

Islam and the Oriental Churches

Their Historical Relations

*Students' Lectures on Missions
Princeton Theological Seminary
1902-3*

BY
WILLIAM AMBROSE SHEDD, M. A.,
*Missionary of the American Presbyterian Church
to Persia*

PHILADELPHIA
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION
AND SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK

1904

BP

172

.S5

1904

NOV 26 1904

Discontinued

COPYRIGHT, 1904, BY

THE TRUSTEES OF THE

**PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION
AND SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK**

DEDICATED TO
THE MEMORY OF
BENJAMIN WOODS LABAREE
WHO MET A CRUEL DEATH, SALMAS, PERSIA
MARCH NINTH, MCMIV
A TRUE FRIEND AND A DEVOTED MISSIONARY
ΣΠΕΝΔΌΜΕΝΟΣ

Preface

THE following chapters were prepared in response to an invitation from the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary to fill the Student Lectureship on Missions. They were delivered in substantially the form published here. After delivery at Princeton they were given also at Auburn Theological Seminary, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago Theological Seminary, and the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky. The kind reception accorded them in these places has encouraged me to present them to the general public.

I am greatly indebted to the following libraries for the generous loan of books: Case Memorial Library of Hartford Theological Seminary, the Library of Princeton Theological Seminary, and the Foreign Missions Library in New York.

The original sources consulted have been Syriac. I am aware that an exhaustive treatment of the subject must be based on the

accounts of the Muhammadan as well as the Christian writers. So far, however, as the evidence of Christian writers mitigates the severity of our judgment of Muhammadan rulers, it can surely be trusted; and the fact is that the principal Syriac writers show few signs of bitterness toward the Arabs. Moreover, the Arabic sources have been used by writers more generally than the Syriac sources. It is, perhaps, well to warn the reader that the treatment of the subject is far from exhaustive geographically or chronologically. In particular the histories of the Christians of Egypt and of those under Osmanli rule illustrate the havoc wrought by the principle of limited toleration.

A word as to that vexed subject, oriental orthography. I have tried to be consistent and scientific, but I have not attempted to represent in any way the Semitic guttural 'ain, which has no equivalent in our Western tongues. If to some readers the spelling *Muhammad* appear pedantic, it must be urged that neither of the alternatives Mahomet or Mohammed is universally adopted and that both are incorrect.

WILLIAM AMBROSE SHEDD.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION—ISLAM AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

Importance of the Muhammadan missionary problem. Neglect and misunderstandings of the historical relations of Christianity and Islam. Importance of studying them. Scope of the present course of lectures I

FIRST LECTURE

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON MUHAMMAD AND ON THE BEGINNINGS OF ISLAM

The personality of Muhammad in Islam. Influences that prepared for Islam. Jewish and Christian influences; character, extent, evidence in Arab poetry. Christian influences that affected Muhammad himself. Evidence of personal contact with Christianity, references to Christianity in the Quran, doctrinal influences, relation to Christianity as claimed by Muhammad. Bearing of these facts on the estimate of Muhammad's character. Relation to the Muhammadan controversy. Can Islam lead to Christianity? The failure and fault of the church II

SECOND LECTURE

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM THEOLOGY

Conditions under which Muslim and Christian theology developed. Oriental Christianity. Its division, extent, character, theological differences and agreements. Interchange of religious ideas between Muslims and others. Christian influence in the doctrine of the "foundations" of Islam. The eternal Quran, legendary history in the traditions, the doc-

trine of agreement. Christian influence on the Muslim doctrine of God and the apostolate. Christian influence on the sects of Islam. Slightness of Muslim influence on Christianity, and limits of Christian influence on Islam. Can Islam meet modern conditions?

45

THIRD LECTURE

THE RELATION OF MUHAMMADAN GOVERNMENT TO THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

General outline and periods of the history A. D., 600-1500. Toleration, in the strict sense, the characteristic of the policy of Islam to other religions. The origin of the policy. Policies of the eastern Empire and of Persia. Practice of Muhammad. The history of the policy. The constitution of Umar, Arabian Christianity, the attitude of the Christians to the Arab conquest, maintenance of the *status quo*, Christianity under the Khalifas, conditions under the Mongols, fanatical reaction. The effect on the churches. Spiritual effect of limiting activity, effect of governmental influence in ecclesiastical affairs. Dangers of toleration. Compromise a characteristic of Islam

91

FOURTH LECTURE

THE EXPANSION OF THE FAITHS

Difficulty of the subject. Some conditions of the expansion. Character of the Muslim propaganda. Divisions of the subject. Converts to Christianity from Islam and Christian apologies. The Syriac-speaking peoples. Failure of Islam to gain them, proselytes from them to Islam. The Iranians. Extent of Christianity among them, extension after rise of Islam, means of extension, Nestorian monasticism and monastic missions, failure of Christianity to win the Iranians, Muslim propaganda and success. The Turks and Mongols. Christianity in China, Uighurs, Keraites, means of extension, character of the Christians, failure of Christianity, propaganda and success of Islam. The relation of Muslim missions to political movements. Estimate of the Nestorian missions. Religious and national movements

139

CONTENTS

vii

FIFTH LECTURE

THE DOWNFALL OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE COMMON RUIN

Tragic character of the course of the history and the relation of the Christians to it. Geographical distribution of the Christians and the fortunes of the centers of Christian population. Service of faith in the dark days **189**

SIXTH LECTURE

THE LIGHT OF THE PAST ON THE FUTURE MISSIONARY CONFLICT

Incentives from the failures of the past. Place of the oriental churches. The missionary character of the Syrian churches. Our duty to them. The Christianity that can conquer. Its methods, its theological character, its vital relation to Christ **205**

APPENDIXES 227

Introduction

Importance of the Muhammadan missionary problem. Neglect and misunderstandings of the historical relations of Christianity and Islam. Importance of studying them. Scope of the present course of lectures.

Islam and the Oriental Churches

INTRODUCTION

THE problem of Islam is so vast and so complex and, furthermore, is of such vital interest to all who desire the coming of the kingdom of Christ on earth, that no apology is required for making it the subject of a course of lectures on missions. To say that the most elaborate investigation ever made into the statistics of Islam resulted in the conclusion that the Muhammadans number two hundred and sixty millions, or over fifteen per cent. of the population of the globe, is dealing in figures too large to be definitely significant to the mind.¹

The geographical distribution will be clearer if we remember that there are large bodies of Muhammadans in every country in Asia,—Siam, Japan, and Korea excepted,—that among the Malays there are thirty millions of this faith, and

¹ Dr. H. Jansen, *Verbreitung des Islams*, Berlin, 1897.

4 *ISLAM AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES*

that about three eighths of the inhabitants of Africa are followers of the Prophet of Arabia. As various as the races represented are the degrees of culture, from the savage just emerged from heathenism to the most refined philosophical pantheist, yet all profess reverence to the same book and the same name.

To the follower of Christ and especially to the student of Christian history Islam possesses a melancholy interest peculiar to it among the religions of the world. It alone can claim to have met and vanquished Christianity. Islam arose in a region accessible to Christianity, for Mecca is only eight hundred miles from Jerusalem over a road traveled by Muhammad in his youth. It arose at a time when Christianity should have evangelized Arabia, for in the six centuries by which the gospel of Christ preceded the creed of Muhammad, Christianity had spread to the borders of the Pacific, Indian, and Atlantic Oceans; had revolutionized the greatest empire known to ancient history, and had created a vast literature and a new learning. Why did it lose in Asia? What were the causes of defeat? Why was it possible for Muhammad to arise in that age of the world? Why did his religion

take root and flourish in lands sacred in Christian history? To ask and seek an answer to these and other such questions is the duty of the apologist, who defends the faith. The missionary should seek, in this dark and well-nigh forgotten past, light on the present battle in the world-wide field.

Another reason that gives the study of this department of history a special claim is that it has been neglected or misunderstood. Church history has very little to say on the subject, and the statements in church histories and in missionary literature are often far wide of the truth. One error is to enroll the eastern church *en masse* in the list of martyrs, as in the following sentence from the latest English history of eastern Christianity: "For long years past the existence of the eastern church has been one continued martyrdom."¹ Similarly, Neale says: "The empire of the Cæsars was vanquished (by the Arabs), and limited, and contracted: the spiritual dominion of the eastern church stooped not to the victor. Many a noble victory was won for Christ: many a glorious athlete was sent to

¹ See Hoare's *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*.

martyrdom. The church rode out the storm: as little did she quail before the successive billows of devastation that poured in around her."¹ An often and opposite error cannot be expressed more tersely than in the following sentences from the *Report of the Ecumenical Missionary Conference in New York*: "When Muhammad arose, Christianity was so dead that it was putrid. Muhammadanism crushed it in its mailed hand as if it had been a Dead Sea apple."²

Another misunderstanding of history is that the Arab conquest of western Asia was a crisis of fire and blood in which multitudes were forced to accept Islam at the point of the sword. It would probably have been better for Christianity, if this had been the case; but it was not. Again, in explaining the causes of the greater comparative success of Islam in this or former ages it is easy to assign reasons that, if true, are exceedingly damaging to the Christian cause. The following from a volume published by a great Christian publishing society is an extreme illustration. Speaking of the success of Islam in west Africa the author remarks, "Given a

¹ *Holy Eastern Church*, Vol. I, p. 5.

² *Report*, Vol. I, p. 436.

climate in which a European can live, and a strong neutral government, Christianity would fear no comparison, in matter of results, with Islam or any other creed."¹ And, forsooth, are a temperate climate and the protection of a civilized government necessary conditions to the successful spread of the religion of Christ? It is an admission of failure in fundamental character worse than a thousand defeats in detail.

Other and cogent reasons can be given for the missionary study of the historical relations of these great historical faiths. Islam has been in contact with Christianity throughout its whole history, and the relation has not been, for the most part, that of master to slave or of conqueror to captive. Force has played a smaller part than is usually supposed. The church has had opportunities and has gained victories, too, that are forgotten by most. In other words there is a history to study, and one that throws light both on the character, the religions, and on our present-day conflict, which has little more than begun.

The study has much to teach as to the character of Islam. That religion claims to be a

¹ Haines, *Islam as a Missionary Religion*, S. P. C. K., p. 207.

daughter of Christianity, or its younger sister, and there are some outside Muhammadan ranks who maintain the rightfulness of this claim. What is the testimony of history? On historical subjects most people have to content themselves with general conceptions and ideas and cannot expect to have detailed knowledge, and this is true of the subject before us. It is not necessary that every missionary worker, even, should have a philosophical grasp of the religion he or she meets, although it is absolutely essential that some missionaries should have a sympathetic and philosophical conception of its system of belief. Christianity takes hold of the masses, and the masses are ignorant folk, especially when, as in Muhammadan lands, women are kept in the ignorance without the innocence of childhood. But it is vastly important that the general conceptions of that religion should be true, and especially so with the missionary, for such ideas enter unconsciously into his whole attitude and color all his thought.

What has been said may appear presumptuous; and lest the performance be disproportionate to the promise, it will be well at once to define the limits of the subject. Such limits are suggested

by the time that can be given to such a course of lectures and are made still more imperative by the personal limitations of the lecturer, as regards both equipment and opportunity. We will discuss the historical relations of the faiths, not their philosophical and moral effects, except incidentally. Geographically we will limit ourselves for the most part not merely to western Asia, but to a portion of that region, and ecclesiastically to the Nestorian and Jacobite churches. Asia Minor and the long contest in it as well as in southeastern Europe; Africa, where Christianity has a checkered history under Muslim rule; Spain, where the faiths came into close contact, and the crusades,—all are largely excluded from our view. It is believed that with these limits the field chosen is one of peculiar importance. It exhibits Islam in the region where it developed, was dominant, and was most free to work out its own destiny. It presents both religions where political rivalries have been least prominent and where missionary activity has been most marked.

It has seemed best to adopt an arrangement which is not chronological but which will, it is hoped, nevertheless indicate to some degree the onward march of history. Perhaps it is well

10 *ISLAM AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES*

to add that all is written from the missionary's point of view, in the full conviction that no destiny for Islam and no Submission (for that is the meaning of the word) can be so full of hope and blessedness as the acknowledgment of the supreme Lordship of Jesus Christ.

First Lecture

**THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY
ON MUHAMMAD AND ON THE
BEGINNINGS OF ISLAM**

The personality of Muhammad in Islam. Influences that prepared for Islam. Jewish and Christian influences, character, extent, evidence in Arab poetry. Christian influences that affected Muhammad himself. Evidence of personal contact with Christianity, references to Christianity in the Quran, doctrinal influences, relation to Christianity as claimed by Muhammad. Bearing of these facts on the estimate of Muhammad's character. Relation to the Muhammadan controversy. Can Islam lead to Christianity? The failure and fault of the church.

First Lecture

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON MUHAMMAD AND ON THE BEGINNINGS OF ISLAM

It has been remarked that in Islam trivial things have been the occasion of far-reaching results. For example, the vicissitudes in the family life of the Prophet lie at the basis of the legislation in the Quran that regulates the status of woman for Muslims in all ages. The reason for this is that the personality of Muhammad dominates the religion as his personal needs and whims in large measure regulated the revelations of the Quran. The traditions occupy themselves with his words and his deeds, the most passing remarks and the most trivial acts. It is said that the great Umar looked at the black stone in Mecca and said: "By God, I know that thou art only a stone and canst grant no benefit, canst do no harm. If I had not known that the Prophet kissed thee, I would not have done so, but on account of that I do it." The following refers

to Ibn Hanbal, one of the masters in law and theology. "It is said this great traditionist would not even eat watermelons, because, although he knew the Prophet ate them, he could not learn whether he ate them with or without the rind, or whether he broke, bit, or cut, them; and he forbade a woman, who questioned him as to the propriety of the act, to spin by the light of the torches passing in the street by night, because the Prophet had not mentioned that it was lawful to do so."¹

These people were not imbecile, though to us their conduct may be incomprehensible. It was based on a conception of religion radically different from ours and on a profound faith in the absolute inspiration of Muhammad. Their ideal was to have the details of life dominated by the example of Muhammad, and hence their minute biographical interest in his life was religious and not historical. This aspect of Islam is brought out clearly by Kuenen in his "Hibbert Lectures" in which he says: "As for Muhammad, we can resolve him into his factors, so to speak, and thus explain him; but we cannot explain Islam without him. If I might for a moment

¹ Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, s. v. Tradition.

separate those elements that in reality never appear except in combination, I should say : Islam is in a high degree and far more than most other religions, the product not of the time or of the people, but of the personality of its founder.”¹ It is evident from all this that our first task should be to inquire into the personal relation of Muhammad to Christianity and into the impress of that personal relation on the religion. In order to understand these we must have as clear an idea as possible of the relation of his people and generation to Christianity.

Muhammad came in the fullness of time. He reaped a quick and rich harvest because the ground had been made ready and the seed sown. The forces that prepared Arabia for revolution were Jewish and Christian in origin, though it is doubtful just what form they took and how much is due to one or the other of the older faiths.

There was no Jewish community in Mecca, the birthplace and home of Muhammad, but north along the road to Syria there were Jewish colonies in Yathrib (now Medina), where Muhammad lived the last ten years of his life, and in Taima, Khaibar, and Fadak. South of Mecca

¹ *Natural Religions and Universal Religions*, p. 23.

in Yaman, opposite the coast of Abyssinia, were large numbers of Jews. Besides the native Hebrews there were Arab converts to Judaism, assimilated to the Jews in customs and tribal life and so separated from their own people. The Jews of Arabia were engaged in agriculture, trade, and manufactures, and were an established and powerful element in society. The following description from Deutsch may be colored with patriotic enthusiasm, but the influence of Judaism in preparing Arabia for Islam is unquestioned. "Acquainted," he says, "with the Halachah and Haggadha, they seemed, under the peculiar story-loving influence of their countrymen, to have cultivated the latter with all its gorgeous hues and colors. Valiant with the sword, which they not rarely turned against their own kinsmen, they never omitted the fulfillment of their greatest religious duty—the release of their captives, though these might be their adversaries; and further, like their fathers from of old, they kept the Sabbath holy even in war, though the prohibition had been repealed. They waited for the Messiah, and they turned their faces toward Jerusalem. They fasted, they prayed, and they scattered round them the seeds of such high cul-

ture as was contained in their literature. And Arabia called them the people of the 'Book'; even as Hegel has called them the people of the 'Geist.' These seeds, though some fell on stones, and some on the desert sand, had borne fruit a thousandfold." The eloquent author goes on to mention specific evidences of Jewish influence, in the calendar, in the religious rites of the Kaaba and the well of Zemzem, in the veneration of Ishmael, and in the remains of Jewish Arab poets. The Quran is full of evidence of Jewish influence, especially in the legends it contains; and above all Judaism with Christianity prepared hearts to echo the great cry of Muhammad, "No god but Allah."¹

Christianity entered Arabia from three distinct geographical sources. The first was Palestine and Syria, whence Christianity went into Arabia Petraea and the region east of the Jordan, and thence farther into the desert. Bostra, east of the Jordan, was for centuries the seat of a bishopric, as was Ayla, at the head of the Gulf of Akaba, in the Prophet's time. The Christian chieftain-kings of Ghassan, farther north and tributary to

¹ *Remains of Emmanuel Deutsch, Islam*, New York Ed., p. 92.

the Roman power, have a place in the ecclesiastical histories of the fifth and sixth centuries. From early times the desert regions adjoining Syria and Palestine were the haunts of the hermits, most famous among whom is St. Simon Stylites, who is credited with the conversion of many Arabs to Christianity. Wellhausen says, "The Rahib keeping shy of men in his lonely cell, with his lamp, which lights caravans by night is a popular figure in Arabic poetry."¹ The second source was Mesopotamia and Babylonia, and here Christianity made a center at Hira, near the Euphrates, with many adherents along the coast and on the islands of the Persian Gulf, and extended south to the borders of Yaman. Of these we read in Nestorian history. From these two sources Christian influences had extended so generally in northern Arabia that we may accept the statement that "if Islam had not intervened, all northern Arabia from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf would shortly have been Christian."²

The third source of Christian influence was Africa, and especially Abyssinia, with which the

¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, III, p. 200.

² *Ib.*, p. 199.

Himyarite Christians in Yaman were closely connected. These last were so numerous as to be a formidable political power and were supported by the Abyssinians. In the century before the rise of Islam, sanguinary conflicts took place between the Jews and Christians of Yaman for the supremacy, conflicts that gave rise to the Christian history of the Himyarites who endured martyrdom at the hands of the Jews. The attempt of the Christian viceroy of Abyssinia to take Mecca with the purpose of destroying the Kaaba, which was frustrated by some sudden calamity, supposedly in the year of Muhammad's birth, is celebrated in the Sura of the Elephant : " Hast thou not seen what thy Lord did with the fellows of the elephant ? Did he not make their strategem lead them astray, and send on them birds in flocks, to throw down on them stones of baked clay, and make them like blades of herbage eaten down ? "

Christian influence was least strong in Central Arabia and in the Hijaz, the region near the Red Sea including Mecca ; but even here there were Christian influences. Slaves were not infrequently Christian captives, the Arabs made trading journeys to Syria and elsewhere, and traders

from outside passed through the country. Says an Arab poet : " Whence has Al Asha his Christian ideas ? From the wine-dealers of Hira of whom he bought his wine ; they brought them to him."¹

Ecclesiastically these influences were very largely either Nestorian or Monophysite, and to a very small extent probably of the Orthodox Greek Church. The Christianity of Syria was largely, and that of Egypt and Abyssinia still more prevailingly, Monophysite. The rather recently organized Jacobite Church had dioceses among the northern Arabs, while there were Nestorian dioceses at Hira on the Euphrates, on the Persian Gulf, and in Najran in Central Arabia. Both these churches were identified with Aramaic culture and the Syriac language. If there was any Arabic translation of the Bible, it was not in general use, and there is little probability that any Christian Arabic literature existed. There was also a large and indefinable body of still more heretical Christianity. The Monophysite movement in the century before Muhammad had been very prolific in minor heresies, among others being a sect of tritheists in Mesopotamia,

¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, p. 200.

which has a special interest as furnishing a possible source for Muhammad's tritheistic conception of Christianity. The numerous hermits were mainly heretical.

The strange survivals to-day in Islam of all sorts of forgotten sects gives one an idea of the possibilities of survivals of old heresies in that time. Two Arabic terms found in the Quran, which have always been puzzles, very likely refer directly to such Christians. One is the word Hanif, which has been referred to monotheistic seekers after more light and so forerunners of Muhammad. It appears, however, to have been used as a synonym of Rahib, a monk, and that the Hanifs were so called because of their relation at least in ascetic practices to the hermits. The other word is Sabæan, frequently used in the Quran along with Jew and Christian and in contrast to idolater. This is not unlikely a name for the Elkasaites, a strange Jewish-Christian sect, who practiced frequent baptisms, hence the "plungers" as the name means.¹ This peculiarity would account for the first Muslims with their frequent ablutions being called Sabæans by

¹ Wellhausen, pp. 206-208. Sell, *Historical Development of the Quran*, p. 65.

the Meccans. In brief, the Christianity that reached Arabia was heterogeneous and varied, made up of conflicting cults and doctrines, yet in part of a definite and ascertainable theological character.

A striking proof that these Christian influences had really affected Arab life is found in the remnants of pre-Islamic poetry. Wellhausen, who has already been quoted, after mentioning several Christian poets, says: "In general Christianity had its silent part in the spiritual culture of the Arabs as represented in poetry. In general also through the channel of poetry with culture Christian thought and sentiment had been infused among the Arabs. For example, it is observable in the sententious, moralizing parts, which are so desired at the close of the poems. Even such specific representations as that of the Heavenly Book, are not unfamiliar to the poets and are used by them. The idea of Allah has assuredly not grown on a purely heathen basis. Besides this, the unpeaceful introspection, the meditation on death, the placing value on the life of the individual instead of on the permanency of the tribe, which we have found to be the fact at least in the case of

single prominent men, point to a preparation through Christian influence."¹ Such influences would go far beyond the limits of specific knowledge of Christian doctrine and would prepare the way for changes which only a stronger force could actually bring to pass.

It seems that the above facts are enough to warrant the conclusions that the people were prepared for Islam by Christian influences, and also that Muhammad himself must have had some general knowledge of Christianity, and that without presupposing any special inquiry on his part. Furthermore, we may conclude that opportunities to get considerable specific knowledge of that religion were within his reach. It is a suggestive tradition that tells of the four Meccans, friends of Muhammad, who, renouncing idolatry, went out to seek for the pure faith of Abraham. Three of the four became Christian, one of them ending his life in Mecca, one in the dominions of the Greeks, and the third in Abyssinia, whither he had fled after having accepted Muhammad's prophetic claims. He used to tell his companions in exile that he had found

¹ Wellhausen, p. 203. Lyall, *Ancient Arabian Poetry*, xxx. 92f., 119.

the truth, while they were still groping in the dark. So early was the first convert from Islam to Christianity.

Specific proof is not wanting that Muhammad came in contact with Christians, even allowing for much that is doubtful in the traditions. These connect his journey or journeys in his youth to Syria with a monk variously called Sergius, Bahira, and Nestor, whom he saw in Syria and who foretold his future greatness: a legend which is found in Syriac as well as Arabic with wonderful amplifications. The use of ascetic practices by Muhammad, particularly night vigils of prayer, and the association of the word Hanif with the hermits, give color to the legend though not to the form it takes in the tradition. Another tradition is that the Prophet heard at the great fair at Oqaz a hermit or poet or bishop, for the details differ, whose preaching made a lasting impression on him. Among the early friends and followers of Muhammad were Zaid, his adopted son, who was of Christian parentage, some who left Christianity for Islam, and the three "Hanifs" mentioned above who accepted Christianity. One of these, Waraqa, is credited in Muslim history with a knowledge

of the Christian Scriptures and even with having translated some portion of them into Arabic. Before Muhammad's flight from Mecca his persecuted followers found refuge with the Christians of Abyssinia; and at Medina he received repeated embassies from Christian tribes.

In seeking to discover what knowledge Muhammad actually had of Christianity, we can go to the Quran for testimony. Its testimony so far as it goes is unimpeachable. If it were our purpose to seek for the evidences of Jewish influence the material would be far more abundant; and especially in view of the Judaistic heresies of the time it is impossible to draw a sharp line between Christian and Jewish influence. It will be simpler, and sufficiently accurate as well, to take into account only the references in the Quran to distinctively Christian doctrine, thus excluding the references to the Old Testament, which might as well be Jewish as Christian in origin. Those to the New Testament are almost certainly Christian in origin, though it would be impossible to say how much was derived from the common knowledge of the story-loving populace and how much came directly from Christians. At the risk of tedi-

ousness it will be well to give a summary of the supposed New Testament history contained in the Quran. All refers to the life of Christ, the only other Christian legend in the Quran being the story of the Seven Sleepers. The sacred history of Christianity as known to Muhammad was, then, somewhat as follows :—

The wife of Imran (*i. e.*, Amram), being without child, dedicated her offspring to God, and though the child was a daughter, remained steadfast in her vow. The child, who was Aaron's sister, was called Mary, and was cared for by Zechariah, aided by some special divine provision, he having been chosen to this office among the priests by lot. Zechariah, though stricken in years, asked God for an heir, and one was promised him; and he then asked for a sign, which was given him in a three days' dumbness. This son was John, the forerunner of the word of God. Angels, or the Spirit of God, announced to Mary, who was in an eastern place (*i. e.*, in an attitude of prayer) and veiled from the rest of the family, that she in her virginity should bear a son who should be the Messiah. The child thus conceived by the power of the Spirit was born under a palm tree, the mother

being refreshed by a stream of water at her feet and by fresh dates sháken from the tree, and being warned to eat no more food that day and to speak to no one. When she brought the child to her people, they reproached her; but she pointed to the little one, who spoke from the cradle announcing himself to be a prophet sent from God. Jesus, after he grew up, taught the people, presented himself to them as a prophet, and by the help of the Spirit worked miracles, forming a bird of clay and breathing life into it, healing the blind and the lepers, raising the dead, telling people what was in their house and what they ate.

At one time the apostles asked Jesus if God were able to send down a table from heaven, saying that they desired to eat from it and so be perfectly convinced in heart. Jesus prayed and God replied with a promise to send it and also with a threat of most dire punishment, if they should still be unbelieving. Again, a dialogue between God and Jesus refutes the idea that Jesus and his mother may rightly be worshiped as gods. The Jews disbelieved in Jesus and were cursed by him, but the apostles under divine guidance were his helpers. Two of them were

once sent to a city and, when they were rejected, a third was sent; but all three were denounced as liars. One man only received their message and was forgiven, while the other people were destroyed by a single sound from heaven. It is a calumny that the Jews killed Jesus. They did not kill him, but some one resembling him; while God took him to himself. On this point Christians are said to differ and to have no certain knowledge. Jesus is the sign of the Hour, an Hour that shall come suddenly and unexpectedly.¹

In these narratives the full acceptance of the Virgin-birth and the denial of the reality of the Crucifixion are noticeable, as is the recognition of the Virgin as worthy of special honor. The legendary and partially trivial character of the material, analogous to the apochryphal and not to the canonical Christian, literature is too marked to require comment. Christ is frequently mentioned in the *Quran* as one of the greatest in the prophetic line, while it is vehemently denied that he is more than man. Indeed the only two specific doctrines of Christianity mentioned in

¹ *Quran*, iii. 30-50; iv. 154-156; v. 82, 109-117; xix. 2-34; xxi. 89-93; xxxvi. 13-28; xliii. 56-70.

the Quran are vehemently contradicted. These are the Trinity, taken in a tritheistic sense, and the Sonship of Christ, taken in a materialistic sense. This denial is implied in such passages as the following short sura:—

“ In the name of the merciful and compassionate God.

Say, ‘ He is God alone !

God the Eternal !

He begets not and is not begotten !

Nor is there like unto him any one ! ” ¹

As well as in explicit statements like this:—

“ O ye people of the Book ! do not exceed in your religion, nor say against God aught save the truth. The Messiah, the son of Mary, is but the apostle of God and his Word, which he cast into Mary, and a spirit from him ; believe then in God and his apostles and say not ‘ Three.’ Have done, it were better for you. God is only one God. Celebrated be his praise that he should beget a son.” ²

And this:—

“ And when God said, ‘ O Jesus, son of Mary, is it thou who didst say to men, take me and my mother for gods, beside God ? ’ He said, ‘ I celebrate thy praise, what ails me that I should say what I have no right to say ! ’ ” ³

¹ *Ibid.*, cxii.

² *Quran*, iv. 168f.

³ *Quran*, v. 116.

A number of passages show that Muhammad was familiar with the term "Holy Spirit," and that he connected the Spirit with Christ in a special manner. The way in which Christ is called the Spirit of God, a term applied now by Muslims to him, shows that Muhammad did not conceive of the Spirit in a personal sense.¹ The only passage approaching a direct reference to the words of Jesus as found in the New Testament is the following: "And when Jesus the son of Mary said, 'O children of Israel! verily I am the apostle of God to you, verifying the law that was before me and giving you glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad.'" ² This has been explained by commentators on the Quran as referring to the word Paraclete, the Greek word being taken apparently as *περικλητός* (renowned) instead of *παράκλητος*, a meaning akin to Ahmad and the cognate word Muhammad, is not an afterthought. Two supposed references to the Sacraments are too indefinite and dubious to merit attention.³ Monks and priests are mentioned, once in praise

¹ See Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, s. v. Spirit.

² *Quran* lxi. 6. Deutsch (*Remains*, p. 68 note) explains Ahmad from Old Testament Messianic prophecy.

³ *Quran* ii. 138; v. 112-114.

and elsewhere with blame.¹ The divisions and disputes of Christians with each other are frequently referred to.

A broader and more difficult matter than determining the direct references to Christian subjects in the Quran is to estimate the extent of Christian influence on the underlying theological conceptions of Muhammad as contained in the book he left behind him. Fundamental to all else is, of course, the idea of God, and there is no room for doubt that the influences which led Muhammad and others in his generation to reject polytheism were Jewish and Christian. He himself regarded Allah, whom he worshiped, as the same as the God of the Jews and the Christians. The most magnificent thing in the Quran is the conception of God "the merciful, the compassionate and the ruler of the day of judgment":

"He who knows the unseen and the visible,—the great, the lofty one. . . . And the thunder celebrates his praise, and the angels too for fear of him; and he sends the thunder-clap and overtakes therewith whom he will;—yet they wrangle about God! But he is strong in might."²

¹ *Quran* v. 85; ix. 31-35; lvii. 27. ² *Quran* xiii. 10-14.

There may be a trace of Christian usage in the name "the merciful," but nevertheless all the distinctively Christian and some of the Jewish elements in the conception of God are lacking. He is not the Father; his holiness calls for no atonement or expiation; his love does not yearn for fellowship with man. Another fundamental conception that is assuredly biblical is that of revelation by means of inspired men and books. Muhammad's doctrines of inspiration go beyond that of any Christians in the idea of a heavenly original of the Quran. Also in the conception of faith, of grace, of obedience, and of submission, there are traces of Christian influences. The conception of the last day with that of the Resurrection is assuredly Christian in origin.

"When the heaven is cleft asunder,
 And when the stars are scattered,
 And when the seas gush together,
 And when the tombs are turned upside
 down,
 The soul shall know what it has sent on
 or kept back.

* * * * *

A day when no soul shall control aught
 for another; and the bidding on that
 day belongs to God." ¹

¹ *Ibid* lxxxii.

Angelology, demonology, eschatology, with Gabriel, the last trump, Iblis, Harut and Marut, Jinns "created before of smokeless fire," the reading of the books, the weighing in the balances, the gardens, the Houris, and all the detail of imagery in which the Quran abounds—these are collected from various sources, Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian, heathen. Like the legends, the Prophet cared not whence they came, so that they suited his purpose. Some are certainly Christian. In the externals of the faith, the fast is probably derived from the Christian Lent, the ablutions from the washings of the Sabæans or Elkasaites, and the ritual prayer from either Jews or Christians. Any one who has attended service in an oriental church and in a synagogue in the east needs no further proof that either could teach the scanty ritual of Islam. Much more might be said on the influence of Christianity as traced in the beliefs of Muhammad, but we must pass on to the conclusions derivable from the evidence.¹

First, however, we must bring to mind the fact that Muhammad claimed, and never weakened in the claim, that he came to confirm the

¹ See Smith, *Bible and Islam*, on this topic.

religion of Abraham, Moses, and Jesus. In what was perhaps the very last sura, we read the words, "promised in truth in the Law, and in the Gospel, and in the Quran."¹

Let us attempt a *general statement of Muhammad's personal relation to Christian teaching*. His fundamental beliefs were largely influenced by Christianity, probably without himself recognizing the source of those ideas; he had considerable but very desultory knowledge of Christian legend and much less of Christian doctrine and ritual; his knowledge was very limited and on many points of the first importance he was ignorant, as for example the sacramental system of Christianity and the distinction between Scripture and tradition; while he misunderstood or misrepresented other equally important doctrines, such as the death of our Lord and the Trinity. It is incredible that he ever saw or heard the New Testament. For example, the opposition of Herod and his attempt to kill the Child Jesus and the flight into Egypt are the kind of narrative that Muhammad made use of, and so also are the persecutions suffered by the apostles. If any Christian writings reached his hand or

¹ *Quran*, ix. 113.

ear, they were apocryphal and legendary; but there seems to be no good reason to suppose that any literary sources are required in order to account for his knowledge, such as it was.

Attempts have been made to trace the materials in the Quran to specific sources in the Syriac and Arabic Christian writings, but even if well taken they do not prove any direct relation. Indeed many of the books referred to are later than Muhammad.¹ The eclectic character of the Christian material is such that it is hopeless to attribute it to one man or to the influence of one sect. If Muhammad takes a doketic view of the death of Christ, he insists that his life was only human. If he objects to tritheism and we read of contemporary monophysite tritheists, Muhammad's trinity is not the same as theirs. He inveighs against the deification of the Virgin, but it is a far call from Muhammad in the seventh century to the Collyridians, an obscure sect that was imported into another part of Arabia in the fourth century. Muhammad was not an investigator into religious teaching, and there is no reason to suppose that he made much effort to learn about Christianity.

¹ *E. g.*, St. Clair-Tisdall, *Sources of Islam*, Ch. IV.

He was a dreamer, a seer of visions, a prophet whose heart burned with a message.

A tradition, like so many others true in spirit though dubious in fact, says that Umar once brought a Pentateuch to Muhammad to read from. The Prophet was displeased and the faithful disciple said in true Muslim spirit: "God protect me from his own anger and that of his apostle! It suffices me that God is my cherisher, and Islam my religion, and Muhammad my Prophet." Then the Prophet added, "If Moses were alive and knew my prophecy, he would follow me."¹ He had the truth of God, and other revelations must be identical with his: therefore he used them merely to support his own claims. This is shown by the character of the contents of the Quran taken in connection with the general acquaintance with Christianity, by the fact that there is no evidence in the Quran of growth in his knowledge of Christianity with the lapse of time, and by the use he makes of Jewish and Christian material. The first of these points need not delay us, except to remark on some of the omissions of the Quran. It seems inconceivable that one who cared to learn, should

¹ Smith, *Bible and Islam*, p. 189

have so little knowledge of the institutions of Christianity, of the place of Christ's death not only in theology but in popular religion, or of the battle cry of controversy, the Theotokos. This last would have been admirably suited to Muhammad's polemic.

Of course this argument from silence must be used with care, because the Quran does not necessarily contain all that Muhammad knew of Christianity. Some things, as the sacraments for example, were uncongenial to his temperament and would not attract him. The suras that contain the narratives referring to Christ belong partly to the Mecca and partly to the Medina period of his life, and they practically agree in their contents. They disprove any growth in knowledge. The denial that Christ was really killed by the Jews is in only a later sura, and this may be a later opinion or a change in opinion.¹ At all events it illustrates the way in which Muhammad used his material and the motive that actuated him. There were two reasons why it suited Muhammad not to accept the death of Christ. One is that in the Quran the prophets are represented as persecuted by the

¹Quran, iv. 156f.

people but delivered by God from them. The other is that the Jews claimed to have killed Jesus and at the time Muhammad was quarreling with the Jews of Medina. The gospel story of Christ's death, hinted at in the reference to the differing opinions on the matter, did not meet his purpose, while the other did, and so he chose it. So throughout the Quran "the Prophet evidently worked over the material he received, to fit it to his own purpose. He was not a historian, but a preacher. . . . For the most part the narratives were made strictly subordinate to his main purpose, and we can understand the narratives only as we keep the purpose in mind."¹

The question must arise as to the bearing of these facts on our estimate of the character of Muhammad. How can we reconcile sincerity with misrepresentation, honesty with unnecessary ignorance, the claim of the identity of his own teaching and that of earlier prophets with the evident differences? A distinction must be made between judging Muhammad as an Arab and as the founder of a universal religion, as a preacher for the seventh century and as a teacher for the

¹Smith, *Bible and Islam*, p. 95f., 61.

twentieth. The same canons of judgment cannot be applied in both cases. These facts are not a sufficient ground for denouncing him as an impostor. He came to his belief not through the teachings of another, nor by way of some system of religion, but through the experience of his own soul, using the materials he found in the life and thought of his time to feed and clothe the faith, that was itself born of the travail of his own spirit. These materials were not, therefore, the foundation of his faith.

Furthermore, there was none of the critical instinct in the mind of Muhammad, as there is very little in the mind of the Orient in general. The skeptics in the history of Islam have been such on metaphysical grounds and not from questioning the historical bases of their religion. The proverbial untruthfulness of Orientals is half of it due to the absence of the critical faculty. They believe contradictions and are as credulous as they are unvaracious. Muhammad was a ready auditor of what he himself called the "fables of the ancients." But, if we regard him no longer as an Arab and citizen of Mecca merely, we cannot urge such considerations. It is no longer a question of sincerity but of worth.

And it is no longer the man alone who is judged, but the religion. The man and the faith are inseparable, as is shown by the fact that the most elaborate attempt yet made to present Islam as a religion for the modern world is entitled *The Life and Teachings of Muhammad* and consists largely of a eulogistic biography of the Prophet.¹ The accuracy of this author's picture of the Prophet's life is as little likely to be accepted by scientific scholarship as is his right to represent Islam likely to be recognized by the Ulema of that faith. His view of the narratives of the Quran as "essential parts of the folklore of the country" and "traditions floating among the people" is very different from that of the mass of Muhammadans in all ages, who regard them as part of the Quran brought down from heaven. It is difficult to conceive how the Quran in its use of impossible narratives and misrepresentation of Christianity can be accommodated to the scientific spirit without making it so indefinite and lacking in authority as to be useless.

The facts that we have been considering offer

¹ *Life and Teachings of Mohammed, or The Spirit of Islam*, by Syed Ameer Ali.

a very obvious line of argument against Islam, as received by Muslims everywhere. The Quran attests the authority of the earlier Scriptures in repeated verses, such as the following:—

“He hath sent down to thee the Book in truth, confirming what was before it, and has revealed the law, and the gospel before for the guidance of men, and has revealed the discrimination.”¹

While thus attesting their authority, it contradicts them. Muslims meet this with the scientifically untenable claim that the Scriptures have been falsified, basing the claim on a charge by Muhammad against the Jews of perverting Scripture. Another argument that has been formulated against Islam is the following: “The Coran is held to be of eternal origin, recorded in heaven and lying there on the ‘Preserved Table.’ Thus God alone is held to be the ‘Source’ of Islam! and, if so, then all effort to find a human origin for any part of it must be in vain. Now, if we can trace the teaching of the Coran, or any part of it, to an earthly source, or to human systems existing previous to the Prophet’s age, then Islam at

¹ *Quran* iii. 2.

once falls to the ground."¹ It may be questioned how effective the argument would prove in this form, for the man who accepts the theory of inspiration referred to will hardly feel its force. Having swallowed the camel, he is not likely to strain at the gnat. However, it undoubtedly furnishes the basis for a strong and effective argument.

These facts have an important bearing on a question that has been discussed of late years, whether Islam is to be regarded as a stepping stone to Christianity. This position assumes two things: that Islam teaches truth, while it eradicates error, and that it is capable of such modification as will enable it to approach Christianity. It is of course evident that it is a great teacher of Monotheism, but observation in any Muhammadan land shows that along with the acceptance of Islam earlier beliefs and practices are singularly persistent.² But passing by that question, can it approximate Christianity as a system or be a bridge for individuals from heathenism to Christianity? I believe that it cannot, unless Christianity deny the Trinity and the divinity of

¹ *Sources of Islam*, p. 2.

² See Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*.

our Lord, and not only that, but also unless he be brought down to the level of other prophets. Besides this dogmatic contradiction of doctrines that have become identified with historic Christianity, and besides the denial to Jesus of a unique place and authority in religious and spiritual matters, there is in Islam, as we have seen, a misrepresentation and distortion of the facts of the sacred history of Christianity. These facts are ignored by writers of whom Bosworth Smith is a conspicuous example. The barrier is not primarily in the traditions or in the later dogmas of Islam, but in the unchanging and unchangeable Quran, nay, it originated in the mind of Muhammad himself. And history bears out this contention.

Islam owes its origin not to the strength of Christian influence but to its weakness, not to force of circumstance but to the fault of the church. Arabia was neglected for six hundred years and the church has suffered the penalty. The Romans, Greeks, and Syrians, despised the barbarians of the desert and they paid the price of their scorn. This is the first chapter of a long story of defeat, but the greatest defeat of all was unfought and unsuspected. It took place in the

desert, where a nation was left in ignorance, as they now call those days, and where forces gathered and matured, suddenly to issue forth with a mighty and long enduring power. Some of the causes for this failure will come before us later. Let us now impress on our minds that such neglect will always be punished, that Christendom will always and inevitably pay the penalty of its indolence.

Second Lecture

**THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO
THE DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM
THEOLOGY**

Conditions under which Muslim and Christian theology developed. Oriental Christianity. Its division, extent, character, theological differences and agreements. Interchange of religious ideas between Muslims and others. Christian influence in the doctrine of the "foundations" of Islam. The eternal Quran, legendary history in the traditions, the doctrine of agreement. Christian influence on the Muslim doctrine of God and the apostolate. Christian influence on the sects of Islam. Slightness of Muslim influence on Christianity, and limits of Christian influence on Islam. Can Islam meet modern conditions?

Second Lecture

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM THEOLOGY

Few periods of equal length in the world's history exhibit such marvelous changes as those in western Asia during the seventh and eighth centuries. In the early years of the seventh century, while Muhammad was preaching a new faith in Mecca and afterwards founding a new empire in Medina, a conflict was taking place between the two great world-empires, Rome and Persia, led by two men of marvelous ability. Not since the days of Darius and Xerxes had Asiatic armies so devastated the shores of the Mediterranean as did those of Khusru, the Persian king, and the campaigns of Heraclius in Asia approach those of Alexander in brilliancy. While Constantinople was beleaguered by Persians and Avars, Heraclius was winning victories in the very heart of the Persian empire, but the permanent fruits of conquest were gathered

neither by the Roman nor by the Persian, but by the Arab. The wars had only prepared the way for a foe who should utterly destroy the one empire and deprive the other of many of its fairest provinces.

Twenty years after the flight of Muhammad alone with Abu Bakr to Medina, Egypt, Syria, and Persia were conquered. In another decade the Arab capital was Damascus, where it remained for nearly a century and whence the Khalifa's dominions extended to central Asia and to the borders of France. In the middle of the eighth century the capital was removed to the fertile valley of the Tigris and Euphrates, a region that has been the seat of empire more continuously than any other in the world. Baghdad was founded, and the close of the century saw the height of Arab magnificence in the reign of Harun-ar-Rashed. These familiar facts are rehearsed because church and state are one in Islam, and with the empire the religion was transplanted.

As in every other religion, so in Islam, first the faith was established and afterwards theology was developed, but never before or since under such circumstances. We can bring these before

our mind more clearly by instituting a comparison with the history of Christianity. In both religions theology was developed under conditions and in regions widely different from those in which the faiths were established. Christianity emerged from Palestine to come into contact and conflict with pagan thought, both religious and philosophical; and the seats of Christian learning were for the most part great Greek and Roman cities, such as Alexandria, Antioch and Carthage. Similarly Islam emerged from the desert, and her theology was developed in centers of population where Christianity and Magianism, with their attendant heresies and modifications, had long been supreme. The parallel is far from complete and one difference is particularly important. For nearly three hundred years Christianity was not the religion of the state; and during this period it was often persecuted, always despised, and never secure. Islam, on the contrary, except for a single decade in the life of the Prophet, was a sovereign state; questions of theology were matters of state; the emperor was also the Khalifa, the successor of the Prophet; and the growth of political power was marvelously rapid. Imagine, if you can,

that the victories of Constantine followed immediately on the events related in the first part of the book of The Acts, and it will give an idea of one important phase of the circumstances in which Muslim theology grew up. It is often said or implied that the growth of Christian theology under the influence of Greek philosophy in particular has been such as to hamper and impair the efficiency of the faith. A similar judgment has been passed on the history of Islam, and it has been claimed that the religion suffered from Persian and Christian influences. Thus a brilliant writer speaks in terms of disparagement of "Persianized and Christianized Islam," meaning Islam as developed in Baghdad.¹ Such a phrase as "Christianized Islam" will come to most as a surprise, if not a shock. Can it be justified and how far?

The advent of Islam synchronizes with the beginning of the last of the Christological controversies, for it was the desire to unite the Christian parties against the Saracens that led the emperor Heraclius to propound as a compromise measure the doctrine of one will in the person of Christ.

¹ *Essays on Eastern Questions*, W. G. Palgrave, p. 336.

Christian theology was therefore developed to nearly the full measure reached by the Orthodox Church of the East, and the peculiar doctrines of the schismatic churches of the Orient were fully defined.¹ The controversies over the definition of the doctrine of Our Lord's Person had resulted in successive great secessions from the main body of Christians, all of which had affected almost exclusively the Christians of Africa and the East. The council of Ephesus, in A. D. 431, anathematized Nestorius, then Patriarch of Constantinople, and his teachings. He was an Antiochian, as were his closest friends, while the great scholar to whose influence the fundamental ideas of Nestorianism are traced, was the Antiochian, Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose diocese, however, was in Cilicia. The ancient Christian school at Edessa, in western Mesopotamia, espoused the cause of Nestorius with zeal, and finally Nestorianism became the religion of the church in Persia, whence it extended far into Asia. Similarly Monophysitism, though not confined to those regions, was strongest in Egypt and Syria; and the organized bodies of Monophysites were those whose successors are now

¹ See Appendix: On the Divisions of Oriental Christianity.

known as the Copts, the Abyssinians, the Jacobites, and the Armenians.

After the Arab conquest all of these Nestorian and Monophysite churches, except the Abyssinian, were subject to Muslim rule, and the brunt of the conflict with Islam fell on them. In this conflict the Orthodox Eastern Church shared, in close identification with the Eastern Empire, though more and more within Muslim dominion ; and not till the complete victory of the Osmanli Turks, nine centuries after the first Arab conquests, was its Patriarch the subject of a Muslim ruler. Among these churches, the Syrian churches, Nestorian and Jacobite, came into the closest contact with Islam and to them accordingly we will devote our attention chiefly. With them might be classed the Coptic and Armenian churches ; but Egypt was for the most part politically separate from the Asiatic regions, and the Armenian history from the Sassanian period is quite distinct from that of the Aramaic churches. It was given a character of its own by the long national conflict with the Persian power, and, furthermore, the Armenians never possessed the proselyting zeal that marked the history of the Syrian churches.

At the risk of digressing from the immediate topic before us to-day, it seems better to get a general view of the Syrian or Aramaean Christianity, with special reference to its theological character.

The spread of Christianity northward and westward from Palestine is familiar to us, but we are far less familiar with its rapid extension to the East. The fact that the apostles, like their Master, spoke an Aramaic dialect, would naturally lead some of them to preach the gospel to the peoples who spoke this language, and tradition agrees in designating Thomas as the Apostle of the East. Whatever the basis may be to that tradition, it is certain that Christianity very soon extended into Mesopotamia. In the second century the princes of Edessa probably professed Christianity. Here a school of Christian learning grew up and with it an extensive and ancient Christian literature, whose most precious but not sole fruitage was the Pshitta version of the Bible. Circumstances rendered the evangelization of the Aramaic or Syriac speaking population that extended from the Mediterranean Sea to the eastern border of the Mesopotamian plain a comparatively easy task. They

had lost all national unity, if indeed they ever had any. They were in part under Roman and in part under Parthian rule, and probably in both cases the authority exercised was not more than that of a suzerain. Neither government certainly had any zeal for the native religion of that region. Furthermore Greek and Persian religions and intellectual influences must have tended to prepare for a change in faith.

At all events, Christianity spread rapidly and was firmly established when the rise of the Sassanians brought into power in Persia and Mesopotamia a strong dynasty definitely associated with the Zoroastrian hierarchy. This was in A. D. 224. From that time for several centuries the history of Persian Christianity is not unlike church history in the Roman empire before Constantine, one of growth in spite of intermittent and sometimes violent persecution. After Christianity became the state religion of the West, it was natural that the most zealous persecutors should be the kings whom ambition or necessity drove to war with Rome. The outcome, however, was different, for in the middle of the sixth century the Persian government under the great Anurshirvan finally recognized the right of Chris-

tianity to be tolerated but not to proselyte.¹ This toleration was secured in part because of the acceptance of Nestorianism as the faith of the Persian Church, that form of Christianity being persecuted by the Empire and so favored by Persia.

We need not regard political expediency as the only motive that actuated Barsuma and his associates in espousing the doctrines of Nestorius and cutting themselves off from the Church of the Empire, for the school of Edessa, from which they were driven to establish themselves in Nisibis, was strongly Antiochian and the memory and writings of the great Theodore were highly venerated. This process of separation had begun before the Nestorian controversy, as is shown by the assumption by the Bishop of Seleucia of the title *Catholicos*; but it was completed on the acceptance of Nestorianism by the organization of the church upon an independent basis. This occurred in the latter part of the fifth century. The Patriarchal seat was at the capital Seleucia, with

¹This is evident from the Syriac Lives of Mar Gregor and Mar Aba as yet untranslated. (Bedjan, *Mar Yakh'alaha*, 1895.) See also the terms of Anushirvan's peace with Justinian in 562 (Rawlinson, *Seventh O. Monarchy*.)

numerous metropolitan and diocesan bishops throughout the Persian empire.

The Monophysite controversy followed close on the heels of the Nestorian, but it was not until the sixth century that Jacob Baradai did for the Jacobites what Barsuma in the fifth century had done for the Nestorians—completed their separate organization. The Monophysite party had always had a large popular following in Syria, but they were persecuted by the government and were divided among themselves, with little hope of success, until this indomitable leader took up their cause and gave them new life and organization. The impression made by his energy is testified to by the report that he ordained 100,000 deacons and priests. The sect of Jacobites is with right named after him. The patriarchal residence shifted among the cities of northern Mesopotamia; while the second in the hierarchy, the *Maphriana*, as he was called, lived in Takrit near Baghdad.

It is impossible to form any exact estimate of the size of these Christian bodies, but we have evidence as to their wide geographical distribution and large numbers. All Syriac historical literature testifies to the large Christian popula-

tion throughout Mesopotamia and the adjacent regions to the eastward, as well as considerable bodies in still more remote districts. Cosmas, a Christian traveler a hundred years before Muhammad, says after speaking of the Christians of India: "In the same way, among the Bactrians, Huns, Persians, Persarmenians, Elamites, and in the whole country of Persia, the churches and the bishops are without number, and the Christian population very numerous." During the Khalifat of Umar Christianity entered northern China. As the Arab hordes poured out of Arabia, they everywhere found Christianity firmly established and organized. In Syria there were the members of the orthodox state-church and large bodies of Jacobites; beyond the bonds of the Empire Nestorians were most numerous, but with them were a few orthodox, Chalcedonians or Melchites as they were called, and more Jacobites; and even in the farther regions of the Persian dominion, as Khurasan, there were not only Nestorians but also Jacobites.¹

The theological tenets of these great divisions of oriental Christianity did not differ as widely

¹The latter had been transported by the Sassanian government from Edessa (*Ass.* III., 420).

as one might infer from the rancor of their debates. I would not depreciate the importance of the Christological controversies in bringing out clearly the true significance of our Lord's person, but that need not make us forget the practical identity of the belief of the disputants on almost all doctrines. For our purpose the differences are important only so far as they affected the character of the Christians themselves, for they lie in a department of theology placed entirely outside the pale of discussion with Muslims by the denial in the Quran of the Sonship of Christ. These differences affected the character of the Christians not so much by the implications of the peculiar doctrines, as by the artificial divisions marked by them and by the unreal character of the theological literature. The founders of the Nestorian and Monophysite churches contended for something that to them had real value. It was not a battle over words, nor was it mere skirmishing for power. But with their successors, generation after generation, the case was different. The point at issue between Jacobite and Nestorian had a merely fictitious importance. Nature, and Person, and Hypostasis were nothing more to them than the

shibboleths of party strife. Their writers did not even discover new arguments ; they merely fought over again the battles of a bygone age, using the same weapons, heaping up opprobrious epithets on Cyril or Nestorius, as the case might be.

The East is full of strange survivals, but there is none more incomprehensible and more pathetic than the rehearsal of old debates by oriental Christians even to-day. It marks a sterility of thought that explains much of their failure to impress the new religion in a vital way. But, as already remarked, these differences were Christological and hence could have little or no interest to Muslims. Not so with their agreements. They were practically at one in their teaching as to the nature of God, in the acceptance of the same canonical Scriptures, even in their traditions and legends, in the organization of the Christian society, in the mode of worship, and in their conception of the Christian walk and life. In all of these it is at least conceivable that they should have influenced Islam. It may be thought that the Nestorians differed more widely from the others than they from each other, and to some extent it is true. The Nestorians were more primitive, for their develop-

ment had been arrested at an earlier stage ; but there is no sufficient reason for calling them, as has been done, the Protestants of the East. They differed from the others in the arrangement of the church, in the rules as to marriage of the clergy, in not using images or pictures, and in some other points. The absence of images would appeal to the Muhammadans, but probably not the other differences. The Nestorian liturgy, which with the other liturgies is very ancient, is less explicit than they in its sacerdotal teaching ; but it contains in essence the doctrine of the sacerdotal priesthood, the sacrificial element in the Eucharist, the prayers for the dead, and the intercession of the saints.¹

If further illustration be required, it may be found in the letters of the Patriarch Ishuyabh, written about A. D. 660, in which he urges certain unruly Christians to submit themselves to the Patriarch, because they were cutting themselves off from the channels of sacramental grace through the ordained ministry and the Apostolic Succession.² In brief, the Christianity we are

¹ See Brightman's *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, Vol. I.

² Budge, *Thomas of Marga's Book of Governors*, ii. 154.

considering was substantially the Christianity of the later Councils, fallen in many ways from primitive purity, but yet not lacking in intellectual power nor altogether in spiritual zeal. The Nestorian and Jacobite writers of the period immediately preceding Islam are men of no little strength, and John of Damascus of the Orthodox Greek Church, famous alike for his hymns and his theological treatises, lived under the Khalifas of Damascus.

But we must turn to Islam. The period of the development of orthodox Muslim theology may be limited by the death in the year 241 of the Hijra of Ibn Hanbal, the last of the four great masters of theology. The seat of empire and of religion was first in Damascus and then in Baghdad, and we know from historical records that in both these places Muslims and Christians discussed with one another theological topics. The most famous disputant in Damascus is John, the orthodox theologian, among whose writings are disputations against Islam. In Baghdad a favorite amusement of some of the Khalifas was to have debates by representatives of different religions, and the illustrious example of the rulers was followed by those in less exalted station. The

Apology of Al Kindi, still extant, shows that the debaters were able and well informed. It is a fact to which we shall have occasion to refer more fully at another time, that the prejudices that exist between Christians and Muslims have been intensified since the early centuries of Islam. The conquerors required the services of the Christians for governmental and literary purposes, and Christians held positions of high influence in the Arab court. One Khalifa after another employed Christian physicians, whose wealth and influence are subjects of frequent remark by the Jacobite historian, Gregory Bar Hebræus. The debt of Arabic learning to the Christians who translated for them the works of the Greek philosophers is remarked by every historian. An evidence of the interchange of religious opinions is that during the period of the great Abbasid Khalifas translations were made of the gospels into Arabic from Syriac, one of them according to Bar Hebræus in the seventh century at the request of an Arab governor, and there is record also of a refutation of the Quran in Syriac about the beginning of the ninth century by one Abu Nuh, who was in the

employ of the governor of Mosul.¹ It is not likely that these works were composed for the purpose of gaining proselytes. The motive was almost certainly theological curiosity.

The story of the Karaite Jews is a very interesting example of the influence of one religion upon another in the period of Arab rule. This sect of Jews was founded by one Anan ben David, who aspired to be the prince of the Baghdad Jews, but failed in his purpose. The point that interests us is that they recognized Jesus as a prophet and also Muhammad, and that they were affected by the discussions current among the Muhammadans as to the anthropomorphisms in the Scripture representation of God. Two Jewish sects at the beginning of the ninth century, founded by Persian Jews, owed their existence to Mutazilite influence; and one of them after the death of their leader borrowed the convenient doctrine of the Alyides that he was not dead but only concealed.² There is no room for doubt as to the opportunity of the Christians to make their beliefs known to the Muhammadans.

¹ See Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, s. v. Arabic Versions; Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 275; Assemani, *Bib. Orient.*, iii. 1, 212.

² Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Vol. II, ch. v.

It is well known that Islam acknowledges four foundations or sources of theology: the Quran, the Sunnat or Tradition believed to embody the rule or teaching of the Prophet; Ijma or Agreement of the Companions of the Prophet and the authoritative expositors of the law; and Qias or analogical reasoning. This department of theology (*i. e.*, its sources) is developed and defined in Islam to an extent unknown to Christianity. The doctrine of inspiration of the Quran is due to the high claims made by Muhammad himself rather than to any later influence. Enough to say that it is regarded as having been sent down from heaven by means of Gabriel and given word for word. In connection with the Quran, however, a question has been the occasion of much controversy, which in all probability was suggested by Christianity. The following quotation from Abu Hanifa, who died A. H., 150, will indicate the character of the doctrine of the "Uncreated Quran," as well as that of inspiration. He says, "The Quran is the Word of God, and is his inspired Word and Revelation. It is a necessary attribute of God. It is not God, but still it is inseparable from God. It is written in a volume, it is read in a language, it is remem-

bered in the heart, and its letters and its vowel points, and its writings are all created, for these are the works of man, but God's Word is uncreated. Its words, its writings, its letters, and its verses are for the necessities of man, for its meaning is arrived at by their use, but the Word of God is fixed in the essence of God, and he who says that the Word of God is created is an infidel."¹ Muhammad used the expression Word of God in reference to Christ; and here while there is no thought of Christ, it is difficult to resist the belief that there is a trace of the teaching of the Word that was in the beginning with God. This is made still more likely by the fact that in the extant disputations of John of Damascus and of his pupil, Theodore Abukara, an argument is based on the use of the title Word of Our Lord by Muhammad. What was original to the Muslim theologians was the application of the concept to the Quran.²

The dogma of the Sunnat, or Tradition, in Muslim theology grew out of the veneration paid to the prophet together with the conception

¹ Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, p. 484.

² Sell's *Faith of Islam*, 79f., 188ff.; Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology*, p. 146; *Dict. of Christ Biog.*, iii. 414.

of religion by which necessity was felt for some word or act of his to guide every detail of life. The Quran was inadequate to the demand and was supplemented by the mass of traditions, and in passing it may be remarked that the number of accepted traditions, goes up into the thousands, while tens of thousands more were rejected. There is nothing corresponding to this in Christianity, though the Apocryphal gospel, if made canonical, would be a partial parallel.

Muslims in arguing with Christians usually maintain that the gospels do not correspond to the Quran but to the Traditions. Alongside of Tradition in the sense just explained there has grown up in Islam, as to some extent in scholastic Christianity, a mass of legendary history and exegesis, created in order to explain the allusions and narratives of the Quran. In character these glosses are like the Quranic legends, only multiplied many times in volume and in marvels; and the sources are similar to those used by Muhammad himself. Furthermore there is the same naïve absence of criticism. Any one who has lived in the East and engaged in religious conversation with Muslims knows that much of the lore of the learned is

composed of statements such as that Job stamped with his foot and two springs, one hot and one cold, gushed out, or that in his later prosperity gold rained on one threshing floor and silver on another. I remember a call on a learned doctor of the law, in the course of which he related to us with a very evident sense of satisfaction the details of an interview between the Lord Jesus and Plato: both of whom, he said, were great physicians. Apparently the transmitters (or inventors) of these legends were mainly Jews, but Christians no doubt furnished a part.¹ Such influences are hardly worthy of mention, except that they make up much of the substance of popular religion.

We can without much doubt trace Christian influence in the third foundation of Islam, Ijma or Agreement. There is difference of opinion as to the persons whose agreement is a valid basis for law and dogma. All join in accepting the Agreement of the Companions of the Prophet, and practically all Sunnites accept the agreement of the great Masters, the four Mujtahids. How-

¹See *Am. Journal Sem. Lang.*, xiv. 137ff. Also *Articles on Bible Characters in Jewish Encycl.*; and in *Hughes' Dict. of Islam.*

ever defined, it is the same principle as the unanimous consent of the Fathers or the decision of an ecumenical council, and probably the latter is the form in which it would be most appealed to by the Christians, with their disputes as to the various councils. A still more direct proof of the Christian origin of this principle is found in Muslim jurisprudence. It must be borne in mind that jurisprudence and theology are in Islam one in their origins and their sanctions. The following is quoted from Macdonald: "The courts (in the territories conquered by the Arabs) were permitted to continue in existence till Islam had learned from them all that was needed. We can still recognize certain principles that were so carried over. That the duty of proof lies upon the plaintiff, that the right of defending himself with an oath upon the defendant; the doctrine of invariable custom and that of the different kinds of legal presumption. These, as expressed in Arabic, are almost verbal renderings of the pregnant utterances of Latin law. But most important of all was a liberty suggested by that system to the Muslim juriconsults. This was through the part played in the older school

by the *Responsa Prudentium*, answers by prominent lawyers to questions put to them by their clients, in which the law of the Twelve Tables was expounded, expanded, and often practically set aside by their comments. . . . Further, the validity of a general agreement of juriconsults 'reminds us of the rescript of Hadrian, which ordained that, if the opinion of the licensed *prudentes* (or lawyers) all agreed, such common opinion had the force of statute; but if they disagreed, the judge might follow which he chose.'"¹

The two departments of theology that are most fully developed in the eastern churches are the doctrine of God and the doctrine of Christ. It has been said by Harnack that "at the close of the fourth century it was settled that the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation constituted the faith."² The proportions of Muhamadan theology are not unfairly indicated by the following statement from a summary of modern scholastic Islam: "Know that it is incumbent on every Muslim that he should know fifty articles of belief, and for each article he should

¹ Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theol.*, 84ff.

² *History of Dogma*, IV, 335.

know a proof, general or detailed. . . . Now, let us state to you the fifty articles shortly before stating them in detail. Know, then, that twenty qualities are necessary in God Most High, that twenty are impossible in him, and that one is possible. This makes up forty-one. And in the case of the apostles, four qualities are necessary, four impossible and one possible. This makes up the fifty.”¹ In Islam the Apostolate (*i. e.*, the prophetic authority) has taken the place of Christology. In beginning, as every theologian must, with the doctrine of God, the Arabs could not but be influenced by the systems worked out in oriental Christianity. The denial of the Trinity would limit that influence, but the eastern churches themselves had no adequate grasp of the character of God as Father and in the enumeration of the attributes of God, which composes so much of Muslim theology, the differences would not be important. It is not imitation that leads the oriental Christian to-day to say, “God is merciful,” in a different language but precisely the same spirit of trust in his arbitrary good-nature as the Muslim.

A Nestorian apologist for Christianity argues

¹ Macdonald, Appendix, *Creed of Muhammad al Fudali*.

that the only difference between Christians and Muhammadans is the acceptance of Muhammad by the latter.¹ We cannot doubt that investigation would reveal parallels in language and substance of doctrine. In one matter of detail it is very certain that there was an interchange of ideas between Muslims and Christians. It is the belief of orthodox Muhammadans that in paradise God will be visible to the corporeal eye. On this matter there was bitter controversy between the conservatives and the Mutazilite liberals. A little before Muhammad this same point was at issue between the Nestorians and the Euchites, the latter believing that in trances they actually saw the Trinity; and at the very time that the Muslims were debating the question there was some difference of opinion among the Nestorians themselves, the Patriarch deciding that the divine essence was not visible even to the human nature of Christ. It may be noticed that the astute Timothy took the same side as the Khalifa Mamun.² In maintaining, with a good

¹ *Epistles of Elijah, or Disputation with Hussein Abulgasim*, Assemani, *Bib. Orient.*, III: 1, 270.

² Assemani, *Bib. Orient.*, III: II, 172. See also Goldziher (*Wiener Zeit. für Kunde des Morg.*, XIII, 53) on Sufi faith-healers, whose spokesman was a Christian, Abukheir.

deal of casuistry, it must be said, the sinlessness of all the prophets, including Muhammad, surely the orthodox were striving to prove his fitness to be in the glorious company of Him in whom was no sin found and against whom alone of the prophets there is in the Quran no suggestion of evil.

The history of Muhammadan theology, to a far greater extent than that of Christian, is one of accretion in distinction from development. Some of these accretions have been accepted into the orthodox system, while others belong to the indefinite body of sectaries and mystics that are in Islam but not of it. They owe their origin in large measure to the inevitable effort of the soul to bridge the chasm between God and man. In the mind of Muhammad this was done by the sending of prophets from God to man, by faith on the part of man, and by an act of forgiveness by God in the working of his omnipotent will. There is no place in this system either for a mediator or a sacrifice, and much less for any Incarnation in which God unites man to himself. This phase of Islam is expressed in the following quotation from a statement by the Sheikh ul Islam at Con-

stantinople some years ago. "The unsubmitted man becomes one of the submitted (*i. e.*, the non-Muslim becomes Muslim) by faith; that is, by fixing in his heart and proclaiming in words, 'There is no God but God, and Muhammad is the prophet of God.' By that act he has become Muslim and has found divine grace. But no human being can be intermediary between man and God. This transaction is one in which men or priests have no part. Belief annuls all sin. The unbeliever who accepts Muhammadanism becomes by conversion as innocent as on the day of his birth, except that his neighbor's rights cannot be annulled; he must make reparation on the Judgment Day to every person whom he has oppressed or injured."¹

Nevertheless, even in scholastic Islam intercession and sacrifice are recognized, while in popular Islam they form a great part of religion. In the Quran itself there is no definite promise of intercession for believers, the sum of the utterances being that no one shall intercede save he "whom the Merciful permits." In the traditions the basis is more explicit, and so in theological works it is taught that Muhammad will intercede

¹ Quoted in Dwight, *Constantinople and its Problems*, p. 59.

for believers, especially but not exclusively on the last day. The intercession is not confined to that of Muhammad, as the following indicates, "He should believe in the intercession of the prophets, next of the learned, next of the martyrs, next of the rest of the believers—each according to his dignity and rank with God Most High."¹ The whole Muslim world is dotted with shrines, which are usually, and perhaps invariably, connected with some holy man, either as his tomb or as being associated in some way with his life. Thus Persia is full of the footprints and fingerprints of Ali. Only a few can make the pilgrimage to Mecca, but these local shrines are patronized by everybody. How much of this is the residue of old heathenism and how much is due to Christian influence, being in part heathenism through Christian channels and in part due to the desire to raise Muhammad to the dignity claimed for Christ, cannot well be decided; but the ideas of the Muslims and those of the Christians are so identical that they have little scruple in visiting and making offerings to each other's shrines.

¹ Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology*, Appendix, Creed by Al-Ghazzali, p. 307.

Lane, in his *Modern Egyptians*, remarks "that it is a very remarkable trait in the character of the people of Egypt and other countries of the East, that Muslims, Christians, and Jews adopt each other's superstitions, while they abhor the more rational doctrines of each other's faiths."¹ This is very true of the practices based on the idea of the intercession of the saints. Sacrifices are made in orthodox Islam in connection especially with the Feast of Sacrifice, at Mecca, where thousands of animals are slain, and all over the world of Islam. Sacrifice was a part of the original rites of the heathen pilgrims and was continued by Muhammad along with the Haj pilgrimage and not from any theological consideration. It was thus from the first a foreign element in the religion, and is so still.

In connection with the veneration of saints just mentioned sacrifices are numerous, and among the Shi'ite Muslims the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, though rejected by the builders, has become the chief corner stone of popular religion. The great religious act of the year, which feeds the

¹ Lane, i. 357. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, is full of illustrations of the survival under Islam of older religious ideas.

flame of enthusiasm, is the commemoration of the battle of Karbala, in which the Imam Hussein, grandson of the Prophet, suffered death. For ten days in every Shi'ite community the people give themselves up to religious emotion, processions in the streets, dramatic representations of the tragedy, recitals and sermons on the sufferings of the Imams, culminating on the last day in an orgy of frantic exhibitions of mourning. The cries of the devotees, the bruised backs of the flagellants, the ghastly aspect of the blood-stained bands of men gashing themselves that thus they may gain a share in the atoning blood of the field of Karbala, all the sights and sounds of that last and great day are such as never to be forgotten. Even the details of the passion bear traces of the imitation of the gospel story, which was rejected by Muhammad. The motive, the impelling force, in this strange ceremony is the belief that the sufferings thus commemorated are atoning. In popular belief, every tear shed during those days is efficacious in washing away guilt, while the blood of Hussein avails to bring pardon on the last day to the guiltiest Muslim.¹

¹ See S. G. Wilson, *The Atoning Savior of the Shiaks*, *Presb. and Reformed Review*, xiii., No. 51. Also Matthew Arnold, *Essays in Criticism*, A Persian Passion Play.

The doctrine of successive incarnations, or rather manifestations, of God in different persons belonging to different ages is a favorite belief of the Persian sects, the last, and for the time at least, most prominent of which is that of the Babis or Behais. The resemblance to the Christian doctrine is more superficial than real, and it may be doubted whether its origin is Christian, even indirectly. In whatever way these influences, all tending to create a doctrine of reconciliation, have reached Islam, it is significant that there has been this instinctive effort to fill up the deficiencies of the religion in the very point where it stands in most marked contrast to Christianity. We have a plain indication here of the need felt for a Saviour, who is more than a prophet and who brings an atonement as well as a revelation.

Christian influences may also be traced in the sects that have arisen in Islam, some to disappear, some to be absorbed in the body of orthodoxy, and others to maintain a separate existence. One of the earliest of these is the Murjiite heresy, which questioned the eternal punishment of the wicked and another is that of the Qadariites, who emphasized the freedom of the human

will. Both of these tendencies may easily have come from the Greek or the heretical oriental churches; as also the belief in purgatory for Muslims, which has become a dogma of Islam. Reference has already been made to the Mutazilites, (philosophical free thinkers), in connection with the questions of the eternity of the Quran and of the vision of God. The animating principles of this sect were derived not from the Christian writings but from those of Aristotle and the Neoplatonists, which reached them through Christian translators. Indeed the debt of the Arab philosophy to the Christians is not exaggerated by Bar Hebræus when he says: "There arose among them (*i. e.*, the Arabs) philosophers and mathematicians and physicians, who excelled the ancients in the subtilty of their understanding. They did not build, however, on new foundations but on Greek edifices, and they perfected the great buildings of wisdom with very ornamental phraseology and careful investigations: like us, from whom they received the knowledge by translators who were all Syrians."¹ The two characteristics here mentioned were true of all the Arab philosophers:

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 98.

they were indebted to Greek thought, and they knew the Greek writing only through Christian translators. A passing trace of the spread of Christian ideas is found in a notice by Bar Hebræus of a sect in the time of Mamun in the mountains north of Mosul headed by a man who claimed to be the Mahdi and also Christ and the Holy Spirit.¹ There may have been others under like influence whose names have been lost to history.

Every religion has its mystics and in Islam from the earliest times there have been mystics. There were such among the Arabs who had a share in the origins of Islam. They are found in Muhammadan history in the beginning of the second century of their era, and ever since they have been numerous in the Muhammadan world. Various influences have entered into their history; the Neoplatonism just mentioned, Buddhist ideas from India, native Persian speculations, Manicheistic teachings, and Christianity also. The home of Sufism, as this wing of Islam has been called, is Persia. Many of its leaders have been dervishes. These two facts, Persian influence and the Jewish orders, will ex-

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 144.

plain the meeting of so many diverse influences. Persia is between the nearer and the farther East, and before the Turkish conquests the area under Persian influence was larger than now both to the east and to the west. There were also large bodies of Christians then in what is now southern and eastern Persia, the old centers of Iranian population. Persia has thus been open to diverse influences and the Persian mind is receptive. Dervishes are wanderers. It is a common thing to-day to meet anywhere in the East men of this class who have been all over the Muslim world. Religion in the very broadest sense is their business in life.

We are so in the habit of regarding Islam as a monotonous and unchanging system that it is well to emphasize the part played in it by the Persian mind, which is speculative, creative, and acute, and also the part played by an ever changing indefinable movement, such as Sufism. And if it is not in good repute among the most orthodox, it must be borne in mind that the persecution of Sufis ceased ages ago. In its beginnings Sufism was ascetic, and it still has the two apparently contradictory phases that marked Gnosticism, asceticism and license. In its ascetic

phase, which gave rise to the name Sufi (woolen, from the wool garment worn), we may connect it with the Euchites, or in Syriac *Msalyani*, that is, "Those who pray." These were devotees of both sexes, who lived by begging and who by the repetition of prayers and by dancing brought themselves into trances. The earliest Sufi mentioned was a woman, Rabia, who died A. H. 135, and in all the history of Sufism women as well as men have had a place. The vagrant lives of the early Sufis brought down on them the reproofs of the orthodox; still the mendicant dervish with his cocoanut bowl has become a ubiquitous and influential character among Muhammadans. The Sufis still have their night vigils, *dhikrs*, in which certain formulas are repeated till all sensation melts away in ecstasy. Even the dancing dervishes, who amuse the sightseer in Constantinople, have their predecessors among the Euchites. The Euchites were found in Syria and in Mesopotamia, where both Nestorians and Jacobites had trouble with them at the close of the sixth century of the Christian era. Under the name of Marcianites they were perhaps found as far east as Khurasan. They were Christian dervishes. The early literature of Sufism shows that

the words of the Sermon on the Mount are echoed in it, as is strikingly illustrated in the following sayings, the first of which is traditionally ascribed to Muhammad and the second to Umar: "Be trustful in God in truth and ye shall be fed, as the birds are fed, who wake hungry in the morning and by evening are satisfied." "In the morning think not of the evening and in the evening think not of the morrow, for you know not your name to-morrow."¹

Enough has been said to show that the long, and in some respects not unfriendly, contact of the faiths has left its impress on Islam, and this in various ways: on the development of the theology which best represents the true spirit of Islam; on the popular cult, full of magic and superstition, with relics of older heathenism; on the accretions to the Islamic system, partly accepted in the orthodox theology and partly belonging to the heretical sects. The mutual influence has been greatest in what has been

¹ On Sufism see Hughes' *Dictionary*, s. v. Sufi; Sell, *Faith of Islam*, 107ff.; *Essays on Islam, The Mystics of Islam; On the Euchites*, see *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*; Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Ec.*, i. 574; ii. 481, 573; *Thomas of Marga*, Bk. i., ch. 27. On the relation of Sufis to Euchites, see Goldziher, *Zeit. für Kunde des Morg.*, XIII, 39, 45f. A Euchite leader was Marcus, see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* Marcians.

called "religion of the second rank," the faith and practice of the people, often in contradiction to the official dogmas. As soothsayer and writer of charms the priest or mulla is received by those who would flee his doctrinal instruction. In some respects Islam has approached Christianity. Yet in spirit, as we shall see later on, the faiths have become more antagonistic with the passage of the centuries; and, in spite of all that can be said, the influence, while marked, has been limited. Christ is no more to the Muslim theologian than he was to the Prophet. The Bible is a half-closed book to one as to the other. In the realm of the organization of the body of believers and their worship the religions have been entirely separated. The ethical standard of Islam does not show Christian influence. The conception of God remains substantially what it was to Muhammad, analyzed and minutely described, but unchanged in essence. And while Christianity has left a permanent impress on Islam, the latter has influenced the former far less. It is difficult to find traces of such influence, unless it be in connection with the iconoclastic controversy, in which the defenders of images accused their opponents with

being prompted by the Saracens.¹ If so, the influence was finally ineffectual.

There is much to admire in the way in which the oriental Christians have never wavered in the confession of Christ, the Son of God, and in their faith in the Trinity. Perhaps we can admire almost more the maintenance of certain principles of Christian morality, especially the marriage law. To this they owe very largely their higher average prosperity than the Muslims of the same class of society. But in part their firmness has been due to inertia and lifelessness, and in part to national and partisan zeal. The Nestorian was as set against the Jacobite doctrine as against Muhammadanism. One author writes a polemic that deals in turn with the Jews, the Muhammadans, the Nestorians, and the Jacobites; while another writes against the Muhammadans, Jews, Jacobites and Melchites.² The oriental Christians might have learned lessons from the Muhammadans in zeal and in freedom of worship and organization, but they learned nothing. In general, the mutual in-

¹ Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iv. 320; Lozer, *Church and Eastern Empire*, 104.

² Assemani, *Bib. Orient.*, iii. 1, 303, 609.

fluence of the faiths has been such as to give little encouragement to those who dream of a fusion of religions.

It will perhaps be said that the reason Islam and Christianity have not had more influence on each other is that they are incompatible and that the only possible relation between them is one of opposition. There is truth in this. For one thing Islam is submission to Muhammad and Christianity is the acceptance of Christ as supreme. However much this personal element in religion is obscured, it cannot be eliminated. Furthermore, the Quran contains a representation of Christ, which, as we have already seen, is contradictory to the Christian history. This is illustrated by an anecdote in the *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* of Bar Hebræus. Amr ibn Sad, famous or infamous in history as one of the murderers of Hussein, asked the Jacobite patriarch to translate for him the gospel into Arabic, but in such a way that Jesus should be called by no divine title and there should be no mention of baptism or of the cross. "And the blessed John replied, 'Far be it from me to subtract one jot or one tittle from the gospel, even if all the darts and spears of your camp pierce me.'

And seeing his courage, the other said, 'Go and write as you please.'"¹ Even the modern apologist for Islam, in spite of his repudiation of Muslim theology, feels it incumbent on him to marshal what arguments he can to show that Jesus escaped the cross.² Muhammadans at least in the present day are accustomed to call Christians Cross-worshippers, and the Cross, with its historical and doctrinal implications, has always been a barrier between the religions. Yet much of the failure must be laid at the door of eastern Christianity. Its theology had ceased to live and grow, and had entered before Islam on the stage of dead scholasticism. More might be said on this, as on another phase that certainly had much influence in preventing Christianity from affecting Islam more than it did. This is the political status of Islam. Islam was not merely the state religion, but it was the state. Christianity at best was a tolerated faith and they could not meet on equal terms. The apology of Al Kindi is a bold polemic against Muhammad, and speaks much for the tolerance of Mamun and his court, but it

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 275.

² Syed Ameer Ali, *Spirit of Islam*, 57.

required a special guarantee from the Khalifa and the invitation of a powerful courtier to make it possible.

Islam must within the next few generations meet a new crisis in its history. It is coming into close contact with modern thought and civilization. It must meet these changed conditions, if it is to live, and the question arises whether it can do this or not. History shows that Islam is capable of great changes and of flourishing under very varied conditions. It also shows that it has received into its system from the very beginning elements from outside, and it is reasonable to suppose that this process may go on. Two attempts have been made within the last half of the nineteenth century to accommodate the religion to present conditions. These are the Babi movement in Persia and that of the so-called Mutazilites of India. Both have claimed a hearing and have sought to gain converts in Christian lands. The method followed is different in each. Babism, while professing great reverence for Muhammad and the Qur'an, substitutes a new prophet and a new revelation. It has a new and different system of theology and a new code of morals. The liberal movement in

India treats Muhammad and the Quran much as the most advanced wing of Unitarians treats Christ and the Bible. It practically repudiates the past history of Islam, except to make a version of Christian history to contrast with their versions of Muhammadan history. The two movements agree in being revolutionary.

However, the elements which have entered Islam from outside in the past have not been assimilated. The pilgrimage to Mecca with all its rites is a useful bond of the Muhammadan world, but it has no relation to Muslim theology. So the intercession of Muhammad and the saints is in contrast, and even in contradiction, to the theory of forgiveness. This inability of Islam to assimilate the elements received into it has been made the reason for denying to it the claim to be a universal religion, and the argument seems to be thoroughly valid.¹ In a sense in this very fact lies much of its strength, its immobility in essence along with a large toleration of divergent or even contradictory doctrine. But this is not progress. The religion itself is not thus gaining power to hold and inspire high

¹ *Natural Religions and Universal Religions*, Kuenen, Hibbert Lectures, 1882; Lect. 1.

and noble minds. For us as Christians, if we believe that Islam is inevitably doomed by the progress of mankind, the obligation is all the greater to substitute for the imperfect that which is perfect, and for the transitory the permanent. At its highest and best Islam is the service of God, but Christianity is Sonship. "The bond-servant abideth not in the house forever: The Son abideth forever."

Third Lecture

**THE RELATION OF MUHAMMADAN
GOVERNMENT TO THE ORIENTAL
CHURCHES**

General outline and periods of the history, A. D., 600-1500. Toleration, in the strict sense, the characteristic of the policy of Islam to other religions. The origin of the policy. Policies of the eastern Empire and of Persia. Practice of Muhammad. The history of the policy. The constitution of Umar, Arabian Christianity, the attitude of the Christians to the Arab conquest, maintenance of the *status quo*, Christianity under the Khalifas, conditions under the Mongols, fanatical reaction. The effect on the churches. Spiritual effect of limiting activity, effect of governmental influence in ecclesiastical affairs. Dangers of toleration. Compromise a characteristic of Islam.

Third Lecture

THE RELATION OF MUHAMMADAN GOVERNMENT TO THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES

IMPOSSIBLE though it be, it seems necessary to attempt to compress into a paragraph the main outlines of the history of western Asia for nine centuries, from the time of Muhammad till the rise of the empire of the Osmanli Turks and of the kingdom of the Persian Shahs. In the place of the divided rule of the Romans and the Persians the Arabs within ten years after the Prophet's death had established the supremacy of his successors, the Khalifas, over the whole of the Persian empire and over a large portion of the Asiatic and African dominions of the Roman empire. This supremacy was for a generation in the hands of the great elective Khalifas, and then for a century in those of the line of the Umayyads with the capital at Damascus. For over five hundred years the Abbasid Khalifas of Baghdad maintained the succession, until the

last one was murdered in A. D., 1258 (A. H., 656) by Hulagu Khan, the Mongol conqueror of Baghdad; but long before that time the empire had fallen to pieces and the suzerainty of the Khalifa had become a mere shadow. This disintegration began with the loss of Spain at the commencement on the Abbasid line (A. D. 750, A. H. 132), and in the next century independent, or semi-independent, dynasties established themselves in Syria, in Egypt, and in the eastern provinces of Persia and Transoxiana. Another hundred years saw the Khalifa stripped of all real authority even in his own capital. Turkish inroads had already begun and for the next three hundred years western Asia was divided by the ever-shifting boundaries of Turkish, Kurdish, and Arab dynasties and of the kingdoms of the Crusaders. Greatest among these rulers were Saladin and his successors and some of the Seljuk Turks. All rose and fell by the fortunes of war.

In the thirteenth Christian, and the seventh Muslim, century the Mongols under Jingsis Khan and his successors obliterated the existing dynasties and threatened to overwhelm Islam in the common ruin. In Persia for a time Hulagu and his successors were the masters of a vast

territory, but they failed to build a lasting dominion. Timur, or Tamerlane, at the beginning of the fifteenth Christian, and the ninth Muslim, century swept like a destructive cyclone over western Asia, establishing "a reign of terror, and not an empire." After a short time the Osmanlis reestablished and extended their rule in the West, and, in the East, Persia became an independent kingdom. A new era began, in comparison with that which preceded an era of peace, but not of stability or prosperity. In this framework of external events must be woven a complex history of religious development and expansion, of magnificence, manufactures, and commerce, of war and famine. There were, roughly speaking, three hundred years of peace, broken indeed by the wars of the Emperors and the Khalifas and by bloody rebellions, but still marked by great luxury and wealth and by the culture of the arts and sciences; and then six hundred years of war and anarchy, interspersed with the armed peace of military rulers and the prosperity of short-lived courts. The actors in the long and varied drama are nations rather than men. First from the desert peninsula of Arabia issued forth the warriors of Islam; then for

generations the walls and armies of Constantinople kept back from Europe the march of conquest; again the mysterious tide of national migration for half a millennium brought horde after horde of savage Turks and Mongols from the heart of Asia, and fire and blood reigned from the banks of the Oxus to the shores of the Mediterranean, while the mailed knights of the Crusades added to the tale of carnage and of woe. The government was Muslim for the most part. Asia Minor, until the rise of the Seljuks and the Osmanlis, was in large part subject to Constantinople; the unstable kingdoms of the Crusaders interrupted Muslim rule in Syria for a time; the Armenians and Georgians in their mountainous regions maintained a precarious independence; and the Mongols were at first pagans. Otherwise Muslim supremacy was complete. Islam was able to develop its policy toward other faiths freely and with little fear of interference from without. It was formulated in the golden age of Islam, under the Khalifas who united the faithful under one head.

Toleration is the distinguishing mark of the policy of the Arabs toward Christianity: toleration in the strict sense of permitting other reli-

gions besides the dominant one to practice their rites, but not toleration in the broader sense of religious equality. Along with the Christians, the Jews are also tolerated, as being possessors of a revelation from God. There are three possible policies with reference to religion, persecution, toleration, and freedom. In the first the attempt is made to compel all to accept the dominant faith. This was the policy of Islam with reference to Arabia and to idolaters everywhere. History is full of examples of the failure of compulsion and of the acceptance of toleration in its stead. Protestantism has been tolerated in Roman Catholic countries and Roman Catholicism in Protestant countries. Perhaps no nation has enforced it more consistently and rigorously than Russia in our own times. Islam accepted it from the beginning with reference to Christianity and Judaism, and it can claim the credit due to the acceptance of toleration rather than persecution and to the incorporation of the principle in the foundations of the faith and in the fundamental code of the State, which is also the church. Practice has often been more lenient than theory. The early Khalifas to some extent destroyed the temples of the fire-

worshippers in Persia, but the policy was not rigorously carried out and Zoroastrianism became practically a tolerated faith. The Manicheans were also tolerated. In Mesopotamia Harran was a center for idolaters, who were tolerated by the government and from whom physicians rose who rivaled the Christian physicians of Baghdad.¹

Probably no application of the principle of toleration is more difficult than toleration of dissenting forms of the prevailing cult. It has been so in Islam. The wars of the Kharajite dissenters were long and bloody, and the Khalifas most tolerant to Christians persecuted "heretics." Even in this, however, toleration has become the practice of Islam. The great Shi'ite shrine at Karbala is on Sunnite territory, while the only Shi'ite monarch, the Shah of Persia, counts thousands of Sunnites among his subjects. The Druzes and Nusairiyeh of Syria, the Yezidees of Mesopotamia, and the Ali Illahis and Babis of Persia are all tolerated subjects of Muslim states. Toleration is capable of varying degrees of strictness in application and is affected by the character of

¹ Muir, *Caliphate*, 363; Müller, *Islam im Morgen und Abendland*, ii. 7; Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 169-171.

the rulers. At best toleration is a compromise and is dependent on the payment of a price. That price is often outward and partial conformity to the faith of the state. What the price has been in the case of Christianity we shall see. The third policy, religious freedom and equality, is based on a separation of state and church utterly foreign to the constitution of Islam.

The origins of this policy of toleration are to be found in the practice of Muhammad himself and in the conditions existing at the time of the rise of Islam. Muhammad was not a persecutor, if by that is meant one who feels it his duty to force upon others at the point of the sword the acceptance of certain beliefs. As long as he was at Mecca, he and his followers were in the minority and were persecuted. Hence the development of the policy of the Prophet toward other faiths belongs to the later period, when he was in Medina, and was the head of a city that grew into a state and finally embraced the whole of Arabia. From the earlier part of his career he brought a friendliness to Jews and Christians, the claim that his religion was the fulfillment of theirs, and the acknowledgment of the divine origin of their

revelations. Medina was a place where he was brought into contact with a large and established body of the adherents of another religion, for the earlier inhabitants were Jews, and the Arabs who accepted Islam were later immigrants. He was thus forced at the very beginning of his political career to establish some sort of a basis of political relationship with them. The original enactments are still extant. In them Muhammad recognizes the status already existing between the Jews, and Arabs of Medina, including the toleration of the Jewish religion, the civil rights of both, their alliance in war, and the common obligation to meet its burdens; but reserving the supreme authority to himself. The later history is not such as was contemplated. It is one of assassination, war, confiscation, exile, captivity, and massacre. We have the story from Muslim sources only and they throw all the blame on the Jews; but the verdict of history is not likely to exonerate the Prophet from a share in the infraction of his ordinances. The fact is plain on any version of the history that Muhammad felt it necessary in establishing his power to treat with the utmost severity, not to say barbarity, the Jews of Medina and adjoining places.

His own spirit may be inferred from the language of the Quran:—

Verily the worst of beasts in God's eyes are those who misbelieve and will not believe; with whom if thou dost make a league, they break their league each time, for they fear not God; but shouldst thou ever catch them in war, then make those who come after them run by their example; haply they may remember then. And shouldst thou ever fear from any people treachery, then throw it back to them in like manner; verily God loves not the treacherous.¹

These attacks were not for the purpose of compelling the Jews to accept Islam and the letter at least of the famous dictum delivered at an earlier time, "There is no compulsion in religion," was kept; but then as always the acceptance of Islam brought relief.²

The conditions that determined the relation of

¹ *Sura*, viii. 57-60.

² *Sura*, ii. 257. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, iv.; *Muhammads Gemeinde ordnung von Medina*. Arnold in the *Preaching of Islam* passes over the subject. It is difficult to see how his view of Muhammad's character is reconcilable with the treatment of the Jews. Syed Ameer Ali (*Spirit of Islam*) makes the most he can of the perfidies of the Jews and the political necessities of Muhammad.

Muhammad to the Christians were different from those in the case of the Jews of Medina. Accordingly the history is different. The Christian Arabs were probably more numerous than the Jewish Arabs, but they were much less denationalized. On many of them Christianity sat very lightly. The centers of Christianity were at a distance from Medina, the political capital of Islam. Muhammad came in contact with them when his power was established, and when his ruling purpose was not to entrench himself firmly and at all hazards in a certain locality, but to win all Arabia to his faith. He doubtless felt that the Jews of Medina were a political menace, but that the Christians were not. It was necessary, however, that they should be not only allies but also subjects, and consequently the terms offered them and the remaining Jews in Arabia were less liberal than those contained in the original enactments for the Medina Jews. His policy comes out clearly in the accounts of the embassies that he sent and received to and from every part of Arabia and is illustrated in the following quotations from his letters.

And Muhammad wrote to the bishop of the Banu 'l Harith, Banu Kab, and

to the bishops of Najran and to their priests and monks: There shall be guaranteed to you the protection of God and his apostles for the possession of your churches and your worship and your monasteries, and no bishop or priest or monk shall be molested . . . so long as you remain true and fulfill your obligations.

And Muhammad wrote to Mar Yuhanna ibn Ruba and to the chiefs of the people of Ayla: Peace to you. I commend you to God besides whom there is no God. I would not war against you without first writing to you. Either accept Islam or pay the poll-tax. And hearken to God and to his Apostle and to these envoys. . . . If you turn my envoys back and are not friendly to them, then will I accept no reparation from you, but I will war against you and will take the children captive and will slay the aged. . . . If you will hearken to my envoys, then shall you be under God's protection and Muhammad's and that of his allies.

The following to a Jewish tribe brings out a little more baldly than most the tribute.

In the name of the gracious and merciful God. This is a letter of Muhammad, the Apostle of God, to the Banu Uraid. Levy of the Apostle of God: ten loads of flour, ten loads of

barley at every harvest, fifty loads of dates. They must be paid every year at its time in full measure and in no-wise held back.

In another case it is agreed that in the tribe of Taghlib the adults should remain Christian but the children should not be baptized.¹ To the heathen Arabs the alternatives offered were two, the sword of Islam, and the threat of war was no empty boast. Muhammad was in many things an opportunist ready to compromise, if that seemed to be the wisest way to accomplish his ends. Religion and politics were so identified that he was necessarily controlled by considerations that we would regard as political. The policy that he bequeathed to his successors with reference to other religions is clear. It was toleration on the basis of paying tribute and accepting the position of protected vassals. The rights guaranteed are those of worship, not of proselyting. Tradition says, and Muslims have always believed, that on his deathbed Muhammad enunciated another principle modifying those already stated. Arabia should be for

¹ Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, iv; *Muhammads Schreiben und die Gesandtschaften an Ihn*, xiv. (p. 106), xlv. (p. 120), xlvii. (p. 121), c. (p. 156).

Muslims only, a land sacred to the true faith. It may well be that as he felt that Medina must be all Muslim in order to be a firm basis from which to win Arabia, so Arabia must be unified in order to win the earth.

How far Muhammad was acquainted with the practice of other countries we do not know. He may well have heard the complaints of Christian refugees from the oppressive laws of the empire and also the stories of the martyrs under the Persian kings. In Arabia itself, the Arabs were not persecutors of other faiths, due perhaps in part to the absence of any strong religious organization. Jews and Christians in south Arabia had set an example of intolerance by persecuting one another. Christianity in that age was intolerant, and the Nestorians and Jacobites knew well the severity of the laws of Justinian and other emperors against all but "orthodox" Christians, the special definition of "orthodoxy" depending on the personal belief of the emperor as well as the creeds of the church. Persecution was not necessarily a sign of religious bigotry. It was as much the policy of the statesman as of the prelate. Heraclius after his victories over the Persians had made the union of the divided

forces of Christendom in the East the main object of his endeavors, not on the basis of equal liberty, but by establishing a new and artificial doctrinal standard. He failed and the Nestorians and Monophysites welcomed the Arab conquerors.¹ In Persia the intolerant zeal of the first Sassanians had cooled, and especially since the times of the great Anushirvan the Christians, particularly the Nestorians and the Jacobites, enjoyed considerable freedom. Proselyting from the religion of the state was bitterly opposed by the Magian priests. From the time of the Parthian kings the very numerous and powerful Jewish community in Babylonia had been tolerated and its community rights recognized, while a poll tax was paid by them and such a tax was collected by some, at least, of the Sassanian monarchs of the Christians also.² It is possible that we have here the origin of Muhammad's policy of tribute, as we have assuredly the precedent followed by his successors.

When Islam under Umar extended beyond

¹ Finlay, *Hist. of Greece Under Foreign Domination*, i. 332, 382f., 394f., 421ff.; Lozer, *Church and Eastern Empire*, 36, 77ff.

² Rawlinson, *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*, ii., ch. iv.; Graetz *Hist. of Jews*, ii., ch. xix.; iii., ch. i.

Arabia into regions whose inhabitants were of a different faith, a reorganization of the state was inevitable and the terms of this new order are found in what is known in tradition as the Constitution of Umar. This provided that the Arabs, who had issued from Arabia, should be a caste of warriors, forbidden to own land and supported from the public treasury. The non-Muslim inhabitants were left in possession of the land, but were required to pay a poll tax while a land tax was levied on the land. In case they accepted Islam, they passed over into the class of Muslims supported from the treasury, and the land they had held was distributed among the non-Muslims, the tax going with it. Within Arabia none but Muslims were permitted to live. In addition to the above fundamental principles, tradition assigns to Umar other regulations as to dress, use of horses, church buildings, etc., which are likely later in origin. This code was too communistic to last long without great modification, but the principle of toleration accompanied by civil disabilities and financial burdens persisted.¹

An immediate result of the policy of Umar

¹ See Appendix, Constitution of Umar.

was the practical extinction of Christianity in Arabia. The process however, was gradual. The force of national enthusiasm and the attraction of the rich spoils of conquest carried most of the Christians over to Islam. Some preferred to pay the poll tax and retain their faith. They were compelled to emigrate. Thus the Christians of Najran, in spite of the promise of Muhammad that they should be undisturbed, had to leave Arabia and part settled in Syria and part near Kufa.¹ The Banu Taghlib held by the faith, and Bar Hebræus tells of two of their chieftains who later suffered martyrdom for it.² The Christian apologist in the time of Mamun boasts of his pure Arab ancestry of the royal tribe of Kindi. Jacobite and Nestorian bishops of the Arabs are mentioned for several centuries, one being bishop even of Sana and Yaman and others of the border regions.³ Badawin Chris-

¹ Muir, *Caliphate*, 155; Arnold, *Preaching of Islam*, 44f.

² Bar Hebræus, *Chr. Syr.*, 112, 115. The persecutors were Abd al Malik and Walid. Muir, *Cal.*, 150. This tribe, however, lived in Mesopotamia rather than Arabia. Muir, *Cal.*, 24, 62.

³ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 303, George Bishop of Arabs (686-724) but probably Syrian Christians in Mesopotamia; iii. 123, in list of dioceses under Maphriana, both Arabia and the Christian Arabs; iii. 193, bishop of Bahrein, c. A. D. 840;

tians are still to be found in Hauran. As Arabic became the language of the Christians generally in Syria and in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris, the remnants of Arab Christianity would become indistinguishable from the Christians of other races.

To the Christians who lived in the regions conquered by the Arabs the change of rulers was a welcome one. This fact is remarked by all the historians of the period. Finlay, the great historian of the Byzantine Empire, calls special attention to the fact that the first easy conquests of the Arabs extended only over the provinces that were most disaffected on account of the religious policy of the emperors. Syria, Egypt, and Mesopotamia were inhabited mainly by "heretics," and they yielded. Asia Minor was "orthodox" and it stoutly resisted.¹ In the same way the Christians in Persia treasured the memory of the martyrs at the hands of the earlier kings, and resented the interference of the later kings in the affairs of the church. Anushirvan had repeatedly exiled from the capital the Nes-

Thomas of Marga, ii. 448, Nestorian bishops of Sana and Yaman, c. A. D. 800.

¹ Finlay, vol. i., ch. v., sect. ii.

torian patriarch and had killed a Jacobite Maphirana, while Parviz had long prevented the election of a patriarch.¹ Christianity and Magianism had long been foes and the former might well rejoice in the other's discomfiture by a new monotheistic faith.

Add to all these the fact that Mesopotamia had for generations been the battle field of the two great empires and that the great Christian cities, such as Edessa, Amid, and Nisibis, had passed through siege after siege, and it is no wonder that the Christians welcomed the advent of Islam. The historian of the Jews tells us that they, too, welcomed the release from Roman and Persian rule.² The Nestorian patriarch just after the Arab conquest is very explicit in his testimony as to the toleration practiced by the Arabs. He says, writing to the Christians of Persia, "The Arabs, to whom God has given the authority of the world at this time, are with us, as you know, and are not only not opposed to Christianity, but they praise our faith and honor the priests and saints of Our Lord and aid the churches and mon-

¹ *Thomas of Marga*, i. lxxiv-lxxvi, ii. 208; *Bar Hebræus, Ec. Chron.*, iii. 95-101.

² *Graetz, Hist. of the Jews*, iii., ch. iv.

asteries." He adds, however, that at Merv this toleration was to be secured by the loss of half their worldly goods.¹ Thomas of Marga in his *Monastic Chronicle* makes no reference whatever to the conquest, showing how retired was the life of the monastery of Beth Abhe, not a hundred miles from Mosul and also how little the outlying districts were affected by it. Bar Hebræus, though he wrote much later, no doubt reflects the sentiments of earlier writers when he contrasts the Arab with the Roman rule, to the disadvantage of the latter. His words are as follows: "On this account (*i. e.*, the persecutions of Heraclius) the God of vengeance by means of the Ishmaelites delivered us from the hands of the Romans. However, our churches (*i. e.*, Jacobite churches seized by the emperor) were not returned to us, because under Arab domination each sect retained whatever was found in its possession. Nevertheless we were better off for being freed from the cruelty of the Romans and from their bitter hatred to us."² One cannot but bewail the shortsightedness of the Christians and execrate the cruel folly of the emperors, but it is

¹ *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 156. *Ass. B. O.* III, 1, 128ff.

² Bar H., *Ec. Chron.*, p. 474, (ed. Abbeloos and Lamy).

also abundantly clear that the favorable verdict on the first Arabs was not altogether undeserved. As one reads of the barbarities of other conquerors and the untold sufferings that have devastated Asia, this feeling of admiration for the Arabs and their great leaders is increased.

The conquest proved to be one of the greatest and most permanent revolutions in history and resulted in a reorganization of society, but many of the changes were gradual. In many things the *status quo* was maintained. In Syria governmental positions were in the hands of the Christians, of course, and the Umayyad Khalifas wisely made use of their services. When the fanatical Umar II attempted to remove them from public service it was to the detriment of the state. Apparently at first the accounts were kept in Greek, for Bar Hebræus says that Walid directed that Arabic should be substituted for Greek; or in Persian and Greek, for Abd al Malik displaced the former language by Arabic.¹ The earliest coins of the Arabs illustrate the conditions. One of Khalid, Umar's great general, is inscribed in Greek, has

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 115; Muir, *Caliphate*, 353; Müller, *Islam im Morgen und Abendland*, 1, 395.

the portrait of the emperor, and is embellished with crosses. Another of Musa, the conqueror of Africa, bears the cross and Roman letters. One of Muawiya has the likeness of the last Khusru with the fire altar and priests, the inscription being partly in Persian and partly in Arabic.¹ Similarly the Christians in Sassanian times had attained eminence in the court as physicians, and under the Arabs they maintained and increased their prestige in this regard. The principle of recognizing the law and dignitaries of the separate religious communities and so to a certain extent their autonomy was a part of Sassanian policy and went over into the Arab period. The principle of toleration was too firmly embedded in the law of Muhammad and the policy of Umar to be dependent on the will of the monarch. Details and minor regulations were so dependent and conditions varied accordingly. The right of worship was guaranteed and respected, the only limitation being the prohibition of bells, of the loud sounding of the *naqusha*,² and of street processions. Even these would apply mainly to the cities, and the Chris-

¹ See engravings in Müller, i. 276, 349, 422.

² Board of hard wood, usually walnut, struck with a mallet.

tians living in country villages separated from the Muhammadan population would be free. The rights of church property were protected and the monastic establishments were not disturbed. The building of new churches was under special restrictions. In the traditional code of Umar it is forbidden, new churches were torn down by the more fanatical Khalifas, and the notices in the Syriac chronicles seem to indicate that permission was regarded as something extraordinary and worthy of remark.¹ Schools and literature do not appear to have been interfered with. However, the restriction of literature is a result of modern conditions and does not belong to the age of manuscripts.²

In general the right of the church to regulate its own affairs was respected. In one important respect it was allowed a wider application than would be permitted in European civilization. The Muhammadan, and in general the oriental,

¹ Arnold (*Preaching of Islam*, 58f.) thinks that this regulation was not usually enforced; but the evidence points rather the other way, though it shows that exceptions were not infrequent.

² See *Thomas of Marga*, Bk. iii., ch. ii. One monk established sixty schools. In the single diocese of Marga, (near Mosu) twenty-six names are given.

conception of religion includes within its sphere matters that in the West would be amenable to the civil law. Thus all questions relating to the marriage contract belong to religious and not to civil jurisdiction, and the same is true largely of inheritance, even as regards the Christian and Jewish communities. Theoretically in Islam itself there is no distinction between civil and religious law, and the codes of canon law of the oriental churches are very broad in their scope. One result of this state of things is to give to the separate religious communities a corporate character unrecognized in the West and to the heads of those communities a political as well as a religious importance. The Jewish Resh Galutha, or Exiliarch, and the Nestorian Patriarch had long been powerful political personages, and the latter was recognized by the Khalifas as in some sense the head of the whole Christian community and not simply of the membership of his own church. Finally, in the beginning of the tenth Christian century the Nestorian patriarch secured from the Khalifa the exclusive right over the Jacobite Maphriana and Greek Metropolitan to reside in Baghdad, the

others being permitted only to visit there for a limited time.¹

Under these circumstances one can see that the requirement that the patriarch should receive investiture at the hands of the Khalifa was a reasonable regulation, prompted rather by the necessities of effective civil administration than by any desire to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. It is possible that Bar Hebræus is right in the statement that it was not until A. D. 987 (A. H. 377) that it was a fixed regulation for the patriarchs to obtain from the Khalifa firmans recognizing their election, but in principle the practice was much older.² In the time of Marwan (A. D. 683) the Jacobite patriarch obtained a diploma from the Khalifa, and from very early times, in both the Nestorian and the Jacobite churches, the voice of the Khalifa was decisive in cases of disputed succession.³ Bar Hebræus tells of a case in which the Khalifa Mamun extended the limits of toleration beyond what seemed desirable to the Christians themselves. A quarrel among the Jews as to the

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 237f. The decision was reaffirmed A. D. 1003, *ib.* 271ff.

² Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 255.

³ See Appendix, The Khalifas and the Patriarchs.

Resh Galutha had occasioned an edict that any ten persons, Jews, Christians, or Magians, might associate themselves together and choose a head. Soon after, the Jacobite bishop of Baghdad was subjected to discipline by his patriarch, but supported by part of his flock he refused to submit. The case went before the Khalifa and the patriarch himself came to Baghdad to support his right to exercise discipline and to protest against the edict as being subversive of the authority of the church. After some discussion the Khalifa accepted the patriarch's view of the case, directed that his discipline be enforced, and revoked the edict.¹

Under these circumstances, the Christians shared in the general fortune of the country, good and bad, perhaps having more than their proportionate share of the wealth, on account of their higher culture and the superiority of Christianity in safeguarding the family and in spite of the heavier burdens of taxation that they bore and their lower position before the law. At any rate there were wealthy men among them and the church in its corporate capacity was possessed of wealth. A physician in the court of Harun ar Rashid is said to have had a professional income

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 255.

annually of 280,000 dirhams, equal to \$35,000, and an income from his property of 800,000 dirhams, or \$100,000. A contemporary describes a visit to him and tells how he found him on a hot summer day in a finely carpeted and ornamented room, warmly dressed in the most costly stuffs and how his wonder at the unseasonableness of his apparel was dissipated when he sat down and found himself in a cold draft from a hidden room filled with ice. Another time in the winter he found him dressed in cool summer clothes seated in a green house, like a garden in extent.¹ The goldsmiths, jewelers, money-changers, and bankers were almost invariably Christians and Jews.² In the country districts there were Christians among the wealthy landlord class, the Persian *dikkans* and *shahrigans*, powerful before the advent of Islam and also afterwards. One of this class is said to have given his portion in the feudal ownership of villages to the monastery of Beth Ahbe.³

¹ Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 179ff. He estimates the dirham as equal to a franc. Budge (*Thomas of Marga*, ii. 403) gives the value at sixpence, and this lower value has been followed.

² Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 185f.

³ *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 180, 256, 282, 309ff., 330ff., and frequently.

A glimpse of landed property belonging to the church is the mention of the act of the Khalifa in returning to the Nestorian patriarch the villages belonging to the see that had been taken possession of by the vizier. Similarly in later Mongol times there were villages near Maragha that belonged to the patriarchate.¹ A melancholy exhibition of the wealth of the church and the large income of the ecclesiastics is found in the immense sums paid as bribes to the Muslim authorities for aid in securing the election of the patriarchate. In A. D. 961 (A. H. 350) a certain Nestorian physician, Pithion by name, is said to have offered the vizier 300,000 dirhams (\$37,500) if he would secure the patriarchate for him. The bishops were unwilling to have him as patriarch and finally effected the enthronement of another elected by themselves by paying 130,000 dirhams (\$16,250). This sum was paid by selling the church plate in order not to reveal the treasure left by the defunct patriarch, said to amount to 70,000 dinars in gold and 600,000 dirhams in silver (\$250,000). Still more incredible is the amount, 45,000 gold dinars (\$112,500), said to have been promised the Khalifa just before the

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 215; Mar Jabalaha, 113.

advent of the Mongols (A. D. 1256) in the course of a prolonged rivalry over the Nestorian patriarchal succession. Of the patriarch Mari (A. D. 987, A. H. 377) Bar Hebræus says that "when he first occupied the patriarchal chair he found in the treasury not the value of a single dirham, but he amassed an abundance and he bought for the see large properties, villages, etc., and built fine buildings onto the church and the residence of the patriarch." Other patriarchs are said to have left large amounts of wealth.¹

It must be remembered that the wealth of Asia flowed into Baghdad for generations, that the court was one of the most magnificent and lavish in history, and that the inhabitants of the city would all share to some extent in the general prosperity; but with all allowance it is more than likely that the Christians were more prosperous than most of the subjects of the Khalifa. Two classes were particularly prominent, the physicians and the officials of lawyers. Throughout the whole history from pre-Islamic times till the times of the Mongols we read of the Christian court physicians, men of great wealth and influ-

¹ Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 192; Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 249f., 423f., 255f.

ence; and besides those whose names are preserved because of their special relation to the Khalifas or their services to learning, there must have been a multitude of others who were successful in a less conspicuous way. Reference has been made to the employment of Christians in the financial and clerical departments of government employ. They were more rarely employed in administrative positions and sometimes as envoys to Christian powers.

In spite of so much that can justly be said to illustrate the degree of prosperity enjoyed by the Christians under Arab rule, there was no such thing as equality, either in religious or in civil affairs. To abandon Islam for Christianity was treason and punishable as such: to abandon Christianity for Islam brought privilege and pardon for past offenses. In civil affairs the Christians were obliged to pay a special tax and were subjected to other vexatious disabilities. The acceptance of Islam by any one resulted in the disinheriting of all non-Muslim heirs. It is no valid defense to say that such regulations were due not to "religious exclusiveness" but to "political necessity," for

religion and politics were inseparable.¹ The theory of Umar, by which the Muslims were all supported from the treasury and the non-Muslims paid the taxes and tilled the soil, broke down of necessity, but not until the conversion of non-Muslims to escape the burdens of taxation had to be forbidden in order to maintain the income of the state. The poll tax remained as a special tax on the non-Muslims. It may be said that this was in lieu of military service; but the early Arabs certainly looked on military service as a privilege rather than a burden. It is so regarded to-day in the East, wherever there is no standing army and where the status of soldier brings special privileges.

The regulations that required Christians to wear clothing that would distinguish them from others, prohibited their riding horses, and imposed other marks of inferiority were no doubt only occasionally and locally enforced, but their existence is evidence of the feeling that Muslims and non-Muslims were separate and unequal castes. Occasionally this feeling broke out into active persecution, as in the destruction of newly-

¹ For the law and the defense of it, see Syed Ameer Ali, *Mohammedan Law*, ii, 85, 96, 121.

built churches by Mahdi, Harun ar Rashid, and Mutasim and in the more general vexations of Mutawakkil, enforcing the regulations of the so-called Constitution of Umar.¹ Fanatical hatred of the Christians increased with the passage of the years and as early as A. D. 837 a Christian bishop describes the sleepless and tearful nights that he passed on account of the growing hatred of the Arabs toward the Christians, due, it is likely, to the orthodox reaction that followed the liberal régime of Mamun.² Destruction of property and attacks on the persons of Christians become more frequent as the history progresses, and testify alike to the weakening of the government and the increase of popular fanaticism.³ The legal status of the non-Muslims, or Dhimmis (Zimmis) was worse in some respects than their actual condition and many of the privileges that they had were due to the favor of the rulers or to the services they rendered society rather than to the guarantees of law.⁴ The employment of

¹ Muir, *Caliphate*, 521ff., 377 ; Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 167 ; Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 118, 126, 146, 155.

² Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 383.

³ See Appendix, Riots against Christians.

⁴ See Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, s. v. Zimmi ; Sell, *Essays on Islam, The Status of the Zimmis*.

Christians in the court was reconciled with their subject condition by the fact that their services were largely of a personal nature. While the court physician was brought into intimate and confidential relations with the Khalifa, he was his personal servant and his office gave him no authority over a single Muslim. The same is to be said in very large measure of the accountants, the secretaries, and the clerks employed in government offices. In Turkey and Persia at the present time hundreds of Christians are employed in similar positions, but they are nevertheless on a lower legal plane than the Muslims. There are cases now and have been in the past in which Muslim rulers have employed Christians as envoys to Christian states. The Sassanians sent Nestorian bishops on embassies to Constantinople and the Khalifa sent a Jacobite bishop to the Georgians to negotiate the release of Muslim captives.¹ The cases in which Christians were placed in positions that gave them rule over Muslims were certainly very rare indeed.² A

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 353; Dionysius, Jacobite Patriarch, was sent by Mamun (A. D. 829) as envoy to rebellious Christians in Upper Egypt, *Ibid.*, 373.

² The only case given by Arnold is that of the prime minister of a Buwayhid prince in Persia (A. D. 949-982).

certain liberal governor was accused to the Khalifa of partiality to the Christians and defended himself as follows, "I have appointed no Christian governors, except Umar ibn Yusuf, whom I appointed governor of Anbar (a city with large Christian population) and except over the Jews and Magians of Jahabad, and in these cases not because of partiality but because of their faithfulness." The act required a special defense.¹

The Mongol conquerors at first were neither Muslims nor Christians, but Shamamists. JIngis counseled his sons "to tolerate all creeds, telling them that it mattered little to the Divinity how they honored him"; but his code of laws was scarcely tolerant, forbidding for superstitious reasons washing the hands in running water or washing in any way cooking or domestic vessels.² He and his first successors were tolerant in all religious matters, not on principle opposed to persecution, but not caring enough for the subject to persecute. Their attitude scarcely affects our subject, at least before the acceptance of Islam by them. The Christians were for a time

¹ Assemani, *Bibl. Orientalis*, iii. 1, 216.

² Howorth, *History of Mongols*, i. 111.

raised to a precarious equality with the Muslims, and in some respects were more favorably regarded. Some of the high officials were Mongols of tribes that had accepted Christianity long before, and in the royal harem a favorite wife often helped the Christians.

With reference to the church the Mongol rulers in Persia exercised the same right of investiture that had belonged to the Khalifa. Bar Hebræus, who as Maphriana or Exarch of the Jacobite Church was in charge of affairs in the East for his church, has left a picturesque account of a visit paid by him to Hulagu Khan in company with his patriarch. A dissension had arisen over the election of the patriarch and both parties, the patriarch-elect with his supporters and the dissident bishops, set out on the long journey from Cilicia to the Mongol court in or near Maragha in Persia. Arriving there, the patriarch and Bar Hebræus (who had gone from Maragha as far as Erzingan in Armenia to meet his superior) found their admission to the court prevented by an order that forbade the reception of monks, the reason being that an Armenian monk had been caught stealing in the court. Fortunately this order had prevented the other party

from seeing "the king of kings," and the versatile bishop found admittance as physician though as a monk he was shut out. Later he secured an audience for himself and the patriarch with the great Khan and the desired papers were given, while Hulagu graciously told how his ancestor, Jingis Khan, had been instructed by men such as they in the fear of God and right laws.¹

This story illustrates the precarious favor the Christians enjoyed in the barbarous court of the conquerors. This is shown still more vividly in the life of the Nestorian patriarch, Mar Yahbhalaha, a younger contemporary of Bar Hebræus. Raised to the patriarchate because of his Turkish descent and familiarity with Mongol customs, he received the insignia of authority, the parasol and royal tablet, from Abaqa, one of the most favorable of all to Christianity, who also granted the church a fixed stipend. The next ruler, Ahmad, was favorable to Islam and the patriarch's position was exceedingly difficult and he was imprisoned for some time. This short reign was followed by a longer period of favor, especially under Arghun, who employed the patriarch's special friend as

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 753ff.

his envoy to Europe, and marked honor was shown and large gifts were given to the church by the king. Then under Ghazan and his successors Islam became supreme and between the efforts of revengeful courtiers and the hatred of the populace the patriarch was repeatedly in danger of his life and the church was stripped of its wealth and favor. The legal status reverted to that which had obtained under the earlier Muslim rulers, but with new influences that made the condition of the Christians far more intolerable than before. The crusades had left a legacy of hatred toward Christians. Turks and Mongols, fierce and barbarous, had completely displaced the Arabs. The fickle favor of the Mongols was most disastrous, for the Armenians and Georgians had been their active allies in their wars with the Muslim rulers of Mesopotamia and especially of Egypt. We shall have to return later to this aspect of the subject. It is useless to speak of governmental relations in the anarchies of the fourteenth Christian century, which closed in the desolation and ruin wrought by Tamerlane. When order again emerged from chaos the remnants of the two great Syrian churches were again the subjects of Muslim rulers, under con-

ditions theoretically the same as those in the history of the Khalifa.

The moral effect on church life and government was most serious. In the first place, the limitation of the preaching of the gospel and the acceptance of that limitation was a surrender of an essential characteristic not only of Christianity but of all truth. This phase of the subject will be referred to again, but another demands fuller consideration now. It has been pointed out that the heads of the church were semi-political officials, exercising a certain amount of authority in affairs not properly spiritual and dependent on the recognition of the Muslim government in order to enjoy the full exercise of their functions. This had most demoralizing effects on the church. The qualification for the highest offices in the church was political ability rather than spiritual character. The conditions and duties of the episcopal office, especially in its higher grades, developed astuteness and craft. The position of the Khalifa as the court of highest appeal in matters connected with the election of the patriarch wrought great mischief. Bribery figured in the elections to a fearful extent. The Syriac histories are full of illustrations of all

these points. The beginnings of the interference of the government in the election of patriarchs and of the intrigues on the part of the Christians are in the Sassanian period. Even then the Christian court physicians played an active part. Both of the Khusrus exerted their influence to secure the election of their favorites, and the opposition of the church to such interference in both these reigns, as on later occasions, is marked by interregna in the succession.

In the time of the third Khalifa, Uthman, we read that the Nestorian patriarch George was imprisoned by the Arab governor of Kufa on the complaint of his enemies, in order to extort money from him.¹ The Umayyad Khalifa Abd al Malik, or perhaps his viceroy in the East, Hajaj, first imprisoned the Nestorian patriarch Khnanishu on account of an impolitic remark in regard to Islam and finally enabled a rival, John the metropolitan of Nisibis, to supplant him. The power of the latter was short lived, for on failing to pay the promised bribe to Hajaj, he was imprisoned and Khnanishu resumed office.²

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 131.

² Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 131ff., 138, note 2.

A story of Mansur illustrates the lengths to which the Khalifas sometimes went, the arbitrariness of their acts, and the character, good and bad, of the Christians themselves. Through the machinations of Surin, who had occupied the Nestorian patriarchal seat for a few months by force of the Khalifa's soldiers, the Nestorian, Jacobite, and Greek patriarchs were all imprisoned at Baghdad. One of the principal plotters against them, a physician, Isa by name, attempted to make use of his position to blackmail other dignitaries of the church and so wrote to the Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis that the Khalifa had heard of the costly plate belonging to his church and desired to have it brought to him in order that he might select such articles for himself as he should desire. Isa also intimated that for a consideration he could avert this calamity. The bishop Cyprian had the courage to go to court and, armed with the letter of Isa, obtained an audience with the Khalifa. The latter was so enraged at the presumption of Isa that he confiscated all his property and released the imprisoned ecclesiastics. They had, however, spent nine years in confinement.

The effect of such an episode on church affairs

can be imagined.¹ The next Nestorian patriarch owed his position to the fact that he replied to the satisfaction of the Khalifa Mahdi to the question as to the kind of tree from which Moses' rod had been cut, while his rival frankly admitted his ignorance.² Then came Timothy, one of the greatest of the Nestorian patriarchs, who for fifty years guided the fortunes of a church whose dioceses extended from the shores of the Mediterranean to the confines of China and at the same time was a successful courtier in the reigns of five great Khalifas, Mahdi, Hadhi, Rashid, Amin and Mamun. It is said that he owed his election to the influence of the governor of Mosul and of his Christian secretary, Abu Nuh, and to the money bags that were displayed to the Nestorian lawyers. These were supposed to contain gold and silver, but after his consecration nothing was found in them but copper coin.³ Instance after instance might be given from Sassanian to Mongol times in which bribes were given, the court physicians or the lawyers in-

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 135f.

² *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 379.

³ *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 383. A similar story of a thirteenth century Jacobite patriarch is given in Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 651.

trigued, and even the armed forces of the Khalifas intervened.¹ As the power of the Khalifas dwindled and that of their viziers increased the Nestorians intrigued with the latter; while the Jacobite patriarch living farther west depended on the favor of the various dynasties that rose and fell, Seljuks, Ayubids, and even Crusaders being the recipients of their bribes. Schisms were not infrequently made by rivals for the patriarchate, and among the Jacobites one such division was prolonged because the church was partly under the rule of the Crusaders and partly under that of the Muslim Emirs of Mesopotamia.

The great lesson of this history lies not in the terrors of persecution but in the far more subtle and ruinous effects of toleration, when it involves the compromise of principles on the part of the church and brings it into relation with a corrupt political power. Christianity was given safety at the price of abstaining from proselyting from the dominant faith and accepted a relation to the Muslim government that subjected the heads of the church to constant temptation to unworthy subservience and intrigue. We often read of the corruption of Christianity through its rela-

¹ See Appendix, Bribery.

tion to Christian governments, beginning with Constantine the Great ; but our study shows the same tendency for the church to become secularized through its relation to a non-Christian government. One of the difficult things in missionary work is to maintain friendly relations with such governments on the proper basis of their gratitude for the benefits to society accruing from the work and of common treaty rights but without compromising principle. It is a still greater temptation to feeble communities of native Christians to accept as inevitable the restrictions to the exercise of the missionary spirit and to limit not merely their activities but their sympathies also by the scanty concessions of an unfriendly government.

History shows how difficult is the question of the political status of missions and native Christians under Muslim governments. It shows that conditions vary greatly according to the character of the ruler and the temper of the people. It shows also that the legal status of Christians so far as their right to worship is concerned is indisputable. It shows also that toleration is conditioned on the acceptance of an inferior status and that this is the fundamental law of Islam,

going back to the Prophet and never changed. It illustrates the menace of mob violence, directly proportionate to the weakness of the government and increasing with time, which to-day is an ever-present danger to the oriental Christians living in Persia and Turkey. It makes it very clear that Islam has been unable successfully to guarantee the rights granted by its own constitution to other religions. It is difficult to see how religious freedom can be granted and maintained by a Muslim monarch, without virtually renouncing the example of his Prophet and the whole past of his religion. Christianity has been intolerant during most of its history, but the Master founded a kingdom not of this world and at last Christendom is beginning to learn his charity. Islam has been more consistent in its history. Muhammad compromised on the basis of limited toleration and his compromise has lasted throughout the centuries, varying in application but not in essential idea. This characteristic of compromise marks all the relations of Islam to Christianity. It seems to yield, but it never yields, the supremacy. Honor is given to Christianity, but Islam is the final faith. Christ is exalted, but his last coming will only prepare the way for Muhammad's tri-

umph. The Bible is praised and its circulation is permitted. The direct persecution of Christians is contrary to the law of Islam and has but little precedent in its history ; but the idea of religious equality before the law is foreign to the system. Hence Islam is misjudged—sometimes denounced as a bloody persecutor and sometimes extolled as a patron of freedom. Neither is true and neither can be, so long as the supreme authority of Muhammad is acknowledged.

This history is an illustration of the general fact of the importance of bringing our arguments against other religions into strict conformity with the facts, and of allowing to them every concession that generosity as well as truth requires. It is weakness to denounce Islam as a persecuting power in the usual sense of the words and to parade the acts of exceptional monarchs as truly representative of the faith. It is right and wise to admit that the early Muslims were more tolerant than their Christian contemporaries, and that the history of Christian Europe contains the annals of more relentless religious persecution than the history of Western Asia since the rise of Islam. But after all this has been admitted, it must also be remembered that what was an ad-

vance in the seventh century is a hopeless barrier in the twentieth, and that active persecution in its very nature must run its course and cease, while toleration is capable of permanency and is for that very reason far more dangerous. The strong argument is the true argument, and Islam is condemned most conclusively by the fairest judgment.

Fourth Lecture

THE EXPANSION OF THE FAITHS

Difficulty of the subject. Some conditions of the expansion. Character of the Muslim propaganda. Divisions of the subject. Converts to Christianity from Islam and Christian apologies. The Syriac-speaking peoples. Failure of Islam to gain them, proselytes from them to Islam. The Iranians. Extent of Christianity among them, extension after rise of Islam, means of extension, Nestorian monasticism and monastic missions, failure of Christianity to win the Iranians, Muslim propaganda and success. The Turks and Mongols. Christianity in China, Uighurs, Keraites, means of extension, character of the Christians, failure of Christianity, propaganda and success of Islam. The relation of Muslim missions to political movements. Estimate of the Nestorian missions. Religious and national movements.

Fourth Lecture

THE EXPANSION OF THE FAITHS

THE topic of the expansion of Christianity and Islam in Western Asia is a vast one, extending over a long period of time and a broad expanse of territory, dealing with the dark ages and unexplored wilds of Central Asia. That the Nestorian Church was a great missionary church is a vague commonplace of literature, but one seeks in vain for an account of its missions. The fact that Asia is Muhammadan from the Mediterranean to the borders of China is patent to all, but very few have any intelligent idea when and how these millions of Asiatics accepted Muhammad as their Prophet. Most, probably, regard the sword as the instrument that converted these vast regions to Islam; but the truth is that in some cases the religious dominion of Muhammad preceded the armies, while in other cases conversion lagged long behind political conquest. Our own age is proving beyond a doubt that the downfall of Muhammadan governments is not followed by

the abandonment of Islam. It is difficult to ascertain the facts of the history. The missionary operations of both faiths were desultory, local, often the result of individual effort rather than corporate activity, and subsidiary to political and commercial movements. Apart from the state, Islam has no formal organization, and the government of the oriental churches was lax. The darvish orders of Islam and the monastic orders of Christianity were very loosely connected with the acknowledged religious organization. Consequently the records of the Khalifat and of the Patriarchates alike refer only incidentally to conversions from other faiths.

In forming an estimate of the fundamental conceptions that determine the character of the missionary operations of Islam we must go back to the origins. Muhammad founded a religion and a state, not as two coöperating bodies but as two expressions of the same force. He preached Islam in Mecca and in Medina and through others all over Arabia. His followers have preached it to the ends of the earth. Apologies and arguments for the faith have been composed and published. Christian missionaries are sometimes earnestly invited to accept Islam for themselves.

As soon as opportunity offered, Muhammad established a state; and the spread of his religion and the extension of his political authority were identical. To quote the modern apologetic historian of *The Preaching of Islam*, "Muhammad exercised temporal authority over his people just as any other independent chief might have done, the only difference being that in the case of the Muslims a religious bond took the place of family and blood ties. Islam thus became what, in theory at least, it has always remained—a political as well as a religious system."¹ One consequence of this was that fighting for the state became not merely a patriotic but a religious duty.

Moreover, in the first preaching of Islam the option offered was the Quran or the sword, or else the Quran, tribute, or the sword. Arnold, the author just quoted, attempts to prove that the doctrine of Jihad, the Holy War, in the sense taught by the unanimous voice of the doctors of Islam, "is wholly unauthorized by the Quran," and maintains that it is due to them that it "came to be interpreted as a religious war waged against unbelievers, who might be attacked even though

¹ *Preaching of Islam*, 27.

they were not the aggressors.”¹ The point is one of academic interest, for practically from the earliest times, indeed from the time of Muhammad, war has had the sanction of religion placed upon it and the refusal of the Arabs, Christian or heathen, to accept Islam or pay the tribute was sufficient *casus belli*. War is a missionary method of Islam, not the only but an authorized means of spreading the faith and the state. To Christians and Jews and usually to others the third alternative of tribute was offered. Hence forced conversion was not the method used with them for the spread of Islam. To the heathen Arabs no alternative was offered to the Quran but the sword; and with other heathen the legal proceeding would have been the same as with the Arabs, but it does not seem to have been followed. The motives that attracted converts to Islam were very mixed from the beginning. The Arabs were led by the force of newborn national zeal as well as by the promise of rich booty to join the armies and accept the creed of Islam. The conditions cannot be more tersely put in the following tradition: “A Christian followed

¹ *Preaching of Islam*, Appendix I. See also Sell, *Faith of Islam*, Appendix B.

the Prophet and said, 'I wish to go with you to fight and to get a share in the spoil.' The Prophet said, 'Dost thou believe in God and in his Prophet?' 'No,' he replied. 'Retire, for I cannot accept the aid of a polytheist.' Three times the man's application was refused, but at last he confessed his faith in Islam and was allowed to join the expedition."¹ Afterwards under Muslim government there was always ready for the new convert relief from taxation, a place of special privilege in comparison with his former coreligionists, and in case of need amnesty for crimes committed. No doubt these rewards, as is the case to-day, were made to glitter as brightly as possible in the eyes of the possible proselyte, even though the gilt tarnished later and riches took their flight.² According to Al Kindi the Khalifa Mamun spoke thus of some of his courtiers, "They belong to a class who embrace Islam, not from any love of this our reli-

¹ Sell, *Essays on Islam*, p. 193.

² One meets not infrequently to-day in Persia apostates to Islam reduced to poverty and bitterly regretting the irrevocable step they took. According to Bar Hebræus (*Ec. Chron.* iii, 287f.), Ignatius, an apostate Jacobite Maphriana, ended his days as a beggar and left behind him a penitential hymn. See Appendix, Apostasy to Islam.

gion, but thinking thereby to gain access to my court and share in the honor, wealth, and power of the realm; they have no inner persuasion of that which they outwardly profess."¹ Beyond the bounds of Muslim government, such rewards could not be offered and the convert from the Mongols or the Turks, except those who were under Muslim rule, probably neither lost nor gained by his change of faith. There does not seem to have been conversion to Islam in the face of persecution.² It is hardly necessary to draw the obvious contrast between the beginnings of Christianity and those of Islam.

It is, no doubt, fortunate for the cause of liberty that the first Christians had to propagate the new faith in the face of social and political opposition. While in Europe political motives aided in the extension of Christianity; such has seldom been the case in Asia outside the bounds of the Roman empire and perhaps the precarious kingdoms of the Armenians and Georgians. Christianity progressed after the rise of Islam by means

¹ Muir, *Al Kindy*, p. xii.

² The only possible exception to this statement would be conversions to Islam in the time of Mongol Emperors unfriendly to Islam. But all the Mongol emperors had Muslim troops and allies, and only Arghun dismissed high Muslim officials.

of preaching, personal influence, example, and (in the estimation of the Christians), by miracles. Aided by the looseness of government, it was propagated in out-of-the-way and remote districts. In the chronicles of Thomas of Marga one reads of heathen in the mountains within one hundred and fifty miles of Mosul, to whom the gospel was preached, showing how little Islam had extended at that early time outside of the cities and how in country places there was still an opportunity for Christian propaganda.¹

The main lines of the extension of the faiths were racial. The conversion of Arabia to Islam and the disappearance of Arab Christianity may here be passed over, and the three great races of Arameans, Iranians, and Turanians be considered. These terms are broad and somewhat indefinite, but are sufficiently accurate for our purposes. Perhaps it would be more accurate to make the distinction one of language than race. The three languages are Syriac, Persian, and Turkish. Arabic was the sacred language of Islam and went wherever Islam went, but it has not become the vernacular of either Persians or Turks. Syriac has been displaced very largely

¹ *Thomas of Marga*, Bk. III, Ch. 3. Also ii. 653.

as a vernacular by the Arabic, but has always been the ecclesiastical and usually the literary language of the Jacobite and Nestorian Churches. With Persian must be grouped Kurdish and various dialects spoken in Persia. The Mongol language was displaced by the Turkish and even in early times a dialect of Turkish (the Uighur) appears to have been the written language for the Mongols.¹ Before taking up these main divisions it seems best to consider separately efforts on the part of the Christians to convert Muhammadans and to present and defend before them their faith.

References in the Syriac literature to converts from Islam to Christianity are very scanty indeed. Bar Hebræus relates that some of the prisoners taken from the Arabs by the Byzantines were baptized and afterwards preferred to remain Christians to returning to their old homes and faith, just as at a later time prisoners taken from the Crusaders are said to have accepted Islam.² More remarkable is the story of Arabs in the region of Nisibis who in the tenth century emi-

¹ The racial and linguistic distinction between Mongols and Turks seems to have been of no historical importance. They coalesced rapidly and easily.

² Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 159.

grated in large numbers to Byzantine territory in order to escape the oppressions of their own rulers and accepted the religion of their new homes.¹ One other instance is found of a Muslim, who is said to have been converted by the miraculous vision of a lamb in a Christian church at the time of the Eucharist. He was imprisoned by the Khalifa Harun ur Rashid and after two years was executed, a martyr to his faith.² There seems to have been less strictness in regard to those who had once been Christians, as is shown by the canons requiring the reordination of repentant renegades; and a few instances are found in which such persons are mentioned by name. Generally, however, they fled to lands under Christian rule.³ The apology of Al Kindi shows that the Khalifa Mamun permitted the discussion of the relative merits of the two religions, but his court was notoriously liberal and fond of religious discussion. About the same time the patriarch Timothy is said to have explained to every one of the five Khalifas under whom he lived the doctrines of Christianity and to have

¹ Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 495.

² Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 132.

³ See Appendix, Apostates to Islam.

left a written account of his disputations with Mahdi; but this is the safest kind of missionary work, for the position of the inquirer secured him from annoyance. A few other instances of Christian apologetics are mentioned in history, and there may have been isolated cases of conversions.¹ They were, at all events, few; liberty was never granted Muslims to change their faith, and there was little effort on the part of the Christians to secure conversions.

At the time of the rise of Islam Christianity was dominant among the peoples speaking Greek, Armenian, and Syriac, and these peoples are still Christian. We are, perhaps, apt to forget this failure of Islam, the failure to attract and convert peoples who have lived for twelve and a half centuries under Muslim rule, accessible to the efforts of Muhammadan teachers, with material gain on the side of Islam; and yet to-day they are more averse to Islam than ever. It would be difficult to point out any similar failure of Christianity in its whole history. It is significant that the nations that possessed in their own language the Scriptures and the church liturgies, and that had a national church and so were not

¹ Appendix, Christian Apologetics.

required to become members of a more or less alien church, have persisted in their Christianity, while others not so favored have lapsed. The Armenian Church is intensely national and with this nation patriotic aspirations have united with religious zeal to hold them fast. The Nestorian and Jacobite Churches have been less intensely national and have never had a political center to which they might rally. The Syriac-speaking people has not been military and long ages ago lost national aspirations, except such as are satisfied by the church and by literature. There were members of both these churches belonging to the Iranian race, as well as to the races of Central Asia and of India, but Syriac was always and everywhere the ecclesiastical language, and the rulers of the church were usually Arameans.

It is the opinion of careful observers that a portion of the Muhammadan population of the Turkish empire are the descendants of Christian ancestors, Greek, Armenian, and Syrian.¹ The evidence for this is largely inferential, and history furnishes little direct testimony of such changes of faith, except in the case of individuals. The

¹ Hogarth, *Nearer East*, 176; Ramsay, *Impressions of Turkey*, 96.

largest numbers doubtless accepted Islam under the first Úmayyids. The apology of Al Kindi speaks with bitterness of the apostates to Islam, implying that they were heretical Christians with half-heathenish ideas, or that they were impelled by unworthy motives, but there is nothing to indicate that their number was large. The occasional storms of persecution that broke the truce of toleration drove some to abandon Christianity. This is said to have been the case when Mansur imprisoned the patriarchs of the three sects. On another occasion Mahdi, angered by the sight of large numbers of Christians in Aleppo riding on horses, is said to have ordered them to accept Islam, which was done by five thousand persons.¹ There was also a stream of conversions, if we may apply that name to such cases, of Christians who became Muslim in order to escape punishment or for gain. Among these there were not a few clergy of the lower ranks, as is indicated by the canons regarding reordination of such apostates, and a number of bishops, and even one Jacobite Maphriana and at a later period two Jacobite patriarchs. The Christian writers assign immorality as the cause in most of

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 127.

these instances, and there is no sufficient reason to doubt the statement in many cases at least.¹

Two stories in Bar Hebræus may be quoted to illustrate the incidents that would often be connected with "conversions." They are such as would be frequent whenever the country was disturbed and rare when the government was strong, and might easily be paralleled by modern instances. One is that of a girl in the neighborhood of Mosul in the twelfth century (A. D. 1159) who was betrothed to a Christian. Her father, born a Christian, had apostatized to Islam, the rest of the family keeping their faith, and in consequence opposition was made by the Muslims to her marriage to a Christian. The Maphriana who authorized the marriage ceremony was arrested and the girl of course was brought before the authorities. She persisted in the profession of faith in Christianity. Finally her firmness and that of the Maphriana, who was in prison for forty days, won the day so far that she was not compelled to accept Islam, but she could not remain in her home and ended her days as a

¹Arnold discredits the charge of immorality, but the easy way for an immoral bishop under discipline to escape trouble would be apostasy.

nun in Jerusalem.¹ The other case is that of a company of armed men in Armenia, who, being caught up with by a band of Muslim bandits, feared for their lives and in order to secure their safety declared that they were on their way to the court in order to profess their faith in Islam, thinking that they would make their escape without fulfilling the promise. They were, however, forced by the circumstances and by the avowal of their intention to go to an Emir and were taken by him into his military service and treated with great favor. After a time they escaped and resumed their former religion.² A similar and frequent occasion of change of religion, as to-day, was the persuasion of girls to marry Muslim husbands, or in troublous times their abduction. Theoretically a Christian woman married to a Muslim husband is not required to renounce her faith, but practically such a marriage must have that result, and in any case the children are Muslim. Muslim tradition also claims the conversion of large numbers of Christians and the adherents of other religions as the results of the efforts of the great doctors of Islam, twenty

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 347ff.

² Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 244.

thousand each being ascribed to Ibn Hanbal and another teacher. The Christian chroniclers make no reference to such occurrences, but that perhaps is not sufficient reason to reject them altogether.¹ All of these causes for the acceptance of Islam by Christians are not sufficient to account for the great diminution in the number of Nestorian and Jacobite Christians, and it may be doubted whether they would more than balance the natural increase of population in times of peace. Why these churches have almost disappeared we shall see later.

Christianity at the time of the Arab conquest had a firm hold in certain parts of Persia. In Southern Persia, Khuzistan was one of the most powerful metropolitan sees of the Nestorian Church, no doubt in part because of its proximity to Ctesiphon. Other proofs exist of the large number of Christians in Khuzistan. In the time of Ali (A. H. 40) Christian mountaineers of this region are said to have joined with the Kharijites in rebellion. On their defeat the number of Christian captives taken into slavery was five hundred. It is evident from this that Christianity had gained a hold on the common people of the

¹ Arnold, *Preaching of Islam*, 65.

country.¹ The adjoining metropolitan see of Persia or Fars was also ancient. The Patriarch Ishuyabh III (A. D. 660) writes of the large number of apostates in that region to Islam in his time. Christianity had before Muhammad's time reached India and bishoprics had been founded on the borders of the Persian Gulf, in the islands, on the Arabian coast, and in Kirman.² Khurasan contained a considerable Christian population, as is shown by the letters of Ishuyabh. Here the metropolitan see of Merv was older than the time of Islam and long remained powerful in the Nestorian Church. Bar Hebræus states that shortly before the rise of Islam the Jacobite sees of Khurasan, Seistan, and Azarbaijan were established.³ A Nestorian metropolitan of Samarkand, a far eastern outpost of Iranian population, was appointed early in the eighth century. Other sees that are mentioned were those of Yezd, Ispahan, and Shiraz in South Persia; Hamadan and Rhai in Central Persia; Urumia and Ushnuk in Northern Persia; Barda in Georgia; and Dailom and Ghilan along the

¹ Muir, *Caliphate*, 292.

² These and other Nestorian bishoprics are mentioned by Bar Hebræus, Thomas of Marga, and Assemani.

³ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 127.

Caspian. This list is not exhaustive, and outside the specifically Persian sees there were Iranian Christians in the dioceses of Assyria and the region about Baghdad.

The history of Christianity in the Sassanian empire shows that there had been a very active and successful propaganda among the Iranians. We read of Christians among the landlord class about Mosul and in the mountain region east of that city. Some of the Christians were of high rank. The last Khusru was killed in an insurrection headed by one of them, whose father had been the chief financial officer of the realm.¹ Some of the patriarchs of the Nestorian Church were converts from Magianism or the sons of such converts. While thus widespread, the Christians were not organized into a national Persian Church. There were certain differences between the Persian Nestorians and those farther west and there were the beginnings of ecclesiastical independence, but the patriarchs asserted their authority in the end. Syriac was the ecclesiastical and theological language and there was at most in Persia a very scanty Christian literature, and the Scriptures had not been translated

¹ *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 112.

into the vernacular.¹ It is clear that Christianity was widely spread in Persia, that in some localities the numbers of Christians were considerable, and that it continued to spread after the rise of Islam.

Two forces had much to do with that spread. One was commerce and the other monasticism. From times before Islam Christian merchants had a share in the wholesale trade of Asia. Trade with India opened the way for the early introduction of Christianity there. The hold Christianity had along the Persian Gulf was probably connected with this trade route and those into Arabia. The strong rule of the early Abbasid Khalifas gave trade the opportunity to develop. The position of the Christians in the capital as bankers and merchants would lead them to share in the trade. Artisans, and the goldsmiths and jewelers who were Christians, would find employment in the large cities. In those days there were no doubt settlements of Christian merchants and artisans in the cities, just as to-day there are Armenians in every large city in Persia and

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 169f. The principal difference was that the bishops were from the married and not from the celibate clergy.

Chaldean merchants from Mosul and Baghdad in many of them. The clergy would follow the merchants in order to supply them with the ordinances of the church, and so episcopal dioceses would be established.¹ In the account of the missions of the Nestorian monks, Thomas of Marga relates that the patriarch Timothy sent his missionary to Mughan on the Aras river in the company of merchants.²

Monasticism was imported into Mesopotamia in the fourth century by monks from Egypt. The legendary account of Mar Awgin, or St. Eugenius, tells that his monastery near Nisibis contained three hundred and fifty monks, while seventy-two of his disciples each established a monastery. The number of monasteries increased rapidly in the fourth and fifth centuries. In the sixth century there was a movement in the Nestorian church against the enforced celibacy of the higher clergy and against celibate monks. Celibacy, however, won the day and monasticism was firmly established. The monks must have been numbered by hundreds, if not thousands, for

¹ An earlier instance of non-Iranian Christians in Persia is that of the colonists settled in Khurasan by Anushirvan. Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 125.

² *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 506.

in addition to the numerous monasteries in Mesopotamia and in the regions north of the Tigris, there were scattered monasteries in Persia and Armenia. Besides the monks living in communities there were numerous solitaries living in caves or rude huts. These were influential enough among the Qatrayi on the Persian Gulf to call for a separate letter from the patriarch Ishuyabh.¹ Some of these monks must have burned with real missionary zeal, but the prevailing spirit of the institution was not missionary. Quiet of the mind and repression of the body were the two great aims of their life. The first canon of Mar Abraham the Great, accepted generally by the monks of the Nestorian Church begins as follows, "First of all a life of tranquillity according to the command of the Fathers and according to the word of the Apostle which he spake to the Thessalonians." This is more picturesquely illustrated by the following story: "Once when Abba Arsenius went to visit the brethren in a certain place the wind whistled through the reeds which grew there and he said, 'What is this noise?' and they said, 'It is the reeds shaken by the wind.' And he said, 'Ver-

¹ *Ibid.*, 168.

ily, I say to you, if a man dwelling in a solitude heareth only the chirp of a sparrow, his heart cannot find that solitude which it requireth; how much less can ye who have all this noise of these reeds?"

One of the saints most approved by Thomas of Marga is a bishop who was carried captive by the nomad Arabs and contentedly spent his life as their camel-herd, because, as he said, "I have determined that this work is the will of our Lord, and also that it does not in any way separate me from a life of purity, and I am not brought in contact with the Arabs, but am alone by myself in the desert. I praise God continually."¹ There is no indication that he was impelled to preach the gospel to these Arabs. Similarly the monks of Beth Abhe successfully resisted the patriarch in an attempt to establish a school in connection with their monastery, on the ground that the boys would disturb their meditations.² The work of preaching to the heathen was conceived of as a hardship, an ascetic exercise, rather than a privilege of the gospel. Accordingly in the accounts of their work as missionaries great stress

¹ *Thomas of Marga*, Book ii., Ch. 41. The life of Malchus, the captive monk, written by Jerome, also illustrates this point.

² *Ibid.*, Bk. ii, Ch. 7.

is laid on their self-denying sufferings and on the miracles they wrought. The monasteries were not leagued together in orders, but each was independent of the others, ruled by its own superior and subject in some degree to the higher episcopal authorities. Consequently there was nothing like a concerted missionary movement or any close control or direction of such work. Another result of this is that there were no comprehensive records of such work.¹

Thomas of Marga, who is referred to so often in these lectures, was the abbot of the monastery of Beth Abhe, sixty or seventy miles northeast of Mosul. He wrote a history of that monastery from the middle of the sixth century till the middle of the ninth. In this work he gives an account of the missionary work done by the monks of the monastery. In passing it may be remarked that other monasteries might no doubt have furnished histories of similar efforts. The regions in which these monks of Beth Abhe preached the gospel were among the most inaccessible and barbarous of those inhabited by the

¹ For a general account of Monasticism in the Nestorian Church, from which the above facts are taken, see *Thomas of Marga* i, cxvii ff.

Iranians, a fact due to the freedom in such regions from interference from Muslim government and to the monastic conception of missionary work as a part of asceticism. It was altogether among the pagans and not the Muhammadans. This missionary propaganda occurred at about the end of the eighth century. The patriarch Timothy sent a monk named Shaukhalishu to carry the gospel to the regions of Ghilan and Dailom along the shores of the Caspian and in the adjoining mountain regions. He was selected because of his knowledge of Arabic and Persian and was provided with funds by the wealthy Christians so as to make "his entrance with exceeding great splendor, for barbarian nations need to see a little worldly pomp and show to attract them and make them draw nigh willingly to Christianity." In this one can see the hand of the courtier in the Khalifa's court. With him were a number of disciples and they taught, preached, baptized, and worked all kinds of miracles, turning to the truth not heathen only but also Manichees and Marcionites.¹ Finally he lost his life at the hands of robbers, and Timothy appointed two new metropolitans, one of Ghilan and

¹ Or perhaps Marcianites, or Marcians, *i. e.*, Euchites.

one of Dailom, sending with them fifteen assistants. These brothers, Kardagh and Yahbhalaha, carried on the work with great success, ordaining not only priests but also bishops. The progress in these regions led to sending another missionary to Mughan, or Moqan, along the lower course of the Aras. This was a holy solitary, ignorant of learning but famous for the austerity of his life and appropriately named Elijah. His fame, like that of Boniface in far-off Europe a century earlier, was made by hewing down a great sacred tree. This was followed by the conversion of many heathen and by a long career of successful work. It is difficult to separate fact and exaggeration in these accounts, although they were written only a few years after the events; but at any rate there was a successful pioneer work in very difficult regions. The Christianity taught could not have been better than that of the teachers and it probably partook more of the magical elements than of those of real spiritual value.¹

Another evidence of the spread of Christianity among the Iranians is to be found in the traditions of certain Kurdish tribes that their ances-

¹ For the histories summarized, see *Thomas of Marga*, Book v, Chs. i-xi.

tors were once Christian, though they do not indicate when they were converted to Christianity.¹

But in spite of all, Christianity failed, and Islam succeeded in gaining the Iranian race. There was doubtless the same process of gradual and individual conversion to Islam already described with reference to the Aramean Christians. Very possibly there were larger numbers of converts among the newly converted and imperfectly instructed Christians of Persia than among those farther west. In the letters of Ishuyabh soon after the Arab conquest, he reproaches the Christians of Fars and of Khurasan for having accepted Islam in large numbers, partly in order to avoid the loss of property entailed by steadfastness in the faith.²

The first Arabs attempted the forcible conversion of the Zoroastrians to Islam and their fire temples were destroyed. Doubtless under this stress numbers went over to the new faith; and

¹ This is true of several tribes on the border of Turkey and Persia near Urumia. In the regions of Bohtan, Midyat and Sassun there are Muhammadan Kurds who are said by tradition to have once been Christian. Those in Sassun are called the "Cross deniers."

² *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 154. The language used is very strong to the effect that thousands of Christians had embraced Islam without any force being laid on them and that churches were deserted because of the apostasy.

the lower classes, especially the heretical sects among the fire-worshippers, are said to have done so gladly. Finally, however, the Muslims adopted a more conciliatory attitude, and toleration displaced persecution in the policy toward the remaining fire-worshippers. The forces of gradual and individual conversion along with the exterminating forces of anarchy and famine reduced the followers of the old Persian faith to a mere handful. Islam was strengthened in its influence over the Persians by the existence from early times of a strong Persian element within itself and finally by the evolution of a distinctively Persian type of faith and doctrine. It thus became identified, as Christianity never was, with the genius of the race. Heathenish ideas persisted, however, in the strange half-secret and very imperfectly known sects that are found in Persia even to-day. The conquering faith paid an indemnity of war, and a heavy one, to the conquered.

The failure of Christianity is not wholly due to the success of Islam. In the form and the method of Christianity, as presented to the Iranians, there was that which made it unable to accomplish the conquest of the race. One great reason probably was that it was never given sufficient inde-

pendence to develop along its own lines and become really indigenous. It may also be that the dogmatic character of the Christianity offered, treating the great themes of theology as closed questions, defined and determined, and not as great truths to feed the intellect as well as to be the objects of faith, had something to do with the failure to win this race. It failed, and to-day only a few ruined churches and some others converted into mosques remain as memorials of Iranian Christianity.

The history of the missionary activity of the Nestorian Church in the farther East is a subject on which the available sources of information are exceedingly scanty. The extant records of that church give very little light, a circumstance not so surprising when one reads that the more distant metropolitans were required to report to the patriarch only once in six years. The sources that we have are scattered notices in Syriac works, the narratives of Mediæval European travelers, and the references to Mongol and Turkish Christians in the Muslim and Christian histories of the Mongols.¹

¹ These are all collected in Howorth's *History of the Mongols*, a work which is drawn on constantly for facts used in the following pages.

There are two routes from Western to Eastern Asia, by sea and by land. Both were used from early times for trade and Christianity followed both, as did Islam. There is good proof that Christianity entered Southern China through the merchants that traded by the sea-route *via* India, but this lies outside our subject. The starting point from which Christianity spread by land into Central and Eastern Asia was naturally the Eastern region of Iranian culture and of Arab rule in Merv, Bukhara, Balkh, and Samarkand. The war of Iran and Turan is as old as history and long before Muhammad Christianity had reached the boundaries of these titantic rivals; and it is possible that it had even overstepped the boundaries, for Theophylact tells of Turkish mercenaries of Khusru Parviz who bore the cross tattooed on their breasts as a charm against the plague.¹

In passing it may be remarked that this story illustrates the fact, to our history of very great importance, that the Turkish migrations westward were as old as Islam itself. Political conditions opened the trade routes from Khurasan and Transoxiana to China. Christianity entered these open doors, for the famous Nestorian mon-

¹ *Theophylact*, 225.

ument of Si-ngan-fu in China tells of the advent in A. D. 635, three years after the death of Muhammad, of a Nestorian teacher from the West called Olopun and how he brought his faith to the favorable notice of the emperor. It then recounts the gracious toleration of Christianity by the emperors till the time the monument was erected in A. D. 781.¹ From Chinese sources it appears that in A. D. 845 Christianity and other foreign faiths, especially the far more prevalent Buddhism, were persecuted and that three thousand Christian monks and other Western teachers, were forced to return to the ordinary walks of life.² From Syriac records we learn that about the beginning of the ninth century a metropolitan of China was appointed by the patriarch Timothy.³

The connection of this early Christianity in northwestern China with that of Samarkand and Balkh is shown by the mention of a priest from Balkh on the Nestorian monument. But Christianity did not reach China at a leap, nor did it cross the thousands of miles of intervening

¹ See Legge's *Edition and Essay*.

² *Nestorian Monument*, Legge, 50.

³ *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 448.

territory without making some impression. The road that the monk traveled was the same that the merchants followed, either over high passes to Kashgar and thence along the Tarim Valley, or farther north over lower passes by Kulja to the Tarim, and thence on to Northern China. The population of Turkish and Mongol tribes in this region was ever shifting. Among them, however, and perhaps less barbarous than most were the Uighurs—"village-dwellers" their name is said to mean—and in this tribe Christianity enrolled many converts. Many among them were Christians—how many and when and through whose efforts they became such we do not know, but that they were numerous is shown by frequent references to Uighur Christians in the literature of the Mongol period, and also by their graves. At Pishpek in Russian Turkestan, near the Chinese border and about three hundred miles east of the city of Tashkend, is a cemetery of Christian graves, eight acres in extent, with Syriac inscriptions on the stones. Here Christians were buried for about five hundred years, from A. D. 850 to A. D. 1330, some with Turkish and some with Syriac names, old men and maidens, laymen and priests—one of the

latest Shlikha, "renowned interpreter of the Scriptures and preacher, who filled all the monasteries with light, the son of Peter the expounder. He was celebrated for wisdom and his voice was sonorous as a trumpet." Thirty miles away is another cemetery. How many more are lost in the wilds of this wild country time may reveal in part and only the Great Resurrection in fullness.¹ An alphabet was adapted from the Syriac by these Turks, which was used extensively by the Mongol conquerors and is still in use by the M'ongols of Eastern Asia. The Uighurs were the scribes, the high officials, and often the generals of the Mongols. One of them, Kitibuka by name, a Christian at least by descent, was the commander and viceroy of Hulagu in Syria and Cilicia. To their influence was due in large part the measure of mercy shown the Christians in the merciless wars.

Another closely related line of evidence begins with a statement of Bar Hebræus, who relates that in A. D. 1007 messengers came from a king, or chief, of a tribe called Keraites to the Metropolitan of Merv, asking for a priest to baptize him and his people. He had lost his way

¹ Lansdell, *Chinese Central Asia*, i. 109.

while hunting and had been guided home by a saint, or holy apparition. Thus attracted to Christianity, he had been more fully instructed by Christian merchants in his capital city and had received from them a copy of the gospels, which he is said to have worshiped daily. Priests were sent and in view of the fare on which the people lived permission was given to use milk during the Lenten fast.¹ Unk Khan, the chief of the Keraits, was first the friend and later the enemy of Jingsis Khan. He is said to have been known as King John, and he finally forsook Christianity.² There can be little doubt that Howorth is right in accepting these statements and in finding in Unk, or Wang, Khan, who figures prominently in the earlier history of Jingsis Khan, the original of Prester John of mediæval legend.³ We have accounts of these Keraits from Marco Polo and the Roman Catholic missionaries, who in the thirteenth century visited the dominions of the successors of Jingsis Khan, which then included a large part of China. These found Christians in various

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 279f.

² Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, i. 541ff.

³ *History of the Mongols*, Vol. i, Ch. x.

cities in Tangut and especially in the region of Tanduc along the northern bend of the Hoang Ho or Yellow river. The princes of this city, they say, were of the line of Prester John and always married from the family of the Great Khan. This last statement is corroborated by the history of the Mongols and explains the presence in the royal harem of Christian wives of Mongol extraction. One of these princes of Tanduc became a Roman Catholic and with his aid the friars prospered greatly in their mission work, but on his death the family relapsed into Nestorianism. In the lists of the Nestorian dioceses of the twelfth century and in the later history the metropolitan see of Tangut is mentioned. The evidence is barely summarized here, but it is clear that Nestorian Christianity was widely extended among the Turks and Mongols of the Uighur and Kerait tribes from the regions adjoining Samarkand to Northern China and Manchuria. It may be that the Christians in China were all Mongols or Turks rather than Chinese, even in the earlier period of the monument of Si-ngan-fu, for the dynasty at that time is described as being "Turkish by alliance, character, and temperament," and it is evident from the

monument itself that the favor of these emperors was a great factor in the progress of Christianity.¹

If the extent of Christianity in Central Asia is very imperfectly known, the means of its extension are still more obscure. We may be sure that commerce was an important factor. It has been remarked that Christianity followed the great trade routes in its progress eastward. They were merchants already in Tanduc, who told Prester John, or his ancestor, the contents of the Christian faith. In the times of Mongol dominion in Persia we read of a wealthy Christian merchant from the region of Mosul, accompanied by a Mongol Christian of high rank, who died in Khurasan on his way home from the far East. His sons were befriended by the Mongol and one of them was afterwards appointed governor of Mosul, a position that he long held.² Other agents in the extension of Christianity were the monks. A considerable part of the Si-ngan-fu monument is taken up with a description and eulogy of the monastic life. The supposedly supernatural guide of the Kerait chieftain suggests a hermit, living such a life as Mar Yahbhal-

¹ Cahun, *Turcs et Mongols*, 121.

² Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 582f.

aha and his companion Rabban Sauma passed before they came west, having their home in a cave in a lonely mountain in the country of the Keraites.

The estimate of the character of these Turkish Christians derived from their part in Mongol history is very low. There is nothing to indicate that they were less inhuman than their comrades in war, pillage, and massacre. In one instance we read of the Christians of Arbil being protected in the celebration of their rites by a squad of Christian Mongols, who bore crosses suspended from the points of their spears.¹ The queens who carried chapels about with them in the nomad courts of the Khans were the inmates of polygamous harems, and the Christianity of their children, some of whom were baptized, was very lightly laid aside when policy required it. The travelers from Europe give an account of the Nestorians that is far from flattering, telling how their priests were in the habit of taking part in the Mongol festivities, blessing the cattle and using charms and magic. Indeed, they are represented as being very eminent as magicians.

It would be necessary, even if we had no more

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Chron. Syr.*, 575f.

favorable testimony to the character of the Mongol Christians to allow for the prejudice of Roman Catholic monks in speaking of Nestorian heretics. One cannot but wonder how much better Roman Catholic Christianity would be under similar conditions of isolation. Fortunately we have another and very valuable source of testimony in the life of Mar Yahbhalaha, Nestorian patriarch from A. D. 1281 to A. D. 1317. The account begins with the story of two Uighur hermits of the region of Tanduc, whose zeal led them to determine to visit the sacred shrines of the West and especially Jerusalem. Their friends and relatives, native Christians of that region, strove to dissuade them, as did the Christian rulers of the country; but they were unshaken in their decision and finally were provided by wealthy coreligionists with funds for the way and by the rulers with letters of introduction and safe-conduct. The long journey across the great continent of Asia was made and they reached the Persian court of the Mongols and visited the heads of their church, but the disturbed condition of the country prevented their visiting Jerusalem. The patriarch made our hero metropolitan bishop and his companion visitor-general of their native

regions, but soon after his death left the patriarchal seat vacant and the patriarchate was filled by the election of Mar Yahbhalaha, chosen on account of his race and relation to the Mongol Khans and in spite of his ignorance of Syriac. The vicissitudes of the thirty-five years during which he occupied the patriarchal throne and during which his companion was sent on an extended embassy to the Christian courts of Europe, tested thoroughly the simple, unselfish character of both, their genuine devotion to Christianity, and also their frank superstitious faith in saints and relics. Mar Yahbalaha suffered himself and was a true shepherd of his flock in a troubled time, ready to lay down his life if need be for them. One is glad to believe that there were others of like faith unknown to history, who lived and died in true and simple obedience.

But whatever Christianity did for individuals, it failed to hold and influence the destiny of the Turkish race. In the sixteenth century the Jesuits who went to North China found only the memory of the Nestorian Christians.¹ Persecution by the Chinese emperors had rooted them out. In Central Asia both internal and external

¹ Yule, *Cathay*. c.

causes can be found for the failure of Christianity. It did not take hold of the Turkish language and create such a literature as should be the fruit of five hundred years of opportunity. It was isolated by the terrible distances, by the uncertain political relations of the East and the West, and by the loose organization and administration of the Nestorian Church. It was cut off entirely from the Christianity of Europe and when Roman Catholicism came it was not a friend but a rival. Finally the Christianity that was preached had lost much of its power. Its crown was no longer the loving and faithful walk of men among men but the life of the hermit apart from men. It relied on relics rather than on the living Spirit of God, on miracles rather than the Gospel of Jesus, and on saints rather than on the ascended Christ.

The accounts of the eastward extension of Islam into Central Asia and to China are as scanty as those of Christianity in the same regions. Before the acceptance of Islam by the great Mongol Khans its history is much like that of Christianity, except that it was connected more closely with political matters, the Khalifas and the Chinese emperors having diplomatic relations

from early times and Islam being a political force on the western borders of Central Asia and gradually advancing its bounds. It entered both Southern and Northern China by the trade routes, the former apparently at the very beginning of the foreign extension of Islam, and the latter a century later. By the middle of the tenth century Islam had a hold on the borders of Northern China as a political and a persecuting power, tolerating, however, Nestorian Christianity. It too gained a hold among the Uighurs. We read of Muslim merchants among the Mongols and of mosques at the court of the Mongol Khans. It appears likely that the Muslims in North China are of Mongol and Tartar descent, and that the immigration of peoples of these races especially in connection with the Mongol supremacy was the cause of the extension of Islam there. Besides the Mongol troops, Khubilai Khan in the thirteenth century made large use of Arab and Persian officials in the administration of his Chinese dominions.

But the real history of the extension of Islam among the Turks and Mongols has far more to do with the westward movements of the hordes than with any missionary or political efforts to

carry Islam to them. The use of Turkish mercenaries had begun in Sassanian times and the Abbasids early adopted it. The Turks thus entering into the territories of the Khalifas and of the Muslim dynasties of the East naturally accepted the religion professed by the princes who employed them and by the large majority of the people among whom they settled. This gradual process went on for centuries and powerful dynasties of Turks arose. They became the dominant race, even the Khalifa being a puppet in the hands of his Turkish guards and viziers. The political conquest of the Turks over the Arabs and the religious conquest of the Arabs over the Turks were both so gradual that we are apt to forget how complete and momentous they were. When the inroads of the heathen hordes of the Mongols took place in the thirteenth century, in all the regions they conquered from those of the Sultan of Khwarizm in Transoxiana to the Seljuk dominions on the Mediterranean, they found Muslims of kindred race, language, and civilization. The religious attitude of the Mongol rulers was such that there was no obstacle to the employment of Muslims in offices of state nor to the intercourse of the immigrants with the conquered

Muhammadans. They married freely from them. The conquerors were thus the easy conquest of the vanquished and about the beginning of the fourteenth century the far-sighted Ghazan Khan saw that it was the best policy of state to accept Islam and to establish his kingdom on that basis. This change was opposed by the conservatives, who had blocked a similar attempt of Ahmad Khan shortly before and who still clung to the Shamamism and the religious indifference of the earlier Khans; but the people had been won by Islam and the state must follow. Christianity played only a minor part in the question.¹

The history of the branch of the descendants of Jingsis Khan who ruled in Transoxiana was similar, except that the opposition to the adoption of Islam was strengthened by the hordes of the steppes, some of them Christian, and Islam was not firmly established till the conquests of Timur. He was a Mussulman before he rose to power in Transoxiana with his capital at Samarkand, whence he made Islam supreme in Central Asia.

¹ This is evident from the history of Mar Yahbhalaha. He had no influence in national affairs, though he was personally favored by the Khans.

Christianity in that part of Asia disappeared before his terrible sword.¹

Imperfectly and in outline the long process has been sketched, in which Christianity gained only to lose again and Islam became supreme from the Mediterranean to the Chinese Wall. Much remains obscure and some must always so remain ; but it is clear that here is a section of the history of Christianity too important to be dismissed with a general eulogy of the missionary spirit of the Nestorian Church or with a condemnation of Islam for using the sword.

One cannot but be impressed with the political character of the triumph of Islam. It is not meant that Islam has been propagated altogether by political means, nor that its victory is due to the forcible suppression of other faiths. What is meant is that, just as in the foundation of Islam religion and state were united, so in its propagation political motives and means have been inextricably joined with those more spiritual in character. Take for example the greatest conquest Islam ever made, that of the Turkish race. It began in the hiring of mercenaries and it ended in the wars of Timur. The claim is sometimes

¹ Cahun, *Turcs et Mongols*, 475-480.

made that this has changed, and that the present extension of Islam is not political. The Wahabi movement is pointed out as a great spiritual movement in modern Islam "one of the two chief factors making for missionary activity in the Mussulman world," and we are assured that it has "lost all political significance outside of Najd."¹ Such a statement flies in the face of history, for Wahabism is a Puritanical return to the ideals of early Islam and a rejection of the accretions and modifications of subsequent history. If it be true to its purpose, it will be spiritual and religious, but it will also be political; for such were the ideals of the Prophet and his companions. The political element may be obscured by circumstances and may be latent for a long time, but it is difficult to see how it can be eliminated.

A true estimate of the missionary activity of the Nestorian Church must contain much of admiration, for surely nothing less is due to such vast expansion as that which marks its history, especially in view of the difficulties encountered. The preaching of the gospel must have been at the cost of great privation and suffering, and the old monks who carried the faith into barbarous re-

¹ Arnold, *Preaching of Islam*, 345

gions were true heroes. At the same time a sense of the inadequacy of the work is inevitable—its inadequacy in motive, in method, and in the gospel preached. This appears not only in comparison with the more developed but purer and simpler Christianity that we know, but even in some respects in comparison with Islam itself. Two closely related points may be specified here ; the equality of believers in respect both to privilege and to obligation, and the freedom and simplicity of organization as realized in Islam. The idea of ritual observances and ascetic exercises is a part of the original constitution of Islam and hence obligatory on all in an equal degree ; but while oriental Christianity required fasting of all, the monastic ideal offered a higher degree of holiness to be attained by some by a special rule of life. It is true that the darvish orders correspond somewhat to the monastic orders, but they are freer and have never become an essential element in the organization of Islam, as monasticism is in oriental Christianity. In Islam each believer has equal access to the One God without any human mediation, not the perfect access that is the ideal of Christianity, but equal access for all. No rites are indispensable. Simple confession of faith

constitutes one a Muslim and he is the peer of every other Muslim. In Christianity along with the priestly conception of religion went the hierarchical form of government. In Islam no external authorization or connection is necessary to the organization of a company of believers, while in oriental Christianity the necessity of the episcopal bond and succession was enforced. Much more might be said in criticism and might be said with profit, if the motive be to learn how best to do our duty. Otherwise we have no right to criticise those who fought even though they failed to win the victory.

One lesson is assuredly the inseparable relation between religious and national movements. Missions have for their primary and unalterable aim the making known to the individual the gospel of Christ in order that he individually may come into living fellowship with God the Father of all through Christ his Son. This aim is inevitably bound up in the conception of religion embodied in Christianity and emphasized by the Protestant Reformation. All other results of Christian missions depend upon the realization of this aim. The method to accomplish other changes is first to change the individual. At the same time, in

order to be a permanent and effective force Christianity must lay hold of the nation and must itself be so organized in its outward form and in its intellectual character as to become an integral part of the life of the nation. The permanency of Christianity in the life of a nation, its power to mold its destiny, is dependent on the possession of the moral and intellectual leadership. The lower, more ignorant, and superstitious forms of Christianity are the least permanent. In other words Christianity must enter into the intellectual life of the people and, if there is no such life, it must create it. The fathers of the church who gave their lives to the creation of Greek theology did more than bring into existence a literature, a new culture, and a system of thought. They bound up with Christianity the destinies of the Greek race, and great as the needs are of reviving and reforming the religious life of that nation, its Christian position is assured and has never been shaken by the onslaughts of Islam.

The same service was done with equal effectiveness and without the aid of political bonds by the Syrian Fathers of Edessa. The truth we are considering is enforced equally by the perma-

nence of Christianity among the Syrians and Armenians and by its transitoriness among the Arabs, Persians, and Turks. Christian schools, the Bible and other Christian literature in the vernacular, the creation of a truly national culture, are indispensable to the conquest of the nations. The great aim of such work is not the impartation of a foreign culture and the arts of civilization, nor is it to attract people to Christianity. It is to entrench Christianity in the life of the nation through leaders and in the thought of the people. Islam did this with the Arabs, Persians, and Turks. Under Islam each of these peoples has produced a literature and had an intellectual life. Another truth writ large in this history is that missions must not lag behind political changes. No better missionary appeal for immediate work in China could be made than the title of a secular work, "China in Transformation." It is folly and it is disobedience to the voice of history not to make every effort to anticipate the political and social revolutions that are taking place so rapidly and that must ere long include the whole non-Christian world. How much harder it is to-day to evangelize Arabia or Persia than it was fifteen hundred

years ago! What a loss to the world that the Turks have been entrenched in Muhammadanism instead of having been won for Christianity! Is the church to-day more clear-sighted in its views of current history than were the Christians who rejoiced in the early conquests of Islam?

Fifth Lecture

**THE DOWNFALL OF CHRISTIANITY IN
THE COMMON RUIN**

Tragic character of the course of the history and the relation of the Christians to it. Geographical distribution of the Christians and the fortunes of the centers of Christian population. Service of faith in the dark days.

Fifth Lecture

THE DOWNFALL OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE COMMON RUIN

THERE is one cause for the ruin of the oriental churches that might in itself be considered sufficient to account for their downfall. Many different causes have operated to bring about that result. The force of national spirit and destiny, the grinding inequality of toleration, violent persecution, outbursts of fanatical and envious mobs, internal disorganization, spiritual apathy, voluntary apostasy, and the active propaganda of Islam may be mentioned; but more than all else the numerical decrease is due to anarchy, pestilence, famine and war. The population of Western Asia is undoubtedly far smaller to-day than it was a thousand years ago, and this in spite of the immigration of the Turks. The ruin has been a common ruin of the whole land and of all its inhabitants, and in it Christianity has shared.¹

¹An illustration of this general fact is to be found in the pitiful handful of Jews now in Mesopotamia and Babylonia compared with the large numbers in Sassanian and Arab times.

The tragic character of the whole history may be illustrated by a rapid survey of the wars that marked its course. The first conquest of Islam was rapid and the leaders were self-restrained. Hence these wars were less destructive than later ones and than those of Heraclius and Khusru in the generation preceding. Twenty-five years after the conquest the civil wars of Islam began in the struggle between Ali and Muawiya and at the same time began the Kharijite rebellions that by turn smoldered and burst into flame for centuries. The last years of the *Umayyids* were marked by insurrections out of which rose the new Abbasid line. Even in the palmy days of Harun ur Rashid we read of rebellions that ravaged Azarbaijan, Mosul, and Mesopotamia ; while after his death the empire was thrown into confusion by the struggle between his sons, in the course of which Baghdad itself was for a whole year in a state of siege. Other civil wars that were terribly destructive were the insurrection of Babek in Persia and the Zenj slave insurrections in the eighth century and the wars of the fanatical Qarmatians about the beginning of the ninth. Most of the wars with the emperors were waged in the territory of the Greeks, but the

tenth century witnessed inroads as far as Edessa in what had long been Arab territory. From the ninth century to the end of the twelfth the history is made up of the rise and fall of dynasties, most of them petty and local but some, as the Saljuks and the Ghaznivids, embracing vast territories, and of the wars of the Crusaders. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were those of Mongol invasion and dominion, closing with Timur. Pages might be taken up with the catalogue of raids, campaigns, sieges, and battles, and as time passed they were more and more barbarous, more terrible in destruction, and wanton in the sacrifice of life. The wars of the Mongols were unutterably savage. The invaders announced themselves to be the scourges of God to punish the world. In China it is said that the slain numbered seventeen and a half millions. In the sack of Baghdad eight hundred thousand human beings are said to have perished. Such numbers are incomprehensible, but not altogether incredible when we remember that the conquerors sometimes required the whole population of a city to go outside and there await the butcher's sword. The terror is shown by such stories as this of Maragha, where a single Mongol alone

went down a street and butchered a hundred people without any one raising a hand against him. Another Mongol in Mesopotamia, having left his sword behind him, commanded a victim to lie still till he fetched it, and he was obeyed. No wonder the Muslim historian Ibn al Athir, who was an eyewitness of what he depicted, says that for many years he could not bring himself to describe the catastrophe that to him seemed the destruction of Islam and the most terrible event in all history from the time of Adam till the great day when the race shall stand before God's throne.¹ Yet after Ibn al Athir came the most terrible scourge of all, Timur. It has been said that it was his mournful service to have swept away the vestiges of the past and that after him out of the chaos a new era began.²

In all these wars the Nestorian and Jacobite Christians were non-combatants, and during a part of the Mongol period they had some favor at the hands of the heathen kings.³ The former

¹ Müller, *Islam in Morgen-und Abendland*, ii. 199.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 311.

³ The only exceptions, so far as I know, to the statement that the Nestorians and Jacobites were non-combatants are the Christian mountaineers of Ahwaz, who fought with the Kharijites against the Khalifas (Muir, *Caliphate*, 292) and the

fact availed little to save them and the latter was a curse. They were perhaps the most civilized part of the population, either settled farmers living in villages, or merchants, artisans, and physicians living in the cities. They belonged to the class that would gather the wealth which would attract marauders and that would be least able to defend themselves. Along with war and in its wake came plague, cholera, fever and famine. In long continued war and especially in periods of anarchy the least part of the sufferings are those endured on the field of battle. Disease and hunger slay more than the sword.¹ In all these Christians shared. The favor of the Mongols to the Christians was vacillating and unreliable; the

mountaineers of the region north of Mosul. These last are mentioned by Thomas of Marga as being given to raids. He gives (ii. 523) the name of a village whose inhabitants had such a character. The name as well as the location is the same as that of a modern village in Tiari on the Zab. He gives the name as Zarn. The modern name is Zarni. In later times they were called *Qayaje* (Turkish, rock-dwellers) and figured largely in the siege of Arbil in the life of Mar Yahbhalaha.

¹ Von Kremer (*Culturgeschichte*, ii. 490ff.) has compiled a list of pestilences and famines during the first four centuries of Islam. It contains thirty-five pestilences and eleven famines or times of scarcity in regions that are directly related to our history.

control of the armies was slight and in massacre distinctions of creed would be obliterated; the number of Muhammadans in high position was almost always larger than that of Christians and in the rank and file they were far more numerous; and, finally, the Muhammadan reaction in hatred and revenge was exceedingly bitter. The Christians were most numerous in those portions of Western Asia that suffered most in the wars, because they were the most fertile, the most populous, the least defensible and on the great highways of the march of armies. A rapid survey of the regions containing Christian population will make this clearer.

The Jacobites were numerous in Cilicia, in Northern Syria, and in Western Mesopotamia. These regions were the scenes of the wars of the Khalifas and the emperors, to some extent of the Crusades, and of the conflict between the Mongols and the Mamluks of Egypt. In the first of these large numbers of prisoners were taken by both armies, and the Jacobites were not regarded as friends by the Greeks.¹ The lives of eastern

¹ Bar Hebræus complains bitterly of the treatment of the Jacobites by the Byzantines in the eleventh century. *Ec. Chron.*, i. 411f., 421ff., 433, 444; ii. 459f.

Christians lost through famine and by the sword in the sieges and counter-sieges of the Crusaders' principality at Edessa must have been many times over those of the European soldiery. In the wars of the Mongols and the Mamluks, both sides ravaged again and again the cities and plains of Syria and Cilicia, while Egyptian raids extended into Mesopotamia. In these wars the Christians must have suffered terribly; for while Muslims fought in both armies, Mongol and Egyptian, the Georgian and Armenian allies of the Mongol Khan were his great reliance and accordingly the Egyptians wreaked their vengeance on the Jacobites and other Christians.¹

Central and eastern Mesopotamia had a very large Christian population of both the Syrian Churches. In the civil wars from early times the Arabs swept back and forth across this region. The rebels who occasioned these wars were often Muslims of the most fanatical sort who rejected the rule of lukewarm Khalifas. At their hands

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 523, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 729. "At this time (C. 1259 A. D.) war, famine, and pestilence prevailed in the whole country, especially in the region of Miletene, which was devastated by the Agagrian Turkomans, so that all Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were filled with Christian slaves and maidens."—Cf. *Ibid.*, 771, 817, and iii. 431.

Christians would receive little mercy. With the fall of the power of the Khalifas the petty dynasties that rose were so oppressive that at one time twelve thousand of the Arab subjects of the princes of Nisibis fled to Byzantine territory, changing their religion, and thence raiding the country they had left.¹ Every Mongol army going to Syria and many who campaigned in Mesopotamia itself left behind it waste and desolation. The population of Mosul and the adjoining region was so largely Christian that the Mongols appointed Christian governors, but this probably brought only temporary relief from the growing hatred of the Muslims and ultimately increased the ruin. In A. D. 1262 Mosul was attacked by troops under a Christian general, and after a siege of six months the town capitulated. The whole population, except the artisans, was put to death. The latter were carried away captive. Later a thousand fugitives, who had fled to the mountains, returned to the city, only to be set on and massacred. Shortly before this the ruler of Mosul had cruelly persecuted the Christians, compelling them to abjure their faith, which was done by many, and at the same time

¹ Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 495.

the Kurds harassed the Christians in the villages and monasteries in the adjoining country.

That the Christians were not spared in the massacres of the Mongol troops is indicated by the successful efforts of the Nestorian bishop of Jezira to save the lives of its inhabitants, when his city was captured by the same army and the same general that had treated Mosul so cruelly, unless the bishop was interceding with the great Khan for his Muslim enemies only.¹ The feeling against the Christians was so bitter, partly due to the attempts of the Nestorian patriarch to carry things with a high hand, that he had first to leave Baghdad, then Arbil, and finally to fix his residence in Ushnuk in Azerbaijan, and this in the reign of Abaqa Khan, one of the most favorable of the Mongols to Christianity.² During the reign of Arghun, who was the most favorable of all to Christianity, Mosul was occupied for some time by a marauding band of Kurds and Turkomans from Egypt and the Muslims of the city made every endeavor to turn their fury against the Christians alone. All, Muslims, Jews and Christians, suffered robbery, rape, and murder.

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 516, 519f.

² *Ibid.*, 525, 571ff.

During the same reign, the Christian governor Masud being disgraced and murdered, the Muslim mobs of the city had their own way with the Christians. In recording it, Bar Hebræus, a contemporary, breaks out as he seldom does in his history, "The cruel persecutions which the people of Mosul suffered during these two months tongue cannot describe nor pen indite. Awake, O Lord, and do not sleep! Look at the blood of thy servants, shed without mercy. Have pity on thy church and flock, which are being torn by persecution."¹

In Baghdad the state of things was similar—the massacres of the Mongols, the passing favor to the Christians, and the fanatical hatred of the mobs. Southern Persia, including the regions of Fars and Khuzistan, where the Nestorians had been numerous, escaped largely the Mongol inroads, and during the period of their domination were ruled by petty dynasties. Yet the Christians disappear from history. It is easy to understand how this would be the case in the anarchy and the general bitterness against Christians after the Mongols. Khurasan was devastated in the first and most terrible onslaught of the Mongols

¹ Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 558, 565f.

under Jingsis Khan himself. Howorth says that "from the banks of the Oxus to Asterabad every town of any importance was reduced to ruins and its inhabitants slaughtered."¹ In Merv one author says there were 1,300,000 corpses and another that there were 700,000. In Nishapur all were decapitated, lest the living should hide under the dead. The only Christians that Mar Yabhahlaha and his companion mention in connection with their long journey westward, in A. D. 1278, were at Tus in Khurasan. One can only wonder that any were left. The facts so far have all been drawn from the history previous to Timur, and to understand fully the tragedy of the history, we must add to all the ruin described the fearful raid of that great scourge over all these regions, remembering that to native savagery he added the fanaticism nurtured in Islam by the Mongol atrocities and that the people at large were inflamed against the Christians with an unreasoning revenge. So perished Christianity utterly in many regions, while in others but an insignificant remnant was left. It was swept away not by deliberate persecution but by war and pestilence and by the passions born of violence and bloodshed.

¹ *History of Mongols*, i. 92.

Let us not forget the services it rendered in the dark days of its downfall, the faith and hope it gave to thousands, the courage with which some refused to save themselves by denying their Lord, and the heroism of others who strove to save the weak and imperiled. The lights and shades of the picture are vividly portrayed in the account of the siege of Arbil in the life of Mar Yahbhalaha. We see the Christians who held the castle, hardened, reckless, and ready to fight, part of them inhabitants of the place and part of them wild mountaineers. There are the common peasantry, inoffensive and helpless, the victims of massacre. On the other side are the treacherous Muslims, Kurds and Arabs, plotting to destroy the Christians. The Mongol court in Persia is distant, the communications uncertain, and the control loose. Two figures stand out in true heroism. One is that of the patriarch, vainly counseling the Christian hot-heads to give up their mad designs, trusting old friendships with some of the Muslims and the respect due to his honor and position, a man of peace and a faithful shepherd, making unavailing efforts to avert disaster and seeing his flock butchered before his eyes. The other figure is that of the Metropolitan of

Arbil, making long journeys on foot and in dangerous regions, once to Baghdad and again to Hamadan and on to Sultania, hundreds of miles, in order to bring influences to bear at the court to save the lives of his Catholicus and his flock, knowing, as the writer says, that otherwise "he would be guilty under the rule of truth and the law of Christ, because if he was a shepherd and a friend it was right to devote and give himself to death and to despise his life and bear all crosses." Finally he got orders for their protection, but they were of little avail. The patriarch escaped, but many others were killed. The hollow honor paid to the metropolitan and to the patriarch by the king and his courtiers was only an aggravation.¹ Syrians living to-day in the mountains of Kurdistan and in the plains of Persia have the tradition that their ancestors were refugees from Arbil at this time. It was a tragedy that was no doubt repeated many times over in the troubled ages and can be paralleled in the events of more recent years in Turkey.

Though the Muslims trembled for Islam in those terrible days, and though the destructive forces were barbarous and not religious, neverthe-

¹ *Mar Jabalaha*, Ch. xviii.

less much must be laid to the charge of Islam. These regions had been in its keeping for centuries. Many of the atrocities were committed by Muslims of races under the control of Islam for generations—and some, too, by Christian allies of the Barbarians. Muslim princes opened the doors of the eastern provinces to the Turks, and the Khalifas gave them employment. The danger was no new one. It was the old battle of Iran and Turan. In earlier ages the forces of civilization had held their own, but somehow they were so weakened under Islam that they could no longer defend themselves.

Sixth Lecture

**THE LIGHT OF THE PAST ON THE
FUTURE MISSIONARY CONFLICT**

Incentives from the failures of the past. Place of the oriental churches. The missionary character of the Syrian Churches. Our duty to them. The Christianity that can conquer. Its methods, its theological character, its vital relation to Christ.

Sixth Lecture

THE LIGHT OF THE PAST ON THE FUTURE MISSIONARY CONFLICT

THE Christian looks backward in order to look forward with greater clearness and in order to press forward with greater certainty. Our study will certainly be incomplete unless it be brought into some relation to the present duty and future course of the church in its missionary activity in Muslim lands. If history be the judgment of the world, the revelation of the relation of human actions and human character to the principles of divine righteousness, its verdict on the great religions must be of the highest value. If it be the revelation of the method of change and progress among men, the missionary must find in it much to guide him in his work.

Surely one lesson of the past is that a conflict is inevitable. These two great faiths have been in close contact for centuries and from its very inception Islam has been influenced by Christianity, but they have remained distinct and antago-

nistic. It was said long ago by a Nestorian apologist for Christianity that the faiths differed only in the acceptance of Muhammad by Muslims, and the same in substance is often said in our own time, the inference being that a conflict is unnecessary and that some sort of compromise may be reached, or some common ground found, so that the faiths may become coöperating forces. History shows no such tendency to agreement. The antagonism has grown sharper and the dazed and wondering welcome accorded the first Muslims has changed to sullen and bitter hatred. The very toleration accorded by Muslims to Christianity is a proof of the living power of Muhammad who established this law rather than an expression of the feeling of the Muslim Church to-day.

History shows that the limits set by Muhammad in the Quran to the acceptance of Christian teaching and the limits set in his practice to the principle of religious freedom are permanent and essential elements of Islam. It shows, furthermore, that while Islam is capable of very great modification, the supremacy of Muhammad is challenged only by those outside its pale. Shi'ite and Sunnite, Sufi and Wahabi, alike accept the

permanent authority of the Quran and the abiding apostolate of Muhammad, although they differ in other things. And does Christ have less honor among his followers? Can we yield his unique and absolute authority? In other words, the point of conflict is one of the first importance to both religions. Because the differences are defined and limited, the conflict is the sharper. Neither faith can compromise. The ultimate question is the personal supremacy of Muhammad or of Christ.

We find in the history incentives to active effort. One such is the very difficulty of the task. If Islam be, as is so often said, the most formidable enemy that the church meets in the battle-field of missions, if history shows that for long centuries Christianity and Islam have been face to face, and if the apparent victory rests with the Prophet who challenged the supremacy of the Christ, surely these are reasons for increased courage and activity. Because the conflict has been and, so far as we can see, will be one of special difficulty, the greater is the incentive.

The measure of success reached by Christianity and the courageous persistence with which ori-

ental Christians have held the faith is another incentive to effort. If a divided, distracted Christianity, tied down in its organization and theology to the divisive disputes of the past, cut off from the communion and aid of the church in other lands, reduced to a position of civil inferiority, and in the midst of anarchy and revolution, could do what the Nestorian Church did, what should we not be able to do in this age? The faithful confession of the name of Christ by the ancient Christian churches of the East is an inspiration to us who have known more of the fullness of that holy name. And the failures of the past urge us on, the double failure—that of Christianity to hold and to gain the supremacy and that of Islam to make right use of victory gained, so as to preserve the heritage of the past and to effect the moral regeneration of society. Nothing can be gained by attempting to conceal the failure of Christianity in Western Asia. Much is to be gained by learning the causes of its failure. Much more is to be hoped for by the realization of the fact that its failure in the past places us under obligations to prove its right to rule by its ability to overcome. And if the failure of Christianity is an incentive to effort, what shall we say

of the failure of Islam? Nothing reveals character more surely than success, and no failure is so fundamental as failure in success. Islam has so failed. Modern research is revealing more clearly year by year the ancient civilizations of Western Asia, and we are learning how highly developed they were, how magnificent were their cities, and how vast was the population. The glories of the early Khalifat and of the other Muslim dynasties that have ruled in more short-lived magnificence are but the relics of these ancient civilizations and not a new creation. In its glory Islam built Baghdad out of the ruins of Seleucia and Ctesiphon and in its decadence the Sultan worships in the church of the Emperors. Islam has failed to preserve the heritage of antiquity. The destructive forces have been barbarous and not religious, but Islam has failed to regenerate them. The nomad Arab is the same to-day as in the days of ignorance before Muhammad, and Arabia is still unknown and unexplored. The Turk has been supreme in Western Asia for nine hundred years, and for that period and longer Islam has been the religion of the Turkish conquerors, except for less than a century of the domination of heathen Mongols. In Europe Christianity con-

verted the barbarians, and since their conversion they have risen to heights of civilization never known before. It conquered the invaders and they became the benefactors of the world. In Western Asia, Islam also conquered the invaders, and they have learned some of the arts of civilization; but nevertheless the Turk remains a menace to the world. The most civilized and the most industrious portions of the population of Muhammadan lands are the Christians; Syrians, Armenians, Greeks, and Copts. A thousand years ago Islam was more tolerant than Christianity, but to-day Christendom is leaving toleration behind, a relic of the past, and grants freedom. The failure of Islam calls for the gospel.

A question very closely related to the history that we have studied is that of the relation of missionary work to the oriental churches. There are three different policies toward these churches in practice among missionaries. One is that of absorbing them into some larger church body. This has been practiced by the Church of Rome for centuries, and is the policy of the Orthodox Church of Russia toward all except the Greek branch of the Orthodox Eastern Church, which is of course its mother church. A second policy

is that of maintaining the old churches in their present organization. This is the policy of the Anglicans, embodied especially in the mission of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Assyrian Christians (*i. e.*, the Nestorians); but even with them it is not carried out rigorously, for in obedience to their theory of the church, the oriental churches, except the Orthodox Greek Church, are heretical and schismatic and accordingly ought to return to their mother church. They are thus led to sympathize with the aim of the Russian Church, but not with that of the Church of Rome. The third attitude is that of recognizing the necessity of a reformation which shall embody the positive results of the Protestant Reformation, even if the accomplishment of this end requires division and separation from the old church. Protestant missionaries began their work in these oriental churches with an earnest attempt to avoid any division in them. Perhaps it was attempting a difficult task without realizing the difficulties of the situation, but it was honest. It failed, and independent bodies have been organized, having polities allied to those of the churches sending the missionaries, but in theory entirely self-governing. It is not the purpose to

discuss these various policies, except to point out what seem to be the right deductions from the history as to general principles and aims, for such a discussion would involve the different views of the essential character and organization of the church and the content of Christian doctrine, loyalty to which is the basis of much of the divergence in missionary policy. Very much of sympathy and mutual appreciation of services done is possible where formal coöperation is impossible, and in the relations of the different Christian missions much is gained by the recognition of the fundamental differences that make the outward divergences inevitable.

The history of the past gives the oriental churches a right to consideration and sympathy. What they have done and what they have suffered alike demand this. We have no right to cut the children off from the memory and heritage of their fathers. They have a past full of inspiration and heroism to which they must be true. That same history also shows the necessity of reformation. The Church exists not for itself but for its Master and to accomplish the work which he came to do. The oriental churches have shown their inability to accomplish the

work that is theirs. This inability, so far as it is due to isolation calls for our coöperation. So far as it is due to an inadequate conception of Christian truth or to spiritual deadness, it calls for our aid and inspiration to higher things. The great aim of all efforts in their behalf is not to preserve them but to enable them to accomplish more fully the manifest duty and privilege that is theirs because of their situation and opportunity. To aid them merely for their own sake is not missionary work in a true sense, and much less is it a sufficient motive to work for them in order to proselyte them to our particular form of Christian teaching or church order. The supreme aim of work for them must be to enable them to accomplish their historic mission, which is distinctly missionary. All work for them and all methods of work should be subordinated to this great aim.

The truest loyalty to the past is to carry forward to completion its highest endeavors. If the mission of the oriental churches can best be accomplished by a change in their form of organization, surely that is warrant enough for such a course. What has just been said as to the endeavors of the past applies in a special way to the two Syrian Churches whose history we have been con-

sidering. They have been the missionary churches of the past in Asia. Even the Armenians owe their Christianity to them. They, too, have suffered most from Islam and from the anarchy of Asiatic history. The very absence of national ambitions and hopes makes them more easily moved by missionary appeals and makes their religion freer from political color. Their adaptation to missionary work, in the case of individuals, is one of the proven facts of the modern Protestant missionary endeavor in Persia. It is evident that in the accomplishment of this mission the oriental churches will need the best equipment possible, the strongest spiritual endowment, and the best training. The duty that rests upon us is not measured by their needs in themselves but by their needs in relation to the broader mission to which they have been called. Nor does the accomplishment of this mission depend necessarily on the reformation of the whole body. In missionary work from the beginning individuals have played a great part and if the net result of missions among these oriental churches be the raising up from them of single workers who accomplish great things for God, that is no small result. It is possible also that

members of any one of the oriental churches, having a new vision of the gospel of Christ and of the mission of the church, may do the greatest good when separated from the parent body. I do not believe that such separation should be sought, but experience shows that it is inevitable. The reformation of the old churches themselves may be hastened by the presence alongside of them of bodies of Christians practising a simpler and more active faith. Furthermore, the active proselyting efforts of the Roman Catholic and the Russian Orthodox Churches are tending constantly to the disintegration of the oriental churches, and practically, by force of theological theory and in spite of a real reluctance, the work of the Anglican Church tends in the same direction.

It is not too much to say that the only hope of national ecclesiastical existence and the accomplishment of their religious mission by the Syrian Churches is to be found in a Protestant reformation embodied in free churches. While holding this conviction, we can rejoice in the evidence, especially in the national Armenian Church, of regenerating influences and in the efforts of enlightened, devoted members of the

English-speaking Episcopal Churches to arouse a new spiritual life in the ancient churches under the conditions of their inherited forms of worship and church order. In brief, the policy of the Protestant missionaries in permitting separation from the ancient churches is justified by the fact of history that Christianity as expressed and limited by the forms of belief and organization of the oriental churches has failed to conquer Islam and that a reformation consequently is imperative in order to do so.

No lesson of the history is plainer than that it is not every form of Christianity that can meet Islam with success, and the question arises; What is the character of the Christianity that shall win the victory for the faith? It is not meant that we can or should mold our religion altogether to suit the needs of a particular conflict or that the fundamentals of faith can be tested in this way; but it is true that we should carefully examine our faith and not load it down with what is not essential in content or method. It is not oriental Christianity alone that has failed to meet adequately the needs of this great conflict, for Roman and Greek Catholicism have failed also. Both have been and are in contact with Islam

and have made very little impression on it. Roman Catholic missions in Turkey and Persia go back to the times of the Crusaders and of the Mongols, and they have very little to show for those centuries beside the proselyting of a considerable number of oriental Christians. Protestant missions are much more recent, the oldest not yet a century old, and it can at least be claimed confidently that they have made more impression on Islam than have the Roman Catholics. But there is no room for self-complacent comparison. The Christianity to meet Islam must be the best and strongest possible.

In method we can perhaps learn from both the faiths in their past conflict. One such lesson is the importance of enlisting in the service of missions the great force of commerce. The modern expansion of Christianity owes much to commerce, though commerce owes a heavier debt to missions. Christian merchants, however, are not yet reckoned among the active forces of missions, and yet why should they not be? In the work of the church at home and especially in the great cities the part taken by laymen is great and is increasing. Why should it not be so in the foreign field also? Why should not men go out

into the great roads of trade and the great marts of commerce to build up the kingdom of God, as the Empire of Britain has been built up by merchants? So also, while the part of physicians in the direct work of missions is very great, the kingdom of Christ owes but little so far to the services of physicians practising in foreign lands on their own account. Why, again, should there not be many such? In some respects they could do a work that no agent of a foreign missionary society could possibly do. Again, it may be questioned whether the modern missionary movement of Protestantism has availed itself as it ought of the monastic organization. A distinction may rightly be drawn between monasticism as a life, an ideal of spiritual attainment in itself, and monasticism as a method. Something can be said for the discipline of community life, but altogether aside from this, why should the method of community life, by which it is possible for men to live and work where the conditions make the establishment of families unadvisable, not be adopted and used by Protestants? The services of monks and darvishes alike suggest this lesson and it is folly to cast it aside because of its association with Roman Catholicism.

The work is so great, the needs so pressing, and the difficulties such that new forces and new methods are called for. The example and ideal of the Christian home with its practical illustration of the dignity and worth of womanhood are indispensable in Muslim lands; but there is a work of widespread evangelization that it would seem can best be accomplished by some adaptation of the principle of monastic organization.

The importance of freedom in organization is another lesson of the history. In this Islam had the great advantage over the developed form of Christianity. It was free and had no elaborate gradation in rank and in niceties of church order to enforce on new converts. Along with the simplicity of organization went a simplicity of statement of doctrine. Modern Christianity has learned in large measure the necessity of presenting the gospel in its simplest terms to new converts, but it may be doubted whether in educational and church work the same lesson has been so well learned. The sense of brotherhood, freedom, and equality within the pale of the faith has been a great force in Muslim expansion as it was in early Christianity. That feeling is obscured by anything which places a barrier between the

missionary and the people, or between part of the people and the rest. The difference in civilization, in kind as well as in degree, between the missionary and the people is a barrier, and is one reason that wide evangelization must be accomplished largely by a native agency. An elaborate and rigid organization of the church is another barrier. In educational work a system, a curriculum, too large a number of students, may be such barriers and may prevent the fellowship that is the very soul of discipleship. There is scarcely a better test, from the missionary's point of view, of the rightfulness of any method of church organization than that of the realization through it of equal fellowship in Christ. Such fellowship implies an equal share in the duties as well as in the privileges of the Christian life, if such a distinction be at all permissible. It makes the members, as no mere plan of organization can, individual forces in the expansive work, a consummation which more than any other one thing is the secret of rapid evangelization. When one reads of the rapid spread of Islam in Central Africa and in the East Indies, and realizes that its extension makes the work of Christian evangelization many times more slow

and difficult, it is impossible to repress the feeling that the Church of Christ needs not only a new baptism of zeal but also a new enduement of wisdom in order to meet the demands of the time. The great brotherhoods of darvishes are preaching Islam, unpaid and with little machinery, while the great Church of Christ moves ponderously.

Theologically Christianity will conquer Islam not because of what is common to the two religions, but because of what is different. It is folly to suppose that men will accept a new faith for anything except for its superiority over that which they possess; and the great superiority of Christianity is in those things which Islam does not have. Christ is greater than Muhammad because he is divine, and the Christian hope of life is more blessed than that of Islam because its foundations are different. It is based on an Atonement and is made possible by an Incarnation. The Christian idea of God is higher because of those elements and those facts that have led to the formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity.

Furthermore, the Christianity that can conquer Islam will hold these doctrines with no doubtful

assent but as living forces feeding the springs of life and answering the soul's deepest needs. They will be more than dogmas. Within the growing body of the church itself and on its outskirts, we must surely look for the same kind of development that is found in the early history of Christianity and in the history of Islam. I mean the springing up of variations and even perversions of doctrine. The almost entire absence of such phenomena, which marks the history of the oriental churches after a certain era, is an evidence of their weakness; and the recurrence of such events in the history of missions should be a cause of encouragement. The church to-day should have attained to a clearness in the apprehension of truth as well as to a charity in its relation to divergences in expressing it that will enable it to guide wisely the growth of belief in mission lands. It is inconceivable that an elaborate system of theology such as Islam possesses can be at once replaced by a system of Christian theology. A process must intervene and in that process variations must arise. No fact in modern Persian life is more truly full of encouragement than the way in which the Bible is entering into the intellectual life of the coun-

try. It is perplexing to meet a keen Babi controversialist and to find how he can turn to his own ends the statements of prophecy and of doctrine in the Bible, but it is also to be welcomed as a proof that Christianity has a hold on the mind of the people beyond the narrow limits of direct missionary influence. The Christianity that will conquer must be able to take hold of the simple, ignorant folk, and also to enter into the thought and life of the cultured and intellectual. It must be able to replace a false philosophy with a true and to grapple with the metaphysical problems that hold the oriental mind.

Finally, it must realize that the real conqueror is Christ and the real force is his Spirit. The truths that Islam lacks are found in him—the Incarnation by which God has brought man into living union with himself, the forgiveness on the basis of an Atonement, the Fatherhood of God, at once righteous and merciful. The contrast of Islam and Christianity is the contrast between Christ and Muhammad, that is, the contrast of the ideals to which the religions are tending, obscured in history but fixed in the foundations of the faiths and inalienable from them. I do not see how any man, Christian in even the remotest

sense, can fail to acknowledge the superiority, nay the indispensableness, of Christianity, if the question be brought to this test, whether he would be willing himself or could counsel any other to put Muhammad where he holds Christ. In this point of view, one cannot but agree with Joseph Parker in saying, "There are comparative religions, but Christianity is not one of them." The story of Jesus Christ, his character, his love, his death, denied by the Prophet in shallow flattery—the preaching of these shall win men to him. The character of Christ, exemplified in the purity of the home, in the tenderness of the physician, in the righteous life and preaching of the missionary, shall lead men to realize something of holiness and of sin. And the patience of Christ, his self-devotion, his love to the very end, these shall give us the power to endure, though the conflict be long and difficult. And Christ, the living Son of God, shall himself be with us and lead us on to victory.

APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

	A. D.	A. H.
Council of Ephesus, Condemnation of Nestorius	431	
Council of Chalcedon, Monophysitism condemned	453	
Organization of Nestorianism in Persian Empire	ca. 490	
Organization of Jacobite Church . . .	ca. 550	
Birth of Muhammad	570	
Wars of Heraclius and Khusru . . .	610—626	
Beginning of Muhammad's prophetic career	611	
The Flight to Medina, the Hijra . . .	622	I
The Death of Muhammad	632	II
Four "Orthodox" Khalifas, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali	632—661	11—40
Conquest of Jerusalem, Syria	637	16
Conquest of Persia	642	21
Umayyid Khalifas of Damascus . . .	661—750	41—132
John of Damascus	700—750	
Abbasid Khalifas of Baghdad	756—1258	132—656
Harun ur Rashid	786—809	170—193
Mamun, Khalifa	813—833	198—218
Timothy, Nestorian Patriarch	780—820	163—205
Samanids, rulers of Khurasan and Transoxiana	874—999	261—389
Buwayhids, rulers of Baghdad	945—1055	334—447
Sultans of Ghazna, rulers of Persia . .	997—1040	387—431
Seljuk Turks	1037—1300	429—700

228 *ISLAM AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES*

Saladin	1169—1193	564—589
Crusades	1100—1250	
Mongol rule in Persia, etc.	1220—1349	617—750
Jingis Khan	1206—1227	603—624
Hulagu Khan	1256—1265	654—663
Sack of Baghdad and murder of Khalifa	1258	658
Ghazan Khan	1295—1304	694—703
Timur (Tamerlane)	1369—1405	771—807

APPENDIX II

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE.—The following list makes no pretensions to be exhaustive in any sense, or even to contain the names of all the works quoted in the foregoing pages or consulted in their preparation. It is intended merely to suggest some of the most useful books. Full bibliographies may be found in Zwemer's *Arabia, the Cradle of Islam*, and in Arnold's *The Preaching of Islam*.

Lives of Muhammad.

Sir William Muir,
Johnstone's Muhammad and His Power,
Sprenger's Life—(in German).

The Quran.

Translations with introductions and notes, especially Palmer's, Rodwell's, and Sale's,
Sell's Historical Development of the Quran,
Poole's Selections from the Koran.

General Account of Islam.

Hughes, Dictionary of Islam,
Sell, Faith of Islam, Essays on Islam,
Ameer Syed Ali, Life and Teachings of Mohammed or The Spirit of Islam,
Zwemer, Arabia, the Cradle of Islam,
Lane, Modern Egyptians.

Oriental Christianity.

Harnack's History of Christian Dogma,
(Also general works on Church History and Encyclopedias),
(For special investigation, Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, Abbeloos et Lamy, Gregorii Heberæi Chronicon Ecclesiasticum,
Bedjan, Gregorii Heberæi Chronicon Syriacum,
Chabot, Histoire de Mar Jabalaha III.)

Origins of Islam.

Deutsch, Literary Remains,
Geiger, Judaism and Islam,
Wellhausen, Skizzen and Vorarbeiten, iii.,
Smith, Bible and Islam,
St. Clair-Tisdall, Sources of Islam.

History of Islam.

Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory,
Muir, The Caliphate,
Freeman, History of the Saracens,
Von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients,
Müller, Der Islam im Morgen-und Abendland,
Howorth, History of the Mongols.

APPENDIX III

THE DIVISIONS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY

The following brief statement is inserted for the benefit of readers who may not have access to church histories.

Christianity in its first spread took hold of the Greek and the Syrian peoples and very soon after of the inhabitants of Egypt. During the first five Christian centuries the Armenians and Abyssinians as peoples and considerable numbers of Persians and Arabs accepted Christianity. Various causes gave rise to the theological controversies that make up so much of the history of the church. These controversies gave occasion and furnished leaders for divisions which followed linguistic and racial lines. Thus the Greeks formed the great body of the Orthodox or Greek Eastern Church, the Syrians divided between the Nestorian and Jacobite Churches and later the Maronite Church, the bulk of the people of Egypt formed the Coptic Church, while the Abyssinians and Armenians form the national churches of

those names. In fact, wherever Christianity became the national faith one or more national churches were formed. The ruling conception of the church and the temper of Christianity made schism the natural way for the formation of such churches. The persecuting policy of the emperors tended to widen and embitter differences in theological belief. The condemnation of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus in A. D. 431 was a blow at the Antiochian school of theology, which was already dominant at Edessa and further East. The Persian kings were some of them bitter persecutors of Christianity and the Christians living within the Persian Empire were suspected of treasonable intentions to aid the Roman power when engaged in war with Persia. The leaders of the Persian Church, especially Barsumas, bishop of Nisibis, saw that by espousing the Nestorian cause they would remove this suspicion and gain a more favorable position in the Persian kingdom. The Jacobite writers charge that the Persian authorities favored the Nestorians so far as to persecute in their interest. A minority of the Christians in the Persian Empire, however, refused to accept Nestorianism. Some of these were later identified

with the Jacobite Church, while others remained faithful to the Orthodox Church and were called Melchites, *i. e.*, adherents of the (Greek) king. The process that resulted in the organization of the Nestorian Church was completed about sixty years after the Council of Ephesus.

The peculiar Christological teaching that became the distinguishing mark of the Nestorian Church introduces a third term into the formula that defines the Person of Christ and says that in his single person he possesses not only two distinct natures but also two hypostases or personalities, one divine and one human, insisting that an impersonal nature is inconceivable. Syria, purged by the government of Nestorianism, refused to accept the "Orthodox" faith and the mass of the people joined the opposite wing and accepted Monophysitism, maintaining not merely the union but also the fusion of the divine and human natures. It is unnecessary here to mention the various subdivisions of Monophysite teaching. In spite of opposition by the government, Monophysitism held its own and finally, about a century after its condemnation by the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451), was organized by Jacob Baradai into what has been known as

the Jacobite Church. It was in reality the national Syrian Church within the bounds of the Eastern Empire. The growth of the Arab power speedily brought them for the most part, though not entirely, under Muslim rule. Aside from the Christological differences, the Nestorian and Jacobite Churches differed from each other in that the former was simpler in its worship and practices. Its liturgy is briefer and more primitive. The differences are important merely because they furnished boundaries and barriers. The other churches do not enter into the scope of this work and cannot be discussed here. Their development was along national lines and in the case of the Armenians especially the theological difference seems to have been entirely fortuitous.

APPENDIX IV

THE CONSTITUTION OF UMAR (From Arnold's *Preaching of Islam*, 52f.)

"The So-Called Ordinance of Umar.

" This formula is traditionally said to have been the one adopted by the Christian cities that submitted to the Muslim army ; but none of the earliest Muhammadan historians give it, and Sir William Muir doubts its authenticity and considers that it contains oppressive terms that are more characteristic of later times than of the reign of the tolerant Umar. 'In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate! This is the writing from the Christians of such and such a city to Umar ibnu-l Khattab. When you marched against us, we asked of you protection for ourselves, our families, our possessions and our coreligionists ; and we made this stipulation with you, that we will not erect in our city or the suburbs any new monastery, church, cell or hermitage ; that we will not repair any of such buildings that may fall into ruins, or renew those that may be situated in the Muslim quarters of

the town; that we will not refuse the Muslims entry into our churches either by night or by day; that we will open the gates wide to passengers and travelers; that we will receive any Muslim traveler into our houses and give him food and lodging for three nights; that we will not harbor any spy in our churches or houses, or conceal any enemy of the Muslims; that we will not teach our children the Quran; that we will not make a show of the Christian religion nor invite any one to embrace it; that we will not prevent any of our kinsmen from embracing Islam, if they so desire. That we will honor the Muslims and rise up in our assemblies when they wish to take their seats; that we will not imitate them in our dress, either in the cap, turban, sandals, or parting of the hair; that we will not make use of their expressions of speech, nor adopt their surnames; that we will not ride on saddles, or gird on swords, or take to ourselves arms or wear them, or engrave Arabic inscriptions on our rings; that we will not sell wine; that we will shave the front of our heads; that we will keep to our own style of dress, wherever we may be; that we will wear girdles round our waists; that we will not display the cross upon

our churches or display our crosses or our sacred books in the streets of the Muslims, or in their market-places ; that we will strike the bells in our churches lightly ; that we will not recite our services in a loud voice, when a Muslim is present, that we will not carry palm-branches or our images in procession in the streets, that at the burial of our dead we will not chant loudly or carry lighted candles in the streets of the Muslims or their market-places ; that we will not take any slaves that have already been in the possession of Muslims, nor spy into their houses ; and that we will not strike any Muslim. All this we promise to observe, on behalf of ourselves and our coreligionists, and receive protection from you in exchange ; and if we violate any of the conditions of this agreement, then we forfeit your protection and you are at liberty to treat us as enemies and rebels.' ”

But Von Kremer, the best historian of the Arab rule, takes a much more unfavorable view of Umar's character and says, “ So Umar established that fanatical, intolerant attitude, which for more than a thousand years has been an essential characteristic of Islam. It was his inflexible, strong spirit, full of scorn and contempt toward all non-

Muslims in the conquered lands, which Umar inspired into Islam, and this spirit has worked on through a long course of centuries as its chief force and life principle."¹

¹ *Geschichte des Herrschenden Ideen des Islams*, 333.

APPENDIX V

THE RELATION OF THE PATRIARCHS TO THE KHALIFAS

The following historical incidents will serve to illustrate what this relation was :

1. In Sassanian Times.

About 425 Marabokht was ordained patriarch at the command of Bahram's generalissimo, whom he had bribed.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 20, ed. Abbeloos—Lamy, n., p. 54.

During the patriarchate of Elisha (520–532) a rival Narses intrigued for the support of the king. The former was aided by the royal physician and the king finally put Narses in prison, where he died.—Assemani, *Bib. Orientalis*, III. 1:167; *De Catholicis*, 23.

Joseph (552–555) was elected patriarch by the aid of Khusru Anushirvan. He was later deposed, and during his time a synod passed a canon against ecclesiastics who obtained preferment through the influence of kings or of others in authority.—Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 29.

The same statements are made of his successor, Ezekiel (567–580).—*De Catholicis*, 31.

Khusru Parviz interfered to secure the election and later the deposition of Gregory (A. D. 604–608) and to his opposition was due the interregnum from 608 till 628, *De Catholicis*, 31.—*Thomas of Marga*, ii. 89f.

These incidents show that the Sassanian kings were accustomed to exercise some right of control in the election of patriarchs and that the Arabs in their policy followed an already existing precedent.

2. *The Diplomas Granted to the Patriarchs.*

The Nestorian writers claim that Ishuyabh II. (628–647) received a firman of some sort from Muhammad and again from Umar, *De Catholicis*, 41ff., *Thomas of Marga*, II., 123, note. Also that his successor Marameh obtained one from Ali, *De Catholicis*, 43f.

Bar Hebræus in his *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* mentions a number of instances in which such diplomas were given to Jacobite patriarchs: A. D. 744 to John by Marwan (i. 309), A. D. 755 to Isaac by Mansur (i. 317), A. D. 755 to Sandal by Mansur (i. 319), A. D. 762 to David, while a rival George was tortured for assuming office without

such authority (i. 325), A. D. 1095 to Athanasius by Ahu Jafar (ii. 465), A. D. 1208 to John by Sultan Iz-ed Din (ii. 625), also to a patriarch from the Khalifa A. D. 1080 (iii. 307). Similar mention is made of the Jacobite Maphriana A. D. 1112 (iii. 317) and of the Nestorian patriarch Abraham III. A. D. 905 (iii. 229). The practice passed over into Mongol times, when the Jacobite patriarch and Maphriana received papers from the Mongol king, A. D. 1264 (iii. 433). Such papers were also given to the Nestorian patriarch Mar Yahbhalaha.

3. *Violent Interference of the Government in Church Affairs.*

George, the Nestorian patriarch (660–680) was imprisoned by an Arab governor to extort money.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, 131. Above p. 130.

Khnanishu, Nestorian patriarch (685–699), imprisoned by Abd al Malik in interest of a rival John, who was himself later imprisoned by the Khalifa.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, 131ff. Above p. 130.

Imprisonment of three patriarchs by Mansur. See above p. 152 for narrative.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, 135f.

Theodosius, Nestorian patriarch (852–858) was imprisoned by Mutawakkil on account of the

Khalifa's anger against Bokhtishu, a Nestorian patriarch.—Bar Hebræus, iii. 191f.

George, Jacobite patriarch, imprisoned and tortured in A. D. 762 by Mansur and his rival David made patriarch. Later Mahdi released George.—*Syriac Chronicle*, edited by Brooks, Z D M G ii. 587, Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 333.

Marwan imprisoned John, Jacobite patriarch, at the instigation of certain bishops in order to extort money from him.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 309.

In A. D. 755 Mansur compelled the Jacobite bishops to elect one Isaac patriarch because of his supposed medical skill, but on the exposure of his ignorance he was killed by the Khalifa.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 315.

The next Jacobite patriarch, Sandal, was set up by the force of the Khalifa and later killed by the Christians.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 319.

Other Nestorian patriarchs said by Bar Hebræus to have been elected by the aid and sometimes the violent interference of the government are Mari (A. D. 987, iii. 255), John II. (A. D. 1000, iii. 261), Ishuyabh (A. D. 1020, iii. 285), Saurishu (A. D. 1061, iii. 301), Yahbhalaha (A. D. 1190, iii. 371).

Assemani mentions also the following as having been elected through the influence of the Khalifas and usually the intrigues of the royal physicians: Joshua bar Nun (820-824), B. O. ii. 435; George (825-829), B. O. ii. 435; Abraham II. (836-841) *De Catholicis* 94; Abraham III. (A. H. 292-325), B. O. ii. 440.

Two orthodox patriarchs of Antioch were killed by the Khalifas. After the death of the first of these there was a vacancy of forty years on account of the opposition of the Khalifa. These were Alexander II., 695-702, and Christopher, 960-966 (Cf. Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 190). Neale's *Patriarchate of Antioch*, 167ff. See also Appendix VII.

APPENDIX VI

MOBS AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS

The following examples of mobs will illustrate the troubles that must have assailed the Christians whenever the government was weak, as it was the most of the time. They are all taken from the *Ecclesiastical Chronicle* of Bar Hebræus.

A Mardin Christian having been caught in adultery with an Arab woman was tortured and all his goods confiscated. A church built by him was changed into a mosque. About the same time a monk apostatized to Islam but repenting fled to Jerusalem. In consequence the Christians of Mardin, and especially his brothers, suffered severe exactions.—ii. 561f.

The Monastery of Mar Cyriacus on the upper Euphrates was sacked by an apostate to Islam, whose father, a wealthy physician named Shimon, had founded it.—ii. 723f.

About A. D. 830. A Jacobite of Takrit being accused of reviling the prophet was seized by a mob, taken to Baghdad, and put to death by the government on refusing to apostatize.—iii. 183.

A. D. 832. Five churches in Basra were destroyed by a mob.—iii. 189.

A. D. 885. A mob sacked the Nestorian patriarchal residence, disinterring the preceding patriarch's body and carrying it about the streets. The occasion was a charge of insult to a Muslim corpse made by beggars who had been turned off from the patriarchal door.—iii. 209f.

A. D. 990. Mobs destroyed Christian churches in Baghdad and continued for some time to ravage the Christian quarter in spite of the attempts of the government to quiet them.—iii. 257f., 261–269.

A. D. 1057. The Nestorian patriarchal residence in Baghdad sacked by troops from Khorasan.—iii. 299.

A. D. 1075. The Jacobite Church in Takrit robbed by the Turks.—iii. 303.

The churches of Takrit destroyed by mobs and the Christians of the place scattered.—iii. 309. About twenty years later they returned and an Armenian was appointed governor of the place.—iii. 317.

During the twelfth century devastations by Kurds in the region of Mosul, a Jacobite bishop killed in his cell, churches and monasteries de-

stroyed, and in the mountains four hundred Nestorian villages ravaged.—iii. 361, 363ff.

A. D. 1215. Mobs in Takrit stopped only by the payment by the Christians of 20,000 gold dinars.—iii. 391.

A. D. 1231. The Kurds of Tur Abdin ravaged the Christian villages of the region and the Jacobite Maphriana killed in an attack.—iii. 405.

Of course these incidents are scattered over a very long period, but they are doubtless typical of what were not infrequent occurrences.

In his *Syriac Chronicle* Bar Hebræus gives the following additional instances of mobs.

C. 885. The Monastery in Baghdad sacked, also new additions to church in Tarsus.—p. 164.

C. 920. Mobs sacked residence of Abdullah, a Christian physician and of Christian lawyers.—p. 174.

C. 971. Two Arabs were killed near a Nestorian monastery in Mosul and the Christians escaped only by the payment of 120,000 dirhams.—p. 192.

APPENDIX VII

BRIBERY AND OTHER EVIDENCES OF WEALTH OF THE CHRISTIANS

The following instances are from Bar Hebræus' *Ecclesiastical Chronicle*.

Ishuyabh III., Nestorian patriarch 647–657, is said to have resorted to bribing the Arab authorities in order to prevent the Jacobites building a church in Mosul.—iii. 127.

John, Jacobite patriarch (A. D. 744), is said to have taken fifty camel-loads of presents to Marwan.—i. 307.

John bar Bukhtishu, Nestorian bishop of Mosul (C. A. D. 900), used to go about his diocese in great state with a crowd of Greek and Nubian servants in livery fit for a king and with a train of baggage that required six camels, besides a number of mules.—iii. 233.

About the same time the Nestorian patriarch spent 30,000 dinars in accomplishing the expulsion from Baghdad of the patriarchs and metropolitans of the other sects.—iii. 237.

Abraham, Nestorian patriarch (C. A. D. 912), said to have received 100,000 dirhams for the ordination of a bishop of Baghdad, 100,000 for the ordination of one of Mosul, and 700,000 for the ordination of one of Nisibis.—iii. 241.

Ishuyabh, Nestorian patriarch (C. A. D. 1190), secured his place by a bribe of 5,000 dinars (iii. 285), and Yahbhalaha by one of 7,000 dinars (iii. 371), and his successor Saurishu by a like sum.—iii. 370.

The Jacobite Maphriana of Mosul (C. A. D. 1189) paid 3,000 dinars in order to be recognized by the governor of Mosul and permitted to enter that city.—iii. 381.

A bribe of 6,000 dinars was promised the prince of Amid in behalf of a candidate for the Jacobite patriarchate, but the intrigue was frustrated by the Metropolitan of Amid.—ii. 609.

During a long continued rivalry and schism in the Jacobite Church (A. D. 1252–1261) bribes were paid to the Franks, the Seljuk Sultan, and the Mongols in behalf of both candidates.—ii. 709–727, 733ff.

APPENDIX VIII

APOSTATES FROM CHRISTIANITY TO ISLAM

When Mansur imprisoned the three Christian patriarchs (above p. 152) many Christians became Muslim.—Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 67–69.

Mahdi, being angered, brought force to bear on the Christians of Aleppo and 5,000 apostatized. (Above p. 152).—Bar Hebræus, *Syr. Chron.*, 127.

C. A. D. 780. Joseph, bishop of Merv, an unsuccessful aspirant to the Nestorian patriarchate was persuaded by the Khalifa Mahdi to embrace Islam, but he later fled to Roman territory, no doubt to escape Islam.—Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 77, B. O. iii.: 1, 160; *Thomas of Marga*, ii. 383.

Bar Hebræus states that the cause of his apostasy was the charge of sodomy.—*Ec. Chron.*, iii. 171.

C. A. D. 798. A general apostasy to Islam in the region of Aleppo.—*Ec. Chron.*, i. 335.

C. 900. Theodore, Nestorian bishop of Beth Garmai, deposed for immorality, later caught in adultery with an Arab woman, became Muslim.—*Ec. Chron.*, iii. 227f.

C. 840. It was proven that Enoch, a disciple and protégé of the Nestorian patriarch Abraham II had at one time apostatized to Islam. He was freed from annoyance only by the payment of a large sum of money to the government and had to give up his ecclesiastical offices.—Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 94, B. O. iii. : 1, 508.

A. D. 962. Gabriel, Metropolitan of Persia, failed to be elected Nestorian patriarch because of the apostasy of his brother to Islam.—B. O., iii. : 1, 199.

A. D. 962. Philoxenus, Jacobite Bishop of Azerbaijan, became Muslim because of immorality.—Bar Hebræus, iii. : 1, 247.

C. A. D. 1050. Ignatius, the Jacobite Maphriana, being convicted of adultery, apostatized to Islam. Later he was reduced to poverty and became a beggar. He left behind him a penitential hymn.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, iii. 287f.

C. A. D. 1080. Cyzicus, the Jacobite bishop of Amid, became Muslim.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, i. 453.

C. A. D. 1155. Aaron, Jacobite bishop of Khdetha, became Muslim, having been caught in adultery. His after life was checkered. Became Christian again and wandered in various places

and joined various sects.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 517f.

C. A. D. 1252. David, Jacobite bishop of Khabur, failing in his ecclesiastical ambitions, accepted Islam.—*Ec. Chron.*, ii. 711.

C. A. D. 1517. The Jacobite patriarch became Muslim, afterwards repented and went to Cyprus, where he resumed the patriarchal office.—*Ec. Chron.*, ii. 847.

C. A. D. 1560. The Jacobite patriarch became Muslim, repented of it, and finally went to Rome.—*Ec. Chron.*, ii. 848.

APPENDIX IX

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

I have found the following references to such writings: John of Damascus and Theodore Abuqara, Von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii. 402.

Abraham, a monk of Beth Khale (C. A. D. 670) is mentioned in the catalogue of Audishu as having written a treatise against the Arabs.—B. O., iii.: 1, 205.

C. 800. Abu Nuh wrote a work on the Quran.—B. O., iii.: 1, 212.

C. 820. The Nestorian patriarch Timothy left a work of debates with the Khalifas.—B. O., iii.: 1, 162.

Elijah of Nisibis (eleventh century) wrote a disputation with Abulkasim on the subject of religion.—B. O., iii.: 1, 270.

Another anonymous tract against Muslims, Jews, Jacobites, and Melchites is mentioned.—B. O., iii.: 1, 303.

C. A. D. 1171. Dionysius Bar Slibhi wrote a

tract against Arabs, Jews, Nestorians, Chalcedonians, and Armenians.—Bar Hebræus, *Ec. Chron.*, ii. 562, n. 1, B. O., ii. 210.