every where, over against that blessing.

But to do any justice to the analogy which here obtains between the two systems, it will be right to dispose the leading facts of the respective accomplishments in a connected order; and to lay Mahometanism side by side with Judaism as well as with Christianity; since it is properly a spurious compound of both revelations, and can be correctly judged of, only by keeping in constant view the admixture.

The *original* covenant with Abraham comprised, as has been already mentioned, two promises perfectly distinct from each other, and marked accordingly by separate characters: 1. "I will make of thee a great nation;" and, 2. "In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed."

The latter promise could not rationally be received in the sense in which the Jews pretend to understand it, as denoting a universal dominion over the earth, for the posterity of Isaac: for, as a distinguished writer on prophecy unanswerably observes, "this had been a strange *blessing* to *all nations*, that they should fall from

their natural liberty, and become subject to the dominion of one people. None but a Jew can see the happiness of such a state; the nations of the earth, if left to their choice, would all refuse this great blessing." * This promise, therefore, by the very terms of its announcement, denoted a mysterious fulfilment: and so, accordingly, it was fulfilled in the posterity of Isaac, by the advent of the Messiah; and by the universal diffusion, through Christianity, of His *spiritual* dominion.

But the former promise, "I will make of thee a great nation," was palpably a *temporal* one; and a state of temporal prosperity for his descendants forming unquestionably one part of the covenant with Isaac, it will be right to inquire, how far this prophetic character, of "a great nation," is applicable to the Jews.

Now, prior to the erection of their kingly government, the Israelites had no settled state or character, as a nation. Nor, under the monarchy, did they attain to the enjoyment, for any long time together, of such a condition of established power and prosperity, as seems essential to the idea of "a great nation." In the earlier and favoured reigns of David and Solomon, the kingdom of Israel was, indeed,

* Bishop Sherlock, p. 115.

both prosperous and powerful to an eminent degree. But its ascendency among the nations of Asia passed rapidly away, before the distractions of a divided monarchy, and the encroachments of the neighbouring and colossal empires of Assyria and Babylon. From this period, the national resources were expended in a long and exhausting struggle, not for empire, but for existence. The effort proved, at length, unavailing, and the national independence was lost. The Jewish monarchy, then, may with propriety be described as a powerful state; but it cannot be justly characterised as "a great nation." The unity, the durability, and the relative ascendency, which in strictness belong to the prophetic definition, are all wanting. In the posterity of Isaac, therefore, this part of Abraham's covenant seems never to have been realized; and we remark, accordingly, that it is not specifically applied to them in Scripture, since it does not recur in any one of the separate promises in behalf of Isaac.

Let us try the application of it in the case of Ishmael.* Here we find the specific promise, "I will make of thee a great nation," appropriated

* "The posterity of *Ishmael* was established in power much sooner, and were as great and successful for many ages as the *Jews*, and much larger empires have sprung from them."—Bishop Sherlock on Prophecy, p. 124.

formally and solemnly to Ishmael and his descendants, on two several occasions; first granted in his favour to Abraham *, and then renewed, on his behalf, to Hagar. †

But how stands that sure test of prophecy, — the historical fulfilment? The twelve tribes of Ishmael in their primitive state, as described by Moses, formed in Arabia not one great, but as many insulated and independent nations. In process of time, as appears both from sacred and profane history, several of these tribes rose to a considerable rank as states; and attained a relative ascendency over the mixed hordes which peopled the Arabian peninsula. But, at no period in their contemporary annals, will the temporal power and prosperity of the Ishmaelitish Arabs bear comparison, for a moment, with the concentrated and consolidated strength of the Jewish monarchy, in its better days and fortunes. So far as we can now glean from history, the rival nations would seem to have gone pretty much together into decline; at least, Arabia makes no distinguished figure beyond its own frontier, in the records of the Greek and Roman empires; and from the coming of our Lord to the age of Mahomet inclusive, the subdivided, though still unsubdued

* Gen. xvii. 20. † Gen. xxi. 18.

peninsula, appears to have been the prey of paltry disputes between its contending tribes and factions.

With the appearance of Mahomet, Arabia suddenly assumed, for the first time in the annals of the world, the attitude of empire. Ishmael now, at length, went forth conquering and to conquer, to the utmost boundaries of the earth. The imperial successors of Mahomet extended, and established in permanent prosperity, the formidable dominion, of which he had laid the foundation. And the promise to Ishmael, that God would make of him "A GREAT NATION," came to be realized, in point of fact, in the empire of the Saracens * ; — an empire, in power, prosperity, and permanency, superior to most, and second to one only, among the mighty empires, which, since the first rise of civil polity, have given laws to mankind.

From the period of the rise of Mahomet, the prophetic analogy between the two covenants becomes manifestly more perfect. Down to this date, the traces of a designed spi-

* "They might indeed be emphatically styled *a great nation*, when the Saracens made those rapid and extensive conquests, and erected one of the largest empires that ever were in the world." Bishop Newton on the Prophecies, Dissertation II. This is one of the only two instances which the author has met with, of any former writer so much as adverting to the connection between Ishmael and the Saracens, as providential, or indeed in any way.

ritual connection especially, are faint and few. But the creed of Mahomet, being professedly an advance and improvement on the Law and Gospel, and, in fact, a spurious copy of those divine originals, runs necessarily parallel throughout, with both systems. The empire of the Saracens, also, being at once a temporal and a spiritual domination, forms, in this its mixed mode of government, the no less striking counterpart of Judaism, and of established Christianity. Through Christianity and Mahometanism, in virtue of their spiritual character, the proselytized nations became adopted into the families of Isaac and Ishmael; the covenant of the former was thus legitimately transmitted from his literal offspring, the Jews, to his spiritual posterity, the Christian world; and that of the latter, from his literal offspring, the Arabs, to his spiritual descendants, the Turks and Persians.

From this general outline of the providential analogy, I would now draw the attention of the indulgent reader to some few particulars of its detail.

We begin with the coincidence of character between Mahometanism and Judaism, which, for our immediate purpose, it will suffice to illustrate from some of the earliest circumstances in the history of the respective systems. For

each system purports to be founded on a divine revelation: each is a compound of civil and religious polity: each was set up by a lawgiver, who claimed also to be a prophet, and united in himself the political and the spiritual administration of affairs: each possessed its sacred book, composed by the respective lawgivers, and comprising the entire code of government, political, moral, and ecclesiastical, for the right ordering of the state. Each case, again, presents the example of a whole people in arms, professing to go forth *under a divine commission* to conquer and colonize; and, so far as their respective conquests and colonies should extend, to extirpate the religions of the subjugated countries, and substitute their own. The Jews, according to the terms of their limited commission, were to effect this object by the excision of the idolatrous inhabitants; the Saracens, according to the analogous terms of their extended commission, by the alternative of conversion or death: each nation, lastly, issued forth on its successful mission, from the same deserts; and established permanently its rule and its religion.

The whole of these agreements are not more remarkable in themselves, than they are *peculiar* to the history of Judaism and Mahometanism: the history of the world supplies no third

parallel. The present is not the place for a further comparison of the two systems. We may observe only in passing, that their correspondence at large, when the comparison comes to be resumed in the progress of our investigation, will be found not less extraordinary, exact, and full, than this beginning. Even these first steps of the correspondence, however, must have their force with reflecting minds, viewed merely as matters of historical fact.

But the analogy of Mahometanism with Judaism serves only as the introduction to a far wider field of comparison and correspondence. The grand feature in the promise concerning Isaac was, that *in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed;* and the responding feature, in the parallel promise respecting Ishmael, that *he should dwell in the presence of all his brethren.* Christianity is allowed, on all hands, to be the accomplishment intended by the former prediction; and Mahometanism bears ample marks and tokens of being the *only* assignable fulfilment of the latter. The known descent of the two founders from a common origin, the stock of Abraham, and the professed derivation of the two systems from a common source, the Divine Legislator of the Jews, lay the clear groundwork for a comparison between

them. The parallelism of the two covenants with Isaac and Ishmael, seems to bespeak further, a correspondent and co-extensive parallelism, between the genuine mission of Jesus Christ and the pretended mission of Mahomet, the descendants and representatives of those brethren. We have only to ascertain experimentally, that the antecedent presumptions are borne out by the historical coincidences, in order to perfect the general argument here proposed; since, where prophecy and history fully reciprocate their lights, nothing would appear wanting, in treating a question like the present, to the proof of a *designed* connection.

As the joint analogy of Judaism and Christianity with Mahometanism will form the subject-matter of the ensuing sections, our attention must, at this stage, be directed and confined to some leading specimens (indicating rather the nature, than the amount, of the proof), from the historical parallel between the two great systems of the Gospel and the Koran.

The general identity of character, in the *external* rise and progress of these opposed creeds, is an obvious and admitted fact. "Christianity and Mohammedanism," to borrow the just observation of Dr. White, "beginning *equally*

in silence and obscurity, have advanced to a dominion *equally* unknown in any former age."

While thus signally resembling each other, however, in the obscureness of their origin, and in the rapidity, extent, and permanence of their promulgation, their similarity in point of success is apparently interrupted, by the wholly dissimilar means resorted to for their propagation. Now, the very contrast, in this respect, which, at first sight, would seem to disturb the *historical* parallel, serves in reality to confirm and complete the *providential* analogy. For this diversity is exactly conformable with the opposite characters of the original covenants established with Isaac and Ishmael.

For Isaac's covenant was the covenant of the spirit, and therefore required and admitted only a spiritual instrumentality; but Ishmael's covenant was the covenant of the flesh, and the arm of the flesh, consequently, was the natural and proper weapon for its enforcement. Again, Isaac's was the covenant of liberty, Ishmael's, that of bondage; the one implying, for its establishment among men, the agency of the spirit of freedom, the other, the operation of the spirit of servile fear.

In just conformity with these primitive conditions of the related covenants, Christ's religion

is termed in Scripture "the Gospel of peace," but Mahomet's is described in the Koran as the religion of the sword*; while the institutions of Christianity were fitted generally to emancipate, those of Mahometanism uniformly to enslave, the human mind. And thus, the marked discrepancies which present themselves on the face of the two systems, arising as they do out of the distinct and opposed characters of the original covenants, serve only to corroborate the *designedness* of the historical analogy, which will be found so largely to obtain between Christianity and Mahometanism.

A few more prominent features may now be submitted with advantage, as a specimen of this analogy: its exposition at large must be reserved for a future occasion.†

The following heads of comparison, then, may, for the present, suffice to illustrate that providential connection, which, *in point of fact*, has continuously subsisted, between the original covenants of Isaac and Ishmael, and the subsequent history of their families, the Jews and the

* Even in this contrast, the parallel is not lost. For, what the religion of Mahomet was, in its primitive constitution, Christianity, long before his appearance, had practically degenerated into, with the growing degeneracy of the Church; until Romanism, in the West, eventually symbolized with Mahometanism, in the East, as alike, characteristically, religions of the sword. See sections x, xi.

† See section iv.

Arabians, viewed in its relations with the civil, and the spiritual, history of mankind.

"In thy seed shall *all the nations of the earth* be blessed," was the peculiar promise of God to Abraham concerning his "only son Isaac:" and the terms of the corresponding promise respecting Ishmael are, "He shall dwell in the face of *all his brethren.*" Let these apparently co-extensive predictions now receive their interpretation from the histories of Christianity and Mahometanism, as their respective fulfilments.

1. Christianity, a religion originally founded and propagated by the posterity of Isaac, and first emanating from the country where a special Providence had placed his descendants, established its dominion over the Roman empire, and extended itself, on all sides, among the most remote and barbarous nations. — Mahometanism, a religion originally founded and propagated by the posterity of Ishmael, and first emanating from the primitive and providential seat of his descendants, overran the whole of Eastern, and great part also of Western, Christendom; and encountered or confronted Christianity in every quarter of its wide-spread territory.

2. The Roman empire in the East was the primitive seat of Christianity, and the theatre of its first triumphs. — The Roman empire in the

East was subverted by the Saracens, and Eastern Christianity wholly supplanted by Mahometanism.

3. In the fourth century of the Christian era, Christianity became the religion of the Roman empire. — "The Saracen empire extended its dominion, in eighty years, over more kingdoms and countries, than the Roman in eight hundred."

4. Christianity had its first rise in Judea. — Mahometanism numbered Judea among its earliest foreign conquests.

5. Jerusalem was the site of the Jewish temple; and the apostolical metropolis of Christendom.— The mosque of Omar now stands on the site of the Jewish temple; and Jerusalem has remained, for eleven centuries, a holy city of Mahometanism.

6. Constantinople was, for more than one thousand years, the imperial metropolis; and the cathedral church of Saint Sophia, during nearly an equal period, the central fane of Eastern Christianity. — Constantinople has been transformed, for nearly four centuries past, into the imperial metropolis of Mahometanism; and, from the fatal date of its conquest by the Turks, the cathedral church of Saint Sophia has been converted into a mosque.

7. Christianity, in the hands of the Papal

power, early in the seventh century, erected a temporal and spiritual kingdom in old Rome, the city founded upon seven hills.—Mahometanism, in the ninth century of the Hejra, erected its temporal and spiritual kingdom in new Rome, like its parent city, lying also upon seven hills.

8. The empire of the cross, originating with the literal posterity of Isaac, the Jews, has passed altogether into the hands of his spiritual descendants, the Christian nations. —The empire of the Crescent, originating with the literal posterity of Ishmael, the Arabs, has, in like manner, passed altogether into the hands of his spiritual descendants, the Turks and Tartars.

9. The pagan tribes of the North, who overran Western Christendom, uniformly embraced the faith of the conquered nations. — The barbarian idolaters of Tartary and Turquestan, who overthrew the empire of the Saracens in the East, universally subsided into the profession of Mahometanism.

10. Judaism and Christianity, however dispersed among the heathen, have preserved, in surprising force, their integrity and independence. — Mahometanism, where, as in Africa and India, thinly sprinkled in the midst of idolatry, is known also to preserve, in full vigour, its primitive integrity and zeal.

11. The advent of Christ Jesus, and the peaceful promulgation and establishment of Christianity, form the grand subjects of the prophecies of the Old Testament. — The appearance of Mahomet, and the violent propagation and establishment of Mahometanism, were also subjects of prophecy, both in the Old and New Testaments; and stand the only examples of a false messiah, and an antichristian tyranny, specifically foreshown in the sacred records, beyond the pale of the true revelation, and as to arise from without the Church.

12. Christ, in the Old Testament, was prophesied of as *a star;* "There shall come *a star* out of Jacob:" and his regal power was prefigured by *a sceptre;* "And *a sceptre* shall rise out of Israel." — Mahomet, in the New Testament, is prophesied of under the same symbol of *a star;* "I saw *a star* fall from heaven unto the earth:" and his regal power is also prefigured by *the crowns* on the heads of his followers, the symbolical locusts of the Apocalypse; "And on their heads were, as it were, *crowns like gold.*"

The coincidences crowd upon us at each step of the historical comparison; but we proposed to offer only a specimen; and to pursue the parallel further, in this place, would be needlessly to forestall the materials of ensuing and more specific

portions of this work. * The place which Mahomet and Mahometanism appear to occupy in prophecy, will form the subject of our next two sections.

The case of the general argument may be now compendiously re-stated. It will be seen to improved advantage, by a simple recapitulation of what has been, for so far, effected in the present section; which presents, in a comparative view, the original prophetic covenants established with Isaac and Ishmael, and the parts subsequently enacted by their descendants, after the flesh and after the Spirit, on the theatre of history.

The bare fact of the existence of two *such* covenants, alike resting on the unchangeable promises of Almighty God, must be received, in the first place, by every believer in Scripture, as alone constituting a full and perfect guarantee, for the effectual accomplishment of the one and the other. The marked correspondence of terms in the contents of these two covenants, would seem to sanction the further expectation of a matter-of-fact correspondence equally remarkable, in their respective historical fulfilments. The covenant with Isaac has unquestionably been fulfilled: we know, also, the precise mode and process of the accomplishment. But this

* See particularly section iv.

consideration supplies, at once, a fresh assurance of the accomplishment of that made with Ishmael; and an index to the mode and process of its parallel fulfilment. The history of the Israelites and Ishmaelites, of the Jews and Saracens, through a long course of ages, progressively meets and satisfies these anticipations; prophecy holds out new lights tending to strengthen and enlarge them; until, in the event, they are met and realized upon an unprecedented scale, by the successive, but strictly parallel rise, progress, and establishment, of Christianity and Mahometanism.

In the present section, it has been my object to lay open the basis of the analogy, on which the general argument of this inquiry rests; and by so doing, to explain the principle whence the historical parallel derives its entire force and authority. With the original covenants themselves, at once for the groundwork of the parallel, and for the proof of a designed connection, it will only remain, in the following parts of this work, to exemplify more at large, in its several distinct branches, the providential analogy which shall be found experimentally to obtain, between Mahometanism, on the one hand, and Judaism and Christianity, on the other.

In the civil, moral, doctrinal, and ritual branches of this comparison, the reader will naturally be prepared to expect full and frequent coincidences, when he reflects, as it is impossible he should avoid reflecting, how largely Mahomet drew on the Law of Moses, and on the Gospel, for the materials of his imposture; and that the Koran, in its best features, is, in great part, a parody on the Bible, and in its worst, wherever it deviates from Arabian tradition, a transcript of the fables of Jewish rabbins, or the dreams of Christian heretics.

But, while the correspondence, in so many particulars of it, may thus easily be accounted for, the fact of its existence is not, therefore, the less remarkable or mysterious. To imitate the true revelation, it may be, and has been, plausibly urged, was the course which would naturally present itself to the mind of an impostor like Mahomet. But if imitation of this kind be thus easy and natural, whence, let us ask, does it arise, that the *only* known instance of such imitation, the *only* example on record of such successful imposture, should be found in the person of a descendant of Ishmael, the joint heir with Isaac of the promises of God?

The studied relationship, therefore, between the Bible and Koran, between the Mahome-

tan, and the Jewish and Christian religions, only serves to link the original covenants of Isaac and Ishmael together, in a more strict providential connection; to furnish one more convincing and conclusive proof, that, as the better covenant of Isaac was fulfilled by the advent of Christ, so the lower covenant of Ishmael had its parallel accomplishment in the rise of Mahomet.

Nor is the unspeakable contrast between the two founders, and the two faiths, less essential towards the completion of the proof in this argument, than the extent and exactness of the analogy and correspondence. Christ Jesus, infinitely holy, pure, and perfect, — Mahomet, earthly, sensual, devilish, beyond even the license of his own licentious creed: Christianity, the religion of sanctity, of meekness, and of peace, — Mahometanism, the religion of sensuality, of pride, of violence: these most opposite characteristics but suffice to expose and fulfil the opposition, which prophecy, from first to last, had expressively marked out, between the two covenants, and the two brethren. Isaac, the child of the Spirit, is here seen to give birth to a spiritual faith; Ishmael, the child of the flesh, to a carnal superstition. The son of *the free-woman*, rightfully and appropriately, introduces

into the world a religion of liberty; the son of the *bond-woman*, not less appropriately and rightfully, establishes upon earth a religion of bondage. In a word, Isaac, the legitimate seed, becomes the father of the true faith; Ishmael, the illegitimate, of a spurious imitation of it.

We need prosecute no further, in this place, a contrast with which the reader is already familiar. It is of the last consequence, however, (and I would here make the observation once for all,) that, in pursuing the proposed comparison through its several branches, this fundamental contrast should be kept continually in our view. For the original distinctions of *legitimate*, and *spurious*, which subsisted between the two sons of Abraham, will be found to pervade and characterize the entire systems of the religious polities which emanated from these brethren. And this distinction, while it gives point and appropriateness to each individual fact and feature of the general analogy, throws Mahometanism, at the same time, to the awful distance at which it must for ever stand, when brought into comparison with the only true revelation.

SECTION II.

PROPHETICAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MAHOMETANISM; AND PROPHETICAL PARALLEL BETWEEN MAHOMETANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE lesser covenant with Ishmael, as well as the great covenant with Isaac, it has been shown, was sealed by the sacramental rite of circumcision. The promise, also, in his behalf, was granted in answer to the petition preferred by Abraham, that Ishmael might live before God; in other words, that he might obtain the inheritance, or at least a blessing equivalent to the inheritance, of the heir of promise, who was as yet unborn.

Neither of these circumstances, it must be allowed, can lessen the natural and revealed inequality essentially subsisting between those brethren, and their respective promises. But both unquestionably serve to strengthen the internal marks of a designed connection between the original covenants; and seem to betoken

further, in the covenant of Ishmael, something beside and beyond a merely temporal accomplishment.

Now, if the analogy established by the correspondent wording of the two covenants was destined to be complete as well as permanent; if it fell within the intentions of Divine Providence to *permit*, that Ishmael should become the founder of a spiritual dominion, answering, in however inferior a sense, to that universal dominion which was *promised*, in the case of Isaac, as the great blessing of his better covenant, — it would seem only reasonable to expect, that the subject should find a place in the intermediate prophecies of Scripture; where both the continuous relation of the covenants, and their twofold parallel fulfilment, would be more largely fore-shown.

Saint Paul, in a well-known passage of the epistle to the Galatians, represents the distinct covenants of the Old and New Testaments as having been allegorized under the opposite covenants and characters of Ishmael and Isaac.

"For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman, was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman, was by promise. Which things

are an allegory: for these are the two covenants." *

From this application it is apparent, that the analogy of the original covenants themselves, on which the Apostle plainly founds his reasoning, was so ordered, as to maintain, throughout their respective fulfilments, a strict proportion with the disparity supposed by the natural relation of the two brethren.

With reference to things spiritual, in which lay the true supremacy of Isaac's covenant, this would be eminently so: and in the prophetic parallel especially, wherever discernible in Scripture, we must be prepared to find the natural disparity religiously preserved. While, therefore, Prophecy holds forth Isaac, the child of the Spirit, the son of the free-woman, the legitimate seed, as the forefather of the Messiah, and the source of the only true religion; Prophecy cannot be supposed to recognize in Ishmael, the child of the flesh, the son of the bond-woman, the illegitimate seed, any thing higher than the forefather of a false prophet, and the source of a spurious faith.

But the Apostle, pursuing his application of the Scriptural allegory, proceeds to observe, that, "as then, he that was born after the flesh

* Gal. iv. 22—24, &c.

persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." * An allusion which indicates further, that, while Prophecy invariably represents Isaac as the parent of a religion of peace, Prophecy could present Ishmael to our view in no more favourable light, than as the father of a religion of persecution.

Neither will it be found at all inconsistent with the analogy of permissive providence, or with due notions of the divine justice and goodness, to learn, that a pseudo-prophet, and a spurious and persecuting creed, were to form one part of the promised portion of Ishmael. For the divine dealings in this matter will be abundantly vindicated, should it appear, that the religious system emanating from the covenant of Ishmael rises as much above the pretensions of all other systems of belief, as it sinks below the unrivalled claims of the Jewish and Christian revelations. In its providential rank, as a middle term between truth and error, such an apostasy cannot, with fairness, be viewed or estimated under a single aspect. As opposed to the Gospel, indeed, Mahometanism must be considered only as a curse: but, as the pre-appointed scourge of heresy and heathenism, as cleansing the world from the gross pollutions of idolatry,

* Gal. iv. 29.

and as preparing the way for the universal reception of a purer faith, it may well be regarded as a blessing. *

These general considerations premised, I shall at once proceed to examine the connecting links, which intermediate prophecies would appear to supply, between the original covenant with Ishmael, and its presumed eventual accomplishment, in the rise of Mahomet, and the establishment of Mahometanism.

The rank occupied by Mahometanism, in the providential history of the world, cannot fail to present itself in a very forcible light, when it shall be seen, as the result of an inquiry into the prophetic Scriptures of both Testaments, that this is *the only spiritual domination on record*, which shares with Christianity the distinction of being marked out by Prophecy.[1]

The prophecy of Daniel, in its prospective view of the providential history of the world, includes the four great empires of antiquity, together with the powers which should succeed

* The spirit of persecution, it may be proper to keep in mind, has been, throughout, the common characteristic of the Eastern and Western Antichrists, of Mahometanism and the Papacy. The whole parallel between these rival tyrannies is indeed wonderful. See section x. Few, however, amidst its manifold aberrations, are willing to account Romanism an unmixed and unmitigated evil. Neither ought any to suppose Islamism destitute of *its* providential compensations.

them to the end of time, and consummation of all things.

A prophecy thus large upon the history of God's world, would not be likely to pretermit, or to be less comprehensive in treating, the history of God's Church. Now Daniel has clearly foreshown the appointed fate of the Jewish polity and people. He has also unquestionably foretold the fortunes of the *western* Church; and has drawn a full and exact portraiture of the spiritual tyranny, which should arise and prevail in that portion of Christendom. This being the case, the analogy of Providence and that of Scripture would seem alike to require, a corresponding prophetic attention, to the parallel events which were to occur in the *eastern* portion. The whole analogy of Providence suggests the likelihood, that the Holy Spirit would not leave one of the two great branches of Christendom without its anticipated history, in a prophecy which thus faithfully exhibits the fortunes of the other. And the direct analogy of Scripture comes in to confirm the inference; since Saint John, who follows Daniel in his prediction of the birth and increase of the papal power, supplies, as is generally allowed, a parallel prediction concerning Mahometanism. On these grounds, we are justified in expecting, that the book of Daniel should con-

tain a prediction of that great apostasy, which was hereafter to arise and overwhelm eastern Christianity: and thus may be legitimately arrived at, a strong antecedent presumption, in favour of the application to Mahomet and Mahometanism, of a well-known prophecy in the eighth chapter of the prophet of the captivity.

But, to reason further from the analogy of the later revelation:

Saint John, in the Apocalypse, has two predictions, generally understood to apply, the one, to the spiritual and temporal domination of the Papacy, in the West; the other, to the temporal and spiritual domination of Mahometanism, in the eastern branch of the Roman empire.*

Now, let us go back to consider the internal marks of the existence, in the book of Daniel, of two strictly parallel predictions. Daniel has, also, two prophecies, couched under a common symbol, concerning two little horns: the one horn to come forth out of the Roman empire in the West; the other out of the Macedonian, or Greek empire, in the East.

The first little horn is generally explained by commentators, as designating the Papacy; a peculiar power of a mixed kind, diverse from the ten kingdoms, from among which it was to spring up,

* See section iii.

being a union of temporal with spiritual dominion. The rules of Scriptural analogy would appear naturally to suggest, on a first view, a correspondent interpretation of the parallel prophetic symbol, connected with the East: and Mahometanism alone supplies the materials for such an interpretation. For Mahometanism, like the Papacy, is a peculiar power of a mixed character, altogether differing from that of the four kingdoms, out of one of which the eastern little horn of the prophecy was to come forth; being also a union of temporal and spiritual dominion.

The history of the world furnishes no third example, of a power similarly constituted and circumstanced: in other words, so answering to the prophecies of the two little horns.

But further, the Papal and Mahometan powers wonderfully symbolize, in the entire character of their simultaneous rise and progress. Both were, in their beginnings, "little" and obscure: both swelled out rapidly into universal domination: both originated in the designing ambition of individuals: both were, alike, propagators of false doctrines, and casters of the truth to the ground: both were, alike, profaners of God's church, and persecutors of his people: in all which particulars, they conjointly and exclusively realize the contents of the parallel pre-

dictions of Daniel, concerning the two little horns. They synchronize, lastly, with a surprising exactness, in the date of their first appearance; each power dating its birth from the commencement of the seventh century of the Christian era. The little horns of the prophecy seem to have the same final term set to their duration: and here, also, the indications furnished by Papal Rome and Mahometanism continue, to the present hour, faithfully and fearfully to correspond. *

* The marks, which concur to identify the Papacy and Mahometanism, with the powers symbolized by the Western and Eastern little horns of Daniel, may be presented still more strikingly, in a condensed summary. 1. The use of a common symbol, appears to denote two powers of the same kind. 2. The use of other similar coincidences, in the wording of the two prophecies, supports this presumption. 3. The geographical positions of the two little horns agree with those occupied by the Papal power and by Mahometanism. 4. Their common prophetic period of 1260 days, indicates a likelihood, that the powers thus symbolized would synchronize, also, in their rise and duration. 5. The accurately parallel rise, character, and continuance, of the great ecclesiastico-political tyrannies in question, so correspond with the whole antecedent indications, as to place this inference, apparently, beyond reasonable doubt, that if, *as no interpreters of any other communion pretend to deny*, the Papacy be the power expressed or typified by the first or Western little horn, Mahometanism must be the power expressed or typified by the second or Eastern little horn.

Dan. vii. 24. The Western little horn is described as "diverse" from the other horns. Dan. viii. 24. The Eastern little horn is characterized as also diverse from its predecessors, being mighty, not by his own power, but by the power of the host given him against the daily sacrifice. Compare Dan. viii. 12. The diversity thus indicated as belonging to both horns, is apparent in the mixed character both of the Papal, and of the Mahometan tyranny; in each of which, the temporal is inseparable from the spiritual despotism.

Before we proceed to the consideration of the prophecy of the Eastern little horn, in its detail, I would desire the special attention of the reader to this broad view of the subject: for the present subject is one, to which the enlarged and comprehensive grasp of Christian philosophy can alone render competent justice.

By the philosophical interpreter of prophecy, we may add, these two first principles will never be lost sight of: 1. that parallel predictions indicate and require strictly parallel fulfilments: and, 2. that the laws of prophecy, and the ways of Providence, so harmonize together, that predictions and events mutually verify one another. *

* In the interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures, much confusion might have been avoided, much curious theory and cumbrous erudition spared, had commentators only regulated their researches by this fundamental rule, — that *Prophecy* and *Providence* are reciprocal interpreters: and that the relative moment and magnitude of events, estimated, not by contemporary standards, but by comparison with the whole annals of time, afford the best criterion, and only certain guarantee, of their having a place in prophecy. This remark particularly applies to those modern writers on prophecy, who, forsaking "the old ways," marked by the footsteps of our Medes and Newtons, can discern its fulfilments only in recent and passing events; events which, however important in their day and generation, may, for aught we can tell, be pregnant with no great results; and which must appear as *nothing*, when confronted with those amazing occurrences, which have filled the world with their consequences, through the lapse of eighteen hundred, or of twelve hundred years.

In the providential history of the world, prospective results are frequently in the inverse proportion of present appearances. How insignificant, for example, in the eyes of contemporaries, must have appeared the

The vision of Daniel, concerning the little horn of the he-goat, or the Macedonian empire, with its accompanying interpretation, has been variously applied, by writers on prophecy, to Antiochus Epiphanes, to the Romans, and to Mahomet or Mahometanism. Not to incumber or interrupt the main subject, I shall reserve the examination of this question for a separate discussion*; and shall, at present, limit myself to pointing out, in the prophecy itself, the internal marks which seem to justify its application to Mahometanism.

While the eye is aided, the sense of this context may be cleared, by simply disposing the prophecy, and its interpretation, in parallel columns.

Daniel viii.	*Daniel* viii.
(THE VISION.)	(THE INTERPRETATION.)
8. The he-goat waxed very great: and, when he was strong, the great horn was broken;	21. The rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes, is the first king. 22. Now, that being broken,

first rise of the *Ottoman* power: how tremendous, on the contrary, the overwhelming inundation of the *Moguls*. In the counsels of Providence, however, the Ottoman was destined to become "the scourge and terror of Christendom:" while the Tartar deluge receded without injury to the church of Christ, and has left scarcely a trace behind.

* See Appendix, No. III.

Daniel viii.

(THE VISION.)

and for it came up four notable ones, toward the four winds of heaven.

9. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the South, and toward the East, and toward the pleasant land.

10. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars, to the ground, and stamped upon them.

11. Yea he magnified himself even to the prince of the host; and by him, the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.

12. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression; and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.

Daniel viii.

(THE INTERPRETATION.)

whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation,
but not in his power.

23. And, in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.

24. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.

25. And, through his policy also, he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and, by peace, shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the prince of princes;

but he shall be broken without hand.

Daniel viii.	*Daniel* xii.
(THE VISION.)	(THE INTERPRETATION.)
13. Then I heard one saint speaking; and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision,	6. And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? 7. And I heard the man — and he sware by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.
concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?	11. And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand, two hundred, and ninety days.
14. And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.	12. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand, three hundred, and five and thirty days.

The theatre of this prophecy is the Macedonian empire; from one of the four dismembered kingdoms of which, the little horn of the vision was to spring up. In the vision, the prophet saw the first great horn of the he-goat, or the kingdom of Alexander, "broken:" an expres-

sion plainly indicating, that the kingdom of Alexander was to have no further place as a kingdom, in the eye of prophecy. Not so the four notable horns, which arose in place of the first: these, in the prophet's eye, appear to survive *unbroken*, their lives being prolonged, after their kingdoms had passed away*; "and *out* (not for, or in place,) of one of them, came forth a little horn." The four notable horns, therefore, or the four great subdivisions of the Macedonian empire, may rightly be considered, as retaining their prophetic existence, after their political independence had passed away†; that is, as still continuing horns of the he-goat, until "out of one of them came forth a little horn."

From these preliminary remarks on the wording of the prophecy at large, we may proceed at once to examine the claim of Mahometanism to be the power here prefigured under the type of a little horn.

* Compare Dan. vii. 12. From the prolonged existence of three of the four beasts, in this prophecy, after "they had their dominion taken away," we may legitimately infer the parallel continuance of the four notable horns. An inference which wholly removes the supposed difficulty arising from the chronological chasm which intervenes, between the political downfal of the four kingdoms of the Macedonian empire, and the rise of Mahometanism.

† The he-goat, Dan. viii. 8., is the same power with the leopard, Dan. vii. 6. (See Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel, p. 119.) But the four heads of the leopard certainly continued to exist: and, therefore, so also did the four horns of the he-goat.

1. The little horn was to come forth out of one of the four notable horns, or members of the subdivided kingdom of Alexander. In proof of its conformity with this fundamental condition of the prophecy, it has been fairly argued, that Mahometanism commenced its career of foreign conquest within the Macedonian empire; and by the capture of Syria, the greatest of its four kingdoms, became an integral member, or horn, of the he-goat. Thenceforward, the kingdom of Syria formed the *nucleus* of the Saracen empire; and continued, during the existence of the Caliphate, to be the central seat of Mahometan power: thence it was that the Saracens extended on all sides their dominion; while their three great eastern capitals, Cufa, Damascus, and Bagdad, were seated all in the kingdom of the Seleucidæ. As the first restorer, therefore, of *a kingdom* in Syria, which the Romans had held only as a province of their empire, Mahometanism thus appears to constitute, in a sense applicable to no other power, a member, or horn, of the Macedonian he-goat.

2. But, while the proof of the rise of Mahometanism within the geographical limits of the Macedonian empire, has been deduced, *indirectly*, through its occupation, at the outset, of the kingdom of Syria, it seems to have unaccount-

ably passed unnoticed, that the deduction can be made, *directly*, from the fact, that a portion of *Arabia*, certainly including a part of the Hejaz, the native country of Mahomet, and of which the capital is Mecca, composed an integral province, both of the empire of Alexander, and of the Ptolemean kingdom of Egypt. "The empire of Alexander," observes M. Rollin, "was distributed into four kingdoms; of which Ptolemy had Egypt, Libya, *Arabia*, Cœlosyria, and Palestine." *

The question has been much agitated, whether Alexander seized and retained any portion of the Arabian peninsula: the fact of his having done so, may be seen in any map of the Macedonian empire. The district occupied, was indeed no more than an outskirt; but the point decisive for the present argument is this, that, unquestionably and unavoidably, that outskirt comprized part of the province of Hejaz; that is to say, part of the very district which gave birth to Mahomet and Mahometanism.

3. The horn in the vision was *a little one*: and Mahometanism, in its first rise, perfectly corresponds with the prophetic symbol: for it

* Ancient History, vol. vii. art. ii. § 1. p. 172., English translation. M. Rollin cites Plutarch. in Demetr. p. 902. Appian. in Syr. pp. 122, 123. Polyb. l. 15. p. 572.

originated with an obscure inhabitant of a desert corner of Asia; and numbered, in the first three years of the Hejra, only fourteen proselytes. The perfectness of the coincidence in this particular deserves to be noted, as of great force in the present application of the prediction of Daniel, since it is an agreement with the prophecy in the character of its fundamental symbol.

The little horn was presently to wax "exceeding great, toward the South, and toward the East, and toward the pleasant land." And Mahometanism, again, in its primitive course of conquest, did so extend itself, by the successive, or almost simultaneous, occupation of Syria, Persia, Egypt, and Palestine: which countries were not only the first-fruits, but became, and continue to the present day, the main seed-plots and store-houses of the great Mahometan commonwealth.

It has been objected, indeed, that no mention is made in the prophecy, of progress westward; while it is well known, that the Saracens extended their creed with their conquests, along the entire continent of Africa; and that Mahometanism retained in its fatal grasp, for centuries, the western extremity of Europe.

The objection has been anticipated by the historical fact just noticed, that Asia ever constituted the seat of the Mahometan empire: and the pretermission may be satisfactorily accounted for by the further considerations, that Western Africa was comparatively an inconsiderable accession; and that the Saracen kingdom of Spain, though long eminently prosperous and powerful, was relatively a late acquisition *, became early insulated from the empire of the Asiatic Caliphs, never afforded a prize for the extension of the Mahometan dominion in Europe, and eventually expired, not merely as a state, but by the total extirpation or expulsion of its Mussulman population.† Toward the West, therefore, Mahometanism could not properly be said, in the language of the prophecy, to have "waxed exceeding great."

* Between the conquest of Egypt and the invasion of Spain there occurs an interval of above seventy years; a chasm which Mr. Lowman conceives sufficient to mark *two distinct epochs* in the history of the Saracens. Western Africa submitted to the yoke only a few years earlier.

† Nor should it be omitted, that the seeds of the future overthrow of the Saracenic empire in Spain were sown simultaneously with those of its first rise, in the establishment, by the heroic Pelagius, of the infant state of Asturias; the germ of that Christian Spanish monarchy, which should one day extirpate Mahometanism from the peninsula. The readers of "Roderick the last of the Goths," perhaps the most finished production of the first English writer of his age, have seen the character of Pelagius drawn, at once, with the genius of a poet, and with the fidelity of an historian. Compare Des Marlès, Hist. de la Dom. des Arabes en Espagne, tome i. pp. 118—124. 147, 148.

But the theatre of fulfilment, marked out by the terms of the prophecy, supplies a conclusive reason for the omission of progress westward. For its scene is laid in the Macedonian empire; and the directions taken in its growth by the little horn carry us in the lines, in which, assuming Babylon, where Daniel saw the vision, as its central point, that empire chiefly extended. Now the kingdom of the he-goat being thus the geographical limit of the prophecy, its fulfilment by Mahometanism is most complete. The Mahometan apostasy, in the present age, literally overspreads the Macedonian empire. The conquests of Alexander in Asia formed the original seat and strength of the Saracenic dominion; and, what is singularly remarkable, after centuries of defeat and failure on the part of Mahometanism, in its reiterated efforts to penetrate towards the West, the primitive seat of Alexander's power in Europe, Greece with its dependencies, and this portion alone of the European continent, has fallen permanently under the iron rule of their successors, the Turks.

4. The little horn of the vision, in the interpretation, is represented as "a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences." The sense of the first characteristic is obvious; but it is of importance to fix the meaning of the second.

The expression, "dark sentences," is equivalent to the familiar scriptural phrases, "dark sayings," and, "dark sayings of old." These phrases, in the language of the sacred writers, will be found uniformly to convey a spiritual signification. Thus the Psalmist, "I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter *dark sayings of old.*" It seems probable, therefore, that the equivalent expression, "dark sentences," relates, in one shape or other, to religion; and the "understanding dark sentences," to real or pretended skill in the interpretation of things spiritual.

Now, let Mahometanism be brought to the test of a comparison with this part of the prophecy, according to its authorized meaning. As the founders of an universal despotism, and the promulgators of a fierce and sanguinary superstition, Mahomet and his successors manifestly answer the description of "a king of fierce countenance." And, as the author of the Koran, Mahomet has himself erected a lasting testimonial of the supremacy of his claim to the prophetic distinction of "understanding dark sentences;" for it is the declared object of this pretended revelation, to revive the traditions of ancient times concerning God and religion;

and it professes, further, to unfold the history of futurity, and the secrets of the invisible world.[2]

5. But the correctness of the application to Mahometanism, of this part of the prophecy, may be yet further ascertained by a comparative examination of the context; every expression of which has distinct reference to a spiritual desolation. Throughout, the vision and the interpretation of Daniel join hand in hand, to point out the power symbolized by the eastern little horn, as an effectual confederation of a temporal with a spiritual tyranny for the subversion of the true religion, circumstantially corresponding with the character exhibited, and the accomplishment effected, by the arch-heresy of Mahomet.

In the vision, the little horn "waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars* to the ground, and stamped upon them." The interpretation explains this prediction as applying to the king of fierce countenance, "who shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." Mahometanism realized the prophecy from the date of its first promulgation, when it stood up against Christi-

* *Stars*, in the idiom of prophecy, signify *rulers*, temporal or spiritual. Dan. xii. 3. may be instanced to show, that this prophet applies the symbol peculiarly, if not exclusively, to the priestly and pastoral offices. Compare Rev. xii. 4.

anity, and destroyed, for religion's sake, the pastors and the people of Christ. The little horn "magnified himself even to the prince of the host." And Mahometanism so magnified itself, by setting up Mahomet above Christ. But the predicted desolation was, further, to be total and permanent; for the horn in the vision took away the daily sacrifice, razed to its foundations the place of God's sanctuary, and cast down the truth itself to the ground; giving both the sanctuary and the host, for a long course of ages, to be trodden under foot. Mahometanism began this appointed work, by the subversion of the Christian churches and altars in every stage of its progress against the Greek empire; and has continued the desolation during nearly twelve hundred years, until it has all but completed the extinction of Eastern Christianity.

6. The vision contains another mark of its identity with Mahometanism, which, so far as I am aware, has passed hitherto unnoticed. From the tenor of the twelfth verse, power would appear to be given to the little horn, not merely for the subversion of the true religion, but for its *permanent subversion*, by the *permanent substitution* of another faith. For not only is it said, that "by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of God's sanctuary was

cast down," — but it is added, that "*an host* was given him against the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression; and *it* cast down the truth to the ground; and *it* practised and prospered." In employing the same term "host," at the tenth and at the twelfth verse, the English version is only faithful to the original, where the one word is likewise used in both places. This immediate recurrence of the term in question has seriously perplexed the commentators; who are unanimous in giving it a *different* sense in the two contexts, although they cannot agree as to what the sense of the expression, as introduced in the twelfth verse, shall be.

Now, let the term be understood in the twelfth verse, as well as in the tenth, in its received symbolic meaning; and let the appropriateness of this meaning be examined, as applying to the Mahometan apostasy. The recurrence of the expression "host," would seem to establish some antithetical relation between the two passages: "the host of heaven," in the tenth verse, being appropriately opposed by an equivalent power, the "host given to the little horn against the daily sacrifice," in the twelfth. But the host of heaven, in this connection, being generally understood to mean the priesthood ad-

ministering the daily sacrifice; the host given against the daily sacrifice must, by parity of reasoning, be taken to signify a rival priesthood, substituted in place of the former. Now, in the twelfth verse, it is explicitly stated, that the power of the little horn was to be exercised mainly through the instrumentality of this second host: for we read that "*it* practised and prospered; and *it* cast down the truth to the ground."

The prediction, thus interpreted according to the natural force of the language and construction, is applicable to no other known power; but as applied to the heresy of Mahomet, its fulfilment appears perfect. For Mahometanism permanently overthrew the Christian priesthood and altars, by the permanent erection of other altars, and of another priesthood, in their room. Every where throughout its vast domains, the mosques replaced the Christian temples; and the Imàms and Muezzin were substituted for the appointed ministry of Christ. In a more enlarged view, the Saracens and Turks themselves composed the antagonist host or priesthood. For in Mahometanism, the sword being the grand engine of conversion, the whole Mussulman people became virtually a priest-

hood; and each individual Saracen and Turkish soldier, a missionary and maker of proselytes.

Accordingly, when Saint John resumes this subject in the Apocalypse *, he represents the two great branches of the Mahometan apostasy, under the character of a two-fold host: the Saracens, as locusts; the Turks, as horses and horsemen; each individual locust and horse being armed with a spiritual, as well as a temporal, weapon of destruction. For the locusts "had tails like unto scorpions; and there were stings in their tails:" and the horses' "tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt."

And thus, the second "host," introduced in the twelfth verse of this context, which has been rejected by the general consent of the learned, as inapplicable, in its literal sense, to any other power, has an easy, clear, and literal correspondence with the phenomena of Mahometanism.

7. The spiritual tyranny of Mahometanism, as contra-distinguished from its temporal, supplies also a satisfactory comment on another difficulty in the sacred text, namely, that attribute of the king of fierce countenance, that "his power shall be mighty, but *not by his own power*." The temporal power of Mahometanism

* Rev. ix.

has repeatedly risen and waned; the Mahometan world has, again and again, changed masters; but its spiritual tyranny has lived and reigned unaltered, through the whole of its yet fulfilled period. It is mighty, that is, *by the power of the host given unto it.*

8. Its spiritual domination, in the last place, furnishes an awful explanation of a further characteristic of the prophetic king, that "*by peace* he shall destroy many." For Mahometanism, by its skilful system of proselytism in times of peace, carried on within its own borders, has, it is but too well ascertained, wrought a far more deadly, and scarcely less extensive spiritual destruction *, than that which it accomplished by the sword.

In this application of Daniel's vision of the eastern little horn, the terms of the Jewish ritual introduced into the prophecy are considered as

* We may instance this, from the fatal effects of a treacherous toleration, on Christianity, in Spain. While, during the Algihed, or holy wars, the Spanish Saracens extended their creed by force of arms, in the intervals of peace, the policy of their Caliphs may be truly said, *by fraud*, to have *destroyed many*. For this policy introduced a system of intermarriage between their Christian and Mussulman subjects, which gradually loosened the hold of the Gospel, and greatly multiplied the voluntary conversions to Mahometanism. See Des Marlès, tome i. p. 237. *note.* — At a later period, under the Ottoman Sultans, the formation of the *Janizaries*, at once the offspring and the scourge of Christendom, presents a still more awful fulfilment of this prediction, in the opposite quarter of Europe.

figuratively denoting the Christian church.* Bishop Newton has justly remarked, that the prophets were in the habit of employing this species of accommodation; and it deserves particularly to be noticed, that he regards this very prophecy of the little horn as a prominent example and evidence of the usage. "It is very worthy of our most serious consideration, *whether this part of the prophecy be not a sketch of the fate and sufferings of the Christian*, as well as of the Jewish, church. Nothing is more usual with the prophets, than to describe the religion and worship of later times by metaphors and figures borrowed from their own religion. The Christians may, *full as well as the Jews*, be comprehended under the name of 'the holy people,' or 'people of the holy ones.'" There can, then, be no question as to the *propriety* of understanding this prediction of Christianity.

But we may observe, further, that this part of

* Some commentators labour to confine the application of this prophecy to the Romans, on the assumption that the ritual terms contained in it *must* be understood, *literally*, of the Jewish temple. Scripture, however, suggests a directly opposite inference. For St. John, Rev. xi. 1, 2. speaks of the Jewish temple, and the treading under foot of its outer court by the Gentiles, long after the destruction of that temple, and where the prophecy unquestionably belongs to Papal Rome. It is only, therefore, according to strict analogy of Scripture, to understand the parallel treading under foot of the Jewish sanctuary, Dan. viii. 13. of the parallel but still more utter desolation of the Eastern Church, by the Mahometan apostasy.

the prophecy contains some marks which may serve to show, not only that it may properly be understood of the Christian church, but that it cannot so properly be understood of the Jewish. For, at the period of the final desolation of Jerusalem by the Romans, the desecrated temple was no longer "the place of God's sanctuary;" and Judaism, now repealed by the substitution of a more perfect revelation, could no longer be accounted "the truth." In laying waste the devoted city and temple, therefore, the Romans could hardly be said to have "trodden under foot *God's sanctuary*," or to have "cast down *the truth* to the ground." And thus, while the analogy of prophecy suggests the abstract propriety of applying the vision of the eastern little horn, to "the fate and sufferings of the Christian church," the internal marks would seem to indicate the strict, if not exclusive, appropriateness of such an application.

The identity of the little horn, which came out of one of the four notable horns of the he-goat, with the Mahometan "abomination of desolation," has been thus far elucidated, from the internal evidences in the vision. It remains to be inquired, whether the symbol may not be brought home to Mahometanism, by a more direct process.

The last of Daniel's visions, entitled the prophecy of "the Scripture of truth," is comprised in the eleventh and twelfth chapters. Sir Isaac Newton observes, that "this prophecy is a commentary upon the vision of the ram and he-goat." But this vision, we have seen, concludes with the prophecy concerning the little horn; which prophecy forms a prominent and chief part of it. There is a strong antecedent presumption, therefore, that the commentary would have a proportionate relation and reference to that part of the vision. Now the eleventh and twelfth chapters, which form the commentary on the eighth, contain several predictions, which interpreters are agreed in applying exclusively to Mahometanism; and which (as interpreters have not hitherto observed) singularly correspond, at the same time, in the leading verbal expressions, with the prophecy of the Macedonian or eastern little horn. Thus, Dan. viii. 24., and Dan. xii. 7., we have *a king* employed in executing the same peculiar judgment; namely, that of *destroying* or *scattering, the power of the mighty and holy people.* Again, Dan. viii. 13., and Dan. xii. 11., we have the same prophetic desolation pointed out; if it may suffice to prove it the same, that it is described in the same words, and these,

too, ritual terms. Now both the predictions here in question, where they occur in the twelfth chapter, are, by general consent of the writers on prophecy, interpreted of *the Turks*.

But the twelfth chapter, it is allowed by high authority, forms part of a *commentary* on the eighth. With what consistency, then, when we return from the comment to the text, can we vary the interpretation?

The reference made by Christ to "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet," in his own prediction of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, has probably contributed, more than all the other apparent coincidences, to determine interpreters in applying the desolation mentioned in the eighth chapter of Daniel to the Romans. Yet is this allusion no sufficient ground for their conclusion. For Daniel's expression, "the abomination of desolation," is a *generic* phrase; which interpreters erroneously taking in a *specific* sense, they have accordingly mistaken and misrepresented our Lord, as though he understood and applied it specifically. The truth is, that, following in this case the analogy of prophecy, the expression appears to denote a permanently existing anti-religious power, operating in the world, at different periods, through different

channels. * Our Lord applies it to the desecrating tyranny of Pagan Rome; the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by this all-consuming power being the accomplishment immediately in his contemplation. It belongs, with equal propriety, to the antecedent profanations exercised by Antiochus Epiphanes, and to the subsequent desecrating progress of Mahometanism.

Thus, when treating of the same expression, on its recurrence in the twelfth chapter, Bishop Newton observes, "the 'setting up of the abomination of desolation,' appears to be *a general phrase*, and comprehensive of various events. — It is applied by our Saviour, St. Matt. xxiv. 15., to the destruction of the city and temple by the Romans. — It may *with equal justice* be applied to the Mohammedans invading and desolating Christendom, and converting the churches into mosques †: *and this latter event seemeth to be particularly intended in this passage.*"

But if the "setting up of the abomination of desolation," in the twelfth chapter, properly

* Thus *Antichrist*, also, plainly denotes, not a single power, but a hydra with many heads.

† "In the ten years of the administration of Omar, the Saracens destroyed 4000 churches or temples of the unbelievers, and built 1400 mosques for the exercise of the religion of Mahomet." — Zouch's Works, vol. i. p. 253.

refers to the substitution of Mahometanism for Christianity, by "the conversion of the churches into mosques," assuredly the parallel context in the eighth chapter, on which the twelfth is a commentary, "the casting down of the sanctuary by the transgression of desolation," as properly relates to the same consummation, — the subversion of Christianity by Mahometanism in the East, and the ruin or desecration of the eastern churches. *

These several coincidences between the eighth and twelfth chapters of Daniel's prophecy, viewed, after Sir Isaac Newton, the former as text, and the latter as commentary, so far serve to mark the identity of Mahometanism with the power denoted by the little horn of the he-goat. A prediction in the eleventh chapter, as yet unnoticed, appears to rivet the connection. Daniel, xi. 40., contains a well-known prophecy, received by interpreters, with one consent, as a joint prediction of the Saracenic and Turkish empires, under the titles of "the king of the South," and "the king of the North."

"And, at the time of the end, the king of

* The light thrown by Bishop Newton's theory on this subject has the greater value, because, in commenting on the twelfth chapter, he has done so independently, and without any reference whatever to its undoubted connection with the eighth. His authority, therefore, has all the force of an undesigned coincidence.

the South," or the empire of the Saracens, "shall push at him," the he-goat, or Macedonian empire, now the Greek; "and the king of the North," or empire of the Turks, "shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships," &c.

The king of the South, it is conceded, denotes the empire of the Saracens, which the prophet describes as *pushing* at the Greek empire, the representative of the four-horned he-goat. Now the same term *push* is employed, in our authorized version, (Dan. vii. 4.) to describe the *butting* of the Persian ram. The rendering is critically exact: for, in the original, the term used in the two contexts is also the same. But the original expression signifies literally *to seek, or assail, with the horn;* a clear indication that the vision of the eighth chapter is, in the eleventh, still in the prophet's view. The Greek, here represents the Macedonian, empire: and the empire of the Saracens, which is figured as *pushing with the horn*, against it, thus becomes, *to the letter*, identified with the power symbolized by the eastern *little horn.*

The periods of action intended by those concurrent prophecies, very plainly coincide with the periods marked out by Saint John, in his parallel predictions concerning the Saracens and

the Turks, under the symbols of locusts and of horsemen; and comprehend the entire career of each of those powers, in their successive prosecution of the overthrow of the Greek empire.* The fact, as a comparison of the prophetic dates will at once show, requires no proof: but from not sufficiently adverting to it, the commentators on Daniel have introduced much confusion into this whole context. Let, however, the periods designed in the prophecy at large only be held constantly in view, and let the order of time be chronologically followed, and the context, to the close of the eleventh chapter inclusive, will be found to yield a sense correspondent throughout with the grand epochs and events of *Turkish* history, from the commencement, to the fatal consummation, of its desolating career.[3]

The final object of the prophecies respecting Mahometanism, in the judgment of the most approved interpreters, is the final joint subversion of the Greek empire, and of eastern Christianity. The Saracens only began this double work of desolation: its accomplishment was reserved for their prophetic successors, the Turks. The commission of the former was but to *hurt;* that of the latter was to *kill.* The Saracens, accordingly, often made, but invariably

* Compare section iii.

failed in, the attempt, to pass the Bosphorus, and strike at the heart of the Greek empire. But prophecy opposed no insuperable barrier to the progress of the Turks; and Greece, and Constantinople, became the prey of the destroyer.

In the latter part of his prophecy, entitled by commentators "the Scripture of truth," Daniel manifestly hastens onward to this concluding scene of desolation. The king of the South, therefore, or empire of the Saracens, is barely noticed, as pushing at "the wilful king:" and the vision passes on to represent, in its full details, the destroying progress of the Turkish empire, or the king of the North.

"And the king of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over. He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries; and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver; and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury

to destroy, and utterly to make away many. And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain: yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." *

The overthrow of the Greek church and empire is the acknowledged end aimed at in this prophecy: and the end proposed may serve to determine the true date of its commencement. The career of the king of the North properly begins in the middle of the eleventh century; when the Turkman hordes, under Togrul Bey and Alp Arslan, violated, for the first time, the Asiatic provinces of the Greek empire. † The irruption of Togrul, A.D. 1050, was the first blast of the prophetic whirlwind; and Byzantine and Oriental writers unite to record how faithfully and fearfully it answered the description. But the invasion of Alp Arslan was its durable continuance: for, from the hour of the defeat and captivity of the Greek emperor Romanus, by this conqueror, A.D. 1071, "the Turks," observes Mr. Gibbon, "have maintained their dominion in Asia Minor ‡, till the victorious

* Dan. xi. 40—45. † See Mede's Works, pp. 586, 587.

‡ "Since the first conquests of the Caliphs, the establishment of the Turks in Anatolia or Asia Minor was the most deplorable loss which the church and empire had sustained." Decline and Fall, vol. x. p. 372.

crescent has been planted on the dome of Saint Sophia." *

A brief comparison of this prophecy, with the history of the eventful period in which our best commentators have placed its fulfilment, will serve more fully to identify the progress of the Turkish whirlwind, under the princes of the house of Seljuk and their successors, with the course of the king of the North.

"And the king of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind; — and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over."] "In the eleventh century," says Mr. Gibbon, the victorious arms of the Turks presented a real and urgent apprehension.† They

* "I have already noticed the first appearance of the Turks; and the names of the fathers, of *Seljuk* and *Othman*, discriminate the two successive dynasties of the nation, which emerged in the eleventh century from the Scythian wilderness. The former established a potent and splendid kingdom from the banks of the Oxus to Antioch and Nice; *and the first crusade was provoked by the violation of Jerusalem, and the danger of Constantinople.* From an humble origin the *Ottomans* arose; the scourge and terror of Christendom. Constantinople was besieged and taken by Mahomet II., and his triumph annihilates the remnant, the image, the title of the Roman empire in the East." Decline and Fall, vol. ix. pp. 8, 9.

† "Hisce gladiis, ô nobilissima Constantinopolis," is the trembling exclamation of a contemporary writer, "*solum tibi stagni interstitium præsidio fuit.*" Ekkehard. Abbat. Libell. ap. Martene et Durand. Vet. Monum. Collect. tom. v. f. 515.

The precise nature of the barrier, which should, for a time, arrest the king of the North, in the midst of his conquering career, is expressively indicated in the prophecy, by the words, he "shall *overflow* and *pass over.*" The position of the Hellespont, so long the impregnable defence of Constantinople, and an invincible obstacle to the progress of the Ottomans,

had subdued, in less than thirty years, the kingdoms of Asia as far as Jerusalem and the Hellespont; and the Greek empire tottered on the verge of destruction."

" He shall enter also into the glorious land."] " The most interesting conquest of the Seljukian Turks," proceeds the historian of the empire, " was that of Jerusalem, which soon became the theatre of nations." This conquest took place A.D. 1076, when Jerusalem and Palestine fell into the hands of Sultan Toucush, brother of Malek Shah.

" And many countries shall be overthrown."] " From the Chinese frontier he [Malek Shah] stretched his immediate jurisdiction or feudatory sway to the west and south, as far as the mountains of Georgia, the neighbourhood of Constantinople, the holy city of Jerusalem; and the spicy groves of Arabia Felix."

" And the land of Egypt shall not escape."] A.D. 1163, Egypt was permanently occupied by the Turks, under the successors of the Seljukian dynasty, Noureddin and the celebrated Saladin. And A.D. 1187, Jerusalem was retaken from the

---

points out geographically the prophetic impediment. The incidental testimony of Ekkehard fully establishes the fact, and the exactness of the fulfilment.

crusaders by Saladin, never since to pass from under the Turkish yoke.

Thus accurately does the first irruption of the king of the North, under the sultans of the house of Seljuk, follow the geographical course pointed out specifically by the prophecy. But the trait properly characteristic of his prophetic career is to be found in the unswerving aim of the Turkish power, from its earliest beginnings, at the *destruction* of the Greek empire. Its conquests spread far and wide, but the end continually in its view was Greece and Constantinople: however distant, the spider still wove his web* around the trembling and conscious victim.

Between the spoiler and his prey, however, a natural obstacle intervened, which all the power of the Saracens had proved unequal to surmount. A narrow strait only separates the opposite shores of Asia and Europe; but the command of the seas must be acquired, before this strait could be "passed over." Let the prophecy be compared with Turkish history in this particular view, and their coincidence may well satisfy the severest judgment.

"And the king of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and

* The spider has woven his web, in Cæsar's palace;
The owl has sung her watch-song, on the towers of Afrasiab.

Lines quoted from the Persic, in the hour of his triumph, by Mahomet II.

with horsemen, *and with many ships.*"] A. D. 1084, the Seljukian kingdom of Roum, "pregnant with mines of silver and iron *, of alum and copper," extended "from the Black Sea to the confines of Syria, from the Euphrates to Constantinople." This seat of empire was still safe behind the waters of the Bosphorus; but already the victorious Soliman was bent on its subversion. Ships must be provided to effect the conquest: and that part of the prophecy which makes mention of them, had, accordingly, its first fulfilment, in the strenuous efforts of the Turkish sultan to erect a naval power. "The Turkish ignorance of navigation protected, for a while, the inglorious safety of the emperor; but no sooner had *a fleet of two hundred ships* been constructed by the hands of the captive Greeks, than Alexius trembled behind the walls of his capital." †

The prophetic career run by the princes of the house of Seljuk was re-enacted by the Ottoman sultans. The design, under both dynasties, was, throughout, the same; the difference lay only in the success. The conquest of Greece, and capture of Constantinople, which had been aimed at by the former, were effected by the latter. When Greece had fallen a prey to the destroying armies of the Amuraths and Bajazets,

* Compare Daniel, xi. 43. † Gibbon.

and when the limits of the empire had been thus reduced, on all sides, to the walls of the capital *, the prophecy of Daniel concerning the king of the North too plainly drew near to its fatal accomplishment; when the last of the Constantines resigned his sceptre with his life, in the breach, which, to use the words of an eye-witness, "Heaven had opened for the passage of the Turks."

The end proposed in this prophecy, the overthrow of the Greek empire, requires to be held specially in view in the interpretation of an apparently obscure part of it: "But tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many."

The subversion of the eastern empire being the appointed work of the king of the North, the tidings out of the East and out of the North which were to trouble him, must have reference to providential interpositions from those quarters, operating directly to interrupt his progress, and for yet a little season to avert its fall.

* The imperious mandate of Bajazet I., surnamed Ilderim, to the Emperor Manuel, marks out, as the last boundary of the Greek empire, the walls of this devoted city, already nodding to their fall: "Our invincible scymitar has reduced Asia with many and large countries in Europe, excepting only the city of Constantinople; *for beyond the walls thou hast nothing left.* Resign that city: or tremble for thyself and thy unhappy people." — Decline and Fall, vol. xi. p. 458.

Now, two extraordinary interpositions, and two only, are to be met with in the history of this eventful period: on the side of the East, the invasions of the Turkish empire by the Tartars; and on the side of the North, the Crusades. For the Moguls penetrated into Asia Minor from the side of Persia and India; and the Crusaders poured their successive myriads into Syria and Palestine, through the northern frontier of the Turkish kingdom of Roum.*

It remains that we identify these interposing powers, by historical evidences, with the prophetic tidings out of the East and out of the North, which should trouble the king of the North.

Now, with respect to the holy wars, the historian of the Roman empire informs us, that "the first crusade was principally directed against the Turks." † The epistles of the Greek emperor, addressed to the Catholic princes, were written expressly to supplicate deliverance from the victorious arms of Soliman, the Turkish sul-

* For full proof of the agreement of the crusades, with Daniel's "tidings out of the North," see Appendix, No. IV.

† The crusades, in their providential aspect, require no further vindication than may be drawn from their effects in repressing the Turkish power. It was by the arms of the crusaders, that the Turks of the four Sultanies (described by Saint John, Rev. ix., as the four angels bound in the great river) were driven back on the Euphrates. See Mede's Works, pp. 585, 586. History contains few more striking fulfilments of prophecy. Compare sections iii. xi.

tan of Roum; and the zeal of Christian Europe was in these letters doubly awakened, by the announcement of the capture of Jerusalem, and of the impending fall of Constantinople. The succeeding crusades were all directed alike exclusively against the Turkish powers; and all operated immediately to divert the king of the North from the accomplishment of his first and last aim, the conquest of Constantinople. The unparalleled waste of human life in the holy wars, and the implacable fury, on both sides, with which they were carried on, are also strongly marked in the prophecy. There would seem, therefore, no reasonable ground for doubt, the prediction at large being admitted to belong to the Turks, that the crusades are designed by the tidings out of the North, which were to trouble the Turkish powers.

On precisely similar grounds, the *tidings out of the East* become identified with the desolating invasions of the Turkish empire by the Moguls, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

At the former period, the downfall of the Greek empire was providentially postponed, by the successful inroad of the Tartar hordes, who, under the famous Holaghou Khan, the grandson of Genghiz, altogether broke, for a time, the power of the Turks in Asia Minor; "spread,

from the East, beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, pillaged Aleppo and Damascus, *and threatened to join the Franks in the deliverance of Jerusalem!*" *

At the latter period, the ferocious Bajazet was summoned from before the walls of Constantinople, by a second irruption of the Moguls, under the celebrated Tamerlane. "The savage," says Mr. Gibbon, "would have devoured his prey, if, *in the critical moment*, he had not been overthrown by another savage stronger than himself. By the victory of Tamerlane," proceeds the historian, "the fall of Constantinople was delayed about fifty years."

Timour was encamped on the banks of the Ganges, when the intelligence reached him which provoked his march against the Turkish Sultan. Bajazet broke up from the siege of the Greek capital, and hastened to encounter him with the furv of insulted pride.† It is needless to

* Gibbon.

† The temper in which the imperious Ottoman received the insulting epistle of Tamerlane, has been forcibly depicted by Mr. Gibbon. "In his replies, *Bajazet poured forth the indignation of a soul which was deeply stung by such unusual contempt*—retorting the basest reproaches on the thief and rebel of the desert.—*The ungovernable rage of the Sultan* at length betrayed him to an insult of a more domestic kind;—and the political quarrel of the two monarchs was embittered by private and personal resentment."—Decline and Fall, chap. lxv. vol. xii. pp. 16—19. Compare the historical fact, in this instance, with the declaration of the

enlarge on the sanguinary issue of the conflict. But the word of prophecy, and the hand of Providence, seem visible throughout, in this their latest interposition; all the circumstances of which combine to identify this unforeseen and timely inroad of the Tartars, with the "tidings out of the East" which should "trouble" the king of the North.

With the expedition of Tamerlane, all providential hindrances were withdrawn. The king of the North had now none left to trouble him. The transition is forthwith marked unequivocally in the next verse of the prophecy: which (however the accuracy of the description has escaped the notice of the commentators) closes the eleventh chapter with a vivid representation of the triumph of Mahomet II.; the fall of Constantinople; and the final erection of the Turkish crescent, and the Mahometan creed, upon the ruins of the Greek empire, and of eastern Christianity.

"And he shall plant the tabernacles of his

---

prophecy concerning the king of the North, and who can fail to own and admire the exactness of the fulfilment? "But *tidings out of the East* shall *trouble him*: therefore he shall go forth *with great fury* to destroy, and *utterly to make away many*." A contemporary could not have more graphically painted, the approach of Timour, the march of Bajazet, and the bloody field of Angora.

palaces between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain." *[4]

Brief as this description is, the most skilful geographer could not more nicely define the site, nor the most exact historian more faithfully depict the past and present fortunes, of the second Rome.

Situated on the straits which connect the Euxine with the Mediterranean, Constantinople is properly characterized as seated "between the seas." As described by the geographical accuracy of Mr. Gibbon, "the imperial city commanded, *from her seven hills*, the opposite shores of Europe and Asia:" she is therefore correctly represented under the figure of a "mountain." As the seat of civil empire, she was "the glorious," as that of ecclesiastical, "the holy, mountain." Upon this mountain, the king of the North was to "plant his tabernacles." — "The palaces and gardens of the seraglio," observes Mr. Gibbon, "the seat of Turkish jealousy and *despotism*, occupy the eastern promontory, *the first of the seven hills*." In the language of Scripture, *the planting of tabernacles* denotes

* Dan. xi. 45. Compare Ezek. xvii. 22, 23. The antithetical relation between the triumphs of the kingdoms of Christ, and of Antichrist, is marked in these contexts by the similarity of the descriptions.

permanent settlement*: the *planting of the tabernacles of palaces* signifies fixed dominion. And the prediction is amply verified in the event. The Turk has already held the imperial metropolis, and profaned the holy sanctuary, for nearly four hundred years.

The fate of this seat of empire was as nothing in the eye of prophecy, when compared with the ruin of eastern Christianity, which attended on its fall. "Constantinople, which had defied the power of Chosroes, the Chagan, and the Caliphs, was irretrievably subdued by the arms of Mahomet the Second. Her empire only had been subverted by the Latins: *her religion was trampled in the dust* by the Moslem conquerors." The sceptical historian unconsciously employs the language of the prophet Daniel, concerning this very desolation; which was "to give *both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot.*"

The prophecy of the king of the North, and the vision of the little horn, seem alike to con-

* Psalm lxxx. 8. Jer. xviii. 9. xxiv. 6. xxxii. 41. Isaiah, xl. 24. Hosea, ix. 13. Amos, ix. 15. These references might have been spared, had not the commentators on Daniel, especially Bishop Newton, by neglecting the invariable figurative force, in Scripture, of the phrase *to plant*, as denoting *permanent habitation*, gone altogether astray, at this place, from the just interpretation. According to Bishop Newton, this prediction remains yet to be fulfilled, by the Turk literally forming *an encampment* in Palestine!

clude with intimations, that the fall of the anti-christian power, typified by these symbols, shall be the work, not of man, but of God. The one foretells that "he shall be broken without hand:" the other, that "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." Both predictions, we may observe in conclusion, remarkably consist with the present tottering condition of the Turkish empire; which now appears to stand, not by its own strength, but in virtue of the political jealousies of the Christian powers of Europe. When its appointed time shall have come, and a controlling Providence shall cause these *needful* jealousies to cease, this last and fiercest head of the eastern Antichrist, so long irresistible by the arm of man, gives every promise of crumbling by its own weight, though retaining, to the latest gasp, its spirit of intolerance and persecution.[5]

SECTION III.

PROPHETICAL ANTICIPATIONS OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MAHOMETANISM; AND PROPHETICAL PARALLEL BETWEEN MAHOMETANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE prophetical anticipations of the Mahometan apostasy, contained in the Old Testament, are materially cleared and confirmed by those predictions of its rise and progress, which, as all the best authorities agree in maintaining, occur in the New Testament.

Indeed, the admission, that Mahometanism and the Saracens have a place in the former revelation, involves the presumption, if not the proof, that they must also occupy a place in the latter: an inference palpably suggested by the fact, that, in almost every ascertainable example, the great predictions of the one Testament are found to be reflected by the other. [1]

We, accordingly, now proceed to connect those remarkable prophecies of the book of Daniel, which have been applied to Mahomet and his followers in the preceding section, with the strictly parallel, and still ampler predictions,

delivered concerning them in the Apocalypse of St. John.

"In the prediction of Daniel," observes a learned writer of our own times, "Mohammedanism alone is spoken of: its two principal supporters, the Saracens and the Turks, are not discriminated from each other: a general history of the superstition, from its commencement to its termination, is given, without descending to particularize the nations by which it should be successively patronized. In the Revelation of St. John this deficiency is supplied: and we are furnished with two distinct and accurate paintings, both of the Saracenic locusts under their exterminating leader, and of the Euphratèan horsemen of the four Turkish Sultanies." *[2]

With one slight correction, this statement may be received as a just representation of the case. Daniel, we have seen, *had* already described the two distinct powers in question, under the titles of "the king of the South," and "the king of the North." But his descriptions want characteristic national traits, to bring them home to the Saracens and Turks; which traits, as might reasonably be expected in a revelation so much nearer to the event, the ninth chapter of the Apocalypse appears to embody in its symbols.

* Faber.

Interpreters are justly struck with the historical exactness of these delineations: but none have done the subject more justice, in the expression of their admiration, than the late learned and exemplary Dr. Zouch. "The prophetic truths comprized in the ninth chapter of the Apocalypse are, of themselves, sufficient to stamp the mark of divinity upon that work. When I compare them with the page of history, I am filled with amazement. The Saracens, a people which did not exist in the time of St. John, and the Turks, a nation then utterly unknown, are there described in language the most appropriate and distinct." *

Without further preface, I shall lay the words of this prophecy before the reader.

REVELATION, ix.

"1. And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit. † 2. And he opened the bottomless pit; and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. 3. And there came out of the smoke locusts upon

* See Zouch on Rev. ix. Works, vol. i.

† The sword was the key by which Mahomet himself professed to unlock the kingdoms of light and of darkness. And he has appropriated to himself the prediction, Rev. ix. 1., by his famous declaration, — "The sword is *the key* of heaven, and *of hell*." See Gibbon, vol. ix. p. 297. Khaled, the most formidable champion of the Koran, received from Mahomet the title of "*the sword of God*."

the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power. 4. And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads. 5. And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months: and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man. 6. And in those days shall men seek death, and shall not find it; and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them. 7. And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads were as it were crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men. 8. And they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions. 9. And they had breast-plates, as it were breast-plates of *iron* * ; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle. 10. And they had tails like unto scorpions; and there were stings in their tails: and their power was to hurt men five months. 11. And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit; whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his

* Mr. Gibbon somewhere opposes "the naked Saracens," to the mail-clad warriors of Heraclius or Chosroes. The contrast is incorrect: allusions occur, both in the Koran, and in the ante-Mahometan Bedoween story of Antar, to the armour, and especially to the breast-plates or mail-coats, worn by the Arabians. The following extract from a journal dated in February, 1826, is in point: "Fragments of *Arabian armour* have been dug up in a field, near Tours, in France. These remains are described as being of very beautiful workmanship in *steel* and silver; and are conjectured to be of the time of the Sultan [Emir] Abderame, defeated by Charles Martel."

name Apollyon. 12. One woe is past; and, behold, there come two woes more hereafter.

" 13. And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, 14. Saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates. 15. And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men. 16. And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand thousand: and I heard the number of them. 17. And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire, and of jacinth, and brimstone: and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions; and out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone. 18. By these three was the third part of men killed; by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths. 19. For their power is in their mouth and in their tails: for their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt.

" 20. And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk: 21. Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornications, nor of their thefts."

The sound of the fifth trumpet ushers in Mahomet and Mahometanism under appropriate

symbols *, in the double characters, of a false prophet and a conqueror; of a spurious revelation, and of a temporal tyranny connected with it. For the symbol of a fallen star † (Rev. ix. 1.) aptly denotes the appearance of a false prophet, and the display of a pretended revelation ‡; and those of crowns (v. 7.), and of a king (v. 11.), indicate a dominion combined with this religion. The preternatural darkening of the sun and air, by reason of the smoke of the pit (v. 2.), no less aptly imports the disastrous effects of the compound desolation: the darkening of the sun foreshowing the eclipse of

* The symbols in this prophecy, it is highly important to notice, are *of the same kind* with those employed in the celebrated prophecy of Balaam, Numbers, xxiv. 17. On the latter prediction, the comment of an authority elsewhere cited is, that it was "a vivid prophecy, and adapted to prepare men's minds for something of no small importance; since it was to be ushered in by a person of remote advent, whose symbols, *a star and a sceptre*, imported, most naturally, *the display of some new revelation*, and *a dominion combined with it.*" — Davison on Prophecy, pp. 201, 202.

† The prophecy of Balaam, as we all know, predicted the advent of Christ. It is but reasonable to except that Antichrist might be introduced, by a prediction clothed in like symbols. But Mahomet was the greatest of false Christs; and, with the appropriate difference only, of the substitution of a *falling* star, to typify the false revelation, the symbols assigned to him, Rev. ix., are the same with those which Balaam's prophecy attributes to the true Messiah. Interpreters ought surely to be cautious, how they question the appropriateness of these signs of Antichrist; lest, in so doing, they should be found to bring into question, the justness of the parallel symbols belonging to the Christ.

‡ The awful origin of this symbol, we may gather from another passage of Scripture. In Isaiah, xiv. 12., it is thus applied to the great enemy of mankind: "How art thou *fallen from heaven, O Lucifer*, son of the morning!"

true religion; while that of the air prefigures the uncontrolled dominion of the powers of darkness. It has been repeatedly observed, as a striking coincidence with the signs here predicted, that a remarkable comet immediately preceded the birth of Mahomet; and that an eclipse of the sun, of extraordinary degree and duration, attended the first announcement to the world of his pretended mission.

The prophecy, in its first grand period, Revelation, ix. 1—12., vividly pourtrays the Saracenic inundation, by its symbol of the locusts, by the qualities which it assigns to them, and by the nature, the term, and the extent of their prophetic devastations. *

1. The locust is a native of Arabia, from whose deserts it is ascertained to issue, and overspread the adjoining countries of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine; the very regions, be it observed, which were first overrun by the arms of the Saracens. The symbol, therefore, while it traces with historical fidelity the first stages of their career, naturally and properly points out the Arabs as the people whom it is designed to

* The principal authorities consulted in this, and in the preceding section, are Mede, the two Newtons, Daubuz, Lowman, Zouch, Dr. Ffrench Laurence, and Mr. Faber. Having apprized the reader generally of the chief sources drawn from, I shall trouble him but little with references in detail.

prefigure. Accordingly, elsewhere in Scripture, we find the Arabians compared to locusts or grasshoppers, when the irruption of the Midianites, in the time of Gideon, is described in the book of Judges. * And, in a genuine production of the native muse of Arabia, the Bedoween romance of Antar, the locust is introduced as the national emblem of the Ishmaelites. It is a remarkable coincidence with these illustrative facts, that Mahometan tradition speaks of locusts having dropped into the hands of Mahomet, bearing on their wings this inscription: "We are the army of the great God."

2. The symbolic locusts of the prophecy possess, as various commentators have noticed, many characteristic marks, nationally appropriate or peculiar to the Saracens; as, bearded faces, like men; long hair, like women; teeth remarkable for strength and destructiveness; crowns, or mitres, that is to say, turbans, † ornamented with gold: they resemble horses, an animal of which Arabia is accounted the original country ‡; which always constituted the chief strength and reliance of the Arabs in war; and whose unrivalled speed depicts but too well,

* Judges, vii. 12.

† "Make a point of wearing *turbans*; because it is the way of the angels." Precept of Mahomet, from the Mishcat-ul-Masabih.

‡ "Arabia," says Mr. Gibbon, "is the native country of the horse."

the rapid and ruinous course of the Saracenic armies.

3. The locusts of the Apocalypse are represented as the offspring of a smoke which arose out of "the bottomless pit;" an origin which would seem very clearly to bespeak a spiritual pestilence: "they had a king over them, the angel of the bottomless pit;" a guidance unequivocally indicating hostility to the interests and adherents of the true religion: and they had tails with poisonous stings, "like unto scorpions;" an attribute which, viewed in connection with the several preceding characteristics of the locusts, appears expressively to denote the infliction of spiritual wounds. In all these particulars, the plague foreshown by the symbolic locusts has been circumstantially realized by the fatal career of the Saracens, under their false prophet.

4. The period assigned for the power of the locusts in this prophecy is "five months;" a term which remarkably represents at once, the actual duration of the natural plague here alluded to, and the conquering era of the Saracenic empire. For the locusts lay waste the countries of the East where they prevail, about the space of five months: and the era of Saracenic conquest, computing from the first appearance of Ma-

homet, to the foundation of Bagdad, extends precisely over the corresponding space of five prophetic months, or one hundred and fifty years.

5. Lastly, the symbol and the Saracens accurately concur, in the extent of their respective devastations: the course of these destroyers being mainly limited to the countries liable to the invasion of the natural locusts; and, as respectable authorities affirm, even varying, in proportion to the degrees, in which those countries are known to be infested by their destructive inroads.

The power given to the apocalyptic locusts was, not to kill, but only to hurt, men. This commission was fulfilled, in a twofold sense, by the Saracens; who were strictly commanded, by the precepts of their religion, to spare the lives of their Jewish and Christian subjects and captives; and who did grievously hurt, but never succeeded in destroying, the Christian empire in the East.

Contrary to the peculiar office of desolation proper to the natural locust, the symbolic locusts of the Apocalypse had it especially in commandment, "that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree." The very singularity of these prohibitions, their apparent paradox, has served, in the event, to

demonstrate the fact of the accomplishment. The famous injunction of the Caliph Abubeker, to Yezid, the commander in the Syrian expedition, the *first* undertaking of the Saracens in the way of foreign conquest, forms such a commentary on this text of Scripture, as the hand and power of an overruling Providence only could supply: "Destroy not palm trees," writes this Caliph, "cut down no fruit-trees, nor burn any fields of corn." *

Although the symbolic locusts were not to kill, they were yet so grievously to *torment*, that, "in those days, men should seek death, and desire to die:" a prediction, we may observe, awfully expressive of the hopeless sufferings and despair of Eastern Christendom, under the lawless insults, violences, and oppressions, systematically practised by its new masters.

On the whole, it may safely be affirmed, that Scripture contains few more accurate predictions, and history few more exact and circumstantial accomplishments, than are furnished by a simple comparison of the first eleven verses of the ninth chapter of Revelation, with the earlier annals of the Saracens.

The second period of this prophecy is hardly less descriptive, in its portraiture of the struggling

* Ockley.

rise, and wide-wasting progress, of the Turkish whirlwind. The plague of the locusts ceases with the sound of the fifth trumpet: the sound of the sixth introduces the more deadly pestilence of the Euphratèan horsemen. The close connection, thus strongly indicated, between these trumpets themselves, and between the twofold desolation which they prefigure, is correctly in accordance with historical fact. The bounds of the Saracenic empire became stationary, from the date of the building of Bagdad: and it was by the capture of that imperial city, that the Turks first commenced the career of victory, which soon enabled them, not only to replace, but to surpass the Saracens, as a conquering power.

Bagdad was taken, and a final period put to the temporal supremacy of the Caliphs, by Togrul Bey *, A. D. 1055. Ten years after, the Turks, under his successor Alp Arslan,

* The change in the national religion of the Turks, which coincided with the conquests of Togrul, determines his era as the period intended by the prophecy, Rev. ix. 13, &c. "Togrul Bey," observes Mr. Turner, "produced or admitted a revolution still more momentous to the mind and fortunes of mankind. *Under his reign, the great Turkish nation adopted the religion of Mohamed;* and professing it with all the energy of their native character, and all the zeal of recent converts, they became its fierce champions *at that precise era when it was losing its hold on the human intellect,* and but for the support of their simple, rude, uncriticizing, credulous, and vehement spirit, *might have quietly expired.*" — History of England, vol. i. p. 307.

crossed the Euphrates; and, by the permanent conquest of the Roman provinces of Armenia and Georgia, finally established themselves within the Greek empire. Both these conquests were completed about the year 1068. And, from this last date, to that of the taking of Constantinople, the interval of time tallies, to a day, with the period allotted by the prophecy, for the course of the Euphratèan horsemen. I shall submit the computation in the words of a late eminent civilian, who has well approved himself in the higher field and character of a Scripture critic.

"*An hour, and a day, and a month, and a year*, make 391 prophetical years and 15 days; or 385 Gregorian years and 156 dynasties. Alp Arslan, under whom were three other dynasties of Turks, crossed the Euphrates, and made a permanent conquest of Armenia and Georgia, Roman provinces, between the years 1065 and 1068, according to the chronology of Mr. Gibbon. From thence count 385 years and 156 days, and you will arrive at the war under Mahomet II., ending with the taking of Constantinople, on the 29th of May, 1453." *

* Critical Remarks by Dr. Ffrench Laurence, p. 139. See Archbishop Laurence's Tracts, vol. ii.

The period here chosen for the application of the prophetic numbers, coincides with the first grand loosing of the Turkish powers from the banks of "the great river Euphrates;" and seems to be determinately fixed as the true period intended, by the commission given in the prophecy to "the four angels *," to slay the "third part of men." For this commission has been rightly interpreted to portend the extinction of the Greek empire; and its final

* By the four angels, according to our great standard interpreters, the prophecy represents the four Turkish Sultanies, founded in the eleventh century, by four princes of the house of Seljuk. The author will not affect to conceal his displacency at the presumptuous tone, in which modern writers undertake to question, in this instance, the judgment of our Medes and Newtons. It is with no ordinary satisfaction, therefore, that he is able to adduce, from the work of a contemporary writer, the Abbot Ekkehard, whose Chronicle was composed A.D. 1117, a decisive confirmation of the generally-received opinion. The following is the impartial testimony of Ekkehard: "Inito per annos aliquos consilio, emerserunt ab *aquilonari* plaga de terra Gorizana — præscriptorum paganorum [scil. Turcorum] copiæ multæ, quæ, *sub quatuor Sultanis* divisæ (sic enim Satrapas suos nominare solent), uni tantum Persico imperatori pene divini cultus more subjecti, per *Armeniam*, indeque *Cappadociam*, *totamque Romaniam*, atque *Syriam*, diffusi sunt." — Ekkehardi Abbatis Libellus, ap. Martene et Durand, Vet. Monum. Collect. tom. v. f. 514. Our modern refiners of prophecy, to make way for their own fancies, have ventured to dispute the *existence* of the four Turkish Sultanies: let them be silenced, if not instructed, by this contemporary evidence. In the above extract, the distinction, between the imperial line of Togrul, and the rising house of Seljuk, we may observe, is accurately drawn; and the *four Seljukian princes* are marked out emphatically, as the actual scourge of Eastern Christendom; a point of fact, which clearly identifies them with the four angels, who were to be loosed from the Euphrates; as does the notice of their having emerged originally *ab aquilonari plaga*, with Daniel's "king of the North."

extinction was effected, through the agency of the Turks, by the capture of Constantinople.

By its army of two hundred thousand thousand horsemen *, the prophecy historically describes the primitive composition of the Turkish armies, which, as well as those of the Saracens, originally consisted exclusively of horse. Thus, Alp Arslan passed the Gihon, at the head of two hundred thousand horse. And the contingent which a single Turkish emir offered to place at the disposal of Mahmoud, Sultan of Gazna, amounted to the same number of two hundred thousand horse. † So that the "two hundred thousand thousand" horsemen of the Apocalypse most aptly denote the innumerable cavalry which composed the first Turkish armies.

The prophetic horses are represented as vomiting out of their mouths "fire, and smoke, and brimstone," by which, it is added, "the third part of men was killed." Bishop Newton and others understand this prediction of the Turkish cannon; the Turks being among the first belligerents who employed, on a great scale, that deadly engine of war. And it is certain, that to his heavy ordnance Mahomet II. was greatly indebted, for the reduction of Constantinople, the

* Rev. ix. 16. † Gibbon.

catastrophe generally allowed to be intended, in this place of the prophecy: "By these three was *the third part of men killed;* by *the fire*, and by *the smoke*, and by *the brimstone*, which issued out of their mouths."[3] In his eloquent narrative of the last fatal siege, Mr. Gibbon bears impartial testimony to the propriety of this application, when he thus details the preparations of the Turkish sultan: "Among the implements of destruction, he studied with peculiar care the recent and tremendous discovery of the Latins; and his artillery surpassed whatever had yet appeared in the world."

The agreement of the prophecy concerning the Euphratèan horsemen with the rise of the Turkish power, is rendered complete, by the marks which this prediction, in common with the preceding one of the locusts, contains of a spiritual tyranny: for, as the locusts "had tails like unto scorpions, and stings in their tails," so the tails of the horses "were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt."

The general connection observable between the visions in the Apocalypse, and those in the book of Daniel, has been already adverted to. But before we take leave of the ninth chapter of Revelation, it may be well to point out

some specific agreements, which seem to connect this chapter, very remarkably, with those prophecies of Daniel concerning the little horn of the he-goat, and the kings of the South and of the North, which, in another place, have been also applied to Mahometanism. *

1. The eastern little horn is presently described to the prophet as "a king of fierce countenance:" — the locusts in the Apocalypse "had a king over them," whose name, "Apollyon," *the destroyer*, identifies his prophetic character with that of the little horn. 2. The king of fierce countenance had an host given him, by whose instrumentality he should carry on his work of desolation: — the Saracenic locusts, formed, both in a temporal and in a spiritual sense, precisely such an host, under the conduct of their destroying king. 3. The little horn waxed great against *the host of heaven*, and cast down some of the host and of *the stars* to the ground: — *the sun* and *the air* were darkened by reason of the smoke of the bottomless pit, from out of which issued forth the locusts. 4. The little horn and its host were to *destroy* wonderfully; they were to *destroy* also the mighty and the holy people: — the *destroying* king, *Apollyon*, and his locusts, were grievously

* See section ii.

to *torment* men; and their successors in persecution, the horsemen of the Euphrates, were to *kill* the third part of men. 5. The king of the South, and the king of the North, powers prophetically descriptive of the empires of the Saracens and Turks, have been elsewhere identified with the vision of the eastern little horn. But the prophecy concerning these kings, contains, further, a remarkable coincidence with this ninth chapter of the Apocalypse, with which we may now close the proofs of a probable connection between the two predictions. Daniel, xi. 40., speaks of the king of the North as coming against the wilful king, or the Greek empire, "with *chariots*, and with *horses*." Now the armies of the Saracens, and those of the Turks, were alike exclusively composed of cavalry: and Saint John, Rev. ix. 9., introduces the very terms of Daniel's prophecy, to describe the onset of the Saracenic locusts: "the sound of their wings was as the sound of *chariots of many horses* running to battle."

The ninth chapter of revelation closes with a catalogue of the crimes which were to draw down so terrific judgments: the sins comprized in it resolve themselves into, the general perversion of religion by idolatry, and a general corruption of manners. The state of the Greek

church and empire in both respects, at the period of the rise of Mahomet, is matter of melancholy notoriety; as is also the fact, that Mahometanism professed itself to be a rod of iron, sent down by Heaven to scourge the idolatry of the nations. There seems wanting, therefore, no one circumstance of agreement, between the prophecy, and the period of history to which it is generally referred: but every thing, rather, concurs to manifest the perfect fulfilment of its plagues, by the Saracenic and Turkish visitations.

The book of Daniel, we have seen, contains two visions concerning two little horns: the first, or western horn, is universally allowed to denote Papal Rome; the second, or eastern horn, is understood, by good authorities, to typify the strikingly analogous, if not strictly parallel, ecclesiastico-political tyranny of Mahometanism. Now the Revelation of Saint John has a vision corresponding with those of Daniel, concerning two beasts: the first beast is universally recognized by commentators as identical with the first little horn, or the Papal power; and the second beast (a circumstance to which the reader will particularly attend) is admitted to apply to the Mahometan apostasy, even by writers who have interpreted otherwise

the second of Daniel's little horns. From the corresponding character of the symbols used by this prophet and by Saint John, and from the unquestionable identity of his first little horn with the first beast in the Apocalypse, I cannot hesitate in concluding the second little horn to be also identical with the second beast. Whence arises an additional presumption, in support of the application, previously made in these pages, of the eastern little horn of Daniel to Mahometanism. *

The vision of the two beasts occurs in the thirteenth chapter of the Apocalypse. Before we proceed to analyse the Apostle's description of the second beast, it may be not unadvisable to notice certain marks, which indicate the distinctness, and fix the respective locations, of these kindred symbols.

The first beast arose "up out of the sea;" the second beast came "up out of the earth:" that is, in other words, the former arose in the West; the latter, in the East. For, by the Jews, in their common parlance, Asia, as contra-distinguished from Europe, was denominated "the earth;" and Europe, as contra-distin-

* See section ii.

guished from Asia, "the sea*:" a fact which appears from Scripture itself, where Europe is spoken of by the title of "the Isles of the Sea." † The distinct locations, thus allotted to the two beasts by the terms of the prophecy, accordingly, have not passed unnoticed. "The Apostle," observes a learned writer of our own day, "was stationed on the sea-shore to view these wild beasts. The first rose from the sea, or westward, as he looked from the Isle of Patmos towards Europe. The second rose from the earth, or East, as he looked towards Asia."‡ Now those interpreters who understand the power of the second beast to be reducible to some modification only of the power of the first, inevitably take away this local distinctness, and in one form or other, confound the two beasts themselves together. But, as the authority just cited well subjoins, "they are clearly distinct; and their temporal and ecclesiastical powers, though acting in conjunction in the business of persecuting the two witnesses, ought not to be confounded."§

* "By *the earth*, the Jews understood the large continents of Asia and Africa, or all those places to which they had access by land; and by *the sea*, they meant the continent of Europe, and the numerous islands with which it is surrounded; or all those places to which they had access only by water." — Culbertson's Lectures on the Prophecies of St. John, vol. i. p. 291.

† Isaiah, xxiv. 15.

‡ Hales's New Analysis of Chronology.

§ Hales, ut supra.

The following is the prophecy concerning the second, or eastern beast: —

REVELATION, xiii.

"11. And I beheld another beast, coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. 12. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth, and them that dwell therein, to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. 13. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men: 14. And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword, and did live. 15. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. 16. And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: 17. And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name, of the beast, or the number of his name. 18. Here is wisdom: Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six."

The *affinity* and the *distinctness* of this and of the former beast appear alike undoubted. The

first beast denotes the power of the Papacy. It shall be our object to examine how far the second beast may appear, from its description in Saint John's vision, to agree with the character of Mahometanism.*

Before, however, we pursue this inquiry, it is essential that we should rightly apprehend *what it is* which constitutes the *foundation* of the similitude and relationship between the two apocalyptic beasts.

The reader will remark, then, as the key of this whole vision, that the beasts represent symbolically two great antichristian powers; and that it is in their character of antichristian powers, that they are exclusively contemplated in the prophecy. Now, in this view, it is ob-

* It is an interesting fact, which seems to have passed altogether unnoticed by the writers on Prophecy, that the vision of the second beast was universally understood of Mahomet and Mahometanism, in the age of Roger Bacon. This great man interprets the prophetic number *666*, as indicating the appointed term of the Mahometan apostasy; and joyfully anticipates the final downfal both of its empire and creed, as even then at hand, "aut *per Tartaros*, aut *per Christianos*." The interpretation, although contradicted by after events, was countenanced by the recent capture of Bagdad, and the final abolition of the Caliphate, by the idolatrous Tartars, under Holaghou Khan. A more *probable* interpretation could not, therefore, have been adopted at the close of the 13th century. See the Opus Majus, p. 167., for this remarkable context. Bacon appears to have arrived at his conclusion by the application of chronology; since he was himself contemporary with the seventh century of the Hejra, and, at the crisis to which he alludes, the six hundred and sixty-sixth year of that era was in the act of elapsing.

vious there subsists as true relationship, and as real grounds of comparison, between the ecclesiastico-political tyranny of Mahometanism, and that of Romanism, as though the analogy lay between the Eastern and Western churches themselves, or between any two antichristian powers, nominally Christian: for it is *the antichristian properties* which here furnish the comparison.

This consideration premised, we will proceed to show the connection of Mahometanism with the vision.

The first beast rose up "out of the sea:" but the second beast came up "out of the earth." The *earth*, we have seen, here signifies the *East*. The local rise of the second beast, therefore, agrees with the local rise of the Mahometan apostasy. But the prophetic terms of "the earth" and "the sea," may be curiously illustrated, conformably with this application, from a Turkish adage, which directly identifies the beast that came up out of the sea, with the Francs, or Latin Christians of Europe; and the beast which came up out of the earth, with the Mahometan powers. "The Turks," says Mr. Gibbon, "themselves acknowlege, that *if God had given them* THE EARTH, *he had left* THE SEA *to the infidels.*" The vision of the two beasts, there-

fore, interpreted as applying to Romanism and Mahometanism, characterizes the powers symbolized with *geographical* discrimination.*

The second beast, "had two horns *like* a lamb." A lamb is the symbol of a church: the power which was to appear in the *likeness* of a lamb, must, therefore be a *spurious* ecclesiastical power. "And he spake as a dragon." A dragon is the symbol of a political despotism: the power which was to speak as a dragon, must, therefore, be also a political tyranny. The twofold character accurately represents Mahometanism; and agrees equally well with no other application. A lamb typifies a church: but the *similitude* to a lamb indicates a *false* church: and such was Mahometanism. The Greek and the Roman might be fallen churches, but they were certainly not false ones.

The second, "exercised all the power of the first beast before him." Mahometanism fulfilled the prediction before the face of the Papal antichrist, by a like course of temporal and spiritual oppressions, and by like vain pre-

* With reference to Mahometanism, the fulfilment is most exact. For its *permanent* empire accurately coincides with that portion of the globe, which the Jews understood by the technical phrase "the earth," as contradistinguished from Europe, or "the sea;" namely, the continents of Asia and Africa.

tences to the performance of "signs and lying wonders."

He caused men "to make an image of the first beast," and had power "to give life unto the image." Mahometanism verified the prophecy, by setting up an antichristian tyranny, the counterpart or image of Popery, yet, at the same time, wholly independent of it, and having a life and power of its own.

He compelled men to worship this living image; which he endowed with the gift of speech, and with authority to cause all who refused to worship it to be *slain*. Mahometanism exacted of mankind *such* spiritual prostration; and employed the penalty of death to enforce the exaction. Death or conversion was its brief alternative to idolaters: and even to the followers of Christianity, its sanguinary language was, "Ye Christian dogs, ye know your option; the Koran, the tribute, or the *sword*." *

In the last place, the second beast of the Apocalypse caused all classes and conditions of mankind, "both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his

* Gibbon.

name." In other words, that they only should be capable of civil and social privileges, who either bore the brand of the beast as his slaves; or who confessed his name and authority, and studied the mystery of his doctrines, as his disciples. This is the natural import of the passage: and never has history supplied a more perfect commentary on prophecy, than this passage receives from the facts of Mahometan domination. As applied to the disciples of Islam, the sense is at once fully explained by the three qualifications necessary to entitle converts to the rank and immunities of true believers; namely, the mark of circumcision, the confession of faith in the name of Mahomet *, and the reception and study of the Koran, as the book of God. But, as understood of its Christian subjects and tributaries, this prophecy finds such an exposition and accomplishment, as may satisfy the most cautious and sober judgment. For the persecutions carried on against the Christians of Egypt and of Western Africa, by their Mahometan masters, verify, even to the letter, the words of this pre-

* The words of the prophecy, Rev. xiii. 17., cannot find a better expositor than Mr. Gibbon. "*By the repetition of a sentence, and the loss of a foreskin*, the subject or the slave, the captive or the criminal, arose in a moment the free and equal companion of the victorious Moslems."

diction. Elmacin records of Asam, the Saracenic governor of Egypt, under the Caliph Solyman Ebn Abdulmelek, that, among other measures of persecution, he imposed a *capitation* tax on the Egyptian monks, which was enforced by hitherto-unheard-of cruelties. In order to ascertain the numbers subject to the tax, Asam caused these monks *to be branded in the hand with an iron ring or seal.* He further enacted, that all those, who should be detected without the appointed legal mark, should have their hands cut off. And this inhuman enactment, the tyrant carried into effect, by a general inquisition throughout the monasteries: where, finding multitudes of his unhappy victims with unmarked hands, he caused many of them to be beheaded, and many more to be scourged to death. The enormities of Asam were renewed, with redoubled violence, by his more infamous successor, Abdallah. This monster doubled the poll tax imposed by his predecessor; commanded both men and beasts to be numbered, and made equally liable to it; and sealed the Christian inhabitants with a certain mark, or brand, bearing the figure of a lion, under the penalty of instant amputation of the offending member, should the hands of any be discovered, unseared by the fatal mark. From

Egypt, Abdallah was transferred to the government of Western Africa; where, by the repetition of his Egyptian enormities, in the persecution of the Christian name and profession, he at length gave rise to a general insurrection. [4] Can these historical facts be impartially compared with the words of the prediction, Rev. xiii. 17., and yet a doubt remain as to the fulfilment?

So many solutions have been proposed, for the numerical enigma concealed in *the name* of the second beast, that, unless so far as the interpretation offered may be substantiated by other proofs, little or no weight can be attached to any of them. When viewed in connection with the whole of the preceding coincidences, it is, however, remarkable, that the name of Mahomet, *as written in the idiom of the Apocalypse*, by the Byzantine historians, accurately returns the prophetic number 666. This mystical number (understood, it has been shown, of Mahometanism, by Roger Bacon,) was first applied to Mahomet personally, by Fevardentius; and I am obliged to subscribe the judgment of a venerable authority still living, that *his* interpretation is preferable to all succeeding conjectures.

The application to Mahometanism, which has now been made, of the prophecy concerning the

second apocalyptic beast, cannot be more suitably summed up, than in the words of the writer last alluded to, the truly learned and ingenious Dr. Hales, who understands this prediction of "Islamism, a new *ecclesiastical* power in the East, 'the image' of the *Papal* in blasphemy and persecution, founded by 'the false prophet,' Mahomet." *

But the second beast, which came up out of the earth, has, by approved expositors, been further and most satisfactorily identified with "the false prophet" mentioned, Rev. xvi. 13., in connection with "the dragon," and the Papal "beast." [5] His new appellation supplies a fresh circumstance to the general proof of his identity with Mahomet, to whom the title of *false prophet* superlatively belongs. Both symbols, it follows, must be identical in import with *the falling star*, Rev. ix. 1., the acknowledged and undoubted type of the Arabian antichrist. Now it may be important to notice, as a final link in the connection of these several prophecies, that, as the star which fell from heaven begins his work of desolation in conjunction with the angel of the abyss, or the devil, — giving free egress to Apollyon and his locust followers, by opening the bottomless pit; and as he after-

* New Analysis of Chronology.

wards re-appears, Rev. xiii., in the shape of the second beast in conjunction with the first, or Papal beast, and the dragon; so, Rev. xx. 10., under the appellation of the false prophet, this same antichristian power, and the dragon, and the Papal beast, are together consigned for ever to the same bottomless pit, or abyss, from whence they had been before severally described to have arisen. In other words, Rev. xvi. 13., the devil, the Papacy, and the Mahometan apostasy, under the titles of "the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet," appear united in the conduct of a simultaneous work; and, Rev. xx. 10., they re-appear, united in a simultaneous condemnation.

These prophetical anticipations will be seen hereafter in their true force, as unfolded by events, when we come to compare historically the two great antichristian apostasies.*

In observing upon the prophetical anticipations of Mahometanism, discernible in the Old and New Testaments, our remarks have been hitherto confined to passages already so applied by former interpreters. The sacred Scriptures, however, must be presumed still to contain, what a great Christian philosopher has termed, *un-*

* See section x.

*heeded prophecies.** One passage, and only one, I would here beg leave to submit to the better judgment of others; to my own it appears of this description.

The passage in question, is a prediction delivered by our Lord himself; and forms a link in the wonderful chain of prophecies comprised in the twenty-fourth chapter of Saint Matthew. This passage, although, so far as I know, it has never yet been interpreted of Mahometanism, contains a representation so clear, exact, and literal, of the country, pretensions, and personal character of Mahomet, that, looking simply to the description drawn, and to the expressions in which it is couched, nothing seems wanting to bring it home to that heresiarch.

The character, moreover, and objects of the discourse, in which the prediction occurs, fully bear out and sanction this specific application of it. For it is a *germinant* prophecy, uniting in the same expressions, the impending desolation of Jerusalem, with the final judgment of the world; and extending its view, from the apostasies which were to precede the fall of the desecrated and devoted city, to those which

* "I meet with much fewer than I could wish, who make it their business to search the Scriptures for — unheeded prophecies, overlooked mysteries, and strange harmonies." — ROBERT BOYLE.

should follow to the end of time. In a view thus comprehensive, there is every antecedent ground for believing, that, where the lesser and nearer apostasies are so remembered, the greater and more distant would not be forgotten: the very occurrence, in such a context, of expressions *applicable* to the Arabian antichrist, affords, it may be added, a strong presumption that we are not wrong in so applying them. But let the reader consider for himself the following passage, and form his own judgment as to the proposed application *: —

SAINT MATTHEW, xxiv.

"23. Then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. 24. For there shall arise *false christs* and *false prophets*, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch, that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. 25. Behold, I have told you before. 26. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, HE IS IN THE DESERT; go not forth: Behold, HE IS IN THE SECRET CHAMBERS; believe it not."

Attempts have been made, by different expositors, to instance fulfilments of this pre-

* It is to be observed, that in proposing any interpretation of *germinant* prophecy as *just*, we would not maintain that it is *exclusively* so. It belongs to the essence of such prophecies, to adumbrate, by the same phrascology, different characters, and distinct events, whether successive or simultaneous.

diction, in the times immediately preceding the fall of Jerusalem. Let the several expositions offered, be only compared with the marks which shall now be noticed, in proof of its matter-of-fact fulfilment in the person and lying pretensions of Mahomet; and the justness of the interpretation may safely be left to be determined by the result of the comparison.

"There shall arise false Christs:"] Mahomet, at the outset of his imposture, offered himself formally to the Jews as their promised Messiah; and is universally spoken of by Christian interpreters, and recognized by the whole Christian world, as antichrist, or one of his chief heads.

"And false prophets:"] Mahomet assumed the title of "the prophet of God;" and thereby constituted himself, in the proper sense of our Lord's words, a "false prophet:" accordingly, it has been already seen, he is expressly styled, in the Apocalypse, "the false prophet."

"And shall show great signs and wonders:"] Mahomet laid claim to supernatural communications with angels, and to immediate conference with God himself, in heaven; he set up the Koran as the greatest of miracles; and his pretensions to miraculous powers appear to have been bounded solely by his prudence, and by the fear of detection and exposure.

"Insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect:"] This part of the prophecy has found a fatal fulfilment in the innumerable apostasies to Mahometanism which have taken place within the Christian church, from the first rise of that arch-heresy to the present day. [6]

"Behold, he is in the desert:"] Christ, it will be had in remembrance, pronounced the prophecy in a country immediately adjoining the Arabian desert; can it, then, be matter of reasonable doubt, when we take into account the conspicuous place which the Arabian heresiarch and his apostasy hold elsewhere in the prophetic Scriptures, that the finger of God is here laid on the birth-place of Mahomet and Mahometanism?

"Behold, he is in the secret chambers:"] In the inner apartments of the house, in its most private recesses: both the Greek term in the New Testament, and its Hebrew equivalent in the Old, have a significancy not to be misunderstood *; the prophecy here pourtrays Mahomet to the life, in his proper character; and pursues him to those hidden scenes of "chambering and

* For the signification of ταμεῖον, see Schleusner in voc.: for that of חדר, which, in the Septuagint version, is uniformly rendered by ταμεῖον, comp. Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon.

wantonness," which set the seal of antichrist on himself and his religion.

In commenting on the several passages of Scripture, which have been submitted in these pages as prophetical anticipations of the rise and progress of Mahometanism, it has been our object to establish, in each example, by internal evidences, the appropriateness of the application.

For two of the passages in question, namely, Dan. viii. 9—25., and Rev. xiii. 11—18., various other interpretations have been assigned, by very high authorities. Each of these interpretations, however, it will be observed, terminates in reducing the *Eastern* little horn of Daniel, and the apocalyptic beast *that came up out of the earth* (or out of the *East*), in one form or other, to the *Western* church or empire. Now the Roman church and empire in the West have their own known and proper symbols in both these books; while it seems contrary to the whole nature and ends of prophecy, and contradictory to the general analogy of the prophetic Scriptures, thus to explain one distinct set of symbols, into modifications merely, and subordinate parts of another. Prophecy may be defined *the interpreter of Providence;* and, as a light sent of God, we have the best reason to anticipate, that the interpretation shall expound

the whole text; that is to say, that the predictions of prophecy shall be found, on examination, commensurate with the course of Providence. If this first principle be a sound one, our only safe introduction to the study of the prophetic Scriptures must be the previous contemplation, in due proportion to their relative magnitude and moment, of those great events more immediately connected with the church of God, which have come down to us upon the stream of time. Now the greatest events which have either affected God's church, or taken place in the world, since the first promulgation of Christianity, beyond all question are, the Papal and the Mahometan apostasies; powers similar in their character, and simultaneous in their rise; the one overshadowing Western, the other overwhelming Eastern Christendom.

The former of these apostasies has undoubtedly been foretold by Daniel, under the symbol of a little horn, and by Saint John (besides other representations), under the emblem of a beast which came up out of the sea; both images being appropriately connected with the Western empire. But Daniel has a second symbol of a little horn, and Saint John a second symbol of a beast, which came up out of the earth; both emblems being apparently con-

nected with the history of the Eastern empire. If we understand the latter pair of symbols, as some commentators have done, of the Latin power civil or ecclesiastical, in any sense whatsoever, they become unavoidably reduced to modifications of the former: that is, they resolve themselves into predictions belonging to *Western* Christendom; and *Eastern* Christendom remains without its proper rank and place in prophecy. If, on the other hand, we interpret them of Mahometanism, the balance is restored; prophecy goes hand in hand with Providence, in both portions of the universal church; foreshowing, concerning each, the retributive visitations which have actually befallen them.

These reflections naturally lead us on, from the prophetical anticipations of the rise of Mahomet, to the prophetical parallel between Mahometanism and Christianity. The two little horns in the book of Daniel, and the two beasts in the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, have been already introduced in general terms as predictions descriptive, the first horn and the first beast of the Papal, the second horn and the second beast of the Mahometan tyranny. We will now dispose these parallel prophecies in one view: from their simple juxta-position, the reader will be enabled to judge for himself, how

far the double reference to Popery and Mahometanism is sustained by the relation of the passages between themselves, and by their respective correspondence with the historical characters of those two great apostasies, viewed as providentially related systems.[7]

DANIEL, vii. (THE WESTERN VISION.)	DANIEL, viii. (THE EASTERN VISION.)
"7. After this I saw in the night-visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.	"8. The he-goat waxed very great:
	and when he was strong, the great horn was broken;
	and for it came up four notable ones, toward the four winds of heaven.
"8. I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom, there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold, in this horn were eyes, like the eyes of man,	"9. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the South, and toward the East, and toward the pleasant land.
and a mouth speaking great things.	"10. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars, to the ground, and it stamped upon them.

DANIEL, vii.

(THE WESTERN VISION.)

" 11. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake.

" 21. I beheld, and the same horn

made war with the saints, and prevailed against them."

THE WESTERN INTERPRETATION.

" 16. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things.

" 23. The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.

" 24. And

the ten horns out of this kingdom,
are ten kings that shall arise:

DANIEL, viii.

(THE EASTERN VISION.)

" 11. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.

" 12. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression; and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practised and prospered."

THE EASTERN INTERPRETATION.

" 19. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end.

" 21. The rough goat is the king of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king.

" 22. Now, that being broken, whereas four stood up for it,

four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.

DANIEL, vii. (THE WESTERN INTERPRETATION.)	DANIEL, viii. (THE EASTERN INTERPRETATION.)
and another shall rise after them,	"23. And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to
and he shall be diverse from the first,	the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.
"and he shall subdue three kings.	"24. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully,
"25. And he shall speak great words against the most High,	and shall prosper and practise,
and shall wear out the saints of the most High,	and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.
and think to change times and laws:	"25. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes: but he shall be broken without hand."
and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time.	"Dan. xii. 6. How long to the end of these wonders?
	"7. For a time, times, and and an half;

DANIEL, vii. (THE WESTERN INTERPRETATION.)	DANIEL, xii. (THE EASTERN INTERPRETATION.)
"26. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end."	and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these [wonders] shall be finished."[8]

Of the two little horns in these corresponding predictions, the first, or that occurring in the seventh chapter, is here understood to symbolize the Papacy; the second, or that introduced in the eighth, to typify Mahometanism. In order to judge of the correctness of both applications, it is essential that we observe, first, the contrast, and then the coincidences, between the two contexts.

1. The former horn, Dan. vii., was to come up from *among* the *ten* horns of the fourth beast; the latter horn, Dan. viii. was to come forth out of *one* of the *four* horns of the he-goat, or the third beast.

2. The first little horn, consequently, was to arise in the West; the second, in the East: the one, out of the Roman; the other, out of the Macedonian, empire.

3. The first was to be a conquering power, for it was *to root up three kingdoms;* and a persecuting power, for it was *to wear out the saints*

of the Most High: the second was also to be a conquering power; but on a far more extended scale, for it was *to wax exceeding great toward three points of the heavens;* and a persecuting power, but with still more sanguinary devastation; for it was *to destroy wonderfully,* and *to destroy the mighty and the holy people.*

These discriminative marks may suffice to show the tyrannies represented by the two little horns, to be two distinct antichristian powers: while the distinctness of character indicated by them, is precisely that which actually obtains, and which discriminates between the Papacy and Mahometanism: the one, like the first horn, arising in the West, and amidst the ten kingdoms of the subdivided Roman empire; the other, like the second horn, springing up in the East, and out of one of the four kingdoms of the subdivided Macedonian empire: the Papacy, again, like the former horn, was a limited temporal conqueror, but an universal spiritual persecutor; Mahometanism, like the latter horn, was both an universal temporal conqueror, and an universal spiritual persecutor and destroyer.

The coincidences, on the other hand, between the prophetic horns, are equally numerous and striking.

1. Both conquerors, 2. both persecutors, they were both alike, 3. to set up kingdoms, 4. to

wear out, or destroy, the saints, or people of God, and, 5. to stand up, or speak blasphemy, against the Most High. — A union of characteristic qualities in the types, which clearly denotes, in the antitypes, the union of temporal with spiritual tyranny: while the whole characteristics specified meet together in the Papacy, and in Mahometanism; which powers have respectively realized the twofold despotism prefigured, in a manner, and on a scale, of which the history of the world affords no third example.

6. In the two prophecies, moreover, the same period is very specifically assigned for the duration of each of the little horns: a mark of chronological correspondence which may fairly be adduced as betokening a probable coincidence in their rise. Now it has been already intimated, and shall presently be more fully shown, that the Papal and Mahometan apostasies were, in point of fact, simultaneous in their rise; and that they have continued conjointly to afflict Christendom, in the West, and in the East, through the greater part, at least through more than twelve hundred years, of the appointed period.

If, therefore, in another place of this work, grounds have been shown, from the internal evidence of the context, Dan. vii., to authorize

our identifying Mahometanism with the symbol of the eastern little horn *, the force of our former conclusion certainly is not diminished by the close parallel now ascertained to subsist between the related prophecies respecting the two little horns, considered as connected, the first, with Popery, and the second, with Mahometanism. For these remarkable predictions, it would appear, unquestionably point toward two distinct powers, of the same kind, and seemingly coincident in their origin and duration; the one belonging to the West, the other to the East: but, Popery being incontrovertibly the prefigured western tyranny, the eastern tyranny must necessarily be one corresponding in character with it; and the only power which ever arose in Asia, thus corresponding with the Papacy, is the great antichristian heresy of Mahomet.

From the comparative view which has just been taken of Daniel's two little horns, contemplated in their respective applications, to the Papacy, and to Mahometanism, we proceed to a similar comparison, with the same application, of Saint John's vision of the two apocalyptic beasts.

The identity of the second beast of the Apocalypse with the second horn of Daniel,

* See section ii.

and, consequently, with the Mahometan apostasy, has been already inferred from the internal evidences. It remains to be seen, how far the inference may derive strength from a comparison of the two beasts, similar to that previously instituted between the two little horns.

REVELATION, xiii. (THE FIRST, OR WESTERN, BEAST.)	REVELATION, xiii. (THE SECOND, OR EASTERN, BEAST.)
" 1. And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads, and ten horns; and upon his horns, ten crowns; and upon his heads, the name of blasphemy.	" 11. And I beheld another beast, coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns, like a lamb, and he spake as a *dragon*.
" 2. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the *dragon* gave him his power, and his seat *, and great authority.	" 12. And he exerciseth all the authority of the first beast, before him; and causeth the earth, and them which dwell therein, to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.
" 3. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.	" 13. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.

* τὸν θρόνον. The word ἐξουσία is rendered uniformly, throughout these passages, as our translators have rendered it in this verse, by the word *authority*.

REVELATION, xiii.

(THE FIRST, OR WESTERN, BEAST.)

"4. And they worshipped the dragon, which gave authority unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him?

"5. And there was given unto him a mouth, speaking great things, and blasphemies; and authority was given unto him to continue forty and two months.

"6. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

"7. And it was given unto him, to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and authority was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.

"8. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the

REVELATION, xiii.

(THE SECOND, OR EASTERN, BEAST.)

"14. And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by the means of those miracles, which he had authority to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.

"15. And it was given unto him*, to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

"16. And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads.

"17. And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

* ἐδόθη αὐτῷ. See also v. 7.

REVELATION, xiii.

(THE FIRST, OR WESTERN, BEAST.)

Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

"9. If any man have an ear let him hear.

"10. He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

REVELATION, xiii.

(THE SECOND, OR EASTERN, BEAST.)

"18. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred, threescore, and six." *

The identity of the second beast in this vision with the Mahometan apostasy, has been already inferred from the local position and characteristic properties assigned to it, in its part of the prophecy. The correspondence of this symbol

* However interpreters may differ in their expositions of Rev. xiii., it will hardly be disputed, by any, that *antichrist* is the power depicted under the figures of the two beasts. But both Saint John and Saint Paul, in their principal descriptions of antichrist, addressed themselves, it will be remembered, to *eastern* Christians; that is, to churches lying within the pale of the Macedonian empire, and eventually forming the eastern or Greek church. Now, this being so, it seems incredible, that the East should not be equally a sufferer with the West, by antichristian tyranny in some shape. But if the Papacy be alone the antichrist foreshown, eastern Christendom manifestly has not experieneed *its* antichristian visitation, although so pre-eminently taught, by Christ and his apostles, to expect the scourge. Mahometanism, however, fearfully fills up the chasm; as has been well observed by the learned Hottinger, who pronounces "Muhammedem ipsum — *antichristum orientalem.*" Compare Hist. Orient. pp. 10. and 62.

with Mahometanism may be now further confirmed by two additional considerations: namely, 1. The obvious agreement of character between Saint John's vision of the two beasts, and Daniel's visions of the two little horns, of which the second has been elsewhere appropriated to Mahometanism; and, 2. The marked propriety with which the Apostle's descriptions of the beasts (like the prophet's descriptions of the horns), when compared together, tally with the characters of the two great rival antichrists, the Papacy and Mahometanism.

1. The two beasts of the Apocalypse evince their identity with the two little horns of Daniel, by several conclusive marks.

Like the first horn, the first beast arose in the West. As that horn sprang up amidst the horns of the fourth beast, or the empire of Pagan Rome, — so this beast derived its authority from the dragon, or Pagan Roman empire, whose throne, or seat of government, it occupied. Like the horn, it had "a mouth speaking great things:" and, as the horn "spake great things against the Most High," so the beast "opened his mouth in blasphemy against God." The horn was "to wear out the saints of the Most High;" the beast, "to make war with the saints, and to overcome them." The first beast, in

fine, has the same prophetic term with the first horn, appointed for its dominion; namely, "forty and two months," equivalent to "a time, times, and the dividing of a time." There can, then, be hardly a doubt, that the first beast of the Apocalypse is the same power with the first little horn of Daniel.

Like the second horn, on the other hand, the second beast arose in the East. As that horn trampled under foot the host of heaven, took away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of God's sanctuary, and the truth, to the ground; so did this beast, inasmuch as "he exercised *all* the authority of the first beast," which "opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven;" "and caused that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." As the horn, "through his policy," was "to cause craft to prosper in his hand," so the beast "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by the means of those miracles, which he had authority to do in the sight of the beast." The second beast, in fine, appears to have the same appointed term of duration with the second horn; for "he exerciseth *all* the authority of the first beast;" but as part of this, we find expressly specified

"authority to continue forty and two months," equivalent to "a time, times, and a half," the period appointed to the second horn. There appears, therefore, good warrant for the conclusion that the second beast of the Apocalypse is one and the same with the second horn of Daniel.

From the contrast preserved, both by Daniel and by Saint John, between the powers thus symbolized by the two little horns, and by the two beasts, it is plain that these symbols denote two *distinct* tyrannies; and from the strong and close coincidences expressed in the descriptions of both prophecies, it is not less plain, that the symbols in question represent, moreover, two *kindred* tyrannies.

The true character of these related powers remains to be ascertained.

The first, symbolized by the first horn, and the first beast, is unquestionably an ecclesiastico-political power, for it is the Papacy. And the second may be shown to be a power of the same kind with the Papacy, by the marks of the second beast; for it had horns like a lamb, denoting it to be a spurious church; and it spake as a dragon, indicative of its being a civil polity. A fact established by the consideration, that the authority exercised by the second, was

the exact counterpart of that belonging to the first, beast; who had his authority from the dragon, or imperial Rome. But Mahometanism is exactly characterized by such an ecclesiastico-political symbol.

Against the application of the vision of the second beast to Mahometanism, some objections have been raised, which, however forcible they may appear at first sight, on examination may be found materially to strengthen and confirm this interpretation of the prophecy. Thus it is asked, How can Mahometanism be said "to worship the first beast," or the Papal power? How, "to exercise all the authority of the first beast before him?" How, to enjoin "them that dwell on the earth to make an image to the beast?" How, itself, "to give life unto the image of the beast?" &c.

On these, and several similar objections, I would observe, that the great error of the objectors appears to lie in their omission to regard the Papacy and Mahometanism in the light in which the prophecy here undoubtedly presents the two beasts, namely, exclusively in their characters of *antichristian* powers. In this, the only proper aspect, the comparison of Mahometanism with the Papacy is as just and apposite as a comparison between any two anti-

christian powers, nominally Christian; and thus contemplated, every expression objected against, in the second part of the vision, has its true and appropriate reference to the first part.

The second beast, or the Mahometan apostasy, may properly be said to cause mankind to worship the first beast, or the Papal apostasy, in the sense intended in the prophecy. For the worship mentioned in the twelfth verse is explained, in the fifteenth, as offered, *not* to the first beast, but to the *image* of the first beast, to which the second had power to give life. If we are to follow the geographical marks laid down in the prophecy, this *image* cannot be more correctly interpreted, than of an antichristian tyranny to be erected in the East, wearing the resemblance of a previously existing antichristian tyranny in the West: in other words, than of Mahometanism, as the counterpart of Popery; or rather of that great antichristian tyranny, which found its maturity in the erection of the Papal power.

For the first beast, it must here be observed, seems intended to represent, not so much the Papacy specifically, as the Papacy in its generic character, as western head of antichrist. Now, though the western antichrist reached its maturity not earlier than the commencement of the

seventh century, the leaven which produced it was actively at work in the first. For Saint Paul, in his vivid prediction of the Papal apostasy (2 Thess. ii. 3—12.), expressly acquaints the primitive churches, that "the mystery of iniquity doth already work."

The western antichristian tyranny, then, which issued in the domination of Papal Rome, and which is figured by the first beast, clearly had its existence *before* the second beast, or the eastern antichristian tyranny. When Mahomet, therefore, set up in the East his rival, but cognate, apostasy, he is, with strict propriety, described as causing "the *earth* and them that dwell therein," that is, the *East* and its inhabitants, to worship the living image of the first beast, — of the previously existing western antichrist; the later, and imitative apostasy, being justly characterized, as the image or likeness of the earlier and original one.

But Mahometanism may, in a sense yet more appropriate, be entitled the *image* of Popery. For the Papal antichrist sprang up *within* the Christian church; while the Mahometan antichrist was only grafted *upon* it. The latter apostasy may, therefore, be most justly regarded as bearing the same relation to the former, which the

image or likeness bears to the original, — the shadow to the substance.

The Papacy, again, from the rank of a Christian church, had degenerated into an antichristian power: but Mahometanism, while it became an antichristian power, never had held the place of a Christian church.

Popery, lastly, derived its relation to Christianity, by genuine descent; while Mahometanism acquired its place as a Christian heresy, solely by arbitrary imitation.

Thus, in whatever aspect we regard it, the antichristian tyranny erected by Mahometanism in the East, seems accurately delineated in Saint John's vision, as the image of the first beast, set up, and given life to, by the second.

In a sense precisely corresponding with that in which the second beast, or the Mahometan apostasy, may be said to have set up the image, it can further be shown to have fulfilled another condition of the prophecy; to have exercised all the authority of the first beast before him.

The authority of the first beast is expressly stated in the vision to have been conferred on him by the dragon, which "gave him his power, and his throne, and great authority." A statement which perfectly describes the Papacy; a power whose authority was not pro-

perly its own, but derived from the Roman empire; and which sat in the seat of that empire, to rule over the nations.

Now, when it is said of the second beast, that "he exercised all the authority of the first beast, before his face," the expression by no means intimates, that his authority was *derived* from the first beast, but only that it was the same, or of the same kind, with the authority of the first; and not only independent of, but even opposed to, that authority; the phrase "before his face," having the force of hostile opposition. * The authority thus characterized is accurately descriptive of the Mahometan domination, which exercised in the East a persecuting tyranny, the same in character with that employed by the Papal antichrist in the West; which especially vented its kindred spirit of persecution, in hostile encounters with the Papal power; and which, instead of deriving its authority from the dragon, or Roman empire, seized on all the authority of that empire by force, and wielded the arms of the eastern, for the subversion of the western, division of it.

The *independent* authority exercised by the

* The expression is a Hebraism; and is to be understood in the same sense with the equivalent prediction concerning Ishmael, "He shall dwell in the presence (literally, *before the face*) of all his brethren."

second beast faithfully represents the Mahometan apostasy; and agrees with no Christian ecclesiastical power.

Enough, perhaps, has been advanced to show, that the beasts in Saint John's vision prefigure two *distinct* antichristian powers. Something may yet be added, with advantage, to the proof, that they represent also two *kindred* antichristian powers.

It has been noticed, that the two beasts appear to the Apostle in the same vision; and seem to rise up, the one from the West and the other from the East, pretty nearly together, in point of time. It has been remarked, further, that they appear to have the same appointed term of continuance: since the second "exercised *all* the authority of the first;" a part of which authority consisted in his duration, inasmuch as "authority was given unto him to continue forty and two months." "Forty and two months" must, therefore, be reckoned as the common period of continuance for both beasts.*

The application can scarcely be mistaken or

* "There is good reason to believe, that as the two beasts are to perish together, (Rev. xix. 20.) so, their period being of the same length, that they arose together." Woodhouse on the Apocalypse, p. 363. While, on several points, the author is obliged to differ from the excellent Dean of Lichfield, he cannot do so, without expressing the most unfeigned respect for his learning, ability, and piety.

evaded, when, on bringing to the experimental test of history the chronological concurrence thus ascribed by prophecy to these related symbols, we find that Popery and Mahometanism originally sprang up together, the former in the West, the latter in the East; that they afterwards advanced progressively together, to a common height of power; and that now, after the expiration of twelve centuries, or of more than forty of the forty and two prophetic months, they apparently together approach the term of their decline.

The reader may naturally chuse to examine more fully for himself, the parallel course of these rival antichrists. Any further statements of this parallel, I prefer to submit in the words of others, rather than in my own. For, however imperfectly deduced, that argument may, at least, be proposed without uneasy apprehension, which can present its conclusions respecting prophecy, in the words of Prideaux, and of Bishop Newton.

"It is to be observed," says the former of these eminent writers, "that Mahomet began his imposture about the same time, that the Bishop of Rome, by virtue of a grant from the wicked tyrant Phocas, first assumed the title of universal pastor; and, thereon, claimed to him-

self that supremacy, which he hath been ever since endeavouring to usurp over the Christian church. Phocas made this grant A.D. 606, which was the very year that Mahomet retired to his cave to forge that imposture there, which, two years after, A.D. 608, he began to propagate at Mecca. And from this time, *both* having conspired to found themselves an empire in imposture, their followers have been ever since endeavouring, *by the same methods*, that is, those of fire and sword, to propagate it among mankind. *So that* ANTICHRIST *seems, at this time, to have set both his feet upon Christendom together, the one in the East, and the other in the West.*" *

"The angel," says Bishop Newton, "having finished his prophecy of the things 'noted in the Scripture of truth,' an inquiry is made relating to *the time of these events.* It was said before, Dan. xi. 40., 'At the time of *the end* shall the king of the South push at him:' and here the question is asked, Dan. xii. 6., 'How long shall be the end of these wonders?' The answer is returned in the most solemn manner, ver. 7., 'that it shall be for a time, times, and an half.' A time, times, and a half, are three prophetic years and a half; and three prophetic years and a half are 1260 prophetic days; and

* Life of Mahomet, p. 13. eighth edition.

1260 prophetic days are 1260 years. *The same time*, therefore, is prefixed for the desolation and oppression of the eastern church, as for the tyranny of the little horn, Dan. vii. 25., in the western church: and it is wonderfully remarkable, that the doctrine of Mohammed was first forged at Mecca, and the supremacy of the Pope was established by virtue of a grant from the tyrant Phocas, in the very same year of Christ 606." *

To close our authorities on this most important subject, in the words of the venerable Dr. Hales: "It is signally remarkable, that the two great persecuting powers of Popery and Islamism rose together, about A.D. 620, arrived at their meridian grandeur together, about A.D. 1300, have since gradually declined together, and will probably set together in that abyss from which they rose. 'This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.'" †

* Bishop Newton on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 126. edit. 12mo.

† New Analysis of Chronology, vol. ii. p. 1348. Dr. Hales dates the rise of Popery and Mahometanism fourteen years later, than the year fixed on, for their joint commencement, by Prideaux and Bishop Newton. Minute variations as to the chronology are immaterial: perhaps interpreters would have judged more wisely, had they abstained from specifying dates too minutely, even respecting *fulfilled* predictions. In the present case, for example, would it not have been quite enough to establish, what few if any will venture to deny, that the Papal and Mahometan powers sprang up together, about the beginning of the seventh century? Whether

When we examine the several periods assigned in Scripture for the reign of antichrist, they plainly appear to be reducible to one and the same term: the visions of the two little horns in Daniel, and that of the two beasts in the Apocalypse, together with some other predictions in these books, applicable to the Papacy, and to Mahometanism, falling all under the same given note of time; namely, "a time, times, and an half," or "forty and two months," or "twelve hundred and sixty days." Now, according to the authorities above cited, and to the indisputable evidence of events, it is further apparent, that this prophetic note of time has been historically explained and verified by the simultaneous rise, progress, and decadency, of the Papal and Mahometan apostasies; to both of which, the prophecies in question had, on grounds of internal evidence, been before severally applied. The chronological coincidence here brought into view thus reflects back on the whole previous argument; and seems entitled to considerable weight in confirming our general application of those prophecies.

---

the retreat to the cave of Hera, or the flight to Medina, be the true date of the rise of Mahometanism, may be fair matter of conjecture; and can be nothing more.

In addition to the series of proofs already advanced, it may be mentioned, that Bishop Newton has noticed, in the conclusion of the book of Daniel, "some intimations, that the religion of Mohammed shall prevail in the East for as long a period as the tyranny of the little horn in the West." From the clear concurrence of history with prophecy in verifying those intimations, that learned prelate further infers the probability, "that the 1260 years of the reign of antichrist are to be dated from this time." *

It may serve to strengthen this probability, if we consider, that, according to Scripture, the twelve hundred and sixty days, or "time of the end," is a period of apostasy and persecution. As such, it can be measured only by a period of persecution and apostasy; and by one, moreover, which shall comprehend it. But such a period we may seek after in vain, save in the Papal and Mahometan tyrannies; which, beginning together in the seventh century, continue to exist in the nineteenth.

Holding it, however, for a fundamental principle, arising out of the very nature and end of prophecy, that the times and the seasons indicated in the prophetic Scriptures must have reached their accomplishment, before they can be fully known, the present writer is neither

* Compare Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel, p. 91.

desirous to affirm the conclusions of others respecting those mysterious dates, nor to advance conclusions of his own: especially remembering where it is written, — "Of that day and hour knoweth no man."*

Merely as a conjecture, illustrative of preceding conjectures on the chronology of these prophecies, he would, however, venture to suggest the *possibility*, that the era of the Hejra, according to Mahometans themselves, unquestionably the measure of Mahometan dominion, may also be that of Saint John's "twelve hundred and sixty days."† On this supposition, "the time of the end" must synchronize with A. H. 1260.‡

* St. Matt. xxiv. 36. St. Mark, xiii. 32.

† Rev. xi. 3. xii. 6.

‡ Even thus much the author would hesitate to conjecture, did he conceive "the time of the end" necessarily to include more than the general *political* downfal of Mahometanism. The *political rise* of this power entered largely into Daniel's description of that prophetic period, in the commencement; its *political extinction*, therefore, may well occupy a prominent place in his description of the close. That this downfal, though silently, yet surely, draws near the predicted consummation, may be inferred from past events. Since the middle of the seventeenth century, the empire of the crescent has been every where on the wane: the era of Turkish conquest ended with the second failure before Vienna; and the Ottoman, once the scourge and terror, has long been the contempt, of Christendom: Persia, again, torn by internal dissensions, had sunk into insignificance at a still earlier period; and her fitful blaze of conquest, under Nadir Shah, served but to hasten the overthrow of the third great Mahometan power, the Mogul empire in India. From this joint view, therefore, of prophecy and history, there seems a strong probability, that we draw near to "the time of the end."

At the same time it may serve, and perhaps was partly intended, to allay a presumptuous curiosity in these high matters, that the period entitled by Daniel "the time of the end," is plainly different from that of the final consummation, or "the end of all things;" this latter period being still concealed in Daniel's prophecy, behind the protracted terms of twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days.* For any thing we know to the contrary, therefore, the accomplishment of the prophecy concerning the first of these mystical periods, or the twelve hundred and sixty days, may pass, as many fulfilled prophecies have already passed, wholly undiscerned by the eye of man; and may be revealed only in the hidden counsels of Omnipotence. Beyond this period, every thing seems wrapped in impenetrable mystery: the variety of dates given serving effectually to confound the efforts of human computation; and as effectually to provide, that the sure word of prophecy shall be made fully known, only in, and by, its final fulfilment.

The proof has been conclusively established by various commentators, that the powers prefigured by the two little horns of Daniel, and by the two beasts of Revelation, are truly and pro-

* Dan. xii. 11, 12.

perly *antichristian* powers. These powers we have seen identified with the Papal and Mahometan apostasies; which, consequently, hold the proper rank and title of antichrists.

The unquestionable claim of Mahomet to the designation of antichrist is established by the consentient testimonies of himself, his adherents, and his opponents; by his assumption of the offices of paraclete, of the prophet like unto Moses, and of superseder of the Christ.

But, although a highly curious and important one, the analogous fact is less generally known, that the place of antichrist was similarly appropriated, by his most familiar friends, to the founder of the papal tyranny.

Respecting Pope Gregory the Great, the author of the Papacy *, it was impiously alleged, that he, like our Lord, was miraculously consecrated, by a visible descent of the Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove, which rested upon him. † This miraculous unction is asserted by his biographer, on the unexceptionable authority of his friend, Peter the Deacon. The Benedictine editor of the works of Gregory the Great affects,

* In the above capacity *only*, the author here speaks of this eminent Father of the Church. As a Catholic Father, the name of Gregory will be held, even by Protestants, in merited veneration; but his *personal character*, though more faultless than it was, cannot enter into our estimate of *the founder of the papal tyranny*.

† It is impossible not here to recollect the story of Mahomet's tame dove. Could this have been plagiarism, rather than invention?

indeed, to discredit the legend, as of an after date; and with good reason for his anxiety; since the very ascription of such a claim must be shunned by intelligent Romanists themselves, as a mark of antichrist. For who so properly and truly antichrist, as the founder of a false religious system, alleged to have been inaugurated by the same miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit which anointed the Christ?[9]

The lying pretensions to this one distinction, which thus rest equally at the foundation of Popery and of Mahometanism, give, it is hardly necessary to add, a fearful prominence to the entire of their antichristian features and characteristics.

The comparison which has been now instituted between the Papal and the Mahometan tyranny, as severally delineated by prophecy, brings more fully into light the nature and amount of the prophetical analogy, which subsists between Christianity and Mahometanism at large. For, both in Daniel and in the Apocalypse, we find the rival apostasies of Rome and Mecca, the catholic, that is, and the heretical, corruption of Christianity, represented under the same symbols, drawn in the same dark colours, and described, as to their several corresponding features, in critically the same words.

Throughout the prophecies in question, the design was, to foreshow Popery and Mahometanism under the one aspect exclusively, namely, as antichristian powers; there is, therefore, a total suppression of their better and happier features, and they are prefigured by their antichristian characters alone. If, then, we can discern no relief in the colouring, it behoves us to recollect, that it was not the object of prophecy, to present either picture on its bright side.

On a retrospect of the predictions from both Testaments, which have been considered in this, and in the preceding Section, the conclusion, we trust, may now be safely drawn, that, under the kindred and coeval apostasies of the Papacy and Mahometanism, antichrist is pourtrayed in Scripture, in his eastern and western heads: while, so similar are the prophetical descriptions of the two powers, that it has been found scarcely possible to discriminate between them. The result is melancholy in the extreme, as it affects the Roman Catholic superstition. But Mahometanism is clearly a gainer by it: for, by the simple fact of its being thus classed and contrasted in Scripture with a *Christian* tyranny, it is raised to the rank of a *Christian* heresy.

In this light, accordingly, the religion of Mahomet has been regarded, by several of our

own soundest and ablest Scriptural critics. The learned and exemplary Mede, in particular, affirms, that the Mahometans are nearer to Christianity, than many of the ancient heretics; the Cerinthians, Gnostics, and Manichees. It may be added, that they approach more nearly to the Gospel, than Socinus, or his imitators and outrunners, the modern Unitarians: since Mahometanism strenuously maintains several prime articles of the Catholic Faith, which those presumptuous innovators strenuously deny. To use the words of Joseph Mede, "Mahometism began as *a Christian heresy*, acknowledging Christ for a prophet, a greater than Moses, born of a Virgin, the word of God." Instances even may be adduced of Mahometan sects, who further held the great Christian verities, of our Lord's pre-existence, and of his participation in the divine nature. Mahomet himself implored the mediation of Jesus; owned him to be the Messiah; and resigned to him, as his unalienable prerogative, the final judgment of the world. It would be an easy task to enlarge the proof of its correspondence with Christianity, were this the proper place for such a discussion; or had not their correspondence been sufficiently set forth, for our present purpose, by preceding writers. "Hence," proceeds the venerable authority just

quoted, "Mahometism has been frequently accounted a Christian heresy; and, as it had its origin in Christianity, so to Christ it looks in the end. For, according to the creed of the Mahometans, Jesus is expected to descend to earth, to embrace the religion of Mahomet, to slay antichrist, and to reign with his saints." *

On the whole it appears, that the analogy between the original covenants of Isaac and Ishmael is carried on, and the ecclesiastico-political character of this analogy elucidated, through a full, clear, and consistent, prophetical parallel, foreshown in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and fulfilled in the related and mutually opposed systems of Christianity and Mahometanism; religions incontrovertibly emanating from those two brethren.

In the great antagonist apostasies of Popery and Mahometanism, at once connected and hostile perversions of the one true revelation, Isaac and Ishmael are to be seen, at the same time, linked with, and enlisted against, one another: while the proof of a *designed* spiritual connection between their covenants is thus preserved,

* For this genuine article of Mahometan belief, see "Mishcat-ul-Masabih, or a collection of the most authentic traditions, regarding the actions and sayings of Muhammed." Calcutta, 1810. Translated from the original Arabic, by Captain A. N. Matthews, Bengal Artillery. Vol. ii. p. 551.

through a period of twelve hundred years, in the history of a twofold antichristian tyranny, *catholic* and *heretical*, which, branching out at precisely the same point of time from the true Church, has continued to afflict Christendom, in the East and in the West, from the commencement of the seventh century to the present day.

The concurrent rise, and the parallel progress and decline, of the eastern and western branches of antichrist, here imperfectly delineated, will be more fully examined in another place.*

* See section x.

SECTION IV.

HISTORICAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE inquiry proposed in this section, into the historical analogy subsisting between the Mahometan apostasy on the one hand, and the Jewish and Christian revelations on the other, properly begins with a review of the historical parallel which subsists between the founders of the three religions. For, if a pre-ordained and providential connection really obtains between the religions themselves, there can be no doubt that this connection will be apparent, in the first instance, in the history of the respective founders, Moses, Christ, and Mahomet. Moses was the great type of Christ, the true Messiah; which relation pre-supposes some signal correspondence in their prophetic characters: and Mahomet, who, in the argument of this work, stands to both in the antithetical relation of the eastern head of antichrist, or a spurious

messiah, ought to unite in himself historical marks of agreement with the type and with the anti-type. *

It is obvious, and has often been remarked, that in many features of the correspondence here proposed for consideration, Mahomet studiously set himself to counterfeit the precedents of Moses and Christ, in the Law and Gospel. In great part of this analogy, therefore, the resemblance unquestionably is imitation. Instead, however, of being an objection, this broad and undoubted plagiarism affords the strongest confirmation to the fact of a providential parallel. It enters into the definition of a false prophet, that he should copy after the true; of a spurious messiah, that he should counterfeit the genuine; of an antichrist, that he should imitate the Christ. The principle here stated, it rests not with us to argue; it has been fixed, once for all, by our Lord's declaration. He foretold the future rise of false prophets, and false Christs, with these accompanying tokens of their character and pretended missions, — that they should assume to be the Messiah foretold by Moses and the prophets,

* In some respects, the agreements could not be common to both type and anti-type: thus, Mahomet was a spurious lawgiver, as opposed to Moses; and a false Messiah, as opposed to Christ.

and expected by the Jews, — and that, by lying signs and wonders, they should so artfully counter-fashion the signs and wonders of the Gospel, as to deceive, if possible, even the elect.* Had not Mahomet, therefore, in his person and in his creed, travestied the historical characters of Moses and Christ, as recorded in Scripture, he must have wanted the proper and essential marks of an antichrist. Nor, without such similitude to Moses in particular, could he, in any sense, rank as a pretender to be the Messiah of the Jews. But he did studiously imitate the greatest of the former prophets: in virtue of this studied likeness, he formally presented himself to the Jews as their Messiah: and, by both proceedings, he established incontrovertibly his providential office, as the predicted antichrist of the East.

Many of the resemblances in this parallel, on the other hand, are certainly *not* imitations. And this fact will also claim the special notice of the reader. Inasmuch as, while the existence of studied agreements was essential to fill up the character of the eastern antichrist, the existence of undesigned coincidences was not less essential, to mark out, in his appointed coming, the predisposing providence of God. Without re-

* St. Matt. xxiv. 24.

semblances of the former class, he could not be antichrist at all: without resemblances of the latter, he could not be the antichrist prophesied of in Scripture. * In the Arabian impostor, both classes of agreements seem so united, as to make his title unquestionably good: he was both by his own contrivance, and by marks beyond human device or control, the antagonist of Christ.

The following table will present to the eye, in one view, the double parallel of Mahomet, in his personal capacity as a pseudo-prophet, with Moses and Christ Jesus. The comparison of the respective religions, in a similar form, will find an appropriate place in the sequel. The real value of the entire coincidences, as it appears to the writer, may be best judged of, after they shall have been seen and examined, in a natural order, in the tabular form of exhibition. At the foot of each table, it is further proposed, to sum up their collective amount in a brief recapitulation: when (at least in the comparison between the founders of the three creeds) the studied agreements, and the undesigned coincidences, may, also, with advantage, be submitted separately for the more full satisfaction of the reader.

* The Scriptural representations of antichrist include predisposing causes, and eventual consequences, wholly independent on the voluntary agency of individuals. See, for example, 2 Thess. ii. 3—12.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
The legitimate descendant of Abraham; and the divinely-appointed founder of the Jews' religion.	The promised seed, and true heir of Abraham; and the divine author of Christianity.	The spurious descendant of Abraham; and the providentially permitted founder of Mahometanism.
"And when *Moses* was full *forty years old*, it came into his heart to visit his brethren, the children of Israel. For he supposed his brethren would have understood how that God, by his hand, would deliver them." *		"The same angel (a Christian Arab assured Chadija) who had formerly appeared unto *Moses*, was now sent to Mohammed. This first overture the prophet made in the *fortieth year of his age* †, which is, therefore, usually called the year of his mission." ‡
The Arabian desert the scene of his prophetic ministry.		The Arabian desert the scene of his pseudo-prophetic ministry.
His genuine revelation received first in Arabia.		His spurious revelation contrived in Arabia.
Composed the books of the law in Arabia.		Composed the Koran in Arabia.
Received the tables of the Law directly from heaven.		Professed to receive the chapters of the Koran directly from heaven.

* Acts, vii. 23. 25.

† The period of life thus chosen, for the pretended call of Mahomet, is said to have been determined on in conformity with an Arabian tradition to this effect, — that *a prophet is never called of God, until he has reached the age of forty*. We may clearly trace the origin of this *ante-Mahometan* tradition: its reference to the age at which Moses received his prophetic call seems undoubted. It is a curious coincidence, that *forty* was also the consular age among the Romans.

‡ Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 56.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
Deposited, by the command of God, the tables of the Law in an ark.		Deposited, in avowed imitation of Moses, and as by the divine command, the chapters of the Koran in a coffer or ark.*
The Pentateuch given and bequeathed as the sole standard for his followers; and contains a complete civil and religious polity.		The Koran given and bequeathed as the sole standard for his followers; and contains their entire civil and religious polity.
Sent forth the Israelites, by divine commandment, from the deserts of Arabia, to punish the idolatry of other nations, and to conquer and colonize Canaan.		Sent forth the Ishmaelites, as by divine commandment, from the deserts of Arabia, to punish the idolatry of the nations, and to conquer and colonize the world.
Died in Arabia, before the Israelites emerged from the desert.		Died in Arabia, before the Saracens issued from the desert.
Palestine subdued by his companion and successor, Joshua.		Palestine subdued by his companion and successor, Omar.
Covered, in the cleft of a rock, by the hand of God.		Pretended to have been, like Moses, covered by the hand of God.

* The chapters of the Koran "Mahomet laid up in a chest, which he called the chest of his Apostleship; in imitation of the ark, or holy chest, among the Jews, in which the authentic copy of their law was deposited." See "Life of Mahomet," prefixed to "Four Dissertations on the Mahometan Religion," p. 29.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
Driven into exile in the Arabian desert, before he entered on his mission.	Driven into exile in Egypt, in the year of his nativity.	Driven into exile in the Arabian desert, before he entered on his pretended mission.
A Prophet.	"A Prophet like unto Moses."	A false Prophet, claiming to resemble Christ and Moses, and to be superior to both.
A Princely Ruler.	A Princely Ruler.	A Princely Ruler.
The great type of the Christ, or Messiah of the Jews.	The Christ, or Messiah of the Jews.	A false Christ, claiming to be the true Messiah of the Jews.
A Legislator, temporal and spiritual, sent of God.	A spiritual Lawgiver sent of God.	A Legislator, temporal and spiritual, professing to have been sent of God.
Gave the Law.	Came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets.	Professed himself a Prophet commissioned of God, to perfect the revelations of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel.
Withdrew into the deserts of Arabia, prior to entering on his ministry.	Withdrew into the wilderness, prior to entering on his ministry.	Withdrew into the Arabian desert, to the cave of Mount Hera, prior to entering on his spurious ministration.
Selected twelve men to explore the promised land; "And I took twelve men of you, one of a tribe."*	"Called unto him his disciples; and of them he chose twelve; whom also he named Apostles."*	"Chose twelve out of their number [*i. e.* that of his disciples] who were to have the same authority among them as the twelve Apostles of Christ had among his disciples."*

* Deut. i. 23. St. Luke, vi. 13. Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 63. "*Abu'l-Feda* omet cette circonstance remarquable. Cependant Gjannabi

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
"And the Lord said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel." *	"After these things, the Lord appointed other seventy also." *	"Returned to Mecca accompanied by seventy-three men of Medina who had professed Islamism." *
Transfigured on Mount Sinai; where he talked with God face to face, and received the two tables of the law. †	Transfigured on Mount Tabor; where he conversed with Moses and Elias, and was borne witness to by the voice of God from heaven. †	"Pretended to have actually conversed with God in heaven, as Moses had heretofore done in the Mount; and to have received several institutions immediately from Him." †
The only prophet, except Christ, who thus conversed with God.	The only prophet, except Moses, who thus conversed with his heavenly Father.	The only false prophet who claimed to share with Moses and Christ, the honour of immediate and familiar converse with God.
Rejected by his own people. "And the people spake against God, and against Moses." ‡	Rejected by his own people. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." ‡	Rejected by his own people. "When he began to preach in public to the people, they declared themselves his enemies, and would soon have procured his ruin." ‡

et les autres auteurs la rapportent, et disent *que cette élection fut faite ad instar de l'élection que J. C. fit de douze Apôtres*, comme on vint de le voir par le discours de *Mahomet.*" — Gagnier, Vie de Mahomet, tome i. p. 278. *note*, edit. Amsterdam, 1732.

* Num. xi. 16. St. Luke, x. 1. Sale, ut supra, p. 63. "Il les joignit donc [les *Mohageriens* et les *Ansariens*] *deux à deux*, pour faire autant de *paires.*" Gagnier, Vie de Mahomet, tome i. p. 303. Compare St. Mark, vi. 7. St. Luke, x. 1.

† St. Matt. xvii. Exod. xxxiv. 30. Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 61.

‡ Num. xxi. 5. St. John i. 11. Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 58.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
The Israelites, in Egypt, were willing to have him put to death.*	The Jews "sought to kill him."*	"The Koreish came to a resolution that he should be killed."*
His brother and sister rose up against him. "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses. And they said, Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses?"†	"Neither did his brethren believe on him."†	When he announced his mission to his own family, "all of them hesitated and declined the matter. And his uncle, Abd'al Uzzah, out of his inveterate hatred to his nephew and his doctrine, went over to the opposite party."†
The founder of a durable religion, and a temporal dominion connected with it.	The founder of a perpetual religion, and of a spiritual dominion.	The founder of a durable religion, and a temporal dominion connected with it.
Recovered the Israelites from Egyptian idolatry; and restored the worship of the one true Jehovah.	Recovered the heathen world from idolatry; and restored the perfect worship of the true God.	Recovered the Arabians, and the Pagan world at large, from idolatry; and restored the doctrine of one God.
Extirpated idolatry by the sword of the flesh.	Extirpated idolatry by the sword of the spirit.	Extirpated idolatry by the sword of the flesh.
	Descended from Israel, through the family of Judah, a younger son.	Descended from Ishmael, through the family of Kedar, a younger son.
	Of royal origin; but of poor and humble parentage.	Of royal origin; but of a reduced and depressed family.

* Exod. ii. 13. 15. St. John, v. 18. Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 66.
† Num. xii. 1. St. John, vii. 5. Sale, Prelim. Disc. pp. 57. and 59.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
	The angel Gabriel the annunciator of his birth and mission.	The angel Gabriel the pretended annunciator of his mission.
	The Angel Gabriel the guardian of his infancy.	The Angel Gabriel his pretended guardian.
	Three in company in flight into Egypt; Joseph, the Virgin Mary, Jesus: Gabriel their conductor.	Three in company in the Hejra, or flight to Medina; Mahomet, Abubeker, Amer Ebn Fohaira: Gabriel their pretended conductor.
	Prophesied of under the symbol of a star: "There shall come a star out of Jacob." *	Predicted under the symbol of a fallen star: "And I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth." *
	His advent, accordingly, made known by the appearance of "his star in the East," *i. e.* in Arabia.	A remarkable comet, rising also in Arabia, said to have preceded the birth of Mahomet.
	His death attended and announced by a preternatural darkness; and this event the prelude to the first general announcement of the Gospel beyond Judea.	An extraordinary eclipse of the sun, attested by Abulfaraj and other Arabian historians, took place in the year in which Mahomet first proclaimed his new creed beyond Arabia, and invited foreign states to embrace it.
	Styled in prophecy, the Evangelist, or	Styled in the Koran, the messenger of

* Numb. xxiv. 17. Rev. ix. 1.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
	messenger of glad tidings.	glad tidings, or the Evangelist.*
	"Consider the Apostle and high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus." † See Acts, iii. 22. vii. 37.	Termed in the Koran, the "Apostle of God." †
"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me." ‡		"It is he [God] who hath raised up, amidst the illiterate Arabians, an apostle from among themselves." ‡
	The Sanhedrim pronounced of Jesus, "He is guilty of death."	Othba exclaimed, in the council of the Koreish, of Mahomet, "He is worthy of death."
	Rejected by the Jews: received by the Samaritans.	Rejected by the Ishmaelites of Mecca: received by the Joktanites of Medina. §
	Re-entered Jerusalem in peaceful triumph.	Re-entered Mecca in warlike triumph.
	Restored and perfected the legitimate patriarchal faith of Isaac.	Restored and raised to such an improved state as it seemed capable of, the spurious patriarchal faith of Ishmael.

* Arab. مبشر *Evangelista.* So, also, Surat xxxix. v. 18. البشري فبشر عبادي "To my servants preach the glad tidings," *i. e. the Gospel.* Thus Saint Luke, ii. 10. Vers. Arab. ابشركم "I proclaim to you the glad tidings," or, *the Gospel.*

† Heb. iii. 1. Koran, passim. ‡ Deut. xviii. 15. Koran, ch. lxii.

§ See Oelsner, Effets de la Religion de Mohammed, p. 12.

MOSES.	CHRIST.	MAHOMET.
	In his human character deemed illiterate: "How knoweth this man letters, having never learnt?" Yet both read and wrote.	Styles himself in the Koran "the illiterate prophet:" Yet penned or dictated the Koran, the standard classic of Arabia.
	Ascended in bodily form into heaven.	Pretended to have been taken up into heaven by night.

RECAPITULATION.

To bring under a compendious separate view, in the first instance, the parallel between Moses and Mahomet, exposed in the preceding table, the reader will observe, that both descended originally from the same stock of Abraham: both entered on the prophetic office at the same age of forty: the Arabian desert was the common scene of their ministry: there, the one first received his genuine, and the other first contrived his spurious, revelation: there, also, the one composed the Pentateuch, the other the Koran: Moses received the tables of the law, Mahomet professed to receive the chapters of the Koran, directly from heaven, and written by the finger of God: the former, by divine commandment, deposited the tables of his law, the latter, avowedly after his example, the chapters of his Koran, in an ark or coffer of wood: the Pentateuch was given by the one, as

containing a complete civil and ecclesiastical polity for the Jews; the Koran by the other, as containing a complete civil and ecclesiastical polity for the Saracens: both sent forth their kindred people, the Israelites and the Ishmaelites, from the same deserts, with the same objects professedly in view, namely, to conquer and to colonize; and, where they settled, there to set up and establish their exclusive religions: both died, in Arabia, before their respective followers issued forth from the desert: both, by their immediate successors, Joshua and Omar, subdued Palestine: both, prior to entering on their missions, were driven into exile in the Arabian desert: both, from obscure life, attained to the sovereignty over their respective people: both did so, by offering themselves to their countrymen as prophets sent of God: both became legislators as well as princely rulers: both were, at once, temporal and spiritual lawgivers: Moses declared himself to be the type of the Messiah; Mahomet claimed to be the anti-type foreshown by Moses: both qualified for the prophetic office by the same means, — a retirement of many years in the desert: both appointed under them, twelve apostles or messengers; and seventy elders or companions: Moses, in the mount, talked with God; Mahomet pretended to have conversed with God in heaven, as

Moses had done in the mount: Christ excepted, these were the only persons who laid claim to this distinction: both were, at the first, rejected by their own people, and resisted by their own families, with signal contempt and contumely: each, eventually, erected a durable dominion, and a religion which continues to the present day: the one recovered the Israelites, the other the Ishmaelites, from idol-worship; they alike restored, more or less perfectly, the patriarchal doctrine of one God; and alike enjoined and effected the extirpation of idolatry by the secular sword. Mahomet, in fine, performed all this, professing himself to be "a prophet like unto Moses," and to be sent of God to restore the religion of Abraham, their common father.

Many of the resemblances in this parallel, we have said, were studied imitations: the fact is of high importance in the present argument; for every such mark of imitation of the great type of Christ, is a mark of antichrist, and contributes to determine the place of Mahomet as his chief eastern head. Many of its agreements, on the other hand, arose without design, and without the possibility of being classed as imitations. It was not imitation, that made Moses and Mahomet alike the descendants of Abraham: it was not imitation, that made them the off-

spring and representatives of Isaac and Ishmael, whose covenants, in point of fact, they successively asserted: it was not imitation, that cast their common lot, and corresponding fortunes, in the same Arabian desert: that caused the books of the Law, and of the Koran, to be composed and published, at an interval of so many centuries, on the same spot: that ended the days of both legislators, in the desert, on the eve of the twofold irruption of their kindred nations: that, in the beginning of their respective careers, drove them equally into exile: that occasioned them to be alike, not only rejected by their countrymen, but resisted and persecuted by those of their own families: that made Mahomet, lastly, as well as Moses, the successful founder of a polity which subsists in full internal vigour, after the lapse of twelve hundred years. None of these resemblances are imitations; but this class is also of high moment in our argument; for, as the studied agreements are indispensable to fix on Mahomet the character of antichrist, so are undesigned coincidences, such as these last, not less required to mark, in the preparation for his coming, the overrulings of a special Providence.

The historical parallel of Mahomet with Christ Jesus is, as we are authorized by the nature of the relation to anticipate, perhaps still

more peculiar and exact. This false messiah, like the true, was of the stock of Abraham: Christ, by Judah, one of the younger sons of Israel; Mahomet, by Kedar, one of the younger sons of Ishmael: both were of royal origin; but of humble immediate parentage: both were foretold by corresponding symbols, Christ as a star; Mahomet as a falling star: a new star, rising in Arabia, preceded and proclaimed the nativity; a fiery comet, rising also in Arabia, is said to have ushered in the birth of Mahomet: the preternatural darkness at the death of Christ was the prelude to the publication of the Gospel beyond Judea; an eclipse of the sun, of extraordinary degree and duration, is stated to have taken place, when Mahomet first proclaimed his creed beyond Arabia, and invited foreign states to embrace it: the same title, Evangelist, is applied to the true Messiah in the Bible, and to the Arabian impostor in the Koran: Christ, in the one, is styled "the Apostle of our profession;" Mahomet, in the other, "the Apostle of God:" the angel Gabriel, in the former, appears as the annunciator of Christ's birth and mission; in the latter, is fabled to appear as the messenger of God revealing his pretended mission to Mahomet: in the flight into Egypt, and in the Hejra, or flight to Medina, the number of per-

sons the same: the true Messiah was rejected by the Jews, but received by the Samaritans: the counterfeit messiah was rejected by the Ishmaelites of Mecca, and received by the Joktanites of Medina: the true Messiah became the founder of a perpetual religion, and a dominion not of this world connected with it: this spurious messiah became the founder of a durable religion, and a dominion of this world connected with it: both, by their countrymen, were pronounced guilty or deserving of death: the one was, in his human nature, accounted illiterate; the other designates himself, in the Koran, "the illiterate prophet:" the former restored and perfected the legitimate patriarchal faith of Isaac; the latter restored and raised the spurious patriarchal faith of Ishmael: Christ ascended in bodily form into heaven; Mahomet feigned to have been taken up into heaven by night: Christ held intimate and immediate converse with the Father; Mahomet "pretended to have actually conversed with God in heaven:" both, by persecution, were driven into exile; Christ, at his nativity; Mahomet, on the first publication of his pretended mission: the one inherited, the other usurped, the characters of prophet, lawgiver, and king: Christ was the "Prophet like unto Moses;" Mahomet claimed to unite in

himself the prophetic characteristics both of Moses and Christ: our Lord came to fulfil the law and the prophets; the Arabian antichrist claimed to be the last and greatest of the prophets, commissioned to perfect the preceding revelations of the law, the prophets, and the Gospel: both withdrew into the wilderness preparatory to entering on their public ministry: Christ chose twelve apostles, selected from the disciples at large; so did Mahomet, with the same object, and in avowed imitation of Christ: our Lord named, to act under the twelve, seventy disciples; Mahomet also had, out of the number of his disciples, seventy-three select followers: Christ was rejected by those of his own nation; so, at first, was Mahomet: denied by his brethren; so was Mahomet: the Jews persecuted the true Messiah unto the death; the Koreish would have put to death their spurious messiah: the Messiah and Mahomet, lastly, alike recalled the heathen world from idolatry; only, the first by the sword of the Spirit, the second, by the sword of the flesh.

Many of these resemblances, again, were studied imitations; but many, also, of necessity, were not. The common descent of the true Messiah and of Mahomet, from Abraham,—and from one of the twelve sons, the twelve pre-

dicted sons of Israel and of Ishmael,—their common royal origin, and lowly parentage,—the corresponding symbols under which they were foretold, and the corresponding signs which marked their appearance, or which attended the first promulgation of their respective systems,—their analogous rejection by their own countrymen, and reception among strangers,—their common denial by their kindred,—the coincidence in their mortal persecution by the Jews and the Koreish,—the prospective analogy, in the last place, arising out of the permanence and universality of their several religions *;—none of these circumstances of agreement were the result of design or imitation. While, in this historical parallel, as in that with Moses, both classes of coincidence have their needful and proper functions: the studied agreements, to prove Mahomet an antichrist; the undesigned, to mark, in the coming of this last and greatest of heresiarchs, the predisposing and overruling agency of a special Providence.

From the parallel between the three founders, the transition is natural and plain to a view of the historical parallel between the three religions.

* Some of the eventual resemblances between the two religions undoubtedly may be traced to the original plagiarisms of Mahomet from Christianity. But agreements of this nature have here been left untouched.

This parallel I shall also present, in the first place, in a tabular form.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
Had its primitive seat in Palestine, the providential patrimony of Isaac.	Had its primitive seat in Palestine, the providential patrimony of Isaac.	Had its primitive seat in Arabia, the providential patrimony of Ishmael.
Jerusalem, the capital of Palestine, the first fixed site of the Jewish church.	Jerusalem the first fixed site of the Christian church.	Mecca, the capital of Hejaz, the first and fixed site of the Mahometan apostasy.
Jerusalem the site of the Jewish Temple.		Mecca the site of the Caaba, or Temple of the Ishmaelitish Arabians.
The site of the Temple, the reputed scene of the intended sacrifice of Isaac.		The site of the Caaba, the reputed dwelling-place of Ishmael.
The sanctuary, in the Temple of Jerusalem, was separated from the rest of the building by a veil.		The interior recess of the Temple of Mecca was parted from the rest of the building by a veil.
The Jewish people, in every age, whether collected or dispersed abroad, prosperous or depressed, has clung to Jerusalem, and the worship of the Temple.		The Arabian nation, in every age, in every change of place, and vicissitude of fortunes, has bowed to the religion of Mecca and the Caaba.
The Temple of Jerusalem was the annual religious resort of the nation, during the continuance of the civil polity.		The Temple of Mecca was the annual religious resort of the nation, both before and since the time of Mahomet.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
Jerusalem is the point towards which the Jews, wherever placed, have been invariably wont to turn their faces in prayer.		Mecca is the point, or Kebla, towards which the Mahomettans, wherever placed, are accustomed and commanded to turn their faces in prayer.
Circumcision, a fundamental rite;		Circumcision, a fundamental rite;
Practised by the descendants of Isaac, from the age of Abraham;		Practised by the descendants of Ishmael, from the age of Ishmael;
Ordained by the law of Moses to the Israelites, after the example of their father Isaac, on the eighth day.		Enjoined in the religion of Mahomet, to the Saracens, after the example of their father Ishmael, in the thirteenth, or rather, about the thirteenth year.*
Moses, in the Pentateuch, prescribes certain fundamental rites of the Jews' religion, as, —		Mahomet, in the Koran, prescribes, as fundamentals, similar rites, copied almost literally, from the ordinances of Moses, as, —
Abstinence from unclean meats,		Abstinence from unclean meats,
Purificatory ablutions,		Purificatory ablutions,
Fasting,		Fasting,
Almsgiving,		Almsgiving,
Prayer.		Prayer.
Permitted the continuance of polygamy and concubinage.		Enacted the continuance of polygamy and concubinage.

* See Appendix, No. I.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
Prohibited usury, as a crime.		Prohibited usury, as a crime.
Framed laws of divorce.		Framed laws of divorce.
Punished adultery by stoning, and fornication by stripes.*		Punished adultery by stoning, and fornication by stripes.*
Ordained death as the penalty of idolatry; and the extirpation of idolatry by the sword.		Enacted death as the penalty of idolaters; and the extirpation of idolatry by the sword.
Embodied in a sacred book; revealed from heaven; and containing the sum of their national polity, both civil and ecclesiastical.		Embodied in a book purporting to be sacred; pretending to be revealed from heaven; and containing the sum of their national polity, both civil and ecclesiastical.
The Pentateuch is the only written system of legislation, the Koran alone excepted, which thus constitutes the entire code, civil and ecclesiastical, of national jurisprudence.†		The Koran, after the Pentateuch, is the only written scheme of legislation, which thus constitutes the entire code, civil and ecclesiastical, of national jurisprudence.†
The precepts of the Law of Moses came subsequently to be enlarged and overlaid by an infinity of legal and rabbinical traditions.		Embodied in its composition, along with a corrupted edition of the Mosaic Law, the legal comments, and traditional rhapsodies, of the

* For the common moral and ritual precepts of the laws of Moses and of Mahomet, see sections v. vii.

† For the analogy of the Koran with the Pentateuch, see section viii.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
		Talmudists and Rabbins.
The Jews, however dispersed, oppressed, and persecuted, have, in every country where they have settled, retained their distinctive character as a people; and remain linked together, in opposite quarters of the globe, by the bonds of language and religion. *		It is observed of the modern Arabs of Africa and India, that "though without any empire in a mother-country, they were bound together by language and religion; and, *like the modern Jews*, were united together, though scattered over various countries." *
From the period of its destruction by the Romans, to the era of Mahomet, the site of the temple of Jerusalem had been laid waste; the attempt even of the apostate Julian had failed to restore it!		After an interval of six hundred years, the Jewish Temple was replaced by a Mahometan mosque! The mosque of Omar was erected on the site of the Temple; so as, according to the accurate survey of D'Anville, exactly to cover the space where once it had stood.
	From an obscure beginning in Palestine, rose to supreme spiritual dominion over the East and West; and to be the	From an obscure beginning in Arabia, rose to supreme dominion temporal and spiritual, over the Christian Greek em-

* Mickle's Lusiad, Pref. No more conclusive evidence can be furnished by a single trait, than that which this one coincidence supplies, to the proof of a *providential* connection between the descendants of Isaac and of Ishmael.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
	established religion of the Roman empire.	pire, and the eastern world.
	Jerusalem the first ecclesiastical metropolis of the Christian world.	Jerusalem, their second Mecca, for nearly twelve centuries a holy city of the Saracens and Turks.
	Constantinople, a new Rome, the first imperial metropolis of Christendom; and the seat of the most magnificent temple which had yet been consecrated to Christian worship.	Constantinople, now, for nearly four centuries, in the possession of the Turks; and the cathedral church of Saint Sophia converted into a mosque.
	A.D. 606—20. The Papal antichristian tyranny erected in the West.	A.D. 606—20. The Mahometan antichristian tyranny first set in motion in the East.
	The popes, or pretended *successors* of Saint Peter, literally the Christian caliphs.	The caliphs, or *successors* of Mahomet, literally the Mahometan popes.
	Western Christianity, under Papal Rome, converted into a religion of the sword.	Mahometanism, from the outset, a religion of the sword.
	The Roman Pontiffs the grand exciters of the crusades against Mahometanism.*	The Caliphs the grand directors of the Mahometan "sacred wars" against Christianity.*

* For the analogy at large between Popery and Mahometanism, see sect. x.; for the Crusades, sect. xi.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
	Jerusalem retaken, and Mecca threatened, by the Latin Christians.	Rome often menaced, and once sacked, by the Saracens.
	Has continually given birth to various sects, heresies, and schisms.*	Has, as continually, engendered various similar sects and schisms.*
	The parent of numerous religious associations, and especially of mendicant orders.	The parent of numerous similar religious associations, especially of mendicant fraternities
	Monks, hermits, anchorites.	Dervises, fakirs, santons. †
	Popery the nurse of the scholastic theology.‡	The parent of the scholastic theology.
	The Christian schools fruitful in ascetics, fatalists, mystics.	The Saracen schools fruitful in ascetics, fatalists, mystics.
	Celibacy imposed on the clergy, by the western antichrist.	Celibacy observed by the dervises, and other disciples of the eastern antichrist.
	Its heretical sects uniformly found to incline towards Mahometanism:	Its sects accounted heretical, generally found to incline towards Christianity:
	e. g. The Catholic doctrine Trinitarian: the heretics all verge	e. g. The sects styled orthodox, are zealous Unitarians;

* See section ix.

† The derivation of the Mahometan religious orders, from those of the Christian church, is most obvious. As for the mendicant orders, Popery and Mahometanism may dispute, if they will not divide, the honour of their invention.

‡ See sections x. xiii.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
	toward Unitarianism, i. e. Mahometanism.	their sectarists approach, in some instances, surprisingly near, to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.*
	Again, the Catholics hold the doctrine of grace: the Pelagians and other heretics, that of human merit.	The orthodox Mahometans maintain the doctrine of merit: the dervises and other mendicants, commonly, the advocates of grace.
	Began as an unlettered religion, and as opposed to the existing philosophy of the Greeks and Romans.	Began as an unlettered religion, and in direct hostility to philosophy and the liberal sciences.
	Became, in the providential issue, the great nursing-mother of letters; their preserver through the eclipse of the dark ages; their restorer, on the first return of intellectual day.†	Became, in the event, the sole refuge of letters; and the first restorer of science and philosophy, both in Asia and Europe, from the 9th to the 15th century inclusive.†
Religious observance of a Sabbath, or seventh day of rest, enjoined.	Religious observance of a Sabbath, or seventh day of rest, enjoined.	Religious observance of a Sabbath, or seventh day of rest, enjoined.
The Jewish, the primeval Sabbath, or seventh day of the	The Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, in com-	The Mahometan Sabbath, on the sixth day of the week, to

* See section vi.

† See section xiii.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
week, in memory of the creation.	memoration of the resurrection.	distinguish it from the Jewish and Christian.
Annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem, a fundamental law of Judaism, during the existence of its civil polity.	The pilgrimage to Jerusalem, a practice in the Christian world in all ages of the church.	The pilgrimage to Mecca, an immemorial usage of the Arabs, before Mahomet*, and a fundamental law of Mahometanism.
Jewish polity, — split into the rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel:	Christian polity, — split into the rival empires of the East and West:	Mahometan polity, — split into the rival Caliphates of Asia and Spain:
The civil, followed by an ecclesiastical division, into the rival churches of Jerusalem and Samaria:	The civil, followed by an ecclesiastical division, into the rival churches of Rome and Constantinople:	The civil, followed by an ecclesiastical division, into the rival spurious churches of Mecca and Damascus, of Bagdad and Cordova:
Subsequent national and theological rivalry, between the Jews and the Samaritans.	Subsequent national and theological rivalry, between the Latins and the Greeks.	Subsequent national and theological rivalry, between the Turks and the Persians.
Judaism subdivided into the sects of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, on the question of tradition.	Western Christendom subdivided into the Romanists and the Reformed, on the question of tradition.	Mahometanism subdivided into the Sonnites and Suffies, the followers of Omar and of Ali, on the question of tradition.
The doctrines of Judaism contained in the Old Testament, styled by the	The doctrines of Christianity contained in the Old and New Testaments, styl-	The doctrines of Mahometanism contained in the Koran, styled by Mahomet

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, pp. 154. 162.

JUDAISM.	CHRISTIANITY.	MAHOMETANISM.
Jews the Bible, or book.	ed in the Christian church the Bible, or book.	himself the Bible, or book.
The doctrines of the Old Testament, the foundation of those of the New.	The doctrines of the Gospel, the completion of the law and prophets.	The doctrines of the Koran, a corruption of both Testaments.
Maintains the doctrines of—	Maintains the doctrines of—	Maintains the doctrines of—
A future state;	A future state;	A future state;
The resurrection of the body;	The resurrection of the body;	The resurrection of the body;
Belief in a Messiah,	Belief in the Messiah, Christ Jesus,	Belief in Christ Jesus, as the Messiah of the Jews,
In future rewards and punishments,	In future rewards and punishments,	In future rewards and punishments,
In hell,	In hell,	In hell,
In paradise, &c.	In paradise, &c.	In paradise, &c.
The paradise of the Jewish Rabbins corporeal, and represented under corporeal images, understood in the gross and literal sense.	The paradise of the Gospel purely spiritual, but represented under natural images, understood in a spiritual sense.	The paradise of the Koran sensual, and represented under corporeal images, understood in their gross and literal sense.
	Christ was succeeded by a number of false Christs, as Barchochabas and others, who gave themselves out, in turns, as the Messiah of the Jews.	Mahomet was rivalled by several pseudo-anti-christs, as Moseilama and others, who laid schemes to supplant him in his pretended mission in Arabia.

RECAPITULATION.

On a review of the historical parallel between Judaism and Mahometanism, represented in the preceding table, the reader will find the two religions antithetically related in the following respects: Palestine and Arabia, the one the inheritance of Isaac, the other of Ishmael, were their primitive seats; the place which Jerusalem and the temple held in the former country and creed, Mecca and the Caaba held in the latter; in every change of scene and of fortunes, the Jews have religiously clung to the one metropolis of their faith, the Mahometan world to the other; Jerusalem was, in all ages, the Jewish Kebla of prayer, and Mecca the Mahometan; circumcision is alike a fundamental of both creeds, the one following the example of Isaac, the other of Ishmael; in its laws, or in the observances derived from it, by Jewish tradition, concerning meats, ablutions, fastings, almsgivings, and stated prayers, — marriage, divorce, and concubinage, — and in its penalties on adultery, fornication, idolatry, and sundry other crimes, the Pentateuch is servilely copied in the Koran, or else corrupted according to the glosses of the Talmudists and Rabbins; the Jews,

and the Mahometan Arabs, under the influences of their respective faiths, alike retain, wherever settled, or however dispersed, their distinctive national character in a way unparalleled by any other nation; a Mahometan mosque has replaced the desecrated Jewish temple; the two opposed creeds are contained in books laying claim to the same divine origin, and respectively embodying, in one and the same code, the civil and the ecclesiastical polities of the nations, — a coincidence unexampled in any other case; they agree practically in the observance of the Sabbath, and of annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem or Mecca; and historically, in their divisions and subdivisions into rival kingdoms, churches, and sects: lastly, Rabbinical Judaism and the religion of Mahomet, possess largely, in common, the same corrupted belief in some of the most important doctrines of revealed religion, — an agreement, originating, partly in vestiges of the patriarchal faith still surviving in Ante-Mahometan Arabia, and partly in the direct plagiarisms of Mahomet from the Jews. This historical analogy requires for its completion only one remark further, namely, that the systems thus related and opposed, have, through every change of time and place, and every chance of good and evil fortune, preserved their common

fundamental principle of a severe and naked theism, unimproved and unimpaired.

The relation between Christianity and Mahometanism, on a similar review of the historical parallel, will appear, in the following particulars of agreement: their rise, respectively in the primitive seats of the families of Isaac and Ishmael, the heirs of God's twofold covenant with Abraham; their common obscure origin, rapid growth, and wide and permanent dissemination; the successive establishment of the one religion, and the successive substitution of the other in its room, in Jerusalem, the spiritual metropolis, and in Constantinople, the imperial metropolis, of the Christian Roman empire; the contemporary rise of Popery and Mahometanism, as the western and the eastern antichrist; the corresponding titles and offices of the Popes and Caliphs; the common appeal of the rival superstitions, under these opposed heads, to the sword; their reciprocal hostile collisions, under the walls of Rome and Constantinople, of Jerusalem and Mecca; the corresponding crops of sects and schisms, which sprang, alternately, from the Gospel and the Koran; the coincidence of the opposed creeds, in giving birth, alike, to numerous sorts of religious solitaries, fraternities, and associations, especially to certain

mendicant orders; the relation of Popery and Mahometanism, as, together, the parents, or rather the latter the parent, and the former the nurse, of the scholastic theology, — the opposed schools reproducing some of the fruits of early Christianity, in the growth of ascetics, fatalists, mystics; the injunction of celibacy by the western antichrist, and its observance, as a religious ordinance, by the dervises, and other devotees of the eastern antichristian tyranny; the curious mutual approximation of Christianity and Mahometanism, through the medium of their respective sects, — the Christian heresies uniformly tending towards the doctrines of the Koran, the reputed heresies of Mahometanism, on the other hand, towards the mysterious truths of the Gospel; the anomaly alike observable in the two creeds, in the identity of their character, at the commencement, as unlettered religions, and again, in their progress, as the grand restorers and perfecters of human knowledge; their concurrence in sundry rites, ordinances, and institutions, and the analogy of their civil divisions, into the rival empires of the East and West, and the rival caliphates of Spain and Asia, — and of their ecclesiastical, into the rival churches of Rome and Constantinople, and the rival spurious churches of Mecca and Cordova, or again, of

the Turks and Persians, — the Turks and Persians being the Greeks and Latins of Mahometanism; the analogy of western Christendom and Mahometanism in their division, on the question of tradition, — the one into Sonnites and Suffies, the followers of Omar and those of Ali, the other into the Romanists and the Reformed; the affinity, finally, of the opposed religions, in the claims of their authoritative records, the Bible and the Koran, — the one containing the sum of the Christian, the other that of the Mahometan, belief, — both documents purporting to be divine revelations, possessing many fundamental points and tenets in common, and the one being, in point of fact, the spurious counterfeit of the other. I shall close this recapitulation by observing, that, if it rested on the single analogy between the Bible and Koran, the historical parallel between Christianity and Mahometanism would be strong: for compare the sacred books of the three religions involved in this parallel, — and they manifestly bear a relation, to those religions, and among themselves, altogether unparalleled in the history of religious belief. In other words, the Old Testament stands to the Jews, the Old and New Testaments to Christendom, and the Koran to the Mahometan world, in a

common relation so peculiar, that no fourth record can be adduced, which will bear a comparison with them.*

In this historical analogy between the three religions, as in that before submitted between their founders, many of the resemblances obviously are, and many as certainly are not, the result of imitation. An attentive inspection of the table will enable the reader to separate the designed from the undesigned coincidences. It will be enough to remind him, once more, of the importance to the present subject, of both classes of agreement: the designed, to affix to Mahomet the character of antichrist, as the spurious imitator of the Christ; the undesigned, to mark the counsels of God's providence, and the fulfilment of prophecy, in the appearance of this false prophet, and in the whole rise and progress of his appalling superstition.

In the tabular sketch of the historical parallel, presented in the present section, our object has been to touch merely upon the general outline of facts. The facts themselves, when scrutinized, will be found to branch out into other comparisons, moral, doctrinal, and ritual, — of sects, heresies, and schisms, — between Popery and Mahometanism; between the contents of the

* See section viii.

Bible and Koran : between the Mahometan and Christian holy wars ; and between the influences of the opposed religions on the general progress of society, and on the general advancement of the human mind.

The separate consideration of each of these heads will form the subjects of the ensuing sections.

SECTION V.

MORAL PARALLEL OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

IT has been stated in the Introduction *, as a fundamental character of Mahometanism, that, in its better features, the law of Mahomet was formed after the models of the law of Moses and the Gospel; and, in its worse features, on precedents derived from the traditional figments of the Jewish Talmudists and Rabbins, or from the still wilder speculations of the early Christian heretics. Thus, in whatever aspect we view it, the distinctive mark of this baleful superstition still will be the continuity of its analogy with the true revelation, either as the servile copy of Judaism and Christianity, or as the counterpart of their corruptions.

If the system of the Koran were, in principle and practice, far sounder and more pure than it can pretend to be, the very position of Mahometanism, excluding as it does, all notion of originality, must for ever disqualify its moral

* See p. 91.

code for competition with the morality of revealed religion. But the parallel, which, as an argument in the hands of infidelity, amounts to less than nothing, possesses a very different value as a link in the great chain of providential coincidences, which connects together the original covenants of Jehovah with Isaac and Ishmael as fulfilled in the history of their descendants. Thus, when we compare, on the principle of comparison laid down in these pages, the religion of Mahomet, and the Mosaic and Christian revelations, with reference to the analogy between their respective moral codes, the agreements and disagreements will be found such precisely as they ought to be: the best features of Mahometanism, in its moral sanctions, falling immeasurably beneath the pure and perfect standard of the Gospel; while, in its worst, it still has parallels and precedents, both in heretical corruptions of Christianity, and in the carnal ordinances of the Jewish law. Its palpable plagiarisms, and its undesigned coincidences, by a rare concurrence, unite together to augment the proof of its providential place and origin: each mark, whether of unpremeditated resemblance, or of studied imitation, (the common patriarchal origin of the founders being always held in view,) standing as a fresh evidence

of the providential connection of Mahometanism with the Law and Gospel: while the moral analogy on the whole, in its actual nature and amount, presents a lively image of the proximity and the distance which characterized the natural relation to which it has been traced, — the affinity, I mean, between the legitimate and the spurious seed of Abraham.

Instead, therefore, of indulging in the indiscriminative censures with which we have been too long familiar, in the conduct of this controversy, I would invite my readers to try the morality of Mahometanism by a reasonable and equitable standard. Instead of heaping condemnation on this spurious offspring of the Law and Gospel, because it stands no higher in its moral code, the analysis here proposed may lead us to discover, that the religion of Mahomet, in point of morals, stands accurately at the height, and in the position, becoming it, as, at once, a corruption of Judaism and an antichristian heresy. And, indeed, the amount of the moral parallel, when the relative position of Mahometanism is fairly taken into account, can hardly fail to strengthen, in reflecting minds, the idea of a strictly providential connection between two systems, thus related, and thus opposed.

In the present section we purpose to trace the Mahometan scheme of faith and morals to its primitive sources, in the law of Moses, the Gospel, the traditions of the Talmudists and Rabbins, and the doctrines of the ancient heretics. The object, of course, will be merely to indicate the connection, by select examples; it would be superfluous to carry the comparison further. But, as the Gospel revelation rests upon principles, and proposes motives of life and action, not merely above the reach of Mahometanism, but beyond the contemplation of the Mosaic law, it will be our first duty, reverently to separate from the proposed parallel, those distinctive features of Christianity, with which, neither the true revelation which preceded, nor the spurious one which followed it, claim to stand in comparison at all.

Contemplated in the only just view, as the perfect and final revelation of the will of God to man, the supremacy of Christianity plainly consists in its character as a religion of grace and power, as a system of divine influences generating in the human heart those pure principles, and holy affections, which alone can raise us to the practice enjoined by its pure and holy law. The very perfection of the Gospel precepts supposes the constant operation of this

divinely-imparted strength; without which, those precepts must become null and void, and by which, alone, as universal experience proves, they can be rendered practicable. Hence the high standard proposed by our Lord in his heavenly teaching, when he penetrates to the secret springs of human action, and addresses his precepts and his prohibitions to the hidden workings of the mind and heart: hence those exhortations, with which the Gospel everywhere abounds, to inward, no less than outward purity; to meekness and humility of mind, charity, forgiveness of injuries, love of our enemies, and so many other virtues, which, until then, had been barely imagined among men, and imagined only to be accounted unattainable.

When we view it in this, its true distinctive aspect, the Gospel of Christ holds up to mankind a standard of attainment, which leaves no room for comparison with the moral standard of any other faith. Let the religion of Mahomet, for example, be brought into contact with Christianity on this ground, and all traces of a moral parallel are gone. In all the higher Christian graces, Mahometanism, as must be anticipated, is found wanting altogether: but, in affirming this irrefragable truth, let it, at the same time, be observed and remembered, that,

in all these particulars, the Gospel is contradistinguished not only from the Mahometan, but also from the Mosaic law. In one sense, indeed, as the repository of the patriarchal faith, which concealed within it the elements of better things to come, and the seeds of an anticipated Gospel, the spirit of Hebrew piety, as expressed in the writings of the prophets, and the lives of individual Jewish worthies, confessedly and triumphantly arose above the mere letter of the law of Moses. Still, however, the letter of this law constituted the ostensible character and sanction of the Jews' religion; whence it has come to pass that Mahometanism, (the too faithful image and reflection of the *defects* of Judaism,) while in comparison with the spirit of the Gospel precepts it altogether fails, will, when compared with the rule of practice tolerated under the Mosaic dispensation, be found, in many particulars, to bear a certain analogy and proportion to this rule.

This literal correspondence between the laws of Moses and Mahomet, in their respective moral codes, it must now be our part to elucidate, by comparison of the Jewish and Mahometan laws of marriage, divorce, and concubinage; the penalties of adultery, and fornication; the rules of retaliation, and avenging of blood; the

precepts concerning truth, justice, liberality, temperance, fasting, almsgiving.

To perfect this comparison, it will be necessary to draw both on the Old Testament at large, and on Jewish and Mahometan tradition; the laws of which had become so incorporated with the original sanctions of the two systems, as to compose a main part of their actual moral polity.

In an early part of this work *, notice has been taken of the unqualified severity with which Christian writers have usually arraigned Mahometanism, as a moral scheme, for the licence which it allows to the passions of mankind. In the conduct of the argument, much controversal ability has been employed, to evince a marked contrast between the licentiousness inculcated in the Koran, and the purity and self-denial required by the Gospel. The contrast is undoubted and complete. But the question remains, whether, by thus submitting Mahometanism to a comparison with Christianity, exclusively of Judaism, we are trying it by the proper and equitable standard. A moment's reflection, one would think, might satisfy us, that, in this matter, the plain reason of the case is against the received practice. The

* Introduction.

system of an heresiarch, bred within the bosom of Christianity, may, indeed, with the strictest justice, be tried by that law which the heresiarch had himself lived under, and perverted. But not such was the situation of Mahomet. This arch-heretic was born and brought up, of heathen parents, in a heathen land; and framed his spurious system, while himself but in the act of emerging from the bosom of paganism. The religion which Mahomet imposed on his idolatrous countrymen, was a palpable and undisguised compound of Judaism and Christianity. It appears, therefore, no more than the barest justice, to concede to Mahometanism, thus originating, that the parts of it derived from the law of Moses, shall be tried by the law of Moses; instead of being condemned, without reserve or discrimination, by another rule, — the infinitely perfect law of Christ.

In pronouncing on the merits or demerits of the institutions of Mahomet, it has been the great and almost universal error of Christian controversy, to neglect the distinction between those parts of his system, which properly originated with himself, and those, in which he conformed merely to preceding national usage. The remark particularly applies to the Mahometan law of marriage; which has generally

been regarded as one of the chief wiles, by which the impostor aimed to seduce, and succeeded in seducing, the Arabs to his standard. The licence extended to their passions in the Koran, is alleged to have had irresistible attractions for the Arabians; as giving free scope to their proverbial love of animal indulgence. The aspect of the case, however, is materially altered by the consideration, that Mahomet did not introduce polygamy among the Saracens: in this matter, as in most others, he followed the usage which he found immemorially prevalent in the peninsula; reduced this usage within rules, and regulated it by law, in the Koran. His personal habits, indeed, were grossly sensual; and grew worse as he advanced in years, and became hardened in the latitude of successful imposture: but, in his legislative enactments, he unquestionably restricted, instead of enlarging, the licence respecting women, at all times universal among the Orientals.

The connection between these enactments, and the view taken of Mahometanism throughout the present argument, is clear and immediate. For the restraints imposed by Mahomet on polygamy were borrowed, precept for precept, and word for word, from the practice of the Jewish law, as interpreted by Rabbinical

tradition.* The law of Moses yielded a reluctant sufferance to prevailing custom, in its silent toleration of a plurality of wives. The tradition of the Rabbins defined the limits of this toleration; distinguishing between the kings, the priests, and the people. To the first magistrate, tradition assigned the prerogative of taking so many as eighteen wives†: it expressly prohibited the priesthood from taking more than one, as a licence contrary to the law: the number of wives, by usual and universal prescription, allowed to the mass of the people, was four‡; and this number, again, was reduced, by traditional counsels or customs, to two§, and even to one. Such is the substance

* See Selden, Uxor Ebraica, cap. viii. ix. Oper. tom. iii. f. 561—570.

† A latitude directly contrary to the law of Moses, see Deut. xvii. 17.

‡ "Quod vero diximus de *quaternario* apud Ebræos uxorum numero, erat id quod *generatim* et *regulariter*, in monitis et consiliis majorum, obtinebat." Selden, ut supra, f. 567.

§ The antichristian profligacy of Papal Rome might be estimated from the single fact, attested, from original authorities, by the accurate research of Selden, that the polygamy or bigamy, of the European Jews, was practised *under the express sanction of a dispensation from the Pope!* "Hodie vero apud Europæos Judæos, veluti qui Italiâ ac Germaniâ degunt, infœcundæ uxori *alia*, prolis gratia, *idque non sine Pontificis Romani indulto*, interdum superinducitur; quod ex R. Leonis Mutinensis, Venetiis Archisynagogi, de moribus Ebræorum libello, seu *Historia de gli riti Hebraici*, didici: manuscripto scilicet illo, quem alibi [cf. Lib. de Successionibus in Bona, cap. 14.] memoro. Nam in codice Parisiis dudum impresso, *id quod de Pontificis Romani indulto hic habetur*, CONSULTO, UT VIDETUR, EST DISPUNCTUM. Et quod de polygamia ibi in ejusdem archetypo olim legebatur, id est, in exemplari meo fideliter in Italia transcripto, ita se habet

of the Jewish law of polygamy: the exactness of its correspondence with that of Mahomet will enable the reader to judge whence the latter was derived.

The following is the Mahometan law of polygamy, as delivered in the chapter of the Koran entitled "Women": "Take in marriage of such women as please you, two, or three, or four, and not more. But, if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably towards so many, marry one only." * These limitations Mahomet profligately

---

Gl è lecito pigliar piu d'una, e quante moglie vonno; pure in Italia e Alemagna non usano pigliare piu d'una, se non in caso che non habbia con la prima figlioli, che si conosca che lo faci per questo; e in Italia hanno usato CHIEDERNE LICENZA, E PIGLIARE DISPENSA DEL PAPA." — Ux. Ebraic. tom. iii. f. 570. For a translation of this passage, see the final note. [1]

The Christian Bishop of Rome, the dispenser of licences for the legal sanction of polygamy among the Jews!!! No just defence can be made by Protestants, for the culpable compliance of Luther and his brother Reformers, with the licentiousness of a German Prince; but surely their single offence claims some indulgence, when we regard the *practice* of the school in which they received their training, and from which they had so recently emancipated themselves.

* The *relative* strictness of the limitation can be judged of aright, only by contrasting the law of Mahomet with the *unlimited polygamy*, not merely tolerated, but inculcated by the modern *Jews*. The Talmudists held it lawful for every man to take in marriage any number of wives he pleased, provided he was possessed of property sufficient for their maintenance. Even the philosophic Maimonides, although ranking foremost among their moralists, and although familiarly conversant with the stricter morality of the Mahometan law, did not scruple to pronounce it right and lawful for any man to marry as many wives as he thought fit to take in marriage, even to the number of *an hundred*; and this, whether *simultaneously*, or in succession! — See Selden, Ux. Eb. cap. ix. Op. t. iii. f. 565.

suspended in his own particular case; but, in so doing, he was also an exact copyist of the Rabbinical code, which indulged the head of the state in an extraordinary licence. The eleven wives of the Arabian impostor, in fact, only seem to complete the analogy with Judaism; as a parallel for the number of eighteen wives, allowed, by the casuistry of the Rabbins, to their chiefs or kings. The table of prohibited degrees in the Koran, exhibits, on the other hand, the most obvious plagiarism from the Pentateuch. And here the moral analogy certainly appears on its brighter side: for several of these prohibitions, especially that against marrying two sisters *, were levelled by Mahomet, against prevailing customs of the pagan Arabs.

On the whole, the circumstantial correspondence of the two systems, in their laws of marriage, clearly forms the ground-work of a providential analogy between Judaism and Mahometanism, in their moral aspect; the latter, in its scheme of polygamy, being nothing else than the spurious counterpart of a corrupted edition of the former. At the same time, in common fairness to the scheme of polygamy sanctioned by the Koran, the reader should be careful to bear in mind these two facts, — 1. that

* Sale's Koran, vol. i. p. 97. Compare Levit. xviii. 18.

Mahomet borrowed both the principle and the details of his law of marriage from the Jews; and, 2. that, in applying this law to his own countrymen, he narrowed, instead of enlarging, the immemorial licence of the Arabians. His design, also, as a legislator, generally appears to have been, to raise the standard of manners, and the moral tone of his countrymen, above the tone and standard which obtained in Arabia in the days of its paganism. In the attempt to effect this reform, besides the obstacle opposed at the threshold by his own bad passions, he plainly appears, further, to have had many difficulties to encounter, and to have been compelled to consult, and yield to, many inveterate national prejudices and prepossessions: his reformation of manners, it follows, in some respects, was *necessarily* imperfect.

Now, in all these particulars, the situation of Mahomet was similar, and his line of conduct, as a legislator, analogous, to that of Moses. The moral law of Moses was framed with the undoubted view to regulate and raise the manners of the Israelities, debased by their long contact with the idolatrous Egyptians. In the provisions introduced for this end, the inspired lawgiver found it, in some instances, necessary to consult the possible rather than the desirable;

and was compelled to lower the standard of his reformation, by reason, as we learn from the highest authority, of the hard-heartedness of his people. To this cause, we are authorized, by our Lord himself, to attribute the occurrence of any apparent anomalies on this subject, in the Mosaic law. Thus polygamy was silently tolerated by it; and the legal number of wives left undefined. The limits, however, were marked by patriarchal usage; to which Moses constantly aimed to recall the nation, and which, in practice, the ancient Israelites appear to have respected, as their unwritten law. The Jewish code of marriage, in after times, is understood to represent correctly the practice of the Jews prior to the captivity, reduced to definite form and fixed rules by the Talmudists. * Mahomet, we have already seen, in his reformation of the unbridled polygamy of the Pagan Arabs, conformed, with scrupulous fidelity, to this precedent; and, in so doing, is thought by some writers to have, at the same time, restored the common patriarchal usage of the Hebrews and the Ishmaelites. However this may be, on the question of polygamy he laboured under the same difficulties

* See Michaëlis on the Laws of Moses, vol. ii. pp. 19, 20., English translation: also, Hallam's History of the Middle Ages, vol. ii. pp. 164, 165., for some interesting and judicious remarks.

as the Jewish legislator; and, the circumstances of his origin and early training duly considered, he seems certainly entitled to plead, in his public capacity, a similar apology; as will further appear, in examining the coinciding latitude of the laws of Moses and Mahomet, on the question of divorce.

"For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept,"* was the reply of our Lord to the Pharisees of his day, when they insidiously urged the authority of Moses, in support of the licence allowed by their legal doctrine of divorce. Christ maintains this judgment by an appeal to patriarchal usage, which was, in its principle, conformed to the primeval law of God; and which, however it might be suspended for a given time or purpose, the law of Moses could not, from its transient nature, be meant to supersede. The facilities, therefore, afforded by the Mosaic law of divorce, were extorted from Moses, in his capacity of a civil legislator, by the demoralized condition of the Jews; whom it was impossible suddenly to raise to the better practice of their fathers, from their debased and degraded state of morals, after a residence of four centuries and upwards in Egypt, and,

* St. Mark, x. 5.

during the latter part of the term, in a state of slavery.

In instituting his corresponding doctrine on this subject, Mahomet certainly was not governed by the same simplicity of motive; but, in his capacity of a legislator, he, no less certainly, had similar difficulties to contend with, and a similar apology to plead, in the universal and inveterate depravity of manners, which, by immemorial prescription, had obtained the force of law, among the pagan Arabs. In point of fact, the doctrine of divorce inculcated by Mahomet, is plainly a studied copy after that laid down by Moses. * The parallel, in this particular, is more perfect than it was in the case of polygamy: there, Mahomet had only negative precedent; here, there was positive precept, to guide him. † The Mahometan law of divorce, as it stands in the Koran, like so many other parts of that pretended revelation, is a compound of the precepts of the Pentateuch, and the traditional adulterations of the Rabbins. As in the case of polygamy, the impostor, in the spirit appropriately characteristic of his office as a false

* According to Mr. Sale, Mahomet's law of divorce has operated as a practical prohibition; divorce being of very rare occurrence among Mahometans, and considered shameful: while it is certain, that the practice was disgracefully prevalent among the Jews. — See Prelim. Discourse, p. 178.

† Deut. xxiv. 1—3.

prophet, arrogates to himself extraordinary personal exemptions from the restraints even of his own licentious rules. But here, again, he only conforms the more exactly to Jewish precedent; since the Rabbins extended to the regal dignity extraordinary exemptions in the matter of divorce, as well as in marriage; a fact which thus serves to complete, in this particular, the analogy which holds through so many particulars beside, between Judaism and Mahometanism, as religions providentially emanating from Isaac and Ishmael, and preserving the affinity and distance of the original natural relation; the one being still the spurious copy of the corruptions of the other. *

The same cause, or causes, which introduced into the Mosaic code the tacit admission of polygamy, and the more express toleration of divorce, would operate, with equal force, to extort from the legislator the recognition of the state of concubinage, so far legalized, as to be made the subject of certain rules and restrictions prescribed by the law. The state of national morals in pagan Arabia, here also, supplies a somewhat similar ground of vindication for Mahomet, in his assumed character of a legis-

* On the topics here noticed, consult Sale, Prelim. Discourse, sect. vi.

lator. Conformably with the invariable distinction observable between the true and the false revelation, between the legitimate and the spurious faith, the liberty of concubinage, indeed, granted, or rather preached, by the pretended successor of Moses, widely separates the religions in their moral aspect, — the studiously restricted latitude of the one, from the unbridled and unbounded licentiousness of the other. But still, the respective laws on this subject, contain ample marks of that sameness of causes which gave birth to them, in many of the provisions which they comprise, and in the position which those regulations relatively occupy, in the civil codes of the two systems. The resemblance, as usual, is the result of imitation. In this part of his moral scheme, Mahomet followed his accustomed model, the Mosaic law, adulterated by Rabbinical traditions. The privileges and exemptions, especially, which he here affects in his own case, are, like his claims of unrestricted personal liberty of polygamy and divorce, in exact conformity with the special exemptions made by the glosses of the Talmudists and Rabbins, in favour of their civil rulers.

Under the Mosaic dispensation, the legal toleration of polygamy and concubinage, was

very far from giving countenance to any general relaxation of national manners. The severest enactments, on the contrary, were provided against immorality; and especially in the case of married and betrothed persons of both sexes. In like manner, the plurality of wives, and legal concubinage, permitted by the Koran, are counterpoised by attention, in other respects, to the public morals *; and by severities of enactment against the unchaste and licentious. Originally, in both codes, the penalty of adultery was death by stoning; and that of fornication, was the infliction of a specified number of stripes. The parallel is necessarily very perfect, for the Mahometan law was plainly copied from the Mosaic. The statute of Moses against the crime of adultery, is found in the following passage of Leviticus: "The man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death." † The peculiar mode of punishment is doubly ascertained by the authority of the New Testa-

* Thus we find illicit indulgences denounced, in chap. xvii. apparently with a moral feeling:

Draw not near unto fornication;
For it is wickedness, and an evil way.
Sale's Koran, vol. ii. p. 100.

† Levit. xx. 10.

ment, and by that of Jewish tradition. The following is the primitive statute of Mahomet, still enforced by the Sonna, and once extant in the Koran: "If a man and a woman of reputation commit adultery, ye shall stone them both: it is a punishment ordained by God; for God is mighty and wise."* In another passage, retained in the text, the sentence denounced against unchaste persons generally, is that both parties guilty shall be immured until they die. † The judgment of the Sonna, and of Mahometan tradition, affirmed and enforced these capital punishments; though Mahomet himself, it must be observed, subsequently abated much of the primitive rigour of his law; a relaxation only suitable to the growing impurity of his personal character. The sanctions of the law of Moses, on the other hand, were unchanging as the personal sanctity of the legislator; and his original penalties remained in their ancient force, as we learn from the New Testament, in our Lord's day. In each step of the analogy we are thus continually reminded, amidst the closest resemblance, of the distance between the legitimate and the spurious creed.

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, sect. iii. p. 88.
† Koran, chap. iv. pp. 95, 96.

In admitting the principle of retaliation, and the private or family avenging, not only of murder, but of manslaughter or accidental homicide, the law of Mahomet follows that of Moses; and both laws were designed, by reducing the licence of resentment under prescribed rules, to mitigate the implacable spirit historically characteristic of the kindred nations, and to set limits to the traditional exercise of indiscriminate revenge. Among the Arabs, in particular, the received practice of revenge and retaliation, prior to the time of Mahomet, involved families and tribes in interminable mutual blood-shedding; the relations, of every degree, being held personally responsible, with their lives, for the crime of the principal or perpetrator; and the law of retribution in kind, descending, with unabated violence, from generation to generation. This state of things Mahomet meets in the Koran, as Moses had met a similar state of things in the Pentateuch, by regulations calculated to abate the evil, as much, probably, as the barbarous habits of his countrymen would bear. The humane object of the legislator is sufficiently apparent in the following passage of the Koran: "Neither slay the soul which God hath forbidden you to slay,

unless for a just cause *; and whosoever shall be slain unjustly, we have given his heir power to demand satisfaction; but let him not exceed the bounds of moderation, in putting to death the murderer in too cruel a manner, or by revenging his friend's blood on any other than the person who killed him; since he is assisted by this law." † In the case of murder, instead of an extreme severity, the law of Mahomet, indeed, betrays a spurious moderation; since it reverses the primeval sentence, denounced by God himself, against this incommutable crime; allowing the guilt of the criminal, by consent of the friends of the party murdered, to be expiated by a fine. ‡ In other respects, the principle of retaliation appears substantially the same, in the Koran, as in the Pentateuch: the laws are strictly parallel in adjusting the equal measure of the injury and the retribution: while, for the enactments of both codes, there is this clear common ground of vindication, that Moses and Mahomet alike legislated for nations at a stage of civilization, and in a state of morals, so low, that, without some accommodation to inveterate

* Viz. apostasy, adultery, or murder: the crimes, according to the commentators, for which a man may justly be put to death.

† Sale's Koran, vol. ii. p. 100.

‡ Ib. vol. i. chap. ii. p. 31, 32.

habits and prejudices in the framing of their laws, they must have alike inevitably legislated in vain.

This part of the moral parallel we need hardly pursue further: the topics thus far treated, may be thought enough to verify the derivation of the whole corresponding ordinances of the Koran, from the carnal and penal ordinances of the Mosaic institution. From this primitive source, and the stream of Rabbinical tradition thence emanating, the entire precepts of Mahomet, on the several points already touched, were, it appears, unquestionably drawn; and, considering the original position of the Arabian lawgiver, as a self-instructed heathen, in the bosom of a heathen land, this portion, including some of the most objectionable features of his moral law, instead of being, as heretofore, tried and condemned by the perfect rule of the Gospel, would seem entitled to be judged by reference to the source whence it is derived, and the standard to which it appeals.

The reasonableness, both of the claim, and of the concession here required, will probably appear still more manifest, as we proceed to examine the moral parallel with Judaism, in a different light; and to show, in the next place, that Mahomet by no means copied ex-

clusively after its lower ordinances, neglecting the brighter and better features of the law of Moses. On the contrary, those parts of the Mosaic covenant, and of the other Scriptures of the Old Testament, most difficult in the observance, or most strictly moral in their nature, — such as the precepts concerning truth, justice, liberality, charity, and the observances of fasting, alms-giving, and stated prayers; above all, the commandments and exhortations animating the Jews to zeal for their religion, and inculcating the faith and fear of God, these are all studiously copied; in these particulars, Mahometanism is a fair transcript of Judaism. I proceed to exemplify this side of the analogy, by a brief selection of parallel precepts from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and from the Koran.

Among the injunctions of Moses to the Israelites, we find precepts such as these: — "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry: and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword; and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless. If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou

shalt not be to him as an usurer; neither shalt thou lay upon him usury."* Again, "If thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him: yea, though he be a stranger or a sojourner, that he may live with thee. And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee, be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant; but as an hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee."† Again, "The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible; which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward. He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow; and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye, therefore, the stranger; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God."‡

Compare, now, these precepts of Moses, thus solemnly delivered to the Israelites, as the great practical tests of their faith, with the following passage of the Koran, in which the same principles are presented in like connection with the fear of God, and embodied together in Mahomet's definition of righteousness or religion: "It is not righteousness, that ye turn your faces in

* Exod. xxii. 21—25.
† Levit. xxv. 39, 40.
‡ Deut. x. 17—19.

prayer towards the east and the west; but righteousness is of him who believeth in God, and the last day, and the angels, and the Scriptures, and the prophets; who giveth money, for God's sake, unto his kindred, and unto orphans, and the needy, and the stranger, and those who ask, and for redemption of captives; who is constant at prayer, and giveth alms; and of those who perform their covenant, when they have covenanted; and who behave themselves patiently in adversity, and in time of violence: these are they who are true; and these are they who fear God." *

These corresponding passages from the Pentateuch and Koran, understood as the Mosaic and Mahometan summaries of practical religion, form no unimportant feature in the moral parallel subsisting between the religions. That we are authorized so to understand the former, as well as the latter, is plain from a well-known passage of the New Testament, which introduces the pious care of the widow and the orphan, as essential elements in the definition of true religion: — "Pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. †

* Sale's Koran, chap. ii. vol. i. p. 31. † St. James, i. 27.

But the moral precepts of the law of Moses, unexpanded by the spiritual comments of the prophets and the Gospel, would be a very imperfect measure of the moral theory of Mahometanism. If, in its lower features, it symbolizes, as we have seen, with the carnal ordinances of the law; in its better part, it copies, with equal exactness, after the more perfect morality of later revelations. In its views and definitions of the three great duties, towards God, our neighbour, and ourselves, the Koran assuredly contains several precepts and principles of action, breathing far more of the spirit of the Gospel, than of the letter of the Jewish law. The parallel of the Koran with the New Testament, the obvious result, throughout, of direct plagiarism, or studied imitation, belongs, more appropriately, to a future place. * For the present, we will look rather to Mahometan tradition; whose comments and expositions may be best calculated to show, how far the lights which the Koran originally borrowed from Christianity, subsequently entered into the constitution of Mahometanism, and became incorporated with its spirit.

The moral spirit of Mahometanism, in its unadulterated strength, is to be found in an au-

* See section viii.

thentic tradition, contemporary with Mahomet himself, and second in authority only to that of the Koran; — the proverbs or sentences of the Caliph Ali Ebn Abu Taleb.* From this primitive source, I shall deduce in brief series, and by select examples, the Mahometan notions of the several duties to God, our neighbour, and ourselves; leaving it with the reader to verify the manifest parallel with the corresponding doctrines of the Gospel. To begin with the duty to God, is but to follow the lead of Mahomet's kinsman and successor, in a fundamental maxim of his sentences; namely, that "*piety* is the source of *morals.*"

The following are among the aphorisms of Ali.† —

* "Sententiæ Ali Ebn Abi Talebi, Arabice et Latine. Oxonii, 1806." For this valuable edition, the fruits of the learned labours of Cornelius Van Waenen, the oriental student is indebted to the liberality of the Curators of the Clarendon Press. From the same spirit, seconded by the eminent attainments in oriental literature of Dr. Nichol, the present Regius Professor of Hebrew, much, we may safely anticipate, will be done, towards bringing to light the MS. treasures of the Bodleian library, and worthily honouring the memory of Archbishop Laud.

† In the original, the Proverbs of Ali are divided after the model of the 119th Psalm, into heads or topics corresponding with the letters of the Arabic alphabet; each sentence beginning with the letter of the head under which it occurs.

The selection here submitted is arranged differently; the sentences being distributed in a *moral* order: an arrangement essential to the object proposed in the text.

PIETY AND TRUST IN GOD.

The fear of God maketh the heart clean.

Fear God, and thou shalt be safe from all other fear.

Tears flowing from the fear of the most high God, are a refreshment to the eyes.

Happy is the man who confideth in God.

There is a dignity above price, — that of them who place their confidence in God.

The worship of God, causeth the face of the pious man to shine.

The word of God, is the medicine of the heart.

Prayer, in the night-watches, is the light of the pious soul.

Illuminate thy sepulchre, with nightly prayers. *

By the remembrance of God, mercy is drawn down from heaven.

The remembrance of God, is light to the mind, and rest in the heart.

The remembrance of God, is the creed of the faithful.

The remembrance of God, rouseth sloth, and enlighteneth darkness.

The remembrance of God, healeth the sick mind;
And driveth away diseases and miseries.

The remembrance of God is the food of the heart;
And the true fellowship of friendship.

The remembrance of God enlighteneth the eyes;
And softeneth down the thoughts of the mind.

The night-watch is the spring-time of the friends of God;
And the rich harvest of the blessed.

* For the allusion here intended, see Boulainvilliers, Vie de Mahomed, p. 94.

Submit thyself unto God, and he will exalt thee;
Draw near to God with the obedience due to him;
And he will draw near to thee.

Our health should be consecrated to the study of the will of God;
Our strength, to strenuous exertion in the way of God.

Cleave the waves of misery, in the ships of salvation.

PATIENCE.

Patience in adversity, is among the treasures of faith.

Patience in adversity, and thankfulness in prosperity, together constitute religion.

How many obstacles are removed by patience!

How many are sad, whose sadness tends towards joy eternal!

How many are joyful, whose joy tends to everlasting sadness!

LOVE OF THE WORLD.

How shall he find leisure for the concerns of another life,
Whose heart is occupied in the things of this world?

The love of the world is the fountain of all sin.

He is made partaker of a transporting joy,
Who hath withdrawn from the allurements of the world.

The food of the world is poison;
And its furniture corruption.

Take heed to thyself of the love of the world;
For it is the furnace of all sin,
And the sink of all wretchedness.

Sell thy worldly for eternal goods,
And thou shalt have great gain.

The world is like a day that is past, and a watch that is over.

It behoves thee to bestow thy labour on another life;
The world will then be to thee a small thing.

Be ye of the number of the sons of another life;
And not of the number of the sons of this world;
For every son shall adhere to his mother,
In the day of resurrection.

CHARITY.

They are the best riches, that are expended in pious uses.
Riches are increased, by the bountiful bestowal of alms.

The liberality of the poor man renders him illustrious;
The avarice of the rich man renders him vile.

The silver sequin of the poor man is brighter in the sight of God,
Than the golden dinar of the rich.

He doubly gives, who gives with a cheerful countenance.

Do good to the evil-doer, and thou shalt prevail over him.

Seat thyself beside the poor, thou wilt augment the value of thy bounty.

The best part of alms is their concealment.

Alms given in secret is the multiplier of wealth.

Expend from that which will not remain with thee,
To procure that which shall never leave thee.

Be abundant in bestowing benefits;
And multiply largely thy beneficence:
For it is a most sure treasure for the future;
And a most pleasant recollection.

Keep thy religion by the expenditure of thy riches;
And thou shalt gain both:
Neither expend thy religion on keeping thy riches;
For so thou shalt lose both.

Preserve thy religion with strictest care;
And dispense munificently thy worldly possessions.

Be tenacious of thy estimation (in the sight of God);
And communicate liberally of thy wealth:
So shalt thou perfect the manly vigour of thy soul;
And shalt be happy in thy conversation.

He is the best of men who, in his prosperity, is liberal and grateful;
And, in his adversity, of a calm and patient mind.

Thy garment, wherewith thou clothest another, will be more enduring to thee,
Than that wherein thou art thyself clothed.

Provide to yourselves in the fleeting days (of time),
Your supply of food against the days of eternity.

The prosperity of the liberal man, manifesteth his virtues;
The prosperity of the avaricious man, proclaimeth his vices.

A liberal unbeliever may sooner hope for Paradise,
Than an avaricious Mahometan.

Three things conciliate love,—piety, meekness, and liberality.

RETURNING GOOD FOR EVIL.

Treat him benignly, who hath dealt injuriously by thee;
That he may be overwhelmed with shame.

It is the height of virtue to pardon an injury;
When thou hast it in thy power to avenge it.

The victory of the generous, consists in forgiveness, beneficence, and humanity;
But that of the ignoble, in pride, insolence, and revenge.

Chastise thy enviers, by becoming their benefactor;
And amend thine enemies, by deserving well of them.

ANGER.

The most excellent government, is the government of (our) anger.

Satan obtains a victory over him whom his anger conquers.

Purify thy heart from hatred;
For it is a wasting sickness, and a pestilent disease.

SELF-GOVERNMENT.

It is more profitable for thee to fly thyself, than to escape from a lion.

The government of thyself, is the chiefest government of all.

The best contest, is to contend against thyself.

Resist thine appetite, and thou wilt enjoy rest.

The integrity of religion consists in abstinence;
And its corruptibility in concupiscence.

Thy cupidity is the most deadly of all thine enemies;
Conquer it, therefore, or it will destroy thee.

To resist desire, and to keep thyself unstained by the things of this world, is the ornament of religion.

The slave of pleasure, is viler than a man reduced to the condition of a slave.

The slave of his own lusts is a captive;
Neither can his chains be loosed.

The ascent to eminent virtue is steep and difficult;
The descent to vice easy.

Fight against cupidity, as an adversary fights against his adversary;
And conflict with it, as enemy conflicteth with enemy;
Then, perchance, thou mayest subdue it.

The victory of lustful cupidity, is the heaviest destruction;
But to subdue it, is supreme dominion.

Let not concupiscence enslave thee;
For God created thee free.

To contend against thyself, is the height of perfection;
To labour for an eternal habitation, is the path to happiness.

PURITY OF HEART.

None shall enjoy Paradise,
But he whose inmost thoughts are good,
And whose intentions are sincere.

He hath attained salvation, who is made free from depravity of soul.

The adornment of the interior part,
Is better than the ornament of the exterior.

The fear of God maketh the heart clean.

The Most High God beholdeth not vices, by viewing what is presented to the eye;
But He inspecteth the heart, according to the rule of faith.

Restrain thy soul from all vice;
And bend thy zeal manfully to generous actions:
Then shalt thou be free from iniquity;
And keep safe the most illustrious virtues.

THE TONGUE.

The speech of a man, maketh manifest the secret workings of his heart.

The heart is the treasurer of the tongue.

The heart of the foolish man, is in his mouth;
And the tongue of the wise man, in his heart.

To restrain the tongue is empire;
To loose it is destruction.

Rule thy tongue, and thou shalt be safe.

CONTENTMENT.

It becomes thee to be content, both in poverty and abundance;

And to be of a grateful mind, both in joy and adversity.

Contentment possesseth riches;
But avidity createth cares.

A little, that sufficeth, is better than abundance that causeth the heart to swell.

The mind, content with its own lot, hath reached the summit of its vows.

DEATH.

Forgetfulness of death, is the lust of the heart.

The recollection of death, is the exhilaration of the heart.

As thou drawest nearer unto death, order the better thine affairs. *

How can any man have pleasure in death,
Whose heart is occupied by the love of this world?

I marvel at him that is slothful, when death seeks him.

The scope of the wise man is to make himself ready,
For the judgment of the last day.

* 1 Kings, xx. 1.—"Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die."

He who hideth himself from death,
Is the nighest of those who go to meet it.

He doth not die,
Who maketh it a science to live.

Lay aside thy glory, and lower thy pride, and remember thy tomb;
For thither shall be thy transit;
And as thou hast sowed, so shalt thou reap;
And as thou hast judged, so shalt thou be judged;
And as thou hast given to-day, that same shalt thou receive to-morrow.

ETERNITY.

I marvel at him who repairs the house that passeth away;
But dilapidates the enduring habitation.

He deals unjustly by himself,
Who sets up his rest in the house that passeth away,
By substituting it for the house that abideth for ever.

GOOD WORKS.

Knowledge without practice, is like a bow without its string.

Learning will profit nothing,
Unless it be accompanied by understanding;
Neither will profession ever suffice,
Unless it produces a corresponding practice.

Let not concupiscence reduce thee to slavery, but be abstinent;
Neither restrain thy beneficence, although thou mayest find none to estimate it at its price.

There is no merchandise like a good work;
Neither gain like its reward.

A man cannot be happy, unless by obedience;
Nor unhappy, unless by disobedience, to God.

HUMILITY.

There is no estimation like humility.

The humility of a man, is his exaltation.

Be humble in thy childhood;
That thou mayest be exalted in thine old age.

FAITH.

He doth not believe in God, in whose heart doubt hath its habitation.

He hath rightly ordered his way, whose heart is the seat of assurance, and his soul, of the fear of God.

The hoarders of riches shall perish, while they live;
But the wise remain, as long as the night and day endureth:
They may be absent in the body;
But their images are present to the heart.

In the specimens which are here submitted to illustrate the moral code and spirit of Mahometanism, in its primitive constitution, the reader will have recognized many principles and maxims, common to it with Christianity; and some points of agreement, (as in the injunctions to forgiveness of injuries, returning good for evil, secrecy in alms-giving, and humility,) with the proper and peculiar morality of the Gospel. In all the particulars in question, moreover, the sentiments of Ali are supported

by the authority of the Koran. The moral doctrines which they teach, however belied by its practice, have, consequently, obtained the universal assent of the Mahometan world.

But, before we pass on to illustrate this further conformity, I must lay before the reader an example of imitation, as palpable, perhaps, as any plagiarism of the Koran: which may serve to evince, that the spurious parallel of Mahometanism with Christianity by no means expired with the life of the impostor; but was faithfully kept up by his immediate followers, and has descended through the unbroken stream of Mahometan tradition. A fact which peculiarly claims our notice; since it is in this traditional propagation of the resemblance, that a Providence seems most sensibly apparent.

In the following very striking specimen of coincidence, between these proverbs of Ali, and the preaching of Christ in the Gospels, the copy after the Beatitudes admits not of doubt. The imitation extends even to the adoption of the *number* of our Lord's blessings; there being nine in each enumeration.

Blessed is he, whose heart is fixed in intent meditation;
And whose tongue is occupied in the praise of God:
Blessed is every one who mourns his errors;
When he recalls to mind his past aberrations:

Blessed is he, who studiously pursues after his salvation;
Before respiration becomes difficult, and despair strong:
Blessed is he, who subdueth himself, neither is subdued by himself;
And who holds his desire under dominion, nor suffers himself to be ruled by it:
Blessed is he, who represseth his anger, neither giveth it up the reins;
And who resists the empire of his appetite, neither is destroyed by it:
Blessed is he, who puts on the tranquillity of a contented mind, as it were a cloak;
And removes prodigality from him:
Blessed is he, whose breast is void of hatred;
And his heart clean from fraud:
Blessed is he, who entereth on the right road;
Before its gates are closed, and his opportunities cut away:
Blessed is he, whom the killing allurements of the world do not kill." [1]

The Proverbs of Ali, to which I have confined myself in the foregoing selection, both as the received production of the kinsman and chosen companion of Mahomet, and as the offspring of a single mind, afford a just standard of the primitive spirit of Mahometanism, and of its studied parallel with the Gospel, as a code of morals. *

* The sentences of Ali, both in spirit and in manner, bear a strong resemblance to the didactic books of the Old Testament, and especially of the Apocrypha; and would seem to have been modelled after the Proverbs

The collections formed from more recent sources, by the learned Hottinger * and others, are composed in the same strain; and determine the place of these sentences, as the rule of Mahometan morality, by the consent of Mahometan tradition. Every age of the Hejra has furnished similar precepts concerning piety, justice, charity, humility, forgiveness of injuries, rendering good for evil, contempt of the world, regulation of the life, purification of the heart, and other virtues; which, however imperfect the comparison of the religions in their practical effects, continually remind us, by the undoubted resemblance, of the no less undoubted relation, of Mahometanism to Christianity, as its spurious counterpart.

From the period of the rise of Arabian learning, the theory of morals contained in the Koran, or transmitted, as we have seen, through Mahometan tradition, is to be found embodied in more systematic form, in the ethical writings of the Saracen philosophers. By this class of interpreters, not only are the moral parts of the Koran explained and enlarged upon, but its ritual precepts are uniformly represented as con-

of Solomon, and the Book of Ecclesiasticus. They are disposed acrostically, according to the peculiar manner of Hebraic composition; and bear much the same relation to the Koran, that the didactic parts of the Old Testament bear to the historical and prophetical books.

* Hist. Orient. p. 315—335.

cealing a deep moral meaning. The commentators have been taxed, and perhaps too justly, with extorting, in some instances, a sense from the text, which it was not intended to convey; but the comments in question are not, on this account, at all lessened in their value, as proofs of the actual moral parallel subsisting between Christianity and Mahometanism; the providential analogy of the religions being as clearly deducible from concurrence in the interpretations, as from correspondence between the texts, of the Bible and Koran. The spiritual gloss of the Saracen philosophers may be no sufficient test, that such was the proper force and aim of certain literal precepts of the latter law; but it is a perfectly satisfactory touchstone of the permanent character and tendencies of the Mahometan scheme of religion. Without a moral bearing in the creed itself, there could not have arisen a progressive series of moral commentaries and glosses. What has been here remarked, an example or two will illustrate.

Among the ritual ordinances of the law of Mahomet, the most prominent religious duties enjoined in the Koran are those of Ablution and Fasting. Notwithstanding expressions to a contrary effect in the original text, it has been usual to regard these fundamental rites of Mahometan-

ism as mere outward forms, incapable of producing any fruits beyond the formal observance of them. But the real questions for our consideration are, how have these precepts been understood among the Mahometans? how have they been explained by standard commentators on the Koran? These queries shall be briefly resolved in the words of the first of its philosophical interpreters, the illustrious Al Gazal.

In stating his doctrine of ablution, Mahomet had pronounced cleanliness to be the foundation of religion, and the half of faith. Following up these sayings, Al Gazal distinguishes four degrees of cleanliness.

1. The cleansing of the natural body, from its defilement, and from every thing unseemly and superfluous.

2. The cleansing of the members of the body, from sinfulness, and illicit actions.

3. The cleansing of the heart, from impure thoughts, and evil cogitations.

4. The cleansing of the hidden man, from every thing but the Most High God. *

The same cause of complaint which attached to the Pharisees in our Lord's day, is preferred by Al Gazal against the Mahometan formalists; against those who observed the letter, as con-

* See Pocock, Specim. p. 295, 296.

trasted with the sense of the Koran: "Men who, having their eyes darkened, were solicitous, in their ablutions, only for the care of that outward part of the body, which is to the rest, as the outer husk of the nut to its desired kernel; when the great concern should be the purifying of the recesses of the heart." * The Arabian philosopher, therefore, after the Gospel precedent, here complains heavily of those who were zealous even to superstition, concerning their outward ablutions, insomuch that they held as unclean, and fled the contact of, all who were less superstitious than themselves in these observances; while, by an inversion of the right order of things, "their own inward part remained desolate, and full of the vices of pride, dissimulation, arrogance, ignorance, and hypocrisy." †

The rite of fasting, Al Gazal contemplates in a similar light, and distinguishes by similar degrees of observance. These degrees, conformably with Mahometan tradition, he makes to be threefold:

The fast commonly so called, the fast properly so called, and the fast eminently so called.

1. The fast commonly so called is, that a man restrain the appetites of the body from fulfilling their desires.

2. The fast properly so called is, that a man

* See Pocock, Specim. p. 295, 296. † Ib. p. 296.

turn away his ears, his eyes, his tongue, his hands, his feet, and his other bodily members from sin.

3. But the fast eminently so called is, the fast of the heart from lower cares, and earthly cogitations, and its aversion from all things excepting God. *

The low standard, and imperfect motives, of its spurious creed, leavened as it originally was by the carnal ordinances of Judaism, necessarily abated or nullified the practical effects of these noble reaches of the Saracen philosophy. They do not, however, for this cause, the less perfectly fill up the outline sketched in these pages; or the less completely fulfil their end, as exemplifications of the moral parallel of Mahometanism with Christianity. The line of demarcation drawn, between the mere formalist in religion, and the true believer, is a studied transcript from the Gospel: it is, in point of fact, of the same nature with the distinction made by our blessed Lord, between the Pharisees and the true fulfillers of the Law: we remark the same contrast of inward with outward observances; the same opposition of the spirit to the letter; the same reduced estimate of the purificatory rites of re-

* Al Gazal, et al Mostatraf, ap. Pocock. Specim. p. 302. The spirit here so nobly inculcated is finely embodied in an Arabic distich, to the following effect.

How many feast, while they fast:
How many fast, while they feast!

ligion, except as means and emblems of the purification of the heart.

Nor was the religion of Mahomet, in this its better aspect, wholly wanting in the production of corresponding fruits. These fruits discover themselves in a reality of belief, a fervour of zeal, and a sincerity of devotion, which, it has been often remarked, might put to shame the majority of the Christian world. The phenomenon would be as strange as it is certain, did not the cause here shown to have been in operation, suffice to explain effects otherwise altogether unaccountable. Wherever Mahometanism has settled, these effects have appeared; and it seems any thing but good judgment, or Christian wisdom, to doubt their practical influence, to a certain extent *, in raising and refining the minds and morals of heathen nations.

Look, for example, at the lessons which this superstition has diffused and familiarized among mankind, not only in the central seats of its empire, but in the most insulated and sequestered situations. Its character, in such remote quarters, supplies, perhaps, the best and surest test of the moral agency of Mahometanism, in its un-

* More than a limited practical influence it would be idle to look for, from a religion destitute of that only living principle of religion, — THE GRACE OF GOD.

controlled and undisguised spirit. In this view the author will own himself to have been particularly struck by a circumstance, perhaps not unlikely to make a similar impression on the reader, incidentally noticed by the accomplished Sir William Jones, on his outward voyage to India. In the Island of Hinzuan, or Johanna, a secluded speck in the Atlantic, off the coast of Africa, this elegant orientalist observed over the gate of a mosque, the following inscription, which he thus renders from the Arabic: —

The world was given us for our own edification;
Not for the purpose of raising sumptuous buildings:
Life, for the discharge of moral and religious duties;
Not for pleasurable indulgences:
Wealth, to be liberally bestowed;
Not avariciously hoarded:
And learning, to produce good actions;
Not empty disputes.

"We could not," proceeds the narrator, "but respect the temple even of a false prophet, in which we found such excellent morality: we found nothing better among the Romish trumpery in the church at Madeira." *

All accounts concur in representing the devoutness of the Mahometan worship, in every

* See Asiatic Researches, for "An Account of the Island of Hinzuan, or Johanna."

country where Mahometanism prevails, as corresponding with, and illustrating, the best features of its morality. From Morocco to Mecca, from Constantinople to Calcutta, the character of this worship is at unity with itself; is alike simply and severely devout in the first of all religious exercises — prayer. The observations of European travellers, however at issue on other points, seem unanimous in this conclusion. Many testimonies might be cited; but I shall content myself with one, which, from the recency of its date, the unpromising national character of the people to whom it is borne, and the unexceptionable authority of the witness, seems entitled to more than ordinary consideration. In the year 1821, when at the town of Baghtchiserai, in the south of the Crimea, Dr. Henderson, then acting as agent to the British and Foreign Bible Society, visited the principal of its thirty-three mosques, at the evening service of the Tartars. His unaffected narrative forcibly illustrates the impression made by the devout decorum of a Mahometan service, on a religious mind: "The Tartars all sat on their heels in the oriental manner, while the Mollah recited to them certain Surahs, or chapters of the Koran; and when he came to the end of a section, or where any direct reference was made to the

object of worship, they bowed themselves twice, so as to touch the ground with their foreheads. During prayer, they covered their faces with both hands, following the Mollah with low and solemn sighs, manifesting throughout the most profound reverence and veneration. Much has been said in defence of pompous and splendid forms of worship, and many have insisted on their absolute necessity in order to interest the vulgar; but I will venture to affirm, that all the dazzling splendour of external ceremonies, superadded to the Christian system *, never produced a solemnity to be compared with that resulting from the simple adoration here exhibited in a Mahometan mosque; every sense seemed closed against earthly objects, and a high degree of self-annihilation appeared to inspire the mind of every worshipper. How humbling the reflection, that so little real devotion, and so feeble a sense of the presence of the great Jehovah, is often to be found in assemblies professing to worship him in spirit and in truth!"

And now, to resume the proposition laid down at the commencement, from the illustrative sketch

* It is to be regretted, that Dr. H. should have drawn this contrast; at least that he should have done so, in a manner thus unguarded. Surely, the worship of the Church of England, her "mild majesty, and sober state," might have claimed exemption from his implied censure.

here drawn of the moral parallel, it may seem sufficiently apparent, that the moral scheme of Mahometanism, in its lower features, is constructed from the carnal ordinances and observances of the Mosaic covenant, as interpreted by Rabbinical tradition; and, in its better parts, is throughout a studied and servile copy of the higher precepts of the Law, or the pure morality of the Gospel. The practical imperfection of its merits, therefore, and the glaring character of its defects, instead of injuring the providential analogy, unite in reducing that analogy to the just relative proportion, which alone, a spurious revelation can bear to the genuine; to that proper and respectful distance, which the illegitimate must ever keep, from the legitimate seed. And, when every concession which truth and justice can require, has been made in favour of the system of Mahomet, as viewed in its practical tenets and effects, an immeasurable gulf remains, and always must remain, between its principles and springs of action, and those of the blessed, everlasting Gospel.

SECTION VI.

DOCTRINAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

WHEN Christianity was originally presented to the Gentile world, its primitive teachers, the apostles, inculcated, as the root of all its other doctrines, two fundamental articles of faith: they preached "Jesus, and the resurrection." And, although the Jews rejected Jesus as the Christ, the coming of a Messiah, and the hope of a resurrection from the dead, were also undoubted fundamentals of belief, in the ancient Jewish church. These doctrines, therefore, stand properly in the foreground of an inquiry into the doctrinal parallel of Mahometanism with Judaism and Christianity.

Now the religion of Mahomet not only recognizes Christ and the resurrection, but, in its recognition of these primary truths, reaches almost as far beyond the popular notions prevalent among the Jews, as it falls short of the pure and perfect belief disseminated under the Christian dispensation. The character and extent of the doctrinal analogy here subsisting, may be easily collected, from a simple review of

the measure of that faith in Jesus Christ, and in the resurrection after death, which are held essential, in all Mahometan confessions of faith, to the character of a true Mussulman.

The belief professed by Mahomet and his followers concerning Jesus Christ, comprises the following great Christian verities. 1. They acknowledge him to be the λογος *, or Word of God, in a mysterious sense proceeding from the Father. So the Koran, in the version there given of the angelic salutation: "The angels said, O 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." † The lowest interpretation, put by the commentators on this passage, asserts Christ to be called the Word, "because he was conceived by the word, or command of God,

* Λογον, seu Sermonem, Christum εξοχως ab iisdem [Muhammedanis] appellari. Dubitandum non est quin επιθετον hoc Servatoris nostri, vel potius χαρακτηρα ουσιωδη, desumpserit Muhammed ex Joh. i. 1. — Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 105. The sense in which the term λογος came subsequently to be understood, among the Saracenic philosophers, may be gathered from the Kitab-al-Resula, or "Book of the Prophet;" where the author, while asserting the uncreated eternity of the divine attributes, thus unconsciously bears testimony to the divine nature of Christ, whom Mahomet owned to be "the Word." "Locutus est Deus cum Mose SERMONE, qui est *proprietas essentiæ ejus, non vero Creatura de Creaturis ejus.*" The doctrine of our Lord's divinity inevitably results from a comparison of this extract, with the admissions of the Koran.

† See Sale's Koran, vol. i. p. 63.; and compare vol. ii. p. 130., and p. 449.

without a father:" the prevalent belief of Mahometans understands the expression, as appropriated to our Lord, in a sense still nearer to the Catholic mystery. * 2. They own Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, and make common cause with Christians, on this question, against them. † 3. They maintain, with the Catholic church, our Lord's incarnation of a pure virgin, by the immediate power or Spirit of God; ‡ alleging him, further, to have been begotten after the similitude of Adam's creation, whom God called into being from the dust. § 4. His immaculate conception. || 5. His sole exemption, the blessed virgin only excepted, from the touch of Satan, or stain of Adam's transgression. 6. His office in heaven as mediator and intercessor between God and man. ¶ 7. His place

* "One sect of them, particularly, believes *that Christ is God*, and the Redeemer of the world."— Worthington's Boyle's Lectures, vol. ii. p. 246. Conf. Pocock, Specim. p. 221.

† "Rem ipsam si spectes, et controversiam que cum Judæis nobis intercedit, an Jesus Nazarenus sit verus Messias, diximus jam, in *Thesaur. Philol.* p. 163., *Muhammedanos à Christianorum stare partibus.*" — Hott. Hist. Orient. p. 105, 106.

‡ So the Koran: "Mary, the daughter of Imran, who preserved her chastity, and into whose womb we breathed of our spirit." — Sale, vol. ii. p. 449. "Tu as créé Jésus de ton Esprit, et de ton Verbe." — Mahomet, ap. Gagnier, tome i. p. 242.

§ Sale's Koran, vol. i. p. 67. Mill, De M. A. M. p. 349. Hott. Hist. Orient. p. 104.

|| Hott. Hist. Orient. p. 94.

¶ Concorditer Arabes docent Christum in cœlo, seu vitâ eternâ, MEDIATORIS, seu ἱκετου, munere fungi. — Hott. ut supra, p. 105, 106.

and final supremacy, as the appointed Judge of all men, Mahomet himself included, at the last day. [1]

From the foregoing summary of its belief in Christ's character and office [2], the reader will perceive that the religion of Mahomet not only reproves the errors of Jewish infidelity, but rises vastly superior to the confession of certain classes of pretended Christians. By a special Mahometan law, the Jews, who altogether deny the character and office of Jesus Christ, and reject him as the promised Messiah, are compelled, first to confess their faith in Christ and Christianity, as the indispensable preliminary to their admission to the rank of Mussulmans. * Nor will orthodox Mahometans admit the affinity laid claim to by those sectaries of Christianity, the disciples of Socinus, or by the more modern Unitarians, who disown those characteristics of Jesus Christ, upon which they strenuously insist; his miraculous incarnation, his immaculate conception, and his exemption from all taint of human frailty, with his media-

* "Si quis Judæus fieri vult Mahumetista, *cogitur prius credere Christo:* cui talis fit interrogatio: Credisne Christum fuisse flatu Dei ex Virgine natum; et ultimum prophetam Hebræorum? Quo concesso, fit Mahumetanus." — M. A. Vivaldus, ap. Reland. De Relig. Mohamm. Præfatio.

torial and intercessory agency in the eternal world.

The belief entertained respecting Christ's person, by some among the Mahometans, approaches yet more nearly to the Catholic doctrine: one theological school in particular (the counterpart, seemingly, of the Arian,) asserts both his pre-existence, and his participation, in a certain mysterious sense, of the divine nature; while another has advanced its speculative creed to the verge of Catholicity, — affirming the belief, "that the divine nature might be united with the human, in the same person," and admitting the possibility, "that God might appear in a human form." *

The fabulous puerilities of the Koran and its expositors, concerning the life and miracles of our Lord, rarely, if at all, of Mahometan invention, may be generally traced to the Apocryphal Gospels, and other spurious remains of Christian antiquity.

The doctrine of the resurrection, with its inseparable consequences, a general judgment, and a future state of reward or punishment, is the next prime fundamental to be considered,

* "The *Holûlians* believed, that the divine nature might be united with the human in the same person; for they granted it possible that God might appear in a human form." — Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 225.

as held in common by Christianity and Mahometanism, however in the latter system lowered and debased by a plentiful alloy of those Rabbinical figments, so congenial to the sensual habits and spirit of its founder. The Mahometan doctrine of the resurrection so far coincides with the Scriptural doctrine, that it comprehends the rising again of the body, and its final reunion with the soul. The mode of their reunion, a question which Saint Paul's masterly argument proves to have been early moved in the primitive church, has also largely exercised the metaphysical zeal and subtlety of the Mahometan doctors; whose theories of the resurrection are distinguished, by the usual incongruous admixture of Gospel truths, with Rabbinical hallucinations; Judaism still supplying what Christianity withholds. *

On the subject of this inexplicable mystery, however, an attempt to thread the maze of Mahometan speculation, would be foreign from the object proposed in these pages. It will be more in place, to call attention to the parallel, observable between Christianity and Mahometanism, in the facts which they agree in representing, as signs

* See Mill, De Mohammedismo, ante Mohamm. p. 399. et sequent.

of the resurrection. Among the occurrences so accounted by the Mahometan doctrine *, are to be found the following marked coincidences with the signs specified by our Lord, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Saint Matthew, whence they are obviously taken: tumults and seditions; the decay of faith among men; great wars of nations; a revolution in the course of the sun; an eclipse of the moon; the coming of Antichrist; and the descent of Jesus on earth. If to these manifest plagiarisms, be added some signs borrowed from other places of Scripture, — such as, the appearance of the Beast; a general apostasy to idolatry; the persecution and final triumph and return of the Jews, — enough will be forthcoming, to indicate the kind of correspondence, on the subject of the resurrection, subsisting between the Christian and Mahometan doctrines: the latter being here, in accordance with the entire analogy of the spurious with the true revelation, the palpable copy and corruption of the former.

For the ridiculous fables interlarded with these fragments of Christian truth, Mahometanism is indebted to the Rabbinical writers; thus, in every deviation from Christianity, still

* See Sale, Prelim. Discourse, pp. 104—110.

so approximating to Judaism, as continually to keep alive the image of its spurious relation to the true religion, in both its branches.

In the teaching of our Lord, and his apostles and evangelists, the resurrection of the dead is uniformly represented as being followed by the general judgment. The Mahometan doctrine of a judgment to come, so far concurs with the Christian; from which it widely differs in the presumptuous and revolting minuteness with which Mahomet and his followers pretend to scrutinize and expose the secrets of the invisible world. Here, however, as in so many other examples, where Mahometanism seems most to swerve from the reverent simplicity of Gospel truth, its aberrations serve only to render a separate branch of the analogy with revealed religion more complete, by betraying further affinities with the errors of Rabbinical Judaism. Thus, the Mahometan notions of the near approach of the sun at the last day, by whose extraordinary heat the wicked shall be then tormented; of the books to be produced, wherein men's actions are registered; of the balance, wherein they shall be weighed; and of the bridge Al-Sirât, over which all must pass, from the judgment to their respective destinations, — with several

more particulars, are notoriously borrowed from the reveries of the old Jewish writers. *

The fearful sights and sounds, on the other hand, which the Mahometans believe are to precede the general resurrection to judgment, very remarkably correspond with the signs predicted in the New Testament; whence, as the following statement of their belief on this subject, given by the learned English translator of the Koran may suffice to show, they must have been derived. — At the first sound of the last trumpet, they say, "the earth will be shaken, and not only all buildings, but the very mountains levelled; the heavens shall melt, the sun be darkened, the stars fall; and the sea shall be troubled and dried up, or turned into flames, the sun, moon, and stars being thrown into it." The reader conversant with Scripture will easily refer the particulars of this representation to their proper sources in the New Testament; — the main resort of Mahometan plagiarism, on the subject of the future judgment.

The commanding claims of the Christian religion, and the vain pretensions of the Mahometan superstition, stand no where more conclusively opposed to one another, than in the doctrines of the two creeds respecting the re-

* See Sale, Prelim. Discourse, pp. 110—120.

wards and punishments of a future state: in their descriptions of hell and paradise; the joys of the blessed in the one, and the torments of the condemned in the other. Nor does the sublime spirituality, and dignified reserve of the Gospel, when treating on these awful and mysterious subjects, more convincingly bespeak the divine origin of Christianity, than the gross sensuality, and disgusting specifications, of the Koran and its commentators, betray Mahometanism in its proper character, as a false and spurious revelation.

Even here, however, a certain analogy will be found to obtain, between the true revelation and the false; and in a way perfectly accordant with their respective characters. For it appears, on examination, that the paradise and hell of Mahomet are, in fact, mainly compounded, either, 1. from materials furnished by Rabbinical Judaism, or, 2. from perverted applications, in the literal sense, of the figurative language of Scripture.

1. The learned translator of the Koran has traced Mahomet, in his representations of hell and its torments, to Jewish sources, for several of the most prominent and peculiar features of his doctrine: the notions of the seven stories, or apartments, into which, according to the Maho-

metan belief, hell is divided; of the guard of angels, over each of these apartments; of the partition-wall, which separates hell from paradise; of the diversity of punishments to be endured by the wicked; of their skins, or faces, being burnt black by the alternations of intolerable heat and cold; and of the limited term appointed to the sufferings of the Mussulmans, or true believers, who shall then be admitted into paradise; — these, with other particulars of his doctrine of hell torments, existed long before the time of Mahomet, in the Rabbinical writings; and plainly appear to have been borrowed from the received doctrine of the Jews. *

Paradise, the Mahometans describe as a garden, situate above, or in, the seventh heaven; the chief beauty of this abode of the blessed, according to the Koran, consisting in the delightful rivers by which it is traversed. Some of these rivers, the commentators say, flow with water, some with milk, some with wine, and others with honey. For the first entertainment of the blessed, on their admission, the commentators provide the ox Balâm and the fish Nûn. The entrance to the hundred different gardens into which paradise is subdivided, they represent as made through eight several gates. Within, the Koran

* See Prelim. Discourse, pp. 121—126.: and compare Mill, De Mohammed. ante Mohamm. pp. 412—416.

teaches, there will be, not only different abodes, but abodes of different degrees of happiness; the felicity of each person being proportioned to his deserts; the portion of those, who shall, morning and evening, behold the face of God, constituting, according to the tradition of Mahomet, the highest degree.

In all these particulars, as Mr. Sale has satisfactorily argued, the paradise of Mahomet is a literal transcript from that fabled by the Jews: "Whence Mohammed took the greatest part of his paradise, it is easy to show. The Jews constantly described the future mansion of the just as a delicious garden, and make it also reach to the seventh heaven. They also say it has three gates, or, as others will have it, two; and four rivers, flowing with milk, wine, balsam, and honey. Their Behemoth and Leviathan, which they pretend will be slain for the entertainment of the blessed, are so apparently the Balâm and Nûn of Mohammed, that his followers themselves confess he is obliged to them for both. The Rabbins, likewise, mention seven degrees of felicity, and say, that the highest will be of those who perpetually contemplate the face of God."*

In one particular alone, the leading feature

* Prelim. Discourse, p. 133, 134. See also Mill, ut supra, pp. 416—419.

and reproach of his sensual paradise, his doctrine of the Houries, Mahomet appears to have plagiarized, not from Jewish sources, but from the creed of the Persian Magi.* That there was nothing, however, inconsistent with the spirit or belief of Rabbinical Judaism, even in this monstrous notion, may plainly be gathered from the gross conceptions prevalent among the Jews of our Lord's day, on the subjects of the resurrection, and the employments of a future state.†

2. Nor was Mahomet indebted to Jewish sources alone, for his descriptions of his material paradise; he seems further, as Mr. Sale has justly noticed, to have wrested to his unhallowed purposes, the Christian Scriptures themselves, by the perverse adoption of their figurative representations of the future world, in the literal and material sense. The process of connection, between schemes so utterly at variance, is thus made out by the ingenious translator of the Koran: "As it is scarce possible to convey to the apprehensions of the generality of mankind, an idea of spiritual pleasures, without introducing sensible objects,

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 134. According to M. Vertot, the Houries of Mahomet's paradise were derived, not, as Mr. Sale has supposed, from the Magian superstition, but from the extravagancies of the wildest of the Gnostic heretics; namely, from the *terrestrial paradise*, provided by Cerinthus for his followers, into which they were to enter after the resurrection. See History of the Knights of Malta, vol. i. p. 233.

† St. Matt. xxii. 23—30.

the Scriptures have been obliged to represent the celestial enjoyments by corporeal images; and to describe the mansions of the blessed as a glorious and magnificent city, built of gold and precious stones, with twelve gates; through the streets of which there runs a river of water of life, and having on either side the tree of life, which bears twelve sorts of fruit, and leaves of a healing virtue. Our Saviour, likewise, speaks of the future state of the blessed, as of a kingdom, where they shall eat and drink at his table." * It is needless to remark, how studiously the principal circumstances of this description have been pressed into his service by Mahomet, in his Koran; where, in addition to the gross misuse of the figures of Scripture language, are introduced those sensual images, in their most offensive reality, which the Scriptures had expressly excluded, and solemnly denounced. †

In some parts of his material paradise, at the

* Prelim. Discourse, p. 134. Compare Rev. xxi. "Falsum est Paradisi Mohammedici voluptatem in solis rebus corporeis et earum usu consistere. Falsum et hoc, omnes Mohammedanos credere illas voluptates corporeas fore: multi enim hæc parabolica dicta, et de voluptatibus spiritualibus intelligenda esse, contendunt, eodem modo quo et nos gaudium cœleste nominibus *horti, civitatis,* cujus fundamenta sint *ex lapidibus pretiosis,* portæ *ex margaritis,* ubi et *arbor vitæ,* et *fluvius purissimus,* et alia erunt, in quo *convvium rerum pinguium,* et *vini defæcati,* solemus describere." — Reland, de Relig. Mohamm. p. 202, 203.

† Rev. xxi. 27.

same time, it must be admitted, Mahomet might have found something too nearly resembling a precedent, in the unpruned and fanciful phraseology of some of the early Fathers. Saint Irenæus, for example, in a well-known passage quoted by Sale, introduces a tradition of Saint John, purporting to preserve the following, as a saying of our Lord: — "The days shall come, in which there shall be vines, which shall have each ten thousand branches, and every one of these branches shall have ten thousand twigs, and every one of these twigs shall have ten thousand clusters of grapes, and in every one of these clusters there shall be ten thousand grapes, and every one of these grapes, being pressed, shall yield two hundred and seventy-five gallons of wine; and, when a man shall take hold of one of these sacred bunches, another bunch shall cry out, I am a better bunch; take me, and bless the Lord by me." * It is true, that, before the Scriptural figures of expression could be wrested to purposes like those of Mahomet, in his sensual paradise, the whole tenor of Scripture must have been wilfully misunderstood; but language like that here employed by Irenæus, might too easily mislead inquirers of a very different spirit from that of the Arabian impostor.

* Irenæus, l. 5. c. 33. ap. Sale, Prelim. Disc. pp. 134, 135. *note.*

On the whole, whether, in his delineations of hell and paradise, Mahomet be traced, to the the writings of the Rabbins, to the Scriptures of the New Testament, or to the language of the early Fathers of the church [3], the coincidences here observable with Judaism and Christianity, compose precisely the kind of parallel demanded, on the basis of the present argument; and exhibit the very agreement to be anticipated, between the legitimate and the spurious revelation. Had the Koran, for example, presented a more spiritual paradise, the resemblance must have been nearer, than that authorized by the original natural relation.

But, in bare justice, it should be added, that, however cherished by the popular and orthodox belief, the more eminent Mahometan doctors regarded sensual delights neither as the sole, nor as the higher felicity, of their paradise. By its philosophical disciples, on the contrary, the gross representations of the Koran are, contrary to its too palpable tenor and design, refined wholly into a mystical and spiritual meaning. * Nor is

* " Sensuales istæ Paradisi voluptates, a sapientioribus Mohammedanis, censentur allegoricæ, ut melius ab intellectu humano concipiantur; eodem modo, quo, in Bibliis Sacris, multa dicuntur *ανθρωποπαθως*. Nam cum, ad Legatum Marrocanum scribens, commemorarem hortum ad instar *Paradisi* amœnum, ille me quasi reprehendens rescripsit, *Paradisum esse talem locum, cui in hoc mundo nihil assimiletur, talem, quem nec oculus*

it to be lost sight of, that even the vulgar belief, itself, reckons the vision of God as the supreme delight of heaven, and as the portion of those who shall obtain a superior degree of honour and felicity. "To these," they say, borrowing the very language of Scripture, "there are prepared, such things as eye hath not seen, nor hath ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." Again, "Mohammed is reported to have said, — that he will be in the highest honour with God, who shall behold his face, morning and evening; and this favour Al Ghazâli supposes to be, that additional and superabundant blessing promised in the Koran, which will give such exquisite delight, that, in respect thereof, all the other pleasures of paradise will be forgotten and lightly esteemed." * As an apology for the sensual paradise of Mahomet, or as a set off against the spirituality of a purer system, this commentary from the Saracenic phi-

---

vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in animum hominis intravit." — Hyde, in Notis ad Bobovii Turcarum liturgiam, p. 21.; ap. Reland, p. 203.

"Addamus et hoc testimonium *Herbeloti*, in *Bibliotheca Orientali* ita scribentis, postquam docuisset Mohammedanos summum bonum in communione Dei, et gaudium cœleste in fruitione luminis faciei Divinæ, quæ, ubicunque est, Paradisum faciat, collocare: 'Non igitur verum est, quod multi auctores qui oppugnarunt Mohammedanismum scripserunt, Muslimannos non aliam beatitudinem in cœlo agnoscere, nisi usum voluptatum quæ sensus afficiunt.'" — Reland, p. 204.

* Sale, Prelim. Discourse, p. 132, 133.

losophy is plainly without value: its importance, at the same time, is considerable in another aspect; namely, as it marks the tendency of Mahometanism to improve; and to improve, by approximation to the lights of Christianity.

Before we pass to another head of the doctrinal parallel, it may be well to submit a specimen or two of the literal agreement of the Mahometan, with the Scriptural representations, of the splendours of paradise.

PARADISE.

SCRIPTURAL.	MAHOMETAN.
And the building of the wall of it was of jasper, and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones.	Its stones were pearls and jacinths, the wall of its buildings enriched with gold and silver, and the trunks of its trees are of gold:
In the midst of the street of it, was there the tree of life; which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month.	Among which, the most remarkable is the tree called Tûba, or the tree of happiness. Concerning this they fable, that it will be loaded with pomegranates, grapes, dates, and other fruits, &c.
And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal. Rev. xxi. 18, 19. xxii. 1, 2.	The Koran often speaks of the rivers of paradise as a principal ornament thereof: but of two especially, Al Cawthar (or the river of happiness), and the river of life.

SCRIPTURAL.	MAHOMETAN.
In my Father's house, are many mansions. St. John, xiv. 2.	In the Mahometan paradise, they reckon no less than an hundred different gardens, or places of different degrees of felicity.
The Mansions, or μοναὶ, spoken of in the Gospel, as the abodes of the blessed, signify abiding tabernacles, everlasting habitations. Τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. St. Luke, xvi. 9. *	The Jannat Aden, or garden of Eden, as paradise is styled by the Mahometans, in Arabic, signifies a settled or perpetual habitation.

It is observable of Judaism and Christianity, that the principal doctrines contained in the Old Testament and in the New, came only gradually, and after long time and discussion, to be developed into the doctrinal systems maintained respectively within the two churches. The observation holds true of Mahometanism also: on comparison with Christianity, especially, the doctrinal parallel stands very strikingly illustrated, by the similarity, or rather sameness, of the great doctrinal questions successively agitated by the opposed religions.

The Jewish church, in our Lord's day, was divided into conflicting parties on the important question, whether the law of Moses was to be received as the sole authority and standard of

* See "Sacred Literature," p. 250.

the Jews' religion, and as, in consequence, its own sole interpreter; or whether the disciples of the law were bound to receive, as of co-ordinate authority with it, the tradition handed down, from ancient times, through the fathers of the Hebrew church. Under Christianity, in the Western church especially, the controversy has raged, through successive ages to the present, between the adherents of the Bible alone, as the exclusive standard of Christian faith and practice, — and the advocates of the tradition of the church Catholic, as of supreme, or of subordinate authority, and as the true and authoritative interpreter of Scripture. On a fair comparison of Mahometanism with both branches of the true religion, the doctrinal analogy, so far as the question of tradition is concerned, certainly has nothing wanting to its completeness. After the precedents of the Jewish and Christian churches, the Mahometan world became early divided on the question, whether the Koran comprehended the sum of the confession of true believers, and constituted their only standard of appeal, — or, whether the Koran itself was to receive its authoritative interpretation from the Sonna, or reputed traditions of Mahomet. Nor are the corresponding features of this analogy distinguished simply by a general air of resemblance: on the con-

trary, the whole triple controversy respecting the authority of tradition, in its origin, its conduct, and its ascertained results; in the parallel sects and schisms to which it gave birth; and in the lasting and implacable enmities to which it ministered fuel, — when viewed even in an insulated light, may well be regarded as no ordinary indication of the providential analogy, assumed to subsist, between the three religious systems.

Upon the doctrinal history of the Christian religion, it must, in this place, be observed generally, that, while the sum of all Catholic doctrine is built on the one sure foundation, — the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, wherein are to be found the announcement, and the proofs, of every verity maintained, from the apostolic age inclusive, by the church, — the rise, on the other hand, of those doctrinal debates, which successively sprang up to disturb the unity of Christendom, has been historically traced, by ecclesiastical writers, to one or other of two sources, the Oriental, or the Greek, philosophy: the former, by its monstrous opposition to the truth, serving only more fully to elicit the sense of Scripture, on that mysterious question of philosophy, the origin of evil; the latter, by its abstract subtleties of speculation, rendering a similar service, on matters equally abstruse and

important, — the nature of the Godhead; the doctrines of liberty and necessity; of grace and human merit; of faith and good works, — with other controversies, which, while they necessarily led to divisions in the church, have still advanced, in their discussion, the great providential aim of clearing and confirming the Catholic verities.

The doctrinal history of Mahometanism presents a striking correspondence with that of Christianity, in the rise and management of its controversies: a correspondence, springing also from the self-same cause, the introduction, into the schools of the Saracens, of the Greek philosophy, engrafted on the Oriental. From the period of this innovation, accordingly, we meet, among the sectaries of Mahomet, similar philosophical disputations, respecting the origin of evil; the nature and attributes of the Godhead; fate and free-will; and several more questions, akin to those which successively prevailed in the Christian world, from the close of the first century inclusive. On each of the mysterious subjects specified, there unquestionably obtains a doctrinal parallel; only with this marked contradistinction between the legitimate revelation and its spurious counterpart, that the doctrines, reputed orthodox in the Mahometan religion, are

chiefly compounded from the Christian heresies; while singular approximations, on the other hand, have been made to the Catholic doctrines, by Mahometan sects accounted heretical. To exemplify the fact by a conclusive instance; the fundamental tenet of Mahometanism, its doctrine of the divine unity, is obviously, in substance, the same with the belief of the various sects calling themselves Christian, who deny the doctrine of the Trinity: while, on the other hand, the Trinitarian doctrine (however confusedly expressed, and imperfectly understood) very curiously re-appears, in the shape of a Mahometan heresy, in the philosophical school of the Hâyetians, or followers of the Motazalite doctor, Ahmed Ebn Hâyet.* The circumstance is highly interesting and important, as an index to the tendency of Mahometanism towards Catholic Christianity; thus manifested, in the early reaching forth of Mahometan speculation, to grasp the fundamental mystery of Catholic truth.

As the parallel between Christianity and Mahometanism, in the rise, nature, and conduct of their doctrinal controversies, must be more particularly examined hereafter, in treating of the analogy of the two religions, in their respective

* Pocock, Specim. p. 18, 19.; and p. 221.

sects and heresies *, it may suffice, for our immediate object, to present the doctrinal parallel, by simple statement of the principal subjects discussed in common by the two creeds; and of the common sources, to which preceding inquiry has traced their doctrinal disputations.

One of the earliest controversies of primitive Christianity (a doctrinal debate, as appears from allusions in the New Testament, already fermenting in the Apostolic age), the celebrated question respecting the origin of evil, has been successfully traced, by ecclesiastical writers, to an extrinsic source; namely, to the Oriental philosophy, as cultivated by the adherents of the Magian superstition. Now, whether borrowed directly from the same source, or, as seems more probable, derived from it indirectly, through the medium of the Gnostic heresies, the question concerning the origin of evil, and the doctrine of two principles, to which this question gave birth, came to be similarly agitated in the philosophical schools of the Saracens; their orthodox doctors maintaining, on the subject, the true belief, which holds God to be the author of good only, and evil to be the work solely of created natures; those accounted heterodox, on the other

* See section ix.

hand, reviving the monstrous notions of the Manichæans, and esteeming good and evil to be alike of divine original. Not only the sameness of subject, but the whole turn of the debate, and tenor of the arguments, mark the substantial sameness in the controversy, successively carried on by Catholic Christianity, and orthodox Mahometanism, so called, against the impious hallucinations of the Manichæan or Magian theology.

The nature and attributes of the Deity became the next grand question of doctrine in the Christian church: and here again, in due process of time, we find a corresponding controversy raised within the Mahometan superstition.[4] With this difference, that the Mahometan line of disputation was the converse of the Catholic; and that the religions here more nearly approach each other, through the medium of their respective heresies.

The Scriptural doctrine of the Godhead, which plainly affirms a trinity of persons, and unity of essence in the Divine nature, as the fundamental tenet of Christianity, found inveterate opponents in the successive schools of heresy, which have, in turns, pretended to the distinction of exclusively maintaining the doctrine of the Divine unity. On the other hand, the boasted Unitarian doctrine, ostentatiously displayed in the Koran,

as the charter principle of Mahometanism, has been formally controverted by Mahometan sects reputed heretical; who, partly deriving their notions from the speculative anticipations of the Greek philosophy, but principally following the remotely-surveyed lights of Gospel truth, have framed to themselves a doctrine, which, however imperfect in its character, presents a singular example of approximation to the Christian mystery. Thus the doctrine, that there exist two Creators of all created natures, the one eternal, namely, the Most High God, the other of more recent origin, namely, Christ, — or, as it has been otherwise expressed by Mahometan writers, that there are two Gods set over the universe, the Eternal, who is God exalted above all, and the new God, which is Christ, — this doctrine, maintained by a powerful Mussulman sect *, inclines at least as much from Unitarianism, towards the Catholic belief, as the tenets of Arius and his school receded from Catholicity.

In the doctrinal history of Christianity, the Arian controversy was succeeded by the Predestinarian; in which the Scriptural doctrine of predestination became blended and confounded with the philosophical disputations con-

* See Pocock, Specim. p. 221.

cerning liberty and necessity; and the Catholic faith was placed in jeopardy, between the opposite errors of the irrespective fatalist, and of the advocates of human free-agency in its most unrestricted acceptation. Now, since the doctrine of absolute predestination stands in the Koran itself, as the fundamental principle of Mahometanism, there would seem the less room to anticipate, under this head, any considerable doctrinal analogy or correspondence. But facts are here at issue with antecedent probabilities. The Mahometan doctrine of fatalism, like the Scriptural doctrine of predestination, was leavened, in process of time, by tenets drawn from the schools of the old Greek philosophy; until Mahometanism, in the event, presented a full parallel with Christianity, in its many and diversified modifications of the primitive doctrine of predestination; from the most absolute control of fatalism, to the most unbounded exercise of free-will. The details of this parallel exhibit a variety of opinions among the chief Mahometan sects, remarkably corresponding with the diversity of doctrine which has prevailed, on this momentous subject, in the Christian church: a fact that may serve to correct the popular error, which assumes fatalism to be the universally-received dogma of the Mahometan superstition: but such details

will more properly be given in another division of this work.*

In our Lord's parable of the publican and the pharisee, who went up to pray in the temple, we recognize the disunion of sentiment which obtained in the ancient Jewish church, upon the grounds of acceptance with God: the disciples of one school confiding solely in the succours of divine grace; those of the other resting exclusively on the plea of human merit.

In the Christian church, from the Apostolic age inclusive, these opposed doctrines found their respective advocates; but were carried to their height in the progress of the predestinarian controversy; of which, in the time of Saint Augustine, they formed a prominent part.

Now, among the adherents of the Mahometan superstition, the existence of a corresponding analogy of debate, on the doctrines of grace and merit, is shortly and clearly ascertained, from the history of the Turkish sects of the Dervises and the Tzofilar, who stand controversially opposed to one another on this momentous subject.

The Dervises, like the followers of Saint Augustine, profess to hold, as their fundamental tenet, "that the law is of no avail, but that it is the grace of God by which alone every man must

* Section ix.

look to be saved; which grace, without the law or human merit, is sufficient to procure salvation." * They further, in imitation of the Catholic doctrine, refer all proficiency in things spiritual to the love of God, in which they place the only source of all perfection and felicity. †

The Tzofilar, on the contrary, after the model of the Pharisees, and of the disciples of Pelagius, maintain that every one must be saved by his own merits; and that human merit alone, without grace and the law, suffices for salvation. ‡

The correspondence of the Mahometan controversy with the Christian, so far as the terms of the debate are concerned, will be perceived by every reader in the least conversant with church history: more than a merely verbal agreement will be neither expected nor desired; for such agreement alone can be supposed suitably to subsist, between the true revelation and its spurious copy.

The doctrinal parallel of Mahometanism with Judaism and Christianity, has been traced, in the

* "Quòd lex nihil prodest, sed *gratia Dei* est, quâ oportet omnem hominem salvari; quæ, *sine lege et merito*, sufficiens est ad salutem."—Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 365.

† "Referunt Dervisii omnia ad *amorem Dei*. In hoc, perfectionem esse, et summum bonum." Ib.

‡ "Quòd unusquisque debet salvari *per meritum*; et hoc sufficit ad salutem, sine gratia et lege." Ib.

foregoing particulars, by the light of religious controversies which have prevailed in the respective creeds. Upon many leading subjects of Scripture doctrine, such as — the creation; the disobedience, and the fall of Adam; original sin; the nature, office, and agency of good and evil angels, — Mahometan tradition, though more vague and undefined, is not without examples of approximation to the truth: its recognition of the fall, in particular, may be seen in that ascertained tenet of orthodox Mahometans, already hinted at, that, of the whole human race, two persons only, Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary, were exempt from the touch of Satan, or stain of original sin. *

But, besides the analogy assuredly obtaining between the three religions, on the several points of Scriptural doctrine which have been thus far noticed, it belongs to the scope of the present argument, to include the mention of

* His biographers have not failed to record the miraculous purification of Mahomet himself, by the ministry of the Angel Gabriel, from the stain or burthen of original sin: "Il est certain que par ce mot de *fardeau*, qui pesoit sur le dos de Mahomet, les interprêtes entendent une tache, ou une goutte noir, qui est la source du péché dans le cœur de l'homme, ou, comme nos théologiens parlent, LE PÉCHÉ ORIGINEL *contracté en Adam*: Péché auquel *Mahomet*, du consentement même de tous ses sectateurs, *avoit participé*, comme tous les autres hommes; et dont personne n'a été exempt *que Marie* et SON FILS JÉSUS." — Gagnier, Vie de Mahomet, p. 89.; compare p. 88.

those doctrinal absurdities, which Mahometanism has borrowed, on the one hand, from the Jewish Rabbins, and, on the other, from the ancient Christian heresies. That memorable controversy, for example, concerning the creation or non-creation of the Koran, which, under the Abasside dynasty, kindled the fires of persecution throughout the eastern portion of the Saracen empire *, was but a faithful copy of the Rabbinical disputation, concerning the creation or non-creation of the books of the Law, or Scriptures of the Old Testament. † In like manner, the belief inculcated by the Koran and its commentators, that Christ did not really suffer on the cross, in his own person, but only in appearance, — a shadowy representation being substituted to deceive the bystanders, while Jesus himself was withdrawn, and carried up to heaven; — this belief was nothing more than a revival of the wild imagination prevalent among the Gnostics, with whom the doctrine of a *notional* crucifixion formed a favourite article of faith.‡ Instances of this class, indeed, it were easy to multiply, did it appear necessary or expedient further to enlarge upon this branch of the subject.

* Pocock, Specim. pp. 222—225. Reland. p. 17—19. *note.*

† Mill, de Mohammed. ante Mohamm. pp. 363—366.

‡ Mill, ib. pp. 347, 348.

In winding up the argument of this section, it seems quite unnecessary to expose, in detail, the spurious and imperfect character of the resemblance, which Mahometanism can be said to maintain with Christianity, in any one of its leading or essential doctrines. But two general considerations, arising out of the foregoing view, should, in this place, be pointed out, and reflected on, as bearing upon the argument of the work at large. 1. The relative position in which Mahometanism, in virtue of the ascertained character of its doctrinal scheme, stands with reference to the most popular and self-approving forms of Christian heresy. 2. The original tendency of the Mahometan religion, to take the opposite course from all other heresies; and, where these have uniformly diverged from the primitive doctrines of Catholic Christianity, progressively to converge towards those doctrines; a tendency, which has certainly brought Mahometanism, in several pregnant instances, nearer to the Gospel, in its later stages, than it had been at its first institution.

1. In its primitive form, Mahometanism, as the reader will remember, maintained the following heads of Catholic doctrine; the miraculous and immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary; the generation of Jesus Christ, after the manner

of the creation of Adam, by the breath of God; his offices in the world to come, as mediator and intercessor with the Father; his perfect nature, and freedom from all taint or stain of sin: in which several respects, the belief inculcated by the Koran itself, stands essentially opposed to the Unitarian or Socinian scheme of doctrine; and primitive Mahometanism occupies a position, proportionably nearer to Catholic Christianity. In certain of its later modifications, the religion of Mahomet, it has been shown, advanced to the admission of Christ's pre-existence; to the acknowledgment, in a restricted sense, of his divine nature; and even to the recognition, thence arising, of a distinction of Persons in the Godhead: which important doctrinal confessions place the belief of some Mahometan sects, on a level with the highest form of the Arian hypothesis. These inferences are drawn with no invidious intention, but simply as conclusions following from the plain facts of the case: but while, in the statement of these facts, bare justice only is done to the character of Mahometanism in its doctrinal scheme, the facts themselves, at the same time, may well suggest matter for serious reflection, to those who, while they, honestly, perhaps, though most unjustly, depreciate the character of the Mahometan heresy,

themselves hold a lower faith, under the specious name of *rational Christianity*.

2. Mahometanism, it will next be observed, was originally less an approximation to Christianity, than it afterwards became; as will easily appear, from comparison of the doctrine of the Godhead, as delivered in the Koran, with the subsequent Mahometan belief and traditions, concerning the nature and office of the Holy Ghost *; and particularly with those notions of a distinction of Persons in the Godhead, entertained by at least one leading sect; comprizing the acknowledgment of Christ as the Word of God, as the Creator of all things, and as God, in a sense subordinate only to the supreme and eternal deity of the Father. Now, let this course of things be compared with that, observable in the doctrinal history of Christianity, and the contrast becomes equally interesting in itself, and important to the present argument: for, while the course of Christian heresies has been uniformly marked by a downward progress, as from Sabellianism to Arianism, to Socinianism, and to opinions yet more cold and comfortless than those of Socinus; that, on the contrary, of the Mahometan apostasy, and of it alone, has been distinguished by the opposite tendency; by an upward progress,

* See Selden, Oper. tom. ii. ff. 1242, 1243.

towards the great and inscrutable mystery of Catholic Christianity: a result eminently demanding observation, not so much on account of any thing which it bespeaks, in the native character of the superstition itself, as because the fact is an index and proof of the tendency of Mahometanism, gradually to approach, and eventually to unite with, the doctrines of the Gospel, and the belief of the Catholic church.

The conclusion towards which the mind of the author has been irresistibly drawn, by reflection on the phenomena here brought together, is concisely this: that, in the doctrinal scheme of the Mahometan religion, however imperfect, inconsistent, and erroneous (and most erroneous, inconsistent, and imperfect, it unquestionably is), the train has yet been laid, for eventual acceptance of the whole Christian scheme. Nor can he reasonably doubt the production of a similar impression, in the minds of those, who will give unbiassed and attentive consideration to the facts.

And now let us anticipate, in this connection, occurrences of futurity, certain as God's unerring word, though concealed from mortal vision, within the womb of time: — let us suppose that happy day arrived, when Christianity shall be purely, wisely, and generally presented, to the Mahometan world; and let us examine, from this

elevated and elevating point of view, the prospect and probabilities of its favourable and universal reception.

The fundamental mystery of the Christian faith, the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, that grand stumbling-block to the pride of modern Unitarianism, found, it has been shown, in the earlier days of Mahometanism, partial countenance and acceptance, among its philosophic sects. Let us now suppose the Christian missionary, after the example bequeathed by the Apostle of the Gentiles, who, in his inspired teaching, every where availed himself of the pre-existing lights; who preached to the Greeks, from the imperfect notions of some of their own poets, the true doctrine of the Godhead; — after this best example, let us suppose the Christian missionary to inculcate and enforce, from the concessions made to his hand by Mahometan philosophy, the Catholic mystery of the Trinity; to take Mahometans on their own ground, — and while, by a skilful exposition of the Hâyetian doctrine of Christ's non-eternal deity, and created Godhead, he demonstrated the absurdity of pausing here, — to prove, from the reachings forth of philosophy which had led them thus far, the reasonableness and the necessity of going still further; to show that the offices and attributes assigned by Ma-

homet himself to Jesus Christ, are inconsistent and incompatible with any theory, save that of his supreme and eternal Godhead; that none other than the supreme and eternal God can judge the world; that He alone who made the human heart, is competent to search into its secrets; that a created Creator is a contradiction in terms; that a participation in both natures, the human and the divine, is, to say the least, credible of Him, who holds the *acknowledged* place and office of Mediator and Intercessor between God and man; —suppose these, and similar positions, plainly deducible from the Koran and its commentators, once brought clearly and conclusively to elucidate the authoritative declarations of Scripture, by men whose zeal shall shine forth on the benighted East, sustained by extensive knowledge, and tempered by a wise discretion, while their walk among men forms that best of commentaries, a living one, on the truth and power of these doctrines; —suppose episcopal Christianity, in a word, one day taught and exemplified in Asia, as it was originally taught and exemplified in the Apostolic times, and who, that reflects on the whole providential history and relationship of the two religions, can doubt the eventual result throughout the Mahometan world? Delays, both obvious and unforeseen, there may, and

naturally will, arise: religious bigotry, national antipathies, the renitency of habit, the pleas of passion, the deeply-instilled and fondly-cherished prejudices of a Mussulman education, the proud recollections of the departed greatness and glories of Mahometanism, — these, and more than these, hereafter as heretofore, will unite to stay the universal diffusion of Christian liberty and light. Prophecy, however, assures us, that the everlasting Gospel shall prosper and prevail, until "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea;" and, with respect to the Mahometan world more especially, the providence of God is already forming an illustrious commentary on his prophetic word, by the large and appropriate provisions made, as if preparatory to the event, in the present extraordinary posture of civil affairs over Asia.

In that decay of the Mahometan, and growth of the great Christian commonwealth, which have gone on together, with sure though chequered progress, from the commencement of the fifteenth century downwards; which have issued, in one direction, in the erection, on the ruins of the Mahometan, of a vast Christian empire, in the heart of India, and in another, in the drooping condition of the only remaining Mahometan

states, beneath the overshadowing greatness of the European powers; — in this great change, while the policy of this world may discern only "wars and rumours of wars," and "distress of nations with perplexity," the Christian moralist will mark the approaching fulfilment of that prophetic consummation, *first* announced in the promise of God to Abraham, that "in his seed should all the families of the earth be blessed;" *since*, through every vicissitude of history and of human affairs, systematically carried onward; and *terminating*, only with the end of time, and the coming of Christ's kingdom.

SECTION VII.

RITUAL ANALOGY OF MAHOMETANISM WITH JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

FROM what has preceded, it is sufficiently clear, that, in its primitive construction, and, still more, throughout its subsequent modifications, the religion of Mahomet drew largely upon Judaism and Christianity, both for its system of morals, and for its scheme of doctrines: in each branch, at the same time, so maintaining its accustomed place, that it never appears as the parallel, without reminding us that it is but the perversion, of the one true revelation.

The analogy will be found to subsist in equal force, when we now extend the comparison; and trace the chief Mahometan rites and ceremonies, to their undoubted sources in the Law and Gospel. With comparatively limited exceptions, the ritual of this superstition was, in its original institution, as framed by Mahomet himself, either servilely copied after, or studiously conformed to, the rites and ceremonies previously sanctioned by the venerable authority of the Jewish and Christian systems. The Mahometan ordinances of *circumcision*, of *baptism*,

of *Sabbaths*, of *ablutions*, of *stated times* and *postures* of *prayer*, *periodic fasts* and *festivals*, *prohibited meats*, *legal almsgiving*, and *pilgrimage*, with sundry other articles of ritual observance, readily occur as examples, either of matter-of-fact conformity with, or of direct and palpable plagiarism from, the Jewish, or the Christian church. Nor should a less known feature of the ritual analogy be left out of our enumeration: namely, the undoubted existence in the creed of Mahometanism, contrary to what has been incautiously asserted by writers of great name, both of *a sacrifice* and of *a priesthood*.

This branch of our subject it is now my design to elucidate, by a short comparison of the Mahometan ritual, with the Jewish, and the Christian: tracing the correspondence under the heads by which it is indicated in the preceding paragraph.

Circumcision, the initiatory seal of admission within the Jewish Church, must be considered the fundamental rite of Judaism. The national use of this rite among the ante-Mahometan Arabians, and the proof of its derivation from Ishmael, their forefather, and from a patriarchal tradition, are matters which belong to another place. * It is our present business to notice,

* See Appendix, Nos. I, II.

that Mahometanism appears to have first raised the custom of circumcision *, as practised by the pagan Arabs, from the character of a mere prescriptive usage, into which it had long degenerated; and to have restored it to its primitive rank, as a religious ordinance; by adopting, after established Jewish precedent, the rite of *circumcision* as *its initiatory fundamental.*

With the Christian church, in which the sacrament of baptism was substituted for the rite of circumcision, Mahometanism, at the same time, contrives to maintain its spurious analogy; since, according to the Mahometan law, *baptism*, no less than circumcision, is *accounted essential*, in the admission of infidels to the rank of Mussulmans. † The predilection for Judaism, however, strongly appears in the prominence given to the Jewish rite, in preference to the spiritual Christian sacrament; which Mahometanism but too willingly lays aside, to return to the carnal letter of the law.

* "Circumcision, though it be not so much as once mentioned in the Koran, is yet held, by the Mohammedans, to be *an ancient divine institution*, confirmed by the religion of Islam." — Sale's Prelim. Disc. p. 141, 142. This omission, in fact, supplies the strongest proof of the *known* patriarchal antiquity of the rite; which thus would seem, in the judgment of Mahomet himself, to have required neither enforcement, nor explanation.

† Reland, p. 74, 75.

The institution of the *Sabbath* furnishes our next example of fundamental agreement, between the rituals of the three creeds. In their common observance of that great primeval law, which enjoined the keeping of one day in seven, as a day of rest from worldly affairs, and of religious service, Judaism, Christianity, and Mahometanism, are, at once, agreed among themselves, and differ from every other known form of religion. The same place which Saturday holds in the Jewish, and Sunday in the Christian church, is assigned, by the Koran, and by established Mahometan usage, to the Friday in each week. This day of rest, it appears, was selected by Mahomet, partly to distinguish his Sabbath from those of the Jews and Christians *, partly because Friday had been traditionally observed among the Arabs, long before his time, as a day of public assembly; though whether for a civil, or for a religious, purpose, seems to be undetermined. †

In the solemn enactment of its ritual law, which thus sets apart one day in seven, as pe-

* "One reason given for the observation of Friday, preferably to any other day of the week, is because, on that day, *God finished the creation.*" Sale, after Al Beidawi and Jallalo'ddin, Koran, chap. lxii. translator's note i.; where several more reasons assigned by the Mahometan commentators, are noticed.

† Sale's Prelim. Disc. p. 199.

culiarly dedicated to attendance on the worship of God, and the duties of religion, the spurious affinity of Mahometanism to the Jewish and Christian revelations betrays itself, by marks of plagiarism which cannot be mistaken. In the popular practice of Mahometan countries, indeed, their Sabbath is less strictly observed, than either the Jewish, or the Christian [1]; but by Mahometan writers, Friday is extolled as "the prince of days," as "the most excellent day on which the sun rises;" and the more devout Mussulmans, according to Mr. Sale, "disapprove the applying any part of it to worldly affairs, but require it to be wholly dedicated to the business of the life to come." *

The legal *washings* and *purifications* which form so marked a feature of the Mahometan ritual, and which are particularly enjoined as preparatives for prayer, or rather indeed as an essential part of it, are too obviously modelled after the rites of the Jewish law, to require any comparison of the details. Nor is the correspondence, here observable, limited to the outward rites: in the principle, also, of their legal purifications, the two systems maintain an

* Sale's Prelim. Disc. p. 199. So, also, the Koran: "O true believers, when ye are called to prayer on the day of assembly [Friday, or the Sabbath], hasten to the commemoration of God, and leave merchandising." — Sale's Koran, chap. lxii. Compare St. Matt. xxi. 12, 13.

extraordinary agreement; both esteeming external ablutions to be indispensable pre-requisites, in order to the internal purifying of the soul by prayer; and both, again, too generally substituting the outward ceremony, for the inward operation. *

While the Koran has expressly declared ablution to be an essential preparation for prayer; *prayer*, on the other hand, was pronounced by Mahomet himself to be the key of Paradise, and the pillar of religion. † Now nearly the entire of the ceremonial connected with this prime duty of Mahometanism, is neither more nor less than a literal transcript from the rites and usages of Rabbinical Judaism, modified by reference to the practice which obtained in the ancient Christian church.

In the appointment of certain *stated times for prayer*, the Rabbins followed Scriptural precedents; as plainly appears by their adoption of three periods of the day for the performance of this duty, namely, morning, afternoon, and midnight. Conformably with this precedent,

* On the Jewish and Mahometan lustrations, see Pocock, Porta Mosis; Mill, De M. A. M. pp. 420—424.; and Reland, De Relig. Mohamm. pp. 66—85. Tertullian notices the observance of ablutions, before prayer, as in use among the early Christians. See Bishop Kaye, Eccles. Hist. chap. vi. ad init.

† Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 142. Pocock, Specimen, p. 297, 298.

the Mahometan ritual prescribes matins, vespers, and the fall of night, as the three solemn prayer times *; while keeping in view, at the same time, the practice of the Christian church, which multiplied the stated recurrences of prayer to five and six times in each day[2], it further enjoins prayer to be repeated by every Mussulman five times daily. †

Again, in their legal *postures*, and changes of postures *during prayer*, the Jewish and Mahometan rituals are identical. For, 1. Each of these creeds has its Kebla, or point of prayer, towards which the respective worshippers must turn, when performing their devotional exercises; the Jews bowing themselves towards Jerusalem, as the Mahometans bow themselves towards Mecca. ‡ 2. According to Rabbinical law, the Jews pray standing, with their feet joined closely together, their hands reverently crossed, while, at intervals, they bend their bodies to the ground, with certain prescribed inclinations and prostrations, in such a manner, that they shall at once hold the knees with the hands; and knees, hands, and foreheads shall

* Sale's Koran, vol. ii. p. 106, 107. Conf. Mill, De M. A. M. pp. 434, 435.

† Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 142, 143.

‡ Jerusalem was Mahomet's first Kebla: it was exchanged for Mecca, A. H. 2.; see Abul Faraj. ap. Mill, p. 323, 324.

simultaneously strike the ground. These devotional attitudes of the Jews, which have been circumstantially described by Maimonides and other doctors, are, in every particular and peculiarity, minutely copied in the offices of Mahometan worship. This correspondence has been set forth at large by Mill, in his very learned dissertation *; and his accurate descriptions may be verified by ocular demonstration, from the plate published by Reland, representing the various attitudes observed by the Mahometans, during the stated prayers. †

In the *forms*, moreover, as well as in the times *of prayer*, where the Mahometan ritual appears at all to vary from Jewish precedent, it so varies, only to assimilate itself more nearly to another cognate formulary, the ritual of the church of Rome; as may be remarked, especially in the practice, common to both superstitions, of counting the prescribed devotional exercises, by telling them over on a string of *beads*, which is worn suspended from the girdle of the worshipper. ‡

But the Jewish ritual by no means confines its ordinances to outward forms of prayer:

* De Mohamm. ante Mohamm. pp. 424—435.

† De Relig. Mohamm. *plate* ap. p. 87.

‡ Ibid. *plate.*

to give efficacy to its formularies, it further requires, that the legal prayers shall be performed with a solicitous and trembling reverence; and that they shall be prefaced by religious silence and meditation. In this respect, also, there obtains a perfect coincidence between the Jewish and Mahometan systems. For the ordinances of the latter creed demand, at least, an equal attention to mental preparation, to devotional silence, reverential self-possession, and much previous meditation. *

The comparative merits, however, of the ceremonials, can be fairly estimated only by their fruits. And here it seems impossible to deny, that Mahometanism leaves modern Judaism very far behind it. Nay, more than this, — according to competent and credible witnesses, the exemplary deportment of Mahometans, while engaged in the duty of prayer, may well put to shame the comparative indevoutness and indifference, even of Christian worshippers. "When," observes an intelligent eye-witness, cited by Hottinger, "I contrast the silence of a Turkish mosque, at the hour of

* Mill, ubi supr. Sale's Prelim. Disc. p. 144. "Monent eorum cordatiores, in oratione præcipue spectari *partes internas*, quæ sint tanquam ejus vita et spiritus; quarum sex præcipuas statuunt, — præsentiam cordis, intellectum, μεγαλυσμον, reverentiam, spem, pudorem." — Pocock, Spec. p. 297.

public prayer, with the noise and tumult but too frequent in Christian temples, I stand astonished, at the strange inversion in the two religions of the order of things which might naturally be expected; how it comes to pass, that, where Mahometans manifest such exemplary devoutness in their public services, Christians, on the contrary, betray so lamentable indevotion! When the whole nature and reason of the case obviously demand, that the effects respectively produced, should be just the opposite from what they are!" Again: "I have seen," is the remarkable testimony of another authority on the spot, "a congregation of at least two thousand souls assembled in the mosque of Saint Sophia, with silence so profound, that, until I entered the body of the building, I was unaware that it contained so much as a single worshipper!"[3]

From the foregoing, and from numerous consentient testimonies, it might easily be shown, that Mahometanism as far excels the church of Rome in that external sanctity *, on which that church so highly values itself, as it falls short of pure Catholic Christianity, in that internal service which our blessed Lord inculcates in the Gospel, when he declares, how "the true

* See Boulainvilliers, p. 78, 79.

worshippers shall worship the Father, in spirit and in truth." *

The resemblance which, in the institution of of its major *fasts* and *festivals;* Mahometanism maintains with the rites and ceremonies of Christianity, and more especially with the ritual of the church of Rome, is too marked to escape even cursory observation; where our attention has been once directed to the fact. A comparison, which has been justly made by the historian Cantemir, respecting the two great Mahometan celebrations of the Ramadan, and the Bairam, might be extended to other particulars of the ritual correspondence with the Christian church: "Ramadân is the ninth month of the Turkish year, during which the Turks fast: but upon the appearance of the next new moon, the Bairam begins, which is a time of feasting and jollity. In short, *the Ramadân answers to the Christian Lent; and the Bairam, to the Popish carnival.*" †

Together with this marked conformity to the fasts and feasts of the Latin church, Mahometanism, in this branch of the ritual parallel, does not fail to preserve its usual analogy with Judaism;

* St. John, iv. 23.

† Compare Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 200, 201. — "La fête de *Bairain*, qui est la *Pâque* des Mussulmans." Boulainvilliers, Vie de Mahom. p. 62.

after which also it has here largely copied. * For example, to notice only one specific coincidence, the Mahometan fast of Ashur, or the tenth day of the month Moharram, was borrowed from the Jewish fast on the tenth day of the seventh month; an observance originally prescribed by the law of Moses. Insomuch that Mahometan commentators themselves freely acknowledge its derivation; expressly stating their fast of Ashur to have been adopted by Mahomet, from the practice of the Jews of Medina. The plagiarism, in this instance, is further established by the identity of the *name:* this fast being denominated Ashur in the Jewish, as well as in the Mahometan ritual; whence the learned Pocock derives a proof of its Hebrew origin which he conceives to be conclusive. †

The corresponding divisions of the Jewish and Mahometan fasts, supply a further exemplification of the ritual connection which Islamism preserves with Rabbinical Judaism. The Rabbins resolve the legal fasts into two classes, between which they discriminate by styling one of those classes *obligatory*, and the other *spontaneous* or *voluntary*. ‡ Now this peculiar mode of discrimination is faithfully reflected by the

* Mill, pp. 435—438.
† Specimen, p. 301, 302.
‡ Mill, p. 437.

Mahometan law. For the Mussulman doctors, also, divide their legal fasts into two classes, and distinguish between them by the very terms employed by the Rabbins, as *obligatory*, and *voluntary* or spontaneous.*

In strictness of outward observance, the Mahometan fasts at once nearly resemble, and far surpass, the austerities of the Romish ritual.† In the internal aim proposed, on the other hand, they carry, at least, the appearance of approximation to the primitive intention of fasting, as understood by the Christian church. In proof that the Mahometan notion of religious fasting is moral, as well as ceremonial, it may be sufficient to adduce the classification according to which the Mussulman doctors distribute the several orders and degrees of fasting "The Mahometans," observes Doctor Pocock "distinguish the ordinance of fasting into three kinds or gradations: fasting, commonly so called; fasting, properly so called; and fasting eminently so called. Fasting, commonly so called, consists in the continence of the several parts of the body from fulfilling its appetites: fasting, properly so called, is the aversion of the ears, the eyes, the tongue, the hands, the

* Mill, p. 485. conf. Pocock, p. 300.
† Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 149.

feet, and our other bodily members, from sin: but fasting, eminently so called, signifies the abstinence of the heart from viler cares, and worldly cogitations; and its separation from every thing save the contemplation of God alone." *

The miserable failure of Mahometanism, in practice, to meet the demands of this exalted theory, serves but as fresh confirmation of the view taken throughout these pages: we can never remark a resemblance, without being instantly reminded, that it is a *spurious* resemblance.

Among other artifices which Mr. Gibbon employs, in the course of his insidious attempt to disparage Judaism and Christianity, by magnifying what is really surprising in the character of Mahometanism, namely, its permanency, as contrasted with the uncommon simplicity of its ritual, he has hazarded the incorrect assertion, that "the Mahometan religion is destitute of priesthood or sacrifice." The historian has abstained from quoting his authorities; and his unsupported statement is contradicted, both by the authority of the Koran, and by the testimony of Saracenic history. From these unexceptionable sources, the proof may be amply drawn, that the Mahometan superstition possesses, and at every

* Specim. p. 302.

period of its existence, possessed, *a priesthood* and *a sacrifice.*

In the Koran itself, we find the rite of sacrifice adverted to by Mahomet, as an integral part of his law: "O true believer! violate not the holy rites of God, nor the sacred month, nor the *offering*, nor the *ornaments hung* thereon." * On this passage, it will suffice to comment, in the words of the English translator: "The offering here meant," observes Mr. Sale, "is *the sheep led to Mecca, to be there sacrificed;* about the neck of which, they used *to hang garlands*, green boughs, or some other ornament, that it may be distinguished as *a thing sacred.*" † This precept of the Koran he illustrates, elsewhere, from the practice of Mahometans, when performing the solemn duties of the pilgrimage to Mecca: "On the tenth of [the month] Dhu 'l hajja, the pilgrims *slay their victims* in the valley of Mina; of which they and their friends eat part, and the rest is given to the poor. These victims must be either sheep, goats, kine, or camels; males, if of either of the two former kinds; and females, if of either of the latter; and of a fit age. The *sacrifice* being over, they shave their heads, and cut their nails, burying

* Sale's Koran, chap. v. ad init. † Id. ib. *note* k.

them in the same place; after which the pilgrimage is looked on as completed." *

But the sacrificial rites practised during the pilgrimage†, are performed according to rules specifically laid down in another chapter of the Koran, in which sacrifice is most circumstantially treated, as a fundamental rite of Islamism: "And whoso maketh valuable *offerings* unto God; verily they proceed from the piety of men's hearts. Ye receive various advantages from *the cattle designed for sacrifices*, until a determined time for slaying them; then *the place of sacrificing them is at the ancient house.* Unto the professors of every religion have we appointed certain rites, that they may commemorate the name of God on slaying the brute cattle which he hath provided for them. — *The camels slain for sacrifice have we appointed for you as symbols of your obedience unto God:* ye also receive other advantages from them. Wherefore commemorate the name of God over them, when ye slay them, standing on their feet, disposed in right order; and when they are fallen down dead, eat of them: and give to eat thereof, both unto him who is content with what is given him, without asking, and unto him who asketh.

* Prelim. Disc. p. 160.

† In the Mahometan ritual, indeed, *sacrifice* may be considered as a branch of the rite of *pilgrimage*; and may be included under that rite. Its practice would seem to belong chiefly to the celebrations at Mecca.

Thus have we given you dominion over them, that ye might return us thanks. Their flesh is not accepted of God, neither their blood; but your piety is accepted of him." *[4]

From its primitive establishment by the immediate authority of Mahomet, as a fundamental rite of Islamism, the institution of *a priestly sacrifice* can be historically traced in its ritual celebrations, through every succeeding age. Under the caliphate, indeed, a sacerdotal office, answering to the office of *high priest* among the *Jews*, and to that of the *Pope* in the *Latin Church*, formed the grand hereditary and incommunicable distinction, appropriated to the legitimate successors of Mahomet.

After the manner of the law of Moses, a great *national sacrifice* was celebrated annually by the Saracens; in which, according to the custom of the ante-Mahometan Arabians, sanctioned, as we have just seen, by direct precept of the Koran, a camel was the appointed victim, and the *caliph* himself acted as the officiating *high priest*. The ceremonial observed at this solemnity has been described, not merely by Mahometan authorities, but by the impartial experience of a Jewish traveller, Benjamin of Tudela; who records in his Itinerary, this annual sacrifice of the Saracens,

* Sale's Koran, vol. ii. p. 171, 172.

as witnessed by him at Bosra, in the twelfth century; and (a circumstance peculiarly deserving of notice), in so doing, specifically recognizes its affinity to the great Jewish sacrifice of *the passover*.

The account of Benjamin may be left to answer for itself: "The caliph having ascended a wooden throne, recited to the congregation certain passages from the Koran; when the elders of the Ishmaelites, rising from their places, offer up prayers for him, in which they commemorate his supreme majesty and piety; and these petitions concluded, all the congregation, with one accord, chaunt Amen. Afterward the caliph pronounces a benediction on them all; and, a camel being brought to him, he slays it; AND THIS IS THEIR PASSOVER. The officiator then distributes portions of the flesh to the chief persons in the assembly, who eagerly snatch it from him, in order that they may taste and refresh their souls with any, the least, portion of the VICTIM, slaughtered by the hand of THEIR HOLY KING. The solemnity thus ended, the caliph withdraws from the mosque." * [5]

This Mahometan celebration, which so forcibly reminded a Jew of his high priest, and his passover, presents to the contemplation of the

* Benjam. Itin. ap. Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 288, 289.

Romanists, a resemblance at least equally close and striking to another priest, and another offering, *the pope, and the sacrifice of the mass.* None assuredly, save the blinded and bigotted votary of Papal superstition, can read the description, and yet refuse to own the correspondence which it exhibits between the rival antichrists of the East and West; seated on their respective thrones, immolating their several victims; pronouncing each, his solemn benediction; and arrogating to themselves at once an infallible sanctity, and an absolute supremacy over the bodies and the souls of men! *

Now, as, during the existence of the Saracenic empire, Mahometanism thus possessed a priesthood in the persons of the caliphs, and a sacrifice in the annual oblation offered by their hands; so, in its Turkish branch, it retains the office of the caliph, in the persons of the Ottoman Sultans, who claim to be the legitimate successors of Mahomet, and heads of their religion; and the office of the priesthood, in the sacerdotal order of the Tusmans, or Muftis, whose dignity has been marked out, by Busbequius, in the following terms: "The Mufti is the Turkish high

* Grasserus has only done justice to this parallel, when he styles the Caliph of Mecca, "Verus Muhammedanorum Papa, Mahometisque successor." — Plaga Regia, p. 151.

priest; and holds the same place among the Turks, with that which the Roman pontiff holds in the Latin church."* [6]

Such is the marked agreement which Mahometanism maintains with the Jewish and Christian churches, in this highly important branch of the ritual parallel. And it is of a creed thus constituted, that an historian who makes lofty pretensions to fidelity with regard to his facts, has not scrupled to pronounce, — "the Mahometan religion is destitute of priesthood or sacrifice."

The traditional law of Judaism placed *alms-giving* on a par with sacrifice; or rather, indeed, accounted the due performance of this legal service preferable to all sacrifices.† This singular comparison, of a moral duty, with a religious rite, was perfectly consonant with the Rabbinical notion of alms-giving; which, according to the doctrine of the Rabbins, bore far more the character of a ritual observance, than of a moral obligation. To the punctual periodic discharge of this service, they ascribed the virtue both of delivering the Israelite from hell, and of purchasing for him an entrance into

* Busbeq. Epist. i. ap. Hotting. Hist. Orient. p. 284.; conf. pp. 297—299.

† See Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 148.; conf. Mill, p. 440.

paradise, or life eternal; these being, as their traditions taught, the sole purposes for which the tenth of every man's possessions, whether consisting in the precious metals, in the produce of the flocks and herds, or in the fruits of the field, had been originally dedicated, by the law of Moses, to the maintenance of the poor. *

Now, in the Mahometan superstition, the legal obligation of *alms-giving* holds exactly the same place, and rests precisely on the same basis, which it occupied in the Jewish ritual. Mahomet pronounced alms to be a chief foundation of religion; and affirmed anew, in his Koran, the maxim, plainly borrowed from the Jews, that the liberal distribution of alms would suffice to ensure to the true believer the favour of God, and a free passage into paradise. With this especial view, moreover, the Mahometan law, like the Rabbinical, enjoins, and rigidly enforces, the payment, by every Mussulman, of a tenth of his property, of his gold and silver, of his flocks and herds, and of all fruits of the field, as a legal tax or contribution for the poor. †

To pass from precepts to *prohibitions*, the Mahometan ritual, again, following the lead of the Jewish, proscribes *certain meats*, as *common or unclean*; and, if more limited than the law of

* Mill, pp. 440, 441. † Ib. pp. 438—440.

Moses in its restrictions on food, so far as it obtains, the correspondence is most exact; the law of Mahomet treading even punctiliously in the steps of the Mosaic code, and proscribing, article for article, the same kinds of meat, which had been previously condemned in the Pentateuch. Including, in so doing, on its list of prohibited meats, some articles which had been forbidden, also, by the law of the New Testament, to the primitive churches.

In one respect, it should be noticed, the exact correspondence with Judaism, in this feature of the comparison, is peculiarly deserving of observation; namely, inasmuch as it supplies a strong circumstance in proof of the *common patriarchal origin* of the rites of the Jews and of the Arabians. The connecting link in question arises from the understood fact, that one of the chief prohibitory laws concerning animal food, which are laid down by the Koran, and which thus remarkably coincide with the Mosaic prohibitions, appears to have been, from time immemorial, in force among the *pagan* Arabs; and to have been incorporated into Mahometanism, not directly from Judaism, but rather from this native source. *

* The prohibition of swine's flesh: see Mill, p. 336.; and Sale, Prelim. Disc. p. 169, 170.

Upon the subject of *forbidden meats*, it may now be enough, in conclusion of this topic, to submit in parallel columns, the coinciding precepts of the Bible and the Koran: they can require no comment.

BIBLE.	KORAN.
"That which dieth of itself, he shall not eat." *	"Ye are forbidden to eat, that which dieth of itself,
"Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh." †	and blood,
"And the swine, he is unclean to you; of their flesh ye shall not eat." ‡	and swine's flesh,
"Abstain from meats offered to idols, and from things strangled." §	and that on which the name of any besides God hath been invocated; and that which hath been strangled, or killed by a blow, or by a fall,
"That which is torn with beasts, he shall not eat." ‖	or by the horns of another beast;
"Neither shall ye eat flesh torn of beasts in the field." ¶	and that which hath been eaten by a wild beast; except what ye shall kill yourselves;
"Save only that they keep themselves, from things offered to idols." **	and that which hath been sacrificed unto idols." ††

* Levit. xxii. 8. † Ib. xvii. 14. ‡ Ib. xi. 7, 8.
§ Acts, xv. 29. ‖ Levit. xxii. 8.
¶ Exod. xxii. 31. Levit. xvii. 15. xxii. 8.
** Acts, xxi. 25.

†† Sale's Koran, chap. v. vol. i. p. 149. The above specimens present a very curious exemplification of the kind of correspondence, which

The rite of the *annual pilgrimage* to Mecca, together with most of the ceremonies observed in its performance, was taken by Mahomet from the practice of the pagan Arabs; among whom, according to the concurrent evidence of Mahometan writers, the usage had prevailed from remote antiquity. * But, whether of pagan or of patriarchal origin (for the Mahometans pretend to derive it from the times of Abraham and Ishmael), this ritual observance practically maintains the general correspondence, between the rites and ceremonies of Mahometanism, and the established rituals of the Jewish, and of the Christian church.

The annual ascent or pilgrimage of the twelve tribes to Jerusalem, during the earlier epochs of their commonwealth, and the periodic resort thither, after the dispersion, of Jews from all nations and countries of the earth, at the time of the passover, constituted the most prominent external feature connected with the worship of the temple.

---

obtains between the Bible and the Koran. The continuous text of the latter, is here literally made up from *disjecta membra* of the Old and New Testaments. Further examples of this species of coincidence, will be found in another place. See section viii.

* See Pocock, Specim. pp. 302—307.; Mill, De Mohammed. ante Mohamm. pp. 324—328.; Reland, De Relig. Mohamm. pp. 113—123.; also Sale, Prelim. Disc. pp. 152—162.